

<http://www.iilj.org/papers/2005.18Marschik.htm>. Marschik believes that states have subsequently consented and acquiesced in resolution 1373, but reserves judgment regarding resolution 1540.

- 29 See *Olberg*. See also Olivia Bosch and Peter van Ham, eds., *Global Non-Proliferation and Counter-Terrorism: The Impact of UNSCR 1540*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C., 2007, pp. 211-212.

Section 1.4: The Breakdown of Disarmament Machinery

- 1 “CD/1693/Rev.1: Initiative of the Ambassadors Dembri, Lint, Reyes, Salander and Vega (“A5 Proposal”),” Proposal of a Programme of Work at the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva, September 5, 2003. Online at <http://reachingcriticalwill.org/political/cd/A5.pdf>.
- 2 “CD/2007/L.1: Initiative of the 2007 CD Presidents: South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, and Syria (“2007 P6”),” Presidential Draft Decision at the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva, March 23, 2007. Online at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/cd/papers07/L1.pdf>.
- 3 Ambassador Christina Rocca, “The P6 proposal for continuing work in the CD in 2007,” Statement to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva, March 23, 2007. Online at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/cd/speeches07/1session/Mar23US.pdf>.
- 4 See Paul Meyer, “The Conference on Disarmament: Getting Back to Business,” *Arms Control Today*, December 2006.
- 5 The U.S. is unlikely to support any amendments referring to negotiations on PAROS, and on March 27, 2007 France said that while it would not oppose the proposal as it stands, it would oppose it if any changes were made to the mandates for nuclear disarmament or NSAs.
- 6 Nicole Deller, Arjun Makhijani, and John Burroughs, eds., *Rule of Power or Rule of Law? An Assessment of U.S. Policies and Actions Regarding Security-Related Treaties*, The Apex Press, New York, 2003, pp. 94-95.
- 7 Stephen Rademaker, U.S. Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation, “Confronting Today’s Threats,” Statement to the First Committee of the General Assembly, United Nations, New York, October 3, 2005. Online at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/1com/1com05/statements/us3oct.doc>.
- 8 Highly enriched uranium refers to uranium enriched to the concentration of 20% or above of the fissile isotope uranium-235. Other fissile isotopes include uranium-233, neptunium-237, and americium-241. Most of the world’s nuclear power reactors operate on low enriched uranium. Uranium enriched to reactor grade is not considered usable in nuclear weapons. Plutonium, any type of which is considered weapons-usable, does not exist in nature and is produced in nuclear reactors as a by-product (*see section 3.1*). See International Panel on Fissile Materials, *Global Fissile Materials Report 2006*, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, 2006, pp. 6-10. Online at http://www.fissilematerials.org/ipfm/site_down/ipfmreport06.pdf.
- 9 *Weapons of Terror*, p. 103.
- 10 UN General Assembly Resolution GA/48/75L, December 16, 1993.
- 11 Ambassador Gerald E. Shannon, “Consultations on the Most Appropriate Arrangement to Negotiate a Treaty Banning the Production of Fissile Material

- for Nuclear Weapons or Other Nuclear Explosive Devices (“Shannon Mandate”),” Report CD/1299 of the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva, March 24, 1995. Online at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/cd/shannon.html>.
- 12 “NPT/CONF.1995/32 (Part I), Annex: Decision 2: Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament,” 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, New York, 1995, para. 4(b). Online at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/legal/npt/1995dec.html#2>.
 - 13 “NPT/CONF.2000/28: Final Document: Part I, Step 3.” 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, New York, 2000, pp. 14-15. Online at <http://disarmament.un.org/wmd/npt/finaldoc.html>.
 - 14 Permanent Mission of the U.S. to the UN in Geneva, “White Paper on a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty,” Geneva, May 18, 2006. Online at <http://www.ipfmlibrary.org/usm06.pdf>.
 - 15 Permanent Mission of the U.S. to the UN in Geneva, “Treaty on the Cessation of the Production of Fissile Material for Use in Nuclear Weapons or Other Nuclear Explosive Devices,” draft mandate and treaty text to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva, May 18, 2006. Online at <http://reachingcriticalwill.org/political/cd/speeches06/18MayDraftTreaty.pdf>.
 - 16 *Weapons of Terror*, pp. 104-105.
 - 17 See Stephen Rademaker, “The Conference on Disarmament: Time is Running Out,” *Arms Control Today*, December 2006.
 - 18 Rebecca Whiteair and Seth Brugger, “BWC Protocol Talks in Geneva Collapse Following U.S. Rejection,” *Arms Control Today*, September 2001. Online at http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2001_09/bwcsept01.asp.
 - 19 *Weapons of Terror*, p. 146.
 - 20 U.S. Air Force Space Command, *Vision for 2020*, February 1997. Online at <http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/usspac/visbook.pdf>.
 - 21 “As long as the potential for such attacks [against U.S. satellites] remains, our Government will continue to consider the role that space-related weapons will play in protecting our assets.” John Monaco, Permanent Mission of the U.S. to the UN in Geneva, “Statement to the CD,” Statement to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva, June 13, 2006. Online at <http://reachingcriticalwill.org/political/cd/speeches06/13JuneUS.pdf>. This was likely a response to Russia’s June 8, 2006 call to all states with military space technology to refrain from practical activities aimed at putting weapons in space.
 - 22 Office of Science and Technology Policy, *U.S. National Space Policy*, Executive Office of the President, The White House, Washington, D.C., August 31, 2006, p. 2. Online at <http://www.ostp.gov/html/US%20National%20Space%20Policy.pdf>.
 - 23 *Space Security 2006*, Spacesecurity.org, July 2006, p. 148. Online at <http://www.spacesecurity.org/SSI2006.pdf>.
 - 24 In October of 2004, Russia declared it would not be the first to put weapons in space, and has since repeatedly called on other states to make similar declarations. See Ambassador Leonid Skotnikov, Permanent Representative of Russia to the UN in Geneva, “Statement of the Russian Federation,” Statement to the First Committee of the UN General Assembly, United Nations, New York, October, 5, 2005. Online at <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/>

1com/1com04/statements/Russia.pdf.

- 25 Kofi A. Annan, Secretary-General of the UN, *'We the Peoples': The Role of the United Nations in the 21st Century*, United Nations Publications, New York, March 2000, p. 53.
- 26 A summary of polls can be found at <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/campaigns/peace>:

US: A survey carried out in 1997 by Lake, Sosin and Snell found that 87% of those polled in the US felt, "the US should negotiate an agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons."

UK: A poll carried out by MORI in 2005, on behalf of Greenpeace, showed a majority (54%) of the British public oppose the development of a new nuclear weapons system. Only one in three (33%) support their development. [In addition, 87% of those polled in Britain by Gallup in 1997 agreed, "Britain should help to negotiate a global treaty to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons."]

Russia: In 1998 61% of Russians polled by Vox Populi commissioned by TASS said, "All nuclear weapons states should eliminate such weapons."

India: 62% of Indians polled by The Hindu in 1998 said, "India should not produce nuclear bombs."

Japan: In a Japanese poll by Asahi Shimbun in 1998 78% agreed that, "all nuclear weapons states should eliminate such weapons."

Australia: A resounding 92% of Australians polled by Roy Morgan Research Co. in 1998 agreed, "Australia should help negotiate a global treaty to ban and destroy all nuclear weapons."

Norway: Similarly 92% of Norwegians polled in 1998 by 4 fakta A/S agreed "Norway should work actively for a ban on nuclear weapons."

Belgium: 72% of Belgian polled in 1998 by Market Response said they were for "an initiative on behalf of Belgium with an aim of initiating talks concerning a treaty for the abolition of nuclear weapons."

Canada: 93% of Canadians polled in 1998 by the Angus Reid Group agreed that, "Canada should take a leadership role in global negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons."

Turkey: In 2004, an Infakto poll, commissioned by Greenpeace, found that 72% of Turkish people supported the idea of making Turkey a nuclear-free zone and 75% would support Turkey leading an international campaign for international nuclear disarmament.

A Greenpeace International-commissioned public opinion survey, carried out by Strategic Communications in April and May 2006, polled Europeans living in the six host countries for NATO U.S. nuclear weapons: Belgium, Britain, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, and Turkey. More than two-thirds said they want Europe to be free of nuclear weapons. "Two thirds of Europeans want Nuclear Weapon free Europe: Greenpeace calls upon Defence Ministers to send US nuclear weapons home," Press Release, Greenpeace International, May 30, 2006.