



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 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

2015 a Make-or-Break Year for Nuclear Disarmament

U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon last month singled out what he described as “one of the greatest ironies of modern science”: while humans are searching for life on other planets, the world’s nuclear powers are retaining and modernizing their weapons to destroy life on planet earth. “We must counter the militarism that breeds the pursuit of such weaponry,” he warned. ➤Pages 2-3

Obama’s Talk Closer to Indian Position on Nukes

Present-day summit meetings are about optics and atmospherics. It is the triumph of style over content. The meeting between Prime Minister Narendra Modi and President Barack Obama was no different. In the age of tweet and TV-driven news coverage, events take precedence over outcomes and sound bytes over substance. ➤Page 4

What Others Say

“The World Is Bigger Than 5” and the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

The Federal Republic of Germany traditionally seeks to have ordinary relations with one of its most important allies, the Turkish Republic. While Germany continues especially good economic relations with the predominantly Muslim country and having several partnerships in other important fields . . . ➤ Pages 5-6

Why a New Anti-nuclear Movement Should Push for an Old Idea: A Comprehensive Test Ban

Humanitarian consequences loom large in the history of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which seeks to ban all testing of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, below ground, under water, and everywhere else, regardless of whether the tests are conducted for civilian or military purposes. ➤ Pages 6-7-8

India’s NSG Membership Questions NSG-NPT Relationship

The talk on India’s participation at the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) has initiated a discourse on the future of the Group, with particular reference to the Group’s relationship with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). ➤ Pages 8-9

The US and China Need to Cooperate on North Korea

The mysterious absence of North Korea’s supreme leader, Kim Jong-un, from public occasions for over a month has generated a great deal of speculation around the world. ➤ Page 10

Civil Society Perspective

How We Learned to Stop Playing With Blocks and Ban Nuclear Weapons ➤Page 11-12



Ray Acheson



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

2015 a Make-or-Break Year for Nuclear Disarmament

By THALIF DEEN

UNITED NATIONS (IPS) - U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon last month singled out what he described as “one of the greatest ironies of modern science”: while humans are searching for life on other planets, the world’s nuclear powers are retaining and modernising their weapons to destroy life on planet earth. “We must counter the militarism that breeds the pursuit of such weaponry,” he warned.



Photo: Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon reads a statement to the media after visiting Ground Zero of the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Site in April 2010. | Credit: UN Photo/Eskinder Debebe

With a slew of events lined up beginning next April, 2015 may be a make-or-break year for nuclear disarmament – either a streak of successes or an unmitigated failure.

The critically important Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, which takes place every five years, is high up on the agenda and scheduled for April-May next year.

Around the same time, there will be an international civil society conference on peace, justice and the environment (Apr. 24-25) in New York, and a major international rally and a people’s march to the United Nations (Apr. 26) by peace activists, along with non-violent protests in capitals around the world.

The year 2015 also commemorates the 70th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, stirring nuclear nightmares of a bygone era.

And it marks 45 years since the first five nuclear powers, the United States, Britain, France, China and Russia (P-5), agreed in Article VI of the NPT to undertake good faith negotiations for the elimination of their nuclear arsenals.

Additionally, anti-nuclear activists are hoping the long postponed international conference on a nuclear-weapons-free-zone in the Middle East, agreed to at the Review Conference in 2010, will take place in 2015.

A network of international non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which will take the lead role in the events next year, will also present a petition, with millions of signatures, calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

The network calls itself ‘the International Planning Group for the 2015 NPT Review Mobilisation: For Abolition, Climate and Justice.’

The group includes Abolition 2000, American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Earth Action, Mayors for Peace, Western States Legal Foundation, Japan Council against A&N Bombs, Peace Boat, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, World Council of Churches, and many more.

Should the 2015 Review Conference fail to mandate the commencement of abolition negotiations, “the treaty itself could fail, accelerating nuclear weapons proliferation and increasing the likelihood of a catastrophic nuclear war,” warns the network.

Asked whether any progress could be achieved in the face of intransigence by the world’s nuclear powers, Dr. Joseph Gerson, co-convenor of the international network, replied, “But what are we supposed to do? Roll over and let the crackpot realists take us all to hell?

“I don’t think so,” he said.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Certainly, prospects for the NPT Review are anything but rosy, warned Gerson, director of the peace and economic security programmes at the AFSC's Northeast region.

"But among other things, having witnessed the debate during last year's High Level Meeting (HLM) on Disarmament and the responses of governmental representatives during the Conference on the Human Consequences of Nuclear Weapons, I do take hope in knowing that our civil society movements are not alone in our struggle for abolition," he added.

The international network says the last 2010 NPT Review Conference reaffirmed "the unequivocal undertaking of the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament."

Five more years have passed and another Review Conference is in the offing. Still, nuclear stockpiles of "civilisation-destroying" size persist, and even limited progress on disarmament has stalled.

Over 16,000 nuclear weapons remain, with 10,000 in military service and 1,800 on high alert, according to the network. "All nuclear-armed states are modernising their nuclear arsenals, manifesting the intention to sustain them for decades to come," it notes. The network also says nuclear-armed countries spend over 100 billion dollars per year on nuclear weapons and related costs. Those expenditures are expected to increase as nuclear weapon states modernise their warheads and delivery systems.

Spending on high-tech weapons not only deepens the reliance of some governments on their nuclear arsenals, but also furthers the growing divide between rich and poor. In 2013, 1.75 trillion dollars was spent on militaries and armaments – more than the total annual income of the poorest third of the world's population. Jackie Cabasso of the Western States Legal Foundation and also a co-convenor of the international network said the nuclear powers have "refused to honour their legal and moral obligation to begin negotiations to ban and completely eliminate their nuclear arsenals".

"As we have seen at the United Nations High-Level Meeting for Disarmament and at the Oslo and Nayarit Conferences on the Human Consequences of Nuclear Weapons, the overwhelming majority of the world's governments demand the implementation of the NPT," she said. "We are working with partner organisations in the U.S. and other nations to mobilise international actions to bring popular pressure to bear on the 2015 Review Conference," Cabasso said.

She said the 2015 mobilisation will highlight the inextricable connections between preparations for nuclear

war, the environmental impacts of nuclear war and the nuclear fuel cycle, and military spending at the expense of meeting essential human needs.

Gerson told IPS, "In my lifetime, despite the stacked decks and long odds, I've seen and been privileged to play small roles in overcoming the Jim Crow apartheid system, the end of the Vietnam War, and the end of South African apartheid systems and dynamics that before they became history seemed at times almost insurmountable.

"I can still easily tap into the emotions of 1971 and 1972 during the Christmas bombings, when the world seemed so black as the bombs rained death on Vietnam despite our having done everything that we could imagine to do to end the war."

In each of these cases, "unexpected developments and powerful human will brought the change for which we had sacrificed and struggled," said Gerson, a member of the board of the International Peace Bureau and of the steering committee of the 'No to NATO/No to War' network. He said the bleak scenario includes the reality that all of the nuclear weapons states are modernising their nuclear arsenals. At the same time, there is collaboration among the P-5 in resisting the demands of the majority of the world's nations to fulfill their Article VI commitments and a renewed era of confrontation spurred by NATO and European Union expansion and Russian President Vladimir Putin's responses, including mutual nuclear threats.

Gerson said the dynamics in East Asia are reminiscent of those in Europe in the years leading to World War I – and all of these carry the threat of catastrophic war and annihilation. "I know that the law of unintended consequences means that we can never truly know what the consequences of our actions will be," he added. "That said I trust that our mobilisation will stiffen the moral backbones and give encouragement to a number of diplomats and governmental actors who are our potential allies." And hopefully, it will also provide the forums and opportunities for movement leaders and activists to think and plan together through mainstream and social media to revitalise popular understandings of the imperative of nuclear weapons abolition, he said.

At the same time, he is hoping the nuclear weapons abolition movement will expand for the longer term, including building alliances with climate change, economic and social justice movements.

"Through our work with students and young people, [we will] help generate the next generation of nuclear abolitionists, even as we race the clock against the dangers of nuclear war." (IPS | October 9, 2014)



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Obama's Talk Closer to Indian Position on Nukes

By SHASTRI RAMACHANDARAN*

NEW DELHI (IDN) - Present-day summit meetings are about optics and atmospherics. It is the triumph of style over content. The meeting between Prime Minister Narendra Modi and President Barack Obama was no different. In the age of tweet and TV-driven news coverage, events take precedence over outcomes and sound bytes over substance.



Documents such as the vision statement or the joint statement, which in times past served as a measure of the agenda and accomplishments of bilateral meetings, are today ignored as pointless verbiage unavoidable for the record.

So after all the hype and hoopla have subsided, a reading of the Modi-Obama statements reveals much that was missed in the euphoria of the occasion. One such outcome to which little attention was paid is the emphasis — in both the joint and vision statements — on nuclear disarmament and a non-discriminatory global nuclear order.

This marks a significant shift in the US position, bringing it closer to the Indian standpoint that has prevailed from Jawaharlal Nehru's time. That President Obama's line, reflected in the statements, may have no takers in the US Congress, strategic community or the military establishment, is a different issue. The fact is Obama has acknowledged India's case for a non-discriminatory nuclear regime. This implies his acceptance of India's rejection of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

In their Vision Statement of September 29, the US President and Indian Prime Minister affirmed that they "will prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and remain committed to reducing the salience of nuclear weapons, while promoting universal, verifiable, and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament".

In their Joint Statement the next day, Obama and Modi "pledged to strengthen their efforts to forge a partnership to lead global efforts for non-proliferation of WMDs, to reduce the salience of nuclear weapons in international affairs, and to promote universal, verifiable, and non-discriminatory global nuclear disarmament".

The NPT is the bedrock of US nuclear policy; and "non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament" is another term for India's rejection of the NPT, which the US has been pressing India to sign since the 1980s.

The US, which asserts its right to nuclear weapons, has sought to bind other powers like India to the NPT and also the CTBT. India has declined to become a signatory because these treaties are flawed and discriminatory. Now Obama is in agreement with India about these regimes being discriminatory. This is the first time a US President has done so. Perhaps, Obama has realised that it is pointless to keep pushing the NPT or CTBT — because when New Delhi has not bowed to US pressure in the past, it will certainly not do so now.

This development comes when Modi — who is avowedly anti-Nehruvian — is publicly committed to dismantling the legacy of Jawaharlal Nehru. Universal nuclear disarmament is rooted in Nehru's vision and is a legacy that Rajiv Gandhi brought alive, in 1988, as the Six Nation-Five Continent Initiative. With India's failure to make the UN General Assembly accept his idea of a nuclear-weapon-free world, the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan (RGAP 88) was all but forgotten.

In 2010, RGAP 88 gained new life when Prime Minister Manmohan Singh set up an Informal Group inspired by Obama's April 2009 speech in Prague, where he spoke of "US commitment to seek peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons".

Modi might now find use for the 284-page report, released in August 2011, of the PM's Group for revival of the RGAP on Disarmament. Should he continue in the footsteps of Rajiv Gandhi and Manmohan Singh, Modi may succeed where they failed: in the mission to take forward Nehru's vision. [IDN-InDepthNews – October 7, 2014]

Photo: President Barack Obama and the Prime Minister Narendra Modi. Official White House Photo by Pete Souza)

**The author is an independent political and foreign affairs commentator based in New Delhi. This article first appeared in DNA.*



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

“The World Is Bigger Than 5” and the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

By ERKUT AYVAZOĞLU*

The Federal Republic of Germany traditionally seeks to have ordinary relations with one of its most important allies, the Turkish Republic. While Germany continues especially good economic relations with the predominantly Muslim country and having several partnerships in other important fields, it seems that there are interesting developments and a kind of rivalry in the background – particularly in recent years.

Of course, it is not known what the concrete issues are – at least for now. However, what we know is that under these conditions, instruments such as German media outlets have become more and more striking in the last couple of years with regard to their negative reports about Turkey and its politics. These are both extremely strange and interesting. In addition to the many controversial articles concerning Turkey that have come from German media outlets, in August 2014 for instance, the German weekly Der Spiegel also revealed that the German Federal Intelligence Service (BND) has been spying on its NATO ally Turkey since 2009. Furthermore, another German daily, Die Welt, claimed recently that Turkey is seeking to acquire enriched uranium. The article published in Die Welt, which is known for its current bias toward the current Turkish government and president, claimed that Turks are working on building a nuclear weapon with instruction from President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. In addition, it was also reported without any reasonable proof that the technology to build this weapon was transferred to Turkey by Pakistan.

However, subsequently to the strange assertions in Die Welt both the Turkish Foreign Ministry and the Turkish Energy Minister Taner Yıldız denied the claims. Turkey did not have the intention or technology, such as a nuclear research reactor or a uranium enrichment program, for nuclear weapons production, Yıldız said. The Foreign Ministry also made clear that Turkey attaches great importance to issues of arms control and disarmament. Moreover, it said that the country is a party to all relevant international treaties and conventions including, in particular, the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is also an active participant in international efforts in these areas.

After World War II, which resulted in the defeat of Nazi Germany, several concerns arose that those few states possessing nuclear weapons would destabilize international relations and a nuclear war could even be possible. Thus, since the 1960s the main objective has been to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, however, there were different opinions in order to achieve this goal. Today, everything could have been different if the Baruch Plan, based on the Acheson-Lilienthal report and submitted to the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission by the U.S., U.K. and Canada, which would have internationalized all nuclear activities from mining to final disposal, had been accepted in 1946 – when the U.S. was the only country that possessed nuclear arms (the Soviet Union did not trust the U.S. disarmament promise – perhaps rightly). Nevertheless, many years later and after other countries also developed their own nuclear weapons, a fundamental event took place: the adoption of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1970. The treaty distinguishes between official "nuclear weapon states" (NWS) such as the U.S., Soviet Union, China, France and the U.K. and "non-nuclear weapon states" (NNWS), that is to say, the rest of the world. The NPT distributes obligations but, above all it bans nuclear arms for every state except the NWS, i.e., those five states mentioned above.

Unfortunately, on the one hand, these NWS did not follow their disarmament pledges under the NPT and, on the other hand, NNWS countries developed their own nuclear arms such as North Korea, India, Pakistan and Israel – of course, "illegally." The NPT issue gets more difficult from the perspective of international law if one examines the case of North Korea, which withdrew from the treaty in 2003, and the case of India, Pakistan and Israel that have never joined the NPT. Ultimately, all four countries possess nuclear weapons as well. So what? Did anyone speak about legality or is there any credibility? In 1995 the treaty was extended indefinitely and there are currently approximately 190 NPT-members, without India, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea. Turkey joined the NPT in 1980.

At the beginning of the 1990s, certain European states reacted reluctantly against the announcement that the U.S. administration under President Bill Clinton wanted to advance a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) with the goal of banning all nuclear explosions in all environments for military or civilian purposes. Non-nuclear states welcomed this attitude while the U.K., a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council (UNSC), supported the idea that nuclear tests are necessary for the safety and reliability of British warheads. Later, this opinion changed surprisingly into the position that Britain's weapons would be safe and reliable even without tests. In a similar way, France changed its former anti-CTBT attitude as well. Ultimately, the CTBT was adopted in September 1996 by the U.N. General Assembly but still it could not enter into force until today.

**Political Scientist, Master of Arts, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg*



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

There are nuclear states such as the U.K. and France who "legally" possess nuclear weapons in accordance with international law. These countries were colonial powers and the U.K. was even a superpower, though, once upon a time. Moreover, there are countries such as Israel, North Korea, India and Pakistan – who acquired nuclear technology under the pretense that if India has the bomb, Pakistan has to possess it as well, which is quite understandable – which possess nuclear weapons as well.

After 2003, EU member states became a little more active in global matters and thus decided to reinforce the current non-proliferation treaties to intensify export controls and extend international cooperation with other states. In that context the EU made efforts within its EU-3 initiative with regard to the revealed Iranian nuclear program. Despite all the developments, the relations between the U.S. and EU improved after a certain period following the Iraq war. Consequently, the EU and U.S. were able to encourage a UNSC resolution that obliges the states to prosecute illegal activities concerning WMD-capable technology.

Despite the obvious and known hypocritical attitude toward certain countries by Western countries concerning nuclear weapons, of course, these steps for non-proliferation are encouraging developments that the global society welcomes. But today we also have to start questioning and challenging the state of mind of those countries that are the NWS, i.e., countries that legally possess nuclear WMDs according to the NPT. And surprisingly, those countries are the so-called five permanent members of the UNSC. As Dr. Cemil Ertem said a few days ago: "When we consider the fact that the five main victors of World War II (China, France, Russia, the U.K. and U.S.) became the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, it is not that difficult to see how and under what circumstances the U.N. was established."

As one notices, the specific question of nuclear WMDs is not just a case that can be reduced to a German newspaper's ideological slandering claims. First of all, there is a main fundamental global inequality that causes several other problematic circumstances in global politics. Thus, those needed steps might be started in accordance with some world leaders' recent call to initiate the UNSC reform. In this sense, a few world leaders demanded the UNSC reform during their addresses to the U.N. General Assembly over the past few days, calling for the addition of more permanent and non-permanent seats on the UNSC and the elimination of the veto. In this context, the slogan, "The world is bigger than five," becomes, therefore, a key statement for the near future. The majority of people around the globe are echoing this call for immediate reform that should be seriously taken into account – otherwise, it might not be possible to solve several other problems that are directly or indirectly related to this issue. [Daily Sabah, October 1, 2014]

Source: <http://www.dailysabah.com/opinion/2014/10/01/the-world-is-bigger-than-5-and-the-nonproliferation-of-nuclear-weapons>

Why a New Anti-nuclear Movement Should Push for an Old Idea: A Comprehensive Test Ban

By THEO KALIONZES*

Humanitarian consequences loom large in the history of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which seeks to ban all testing of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, below ground, under water, and everywhere else, regardless of whether the tests are conducted for civilian or military purposes. (Simulations on computers, however, are permitted.)

The treaty's humanitarian considerations have their roots in a wide variety of sources: In the early days of the Cold War, alarm bells went off after the discovery that fallout from nuclear testing boosted levels of radioactive isotopes in children's teeth. Similarly, the 1954 discovery that Japanese fishermen suffered acute radiation sickness from their exposure to the larger-than-expected yield of the Castle Bravo thermonuclear test raised concern. Soon doctors, scientists, diplomats, and civil society organizations began calling for a ban on testing, united in their fears about its harmful effects on public health and the environment.

Meanwhile, ending nuclear tests came to be recognized as a powerful tool in the call for complete nuclear disarmament. A testing ban was thought to reduce the perceived value and usefulness of nuclear arsenals, thereby paving the way for their obsolescence and ultimate elimination.

**Theo Kalionzes is a program assistant at the Carnegie Corporation of New York*

Source: <http://thebulletin.org/why-new-anti-nuclear-movement-should-push-old-idea-comprehensive-test-ban7690#.VDQI9ebl21k.twitter>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

Consequently, calls for a ban on all nuclear tests made their way into the non-binding preambles of the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty, which eliminated testing in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)—which sought to stop, or at least slow down, the spread of nuclear weapons. After the former drove the majority of explosive testing underground—allowing the arms race to continue unabated—advocates saw even more justification for the goal of a total ban. The CTBT finally came up for signature in 1996. Just getting to that point was a huge accomplishment; President Clinton called it “the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control.”

The prize may be long-sought and hard-fought, but it still has not been won. While the UN’s General Assembly adopted the CTBT by a large majority, it still has not taken full legal effect—“entered into force” in diplo-speak—because eight countries have yet to “ratify,” a legal term that often goes beyond a leader’s signature to require consent from a country’s parliament or congress. The eight are China, Egypt, Iran, Israel, and the United States, which have at least signed it, and North Korea, India, and Pakistan, which have not. This “unfinished business”—as Rebecca Johnson of the Acronym Institute once described it—has been looming over the international community, leaving the CTBT to languish in legal limbo, even while the humanitarian argument against nuclear weapons has grown into a movement with broad international appeal.

On December 8 and 9 of this year, diplomats will gather at Vienna’s Hofburg Palace to discuss the next steps of the movement to reduce or eliminate nuclear weapons on humanitarian grounds. This is an opportune time to call for progress on the CTBT’s ratification. Partisan gridlock in Washington has dimmed prospects for US ratification in the short term, but with the CTBT back on the front burner in Vienna, diplomats could at least push for trying to overcome the reluctance of the other remaining holdout countries.

Stirring the pot. The final document for the 2010 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty spurred the humanitarian movement onward with its reference to the “catastrophic humanitarian consequences” that would result from a nuclear attack. In a departure from the traditional characterization of nuclear weapons as prestigious guarantors of state security, this new effort reframes them as indiscriminate instruments of warfare whose use would violate international humanitarian law. The reframing appears to have given voice to many states’ long-simmering frustration with the pace of nuclear disarmament. The first two conferences—held in Oslo, Norway and in Nayarit, Mexico—attracted representatives from 128 and 146 countries, respectively. Many nongovernmental groups also attended, although the P-5 (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) stayed away.

Given the interwoven history and the shared aims of the CTBT and the humanitarian impact movement, one might assume that diplomats took advantage of the Oslo and Nayarit meetings to push forcefully for the treaty’s entry into force. On the contrary, support for the CTBT at these meetings appears to have been muted at best. A review of the official country statements made available on the Oslo conference website revealed that only two—Albania and Mongolia—directly called for the treaty’s adoption. Notwithstanding the Norwegian government’s strong support for the CTBT, the Oslo chair’s summary failed to mention CTBT implementation (although it did refer to the human cost of nuclear testing). None of the official statements made available on the Nayarit conference website calls for the treaty’s entry into force; although the Nayarit chair’s summary does refer to the goal of bringing the treaty into full legal effect, this was not a point of emphasis.

And the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty needs all the help it can get. Although 183 nations have signed, it faces corrosive political uncertainty precisely because it has not yet taken full legal effect. Seven other countries must still ratify the treaty to bring it into force; the conventional wisdom among treaty-watchers is that none of them will do so unless Washington ratifies first. According to the logic of this argument, while US leadership was instrumental in moving the CTBT from the drawing board to the negotiating table in the 1990s, the Clinton administration’s failure to win ratification in 1999 removed the sense of urgency upon other holdout countries to ratify. Once the United States ratifies—says this argument—China will quickly follow suit, increasing the pressure on others to bring the treaty into force.

In 2009, President Obama pledged to “immediately and aggressively” pursue ratification, but partisan acrimony on Capitol Hill and conflicting domestic priorities have made it all but certain that it will not take place on Obama’s watch. This assessment could lead advocates to conclude that the most viable strategy is to call for a timeout until a new US president is elected, hoping for improved future prospects.

This is a risky strategy. If there is no progress on making the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty legally binding, then the sustainability of the entire CTBT cannot be assured. What’s more, US ratification alone—while a necessary step—is not sufficient to make the treaty go into force; there is still the matter of those seven other holdouts.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

The current situation will require a renewed push at the multilateral level, and the December humanitarian impact conference would be a good place to begin. The administrators of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Organization recently launched a promising venture called the Group of Eminent Persons, which aims to promote the treaty's entry into force by convening high-level strategy groups of experts and politicians, including luminaries such as former US Secretary of Defense William Perry, and Hans Blix, former International Atomic Energy Agency director general.

Uniting the humanitarian impact movement and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty would be a natural fit, and there is reason for optimism: The December conference will be held just a stone's throw away from the CTBT's Vienna headquarters. This closeness in space and time is propitious. If the humanitarian impact movement were to join forces with the Group of Eminent Persons in December, it could go a long way in building the support needed to make the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—long-sought and hard-fought—go into effect. (October 6, 2014)

India's NSG Membership Questions NSG-NPT Relationship

By ARKA BISWAS

The talk on India's participation at the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) has initiated a discourse on the future of the Group, with particular reference to the Group's relationship with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Those opposing India's entry to the global nuclear export control regime argue that letting India join the NSG would mean a decoupling of the NPT and the NSG membership.



Photo: India's Nuclear Dilemma. Credit: Google Imagine Commons

It is also said that by including a non-NPT state, the NSG would undermine the legitimacy of the NPT. These arguments essentially stem from the belief that the NSG was established to support and complement the NPT in its goal of nuclear non-proliferation.

India, on this front, is not considered by some nations and global nuclear experts as like-minded as it continues to remain outside the NPT. There are two important factors, however, which require careful examination before any judgement is made on either the like-mindedness of India or India's participation at the NSG. The first aspect to be examined is that of a direct proportionality which is assumed to exist between NPT-membership and like-mindedness of a country on nuclear non-proliferation. The second factor which needs to be studied is the relationship between the NSG and the NPT memberships.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

The necessity of like-mindedness is understandably critical considering that the NSG functions on consensus and including countries which do not adhere to the common principles and norms of non-proliferation could diminish the efficiency of the Group significantly. But there appears to be an assumption made in this argument (against India's participation) that NPT-membership and like-mindedness on nuclear non-proliferation are directly proportional to each other. History, however, proves that the NSG has, in fact, faced situations when some of its participating governments (PGs), that were also party to the NPT, did not show the like-mindedness which is expected to be demonstrated.

For instance, for over 13 years after the NSG meeting of 1977 in London, the NSG PGs did not meet to discuss the proposal of creating the requirement of full-scope safeguards at the recipient state a condition for export of nuclear materials, equipments and technologies that were covered in the NSG's trigger list.

Though the Guidelines as established in 1977 were not violated by any of its PGs and the Group also expanded with 12 new countries joining the Group in that period, due to commercial interests of some of the PGs, as argued by Ambassador Tadeusz Strulak, Chairman of the NSG in 1992, the PGs did not meet.

This absence of like-mindedness also resulted in the absence of expansion and upgradation of the NSG trigger list (of sensitive nuclear and related materials, equipments and technologies) which allowed some NPT nations, in particular Iraq, to acquire dual-use equipments to run a clandestine nuclear programme. It was only at the end of the Gulf War, that the NSG PGs agreed to meet and discuss the expansion of the trigger list to include nuclear related dual-use items.

Another and a more recent example is that of China and its export of two additional nuclear reactors to Pakistan at Chashma-3 and -4. China claimed that the export of the reactors is grandfathered by an agreement made between China and Pakistan in the early 1990s, much before 2004 when China joined the Group. But the fact remains that China did not disclose its plans of exporting new reactors to the NSG PGs in 2004 which it was required to notify. On the contrary, it had assured the NSG that it will not export any other reactors than Chashma -1 and -2. China's decision to export reactors, without acquiring formal exemption for Pakistan is a clear violation of the NSG Guidelines and it threatens the credibility and the legitimacy of the Group.

These two examples illustrate the argument that NPT membership does not necessarily reflect the like-mindedness of a country on nuclear non-proliferation. The cases of Iraq (in the early 1990s), Iran and North Korea further consolidate the validity of this argument. While being signatories to the NPT, they have either run clandestine nuclear programme or have left the Treaty and developed and tested weaponised nuclear devices. Though the reasons could vary, such instances showcase that NPT membership alone cannot determine the path a nation takes in so far as nuclear proliferation is concerned.

Meanwhile, examination of the NSG's history actually reveals that the Group, in the past, has gone beyond the NPT by including nations which were not signatories to the latter. France, for instance, joined the NPT in 1992, but it has been at the NSG since 1977. In 1974, SGN, a French company, had signed a contract with the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PAEC) to construct a reprocessing facility which could have enabled Pakistan in producing between 100 kg and 200 kg of weapons-grade plutonium. However, soon after joining the NSG, France terminated the contract with the PAEC and also abandoned its other plans of nuclear and related exports to countries who were then seeking latent nuclear capabilities.

NSG's relationship with NPT is critical as the former's decision to include states that are not like-minded would not just damage its own efficiency but could also jeopardise the legitimacy of the latter. Yet, considering that NPT-membership has failed to serve as an accurate indicator of the like-mindedness of a nation on nuclear non-proliferation, the NSG would benefit by broadening its understanding of like-mindedness on nuclear non-proliferation and going beyond the NPT to include nations that can contribute to the true spirit of non-proliferation. If NSG includes a non-NPT signatory in the near future, it will definitely not be the first time. [South Asian Voices, October 4, 2014]



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

The US and China Need to Cooperate on North Korea

By DINGDING Chen

The mysterious absence of North Korea's supreme leader, Kim Jong-un, from public occasions for over a month has generated a great deal of speculation around the world.



The mysterious absence of North Korea's supreme leader, Kim Jong-un, from public occasions for over a month has generated a great deal of speculation around the world. The fact that three top North Korean officials paid a [snap visit](#) to South Korea only caused more speculation; the most interesting rumors question whether the young leader is still in charge. Although one can not rule out the possibility that a coup has occurred, most analysts ([here](#) and [here](#)) believe that Kim Jong-un is ill but remains in charge.

Furthermore, a series of diplomatic moves by North Korea in recent months suggests that North Korea is now desperate to end its isolation in the international community. For example, it held a briefing at the U.N. to discuss its human rights record, and surprisingly admitted that there are labor camps in North Korea with the purpose of "reforming" people. North Korea also reached out to Japan earlier to discuss the issue of abducted Japanese citizens, hoping that Japan would ease some sanctions in return. Put all these recent moves together and one might conclude that indeed North Korea is adopting a "divide and conquer" strategy as it faces very strong international pressures to give up its nuclear program.

If so, then the question is whether North Korea's new strategy can work. Although in the past North Korea has been quite effective in getting international aid (primarily from China and South Korea) without giving up its nuclear ambitions, this time it seems that North Korea has reached its limits in manipulating the international community for a set of reasons.

Among them, the most important factor is China's changing attitude toward North Korea under the new leadership of Xi Jinping. The fact that Kim Jong-un has yet to pay a visit to China since he took charge in North Korea in 2011 is a strong signal. As North Korea's largest trade partner and most important ally, China has given a cold face to North Korea since it conducted a third nuclear test last year. It is likely that China stopped exporting oil to North Korea for five months, a clear warning sign to North Korea regarding its uncooperative behavior. Xi is a strong leader and he is determined to end North Korea's game of manipulation, provided that North Korea does not collapse quickly as a result. Chinese media, in the meantime, have also adopted a harsher tone towards North Korea, again signaling China's anger.

The fundamental reason behind Beijing's tough stance is China's determination to end North Korea's ambitious nuclear program, which is a strategic interest shared by the United States. Both powers understand that North Korea's nuclear ambitions, if realized, could deeply destabilize Northeast Asia by encouraging a nuclear arms race. The U.S. approach to North Korea, strategic patience, has not resulted in concrete progress. It has become increasingly clear among Chinese analysts that Sino-U.S. cooperation is a must to end North Korea's nuclear threat. According to this perspective, the first step is for both China and the United States to control the possible crisis that could result from North Korea's nuclear program. After accomplishing this, both should work together to push for a "soft landing" of the North Korean regime. The U.S. should not seek a regime change whereas China should put more pressure on North Korea to embark on reforms. Regardless of Kim Jong-un's health and status, leaders in North Korea must understand that they will have to adopt a "opening and reform" strategy, just like China did in the late 1970s.

This is not an easy task, particularly when China and the U.S. have different understandings of the North Korea issue. The U.S. should give up its high-pressure approach toward North Korea by viewing it not as a direct threat, and China should make more efforts to impose real sanctions on North Korea. If the two countries can work together effectively on North Korea, then it would be a meaningful step toward building a "new type of major power relations," which undoubtedly would benefit Asia and the whole world enormously. [The Diplomat, October 20 2014]



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

How We Learned to Stop Playing With Blocks and Ban Nuclear Weapons

By Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

“It is in the interest of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances.” This is the view of the 155 states that endorsed the joint statement delivered by Ambassador Dell Higgie of New Zealand. “The only way to guarantee that nuclear weapons will never be used again is through their total elimination.”

The majority of states and their publics share this view. It is only a handful of states, generally among the most wealthy in the world, that have consistently resisted progress in this area.

Another 20 countries signed onto a separate statement calling on states to address the “important security and humanitarian dimensions of nuclear weapons.” Delivered by the Australian delegation, this statement suggested that working “methodically and with realism” is the way to “attain the necessary confidence and transparency to bring about nuclear disarmament.”

By this, the 20 countries refer to the “step-by-step” or “building blocks” approach. As outlined by an all-male panel hosted by Japan and the Netherlands last week, the blocks include, among other things, entry into force of the Comprehensive nuclear Test Ban Treaty, negotiation of a fissile materials cut-off treaty, reducing the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines, increasing transparency of and de-alerting nuclear forces, and arsenal reductions.

Yet as the Irish delegation pointed out, these actions—while welcome to the extent that they lead to concrete disarmament—do not constitute implementation of article VI of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Article VI calls for an effective multilateral framework for nuclear disarmament and the end to the nuclear arms race. “Until we put in place the framework,” argued Breifne O’Reilly of Ireland, “we all stand accused of failing to implement our NPT obligations.”

It is the responsibility of all NPT states parties to pursue effective measures for nuclear disarmament. Yet supporters of the step-by-step or building blocks approach seem unwilling to put these “blocks” in place themselves. Some of them host US nuclear weapons on their soil, without acknowledging their presence. Most of these states include nuclear weapons in their security doctrines via NATO, which has not taken a collective decision to reduce the role of this weapon of mass destruction in its military doctrine.

So far, none of these states have been open to articulating a clear legal prohibition against nuclear weapons, even though, as Costa Rica noted, the prohibition of weapons with unacceptable humanitarian impacts has typically preceded their elimination. The Irish delegati-

on pointed out that without the clear prohibition against chemical weapons, these weapons would probably not now be so universally condemned and subject to a specified programme of elimination.

Maritza Chan expressed Costa Rica’s willingness to join a diplomatic process to negotiate a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons, even if the nuclear-armed states are unwilling to participate. She argued that such a treaty would establish a strong legal norm against the use, possession, and deployment of nuclear weapons and represent a significant step towards their complete elimination.

Palau’s delegation agreed with the utility of this approach, noting that such a treaty could compel states to reject any role for nuclear weapons in their military doctrines, prevent nuclear sharing, and prohibit investments in nuclear weapons production. The Thai delegation, among others, expressed a firm conviction that is time to “initiate negotiations on a legal instrument to comprehensively ban nuclear weapons.”

The countries resisting this approach argue that the “security context” is not ripe for pursuing such an effective measure. Australia continues to demand that “we” need to address the security dimensions of nuclear weapon possession. The nuclear-armed states of course want to focus on their own perceived security interests. France asserted that disarmament cannot move forward if it “ignores” the “strategic context.” The United Kingdom argued that “we do not yet have the right political and security conditions for those without nuclear weapons to feel no need to acquire them, nor for those who do have them to no longer feel the need to keep them. Nor is it possible to identify a timeframe for those conditions.” The UK even argued that “nuclear weapons are not per se inherently unacceptable” and that they have “helped to guarantee our security, and that of our allies, for decades.”

This is a dangerous narrative, noted Ireland. In effect, it makes an argument in favour of proliferation. “Every state on earth has a strategic context,” noted Mr. O’Reilly. Arguing that nuclear weapons are good for some is the same as arguing they are good for all. They either provide security or they don’t. Their consequences are either acceptable or unacceptable.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH OCTOBER 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

The majority of states, international organisations, and civil society groups have articulated clearly that nuclear weapons do not provide security and that the consequences of their use are wholly unacceptable. There is no ambiguity here. But the narrative of “conditions” ensures that nuclear disarmament is perpetually punted down the road to some unknown, possibly unattainable future state of affairs in which the world is at peace and security is guaranteed through some other imagined means.

Most states reject this utopian view. The majority considers the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons to be a key step in the pursuit of peace, global justice, and security for all.

Some states have already put this approach into practice. Sweden’s delegation explained that it discontinued its nuclear weapons research and development programme in the 1960s because it believed that abolition was the safest option both for its people and for the rest of the world. Focusing on preconditions, Sweden argued, will not help overcome challenges nor uphold commitments.

At the 2000 NPT Review Conference, Sweden noted, the nuclear-armed states committed themselves unequivocally to eliminate their nuclear arsenals without any preconditions. Today, however, the nuclear-armed states and their allies have retracted from this commitment and from any other that rejects the legality or utility of nuclear weapons. They continue to pursue a path that has proven incapable of addressing the core obligation to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The continued stalemate in pursuing the “building blocks” specified by nuclear weapons dependent governments suits their interests only. It supports and even seeks to legitimise the continued possession of nuclear weapons by a select few. These states reject the most feasible, practical, and meaningful “building block” available under current circumstances—the prohibition of nuclear weapons—precisely because it would be an effective measure for nuclear disarmament.

Yet at the same time, they insist they do not have a predetermined course for action. “Each step builds on past steps and provides a foundation for future action,” argued the US delegation. “The temporary inability to make progress in one area does not preclude progress in others or prevent us from putting in place the building blocks for a comprehensive approach to disarmament.”

This is a compelling argument for pursuing a treaty banning nuclear weapons. While the nuclear-armed states and their allies resist negotiations on the comprehensive elimination of these weapons, the rest of the world can begin to establish the framework for this by developing a clear legal standard prohibiting these weapons for all. This will take courage. But it is a logical, feasible, achievable, and above all, effective measure for nuclear disarmament. (October 31, 2014)

This article was originally published on www.reachingcriticalwill.org



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 Service Deutschland] SGI-IPSP Project Director: Katsuhiko Asagiri | President IPS Japan

SGI-IPSP Project Coordinator | Editor-in-Charge: Ramesh Jaura