

The Shining Star

*Poems should be written in such a way that
if thrown onto a window, it would shatter the glass.*

Daniil Kharms

A month passed, as the President of the Conference to negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading towards their total elimination, the Costa Rican Ambassador Elaine White presented the draft Convention on the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

The first week of the negotiations showed that the draft Convention began to slowly blur as a blot on paper.

Serious disagreements raise questions on the inclusion in the draft Convention of prohibitions of **the threat of use of nuclear weapons** and **the transit of nuclear weapons**.

There are questions to the preamble of the Convention. Unfortunately, it does not give the feeling of the historical importance of the document, the breakthrough in the field of nuclear disarmament. As a result, the preamble does not set the tone of the Convention and, as a consequence, does not convey the spirit of the signed document.

Previously, New Zealand at the first session of the negotiations in March this year rightly noted that "*it is necessary to show the path traveled by the world community since 1946*".

In this connection, of course, in the preamble of the draft Convention it is likely to see unambiguous references to:

- Article VI of the NPT;
- the first UN General Assembly resolution on January 24, 1946;.
- the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of July 8, 1996;

- the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly of 30 June 1978;
- Conferences held on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons;
- conventions on the prohibition of biological and chemical weapons;
- the United Nations Millennium Declaration.

What's better? – a soft text and a larger number of States parties to the Convention or a strong instrument and, accordingly, fewer states that support it?

We are convinced that it is necessary to continue to insist and convince on the inclusion of strong provisions in the draft Convention. In particular, the prohibition on the threat of use of nuclear weapons and the prohibition on the transit of nuclear weapons.

As is known, the nuclear-weapon States and their allies boycott these negotiations.

However, some countries participating in the Conference are under their influence and sympathize with them.

It is this fact, and not the arguments they give, that explains their desire to weaken the text of the Convention. The overwhelming majority of the states participating in the negotiations, showing responsibility and political will, need to understand that those who support the weakening of the draft Convention do not in fact believe that this document is capable of making a significant contribution to the process of nuclear disarmament.

And here we should allow them to stay in the old paradigm of thinking, in the illusions that nuclear weapons provide security. They are not ready yet, as they continue to look back. The time will come and they will join the Convention.

This Convention is a "*good news*", a historical document that changes the architecture of international security.

Very soon, nuclear weapons will not be an advantage, not a privilege, not a sign of strength, but a weakness that only causes compassion. Is a healthy person able, is a healthy state capable of pushing a button and simultaneously destroying hundreds and hundreds of thousands of innocent people (*husbands, mothers, children ...*)?

The draft Convention is not a semi-unspoken document with vague wording, agreed upon with concessions for the sake of signing. **It is the shining star, illuminating the way to a world free of nuclear weapons...**

June 23, 2017

Alimzhan Akhmetov,
Director of the Center for International Security and Policy,
Kazakhstan