

**8thRoK-UN Joint Conference
on Disarmament and Non-proliferation Issues**

Report

Session I: Towards a nuclear weapon-free world

Chair: Ambassador Libran Cabactulan

Rapporteur: Mr. Roman Hunger

Session 1, "Towards a nuclear weapon-free world", was chaired by Amb Cabactulan and covered a wide range of important topics to launch the 8th RoK-UN Joint Conference on Disarmament and Non-proliferation issues. The session was divided into two parts and participants received 6 presentations in total.

The first part of the session was introduced by two presentations from both, a nuclear weapon state and a non-nuclear weapon state.

Amb Burk stressed that her country is committed to leading by example on disarmament but didn't forget to mention that they cannot do it alone. Our greatest and most immediate opportunity is to take stewardship of the shared responsibilities with the upcoming 2010 Review Conference. A constructive Review Conference will require all States Parties to look beyond their differences to find those areas where they can agree now both on concrete measures to shore up the global regime, and on areas where further work and deliberation are needed for future steps to strengthen the regime. In addition, she mentioned that the United States are committed to disarmament not only to fulfill their treaty obligations, but because it is in their security interest to do so. Non-Nuclear Weapon States, however, bear no less responsibility to work constructively and actively to prevent further proliferation and help create the conditions for nuclear disarmament efforts to succeed.

Amb de Silva stated in her presentation that in the process of addressing global disarmament, it is necessary to focus on the challenges encountered in the elimination of the nuclear threat from the world. She mentioned particularly the full implementation of the NPT leading to universal nuclear disarmament, to end the conduct of nuclear tests and bring the CTBT into force, to start negotiations on a FMCT and to impose stricter controls for the export of sensitive goods and technologies of the nuclear fuel cycle. She continued that the issue of nuclear arms proliferation has become pertinent in the current security scenario of the world due to the role that non-state actors such as terrorists and pirates are playing. If nuclear weapons capability gets into the hands of ruthless terrorist groups, the devastation that would be caused is unimaginable.

A serious phenomenon in South Asia related to nuclear non-proliferation is the lack of confidence in the region stemming from the inability of India and Pakistan to have a higher degree of nuclear transparency but didn't forget to mention that the US-India nuclear cooperation agreement added an extra-regional dimension to recent developments in the region.

In the discussion, some participants made references to the US-India deal and were questioning the consequences of the agreement. It was especially questioned, if the deal helps to bring India closer to the ongoing discussion on non-proliferation, closer to the NPT, or is it even diminishing the moral authority of certain non-Nuclear Weapon States. Another participant questioned if this agreement really strengthens transparency or just increases the mistrust in the region. One way would be by offering the same deal to Pakistan what was unlikely in other participants' views. Participants also commented on the interdependence of the three pillars of the NPT. Some participants underlined that the three pillars mutually reinforce each other while another participant stressed that the third pillar is a State's Parties right but does not mutually reinforce nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. It was also pointed out that with regard to the third pillar, non-Nuclear Weapon States should view the NPT as a benefit-oriented system. Reference was made to NPT States Parties and their responsibilities to support the IAEA whose international nuclear safeguards regime verifies a party's compliance with its nonproliferation obligations. The regime needs to be as robust as possible.

The second part of session I was dedicated to the Entry into Force of the CTBT and negotiations on an FMCT as well as to a discussion on a philosophical approach: idealism vs. realism.

Dr. Mosley mentioned in her presentation that achieving the CTBT's entry into force would send an important signal, a signal that a practical, legally binding, multilateral instrument with a nuclear disarmament aim is possible -something that has never been achieved before. It would be a concrete demonstration of a determination to work towards a world free of nuclear weapons. Yet continuing high-level support for the treaty's entry into force is of essence, States Parties need to further support the Provisional Technical Secretariat as it works to get the monitoring system and the data centre fully up and running. States Parties need to stand by their commitment to the Treaty and to continue to build on what has already been achieved.

Mr. Giroux in his presentation on FMCT negotiations touched upon recent successes and challenges as well as contentious issues with a look forward. Since the dawn of the nuclear age, an FMCT was seen as a crucial international instrument that would contain the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. But only the end of the cold war in the 1990s put life back into advancements on the FMCT issue. Recent developments have brought back consensus on a negotiating mandate for an FMCT (Shannon Mandate) and the agreement on the 2009 program of work for the Conference on Disarmament.

Disappointingly, there was no consensus on implementing the Program of Work due to opposition within the CD, which called on for simultaneous work on all of the core issues on the CD's agenda. It has to be seen if in 2010 an agreement on a Program of Work that includes FMCT negotiations can be achieved, then implemented and sustained in years to come.

In her presentation, "A nuclear weapon free world: the case for idealism", Dr. Hanson pointed out that idealism in the field of nuclear disarmament should not be seen as utopianism, but rather as something that challenges dominant thinking of being focused on our own security and thus driven by an unending quest for power. She argued for an evolution in the moral behaviour of persons and governments. The rise of human rights, international law, the actions of civil society demonstrates a clear shift away from realism where human nature and security fears are closely aligned and that realists themselves are beginning to understand that nuclear weapons have little or no utility and can act against the interests of national and global security. In this sense, realists are changing views and conclude that there is little or no utility for nuclear weapons, that their presence encourages proliferation and continues to allow the danger of an accidental or sub-state nuclear attack, and that therefore the most logical step to take is to eliminate them.

Amb Oh reflected more on the fundamental rationale behind the phenomenon of weapons. Now that we realize that due to the unprecedented power of nuclear weapons to inflict massive and indiscriminate destruction, our concerns may not actually be about nuclear weapons in and of themselves, but more about the existence of any weapon capable of destruction beyond a certain level. For realists, we do not fight because we have weapons but rather we have weapons because we fight. Idealists on the other hand believe that humanity learns lessons and evolves. We might have sought only to dominate others in the past, but now we have learned to co-exist and cooperate with others. There is therefore less need to seek military superiority in our relations with others. As various initiatives pursue the vision for a world free of nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament seems to be gaining more political and moral legitimacy. However, without taking the realities of our world into account, Global Zero may simply remain a catchphrase.

The discussion following the four presentations looked among others at the question if we were approaching Global Zero in a different pace if states involved were more democratic or non-democratic. In this context, some participants mentioned that authoritarian regimes have different national security approaches and that due emphasis should be given to individual cases as every case has its specifications. On the CTBT, one participant added that with required conditions of 44 states with nuclear capability, it is difficult to reach the goal of an entry into force without a genuine breakthrough. To move the debate on an entry into force forward, it was necessary for one major power to make changes in its political approach. Without this new approach, it would be more difficult to have such a debate.

Another participant made a comparison to the chemical and biological weapons convention where negotiators did not allow a number of countries to retain the respective weapons. In case of the NPT, it seemed to be necessary for some states to keep the weapons and added that the rationale behind nuclear weapon states lies in the understanding that they need to keep their weapons as long as others have them too and added, "we have weapons because we don't want to fight." There is no solid fit for all size models for making countries less depended on use of force and less likely to go for war. Yet, weapons shouldn't rule us, but we should have a human capacity to outlaw these weapons.

With this, I give the floor back to the chair. Thank you very much.

Discussion Part I (Burk, de Silva)

- (Potter) – reference to UN India deal, challenge this perspective by arguing the NSG exemption represents a collective amnesia of NSG parties. Benefits of non NWS under NPT, set a formal precedent providing two different categories, diminish moral authority of NAM movement – in what sense would you interpret US India deal and NSG exemption, any positive elements?
- (Ford) – Russia China nuclear modernization, comment a bit on the role of this process
- But regarding Pakistan, political scenario needs to be considered. Situation is different. It is not that deal itself is very positive in relation to non-proliferation regime. But at least it is some kind of a beginning that India is in discussion. It is a good beginning. Confidence building is of utmost importance. That will eliminate or reduce root causes. It is in that spirit that this agreement brings India into this.

Discussion Part I Answers Part II

- NAM common position: sensitive political issues, not too many common positions. Lost over common positions. Pakistan's reaction: very unhappy, but it doesn't seem to be a likelihood and it doesn't seem to be a similar deal between US and Pakistan.
- (Burk) – conditions: talking about lowering numbers of nuclear weapons by NWS. On deliverables: US is looking at it. ON additional protocol: universal adherence, but very different views on it. We have to see what the common point is next May,

Discussion Part III

- (Aly) NAM has very strong position on almost every detailed elements of the upcoming conference.
- (Wang) extra regional dimension – presence of nuclear weapons does not necessarily create attention to neighboring countries.
- (Kwong) – 3 pillars are mutually reinforcing

Discussion Part IV (CTBT/FMCT/Realism)

- (Cotton) - idealist arguments not rejected – consider an idealist account of a non nuclear world, would it differ if some states involved continue to be non democratic or authoritarian? Democracy has made progress but also did so

in early 1990's. Argument is probably not sustainable regarding democracy. Regime concerns which are not universalisable

- (Ford) – who is willing to discuss but more who is in a position to implement some of the ideas we discuss. Upon US policy in a sense, that in some regards US is a relative easy case while others don't even enter into discussions. US only NWS that is not modernizing delivery system while others do, feels less non dependable on nuclear weapons compared to many other NWS.
- (Kim) – regarding CTBT, entry into force: required conditions of 44 states with nuclear capability, it is difficult that entry into force is doable without a genuine breakthrough. On Idealism, role of civil society and changing views. Authoritarian regimes with different national security approaches. Due emphasis should be given to individual cases, Middle East, Korean Peninsula – every case as its specifications.
- (Duarte) – CWC and BWC, negotiator did not allow a number of countries to retain these weapons. In case of nuclear weapons, it seemed to be necessary for some states to keep the weapons. Rational behind NWS, that they need to keep their weapon as long as others have them... we have weapons because we don't want to fight.

Answers IV

- (Hanson) - we still do not need a nuclear weapon to respond. I would argue that it is quit possible to go for nuclear weapon free world. If there is a risk of breakout and cheating, we don't need nuclear weapons to respond to that risk. In the same view using a nuclear weapon against north korea/kaida, it is not considered as an acceptable way forward. Conventional weapons capability would be adequate to respond – far more suited.
- (Hanson) – is has been necessary for US to make changes in order for the debate to move forward. Without new approach of Obama admin, it would be more difficult to have such a debate. What happens if zero nuclear weapons what would lead to an unbalance on the conventional side.
- (Hanson) – weapon should rule us, but rather that we have a human capacity to outlaw this weapon.
- (Oh) –there is no solid fit for all size models for making countries less depended on use of force and less likely to go for war. We have weapons that's why we don't fight – deterrence approach.
- (Mosley) –

Discussion Part V

- (Sano) – comprehensive action agenda
- (Kwong) –CTBT: competition for political attention between CTBT and NPT
- (Aly) – CTBT/FMCT: how could we miss putting them into relation to NPT (13 steps)

Answers V

- (Hanson) – cautious optimism, but 2025 very far away. Long term goal, but commission goals for vantage point, to see the land much better.