

Janet Bloomfield

THE FUTURE OF THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

January 2007

Janet Bloomfield is British Coordinator of the Atomic Mirror, a small trans-Atlantic initiative that uses the arts to raise awareness of nuclear issues (www.atomicmirror.org). Janet is on the boards of – or adviser to – numerous other peace and disarmament organisations including the International Peace Bureau, CND, Abolition 2000 and the WMD Awareness Programme. She has worked with Oxford Research Group (ORG) since 1997 in various roles including NGO liaison, fundraising and running dialogue training workshops. She has served as UK Security Consultant to ORG since 2000, and this briefing integrates some key themes of her recent and continuing work for nuclear disarmament. She will be laying down this role at the beginning of 2007 to concentrate on her work with the Atomic Mirror. She will continue to support ORG as a Patron.

The next cycle of meetings of the States Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) will begin next year in April. Since the unsuccessful conclusion of the 2005 NPT concern has grown as to whether the Treaty can survive. In this paper Janet Bloomfield examines the question: **How can the goals of nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the peaceful use of nuclear technology be achieved?**

In attempting to answer this question, I will look back a little but mostly I intend to look forward and offer some suggestions as to how we can move away from the dangerous situation we are in to more genuine security.

The last time the international community gathered together to address the question of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament was at the UN in New York on the occasion of the 2005 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. I attended the whole conference on behalf of the Atomic Mirror and Oxford Research Group. One of the most memorable NGO sessions at that Conference was when former US Defence Secretary Robert McNamara, President Kennedy's speechwriter Ted Sorenson and Ambassador Tom Graham (one of the diplomatic architects of the NPT) addressed a packed room full of diplomats and experts. They gave a heartfelt appeal expressing the urgent need for a group of courageous nations to get together and stand up against the refusal of the current US administration to use the multilateral machinery that had been so carefully built up over the years to make real progress on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. I am sure that they had many European nations in mind when they spoke. I believe, like McNamara, Sorenson and Graham, that action by European governments, parliamentarians and citizens is crucial. But for that action to happen many things need to change.

I was recently introduced to a fascinating model of change by a colleague that I think may help us.¹ Her model asserted that change has five stages. In reverse order these are:

- 1) Change that requires assets and resources.**
- 2) Change in process, policies and procedures.**
- 3) Changes in skills and knowledge.**
- 4) Change in will, desire, motivation.**
- 5) Change in ethos.**

¹ Thanks to Francesca Cerletti, Head of UK Programmes, at Peace Direct for this model.

If we begin with number five – change of ethos – it is clear that many of the changes that we have seen in the international arena in the last 6 years flow from the rejection of the ethos of multilateralism by the government of the most powerful country in the world. So to reverse that we need to revitalise the ethos of multilateralism. We can hope that the recent results of the mid-term election in the USA will help in moving the world in the right direction but we cannot rely on it. I would recommend that we need to develop and advocate an ethos of sustainable security that recognises our interdependency. In the words of a recent report from Oxford Research Group:

“This new approach to global security can be characterised as a ‘sustainable security paradigm’. The main difference between this and the ‘control paradigm’ is that this approach does not attempt to unilaterally control threats through the use of force (‘attack the symptoms’), but rather it aims to cooperatively resolve the root causes of those threats using the most effective means available (‘cure the disease’). For example, a sustainable security approach prioritises renewable energy as the key solution to climate change; energy efficiency as a response to resource competition; poverty reduction as a means to address marginalisation; and the halting and reversal of WMD development and proliferation as a main component of checking global militarisation. These approaches provide the best chance of averting global disaster, as well as addressing some of the root causes of terrorism.”²

Change number four – a change in will, desire and motivation – relates to the political will called for by McNamara and his colleagues in New York in 2005. The European Union and its member states need to seize the moment and take global leadership on the issues we are addressing. The issue of the withdrawal of US nuclear weapons from European territory is crying out for action. There is no military reason for these weapons to be on European soil. They are another hangover of the Cold War and their removal would do an enormous amount to counter the charge of double standards that allows some countries to go ahead with proliferation against the will of the international community. The UK could make an enormous contribution by not renewing its Trident nuclear weapons system in the next few years.

The third change – change in skills and knowledge – means to me, in this context, a change in the level of awareness of us all about the reality of the nuclear threat today. We can no longer simply say that the end of the Cold War took the nuclear issue off the agenda and move in an internally referenced world of experts hoping that something or someone will turn up to change public perceptions. If all the 25 countries in the EU really seriously took up the recommendations of the UN study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education³ than the knowledge base of our societies about nuclear issues would improve beyond recognition and pressure would grow for action.

The second change – in process, policies and procedures – relates to what international institution like the United Nations and the European Parliament could do. It is widely recognised by those with lengthy experience of the process of negotiations on non-proliferation and disarmament that the mechanisms used are not fit for purpose. The 2005 NPT Review Conference ended with no final document due to the misuse of the consensus process by a few delegations. The Conference on Disarmament is similarly stuck due to the way the process makes it impossible for breakthroughs in the negotiations to be made. It is time for creative thinking by those governments that want to see progress and NGOs like ORG which have expertise in dialogue have an important contribution to make.

The final change, which flows from all the things that preceded it, is change in assets and resources. My recommendation for that relates to the IAEA and relates directly to the question this paper seeks to

² Chris Abbott, Paul Rogers and John Sloboda, *Global Responses to Global Threats: Sustainable Security for the 21st Century* (Oxford: Oxford Research Group, 2006).

³ See, <http://disarmament.un.org/education/>.

address. The work on the IAEA in monitoring and inspecting nuclear developments around the world is incredibly valuable and they need more resources to do that. But I would like to propose something more radical than simply increasing the IAEA's resources. I would propose that its mandate for the promotion of nuclear energy be removed and a new agency – the International Sustainable Energy Agency⁴ be created to really tackle the problem of energy security worldwide in a sustainable and secure way.

This visionary proposal first arose in 1995 as a number of groups working for nuclear abolition created the 11-point Abolition Statement at the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference that took place at the UN in May of that year. The 11th point states: “*Establish an international energy agency to promote and support the development of sustainable and environmentally safe energy sources.*”⁵

Since then a model statute for such an Agency has been drafted. It was widely discussed at the Commission for Sustainable Development in the spring of 2006 and a number of governments have expressed interest in the idea including Germany and Sweden. It is an idea whose time has come (see Appendix).

My specific answer to the question “*How can the goals of nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the peaceful use of nuclear technology be achieved?*” is that they can't. They are mutually contradictory. If we really want to stop nuclear proliferation and work towards the global abolition of nuclear weapons we have to honestly face the reality of the proliferation risks of nuclear power. In 1946 The Acheson-Lilienthal report commissioned by the US government contained some startling conclusions about nuclear development and the risk of nuclear proliferation. According to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists “...the board determined that the pursuit of atomic energy and the pursuit of atomic bombs were in large part interchangeable and interdependent, and that because of global rivalries, an international inspections regime based on good faith was doomed to fail.”⁶

The Board in its report, wrote:

“We have concluded unanimously that there is no prospect of security against atomic warfare in a system of international agreements to outlaw such weapons controlled only by a system which relies on inspection and similar police-like methods...National rivalries in the development of atomic energy readily convertible to destructive purposes are the heart of the difficulty... A system of inspection superimposed on an otherwise uncontrolled exploitation of atomic energy by national governments will not be an adequate safeguard.”

We are now reaping what was sown when those warnings were not heeded. In the long term we need to phase out nuclear power. In the medium term we need to stop the so-called “nuclear renaissance” in its tracks and in the short term we need to take on board and implement in full the seven-point programme proposed by the head of the IAEA, Mohamed El Baradai, for dealing with the spread of nuclear materials.

⁴ See, *International Sustainable Energy Agency: Proposed Model Statute*, GRACE Policy Institute. Available at <http://www.gracelinks.org/energy/docs/ISEA1.pdf>.

⁵ See http://www.abolition2000.org/site/c.cdJIKKNpFqG/b.1316717/k.8870/The_Abolition_2000_Statement_English.htm for a copy of the full Abolition Statement.

⁶ Leonard Weiss, “Atoms for Peace. Did the 50-year-old Atoms for Peace program accelerate nuclear weapons proliferation? The jury has been in for some time on this question, and the answer is yes.” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, vol. 59, no. 06 (November/December 2003) pp.34-41. See, www.thebulletin.org/article.php?art_ofn=nd03weiss.

These steps are:

- 1) A five-year moratorium on building new facilities for uranium enrichment and plutonium separation, materials that can be used for weapons production.**
- 2) Accelerate efforts to convert research reactors operating with highly enriched uranium (HEU) to low enriched uranium and to make HEU unnecessary for all peaceful nuclear applications.**
- 3) Increased access for IAEA inspectors to all nuclear sites.**
- 4) Swift Security Council action in the case of any country that withdraws from the NPT.**
- 5) Speedy action by all countries to prosecute any illicit trading in nuclear materials and technology.**
- 6) Accelerated implementation by all five nuclear weapon States of their “unequivocal commitment” to nuclear disarmament.**
- 7) Action to resolve existing security deficits and provide security assurances in areas of tension such as the Middle East and the Korean peninsula.**

How we can support Mr El Baradai and the IAEA and make those recommendations a political reality? The next Preparatory Committee of the NPT is scheduled to meet in Vienna in April 2007. This meeting is an opportunity to tackle the issues outlined in this paper and begin to implement El Baradai's recommendations. Dialogue between civil society and governments prior to the meeting is crucial and I look forward to ORG playing a role in this.

I conclude by returning to the first level of change I outlined. The change in ethos. I would add vision to that word to. Both the UN and the EU come in for more than their fair share of criticism. Yes they can be slow and bureaucratic but we should never forget that they are both remarkable manifestations of a commitment to the creation of a more peaceful and cooperative world. The ethos that created them has produced better lives for millions of people. They can do so in the future but only if we as citizens and civil society participate fully in their work.

Based on a presentation given by Janet Bloomfield to the European Parliament Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Security and Defence, in Brussels on 14 September 2006.

Appendix

INTERNATIONAL SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AGENCY PROPOSED MODEL STATUTE SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AGENCY (ISEA) SUBMITTED TO THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVES: The International Sustainable Energy Agency (ISEA) would seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution worldwide of sustainable energy strategies, technologies, and applications for the purpose of achieving a sustainable quality of life for all, including

- equitable access to sustainable energy resources and development: to ensure equitable, decentralized availability and development of sustainable energy strategies and technologies, in order to drastically reduce and ultimately eliminate dependence on unsustainable forms of energy, such as costly and polluting imported fuels;
- poverty eradication: to provide sustainable energy resources to benefit development and the goal of poverty eradication in low-income areas in the world that currently lack adequate energy, especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition;
- global security: to promote clean, safe, sustainable energies as a substitute for the world's precarious global reliance upon foreign sources of fossil and nuclear fuels and the costly protections they require, and to eliminate nuclear proliferation, which is inextricably linked to the process of nuclear power generation and waste production;
- climate protection: to significantly reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and to increase existing international commitments or targets for same;
- environmental and social protection: to significantly reduce non-greenhouse energy-related pollutants affecting air, water, and land, and concurrently, the health of affected peoples;
- technological innovation and dissemination: to promote the accelerated development and dissemination of sustainable energy industries and businesses for the 21st century.

FUNCTIONS: The United Nations General Assembly would authorize ISEA to:

- 1) assist member states in identifying, phasing out and ending all government production subsidies and all government consumption subsidies for unsustainable forms of energy, except for those targeted for low-income persons, and redirecting subsidies toward support of sustainable forms of energy, including 20% of such subsidies to support an International Sustainable Energy Agency;
- 2) assist member states in achieving the institutionalisation of public participation by all major groups of civil society, as well as transparency, and information access, in all governmental energy policy decision-making and implementation;
- 3) assist intergovernmental entities in achieving the institutionalisation of public participation by all major groups of civil society, as well as transparency and information access, in all intergovernmental energy policy decision-making and implementation;
- 4) assist member states and intergovernmental entities in identifying and utilizing national and international sustainable resources to promote energy conservation and diversification to sustainable forms of energy, for long-term energy security and social needs and economic development while protecting the environment locally, regionally, and globally; and specifically, to:
- 5) assist member states to meet targets for greenhouse gas reductions and energy conservation and efficiency goals in the Protocols to the Framework Convention on Climate Change and other international and regional agreements, as well those in national plans;
- 6) assist member states to conduct and stimulate research, development and deployment of sustainable energy strategies, technologies, and applications;
- 7) assist member states to integrate external costs, such as those of health, society and the environment, into energy policy and pricing decisions and regulations, and to compile and compare national energy policy and data among member states for energy policy and planning purposes;

- 8) assist member states to increase the commercial market penetration of sustainable energy technologies by integrating sustainable energy considerations into policy-making in major energy-consuming sectors of the economies of member states, such as transport, agriculture, industry, housing, etc.; and by addressing regulatory issues so as to allow markets to function in accordance with sustainable development objectives;
- 9) assist member states to facilitate the transfer of sustainable energy strategies, technologies and applications and increase capacity-building and the dissemination and exchange of information and expertise, by acting as a forum and clearinghouse for same;
- 10) assist member states to promote sustainable energy education and training at every level and in all sectors, and especially primary, secondary, university, adult, and consumer education programs; and create a pool of skilled sustainable energy managers and technologists through education and training programs in sustainable energy management;
- 11) assist member states to standardize norms for the manufacture of sustainable energy technologies and evaluate their efficiency and performance; and provide for the application of such norms to operations of the Agency as well as to member states under any bilateral or multi-lateral arrangements;
- 12) assist member states and intergovernmental entities to monitor sustainable energy projects and provide implementation reports based on the social, economic and environmental standards of sustainability; and serve as a repository for same; and
- 13) assist the further establishment of national and local Agenda 21s, including targets and timeframes, to serve as guiding documents in planning and implementing these functions;
- 14) create and administer a special ISEA sub-Agency comprising 50% of the income of ISEA, to support sustainable energy projects and incentives in low-income areas in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and assist in identifying additional sources of public and private funding to attract investment to such areas; and
- 15) take additional actions to enhance regional and international cooperation in promotion of the objectives and functions described herein.