

Religions for Peace



# NUCLEAR **BAN** TREATY NEGOTIATION **HANDBOOK**



A black and white photograph of the United Nations Secretariat Building. The building is a tall, modern skyscraper with a distinctive grid-like facade of windows. It is viewed from a low angle, making it appear very imposing. In the foreground, a row of flags on poles is visible, partially obscuring the base of the building. The sky is visible on the left side of the frame.

Published in March 2017 by  
the International Campaign to  
Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN)  
and Religions for Peace

Contact: [info@icanw.org](mailto:info@icanw.org)

Cover image: Jenny Jordahl  
This page: Frode Ersfjord



# Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Our campaign</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The negotiations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Humanitarian impact</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Why a ban treaty</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Advocacy messages</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Communications</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Practical information</b>	<b>18</b>

# Foreword

## A moral imperative to ban nuclear weapons

**R**eligions for Peace (RfP) is pleased to join in the historic publication of the ICAN/RfP Nuclear Ban Treaty Negotiation Handbook. As the negotiations on the nuclear ban treaty begin at the United Nations, RfP is committed to further educating, mobilizing and engaging its global network of religious communities across the world for needed education, action and advocacy for the success of these historic negotiations. RfP is particularly delighted to be working side by side with ICAN on this crucial issue.

Moral imperatives against the use or possession of nuclear weapons arise from the depths of human conscience. Nuclear weapons, as indiscriminate weapons of mass destruction, are intrinsically evil. Even the development or possession of nuclear weapons is morally disordered.

Nuclear weapons present a unique existential threat to humanity. The number of states possessing nuclear weapons continues to grow, as does the possibility of terrorists making or acquiring nuclear weapons. This proliferation is accompanied by an increase in risk. Moreover, the technology designed to manage these weapons cannot be made foolproof and the simple possession of these weapons exposes the human family to potentially devastating accidents. In addition, the vast amount of money spent on these weapons is a form of “theft” that diverts desperately needed funds from development. Finally, a security framework that includes the threat of annihilating our neighbours is like a

form of silent cancer that eats away at our souls and thwarts our efforts to build “shared security”.

New and historic opportunities for progress on nuclear abolition are emerging. High-level policymakers, including many who formerly supported nuclear deterrence, are signalling their support for a nuclear-weapon-free world. We should together seize the moment to work for the establishment of a clear international norm – in the form of a global treaty – to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons.

Allow me to express my heartfelt gratitude for all who have contributed – both directly and indirectly – to the production of the ICAN/RfP Nuclear Ban Treaty Negotiation Handbook. As we equip ourselves for needed education, action and advocacy with this handbook, let us all commit to working shoulder to shoulder to free our world from the obscene grip of nuclear weapons. By doing so, we can advance the peace which, the world’s diverse religions agree, is our true human destiny.

**Dr William F Vendley**

**Secretary General, Religions for Peace**



# Introduction

## Civil society working for a more peaceful world

---

**H**umankind can never coexist with nuclear weapons. This does not simply represent a view from the perspective of ethics, morality or religion. Anyone who thinks rationally understands that this is a consensus supported by all people. Moreover, nuclear weapons endanger not only humankind but all forms of life. Based on this recognition, I would like to emphasize that it is the duty of human beings to abolish all nuclear weapons.

The World Conference of Religions for Peace (WCRP), comprising religious leaders from around the world, also represents global civil society. The organization has been stressing the inhumane nature of nuclear weapons and is committed to the nuclear abolition movement. This movement originated from the misery and agony experienced by the victims of the atomic bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. At the first world conference of WCRP, held in Kyoto in 1970, we decided to establish the organization and adopted a statement which includes the following passage: “As men and women of religion we confess in humility and penitence that we have very often betrayed our religious ideals and our commitment to peace. It is not religion that has failed the cause of peace, but religious people. This betrayal of religion can and must be corrected.”

This statement is based on our sincere penitence for having occasionally supported narrow-minded nationalistic policies without any criticism, and made compromises with the government of the day from the standpoint of religious leaders. Based on this deep penitence, and having recovered our religious conscience, we are now determined to work for the cause of peace, regarding it as our own mission. At the same time, we are also fully aware that we must fulfil this mission with an open-minded spirit that transcends differences between religions. I truly believe that this awareness will enable all religious men and women to combine their efforts and collaborate with grassroots citizens to further develop the nuclear abolition movement.

In the past, we saw many grassroots citizens involved in campaigns against anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions. Civil society also set forth scientific proposals

and actively lobbied related parties. These initiatives created a surge of international public opinion, paving the way for the conclusion of the Mine Ban Treaty and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. We are currently working towards the adoption of a treaty banning nuclear weapons for which we desperately need support from a broad range of constituents of civil society. Whereas civil society, including WCRP, emphasizes the inhumane nature of nuclear weapons, nuclear-armed states argue the importance of nuclear deterrence. The nuclear deterrence theory, however, involves intimidation and cunning scheming in its essence, which can lead to mutual mistrust. Suspicion and distrust in one another increases the risk of using nuclear weapons rather than stopping their use, making the world even more dangerous. Foreign policies based on nuclear deterrence theory have a negative impact on creating world peace. Moreover, they are against our religious beliefs and should never be permitted.

It is my sincere hope that this handbook will deepen the understanding of all constituents of civil society of the vital importance of the nuclear weapon ban treaty, help them develop a multifaceted approach to the movement, and boost the creation of a surge towards adoption of the treaty. To this end, the handbook indicates various techniques for conducting effective negotiations with government officials, effective campaign methods, and strategies relating to the media. I truly hope that you will find this handbook useful and instructive.

In a Buddhist sutra, there is the phrase “hyoka muyo”, which refers to the peaceful state in which military forces and weapons are totally useless. Our peace movement originated in the belief that this is not simply an idealistic view, but a feasible and attainable future state of humankind. With this firm belief, we will continue our commitment to work for the adoption of the treaty banning nuclear weapons, and eventually the total abolition of nuclear weapons.

**Gijun Sugitani**

**Chair, International Standing Commission on  
Disarmament and Security, Religion for Peace**

# Our campaign

## A coalition motivated by humanitarian concerns

**T**he International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) is a coalition of non-governmental organizations in one hundred countries advocating for a strong and effective treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons. Our partners range from local peace groups to global federations representing millions of people.

ICAN was initiated in Melbourne, Australia, in 2007 and launched internationally in Vienna, Austria. Our campaign's founders were inspired by the tremendous success of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, which a decade earlier had played an instrumental role in the negotiation of the anti-personnel mine ban treaty.

Since our founding, we have worked to build a powerful global groundswell of public support for the abolition of nuclear weapons. By engaging diverse groups and working alongside the Red Cross and like-minded governments, we have reframed the debate on nuclear weapons and generated momentum for the start of treaty negotiations.

### Humanitarian focus

At a review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 2010, all nations expressed their deep concern at the “catastrophic humanitarian consequences” of any use of nuclear weapons – a collective statement that led to the convening of three major conferences in 2013 and 2014 focusing on the humanitarian impact of nuclear detonations. ICAN served as the civil society coordinator for these meetings, which brought together most of the world's governments, along with international organizations and academic institutions. In 2015 we helped garner the support of 127 nations for a diplomatic pledge “to fill the legal gap” in the existing regime governing nuclear weapons.

Based on the outcomes of the humanitarian conferences, we also campaigned for the establishment of a special UN working group to examine specific proposals for advancing nuclear disarmament. This body met in Geneva in February, May and August 2016. It issued a landmark report recommending that negotiations begin in 2017 on a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons once and for all.

Our campaign then lobbied successfully for the UN General Assembly to adopt the resolution in December 2016 to launch negotiations on “a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons”.

### How we work

ICAN coordinates global days of action, raises public awareness, and engages in advocacy at the UN and in national parliaments. We work with survivors of nuclear testing and the US atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, helping share their testimonies with the public and decision makers.

Many prominent people have lent their support to ICAN, including Nobel laureates Desmond Tutu and the Dalai Lama, musician Herbie Hancock, artist Yoko Ono, and actors Martin Sheen and Michael Douglas. The UN secretary-general has praised ICAN's work.



# The negotiations

## Strengthening the norm against nuclear weapons

In one of its final acts of 2016, the UN General Assembly adopted a landmark resolution to begin negotiations on a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons. This historic decision heralds an end to two decades of paralysis in multilateral nuclear disarmament efforts. Nuclear weapons are the only weapons of mass destruction not yet prohibited in a comprehensive and universal manner, despite their well-documented catastrophic humanitarian and environmental impacts. Biological weapons, chemical weapons, anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions have all been explicitly and completely banned under international law, whereas only partial prohibitions exist for nuclear weapons. The new treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons will strengthen the global norms against using and possessing these weapons. And it will spur long-overdue progress towards disarmament.

Eliminating the nuclear threat has been high on the UN agenda since the organization's formation in 1945. But international efforts to advance this goal have stalled in recent years, with nuclear-armed nations investing heavily in the build-up and modernization of their nuclear arsenals. More than 20 years have passed since multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations last took place.

The risks of nuclear weapon use are real and increasing. There are roughly 14,900 nuclear weapons in the world today, mostly in the arsenals of just two nations: the United States and Russia. Seven other nations possess them: the United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea. The successful conclusion of the UN negotiations in 2017 to outlaw nuclear weapons is not contingent upon the support and participation of these nations. No nation will have the power to veto the treaty's adoption.

The vast majority of UN member states believe that weapons intended to inflict catastrophic humanitarian harm should, as a matter of principle, be prohibited under international law. They have concluded that nuclear weapons must now be placed on the same legal footing as other weapons of mass destruction. Experience shows that the prohibition of a particular type of weapon provides a solid foundation for advancing its progressive elimination.

### The process so far

#### MAY 2010

##### **Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference**

In the final document adopted by consensus at the Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference in 2010, parties to the treaty express their "deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons". This gives impetus to future statements and conferences on the subject.

#### NOVEMBER 2011

##### **Red Cross resolution**

The international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement – the largest humanitarian organization in the world – adopts a landmark resolution appealing to all nations to negotiate a "legally binding international agreement" to prohibit and completely eliminate nuclear weapons. Nuclear disarmament becomes a top Red Cross priority.

#### MAY 2012

##### **First humanitarian statement**

On behalf of 16 nations, Switzerland delivers the first in a series of joint statements on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, urging all nations to "intensify their efforts to outlaw nuclear weapons". Support for this humanitarian call grows with each new statement. Eventually, 159 nations sign on.

#### MARCH 2013

##### **Oslo conference**

Eager to strengthen the evidence base for prohibiting and eliminating nuclear weapons, Norway hosts the first-ever intergovernmental conference on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, attended by 128 nations. Relief agencies warn they would be powerless to respond meaningfully in the aftermath of a nuclear attack.

*(continued)*

## **FEBRUARY 2014**

### **Nayarit conference**

Mexico hosts the second humanitarian consequences conference, in Nayarit, with 146 nations present. The chair calls for the launch of a “diplomatic process” to negotiate a “legally binding instrument” to prohibit nuclear weapons – a necessary precondition for reaching the goal of elimination. He declares the conference “a point of no return”.

## **DECEMBER 2014**

### **Vienna conference**

A record 158 nations participate in the third conference on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, in Vienna, which concludes with a pledge to cooperate in efforts to “fill the legal gap” in the international regime governing nuclear weapons. Within months, 127 nations formally endorse the document, known as the Humanitarian Pledge.

## **AUGUST 2016**

### **UN working group in Geneva**

A special UN working group on nuclear disarmament meets in Geneva in February, May and August 2016 to discuss new legal measures to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world. It recommends the negotiation of a treaty to prohibit nuclear weapons – a decision that the Red Cross hails as having “potentially historic implications”.

## **DECEMBER 2016**

### **General Assembly resolution**

The United Nations General Assembly adopts a landmark resolution to convene a conference in 2017 to negotiate “a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading towards their total elimination”. The decision heralds an end to two decades of paralysis in multilateral nuclear disarmament efforts.

## **Setsuko Thurlow's appeal**

In advance of the vote at the United Nations on the resolution to formally establish nuclear weapon ban negotiations, Setsuko Thurlow, an ICAN supporter and Hiroshima survivor, delivered an impassioned plea to governments, encouraging them to support the initiative:

When I speak about my experience of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, often the first thing that comes to mind is an image of my four-year-old nephew Eiji – transformed into a charred, blackened and swollen child who kept asking in a faint voice for water, until he died in agony. Had he not been a victim of the atomic bomb, he would be 76 years old this year. This idea still shocks me.

Despite the passage of time, he remains in my memory as a 4-year-old child who came to represent all the innocent children of the world. And it is the image of massive death of innocents that has been the driving force for me to continue my struggle against the ultimate evil of nuclear weapons. Eiji's image is burnt into my retina.

As a 13-year-old schoolgirl, I witnessed my city of Hiroshima blinded by the flash, flattened by the hurricane-like blast, burned in the heat of 4,000 degrees Celsius and contaminated by the radiation of one atomic bomb. A bright summer morning turned into dark twilight with smoke and dust rising in the mushroom cloud – dead and injured covering the ground, begging desperately for water and receiving no medical care at all. The spreading firestorm and the foul stench of burnt flesh filled the air.

Many survivors of the nuclear bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki have been passing in recent years with their dreams of nuclear abolition unfulfilled. Their motto was “abolition in our lifetime”. Nuclear weapons are far from abolished. As you know, the nuclear-armed states are continuing to upgrade and modernize their nuclear arsenals, and disarmament negotiations continue to be blocked while international tensions are on the rise. But the world now has an historic opportunity to achieve something remarkable.

Over the past five years, I have witnessed the mounting momentum of a global movement involving states without nuclear weapons and non-governmental organizations working together to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons. This movement has shown beyond all doubt that nuclear weapons are first and foremost a grave humanitarian problem, and that the terrible risks of these weapons cast all techno-military considerations into irrelevance. Following three international conferences on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, a United Nations working group recommended that negotiations commence in 2017 for a legally binding instrument to ban nuclear weapons. This proposal is now on the table.

At the end of this month, governments will vote on a resolution to start negotiations of a treaty that will prohibit nuclear weapons. I beseech you to vote yes, with every fiber of my being, and to participate actively in negotiations next year to expose and legally challenge this most inhumane and unacceptable instrument of mass murder. This is an historic moment. Let us seize this opportunity to ban nuclear weapons – in our lifetime. For all the children, like my nephew Eiji, and you can imagine your own children, and the children who will be born – that they might inherit the privilege to love and enjoy our one shared world. Nothing less is at stake.

# Humanitarian impact

## Why nuclear weapons must be banned

---

**N**uclear weapons unleash the binding forces that power the stars to produce incinerating heat, powerful shock waves and overpressures, and ionizing radiation. Unlike conventional weapons or other weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons instantaneously wipe out entire populations, level cities and devastate the environment. Moreover, they produce radioactive contamination that causes cancers and other illnesses that can persist across generations for millennia. No weapon ever invented can cause so much death and destruction so quickly, on such a catastrophic scale, or such widespread and persisting toxicity in the environment.

A single nuclear weapon can destroy a city and kill most of its people. A small number of nuclear explosions over modern cities would kill tens of millions of people. Casualties from a major nuclear war between the US and Russia would reach hundreds of millions in a matter of hours.

Less than 1 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world today could disrupt the global climate and cause nuclear famine. The thousands of nuclear weapons possessed by the US and Russia could bring about a nuclear winter, destroying the essential ecosystems on which life depends. Physicians and first responders not themselves victims would be unable to work in the totally devastated, radioactively contaminated wastelands that would extend for kilometres beyond ground zero, making it impossible to reach and treat survivors.

Whether or not they are detonated, nuclear weapons cause widespread harm to health and to the environment. The mining and processing of uranium that provides the fuel for nuclear weapons, for example, has serious and long-lasting health consequences for workers and local communities.

### Physical trauma and burns

Nuclear weapons have extreme blast and burn effects that kill people and destroy infrastructure on a scale and with an intensity that puts them in a class of their own compared with any other weapons. The heat wave from a nuclear detonation incinerates everything combustible in its path, including human flesh. Firestorms consume all remaining oxygen, suffocating everyone who managed to take refuge

from the flames themselves. The blast wave and associated overpressures and hurricane-force winds collapse all but the strongest buildings, destroy roads and transportation systems, and turn objects (including human victims) into missiles that amplify the damage, until nothing remains but rubble.

An electromagnetic pulse disrupts the electricity supply grid and electronic equipment and systems, including computers, medical equipment and satellite communications. These levels of destruction, which are more extreme than produced by any other weapon, cannot be limited to military targets or to combatants.

### Radiation

Nuclear weapons produce ionizing radiation, which kills or sickens those exposed, contaminates the environment, and has long-term health consequences for those who do not die right away. Acute radiation sickness can cause death within hours, days or weeks; those who recover may remain ill for months or even years. Lower doses of ionizing radiation can cause leukaemia, thyroid cancer and many other cancers, even many years after exposure. Increased risk of cancer persists for the lifetime of those exposed. Radiation exposure also causes birth defects and genetic damage. Subsequent generations can suffer both because of genetic damage they inherited, as well as exposure to radioactivity from lingering radioactive contamination and fallout.

A dose of radiation lethal for a human being can contain no more energy than the heat in a single sip of hot tea or coffee. There is no antidote to radiation exposure and no way to hasten the pace of physical decay, which is innate to each different radioisotope. Exposure to dangerous ionizing radiation has become a persistent global problem because of continuing fallout from atmospheric tests and contamination of land and water around the former test sites, nuclear weapon production facilities, and radioactive waste storage sites. Radiation poses a particular problem for physicians and other first responders, who jeopardize their own health and safety by entering contaminated areas in the attempt to find and treat survivors.

## Nuclear winter

A limited, regional nuclear conflict involving only 100 Hiroshima-size nuclear weapons would severely disrupt the global climate and agriculture for two decades or more. The resulting food shortages would place at least two billion people at risk of starvation. The effects of nuclear famine would hit hardest the people who are currently most affected by food insecurity, even if they are distant from the region of conflict; but no region would be spared. The massive arsenals held by the US and Russia can still create a nuclear winter, destroying Earth's fundamental ecosystems, on which all life depends. These findings have profound implications. Use of nuclear weapons by any nation, with uncontrollable risks of escalation, would be suicidal. And not only the bloated arsenals of Russia and the US, but also the arsenals of Britain, France, China, Israel, India and Pakistan pose an unparalleled global threat.

## Doctors can't help

In the aftermath of a nuclear detonation, doctors and healthcare workers would be killed or severely injured along with the general population. Hospitals, clinics and other medical facilities would be destroyed or rendered unusable. Medicines, blood for transfusions, diagnostic equipment and all other essential supplies would be unavailable. There would be no water, no electricity, no transportation, no communication systems. Roads would be impassable and the terrain would be unrecognizable. Corpses would be everywhere, strewn among the injured and the dying. Surviving doctors and nurses would be unable to find, let alone treat, other survivors. Dangerous levels of radiation would prevent doctors and other emergency responders from entering affected areas in search of survivors.

In the aftermath of a nuclear war, these conditions would be multiplied many times over, in many places. In addition, all forms of international travel, including planes and trains, would likely be disrupted for an indeterminate time. Electronic communications could fail worldwide as a result of electromagnetic pulse effects. The global economy would be severely impacted, creating financial impediments to an internationally organized humanitarian response.

The fact is, a meaningful medical and humanitarian response to aid the immediate survivors of the use of

nuclear weapons is impossible. Facing multiple injuries, an unrecognizable world, and most of the normal supports and essentials of life gone, few of those with more than minor injuries are likely to survive even the immediate aftermath. And no humanitarian response could undo even a small part of the terrible destruction and cataclysmic scale of death and injury inflicted.

Since the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945, the medical and international relief communities have understood that there can be no meaningful response to the terrible devastation caused by nuclear weapons. All existing resources would be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the devastation, and no amount of planning or spending on improved capacity can change this reality. Based on this understanding, we have a responsibility to prevent what cannot be cured. Banning and eliminating nuclear weapons is the best and only way to prevent their use.

*This section of our handbook is taken from a campaign kit on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons published in 2014 by the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.*



Iroji Kebinli suffered radiation burns to his skin in 1954 after contact with "Bikini snow" – radioactive ash from US nuclear tests in the Marshall Islands.

# Why a ban treaty

## The logic of prohibition as a step towards elimination

---

**T**he negotiation of a new legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons – or, as it is widely known, a ban treaty – is a genuine opportunity for the international community, at long last, to break through the logjam in multilateral nuclear disarmament efforts and to make real progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

Many believe that the effort to prohibit nuclear weapons is a result of frustration with nuclear-armed states and their lack of progress in disarmament. They are right that frustration runs high at the lack of implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva – and that this frustration has helped the ban treaty's cause – but this is not why nuclear weapons are being banned.

Rather, this effort is about determining which weapons the international community deems unacceptable, and preventing catastrophic humanitarian harm. It reflects a shift in security and development policies towards a more central role for humanitarian concerns and humanitarian law. It also reaffirms multilateralism and the understanding that problems with global impact mean all regions of the world – not just the permanent members of the UN Security Council – must have a say in the solutions.

Unfortunately, as the campaign for a prohibition of nuclear weapons has evolved, so too has a more challenging international security environment. Experts have argued, even before the election of Donald Trump as president of the United States, that the risk of a nuclear detonation is now the highest it has been since the end of the Cold War. Trump has announced that he will “greatly strengthen and expand” US nuclear capabilities, echoing Russian president Vladimir Putin's promise to “strengthen the military potential of strategic nuclear forces”. Between them, the US and Russia control around 90 per cent of the world's nuclear weapons.

Ensuring that nuclear weapons are never again used has become a yet more urgent task. As long as nuclear weapons continue to be valued as strategic assets necessary for security, significant nuclear disarmament will be extremely difficult, if not impossible. In order to get rid of nuclear weapons,

the international community must declare these weapons no longer acceptable or desirable. For the majority of states in the world, the time to do that has come.

It is possible that none of the nuclear-armed states will participate in the ban treaty negotiations, and it is unlikely that any of them will sign a finished treaty in the near future. Yet that does not diminish the treaty's value. The reaction of some nuclear-armed states to the idea of negotiations shows that the legal delegitimization of nuclear weapons is, to put it mildly, making them nervous. Past experience in the development of global norms strongly suggests a ban treaty would affect the behaviour even of states that do not join.

A treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons without the signature of nuclear-armed states does not, in and of itself, constitute disarmament. But it directly challenges the acceptability of nuclear-weapon use and possession by any state under any circumstances, thereby providing further impetus for concrete legal, political and normative measures to eliminate nuclear weapons. Other nuclear-weapon-related treaties, such as the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban-Treaty and even the NPT have not themselves achieved nuclear disarmament either – but they have provided the impetus for progress. A prohibition delegitimizing nuclear weapons would significantly contribute to a strengthened norm against the weapons, at a time when the world desperately needs it.

For other prohibited weapons, such as biological and chemical weapons, landmines and cluster munitions, prohibition has been the necessary starting point for elimination. Prohibition precedes elimination – not the other way around. A treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons is not only a legal tool. A ban will also create space for states, international organizations, civil society and individuals to carry out the political work necessary to spread the commonsense understanding that possessing nuclear weapons is unacceptable. The process of negotiating a treaty itself will mobilize civil society and build public pressure around the world. It provides a concrete opportunity to rally the public, engage media and ask for action in parliaments. In short, it gives the anti-nuclear-weapon movement focus.

A nuclear weapon prohibition will not magically make nuclear-armed and nuclear-alliance states give up the bomb, but it will make it a less attractive weapon to maintain or pursue, and provide states with more incentives for elimination. Whether they admit it or not, governments care about how they are perceived in the international community. Stigmatizing weapons creates perceptions of unacceptability, which can be incompatible with the identity a state wishes to hold in the world.

International humanitarian law has evolved since the end of the Second World War, and carpet bombing and killing hundreds of thousands of civilians is no longer considered an acceptable method of warfare. If this is a global norm to which states are committed, nuclear weapons can no longer be accepted either. And if the international community is ever going to get rid of these weapons, it must start by clearly rejecting them through a prohibition treaty.

### **Impact of the treaty**

As with other international prohibitions on entire categories of weapon systems, an international treaty that prohibits nuclear weapons can have a wide-ranging standard-setting function. The stigmatization of certain categories of weapons has been a very important outcome of international treaties that prohibit chemical weapons, biological weapons, anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions. The treaty will enhance the stigma against nuclear weapons, contribute to legal clarity surrounding these weapons, and increase awareness and facilitate cooperation among a community of states, international organizations and civil society towards their elimination. While the exact content of the treaty is still to be negotiated, it could also, explicitly or implicitly, curb financing of nuclear weapons, impose limitations on military cooperation between nuclear and non-nuclear-armed states, and recognize the rights of victims of nuclear weapons, whether from use or testing.

Whilst nuclear weapons have been unacceptable since their invention and use more than 70 years ago, a handful of nuclear-armed states continue to modernize and expand their nuclear arsenals, sometimes using their nuclear weapons as justification for self-proposed claims to their political power and status or as a bargaining chip to further their own national interests. Some states in military alliances with nuclear-armed states continue to accept the use of nuclear weapons on their behalf as legitimate. By negotiating and adopting a nuclear weapon ban treaty, the international community will send a clear message to these states that such behaviour is unacceptable and must stop.

By prohibiting and stigmatizing nuclear weapons, the responsible majority of states will increase the political costs

for those states that choose to maintain and possess nuclear weapons while reducing the political incentives for other states to acquire nuclear weapons.

History shows that the international treaty prohibitions on categories of weapons precedes and facilitates progress towards their elimination. Weapons that are outlawed are increasingly seen as illegitimate, losing their political status and, along with it, the resources for their production, modernization and retention. While the ban treaty will only be legally binding for states that join it, it will have an impact well beyond its formal membership. States opposed to the ban will have to justify their failure to join the ban treaty to their citizens and parliaments as well as international allies, thus forcing them to continuously reassess their security concepts and military doctrines against the backdrop of increasingly stigmatized weapon systems. The treaty and its prohibitions, as well as the normative functions it has beyond that, will create a situation of perpetual pressure for these states to explain why they will not accept the illegality of weapons of mass destruction that threaten the gravest humanitarian consequences.

### **Providing legal clarity**

Once adopted, the nuclear weapon ban treaty will form part of a growing body of international law regulating the means and methods of warfare. The treaty will fix the legal anomaly whereby nuclear weapons are the only weapons of mass destruction not yet subject to a prohibition, alongside other weapons deemed unacceptable from a humanitarian point of view. Biological weapons, chemical weapons, anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions are among those weapon systems that are already subject to categorical, explicit and comprehensive prohibitions under international law. The ban treaty will resolve the legal ambiguity that has hitherto surrounded the last weapon of mass destruction not completely prohibited. Rather than allowing nuclear weapons for some but not for others, the treaty will set a common standard that these weapons are unacceptable for all.

The nuclear weapon ban treaty will fill this legal gap while complementing other international instruments on nuclear weapons. The ban treaty will strengthen the disarmament and non-proliferation objectives of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, improve conditions for the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, and build on and facilitate efforts to universalize nuclear-weapon-free zones.

By including a provision requiring states to destroy nuclear weapon stockpiles, the ban treaty would provide a simple framework for the elimination of nuclear weapons. While it will not need to anticipate all the detailed steps that a state with nuclear weapons would need to go through, it would



Protesters at the US military facility Pine Gap in central Australia, which helps target nuclear weapons. Credit: Tim Wright

make the total elimination of nuclear weapons into a clear legal obligation, thus resolving once and for all disputes surrounding the meaning and implementation of the NPT's disarmament obligation under article VI.

### **Increased awareness and cooperation**

A treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons will contribute to increased awareness of the catastrophic humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons and the risks of a nuclear detonation. Numerous scientists and experts have repeatedly and for many years warned of the existential threat posed by nuclear weapons. Yet, the nuclear-armed states and some of their allies continue to disregard and suppress this evidence when formulating policy on nuclear weapons.

The treaty and its meetings of parties will bring nuclear weapons as a humanitarian issue back to the centre of public discourse, forcing the nuclear-armed states and their allies to face the facts about nuclear weapons. It will place the issue on the same footing as other global issues with grave humanitarian consequences, such as climate change, poverty and involuntary migration. This will in turn facilitate increased engagement from key constituencies, including the media, national parliaments, international humanitarian organizations and civil society on this issue.

The treaty will also facilitate a strong community of states that reject nuclear weapons and that are working towards their complete elimination. This community would be able to engage substantively and constructively with those states with nuclear weapons towards the goal of guaranteeing

their elimination. In the same way, the treaty would facilitate greater and more effective mobilization by civil society, including in the nuclear-armed states. Such partnerships, between states, international organizations like the International Committee of the Red Cross, UN agencies and civil society, have the capacity to set the standards for which weapons are considered acceptable and unacceptable.

More concretely, a signing ceremony or ratification by a state party, the entry into force of the treaty and every meeting of treaty members will all be opportunities to highlight that nuclear weapons are unacceptable, to pressure outlier states to join and comply with the prohibition, and to expose behaviour that runs counter to the treaty's aims. In addition, ongoing acts by outlier states such as conducting nuclear exercises, modernization programmes or testing nuclear weapons or nuclear-capable missiles, could be targets for criticism of nuclear-armed and nuclear-alliance states by states and other relevant actors that are supporting a prohibition of nuclear weapons.

By prohibiting assistance in the commission of prohibited acts, the nuclear weapon ban treaty will, explicitly or implicitly: restrict investments in companies that produce or otherwise carry out commercial activities involving these weapons; limit the potential for nuclear-armed states that have not joined the treaty to fully participate in military cooperation arrangements; recognize the rights of victims of use and testing of nuclear weapons and facilitate support for victims and affected communities.

## ICAN's principles for the treaty

The humanitarian initiative on nuclear weapons has provided stark and irrefutable evidence that nuclear weapons cause death and displacement on a catastrophic scale, with profound and potentially irreversible damage to health and the environment, to socio-economic development, and to the social order. No state or international body could adequately address the immediate humanitarian emergency or long-term consequences caused by nuclear weapon detonations.

Nuclear testing in several parts of the world has left a legacy of serious and persisting health and environmental impacts that cannot be undone and have yet to be adequately addressed. Regular activities around the command and control of nuclear weapons, such as transport of warheads and materials, military exercises, maintenance and upgrades pose a continued risk of accidents, miscalculations or errors. The risks of nuclear weapon use are real and increasing.

In this context, ICAN believes that a treaty banning nuclear weapons is the best step that can now be taken to prevent their use and progress their elimination. The renewed attention to the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons since 2010 has reinvigorated global determination to prohibit and eliminate these weapons once and for all. In 2016, the UN General Assembly decided by overwhelming majority to negotiate a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons, with negotiations commencing in March 2017.

A legally binding international instrument that comprehensively and explicitly prohibits nuclear weapons based on their unacceptable consequences would put nuclear weapons on the same footing as the other weapons of mass destruction, which are subject to prohibition through specific treaties. This treaty has the transformative potential to codify the illegality of nuclear weapons, stigmatize their possession, and facilitate nuclear disarmament.

A treaty banning nuclear weapons would build on existing norms and reinforce existing legal instruments, notably obligations under article VI of the NPT. It would also strengthen the existing nuclear weapon regime and clearly codify the illegitimacy of possession. In line with other international legal instruments addressing unacceptable weapons, it should also reaffirm the rights of people who have been victimized by nuclear weapons.

A treaty banning nuclear weapons should establish a non-discriminatory international legal instrument that will prohibit its parties, their nationals and any other individual subject to its jurisdiction from engaging in activities such as development, production, testing, acquisition, stockpiling, transfer, deployment and use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. It should also prohibit its parties from assisting, financing, encouraging and inducing

prohibited acts. The treaty should provide an obligation for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and a framework to achieve it. It would not need to establish specific provisions for elimination, but states parties to the treaty could agree to relevant measures and timelines as part of the implementation process, through protocols or other appropriate legal instruments. Finally, the treaty should include positive obligations for states parties, such as ensuring the rights of victims and survivors of nuclear weapon activities, requiring actions to address damage to affected environments, and providing for international cooperation and assistance to meet the obligations of the instrument.

The process for banning nuclear weapons should be open to all states and inclusive of civil society and international organizations; be initiated, conducted, concluded and adopted by governments who share the objective of banning and eliminating nuclear weapons, even, if necessary, without the participation of the nuclear-armed states; and not rely on rules of consensus and thus be blockable by none.



A nuclear device fired from a tower at Enewetak Atoll in the Marshall Islands in 1951.

# Advocacy messages

## Ensuring the negotiations produce a strong treaty

---

**T**he first session of the United Nations conference to negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons will take place from 27 to 31 March in New York. The Costa Rican ambassador Elayne Whyte Gomez will chair the negotiations. During the first session, states will outline their views on what the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons should contain and how it will relate to humanitarian law and other instruments governing nuclear weapons and other kinds of indiscriminate weapons.

### The opening session

The negotiations for a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons are a genuine chance for the international community to make long-overdue progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons. The humanitarian initiative has led the international community to this point. ICAN believes that the opening session of the negotiations will be a unique opportunity for governments to highlight the historic nature of this process and to explain why this treaty is important and will have a significant impact, even if nuclear-armed states might not participate. Governments should highlight the following:

- The case for prohibiting nuclear weapons is clear: they are by nature inhumane and indiscriminate. The use of a nuclear weapon on a populated area would immediately kill tens if not hundreds of thousands of people, with many more injured. Negotiating a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons will codify the stigma against causing such inhumane consequences. Weapons that cause unacceptable harm to civilians cannot remain legal or be considered legitimate options for states in warfare.
- Past experience in the development of international norms strongly suggests a ban treaty would affect the behaviour even of states that do not join. Other prohibitions on weapons, such as the treaties outlawing biological and chemical weapons, landmines and cluster munitions, have been the necessary starting point for elimination. Prohibition precedes elimination.
- Once adopted, the nuclear weapon ban treaty will form

part of a growing body of international law regulating the means and methods of warfare. Rather than allowing nuclear weapons for some but not for others, the treaty will set a common standard that these weapons are unacceptable for all.

- A treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons would also be an extra non-proliferation measure, strengthening the commitment by non-nuclear-weapon states to remain without nuclear weapons forever. It could strengthen trust among governments that non-nuclear-weapon states will not break from established non-proliferation regimes.
- The prohibition treaty will contribute to increased awareness of the catastrophic humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons and the risks of a nuclear detonation.
- It will also create space for states, international organizations, civil society and individuals to carry out the political work necessary to spread the understanding that possessing nuclear weapons is unacceptable.

### Topic 1: Principles, objectives and preamble

The treaty should reflect the following points:

#### Humanitarian consequences:

- The impact of a nuclear weapon detonation, irrespective of the cause, would not be constrained by national borders and could have regional and even global consequences, causing destruction, death and displacement as well as profound and long-term damage to the environment, climate, human health and well-being, socio-economic development and social order, and could even threaten the survival of humankind.
- The use and testing of nuclear weapons have demonstrated their devastating immediate, mid-term, and long-term effects. Nuclear testing in several parts of the world has left a legacy of serious health and environmental consequences. As well as contaminating food and water resources in parts of the world, the impacts of nuclear testing continue to be measurable in the environment and harm human health to this day.

- Nuclear weapon explosions and nuclear testing have caused unacceptable harm to generations of people. The rights and needs of victims and survivors need to be adequately addressed.
- Radioactive contamination and other impacts of nuclear detonations disproportionately affect women and children;
- No state or international body could address in an adequate manner the immediate humanitarian emergency or long-term consequences caused by a nuclear weapon detonation in a populated area, nor provide adequate assistance to those affected. Such capacity does not exist and is not likely ever to be possible.

#### **Risk:**

- As long as nuclear weapons exist, there remains the possibility of a nuclear weapon explosion. The risks of accidental, mistaken, unauthorized or intentional use of nuclear weapons are evident due to the vulnerability of nuclear command and control networks to technical failure, human error and cyber-attacks, the maintaining of nuclear arsenals on high levels of alert, forward deployment, and the modernization of nuclear weapons and delivery systems.
- The risk of a nuclear weapon detonation appears to be increasing, not decreasing. Heightened tensions among nuclear-armed states in recent years mean that progress towards nuclear disarmament is all the more urgent.

#### **International law:**

- All rules of international humanitarian law need to apply fully to nuclear weapons, such as the rule prohibiting attacks directed at civilians or civilian objects, the rule prohibiting indiscriminate attacks, the rule of proportionality in attack, the rule on the protection of the natural environment, the obligation to take feasible precautions in attack, and the rule that no weapons, projectiles and materials and methods of warfare of a nature that cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering should be employed in armed conflicts.
- Efforts to maintain international peace, security and justice are the responsibility of all states, which have committed to refrain from the threat or use of force against any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

## **Topic 2: Core prohibitions**

During the debate on core prohibitions of the treaty, governments should reflect the following points:

- The treaty should prohibit its parties, their nationals, and any other individuals subject to its jurisdiction from engaging in activities such as development, production, testing, acquisition, stockpiling, transfer, deployment and use and threat of use of nuclear weapons.
- The treaty should also prohibit its parties, their nationals, and any other individuals subject to its jurisdiction from assisting, financing, encouraging and inducing any of the abovementioned prohibited acts.
- The treaty should provide an obligation for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and a framework to achieve it. The instrument will not need to establish detailed provisions for elimination, but states parties to the treaty could agree to relevant measures and timelines as part of the implementation process, through protocols or other appropriate legal instruments.
- The treaty should include positive obligations for states parties, such as ensuring the rights of victims and survivors of nuclear weapons activities, requiring actions to address damage to affected environments, and providing for international cooperation and assistance to meet the obligations of the instrument.

## **Topic 3: Institutional arrangements**

The institutional arrangements of a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons should follow the same spirit as the negotiations for such a treaty – they should be open to all interested states, international organizations and civil society and no state should single-handedly be able to block its establishment. During the debate on institutional arrangements, governments should therefore make the following points:

#### **Relationship with other treaties:**

- The treaty should reinforce other instruments prohibiting inhumane and indiscriminate weapons, such as the biological weapons convention, chemical weapons convention, the anti-personnel landmine treaty and the convention on cluster munitions.
- States should also ensure that the treaty is compatible with, builds upon and strengthens other key instruments regulating nuclear weapons, such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties. The ban treaty should be seen as an important part of the implementation of the NPT's article VI obligation to pursue multilateral nuclear disarmament in good faith.

- This treaty is an important contribution towards nuclear disarmament; therefore, additional measures, both practical and legally binding, for the irreversible, verifiable and transparent destruction of nuclear weapons will also be needed in order to achieve and maintain a world without nuclear weapons.

#### **Entry into force:**

- The treaty should include a simple entry-into-force provision stipulating that it will become binding international law once a certain number of states have ratified it. Entry into force must not be contingent upon the ratification of any particular state or group of states.

#### **Reservations:**

- Consistent with most other weapon-related international agreements (such as prohibitions on biological and chemical weapons, landmines and cluster munitions, as well as the nuclear-weapons-free zone treaties), states should not be allowed to make reservations to any of the articles of this treaty.

#### **Implementation:**

- The treaty should provide for international cooperation and assistance to meet the obligations of the instrument.
- The contribution of international organizations and civil society has been instrumental in achieving a process to prohibit nuclear weapons and should be considered instrumental also in the application and implementation of the treaty, and in raising the awareness about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons as well as their implications for international humanitarian law.
- The treaty should include a commitment by states parties to encourage all states not parties to join to treaty with the ultimate goal of universalization.

#### **Meetings of states parties and review process:**

- The treaty should provide for regular meetings of states parties and review conferences in order to consider and take decisions with regard to the application or implementation of the treaty, such as concerning the operation and status of the treaty, matters arising from reports submitted to the treaty, international cooperation and assistance regarding the treaty, stockpile destruction and related verification measures, and other issues.
- States not parties to the treaty, as well as the UN, other relevant international organizations or institutions, and non-governmental organizations should be allowed to participate in these meetings as observers.

#### **Parliamentary outreach**

More than 850 elected representatives from 42 nations have signed ICAN's global parliamentary appeal for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons. In May 2016, we submitted this document to the Thai ambassador Thani Thongphakdi in his capacity as chair of the UN open-ended working group on nuclear disarmament. The appeal reads:

We, the undersigned parliamentarians, conscious of our duty to protect and promote the safety and well-being of the people we represent, express our deep concern at the continuing threat posed by many thousands of nuclear weapons across the globe. Any use of these ultimate weapons of mass destruction – whether by accident, miscalculation or design – would have catastrophic consequences for humanity and the planet as a whole. The only way to guarantee that they will never be used again is to outlaw and eliminate them without further delay. We call upon all national governments to negotiate a treaty banning nuclear weapons and leading to their complete eradication. A global ban on nuclear weapons is a humanitarian imperative of the highest order. It is necessary, feasible and increasingly urgent.

Working with elected representatives is an important way to ensure that nuclear disarmament is high up the political agenda. Even in countries where the governing party or coalition opposes a ban on nuclear weapons, there will likely be some parliamentarians and parties willing to support it.

In the lead-up to the UN conference to negotiate a treaty banning nuclear weapons, many parliamentarians around the world have posed questions to their foreign minister or submitted motions in support of the negotiations. This, in turn, has sparked public debate and made it more difficult for governments to continue supporting nuclear weapons.

Our campaigners have met with many parliamentarians from different political parties to explain why we need a treaty banning nuclear weapons and how they can work with ICAN to ensure that it is a strong and effective agreement.

# Communications

## Conveying our message to the wider public

---

**T**he negotiations for a prohibition on nuclear weapons will be an extraordinary moment for our campaign. The process to develop such a treaty has two goals: produce a strong text for adoption and inform people outside the negotiations that nuclear weapons are unacceptable and are being banned. Our communications strategy needs to focus both on influencing governments participating in the negotiations and those not in the room. The negotiations will be one of the best opportunities civil society has to raise awareness about the humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons and the work to ban them, so our communications work needs to reach outside the walls of the UN.

### Key messages

ICAN will work to achieve a robust treaty, with the constructive participation in the negotiations from as many governments as possible. In order to achieve this, we need to push the following points:

- The evidence is clear: the humanitarian impacts conferences show that nuclear weapons are inhumane, indiscriminate and unacceptable, and must be prohibited under international law.
- The treaty needs to include a clear prohibition on the use and possession of nuclear weapons, and provide an obligation to eliminate them.
- This treaty will be a historic breakthrough in the efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, and can be a counter-measure to escalating tensions and increasing focus on nuclear weapons by the nuclear-armed states.
- Past experience in the development of international norms strongly suggests a ban treaty would affect the behaviour even of states that do not join. Other treaties prohibiting categories of weapons show that prohibition precedes elimination – not the other way around.
- All states serious about humanitarian law and preventing the use of nuclear weapons should engage in the negotiation of a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons, and support multilateralism and UN negotiations.

### Media

Media will play an important role in how the treaty is being seen and will increase the pressure on those states that are not participating in the negotiations. It is therefore crucial for ICAN campaigners to reach out to media to get them to cover the negotiations. The opening of the negotiations and their conclusion should definitely be newsworthy events for media around the world. It is essential that we prepare journalists so that they can report accurately and in depth on these events, and help them understand the treaty and its potential impact.

### Checklist for media work:

- Identify a number of journalists that write about security, defence, nuclear weapons, humanitarian issues or other relevant topics in your country.
- Prepare background materials about the process so far, key arguments, visual material, statistics and other useful documents.
- Inform the journalists about the negotiations. Call them and follow up with personal emails (press releases rarely generate media coverage; it's the personal contact that works best) throughout the negotiations with short summaries of what's going on and why they should write about it.
- Identify key moments that could generate media interest for your national context and send pitches to journalists about these events in advance.

### How to pitch:

- Newspaper editors and reporters are usually looking for story ideas where you can provide information on the “who”, “what”, “when”, “where”, “why” and “how” of the story. Who is the story about and who does it affect? What is happening and why it is newsworthy? When is the story occurring? Did it happen already or will it happen in the future? Where is the story taking place? Is it national? Why does the story matter? Why should readers care? How does this story affect the community?

- It's often said that the best pitches aren't written at all, they are spoken. Try to sell your story to them in person – either on the phone or face to face if possible. It will most of the time get much better results than an email, even if the email is personalized.
- Cold-calling a newsroom to speak to a journalist you don't know can be an intimidating experience, that is for sure! But be confident and don't forget you are offering them something. In any case, even if they aren't interested in the story, they will remember you more clearly if you have called.

## Social media

Having a strong digital presence for the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons and ICAN means increased legitimacy and provides an unparalleled forum for increasing awareness without actually having to leave our desks. Throughout the negotiations, we want to use social media to highlight the humanitarian consequences and the unacceptability of nuclear weapons, engage people in the negotiations to prohibit them, and showcase the work that the campaign does around the world and the diversity of partner organizations and campaigners. There are a bunch of different social media platforms today, and you and your organization should choose the platforms that work best for you.

### Twitter:

- Twitter is good for quick discussions and reports on what is going on during the negotiations. Use hashtags and mentions: we want our tweets to reach the largest number of people possible. Adding hashtags (**#nuclearban** or other relevant hashtags) and mentioning handles (for example, **@nuclearban**) will ensure that messages don't get lost in the Twitterverse. Tag governments, diplomats, UN missions and other relevant stakeholders and people to ensure that the tweets get noticed.
- Be liberal with retweets and favourites: This won't cost you anything, but make the original publishers feel very engaged and more likely to follow you back and engage with your tweets. But don't just fill your entire feed with retweets: make sure you break it up with some original content from yourself too.
- Add images: Tweets with an image gets a lot more engagement than just text-based tweets. Search through our **Flickr** account ([www.flickr.com/photos/30835738@N03/](http://www.flickr.com/photos/30835738@N03/)) for high-quality photos of our work, free for use.

### Facebook:

- Facebook ([www.facebook.com/icanw.org](http://www.facebook.com/icanw.org)) is great for engaging followers, for encouraging them to share information and take action. The current algorithms prioritize visual content, so add images, video and livestreams to reach as many people as possible.
- Keep it short. Messages should not be more than four lines long. If it's more than four lines total, save it for a website article.
- Calls to action: Facebook is great for asking people to act. As them to click on a link, to sign up for a newsletter, or share the post to increase that post's reach.
- Explore what content works best: Mix in posts that highlight photos, blogs, videos, text, and news to see what captures your audience's attention. Post more of what they like and less of items that receive less engagement.

### Instagram and instagram stories:

- Instagram ([instagram.com/goodbyenukes](http://instagram.com/goodbyenukes)) is great for sharing images and short films, and usually accounts that post regularly receive a high engagement rate on posts.
- Hashtags and location: These are good for finding posts and images from people that have similar interests, and searching for location can be really great for big events. For example, we searched for the location of the big anti-Trident demonstration in London last year and started liking and following a lot of accounts that posted images from the demonstration. It was a great way to get noticed by people already outraged by nuclear weapons.
- Show behind the scenes material via Instagram stories: Instagram stories is a Snapchat-like function of Instagram that allows you to post images and filmclips that will be available to your followers for 24 hours only and will then disappear. It is perfect for a bit more laid-back material, to show what goes on behind the scenes in campaigning. This can be a fun way to showcase the campaigning and the people behind the work.

# Practical information

## When, where and how

---

### Timetable for negotiations

**Where:** Conference Room 4, UN Headquarters

#### Monday 27 March

*Morning session: 10:00am – 1:00pm*

- Opening of the conference
- Election of the president
- Adoption of the rules of procedure
- Adoption of the agenda
- Organization of the work
- Election of other officers
- Appointment of credentials committee
- General exchange of views

*Lunch: 1:00pm – 3:00pm*

*Afternoon session: 3:00pm – 6:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 1: Principles and objectives, preambular elements

#### Tuesday 28 March

*Morning session: 10:00am – 1:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 1: Principles and objectives, preambular elements

*Lunch: 1:00pm – 3:00pm*

*Afternoon session: 3:00pm – 6:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 1: Principles and objectives, preambular elements

#### Wednesday 29 March

*Morning session: 10:00am – 1:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 2: Core prohibitions, effective legal measures, legal provisions and norms

*Lunch: 1:00pm – 3:00pm*

*Afternoon session: 3:00pm – 6:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 2: Core prohibitions, effective legal measures, legal provisions and norms

#### Thursday 30 March

*Morning session: 10:00am – 1:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 2: Core prohibitions, effective legal measures, legal provisions and norms

*Lunch: 1:00pm – 3:00pm*

*Afternoon session: 3:00pm – 6:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 2: Core prohibitions, effective legal measures, legal provisions and norms

#### Friday 31 March

*Morning session: 10:00am – 1:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 3: Institutional arrangements

*Lunch: 1:00pm – 3:00pm*

*Afternoon session: 3:00pm – 6:00pm*

- General exchange of views
- Topic 3: Institutional arrangements
- Credentials of representatives of the conference: Report of the credentials committee
- Organization of the work at the second session

*Note: The conference will follow a rolling agenda, so that when one session is complete, the president will immediately continue to the next session. All times are therefore indicative.*

## Timetable for side events

**Where:** Conference Room B  
(unless indicated otherwise)

### Monday 27 March

8:30am – 9:50am

ICAN campaigner meeting

1:15pm – 2:30pm

Banning the financing of nuclear  
weapon producers

PAX and Future of Life Institute

3:00pm – 6:00pm

TBC

IALANA

### Tuesday 28 March

8:30am – 9:50am

ICAN campaigner meeting

11:00am – 1:00pm

The perspective of the Holy See

Where: Conference Room 12

1:15pm – 2:30pm

A Pacific islands priority

IPPNW

7:00pm – 9:00pm

Public youth event on the ban

Where: New York University

### Wednesday 29 March

8:30am – 9:50am

ICAN campaigner meeting

1:15pm – 2:30pm

The humanitarian initiative

Hibakusha Stories

### Thursday 30 March

8:30am – 9:50am

ICAN campaigner meeting

1:15pm – 2:30pm

What content for an efficient ban treaty

International Peace Bureau

### Friday 31 March

8:30am – 9:50am

ICAN campaigner meeting

1:15pm – 2:30pm

Looking towards a draft treaty

ICAN



## Coordinating our advocacy

Campaigners are expected to play an active role reaching out to governments throughout the conference. We encourage you to use the advocacy messages in this handbook as a basis for discussion. Find out what the representatives' reflections on the conference are, and what your government's position is on a nuclear weapon ban. If you are meeting with representatives from a government other than your own, be sure to check in with ICAN campaigners present from that country first so that you can coordinate your efforts. To ensure that you are well prepared, take part in ICAN coordination meetings each morning and afternoon.

Report back on your advocacy work to the ICAN team. Information sharing is key! Please tell us who you met with (the country and and delegate's name and position), the key points discussed, and any follow-up actions needed.

We encourage you to promote ICAN's work and messages online with Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and website articles. Discuss the ban treaty negotiations and ICAN's messages through your organization's online media. Write a blog, an article or a newsletter piece about the conference. Throughout the meeting, post regular updates on Twitter using **#nuclearban** and be sure to follow **@nuclearban**. Post pictures and updates on Facebook!

## Tips for effective meetings

- Be prepared. Know who you are meeting and what their role is. Find out about the government's previous statements on a ban treaty before you meet.
- Think about what you want to find out from the government representative, and prepare what you want to say and ask. You can use the advocacy messages in this guide as a basis for discussion. Make sure you've read the relevant lobby brief or position paper in advance and be clear on the points you want to get across.
- Ask other civil society representatives from your country/region, or experts that you would benefit from having at your meeting, to join you.
- Bring ICAN's briefing papers that you want to give to your government delegate.
- Remember to follow up afterwards on any action points and to stay in touch. Try to have clear action points at the end of the meeting. This might be sending the delegate some information you have promised electronically.

*Good luck!*





The First Committee of the UN General Assembly in 2016. Credit: Frode Ersfjord



In loving memory of Dr Bob Mtonga – a tireless campaigner for peace and disarmament, whose wit, energy, passion and wisdom will be much missed at the nuclear ban treaty negotiations.