

Nuclear Disarmament: Views and Efforts of NGOs

Presentation by Alyn Ware

*Global Coordinator, Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament
Consultant, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms
Vice-President, International Peace Bureau
Steering Committee, Middle Powers Initiative*

The 19th United Nations Conference on Disarmament Issues in Sapporo



“New vision and required leadership towards a world free from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction”

27-29 August 2007, Sapporo City, Japan

Nuclear Disarmament: Views and Efforts of NGOs

In 1791 a young member of the British parliament William Wilberforce introduced a bill to abolish the slave trade. Wilberforce argued that the slave trade was immoral, inhumane and a blight on the character of Britain. His bill was easily defeated as members of parliament argued that such action, while a noble gesture, would jeopardize the economic security and global power of Britain, and would not end the slave trade as other countries would continue the practice and gain an advantage over Britain.

Wilberforce did not give in to such spurious arguments. And now in 2007 we celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Slave Trade Act, adopted by 283 votes to 16, which ended Britain's slave trade and paved the way for the global abolition of slavery.

Fundamental to the success of the campaign to abolish slavery was that it aimed correctly for abolition. Wilberforce and the campaign did not accept proposals to merely improve the conditions on slave ships, or regulate the trade, or lessen the numbers of slaves being sold. Slavery was unacceptable and had to be abolished.

The same is true of nuclear weapons. Any use of nuclear weapons would be a crime against humanity. To possess nuclear weapons is to threaten others with their use, which is also a crime. It is a crime that must be stopped. It is a practice that must be abolished. It is a regime that can and must be eliminated.

Lt General Romeo Dallaire, Commander of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Rwanda said recently that "Nuclear weapons constitute the most massive abrogation of human rights possible and are the ultimate weapon of genocide."¹ Dallaire witnessed the failure of humanity that led to Rwanda's descent into genocide in 1994, and says that we cannot allow such a failure to happen again. Genocide is preventable. Genocide from nuclear weapons is preventable, but only if we abolish and eliminate the

¹ Statement to the launch of Securing our Survival, Grand Hall, New Zealand Parliament, August 14, 2007

weapons. Dallaire says that “No physical or financial obstacle is preventing us, within a decade or less, from freeing the world from the man-made scourge of nuclear weapons. The only things lacking are moral leadership and political will.”

NGO’s are working with local and national governments and other constituencies to build such moral leadership and political will. A key recent development is the revision of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (Model NWC)² and the release of the book *Securing our Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention*³ by the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. The Model NWC examines the practical elements required for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear weapons free world. It took a group of experts, working in a similar way to treaty negotiators, a year to complete the first draft in 1997, and another six months to update it in 2007 taking into consideration the legal, technical and political developments over the past decade.

Securing our Survival focuses on the why, what, how, who, when and what if questions relating to a treaty abolishing nuclear weapons – why a treaty is necessary to get us out of the current quagmire, what a nuclear weapons convention is, how it could be achieved, who it would cover, when it could be accomplished, and what if some countries or non-State actors break-out of a treaty regime.

The book and the Model NWC demonstrate that nuclear abolition is no longer a pipe dream. They reflect developments in global politics, technology and human consciousness that have transformed the aspiration of nuclear abolition from a utopian imperative into a practical and achievable goal.

As such, the launch of *Securing our Survival*, the proposal for a Nuclear Weapons Convention and the more general call for nuclear abolition, have received support from across the political spectrum and

² NPT/CONF.2010/PC.I/WP.17. www.reachingcriticalwill.org/legal/npt/prepcom07/workingpapers/17.pdf

³ *Securing our Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention*, Merav Datan, Felicity Hill, Juergan Scheffran, Alyn Ware. IPPNW 2007

from a wide array of constituencies including liberal and conservative leaders, mayors, academics, think-tanks, cross-party groups of parliamentarians, scientists, governments, Nobel laureates, NGOs and general public.

Liberal and conservative leaders:

Support for nuclear abolition has enjoyed the support of moderate and liberal leaders for many years, including for example the Six Nation Initiative in the 1980s-1990s that included the Heads of Government of Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania, Argentina and India. More recently a number of conservative leaders have joined the call. In January 2007 the Wall Street Journal published an article by Henry Kissinger (US Secretary of State under Richard Nixon), George Schultz (US Secretary of State under Ronald Reagan), William Perry (Secretary of Defense under Bill Clinton) and Sam Nunn (Former Chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee) calling for an end to nuclear deterrence and on leadership to achieve a nuclear weapons free world.⁴

A number of conservative former Heads of Government have participated in, or otherwise supported, the launch of *Securing our Survival*. This includes the Rt Hon Malcolm Fraser, former Prime Minister of Australia; and the Rt Hon James Bolger, former Prime Minister of New Zealand.

Jim Bolger said recently that:

*“Our world is correctly putting considerable focus and effort on major issues like global warming, clean energy and producing sufficient food to meet the needs of a growing world population. We need a similar commitment by the world community to rid the planet of nuclear weapons.”*⁵

Mayors and local authorities

Over 1600 mayors and cities from around the world have recently joined the Mayors for Peace call for a Nuclear Weapons Convention to be negotiated by 2010 with the complete elimination of nuclear

⁴ *A World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, Wall Street Journal, January 4, 2007. www.gsintstitute.org/docs/01_04_07_WSJ.pdf

⁵ Statement to the launch of *Securing our Survival*, Grand Hall, New Zealand Parliament, August 14, 2007

weapons to be achieved by 2020. This includes the cities of Amman, Amsterdam, Athens, Atlanta, Beijing, Berlin, Bern, Boston, Brussels, Budapest, Buenos Aires, Delhi, Dublin, Geneva, Jakarta, the Hague, Istanbul, Jerusalem, Kabul, Kampala, Karachi, Kiev, Kigali, Kuala Lumpur, Lisbon, London, Los Angeles, Madrid, Minsk, Mombassa, Moscow, Ottawa, Paris, Philadelphia, Rome, San Jose, Sarajevo, Sofia, Stockholm, Sydney, Tashkent, Tripoli, Ulaanbaatar, Vienna, Wellington...⁶

Mayors joined with parliamentarians to submit a *Mayors and Parliamentarians Appeal for a Nuclear Weapons Free World* to the United Nations in 2005. The appeal notes that:

*As mayors and national legislators we have a role to protect the security of citizens living within our jurisdictions and to protect our localities for future generations. Regardless of where nuclear weapons are targeted or detonated, or whether they are used by terrorist organisations or State militaries, no-one would escape the calamitous consequences of a nuclear attack. Even cities that are not the direct brunt of an attack would feel the global economic, social and medical repercussions, which would dwarf those of 9/11. The overwhelming majority of citizens in our cities, countries and around the world support the abolition of these ultimate weapons of mass destruction, and we mayors and legislators have a responsibility to use our authority to ensure the implementation of this imperative.*⁷

Parliamentarians

Parliamentarians from across the political spectrum are working together through the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament (PNND) to promote nuclear abolition and a Nuclear Weapons Convention. This includes resolutions, Early Day Motions, statements, declarations, submission of the Model NWC to parliaments and public events including parliamentary launches of *Securing our Survival*.

⁶ See www.mayorsforpeace.org

⁷ www.gsinsitute.org/pnnd/jointstatement_001.htm

The Japanese parliament, for example, unanimously adopted a resolution introduced by Tsuneo Suzuki, Chair of PNND Japan, calling on the government to “do its utmost to carve out a future of sustainable human co-existence that includes the abolition of nuclear weapons.”⁸

The European Parliament in March 2007 adopted a resolution affirming that “for multilateral non-proliferation efforts to be effective, they must be set within a well-developed vision of achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world at the earliest possible date.” The resolution also “highlights the role of parliaments and parliamentarians in promoting nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament and, against this background, welcomes the efforts of the global Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament.”⁹

The Australian Senate in December 2006 adopted a resolution introduced by PNND member Senator Lyn Allison which “emphasises the need for all states to take further steps and effective measures towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons, with a view to achieving a peaceful and safe world free of nuclear weapons.”¹⁰

In March 2007 the Canadian Senate unanimously adopted a resolution introduced by PNND Special Representative Senator Romeo Dallaire which affirmed that: “*Most member states of the United Nations are calling for immediate negotiations on a convention on nuclear weapons that would ban the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat and even the ultimate use of nuclear weapons.*” The resolution called on the Canadian government to “*take a global leadership role in the campaign of eradicating the dire threat to humanity posed by nuclear weapons.*”

PNND member and Democratic Presidential contender Dennis Kucinich has submitted a resolution to the US House of Representatives which notes that “*the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention, circulated by the United Nations, demonstrates the feasibility of achieving the global elimination of nuclear*

⁸ See PNND Notes, January 2006, pp 5. www.gsinsitute.org/pnnd/docs/PNND_News_2005_Final.pdf

⁹ European Parliament resolution of 14 March 2007 on non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament

¹⁰ *Nuclear Non-proliferation*, adopted Australian Senate December 7, 2007.

weapons,” and which “calls upon the President to initiate multilateral negotiations for the abolition of nuclear weapons.”¹¹

A parliamentary launch of *Securing our Survival* in New Zealand received support letters from Nobel laureates, legislators, mayors and diplomats from around the world. Ambassador Sergio Duarte, UN High Representative for Disarmament noted that:

This launching of Securing our Survival is a memorable event for many reasons. Amid calls from throughout the world for new progress in global nuclear disarmament, this timely study offers an updated model convention for achieving this historic goal. Parliamentarians have essential roles to play in promoting this goal, through collaborative non-partisan efforts, mobilizing support for disarmament among their constituents, and ultimately in the process of ratifying the convention.

Academics and think-tanks

Probably the most respected and expert think-tank on the issue at the moment is the *Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission* chaired by Hans Blix, former Head of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission. The Blix Commission recommended that nuclear weapons be outlawed, as has been done with chemical and biological weapons through international treaties, and that the Nuclear Weapon States develop plans for their elimination.

*A nuclear disarmament treaty is achievable and can be reached through careful, sensible and practical measures. Benchmarks should be set; definitions agreed; timetables drawn up and agreed upon; and transparency requirements agreed.*¹²

Scientists

On January 17 the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* moved the hands of their Doomsday Clock closer to midnight. The Clock indicates, in the view of eminent scientists, how close we are to a catastrophe that

¹¹ www.gsinstitute.org/pnnd/docs/12_06_06_Kucinich.pdf

¹² *Weapons of Terror: Freeing the World of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Arms*. Report of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission

could destroy civilization. It now stands at 5 minutes to midnight. The move was made because of the growing risks from climate change and a growing threat from nuclear weapons including North Korea joining the nuclear club, Iran possibly on its way to doing so, an increased readiness by existing nuclear weapon powers to use nuclear weapons, and an increased propensity to use military force to deal with nuclear proliferation issues.

Mathematician Stephen Hawking, at the press conference announcing the Doomsday Clock change, noted; *"As scientists, we understand the dangers of nuclear weapons and their devastating effect, and we are learning how human activities and technologies are affecting climate systems in ways that may forever change life on Earth. As citizens of the world, we have a duty to alert the public to the unnecessary risks that we live with every day, and to the perils we foresee if governments and societies do not take action now to render nuclear weapons obsolete and to prevent further climate change."*¹³

Governments

A majority of governments support UN General Assembly resolutions calling for a NWC, in particular the resolution adopted every year since 1996 on Follow-up to the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons.¹⁴ The ICJ determined that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. The UN resolution calls for implementation of this obligation through negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

Supporters of the resolution include some States currently possessing nuclear weapons including China, India, Pakistan and North Korea. The United Kingdom, while not yet supporting the resolution, has indicated its support for a Nuclear Weapons Convention in the not-too-distant future. On 25 June, Hon Margaret Beckett, the then-UK Foreign Secretary, delivered a key note speech recalling the successful

¹³ *Doomsday Clock Moves Two Minutes Closer To Midnight*, The Bulletin Online, 18 January, 2007. www.thebulletin.org/media-center/announcements/20070117.html

¹⁴ The most recent is UN A/RES/61/83 www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/1com/1com06/res/L.44.pdf

campaign to abolish slavery, invoking the vision of nuclear abolition, and committing the UK to study and develop the technical and political conditions required to achieve complete nuclear disarmament. Beckett said that: *“What we need is both vision - a scenario for a world free of nuclear weapons - and action... When it comes to building this new impetus for global nuclear disarmament, I want the UK to be at the forefront of both the thinking and the practical work. To be, as it were, a disarmament laboratory”*¹⁵

The New Agenda Coalition, including Brazil, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden, have called for *“a universal and multilaterally negotiated legally binding instrument or a framework encompassing a mutually reinforcing set of instruments.”*¹⁶ This is the same as what a Nuclear Weapons Convention would be.

Nobel Laureates

In November 2006, a gathering of Nobel Peace Laureates in Rome released a powerful statement calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons. The declaration says that:

*Nuclear weapons are more of a problem than any problem they seek to solve. In the hands of anyone, the weapons themselves remain an unacceptable, morally reprehensible, impractical and dangerous risk. The use of a nuclear weapon against a state without nuclear weapons is patently immoral. Use against a state with nuclear weapons is suicidal. These weapons have no value against terrorists or criminals. As Nobel Peace Prize Laureates we commit to work collectively to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons, which we believe are unworthy of civilization.*¹⁷

Non-governmental organisations

At the NPT Review and Extension Conference in 1995, 130 NGOs endorsed a statement calling on the implementation of Article VI of the NPT through negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention.

¹⁵ *A World Free of Nuclear Weapons?* Keynote address by Margaret Becket, Carnegie International Nonproliferation Conference, June 25, 2007. Washington.

¹⁶ *A Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: The Need for a New Agenda*, Joint Declaration by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden, 9 June 1998

¹⁷ *The Rome Declaration of Nobel Laureates*, www.gsinstitute.org/docs/Rome_Declaration_2006.pdf

From this was born Abolition 2000,¹⁸ a global network of civil society organizations working for nuclear abolition. Over 2000 organisations have now joined Abolition 2000s call and are working around the world to promote a Nuclear Weapons Convention, and steps towards achieving this.

One such step is the establishment of zones in which nuclear weapons are prohibited, i.e. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones. These include nuclear-weapon-free cities, nuclear-weapon-free countries and nuclear-weapon-free regions. The criteria of such zones differs from zone to zone. Some are symbolic. Others include more robust legal prohibitions. Some just prohibit stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories within the zones. Others prohibit transit of nuclear weapons through the zones, prohibit investment in corporations involved in nuclear weapons, and criminalize acts involved in nuclear weapons production, acquisition, threat or use. NGOs have been working with local and national authorities on the establishment of such zones, strengthening existing zones and developing collaboration between zones.

In April 2005, the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament and Mayors for Peace organized a Civil Society Forum as part of the First Conference of States Parties of Regional Nuclear Weapon Free Zones held in Mexico City. The final document supported the establishment of NWFZs in additional regions including North East Asia, and endorsed the proposal for a Southern Hemisphere and Adjacent Areas Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. It even suggested that the “Adjacent Area” should be the Northern Hemisphere in order to make the world a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. In the meantime it recommended that “Individual States take domestic action to strengthen the international norm against nuclear weapons by adopting regulations or legislation prohibiting nuclear weapons and instigating criminal responsibility for violations, such as the legislation adopted by New Zealand.”¹⁹

¹⁸ www.abolition2000.org

¹⁹ NPT/CONF.2005/WP.46. Note verbale dated 10 May 2005 from the Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Conference. Annex IV, pp 13-15.

General public

Nuclear weapons are not the top priority on the general public's mind. This is understandable. Nuclear weapons have not been used in wartime since 1945, and most nuclear weapons are deployed out-of-sight, out-of-mind, in silos and submarines. Thus, there is a complacency, which, like the dangerous corner in a road, might only get sufficient attention once an accident actually happens. The problem with nuclear weapons is that once a weapon is used – whether by accident, miscalculation or intent – it will be too late. There will be no way to fix the catastrophe. There will be no way to reverse or limit the damage. Policy makers must thus act even if there does not appear to be a groundswell of opinion pushing them. To wait for such a groundswell will be too late.

However, policy makers can be confident that the public is behind them when they act for nuclear abolition, even if they do not witness millions of people marching in the streets. Independent public opinion polls indicate public support around the world for nuclear abolition through a NWC at over 80%. This includes support greater than 80% in key nuclear weapons States such as the USA and UK, and in NATO countries.²⁰

Barriers to action

Nuclear Weapon States have agreed to the goal of nuclear abolition, but have not yet exercised the vision or dedication to achieving this goal. The five major barriers to its achievement are:

1. the belief by a minority that nuclear weapons provide security through deterrence, which cannot be provided by other means;
2. policies that nuclear weapons can, under certain circumstances, justifiably be used to achieve legitimate objectives;
3. a lack of confidence that nuclear weapons can be verifiably eliminated with adequate enforcement measures
4. a perception that power and status are achieved through possessing nuclear weapons

²⁰ See *People Worldwide Want Nuclear Abolition*, www.abolition2000.org/atf/cf/%7B23F7F2AE-CC10-4D6F-9BF8-09CF86F1AB46%7D/poll_worldwide.pdf

5. vested economic interests in the production of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems

Each of these barriers can now be overcome.

The security benefits of nuclear weapons may have made some kind of sense – although a very risky sense – during the Cold War when there were two main power blocs that could possibly deter each other with nuclear weapons. Traditional international realist theory provides a rationale for nuclear deterrence in a world of competing security interests based on sovereign territorial control. However, the world is becoming a very different place. There are no longer two main power blocs. Thus, if states pursue deterrence through nuclear weapons, it now more than ever is a recipe for proliferation. There has also been a steady development of international mechanisms and methods for dealing with conflicts and security threats, and for dealing with aggression, without the need to resort to the threat or use of nuclear weapons. This includes greater use of the UN Security Council, Good Offices of the Secretary-General and the International Court of Justice, as well as the establishment of the Ad Hoc Tribunals, Law of the Sea Tribunal and International Criminal Court.²¹

In addition, the world has seen the development over the past two decades of an increasingly interconnected world in many spheres – economics, communications, legal systems, multicultural communities, entertainment, sports... The new global society is multifaceted and not divided solely into independent nation states. Defending one's own state with a fortress approach including the threat to use the ultimate weapon against 'enemy' states, is entirely anti-thetical to the economic, security, social and political needs of states in such an interconnected world. Instead, there has been an incredible development of regional and international systems for addressing security needs that make nuclear weapons redundant. Or if not entirely redundant yet, the development of a Nuclear Weapons Convention would include a further development of security mechanisms that would complete this process. Thus, New Zealand's Prime Minister Helen Clark has noted that "In the 21st century, as the

²¹ See, for example, Rule of Force or Rule of Law? Legal Responses to Nuclear Threats from Terrorism, Proliferation and War, Alyn Ware, Seattle Journal for Social Justice, Vol 2, Issue 1, Fall/winter 2003.

ever-expanding exchange of peoples, cultures and trade across nations helps to ease nationalistic prejudices, and as the shibboleths of the Cold War subside, it is time to abolish nuclear weapons and make the world a safer place for all.”²²

The Model Nuclear Weapons Convention demonstrates how nuclear weapons can be verifiably eliminated with adequate enforcement measures. While it might not be possible in the short term to achieve 100% confidence that every single nuclear warhead had been destroyed under a nuclear abolition regime, a combination of legal and political measures would make it impossible for any person or country to gain an advantage by holding onto, using or threatening to use a nuclear bomb. Such an act would be a crime subject to a range of measures enforceable both domestically and at the highest level of international law including through the Security Council. This would include empowering the NWC treaty body, United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council to take direct action to destroy illicit nuclear weapons and apprehend individuals, including government officials, committing crimes under the convention. This would be quite a different situation from what we have today where many of those possessing nuclear weapons appear to have impunity under international law, while those acting for disarmament are often charged with crimes and sent to prison.²³

Under a nuclear abolition regime there would also be a very different political status in possessing nuclear weapons. Currently, there is a capacity to justify the development of nuclear weapons as being done to counter the nuclear weapons of other States. This justification collapses in a nuclear free regime. There are also a number of attractions in developing nuclear weapons under existing political conditions that would evaporate in a nuclear weapon free regime. Such development can be a source of national pride as it indicates a sophisticated degree of technical development. In addition, nuclear weapons provide a particularly powerful currency in a world where the five permanent members of the

²² Foreword to the Naked Nuclear Emperor: Debunking Nuclear Deterrence, Robert Green, The Disarmament and Security Centre, Christchurch, 2000.

²³ Mordechai Vanunu, for example, the nuclear technician who confirmed that Israel possessed nuclear weapons, was convicted by an Israeli military court and sentenced to 14 years in prison. A number of other anti-nuclear activists have been imprisoned in the UK, Germany, France, Belgium, Italy, the United States, Russia, and the Netherlands. See The Nuclear Resister, February 18, 2007. <http://www.serve.com/nukeresister/nr145.pdf>

Security Council are Nuclear Weapon States. Thus countries pursuing a nuclear option – such as North Korea and Iran – gain specific political attention.. A nuclear abolition regime would remove both those attractions of nuclear weapons, and replace them with the stigma of being a pariah State if one was to develop a nuclear weapons capacity.

The vested economic interests in nuclear weapons are very difficult to turn around. Corporations which produce nuclear weapons and/or their delivery systems, such as Lockheed Martin, have huge lobbying budgets with which to influence policy makers. However, one very effective tool which is starting to be used, just as it was to bring the apartheid regime in South Africa to collapse, is international divestment. From 2004-2006, the Norwegian Pension Fund pulled its investments of millions of dollars from Lockheed Martin and other corporations producing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, after analysis indicated that such investments were not consistent with the *United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment*.²⁴ This is stimulating government funds in other countries to follow suit. Such actions could damage these corporations enough to move them to abandon nuclear weapons enterprises, just as a consumer boycott in the 1980s moved General Electric to abandon its nuclear weapons work.²⁵

Next steps

NGOs are calling on governments to take a number of steps towards the abolition of nuclear weapons including to:

1. Discuss the legal, technical and political elements required to achieve nuclear abolition. This could be done as part of the Conference on Disarmament programme for action, at the NPT Prep Coms and Review Conferences, at the United Nations General Assembly or in informal settings such as the Article VI Forum.
2. Jointly submit the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention to the United Nations General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament in order to assist in such deliberations.

²⁴ www.unpri.org

²⁵ See *GE to leave Nuclear Weapons Industry*, WISE Communique, December 15, 1992 www10.antenna.nl/wise/index.html?http://www10.antenna.nl/wise/384/3750.html

3. Commence negotiations on a comprehensive programme of nuclear disarmament culminating in a Nuclear Weapons Convention. If it is not possible to commence such negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament because of the consensus rule, another forum could be used to start the negotiations - such as the UN General Assembly or a negotiating conference hosted by a State or group of States (as was done with the Landmines Convention).
4. Start practical work on the technical aspects for nuclear abolition including developing verification mechanisms and technologies.
5. Encourage your Heads of Government to publicly promote the concept of nuclear abolition, and advocate for it in meetings with other Heads of Government, in order to help build the political momentum required.
6. Adopting national legislation prohibiting nuclear weapons and including criminal responsibility for actions to acquire, produce, transfer, use, threaten to use nuclear weapons or to aid and abet anyone to commit such acts.
7. Engage in a re-evaluation of international realist theory to reflect the emerging political realities - including political incentives and disincentives - related to the establishment of a world free of nuclear weapons.

Taking such steps will help prevent the nightmare of another use of nuclear weapons, and ensure instead that our collective dream for a world free from the threat of nuclear weapons will indeed become a reality.

Thank you.