



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

This newsletter is part of Inter Press Service (IPS) and Soka Gakkai International (SGI) project. It includes independent news and analyses as well as columns by experts, news from international NGOs and a review of the global media for a glimpse of what is happening on the ground. Newspaper articles reproduced in this newsletter are for personal use and aim at giving information to readers. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is forbidden.

In-Depth Reports

Nuclear Weapon Free Northeast Asia Is Possible

While existing tensions in Northeast Asia continue to be a source of concern and urgent action is required to diffuse these and bring about meaningful cooperation, a nuclear-weapon free zone (NWFZ) in the region is possible and should in fact be a priority, according to an international conference held in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, on November 26.

➤ Pages 2-3

Why Nuke Disarmament Could Still Be The Most Important Thing There Is

HELSINKI - At the height of the Cold War the world's total arsenal of nuclear weapons, counted as explosive potential, may have amounted to three million Hiroshima bombs. The United States alone possessed 1.6 million Hiroshimas' worth of destructive capacity. Since then, much of this arsenal has been dismantled and the uranium in thousands of nuclear bombs has been converted to nuclear power plant fuel. ➤ Pages 4-5

Humanitarian Impact Of Nukes Calls For Concerted Action by Daisaku Ikeda

As we approach the 70th anniversary next year of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, there are growing calls to place the humanitarian consequences of their use at the heart of deliberations about nuclear weapons.

➤ Pages 6-7

A Nuclear Weapon Free Zone For North-East Asia? by Jayantha Dhanapala

In 2015 it will be 70 years since the horrible bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the USA – the only time nuclear weapons were ever used. The urgent need to seek solutions over nuclear weapons in North-east Asia was highlighted in the following paragraphs from the Asia Pacific Leaders Network's (APLN) Jakarta Declaration of September 2014:

➤ Pages 8-9-10

Translations ➤ Page 10

What Others Say

Nuclear Weapons As Bargaining Chips In Global Politics

Has the world reached a stage where nuclear weapons may be used as bargaining chips in international politics? So it seems, judging by the North Korean threat to conduct another nuclear test – if and when the 193-member U.N. General Assembly adopts a resolution aimed at referring the hermit kingdom to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for human rights abuses. ➤ Pages 11-12

A Plea for Banning Nuke Tests and Nuclear Weapons by Lassina Zerbo

Executive Secretary of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBT)

December 1938 was a decisive month in human history: In Germany, the scientists Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassmann discovered that when bombarded with neutrons, the atomic nucleus of uranium would split. The discovery of nuclear fission laid the basis of nuclear technology with all its manifestations – in the short term, the most destructive weapon ever devised and used a few years later in the Second World War. ➤ Pages 13-14

IPS Honours Crusader For Nuclear Abolition

Jayantha Dhanapala was awarded the IPS International Achievement Award for Nuclear Disarmament on Nov. 17 at the United Nations in New York. ➤ Pages 14-15

The Clock Is Ticking For Disarmament by Jayantha Dhanapala ➤ Pages 16-17

Civil Society Perspective

Complacency Is Slowly Killing The Non-Proliferation Regime ➤ Pages 18-19



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Nuclear Weapon Free Northeast Asia Is Possible

By JAMSHED BARUAH

GENEVA - While existing tensions in Northeast Asia continue to be a source of concern and urgent action is required to diffuse these and bring about meaningful cooperation, a nuclear-weapon free zone (NWFZ) in the region is possible and should in fact be a priority, according to an international conference held in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, on November 26.



Conference 'Dimensions to create a Nuclear-Weapon Free Northeast Asia' | Credit: ICAN

Mongolia's single-state NWFZ is a strong illustration of leadership in this area, and should serve as an example to other states wishing to take action against nuclear weapons and the dangers they pose, final document of the international Conference 'Dimensions to create a Nuclear-Weapon Free Northeast Asia' stated.

The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) Northeast Asia and Blue Banner, Ulaanbaatar Focal Point of GPPAC, organized the conference under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Economic Development of Mongolia.

Over 60 people, including civil society representatives and scholars from Guangzhou, Hong Kong, Kyoto, Pyongyang, Seoul, Taipei, Tokyo, Ulaanbaatar and Vladivostok, as well as representatives of the GPPAC Global Secretariat in The Hague, attended the conference.

The conference considered "Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and the role that the country could play in promoting greater confidence, stability and non-proliferation in the region". It reaffirmed the participants' commitment to conflict prevention, peace-building and non-proliferation in the region, as reflected in the previous statements of GPPAC Northeast Asia in the 2005 Tokyo Agenda, the 2006 Mt Kumgang Action Plan, and the 2007 and 2010 Ulaanbaatar statements.

The participants were of the view that addressing issues of the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons detonation, accidental or intentional, was an important and timely measure that would allow the international community to maintain high awareness of the urgency of nuclear disarmament by deepening the understanding of the devastating consequences of nuclear detonation.

Hence they welcomed the holding of two conferences on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons in Oslo, Norway in 2013 and in Nayarit, Mexico in 2014, and the civil society involvement therein.

The Oslo conference addressed the consequences of a nuclear weapon detonation through a humanitarian lens, while the Nayarit conference allowed a deeper understanding of such consequences focusing on long-term effects as well as effects on public health, environment, climate change, food security, displacements and development.

They said that they expected third conference, to be held in Vienna on December 8 and 9, to highlight further the urgency of abolishing nuclear weapons by hearing further testimonies, looking at consequences of nuclear weapon tests, and the risks of human and technical error and would contribute to starting negotiations aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons. ➔



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Therefore they called upon civil society organizations to take an active part in both the governmental conference and the civil society forum being organized by ICAN (International Campaign for Abolition of Nuclear Weapons) on December 6 and 7 in Vienna.

Complete abolition of nuclear weapons

Participants reaffirmed their conviction that the only effective guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons was their complete prohibition and elimination through conclusion of international legally binding instrument to this effect.

In view of this, they rejected modernization of existing nuclear weapons and development of new types of such weapons as acts inconsistent with the goals and obligations of nuclear disarmament.

They welcomed the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations to designate September 26 as International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, the convening in 2013 of a high level meeting on nuclear disarmament and its outcome, and called upon states to convene the second meeting not later than 2018 so as to identify concrete measures and actions to eliminate nuclear weapons in the shortest possible time.

In the interim, they called on the international community to commence negotiations and adopt without delay a universal and legally binding instrument on negative security assurances. The conference also expressed its support for the Republic of the Marshall Islands' Nuclear Zero lawsuits, holding the nine nuclear-armed nations accountable for failing to comply with their obligations under the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

2015 NPT Review Conference

The participants discussed at length the preparations for the 2015 NPT Review, which was the cornerstone of the disarmament and non-proliferation regime. They called upon nuclear-weapon states to fully comply with their obligations to nuclear disarmament under Article VI of the NPT, and fully implement the 13 practical steps towards nuclear disarmament agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference as well as the Action Plan adopted at the 2010 Review Conference, in particular Action 5.

The conference reaffirmed the important role that NWFZs play in strengthening regional and international security, and expressed support for strengthening the existing ones. In that respect it expressed concern that despite the agreements reached by the states parties to

the NPT in 1995, 2000 and 2010, the international conference on the establishment of a Middle East NWFZ had not been held and expressed the hope that such a conference would be held before the 2015 NPT Review Conference.

According to the final document, the participants expressed concern over the persisting tensions in the Northeast Asian (NEA) region, including on and around the Korean peninsula. They believed that the Six Party Talks (involving South Korea and North Korea, China, Russia, Japan and the U.S.) still could play an important role in addressing some of their causes, and that other forms of dialogue to contribute to a permanent peace regime be sincerely pursued.

"The participants believed that confidence-building measures to improve relations and a broad approach to addressing this issue, including the feasibility of establishing a NEA-NWFZ, were practically useful, and that the nuclear umbrella and extended nuclear deterrence needed to be given up altogether."

The conference welcomed the Mongolian President's proposal to promote the Ulaanbaatar Dialogue on Northeast Asian Security as an effective way to reduce mistrust and promote mutual understanding and greater confidence.

It expressed the view that civil society needed to play its role in promoting understanding and dialogue in the region and reiterated their commitment to continue cooperation of civil society organizations with a view to developing and strengthening a shared vision for a peaceful and stable Northeast Asia, as the Ulaanbaatar Process proposed by GPPAC Northeast Asia in 2007 and currently in preparation.

The potential agenda for future dialogue sessions was to focus not only on traditional peace and security issues, but also include more comprehensive aspects such as economy, the environment, sustainability, disaster relief, gender, human security and the potential role of civil society.

The participants welcomed Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free zone policy both as a concrete contribution to regional stability, and as an innovative approach to addressing nuclear threat-related issues. They welcomed the joint declaration of the five nuclear-weapon states whereby the latter pledged to respect Mongolia's status and not to contribute to any act that would violate it. The participants expressed the hope that Mongolia's example would be an inspiring example in addressing similar cases. (IDN-InDepthNews – November 27, 2014) ❖



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Why Nuclear Disarmament Could Still Be The Most Important Thing There Is

By RISTO ISOMAKI

HELSINKI - At the height of the Cold War the world's total arsenal of nuclear weapons, counted as explosive potential, may have amounted to three million Hiroshima bombs. The United States alone possessed 1.6 million Hiroshimas' worth of destructive capacity. Since then, much of this arsenal has been dismantled and the uranium in thousands of nuclear bombs has been converted to nuclear power plant fuel.



Future historians are likely to offer some stingy comments on how 20th century governments first used thousands of billions of dollars to laboriously enrich natural uranium to weapons grade uranium with gas centrifuges, and then reversed the process, diluting their weapons grade uranium with natural uranium.

This declining trend has led many people and governments to believe that nuclear disarmament is no longer an important issue.

It is true that the probability of a nuclear war is currently immensely smaller than during the [Cuban missile crisis](#) of 1962 or during the other hair-raisingly dangerous moments of the Cold War.

In spite of this, it could be a grave mistake to assume that the danger is now over, forever.

We have not really been able to push the evil genie back into the bottle, yet. The remaining U.S. and Russian inventories might still amount to 80,000 Hiroshima bombs. This is approximately forty times less than at the height of Cold War's nuclear armament race, but still much more than enough to destroy the world as we know it.

While the world's nuclear arsenal has become smaller, the remaining nuclear weapons are more accurate and on average smaller than before. This might, some day, lower the threshold for using them.

Besides, it now seems that we have seriously underestimated the destructive capacity of all kinds of nuclear weapons.

In both Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nuclear bombs ignited large firestorms that burned all the people caught inside the fire perimeter to death. However, U.S. military scientists regarded fire damage as so unpredictable that for fifty years they concentrated only on analysing the impact of the blasts.

The story has been beautifully documented by Lynn Eden, a researcher at Stanford University, in an important book [important book](#) entitled *Whole World on Fire: Organizations, Knowledge & Nuclear Weapons Devastation*.

When, in 2002, the United States was afraid of a nuclear war between Pakistan and India, it warned their governments that a nuclear war in South Asia might kill twelve million people.

The figure was absurdly low because it only took the impact of the nuclear blasts into consideration. According to recent research, the fire damage radii of nuclear detonations are from two to five times longer than those determined by the blast effects. In practice, this means that the area destroyed by the fire is typically 4 to 25 times larger than the area shattered by the blast.

The Second World War firestorms in Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Hamburg and Dresden caused very strong rising air currents and hurricane-speed winds blowing towards the fire from the edges of the fire perimeter. ➔



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Nuclear detonations in modern cities created even fiercer firestorms because they contain very large quantities of hydrocarbons in the form of asphalt, plastic, oil, gasoline and gas.

According to one study, the firestorm ignited by even a small, Hiroshima-size explosion in Manhattan would produce incredibly strong super-hurricane winds blowing towards the fire at the speed of 600 kilometres per hour. Most skyscrapers have been designed to withstand wind speeds amounting to 230 or 250 kilometres per hour.

The worst-case scenario is a nuclear detonation happening far above the ground. According to the so-called 'Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack' – or [EMP Commission](#) for short – of the U.S. Congress, between 70 and 90 percent of the country's population might die within one year if somebody detonated a megaton-sized nuclear weapon at the height of 160 kilometres above the continental United States.

A nuclear explosion always produces a very strong electromagnetic pulse or, to be more precise, three different electromagnetic pulses, which can fry all unprotected electronic equipment within a line of sight. From the height of 160 kilometres, everything in the continental United States is within a line of sight. Everything works with electricity and practically nothing has been protected against an EMP.

In other words, a single nuclear weapon could wipe out health care, water supplies, waste-water treatment facilities, agricultural production and the factories and laboratories making pharmaceuticals, vaccines and fertilisers – among many others.

Europe is equally vulnerable and most other countries, including India and China, are doing their utmost to become as vulnerable as the old industrialised countries already are.

According to the EMP Commission, the cost of electronic equipment would only rise by 3-10 percent if it were hardened against an electromagnetic pulse, and protecting the key 10 percent of everything with electronics would be enough to secure the crucial functions of an organised society. However, in practice, nothing like this has been done, in any country.

We should not forget nuclear disarmament, because it could still be the most important thing there is.

It would probably be wise to utilise the periods of relative calm as efficiently as possible for further reducing our nuclear weapons arsenals and for developing better alternatives for nuclear electricity. Otherwise, tensions between declining and rising great powers may one day again create new nuclear armament races, with potentially disastrous consequences.

The spread of nuclear reactors increases the risks. Every country that acquires the ability to construct a nuclear reactor also acquires the ability to manufacture nuclear weapons.

Nuclear reactors were originally developed for making better raw material for nuclear weapons, and all our reactors are still making plutonium, every second they operate.

The weapons grade uranium used in nuclear bombs is enriched by the same gas centrifuges that produce the fuel for our power-producing nuclear stations.

The stakes will rise higher if we also begin to construct fourth-generation nuclear power plants or breeder reactors. Breeders need, in one or more parts of the reactor, nuclear fuel in which the percentage of the easily fissile isotopes has been enriched to 15, 20 or 60 percent, or to even higher levels. This kind of fuel can already be used for making crude nuclear weapons, without any further enrichment.

It is often said that when a technology has been developed it can no longer be forced back into the Pandora's box from which it came. However, when it comes to nuclear technologies, we just have to try. The long-term survival of our species may depend on this choice. (IPS COLUMNIST SERVICE | November 26, 2014)



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Humanitarian Impact Of Nukes Calls For Concerted Action

By DAISAKU IKEDA*

TOKYO - As we approach the 70th anniversary next year of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, there are growing calls to place the humanitarian consequences of their use at the heart of deliberations about nuclear weapons.

The Joint Statement on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons presented to the U.N. General Assembly in October was supported by 155 governments, more than 80 percent of all member states.

The view powerfully expressed in the Joint Statement, that it is “in the interest of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances,” expresses the deepening consensus of humankind.

The Third International Conference on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons will be held in Vienna on Dec. 8-9. This conference and its deliberations should provide further impetus to efforts to end the era of nuclear weapons, an era in which these apocalyptic weapons have been seen as the linchpin of national security for a number of states.

This can only happen when the goal of a nuclear-free world is taken up as the shared global enterprise of humanity with the full engagement of civil society.

Within the agenda of the Vienna Conference, there are two items in particular that require us to adopt the perspective of a shared global enterprise.

Today, if a missile carrying a nuclear warhead were to be accidentally launched, there could be as little as 13 minutes before it reached its target.

The first is the examination of risk drivers for the inadvertent or unpredicted use of nuclear weapons due to human error, technical fault or cyber security.

During the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, people were transfixed in horror as the world teetered on the edge of



full-scale nuclear war. It took the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union 13 days of desperate effort to defuse the crisis.

Today, if a missile carrying a nuclear warhead were to be accidentally launched, there could be as little as 13 minutes before it reached its target. Escape or evacuation would be impossible, and the targeted city and its inhabitants would be devastated.

Further, if such an inadvertent use of a nuclear weapon were met with retaliation of even the most limited form, the impact on

the global climate and ecology would result in a “nuclear famine” that could affect as many as two billion people.

The use of a single nuclear weapon can obliterate and render meaningless generations of patient effort by human beings to create lives of happiness, to create societies rich with culture. It is in this unspeakable outrage, rather than in the numerical calculation of the destructive potential of nuclear weapons, that their inhuman nature is most starkly demonstrated.

The second agenda item that will bring into sharp focus the uniquely horrific nature of nuclear weapons—the aspect that makes them fundamentally different from other weapons—is the impact of nuclear weapons testing.

The citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are not the only people to have directly experienced the horrendous effects of nuclear weapons. As the shared use of the term “hibakusha” indicates, large numbers of people continue to suffer from the consequences of the more than 2,000 nuclear weapons tests that have been carried out to date.

➔



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Further, communities near nuclear weapons development facilities in the nuclear-weapon states have experienced severe radiation contamination, and there are ongoing concerns about the health impacts on those who have worked in or lived near these facilities.

As these examples demonstrate, the decision to maintain nuclear weapons—even if they are not actually used—presents severe threats to people's lives and dignity.

Annual global expenditures on nuclear weapons are said to total more than 100 billion dollars. If this enormous sum were to be directed not only at improving the lives of the citizens of the nuclear states, but at supporting countries where people continue to struggle against poverty and inadequate healthcare services, the benefit to humankind would be immeasurable.

To continue allocating vast sums of money for the maintenance of a state's nuclear posture runs clearly counter to the spirit of the UN Charter, which calls for the maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources—a call echoed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

Further, we must face squarely the inhumanity of perpetuating a distorted global order in which people whose lives could easily be improved are forced to continue living in dangerous and degrading conditions.

By taking up these two crucial themes, the Vienna Conference will place in sharp relief the underlying essence of the threat humankind imposes on itself by maintaining current nuclear postures—through the continuation of this “nuclear age.” At the same time, it will be an important opportunity to interrogate security arrangements

that rely on nuclear weapons—and to do so from the perspective of the world's citizens, each of whom is compelled to live in the shadow of this threat.

In 1957, in the midst of an accelerating nuclear arms race, second Soka Gakkai president and my personal mentor Josei Toda (1900–58) denounced nuclear weapons as a threat to people's fundamental right to existence. He declared their use inadmissible—under any circumstance, without any exception.

The SGI's efforts, in collaboration with various NGO partners, find their deepest roots in this declaration. By empowering people to understand and face the realities of nuclear weapons, we have sought to build a solidarity of global citizens dedicated to eliminating needless suffering from the face of the Earth.

The impassioned wish of the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—and of all the world's hibakusha—is that no one else will have to suffer what they have endured. This determination finds resonant voice throughout civil society in support for the Joint Statement adopted by 155 of the world's governments.

Even with governments whose understanding of their security needs prevents open support for the Joint Statement, there are real concerns about the inhumane nature of nuclear weapons.

I trust the Vienna Conference will serve to create an enlarged sphere of shared concern. This should then lead to the kind of shared action that will break the current stalemate surrounding nuclear weapons in the months leading up to the 70th anniversary of the world's only uses of nuclear weapons in war.

(IPS | IDN | November 21, 2014) ❖



Credit: Federation of American Scientists



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

A Nuclear Weapon Free Zone For North-East Asia?

By JAYANTHA DHANAPALA*

KANDY, Sri Lanka - In 2015 it will be 70 years since the horrible bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the USA – the only time nuclear weapons were ever used. The urgent need to seek solutions over nuclear weapons in North-east Asia was highlighted in the following paragraphs from the Asia Pacific Leaders Network's (APLN) Jakarta Declaration of September 2014:

“Acutely conscious that the world's more than 16,000 remaining nuclear weapons are strongly concentrated in the Asia Pacific region, with the US and Russia having over 90 per cent of the world's stockpile and major strategic footprints here, China, India, and Pakistan all having significant arsenals, and the breakout state of North Korea continuing to build its capability,

Noting further that most of the projected world growth in civil nuclear energy – with all the proliferation, safety and security risks associated with such energy production unless it is closely and effectively regulated – will occur in the Asia Pacific.”

The Six-nation talks over the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's (DPRK) nuclear programme has made little progress even as China's patience with that country wears thin. Tensions among China, Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK) continue over the bitter legacy of World War II and the disputes over the ownership of Islands in the East China and South China seas exacerbate them while the US hovers in the background.

Five nuclear weapon free zones (NWFZ), one single-state nuclear weapon free zone (Mongolia) and one unpopulated nuclear weapon free continent (Antarctica) – apart from the denuclearization of the extremities of the seabed and ocean floor and outer space – have been legally established and exist in the world today. While they do not conform to a replicable model, the UN Disarmament Commission has established guidelines, which future proposals for NWFZ may wish to follow.

The proposal for a North East Asian NWFZ (NEANWFZ) has intrinsic merits but the first steps towards it in this



tension-fraught region are still a long way off. The proposal has acquired a fresh relevance both as a solution to the nuclear weapon programme of the DPRK and as a safeguard against a possible nuclear weapon option being exercised by Japan and the ROK. It could also assuage fears of a Chinese nuclear threat in East Asia with China accepting the protocols to a future NWFZ. The NEANWFZ is being seriously discussed among academics and legislators – perhaps a prelude to a negotiation at the policy making level.

Conceptually NWFZs represent 'affirmative action' on the part of non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS) within the Treaty for the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in accordance with its Article VII. There

is strong opposition to nuclear weapons among non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS), actually predating the NPT, and the creation of NWFZs as building blocks for a nuclear weapon free world.

Indeed NWFZs in their preambles refer to global nuclear disarmament in unambiguous terms. As quarantine zones protecting countries and regions from the contagion of nuclear weapons, NWFZs are not all consistent in the set of prohibitions they have adopted.

The Treaty of Rarotonga for the South Pacific NWFZ and the Treaty of Semipalatinsk for the Central Asian Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (CANWFZ), for example, include countries that have defence agreements with NWS and therefore enjoy extended nuclear deterrence.

*Jayantha Dhanapala is a former UN Under-Secretary-General and a former Ambassador of Sri Lanka.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

In the case of Rarotonga the treaty permits the passage of nuclear armed vessels through the NWFZ and the harbours of its member states. These compromises on the principles of the prohibitions enshrined in the NWFZ treaties through adroit drafting were not seen to be in such fundamental conflict with the prohibitions as to vitiate the central thrust of the treaty. The 1999 UN Disarmament Commission guidelines for establishing NWFZs states, inter alia, that:



UN Disarmament Commission guidelines

"States parties to a nuclear-weapon-free zone exercising their sovereign rights and without prejudice to the purposes and objectives of such a zone remain free to decide for themselves whether to allow visits by foreign ships and aircraft to their ports and airfields, transit of their airspace by foreign aircraft and navigation by foreign ships in or over their territorial sea, archipelagic waters or straits that are used for international navigation, while fully honouring the rights of innocent passage, archipelagic sea lane passage or transit passage in straits that are used for international navigation."

All NWFZ treaties allow, at the sovereign discretion of each member state, for overflight and transit of nuclear armed vessels through international waters. The provisions of the Treaty of Bangkok also cover the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) and continental shelves. However, it is disputed whether this is in accordance to the UN Law of the Sea Convention. Jozef Goldblat has noted in respect of the CANWFZ that:

"This means that transit of nuclear weapons may be allowed or refused, but the decisions "should not be prejudicial" to the purposes and objectives of the treaty. Since neither the frequency nor the duration of transit is limited by the treaty, it is not clear to what extent transit differs from stationing. With the proviso mentioned above, total absence of nuclear weapons in the CANWFZ, as envisaged in Article VII of the NPT (dealing with the right of states to conclude regional denuclearization treaties), cannot be guaranteed.

Introduction of nuclear weapons into the zone, even for a short time, would defeat the sought goal of regional denuclearization. Moreover, transit of nuclear weapons allowed by one zonal state might affect the security of another."

With regard to another aspect of a NWFZ treaty, more recently the agreed Australian decision to export urani-

um to India despite the latter not being within the NPT is widely seen as a violation of the Treaty of Rarotonga. Thus accepted NWFZ guidelines have been shown to be flexible.

In the case of all NWFZs however the provisions of the NPT apply since they are all states parties of this treaty. Thus the application of extended deterrence or sheltering under the nuclear umbrella offered by any one of the NWS must be seen as a violation of Article 1 – one of the core arti-

cles of the NPT.

Firstly the transfer of nuclear weapons or control of such weapons "directly or indirectly" is prohibited. This has been violated by the geographical location of US nuclear weapons in five NATO countries in Europe but has been justified by the US because the weapons are under US control – a justification frequently rejected by NNWS at NPT Review Conferences and other forums. No NWFZ would make the actual stationing of nuclear weapons whether under the control of a NWS or not legal.

Secondly, the prohibition "not in any way to assist, encourage, or induce" any NNWS to acquire or control nuclear weapons stands obviously violated when the protection of a nuclear weapon defence is agreed upon by a bilateral treaty with a NWS as in the case of Australia, Japan or ROK.

ICJ ruling

The International Court of Justice in its Advisory Opinion of July 8, 1996 ruled unambiguously on nuclear deterrence and extended nuclear deterrence both of which contain a threat of the use of nuclear weapons. The case brought before the ICJ by the Marshall Islands against nine nuclear weapon armed states may very well clarify and expand on the 1996 ICJ Advisory Opinion when it is taken up in 2015.

Thus a NWFZ in North-east Asia has many reasons to commend itself as a solution to the complex issues in the region that threaten its security. However, compromising on fundamental NWFZ principles will only exacerbate matters. Exceptions and ambiguities have been introduced in the negotiation of past NWFZs but they cannot, and should not, be cited as precedents for future NWFZs. Extended deterrence and a NWFZ are mutually exclusive and so, as the DPRK nuclear programme is dismantled, the US nuclear umbrella, under which ROK and Japan have long been sheltered, must be folded in the interests of regional and global security. ➔



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

The Obama speech in Prague in April 2009 and all that has transpired with regard to the objective of a nuclear weapon free world has altered global circumstances. Cold War warriors Schultz, Kissinger, Nunn and Perry said in their famous Wall Street Journal op-ed of 2007 that, "The end of the Cold War made the doctrine of mutual Soviet-American deterrence obsolete. Deterrence continues to be a relevant consideration for many states with regard to threats from other states. But reliance on nuclear

weapons for this purpose is becoming increasingly hazardous and decreasingly effective."

The time to bury nuclear deterrence and extended nuclear deterrence is now. A NWFZ for North-east Asia guaranteed by the five nuclear weapon states in the NPT is the new security architecture needed for the region.

[IDN-InDepthNews – November 4, 2014] ❖

TRANSLATIONS

Nuclear-Weapon Free Northeast Asia Is Possible

[JAPANESE TEXT VERSION PDF](#)

「モンゴル」北東アジア非核兵器地帯は可能

【ジュネーブIDN＝ジャムシエツド・バルーア】

「北東アジア」では、既存の緊張関係が引き続き悩みの種であり、緊張を緩和し有意義な協力関係を生み出す緊急の行動が求められている。しかし、北東アジア非核地帯の構築は可能であり、優先課題とすべきである。」11月26日にモンゴルのウランバートルで開催された国際会議において、このような提言が出された。

Why Nuclear Disarmament Could Still Be The Most Important Thing There Is

[JAPANESE TEXT VERSION PDF](#)

「視点」なぜ核軍縮が依然としてもっとも重要な問題なのか

フィンランドの環境活動家で、小説が数か国語に翻訳されているTähtivaeltaja賞受賞作家のリスト・イソマキ氏はこのコラムで、世界中に現存する核施設に備わっている、実際には想像を超える破壊能力について述べ、核技術を元のパンドラの箱に戻すという不可能に挑戦すべきだと論じている。

SPANISH

El armamento nuclear es y será el mayor peligro mientras exista

En esta columna, el novelista y militante ambientalista finlandés Risto Isomäki afirma que el arsenal mundial de armas nucleares no ha disminuido su peligrosidad aunque hoy sea 35 veces menor al que existía en el momento culminante de la Guerra Fría, cuando equivalía a tres millones de bombas como las que aniquilaron Hiroshima. Eso porque las bombas actuales son más pequeñas, más precisas y más fáciles de transportar, y son mucho más que suficientes para destruir el mundo tal como lo conocemos.

Humanitarian Impact of Nukes Calls For Concerted Action

[GERMAN](#) | [JAPANESE TEXT VERSION PDF](#)

A Nuclear Weapon Free Zone for North-East Asia?

[JAPANESE TEXT VERSION PDF](#)

北東アジアに非核兵器地帯？（ジャヤンタ・ダナパラ元軍縮問題担当国連事務次長）

【キャンディ（スリランカ）IDN＝ジャヤンタ・ダナパラ】



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

Nuclear Weapons As Bargaining Chips In Global Politics

By THALIF DEEN

UNITED NATIONS - Has the world reached a stage where nuclear weapons may be used as bargaining chips in international politics? So it seems, judging by the North Korean threat to conduct another nuclear test – if and when the 193-member U.N. General Assembly adopts a resolution aimed at referring the hermit kingdom to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for human rights abuses.

“If North Korea begins a game of nuclear blackmailing,” one anti-nuclear activist predicted, “will Russia not be far behind in what appears to be a new Cold War era?”

Dr. Rebecca Johnson, author of the U.N.-published book ‘Unfinished Business’ on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) negotiations, told IPS the larger danger – exemplified also by some of the rhetoric about nuclear weapons bandied around the crisis in Ukraine – is that nuclear weapons are not useful deterrents but are increasingly seen as bargaining chips, with heightened risks that they may be used to “prove” some weak leader’s “point”, with catastrophic humanitarian consequences.



She pointed out North Korea’s recent threat to conduct another nuclear test – its fourth – is unlikely to deter U.N. states from adopting a resolution to charge the regime of Kim Jong-un with crimes against humanity.

“North Korea’s nuclear sabre-rattling appears to draw from Cold War deterrence theories, but a nuclear test is not a nuclear weapon,” she added.

South Korean Foreign Minister Yun Byung-Se told the Security Council last May North Korea is the only country in the world that has conducted nuclear tests in the 21st century.

Since 2006, it has conducted three nuclear tests, the last one in February 2013 – all of them in defiance of the international community and the United Nations.

The resolution on North Korea, which is expected to come up before the U.N.’s highest policy making body in early December, has already been adopted by the U.N. committee dealing with humanitarian issues, known as the Third Committee.

The vote was 111 in favour to 19 against, with 55 abstentions in the 193-member committee. The vote in the General Assembly is only a formality.

Alyn Ware, a member of the World Future Council, told IPS: “Nuclear weapons should not be used as threats or as bargaining chips.”

Their use, after all, would involve massive violations of the right to life and other human rights.

However, he noted, this applies also to the other nuclear-armed states in the region (China, Russia and the United States) and states under extended nuclear deterrence doctrines (South Korea and Japan).

“The nuclear option should be taken off the table by establishing a North East Asian Nuclear Weapon Free Zone,” he said. ➔

Photo credit: UN Photo/Jean-Marc Ferré



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

And the states leading the human rights charges against North Korea should make it crystal clear that such charges are not an attempt to overthrow the North Korean government, he added.

The tensions between countries in the region, and the fact that the Korean War of the 1950s has never officially ended (only an armistice is in place), makes this a very sensitive issue, said Ware. If the General Assembly adopts the resolution, as expected, it is up to the 15-member Security Council to initiate ICC action on North Korea.

But both Russia and China are most likely to veto any attempts to drag North Korea to The Hague.

In an editorial Sunday, the New York Times said North Korea's human rights abuses warrant action by the Security Council.

"Given what is in the public record, it is impossible to see how any country can defend Mr Kim and his lieutenants or block their referral to the International Criminal Court," the paper said.

"As confidence in the NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty) continues to erode, has the time come to ban all nuclear weapons?" asked Dr Johnson.

She said "a comprehensive nuclear ban treaty would dramatically reduce nuclear dangers and provide much stronger international tools than we have today for curbing the acquisition, deployment and spread of nuclear weapons."

The status some nations attach to nuclear weapons would soon be a thing of the past, nuclear sabre-rattling would become pointless, and anyone threatening to use these weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) would automatically face charges under the International Criminal Court, said Dr. Johnson, who is executive director and co-founder of the Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy.

"This might not stop nuclear blackmail overnight, but it would make it much harder for North Korea and any others to imagine they could gain benefits by issuing nuclear threats."

As North Korea withdrew from the NPT over 10 years ago, and has already conducted three nuclear tests, it is unlikely that a threatened fourth test would be an effective deterrent, said Dr Johnson.

The U.N. resolution has been triggered by a report from a U.N. Commission of Inquiry on North Korea which recommended that leaders of that country be prosecuted by the ICC for grave human rights violations.

The commission was headed by Michael Kirby, a High Court Judge from Australia.

In a statement before the Third Committee last week, the North Korean delegate said the report of the Commission "was based on fabricated testimonies by a handful of defectors who had fled the country after committing crimes.

"The report was a compilation of groundless political allegations and had no credibility as an official U.N. document," he added.

Ware told IPS, "I have a lot of respect for my colleague Michael Kirby from Australia, who led a year-long U.N. inquiry into human rights abuses which concluded that North Korean security chiefs, and possibly even Kim Jong Un himself, should face international justice for ordering systematic torture, starvation and killings.

"I find the response of the North Korean authorities to try to discredit his report due to his sexual orientation to be reprehensible," he added. "Nor do I find credible the North Korean counter-claims that their human rights violations are non-existent, while the real human rights violator is the U.S. government."

Ware said there are indeed human rights violations in the United States, but they pale in comparison to those in North Korea.

There is a body of U.S. civil rights law and legal institutions that provide protections for U.S. citizens even if it is not fully perfect nor implemented entirely fairly, he pointed out.

But there is a lack of such protection of civil rights in North Korea, with the result that the North Korean administration inflicts incredibly egregious violations of human rights with total impunity, according to Kirby's report.

"I do not believe that the threat of a nuclear test by North Korea should deter the United Nations from addressing these human rights violations, including the possibility of referral to the International Criminal Court," Ware declared. (IPS | November 25, 2014) ❖



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

A Plea for Banning Nuke Tests and Nuclear Weapons*

By DR. LASSINA ZERBO

Executive Secretary of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBTO)

UNITED NATIONS - December 1938 was a decisive month in human history: In Germany, the scientists Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassmann discovered that when bombarded with neutrons, the atomic nucleus of uranium would split.

The discovery of nuclear fission laid the basis of nuclear technology with all its manifestations – in the short term, the most destructive weapon ever devised and used a few years later in the Second World War.

A nuclear weapons programme requires vast resources that could have been allocated to support development and infrastructure – every nuclear test, every warhead represents a school, a hospital or a major road unbuilt.

But God is fair, He unleashed a force of good at the same time: Back in 1938, nearly the same day that Otto Hahn publicised his discovery, a very special boy was born on the other side of the planet in Sri Lanka. His name: Jayantha Dhanapala. In the town of Pallekelle, which later became home to one of our monitoring stations – but to that later.

Jayantha Dhanapala's life story is linked closely to that of nuclear arms control, and in particular to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, in short CTBT, that my organisation is tasked with implementing.

Throughout his soaring career, as a diplomat and in the U.N., Jayantha has worked with persistence and eloquence to rid the world of weapons of mass destruction.

In 1995, Jayantha chaired the landmark review and extension conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. He masterminded the central bargain, a package of decisions that balanced the seemingly irreconcilable interests of the nuclear weapon states and the non-nuclear weapon states.

A critical part of this bargain was the promise that the CTBT, which was still being fiercely negotiated at the time in Geneva, would be finalised no later than 1996, prompting the adoption of the Treaty by the General Assembly on Sep. 10, 1996. So in a way, Jayantha actually fathered the CTBT.

Shortly later, from 1998 to 2003, he served as United Nations under-secretary-general for disarmament affairs. This was a crucial time for nuclear disarmament, particularly for the CTBT as the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan flouted the still young treaty.



Jayantha is active in probably all of the world's most important advisory boards and international bodies. Notably, he is the president of the Nobel Peace Prize-winning Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, and a member of the Governing Board of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). For these reasons and more, I invited him to join the Group of Eminent Persons (GEM), which I launched in 2013 to ensure an innovative and focused approach to advancing the CTBT's entry into force.

Although we have not yet reached this goal, the treaty has played an important role in making our planet safer. Although technically labelled a "provisional" secretariat, there is nothing provisional about our work. To paraphrase Hans Blix, another member of the GEM, it is a treaty that has not legally entered into force, with an organisation that is more accomplished in verification than everything else we have seen.

This is in part due to the global network of stations we are building to detect signs of nuclear tests anywhere on the globe. Nearly 90 percent of this system of over 300 stations is complete, including the one in Jayantha's home town of Pallakelle.

The system, which was recently hailed by U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry as "one of the great accomplishments of the modern world," has the proven capability to detect nuclear tests at a fraction of the yield of the first nuclear weapon test in the desert near Alamogordo in July 1945.





BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

The international community forcefully condemns any violations of this norm today, as has been the case with each of North Korea's tests – the only ones to be conducted in this millennium.

Consistent progress has also been made in the area of on-site inspections. This is the CTBT's ultimate verification measure and involved a team of highly specialised experts searching the ground using a wide range of state-of-the-art technologies.

In fact, I am just coming from Jordan where I visited our second full-fledged on-site inspection simulation, the Integrated Field Exercise 2014, which is currently being conducted on the banks of the Dead Sea in Jordan.

Jayantha and I both come from countries in the developing world. One of the most persuasive arguments he has consistently made is the opportunity cost a developing country incurs when embarking on a weapons of mass destruction programme.

In particular, a nuclear weapons programme requires vast resources that could have been allocated to support development and infrastructure – every nuclear test, every warhead represents a school, a hospital or a major road unbuilt.

In Pakistan, for example, where the anniversary of the 1998 nuclear tests is officially celebrated each May, we increasingly observe voices questioning the value of a

nuclear weapons programme when parts of the country lack basic necessities such as clean water and electricity.

Developing countries also have much to lose from a nuclear conflict, even one far from their borders. A recent study has shown that even a limited nuclear exchange would “disrupt the global climate and agricultural production so severely that the lives of more than two billion people would be in jeopardy”. This would result in unprecedented famine and starvation far beyond the directly affected areas, especially in the developing world.

It is encouraging to see that Jayantha is actively promoting the CTBT, especially in his home region of in South Asia, where India is one of the countries that have yet to sign the CTBT. To me, Jayantha formulated the most eloquent rebuttal ever to India's criticism of the CTBT:

“Opposing the CTBT because it fails to deliver complete disarmament is tantamount to opposing speed limits on roads because they fail to prevent accidents completely.”

In conclusion, the world we live in today would be less safe and less civilised were it not for Jayantha Dhanapala. I would like to thank the Inter Press Service and Ramesh Jaura for organising the International Achievement Award and to Soka Gakkai International for supporting it. (IPS | November 23, 2014)

*Excerpts from a speech made at an event marking the 2014 IPS International Achievement Award for Nuclear Disarmament at the United Nations on Nov. 17. ❖

IPS Honours Crusader For Nuclear Abolition

By ROGER HAMILTON-MARTIN

UNITED NATIONS - Jayantha Dhanapala was awarded the IPS International Achievement Award for Nuclear Disarmament on Nov. 17 at the United Nations in New York.

Dhanapala, U.N. Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs until 2003, has remained committed to the goal of a nuclear weapons-free world since leaving his post, presiding since 2007 over the Nobel Prize-winning [Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs](#).

“A nuclear weapon-free world can and must happen in my lifetime,” [Dhanapala told attendees](#) at an official ceremony sponsored by the Buddhist organisation Soka Gakkai International. “Scientific evidence is proof that even a limited nuclear war – if those confines are possible – will cause irreversible climate change and destruction of human life and its supporting ecology on an unprecedented scale. We the people have a ‘responsibility to pro-

tect’ the world from nuclear weapons by outlawing them through a verifiable Nuclear Weapon Convention overriding all other self-proclaimed ‘R2P’ applications.”

The event was attended by U.N. ambassadors including the president of the General Assembly, Sam Kutesa, who said that “the work of organisations such as Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs – which Mr. Dhanapala presides over – Inter Press Service, our host this evening, or Soka Gakkai International, the sponsor of this award, contributes to raising awareness of the dangers of nuclear weapons and to advocating for their total elimination.” ➔



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

Kutesa spoke of the importance of upcoming opportunities to make further inroads into global non-proliferation and disarmament. "The 2015 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference will present an opportunity to further strengthen the global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime."

CTBTO support

Kutesa's sentiments were echoed by other speakers including Dr Lassina Zerbo, executive secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organisation ([CTBTO](#)). Zerbo noted that Dhanapala was born in the same month (December 1938) that German scientists Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassmann discovered nuclear fission.

"In 1995, Jayantha chaired the landmark review and extension conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. He masterminded the central bargain, a package of decisions that balanced the seemingly irreconcilable interests of the nuclear weapon states and the non-nuclear weapon states."

The result of this work was that the CTBT, which was being contested in Geneva, was adopted by the General Assembly in 1996. Dhanapala continues to support the CTBTO, as part of a group of experts who work to advance the CTBT's entry into force.

Zerbo recalled Dhanapala's criticism of India's position in opposing the CTBT. India's criticism of the CTBT has been that it will not move disarmament sufficiently forward. In response to this, Dhanapala has said, "Opposing the CTBT because it fails to deliver complete disarmament is tantamount to opposing speed limits on roads because they fail to prevent accidents completely," Dhanapala has pointed out.

Collectively known as the "Annex 2" states, India forms part of a group of eight countries that are required to ratify before the treaty before it can enter into force. India, Pakistan and North Korea have yet to sign the treaty, while 5 other states have signed but failed to ratify.

Zerbo also noted the relevance of Dhanapala's nationality in his advocacy for disarmament and non-proliferation, saying, "Jayantha and I both come from countries in the developing world."



"One of the most persuasive arguments he has consistently made is the opportunity cost a developing country incurs when embarking on a weapons of mass destruction programme. In particular, a nuclear weapons programme requires vast resources that could have been allocated to support development and infrastructure."

IPS Director General Ramesh Jaura, who read a statement from IPS founder Roberto Savio, spoke of the origins and importance of the award.

"The award was created in 1985 with the idea to provide a link between the action of the U.N. at global level, and actors who would embody that action," he said.

"The U.N. way is not to recognise individuals, so the award is a recognition of the bridge between ideals and practice." The award has been resurrected after a six-year hiatus, and will be in place next year again. Additional awards in 2016 and 2017 will focus on the Sustainable Development Goals.

There are several opportunities in the coming months for inroads to be made in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Notably, early next month's Vienna Conference on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons.

In the meantime, Dhanapala called on groups to support the ICAN and PAX ["Don't Bank on the Bomb"](#) divestment campaign, saying, "I appeal to all of you present to make your own practical contribution to nuclear disarmament by joining the divestment campaign. The faded rhetoric of President Obama's celebrated Prague speech in April 2009 about a nuclear weapon free world has little to show as results unless civil society acts."

(IPS | November 19, 2014) ❖

Photo: From left, SGI Executive Director for Peace Affairs Hirotsugu Terasaki, IPS Director General Ramesh Jaura, and honoree Jayantha Dhanapala. Credit: Roger Hamilton Martin/IPS



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

The Clock Is Ticking For Disarmament

By JAYANTHA DHANAPALA

Former U.N. Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs

The following are excerpts from an address when he received the 2014 IPS International Achievement Award for Nuclear Disarmament on Nov. 17.

UNITED NATIONS - A nuclear weapon-free world can and must happen in my lifetime. This may seem a bold and wildly Pollyannaish statement for me to make after a lifetime of work in peace and disarmament.

But consider some of the key global threats facing us today, 25 years after the Berlin Wall fell, symbolising the end of the Cold War and on the cusp of the 70th anniversary of the United Nations – this centre for harmonising the actions of 193 nations mandated by the Charter to maintain international peace and security.

There is the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), conveying the unambiguous message that climate change is caused by human action and that unchecked it will lead to catastrophe;

There is inequality of income as a feature throughout the world, where the poorest 1.2 billion consume just one percent while the richest billion consume 72 percent, causing increasing frustration and tension, especially among the youth who are 26 percent of the global population;

There is religious extremism, racism and the bestial violence of ISIS, Boko Haram and other anarchic groups which challenge our shared values and civilised societal norms;

There is the state terrorism of Israel waging unequal war against the Palestinians while occupying their territory and depriving them of their statehood in violation of international law;

There are more than 50 million who are currently displaced by war and violence – some 33.3 million in their own countries and approximately 16.7 million as refugees – the highest number since World War II;

And there are the problems of hunger, disease, poverty and violations of human rights that continue to disfigure the human condition.

The spectre of the use of a nuclear weapon through political intent, cyber attack or by accident, by a nation state

or by a non-state actor is more real than we, in our cocoons of complacency, choose to acknowledge.

Is the nuclear weapon ever going to be a deterrent to combat these threats, let alone be used to solve these problems? Or is it not more likely that in a skewed world of nuclear “haves” and “have-nots” we are going to have increasing proliferation, including by terrorist non-state actors?

Scientific evidence is proof that even a limited nuclear war – if those confines are possible – will cause irreversible climate change and destruction of human life and its supporting ecology on an unprecedented scale.

We the people have a “responsibility to protect” the world from nuclear weapons by outlawing them through a verifiable Nuclear Weapon Convention overriding all other self-proclaimed “R 2 P” applications.

Despite this overwhelming evidence, the world has 16,300 nuclear warheads among nine nuclear weapon-armed countries, with the United States and the Russian Federation accounting for 93 percent of the weapons. Of this, about 4,000 warheads are on a deployed operational footing.

The spectre of the use of a nuclear weapon through political intent, cyber attack or by accident, by a nation state or by a non-state actor is more real than we, in our cocoons of complacency, choose to acknowledge.

At a time of declining resources for development, a huge amount – 1.7 trillion dollars – continues to be spent on arms in general and nuclear weapons modernisation. In the U.S. alone, in a glaring contradiction of President Obama’s promises, nuclear weapon modernisation will cost 355 billion dollars over the next 10 years.

A far-sighted military general twice-elected president of the U.S., Dwight Eisenhower, warned over 50 years ago about the insidious influence of the “military industrial complex” in his country. That influence, driven by an insatiable desire for profit, has spread globally, stoking the flames of war even as the United Nations and other peacemakers try to find peaceful solutions in terms of the Charter. ➔



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

I am proud that the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, which I am privileged to lead today, has campaigned assiduously for over five decades seeking the total elimination of nuclear weapons based on the 1955 London Manifesto co-signed by Albert Einstein and Lord Bertrand Russell.

Sir Joseph Rotblat, one of Pugwash's founding fathers who walked out of the Manhattan Project as a conscientious objector, shared the Nobel Peace Prize with Pugwash in 1995.

Pugwash is but one of the many citizen movements who have since 1945 urged the abolition of nuclear weapons. It was pressure from civil society that finally led to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and other significant milestones on the road to outlawing nuclear weapons.

The world has already accomplished a ban on two other categories of weapons of mass destruction – biological and chemical weapons.

I salute the Marshall Islands for taking the nine nuclear weapon states to the International Court of Justice, accusing them of violating their legal obligations, and look forward to the outcome at next year's hearings.

Two NGOs -ICAN and PAX – have painstakingly researched the money behind nuclear weapons and have revealed in their “Don't Bank on the Bomb” report that since January 2011, 411 different banks, insurance companies and pension funds have invested 402 billion dollars in 28 companies in the nuclear weapon industry.

The nuclear-armed nations spend a combined total of more than 100 billion dollars on their nuclear forces every year. Let me quote from the report:

“The top 10 investors alone provided more than 175 billion dollars to the 28 identified nuclear weapon producers. With the exception of French BNP Paribas, all financial institutions in the top 10 are based in the U.S. The top three – State Street, Capital Group and Blackrock – have a combined 80 billion dollars invested. In Europe, the most heavily invested are BNP Paribas (France), Royal Bank of Scotland and Barclays (both United Kingdom).

“In Asia, the biggest investors are Mitsubishi UFJ Financial and Sumitomo Mitsui Financial (both Japan) and the Life Insurance Corporation of India.”

I appeal to all of you present to make your own practical contribution to nuclear disarmament by joining the divestment campaign. The faded rhetoric of President

Obama's celebrated Prague speech in April 2009 about a nuclear weapon-free world has little to show as results unless civil society acts.

The world has scaled many heights in my lifetime.

Colonialism which enslaved my country for 450 years was dismantled in my lifetime, liberating numerous countries, including mine;

The civil rights movement in the U.S. ended segregation, racial discrimination and other indignities imposed on black Americans;

I have seen the end of the odious apartheid regime and the peaceful transition to a non-racial democracy in South Africa;

And, finally, we have witnessed the end of the Cold War with its global tension and rivalry.

These are inspirational achievements of which humankind can be proud. Through all these achievements we remember gratefully the exemplary leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela. It was their unswerving dedication to non-violence that ensured victory over evil and injustice.

Nuclear disarmament is likewise an achievable goal and not the mirage that the nuclear weapon states would have us believe. The successful conclusion of a final agreement on Iran's nuclear programme and the forthcoming NPT Review Conference in 2015 are opportunities for us all to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons by eliminating the weapons themselves.

I fear that the longer we wait for nuclear weapon states to act, the greater the risk that the anger of impotence may lead to extremist groups seizing control of nuclear weapons.

We are fortunate to have in Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon a global leader dedicated to the cause of nuclear disarmament and his Five-point Plan remains a lodestar for the global community.

The Inter Press Service (IPS), our hosts this evening, must be congratulated on their 50th anniversary. Serving the cause of the developing world, IPS has held aloft important principles of equity and justice in international relations calling for an end to unequal exchange in all its forms.

I am deeply grateful for the award conferred on me today. I have long believed in the dictum of Jean Monnet – the European Union's architect and visionary – that “Nothing is possible without men, but nothing lasts without institutions.” (IPS | November 19, 2014) ❖



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

Complacency Is Slowly Killing The Non-Proliferation Regime

By PAUL INGRAM*

Arab decision-makers and security experts met in November at the Amman Security Colloquium and nuclear forum, expressing their frustration with the lack of progress on a diplomatic agenda to achieve a WMD-free zone in the Middle East. They are considering their strategy to find leverage over those that appear comfortable with protracted conversations focused only on defining principles and agenda. However, the Arabs are not the only ones who may get in the way of any consensus that papers over the cracks when senior diplomats meet next May at the month-long nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference to discuss progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The world of nuclear diplomacy is in broader crisis over dashed expectations on the disarmament agenda; nuclear arsenals are being modernised for a new generation.

So what are the consequences in the 'real world' of declining confidence in the NPT?

In several meetings in the Gulf last week run by BASIC, people from the region expressed deep anxieties about Iran's nuclear programme and its other activities in the Arab world. We are on the verge of a possible historic deal with Iran that should increase assurance for the regional and international community. The deadline for this round of talks is 24 November. Whilst Gulf states support the process in public, the level of suspicion and gut opposition is tangible. From their perspective, an agreement could be used by Iran to neutralise western opposition and win the upper hand in the region in a much broader and deadly contest of influence. Those states have generally delegated their strategic security, having opened up their economies and even cultural identities, to those very states who are now dealing with their adversary Iran. Representatives express a sense of exposure and vulnerability that many of us cannot understand. It may mean Saudi Arabia could start considering options that involve diversifying their sponsors or developing their own capabilities.

Saudi Arabian officials have in recent years been suggesting that the Kingdom (KSA) cannot simply stand by and watch the revolutionary Islamic Republic strengthen their hand with a strategic nuclear weapon capability

whilst also building their soft power and military influence in Yemen, Syria and Lebanon. There are whispers of an agreement between KSA and Pakistan, whereby KSA could call in favours involving nuclear guarantees or the actual transfer of warheads. This is clearly designed to signal to the Iranians the consequences of their nuclear ambiguity.

But it is unclear that KSA can rely upon any such agreement, should they call it in—it would put Pakistan in a very uncomfortable strategic position with their Iranian neighbour, with whom they have largely had a stable relationship. Pakistan is not looking to open another hostile front when they already feel exposed to a much larger adversary to their east. So there may well be strong incentives for the Kingdom in the coming years to follow up those rumours with real independent actions. It may be worth the KSA investing in dual-use technology, not because they choose to have a nuclear weapons capability, but because they believe the ambiguity and the possession of a credible independent option is necessary for their diplomatic strategy with Iran.

There is another dimension to this that concerns nuclear blackmail—not of adversaries, but of one's allies. We have seen it before. Apartheid South Africa's possession of a handful of nuclear weapons in the 1980s, at a time of desperation, boycotts and international isolation, was not intended to directly intimidate its strategically weaker neighbours, but rather to threaten the international community with a bloodbath in the region, thus persuading them to tolerate the status quo.

A clearer example of this is Israel. In a [blog post](#) earlier this year, BASIC's Lianet Vazquez highlighted a similar strategy first identified by investigative journalist Seymour Hersh. Israel's use of nuclear weapons in the region would not only be disastrous for its neighbours, but it would be what has been described as a [Sampson option](#). Israel's nuclear deterrent of its Arab neighbours is less credible than its privileged ability to force the United States to ensure Israel's security by supplying it with the most sophisticated conventional weapon systems and to restrict the capabilities of those it supplies to all Arab states. ➔

*Paul Ingram has been executive director of the British American Security Information Council (BASIC) since 2007. BASIC works in the US, the UK, Europe and the middle east to promote global nuclear disarmament and a transformation in strategic relationships using a dialogue approach. Paul was also until recently a talk show host on state Iranian TV promoting alternative perspectives on strategic matters, and taught British senior civil servants leadership skills.

Source: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/opensecurity/paul-ingram/complacency-is-slowly-killing-nonproliferation-regime>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

In the 1973 conflict, the Arab states knew the Israelis had a nuclear weapon, yet still chose to confront Israel by amassing a combined Arab force. Deterrence had failed. The Israeli leadership at the time believed that the survival of the state was at risk yet chose not to deploy their nuclear weapon, or even ready it. Yet that arsenal did its job. The signal got through to the US, who then supplied the country with game-changing military equipment to dissuade the Israelis from contemplating the unimaginable.

It may seem extraordinary that the United States seems willing to tolerate such a continuing arrangement.

Whilst the nature of the relationship is very different, the Saudis could choose a similar route. They may think it a complementary strategy to their dependence upon the United States. The Arab monarchies are less confident of that US guarantee since President Mubarek lost control of Egypt. The Saudis are well aware of the importance of the non-proliferation regime. But if they lack the necessary trust in it, and they start to consider options that more clearly signal their discontent, then the NPT itself could be severely, perhaps fatally damaged.

This is not to say the deal with Iran is a poor one, or that we should be particularly cautious in agreeing one. Indeed, a deal is probably essential to the stability of the region. The bigger lesson is that members of the NPT, and particularly the depository states—the United States, the UK and Russia—need to deliver more clearly on their promises and restore the faith of the international community in the broader regime, and that means establishing a far stronger international consensus by demonstrating a more serious commitment to multilateral disarmament, and pressuring Israel to attend a WMD

Free Zone conference in Helsinki at the earliest opportunity. Because without that faith, there is a very real possibility that we could enter into a new and unstable set nuclear relationships.

It seems there is already fatalism over the chances of achieving agreement at the NPT Review Conference, symptomatic of a failure that goes deeper than the inefficiencies of the diplomatic process. Governments seem to have priced in a failure to agree on an on-going action plan, and are already talking about picking up the momentum at the next meeting—in 2020. Some appear to believe we can manage this crisis using sanctions and bilateral talks.

This short-termist attitude is extremely dangerous. It is exactly when relations between states are stressed, and when turbulence and uncertainty is raging, that control over the possession and doctrine of nuclear weapons and other WMD is most important. It is at that moment that confidence in the NPT, and its contribution to national, regional and global security must be maintained. Member states need to feel secure within its constraints, rather than simply bound by its legal obligations or by threats from more powerful states to comply. It is therefore confidence in the stability of the regime itself that is as critical as the surviving legal terms.

When the five nuclear weapon states meet in London in February to discuss the possibilities on the multilateral disarmament agenda, and their lines for the NPT Review Conference explaining how they will meet their obligations under the 2010 Action Plan, let's hope they have a good story to tell. And let's also hope we have some positive news on that overdue Helsinki WMD-free zone Conference. ❖

openSecurity 
Conflict and peacebuilding



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH NOVEMBER 2014 ARTICLES



TOWARD A NUCLEAR FREE WORLD



<http://www.nuclearabolition.info/>



People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition
Initiated by Soka Gakkai International (SGI)



<http://www.peoplesdecade.org/>

Publisher: Global Cooperation Council

[umbrella organisation of IPS-Inter Press ServiceDeutschland]

SGI-IPS Project Director: Katsuhiko Asagiri | President IPS Japan

SGI-IPS Project Editor-in-Charge: Ramesh Jaura