Subject: Re: This might help us understand what the NPT is about and reasins why some countries won;t sign
Posted by akhilesh on Wed, 08 Mar 2006 16:19:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Treaty pillars[edit]First pillar: non-proliferationFive states are permitted by the NPT to own nuclear weapons: France (signed 1992), the People's Republic of China (1992), Soviet Union (1968; obligations and rights assumed by Russia), United Kingdom (1968), and the United States (1968). These were the only states possessing such weapons at the time the treaty was opened to signature, and are also the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. These 5 Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) agree not to transfer nuclear weapons technology to other states, and non-NWS parties agree not to seek or develop nuclear weapons.The 5 NWS parties have made undertakings not to use their nuclear weapons against a non-NWS party except in response to a nuclear attack, or a conventional attack in alliance with a Nuclear Weapons State. However, these undertakings have not been incorporated formally into the treaty, and the exact details have varied over time. The United States, for instance, has indicated that it may use nuclear weapons in response to a non-conventional attack by "rogue states". The previous United Kingdom Secretary of State for Defence, Geoff Hoon, has also explicitly invoked the possibility of the use of the country's nuclear weapons in response to a non-conventional attack by "rogue states". In January 2006, Jacques Chirac of France indicated that an incident of state-sponsored terrorism on France could trigger a small-scale nuclear retaliation aimed at destroying the "rogue state's" power centers.[edit]Second pillar: disarmamentArticle VI and the preamble indicate that the NWS parties pursue to reduce and liquidate their stockpiles; Article VI also calls for "...a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." In Article I, the Nuclear Weapon States declare not to "induce any non-nuclear-weapon State to ... acquire nuclear weapons." A preemptive-strike doctrine and otherwise threatening postures can be viewed as induction by non-NWS parties. Article X states that any state can withdraw from the treaty if they feel that "extraordinary events", for example a perceived threat, force them to do so.[edit]Third pillar: the right to peacefully use nuclear technologySince very few of the nuclear weapons states and states using nuclear reactions for energy generation are willing to completely abandon possession of nuclear fuel, the third pillar of the NPT provides other states with the possibility to do the same, but under conditions intended to make it difficult to develop nuclear weapons.For some states, this third pillar of the NPT, which allows uranium enrichment for fuel reasons, seems to be a major loophole. However the treaty gives every state the inalienable right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and as the commercially popular light water reactor nuclear power station designs use enriched uranium fuel, it follows that states must be allowed to enrich uranium or purchase it on an international market. Peaceful uranium enrichment can arguably be considered a small step away from developing nuclear warheads, and this can be done by withdrawing from the NPT. No state has successfully constructed a nuclear weapon in secret while subjected to NPT inspection.Countries that have signed the treaty as Non-Nuclear Weapons States and maintained that status have an unbroken record of not building nuclear weapons. In some regions, the fact that all neighbors are verifiably free of nuclear weapons reduces any pressure individual states might feel to build those weapons themselves, even if neighbors are known to have peaceful nuclear energy programs that might otherwise be suspicious. In this, the treaty works as designed.Mohamed ElBaradei, the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the UN's nuclear regulatory body, has said that if they wanted to, forty countries could develop nuclear bombs.[edit]HistorySee also: nuclear

proliferationThe treaty was proposed by Ireland, and opened for signature in 1968, Finland was the first to sign. By 1992 all five then-declared nuclear powers had signed the treaty, and the treaty was renewed in 1995 (and followed by the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996). Several NPT signatories have given up nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons programs. South Africa undertook a nuclear weapons program, allegedly with the assistance of Israel, and may have conducted a nuclear test over the Atlantic, but has since renounced its nuclear program and signed the treaty in 1991 after destroying its small nuclear arsenal. Ukraine and several other former Soviet Republics destroyed or transferred to Russia the nuclear weapons inherited from the Soviet Union.[edit]United States-NATO nuclear weapons sharingAt the time the treaty was being negotiated, NATO had in place secret nuclear weapons sharing agreements whereby the United States provided nuclear weapons to be deployed by, and stored in, other NATO states. This would appear to be an act of proliferation violating Articles I and II of the treaty. The NATO states argued internally that the U.S. controlled the weapons in storage, and that no transfer of the weapons or control over them was intended "unless and until a decision were made to go to war, at which the treaty would no longer be controlling", so there is no breach of the NPT. These agreements were disclosed to some of the states, including the Soviet Union, negotiating the treaty. But most of the states that signed the NPT in 1968 would not have known about these agreements and interpretations at that time [2].As of 2005 the United States still provides about 180 tactical B61 nuclear bombs for use by Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey under these NATO agreements [3]. Many states, and the Non-Aligned Movement, now argue this violates Articles I and II of the treaty, and are applying diplomatic pressure to terminate these agreements. They point out that the pilots and other staff of the "non-nuclear" NATO states practise handling and delivering the U.S. nuclear bombs, and non-U.S. warplanes have been adapted to deliver U.S. nuclear bombs which must have involved the transfer of some technical nuclear weapons information.Even if the NATO argument is considered legally correct, such peacetime operations contravene both the objective and the spirit of the NPT. NATO believes its "nuclear forces continue to play an essential role in war prevention, but their role is now more fundamentally political" [4].[edit]India, Pakistan, IsraelSee also India and WMD, Pakistan and WMD, Israel and WMDThree states - India, Pakistan, and Israel - have declined to sign the treaty. India and Pakistan are confirmed nuclear powers, and Israel is widely believed to possess nuclear weapons, although it is not known to have conducted tests (see List of countries with nuclear weapons). These countries argue that the NPT creates a club of "nuclear haves" and a larger group of "nuclear have-nots" by restricting the legal possession of nuclear weapons to those states that tested them before 1967, but the treaty never explains on what ethical grounds such a distinction is valid.India and Pakistan have publicly announced possession of nuclear weapons and have detonated nuclear devices in tests, India having first done so in 1974 and Pakistan following suit in 1998. Indian nuclear stockpiles are estimated to have enough fissile material for more than 150 warheads. Pakistan reportedly has 60. Israel has been developing nuclear weapons at its Dimona site in the Negev since 1958, and is believed to have stockpiled between 100 to 200 warheads. The Israeli government refuses to confirm or deny these claims, although this is now regarded as an open secret after Israeli nuclear expert Mordechai Vanunu -- later abducted and jailed by Israel -- revealed the program to the British Sunday Times in 1986.In early March of 2006, India and the United States finalized a controversial deal to provide India with US civil nuclear technology. Although India has not signed the NPT, and the deal could be seen as sending the wrong message to other non-NPT countries, proponents of the deal note that India will now classify 14 of its 22 nuclear facilities as being for civilian use, and thus open to inspection. Mohamed ElBaradei, the director the IAEA at the time, welcomed the deal by calling India "an important partner in the non-proliferation regime". However, attempts made by Pakistan to sign a

similar agreement have been thwarted by the U.S. as well as the international community. The basic argument put forth is the fact that Pakistan doesn't have the same kind of energy requirements and the track record of Pakistan as a regular nuclear proliferator makes it impossible for it to have any sort of nuclear deal in the near future. [5][edit]North KoreaSee also: North Korea and weapons of mass destruction, Six-party talksNorth Korea ratified the treaty, but withdrew from the treaty on January 10, 2003 following U.S. accusations that it had started an enriched uranium weapons program, and the U.S. stopping fuel oil shipments under the Agreed Framework which had resolved plutonium weapons issues in 1994 [6]. On February 10, 2005, North Korea publicly declared that it possessed nuclear weapons and pulled out of the six-party talks hosted by China to find a diplomatic solution to the issue. "We had already taken the resolute action of pulling out of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and have manufactured nuclear arms for self-defence to cope with the Bush administration's evermore undisguised policy to isolate and stifle the DPRK," a North Korean Foreign Ministry statement said regarding the issue [7]. Six-party talks resumed in July 2005, but recessed on August 7 with no progress. The parties met again the week of August 29.On September 19, 2005, North Korea announced that it would agree to a preliminary accord. Under the accord, North Korea would scrap all of its existing nuclear weapons and nuclear production facilities, rejoin the NPT, and readmit IAEA inspectors. The difficult issue of the supply of light water reactors to replace North Korea's indigenous nuclear power plant program, as per the 1994 Agreed Framework, was left to be resolved in future discussions [8]. On the next day North Korea reiterated its known view that until it is supplied with a light water reactor it will not dismantle its nuclear arsenal or rejoin the NPT [9].[edit]IranMain article: Iran's nuclear program Iran has signed the NPT, but as of 2006 is under suspicion from the United States of having violated the treaty through an active program to develop nuclear weapons. The International Atomic Energy Agency is investigating. Iran says it merely wants to develop nuclear energy. However, as of 2006, several European states, including the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, share the United States' suspicions about Iran's nuclear intentions, particularly after a series of hard-line statements by recently-elected President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who has declared that Israel should be "wiped off the map."Some argue that Iran's extensive oil and gas reserves cast doubt on the economic viability of purely civilian nuclear power. However modern economic theory holds that the relevant consideration is the "opportunity cost" of oil. The argument is that by burning oil internally, Iran must forgo revenue that would have come from selling the oil. Under this analysis Iran faces essentially the same choice in its oil-use decisions as an oil importer.Ayatollah Ali Khamenei issued a fatwa forbidding the production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons on August 9, 2005. The full text of the fatwa was released in an official statement at the meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna. [10]See also: Iran and weapons of mass destruction[edit]Leaving the TreatyArticle X allows a state to leave the treaty if "extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country", giving three months' notice. The state is required to give reasons for leaving the NPT in this notice.NATO states argue that when a state decides to go to war, the treaty no longer applies; effectively the state leaves the treaty with no notice. This is a necessary argument to support NATO nuclear weapons sharing policy, but a troubling one for the logic of the treaty. See United States-NATO nuclear weapons sharing above.[edit]FutureThe inclusion of (civilian) nuclear power in the July 2005 Asia-Pacific Partnership for Clean Development and Climate is politically sensitive, as India, which tested its first atomic bomb in 1974, refuses to sign the NPT. Prior to the announcement of the Asia-Pacific Partnership, on 18 July 2005, US President George W. Bush had met Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and declared that he would work to change US law and international rules to permit trade in US civilian nuclear technology with India. [11] It is feared that in combination with

US attempts to deny Iran (an NPT signatory) civilian nuclear technology, this would effectively destroy the NPT.[12]Every five years, there is a Review Conference on the treaty. At the seventh Review Conference in May 2005, there were stark differences between the United States, which wanted the conference to focus on proliferation, especially on its allegations against Iran, and most other countries, who emphasized the lack of serious nuclear disarmament by the nuclear powers. The non-aligned countries reiterated their position that NATO's nuclear sharing arrangement violates the treaty.[edit]Parties to the treatyAfghanistan Albania Algeria Andorra Angola Antigua and Barbuda Argentina Armenia Australia Austria Azerbaijan The Bahamas Bahrain Bangladesh Barbados Belarus Belgium Belize Benin Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Botswana Brazil Brunei Bulgaria Burkina Faso Burundi Cambodia Cameroon Canada Cape Verde Central African Republic Chad Chile People's Republic of China Republic of China (Taiwan)1 Colombia Comoros Democratic Republic of the Congo Republic of the Congo Costa Rica Côte d'Ivoire Croatia Cuba Cyprus Czech Republic Denmark Djibouti Dominica Dominican Republic East Timor Ecuador Egypt El Salvador Equatorial Guinea Eritrea Estonia Ethiopia Fiji Finland France Gabon The Gambia Georgia Germany Ghana Greece Grenada Guatemala Guinea Guinea-Bissau Guyana Haiti Holy See (Vatican City) Honduras Hungary Iceland Indonesia Iran Iraq Ireland Italy Jamaica Japan Jordan Kazakhstan Kenya Kiribati North Korea South Korea Kuwait Kyrgyzstan Laos Latvia Lebanon Lesotho Liberia Libya Liechtenstein Lithuania Luxembourg Macedonia Madagascar Malawi Malaysia Maldives Mali Malta Republic of the Marshall Islands Mauritania Mauritius Mexico Federated States of Micronesia Moldova Monaco Mongolia Morocco Mozambique Myanmar Namibia Nauru Nepal Netherlands New Zealand Nicaragua Niger Nigeria Norway Oman Palau Panama Papua New Guinea Paraguay Peru Philippines Poland Portugal Qatar Romania Russia2 Rwanda Saint Kitts and Nevis Saint Lucia Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Samoa San Marino São Tomé and Príncipe Saudi Arabia Senegal Serbia and Montenegro3 Seychelles Sierra Leone Singapore Slovakia Slovenia Solomon Islands Somalia South Africa Spain Sri Lanka Sudan Suriname Swaziland Sweden Switzerland Syria Tajikistan Tanzania Thailand Togo Tonga Trinidad and Tobago Tunisia Turkey Turkmenistan Tuvalu Uganda Ukraine United Arab Emirates United Kingdom United States Uruguay Uzbekistan Vanuatu Venezuela Vietnam Yemen4 Zambia Zimbabwe Notes:The Republic of China (Taiwan) was an original signatory of the NPT, but was effectively expelled from the UN in 1971. Though the UN no longer recognizes the ROC, the ROC states it will continue to abide by the treaty. through the Soviet Union. through Yugoslavia. through the Yemen Arab Republic and People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.