

NPDI Matters

Recommendations to the 2014 Ministerial

Author

Susi Snyder

Contributing Authors

Loreta Castro, Miriam College, Philippines

Tim Wright, ICAN Australia

ISBN Number 9789070443771

Published March 2014

About Pax

PAX stands for peace. Together with people in conflict areas and critical citizens in the Netherlands, we work on a dignified, democratic and peaceful society, everywhere in the world.

www.PAXforpeace.nl

About the No Nukes Project

No Nukes is Pax' campaign for a world free of nuclear weapons. The No Nukes project seeks opportunities to strengthen the global non-proliferation regime and to accelerate global nuclear disarmament by stigmatizing, outlawing and eliminating nuclear weapons.

www.NoNukes.nl

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following people for their advice and input: Akira Kawasaki, Beatrice Fihn, Cesar Jaramillo, Miriam Struyk, Ray Acheson, Selma van Oostwaard, Tim Wright, and Wilbert van der Zeijden.

The written contents of this booklet may be quoted or reproduced, provided that the source of the information is acknowledged. Pax would like to receive a copy of the document in which anything is quoted. For more information, please contact nukes@paxforpeace.nl.

“continued engagement by all of us, as representatives of the global community, will provide the best chance of securing a safer future without nuclear weapons for all of us and for future generations.”

NPDI Statement to the High Level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament, 7th Ministerial Meeting of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative, 26 September 2013

Introduction

The Non Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI) was established in September 2010 with the purpose of taking forward the Action Plan contained in the consensus outcome of the 2010 nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference.¹ NPDI is a geographically diverse group of twelve countries that are actively engaged in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control discussions, both inside and outside the NPT framework.

The NPDI states: Australia, Canada, Chile, Germany, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, the Philippines, Poland, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, will meet in Hiroshima in April 2014 for their eighth Ministerial Meeting. States will discuss progress on several initiatives and objectives the group has put forward. In addition, it is expected that the NPDI meeting will provide the basis for a joint statement and a series of working papers on behalf of the group, to be presented at the 2014 NPT Preparatory Committee meeting in New York.

This paper examines the composition of the NPDI and assesses some of the contributions made to date. The paper also puts forward recommendations as food for thought for the participants of the April 2014 meeting and beyond.

This paper is a joint publication of civil society organisations operating within NPDI member states. These organisations including ICAN Australia, Miriam College (Philippines) and Pax (Netherlands) are engaged in the non-proliferation and disarmament discourse through research, advocacy and public education efforts. Through the production of this paper, these organisations seek to broaden the dialogue both with NPDI members, and the global community to support the creation and maintenance of a nuclear weapons free world.

Summary of recommendations

Humanitarian Initiative

- The NPDI Ministerial Meeting should welcome Austria's announcement of a follow-up conference to the Nayarit conference, and encourage all states to attend.
- NPDI members, in their national and joint statements to the NPT Preparatory Committee meeting, should call for a treaty banning nuclear weapons and leading to their elimination as a way of fulfilling existing disarmament obligations under the NPT.

Transparency

- NPDI members should report to the 2014 NPT Preparatory Committee meeting using their own proposed reporting format
- NPDI members should work with civil societies and parliamentarians in their countries to hold public discussions and debate on the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

Reducing the role of nuclear weapons in security strategies

- NPDI members should issue national and joint declarations that their security arrangements are not predicated on nuclear weapons.
- NPDI members should elaborate on what they are doing to encourage this issue with the nuclear armed countries.

We remain deeply concerned by the risk for humanity represented by the possibility that nuclear weapons could be used and the catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from their use.

NPDI Sixth Ministerial Meeting, April 2013

Humanitarian Debate

Since 2010, the nuclear weapons discourse shifted back to the original driver for disarmament- namely the catastrophic humanitarian consequences caused by any use of these weapons. In each ministerial statement since its inception, the NPDI has reaffirmed that any use of nuclear weapons would cause grave consequences for humanity, and threaten its very survival. This is a theme agreed during the 2010 NPT Review Conference, when the “*Conference expresse[d] its deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons*”². Yet, in the follow-up to this, not all NPDI member states have been as actively engaged as the others. While the NPDI hopes “*to contribute to a growing consensus that any perceived security or political advantages of nuclear weapons are outweighed by the grave threat they pose to humanity*”³, this is not yet thoroughly reflected by its group actions and proposals.

All NPDI members participated in both the March 2013 conference hosted by Norway and the February 2014 conference in Nayarit on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons. It would be logical for the NPDI to reflect the outcomes of those conferences in its ministerial statement resulting from the April 2014 meeting. Just as the NPDI encouraged global participation in the Nayarit conference⁴, the April 2014 ministerial statement should also encourage participation in Austria’s planned follow-up meeting.

Building on the outcomes of the Oslo Chair’s summary, the NPDI in its statements could also reflect some of the outcomes of the Nayarit meeting, including:

- The effects of a nuclear weapon detonation are not constrained by national borders – it is therefore an issue of deep concern shared by all.
- It is a fact that no State or international organization has the capacity to address or provide the short and long term humanitarian assistance and protection needed in case of a nuclear weapon explosion. Moreover, it would not be possible to establish such capacities, even if attempted.
- Today the risk of nuclear weapons use is growing globally as a consequence of proliferation, the vulnerability of nuclear command and control networks to cyber-attacks and to human error, and potential access to nuclear weapons by non-state actors, in particular terrorist groups.
- The wide range of damage and negative impact in the likelihood of a nuclear explosion, as well as the vast resources allocated to maintain and modernize nuclear arsenals, make the mere existence of these weapons absurd, question the arguments in their defense and ultimately are contrary to human dignity.⁵

As the NPDI has already repeated, the only way to prevent the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons is to eliminate the weapons completely. The Nayarit conference reaffirmed that action such as the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty as a core element of the international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime, and the achievement of a comprehensive outcome in the 2015 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, together with the discussions on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, are mutually reinforcing processes. This is well in line with stated NPDI priorities.

As the NPDI has already taken note of the UN Secretary General’s Five – Point plan for nuclear disarmament, including the possibility of a nuclear weapons convention or framework of agreements, providing additional support to this important step would strengthen existing efforts. NPDI members should incorporate a reference to a treaty banning nuclear weapons and leading to their elimination as a way to fulfil existing disarmament obligations. As the Nayarit summary concluded, “*The broad-based and comprehensive discussions on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons should lead to the commitment of States and civil society to reach new international standards and norms, through a legally binding instrument... It is time to take action.*”⁶

**We urge transparency in their [nuclear
weapon-States] work and express
particular interest in their perspectives
on reducing the size of nuclear arsenals,
role of nuclear weapons in military and
security policies, and the operational
status of nuclear weapon systems,
transparency and confidence building.**
NPDI Fourth Ministerial Meeting, June 2012

Transparency

The NPDI standard reporting format generated as a response to Action 21 of the 2010 NPT Action Plan is a welcome contribution. It builds on Canada's history of calling for strengthened reporting and accountability to NPT agreements- and proposals and working papers put forward in previous NPT cycles. A draft form was presented by the NPDI to the five nuclear weapon states for feedback and submitted to the 2012 NPT Prepcom as working paper NPT/CONF.2015/PC.IWP.12.

While the nuclear armed countries recognized by the NPT rejected the NPDI suggestion, that does not prevent NPDI members from using this same form for their own reports to the 2014 Prepcom. In the 2013 *NPDI Matters*⁷, these forms were completed for some NPDI states as an example. Not all questions relate to all NPDI states, yet the format does provide a baseline accounting, including around fissile materials capabilities and holdings. What is missing is a format for countries who rely on nuclear weapons in their own security strategies - those within NATO, and those who have existing or perceived bilateral nuclear umbrella agreements. The proposed form could easily be adapted and filled out by some of these countries, as a way to build confidence, increase transparency, and further establish the baseline by which to assess the implementation of commitments.

NPDI members should also report on their specific activities to implement the 2010 Action Plan in their reports to the 2014 Preparatory Committee meeting. Civil society monitoring, conducted by Reaching Critical Will⁸ and the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies⁹ are examples of what is possible, however the NPDI should consider providing its own report card to the nuclear armed states at the NPT, specifically highlighting their priority areas.

Transparency goes beyond reporting to NPT meetings, national discussions and deliberations are enhanced by information sharing and democratic dialogues. NPDI members have encouraged the promotion of disarmament and non-proliferation education as one of their key issues. NPDI members can take the first step in broadening discussions and encouraging public attention and interest in these issues by cooperating with civil society actors in their own countries, and holding transparent debates. These debates could take on a number of issues- from the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, to how and why nuclear weapons are perceived by some to be of security importance. Building from the Oslo and Nayarit conferences, and leading towards the Vienna meeting, NPDI members are encouraged to work with their national civil societies and parliaments to elaborate on these issues, in a transparent manner.

According to the general principles of the [NPT 2010] action plan laid down in actions 1 and 2, declaratory policies should reflect the commitment to achieving a world without nuclear weapons and be consistent with the principles of irreversibility, verifiability and transparency.
NPDI Working Paper, NPT/CONF.2015/PC.II/WP.4

Reducing the role of nuclear weapons

The NPDI has called for a reduced role of nuclear weapons in security and defence doctrines and policies. NPDI members have a unique opportunity to contribute to this reduction through their national and alliance activities. The seven NPDI members that currently rely on nuclear assurances from the U.S. have a special responsibility in this respect. As they rely on nuclear weapons in their own security strategies, they could take a positive step by issuing national declarations that their security arrangements do not include a nuclear retaliation option, and publicly recognise that retaliation with nuclear weapons would cause immediate casualties in the thousands (or millions) it also has the potential to cause environmental destruction leading to global famine. These umbrella countries can also state publicly that they do not link their national security to nuclear weapons, thereby contributing to the reduced reliance on nuclear weapons in all security strategies as committed to in 2010.

NPDI members have also held a series of meetings with the recognised nuclear weapons states- as bridge builders. These ongoing communications are useful, but do not substitute for participation in all forums related to nuclear weapons by these nuclear armed countries. The NPDI should be commended for continuing to hold these exchanges, and could build on the positive experiences in the past by incorporating additional items to the agenda (de-alerting, transparency & reporting, disarmament education, etc).

NPDI members could also use their special relationship with nuclear armed countries to request clear responses to the question of when the use of nuclear weapons would be acceptable, if at all. This could lead to further engaged dialogue about doctrines and the justification for these doctrines. For example, NPDI members could ask: Is it acceptable to use them in response to an attack with biological weapons or chemical weapons? In response to energy supply attacks that put thousands of lives at risk? Is there ever a scenario where it would be acceptable to use nuclear weapons against a country that is party to a nuclear weapons free zone agreement? If not, is there any reason to maintain reservations to existing NWFZ agreements and the security assurances contained therein? During the 2013 NPT Preparatory Committee meeting, "*Some nuclear-weapons States outlined that under their respective national policies any use of nuclear weapons would only be considered in extreme circumstances in accordance with applicable international humanitarian law.*"¹⁰ While simply upholding international humanitarian law will not prevent the use of nuclear weapons, the NPDI has an opportunity to encourage these nuclear armed states to revisit these policies, and to make every effort to ensure nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances.

As seven of the NPDI members have a role for nuclear weapons in their national security strategies, the NPDI has a unique opportunity to answer these questions themselves, and show a positive example for the nuclear armed countries to do the same.

The NPDI has the opportunity, both during the 2014 Ministerial meeting in Hiroshima and through the working papers and statements prepared for the 2014 NPT Preparatory Committee meeting to further elaborate its strategy to encourage a reduced reliance on the role of nuclear weapons in security strategies. The NPT working paper on this issue could contain information about specific steps – in bilateral discussion, and through other forums- NPDI members are taking. The national and joint statements are also an opportunity for the majority of NPDI members to seize their sovereign right and obligation towards nuclear disarmament by declaring they will no longer rely on nuclear weapons themselves.

We recognize the significant role that civil society can play in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The NPT is ready to intensify its engagement with civil society organizations in order to attain our common objectives.

NPT Sixth Ministerial Meeting, April 2013

Notes

1 NPT 2010 Final Document can be found at: [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=NPT/CONF.2010/50 \(VOL.I\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=NPT/CONF.2010/50 (VOL.I))

2 NPT 2010 Final Document can be found at: [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=NPT/CONF.2010/50 \(VOL.I\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=NPT/CONF.2010/50 (VOL.I))

3 First NPT Ministerial Statement, 22 September 2010, found at <http://www.dfat.gov.au/security/npti-meeting-20100922.html>

4 NPT Statement to the High Level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament, Seventh Ministerial Meeting of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative, 26 September 2013

5 Nayarit Conference Chair's summary can be found online at: <http://www.sre.gob.mx/en/index.php/humanimpact-nayarit-2014>

6 Nayarit Conference Chair's summary can be found online at: <http://www.sre.gob.mx/en/index.php/humanimpact-nayarit-2014>

7 See <http://www.nonukes.nl/media/files/npti-matters-final-web.pdf>

8 See <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/resources/publications-and-research/publications>

9 See the 2013 report on Disarmament obligations, found here: http://cns.miis.edu/stories/130405_2013_cns_npt_monitoring_report.htm

10 2013 Chairman's Factual Summary NPT/CONF.2015/PC.II/CRP.2, found online at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/npt/prepcom13/documents/CRP2.pdf>

**We, the Foreign Ministers of the
Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative
(NPTI) – Australia, Canada, Chile, Germany,
Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland,
Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and our two
new members, Nigeria and the Philippines –**

concerned by the threat posed to humanity,

**reaffirm with a sense of urgency
our unwavering commitment
to achieving and maintaining
the shared goal of
a world free of nuclear weapons.**

**NPTI Matters
March 2014**

