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Thumbs up on a busy schedule

Taking stock of the events that disseminate knowledge, keep us connected and support our work

Dr. Alistair Edgar, ACUNS

Sometimes I find myself writing these notes in different, interesting places. This time, I am in Istanbul as I have been visiting and working with my colleagues, Rector Mustafa Aydin and Associate Professor Mitat Celikpala at Kadir Has University in preparing for the ACUNS 2014 Annual Meeting. It will be a great meeting, and of course Istanbul is a fascinating city in so many ways. The Call for Papers has been posted, so please submit your proposals soon – and be sure to look on the AM14 section of our web site at the details of the ISA/IPSA/APSA/ECPR partners’ Human Rights Conference that is being held directly preceding ours, as you may be interested in attending both and perhaps to present papers at both events, as well.

We have had a very busy few weeks and months since the last Newsletter. In Paris, ACUNS member Annett Richter presented our members’ collected expertise to the 37th session of the General Conference of UNESCO – you will have seen our email to all members asking for your input to this presentation, and indeed we received many excellent responses. Annett’s presentation was very well received, and has elicited immediate interest from (for example) the Turkish National Commission to UNESCO. We will continue to build on these new links to UNESCO, and look forward to helping the organization and its member states while also opening up new opportunities for ACUNS members.

Elsewhere, ACUNS member and US Paralympic Athlete Kristin Duquette was registered to, and represented ACUNS at, the UN High Level Meeting on Disability and Development. Kristin was one of only four attendees who were selected to ask a question in person to former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan. You can find two of Kristin’s articles (“The Way Forward” and “Leave No One Behind”) now archived on the ACUNS web site (use the search function!) and also follow her writing at The Huffington Post.

What else? In the November E-Update you will find two more of our podcasts, including an interview held in New York City with SOS Children’s Villages; and an interview held in a hotel lobby (hence, not as good sound quality) with Nobel Laureate Jody Williams, the latter discussing her work with the Nobel Women’s Initiative as well as reflecting on the current state of the Landmines Ban treaty. The ACUNS New York Seminar series has continued, with our co-hosting partner TECO-NY; the most recent seminar featured Professor Tapio Kanninen from the Ralph Bunche Institute (and former Chief of the Policy Planning Unit at UN DPA) and Kate Offerdahl of the International Institute for Sustainable Development, discussing post-2015 development planning. Our next seminar on 26 November brings us Professor Michael Gerrard, Director of the Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia University. These seminars feature highly relevant topics being addressed by leading expert scholars and practitioners, and regularly have several Permanent Representatives speaking: I hope that they capture the attention of more ACUNS members in the New York area to attend them.

The ACUNS Secretariat recently initiated an outreach to all of the Permanent Missions in New York, sending each a copy of our Newsletter and a personal letter from your executive director; thus far, we have made appointments with almost a dozen of the Missions to have follow up visits and to tell them more about our work. We also have engaged closely with the Global Compact office in New York, and recently with the GC Networks in Turkey and in Canada.

Last but certainly not least, all ACUNS members will have received a printed copy of the High Level Panel Report on the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The support provided to us from the High Level Panel Secretariat to be able to offer the report to our members was a highlight for me so far this year. We are happy now, with our current mailing, to be able to send all members a copy of The Hague Approach, recently released by The Hague Institute for Global Justice; another one of the benefits of ACUNS membership, and a trend that I look forward to being able to continue whenever such opportunities can be identified.
THE HAGUE APPROACH

six principles for achieving sustainable peace

On 28 August, 2013

THE PEACE PALACE OPENED ITS DOORS IN THE HAGUE FOR THE FIRST TIME. In the intervening century, the city – home to the only principal organ of the UN outside New York, the International Court of Justice - has established itself as a global capital for issues of peace and justice, and is now home to a constellation of courts, tribunals and international organizations, which share the mission of fostering international peace. The institutions based in The Hague are both a symbol of a rule-based international order and a practical means of advancing international law. Though imperfect, such institutions have contributed to a marked reduction in conflict as a means of settling disputes.
What is needed in place of ‘actor overload’ is a dynamic network... the goal should be less a ‘coalition of the willing’ and more a ‘coalition of the relevant’.

As the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, observed, the centenary celebrations of the Peace Palace offered an opportunity to take stock of such achievements, but also to confront current challenges to international peace and security. For this reason, and in recognition of this important anniversary, The Hague Institute for Global Justice launched The Hague Approach, which comprises two empirical studies of rule of law in post-conflict societies (one focusing on post-Gaddafi Libya and a comparative study of Iraq and Afghanistan) as well as a series of guidelines which draw on this research. I am delighted to be able to share this report, The Hague Approach: Six Principles for Achieving Sustainable Peace in Post-Conflict Situations, with colleagues as a supplement to this ACUNS Newsletter. These principles are intended as practical guidance in support of the work of peacebuilders in conflict-affected settings. They identify key trends and provide tools for achieving sustainable peace in countries buffeted by war.

The Hague Approach is founded on an understanding that, notwithstanding progress at the normative level, significant challenges to a more peaceful and just world remain. New and renewed conflicts continue to devastate societies, leading to human suffering, economic collapse and political instability. Even when a formal agreement has been reached between warring parties, lasting peace often remains elusive. Communal violence can rage for decades after a peace process has been implemented. Vital institutions remain weak and the rule of law is either non-existent or inaccessible for large swathes of the population. A failed peace can be disastrous: one of the main indicators of future conflict in a country is its incidence of past conflict. When countries relapse into widespread violence, the disillusion that spreads can corrode any hope of a lasting peace, dooming fragile states to cycles of instability.

Confronting these contemporary challenges, policy-makers have increasingly turned their attention to the vital period immediately following conflict. In this phase, international and local actors must work quickly and effectively to consolidate peace, counter the efforts of those who would renew hostilities and set post-conflict societies on a virtuous course. The challenge facing peacebuilders is not an easy one. Many goals must be pursued simultaneously: basic security must be established, armed groups must be demobilized and disarmed and equal access to justice must be established or rebuilt, a particularly complex endeavor given the need to reconcile formal and informal justice systems.

Too often, international actors have taken on these tasks ineffectively, coordinating poorly with each other with each organization pursuing its own agenda. What is needed in place of ‘actor overload’ is a dynamic network; peacebuilding actors – international, national and local – must work flexibly, basing their activities and communications on the needs expressed by the local population. While the concerns of key interested players – especially those with incentives to renew violence – must be considered as part of this process, the goal should be less a ‘coalition of the willing’ and more a ‘coalition of the relevant’. Traditional actors like western donors and the UN have crucial roles to play alongside local leadership, but peacebuilding activities should also leverage the key role of the private sector – both international and local – the positive potential role of which is rarely recognized.

Achieving sustainable peace in countries which have experienced conflict for decades is often seen as an insurmountable challenge. By understanding local contexts and applying knowledge of local political dynamics to prevent a return to violence, international actors can improve the effectiveness of their efforts. The emerging ‘demand-driven’ approach which is championed above all by the New Deal for Fragile States is an important step forward in this regard and can be further enhanced by proactive efforts to understand the needs and priorities of local communities and host states, including by harnessing the potential of new technologies.

There is, of course, no archetype for peacebuilders to follow in post-conflict situations which can substitute for an intimate understanding of local politics, society and culture. No blueprint can be derived from one context and be easily transposed to another. But while practitioners – especially international ones – ought to be wary of a single ‘peacebuilding formula’, they should also be careful not to operate in a vacuum. In taking care to tailor their activities to the context, peacebuilders should be open to the lessons provided by previous initiatives. In this sense, there should be increasing recognition of a ‘Responsibility to Learn’ encompassing an increased reliance on local expertise and more effective institutional learning to inform future programming.

Continued on page 9 >
A MIDDLE EAST FREE OF NUCLEAR AND OTHER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION: NEXT STEPS

I - Introduction
The recent events in the Middle East, particularly in Syria, should inspire policy makers to accelerate worldwide efforts for disarmament including a serious push to move forward with the nuclear-free zone in the region.

It is important not to underestimate the level of frustration that has built up around the subject of a zone, free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD), in the Middle East. It is integral to confidence building and stability in the region. It also is critical for the success of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) Review Cycle. The establishment of other regional zones, free of nuclear weapons (NWFZs), such as the Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Bangkok treaties2 provide experience upon which the conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone can draw.

II - NPT Regime and Other International Treaties
It is important to address the centrality of the NPT regime when negotiating a treaty-based Middle East zone. Negotiators should consider IAEA safeguards, as well as verification and inspection mechanisms. These tools must be implemented in a manner that complies with Article IV of the NPT, and avoids hampering the economic or technological development of the Parties or international cooperation on peaceful nuclear activities.

The NPT is central to non-proliferation policy in the Middle East. Its principal sponsors, however, appear willing to let it die. It is unsustainable to expect NPT members to exercise indefinite restraint and take on ever-increasing burdens to prove peaceful use when regional neighbors not party to the NPT brandish nuclear weapons with impunity and continue to benefit from civil nuclear cooperation. The status quo undermines the credibility of the NPT regime and the legitimacy of actions intended to enforce its provisions3.

The role of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in any future zone is also important. The commitment by States not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion, and to prohibit and prevent any such nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction, is one of the critical building blocks of any future zone. Those vested in the establishment of a Middle East zone should give a greater degree of attention to the CTBT, in addition to other international treaties such as the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and Biological Weapons Convention (BWC).

III - The Current Situation
The 1995 Middle East resolution called for the establishment of a nuclear and other WMD-free zone (WMDFZ) in the region and was integral to the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995. For many member states, the resolution constitutes the fourth pillar of the regime. Unfortunately, in the eighteen years since the resolution member states have failed to take practical steps beyond appointing a facilitator to implement the resolution, albeit with a limited mandate4.

The “Arab Spring” undoubtedly changed fundamental dynamics in the Middle East, with significant implications for the political and security settings of the region. Public opinion increasingly plays a more prominent role in Arab societies and, in this respect, will have a fundamental role in the formulation of disarmament and security policies. Given the democratic changes, parliaments—particularly through their committees on foreign affairs, Arab affairs and national security—are expected to play a more prominent role in foreign policy issues. Presumably, nuclear issues will receive considerable attention. As recently witnessed, the flow of masses in the streets is a sign of their desire for deeper engagement in the policymaking and security concerns in the Middle East.

IV - Successful Relevant Experiences
Despite the contextual differences between these zones and the Middle East4, the Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Bangkok treaties nevertheless provide guidance for formulating the technical, institutional and scientific dimensions of a weapon-free zone5.

A - The Pelindaba Treaty
The Pelindaba Treaty6, for example, contains the following provisions:

• The Treaty prohibits the research, development, manufacture, stockpiling, acquisition, testing, possession, control or stationing of nuclear explosive devices in the territory of parties to the Treaty and the dumping of radioactive wastes in the African zone by Treaty parties;

• The Treaty also prohibits any attacks against nuclear installations in the zone by Treaty parties and requires them to maintain the highest standards of physical protection of nuclear material, facilities and equipment, which are to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes;

• To allow for the verification of its nuclear non-proliferation undertaking, the Treaty requires parties to conclude comprehensive safeguards agreements with the IAEA equivalent to the agreements required in connection with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT);

Continued on page 6
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- The Treaty provides for verification and compliance mechanisms, including the African Commission on Nuclear Energy (AFCONE), which serves as a compliance mechanism and encourages regional and sub-regional programs for cooperation on the peaceful uses of nuclear science and technology;
- The establishment of AFCONE encourages African states to take responsibility for natural resources and, in particular, nuclear material, and protects against the dumping of toxic waste.

B - The Argentine-Brazil Institutional Experience

The Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Weapons (ABACC) is a regional organization that also has relevance to the establishment of a Middle East zone. The relationship attained by Brazil and Argentina through ABACC, in addition to the signature in July 1991 of the Agreement for the Exclusively Peaceful Use of Nuclear Energy, is significant. While recognizing the sovereign right of each nation to access nuclear technology for scientific, technological, economic and social development, both Brazil and Argentina created a Common System for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials (SCCC). Moreover, the Agreement implied a clear and definite compromise for the use of all peaceful-use materials and nuclear facilities submitted to Brazil and Argentina’s jurisdiction and control.

C – The South African Experience

South Africa’s dismantlement of its nuclear program also remains an unprecedented example of dismantlement. It took South Africa five years to build the country’s first nuclear device and a total of sixteen years to construct its six-weapon arsenal. South Africa terminated and fully dismantled its program and all related facilities it less than twenty-four months, wherein it:
- Dismantled the six completed gun-type devices at Armaments Corporation of South Africa Ltd. (ARMSCOR) under controlled and secure conditions;
- Melted and recast the highly-enriched uranium (HEU) from the six devices, including a partially complete seventh device, and returned it to the Atomic Energy Corporation (AEC) for safe-keeping;
- Fully decontaminated ARMSCOR facilities and returned severely contaminated equipment to the AEC, including a melting furnace;
- Converted the ARMSCOR facilities to conventional weapon and non-weapon commercial activities and destroyed all hardware components of the devices, technical design and manufacturing information;
- Joined the NPT, signed the Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement with the IAEA, and submitted a full and complete national initial inventory of nuclear material and facilities as required by the Safeguards Agreement;
- Welcomed the first IAEA team in South Africa in November 1991.

V - NEXT STEPS

The South African example sets a precedent for dismantlement in the international community. Moreover, the technical and nuclear rollback dimensions of the South African case are particularly useful for potential disarmament strategies in the Middle East, including in Israel.

Continued on page 10 -

Is There Life after Facebook? Geopolitics of Technology and other Foreign Policy Essays

Anis H. Bajrektarevic

In this monograph of essays, the author has skillfully blended history, evolutionary biology, geopolitics, international law and foreign policies, technology, philosophy, quantum mechanics, informatics, astrophysics and cognitive science, and analyzes all together with a complex uptake and digestion of the contemporary issues within the world today. Anis Bajrektarevic is one of the few that can undertake this complex analysis successfully and this is the hallmark of his fabulously novel perspectives that he is able to put into any subject. If the “world is flat” today, it is mostly in the field of ideas, with the single (over-)dominant narrative. However, Anis Bajrektarevic’s writings are more than just a counter-narrative. This monograph is a tribute to transdisciplinary thinking, the future of intellectual thought in geopolitical discipline of which Bajrektarevic is in the vanguard. His approach to geopolitics and style is one that will be emulated by many others in the future, if we only wish to reverse the ruling trend of compartmentalizing and alienating the science. The very title of the book is a provocative challenge to the reader to think about what is happening, questioning our accepted norms before the cover is opened.

Disarmament Diplomacy and Human Security: Regimes, Norms, and Moral Progress in International Relations

Denise Garcia

There has been substantial change and progress in international relations in the last decade. Change has occurred in the least likely realm: the one closest to the national security of states where they manage their arms. Within this sphere, an indicator is disarmament diplomacy, which has seen tremendous transformation.

Far-reaching negotiations have led to sweeping innovations in the making of international treaties and agreements that have an impact on saving lives and improving human security. Ground-breaking vision have either led to the creation of treaties and agreements on arms restraints and prohibitions of use, or initiated novel processes of regime building in order to establish new prohibitions or multilaterally-agreed restraint and transparency on how states manage their arms.

This book examines the evolution of international treaties, regimes, and emerging norms on issues that are closely associated with the security of states. It aims to determine moral and normative progress in international relations by investigating three cases: the Arms Trade Treaty; the ban on cluster munitions; and, the international regime on small arms and light weapons and the attempts to curb the resulting armed violence.

The book argues that these new treaties and initiatives are moral security regimes propelled by the compelling force of previously existing International Law normative frameworks, namely Human Rights Law and International Humanitarian Law.

In this study, Garcia anticipated the Arms Trade Treaty (at the time of writing, it did not exist) and examined the process in depth, mainly its origins and International Law aspects. The Treaty is now in place and was just opened for signature at the UN in NY in June 2013. The Treaty is indeed an important landmark for international relations and international law.

The book is an account of the first comprehensive legally binding treaty on all conventional arms, and other novel security related international treaties.

French Justice towards Independence: Political pressures, International Constraints and Reforms

Yves Beigbeder

This French-language book by Yves Beigbeder was published by the Paris publisher French Justice L’Harmattan in early September 2013. It describes and supports the evolution of French justice towards independence, as backed by international conventions, Charters and principles of the United Nations and the Council of Europe. The book recalls the complexity of French judiciary institutions, and their “entourage critique” (their critical surrounding), – judiciary and lawyers trade unions, NGOs and medias, and summarizes a few political/judiciary “affaires”. France’s respect for its obligations under international or European human rights pacts and conventions it ratified, is assessed in often critical reports of committees created by these instruments and in judgments of the European Court of Human Rights. Finally, the book refers to French constitutional and legislative reforms of 2010, and proposes new institutional reforms intended to reinforce the independence of French Justice.
The United States of America has signed the Arms Trade Treaty.

The story of the Treaty started more than 20 years ago, when a group of Nobel Peace laureates led by Oscar Arias, the former president of Costa Rica, called for: “An Arms Trade Treaty [which] would make legal ties out of the moral ties by which we already know we must abide”. After a complex negotiation involving security, trade, Human Rights Law (HRL), International Humanitarian Law (IHL), and general principles of international relations, on April 2, 2013, 155 states, including the United States, voted to adopt the first-ever comprehensive, legally binding international treaty governing the transfer of conventional arms. At the time of writing this article, eight countries already have ratified the Treaty and 114 have signed it, including some of the largest arms producers and some of the rising arms producers and importers, and now, the United States.
Despite the densely regulated global trade in all sorts of goods, until 2013, there were no agreed international rules governing the import and export of arms. This means that countries were free to buy and sell anything from Kalashnikovs, machine guns, mortars, shoulder-fired surface-to-air missiles, and other small arms and light weapons (SALW) to larger conventional arms such as: tanks and aircraft, with no commonly agreed upon norms of conduct governing those purchases. There were far more regulations governing trade in fruits and vegetables, than in weapons. The absence of norms on arms made for decades of unregulated arms transfers from non-state arms dealers, known as arms brokers, and free reign by states to transfer arms to infamous human rights abusers ranging from tyrants to terrorists. The Arms Trade Treaty is a well-received first step.

Without the Treaty, violations of Human Rights Law (HRL), the branch of International Law protecting the right to life and to be free from torture, soared along with abuses of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) which limits state conduct during conflict setting humane principles of distinction, protection, and the choice of non-indiscriminate weapons. State responsibility, however, could not be invoked for accountability or transparency on arms transfers that would aid and abet atrocities, terrorism, political repression, and organized crime. The Treaty is a step in the right direction; though considerable challenges lie ahead.

Fifty ratifications are needed for entry into force and given the momentum, this is likely to occur swiftly. The challenge will be for the ratifications of the United States, Russia, and China to become a reality. It is unlikely that the first two will ratify the Treaty within their current domestic political and lobbying realities. China, as the newest member of the group of the world’s largest weapons exporters, has an interest to establish itself as playing by the rules. This is especially the case if it wants to straddle between the civilian and military dual use domains where a more legitimate trade and business profile are desirable. An analogy here is the Kimberly Process that made the diamond trade a legitimate and principled business. The Americans already have a strong arms export control policy, while the Chinese and Russians do not. The Treaty ratification gives them a reason and a chance to look good, and to increase their reputations as global players.

The Treaty’s practical goal according to its Article 1 is to establish the highest possible common international standards for regulating or improving the regulation of the international trade in conventional arms; as well as to prevent and eradicate the illicit trade in conventional arms and prevent their diversion. States then will have a choice of belonging to the rules-bound club but even for these, it will be hard to account for preventing arms to be diverted to the illicit trade. This difficulty may even discourage some states from ratification.

The Treaty represents the first global multilateral framework to address arms transfers. It is therefore the only legally binding effort of a global nature that is comprehensive in scope. Other efforts exist, but are not politically binding, not of a global reach, or not as far-reaching in scope.

In theory, the Treaty is a landmark text because it will address the problem of arms flows to destabilizing regions and help to prevent arms diversions. In the implementation phase, once into force, the efforts to prevent dangerous arms flows will represent a major challenge for states. The arms covered by the Treaty include: tanks, armored combat vehicles, large-caliber artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, missiles and missile launchers, and small arms and light weapons (SALW). The Treaty does not account for new weapons technologies, such as fully autonomous weapons systems, nor under development - therefore the Treaty is flawed in that account. Only after six years into force, will states have the chance to vote for amendments.

It is important to note that the Arms Trade Treaty does not limit or ban the production of any weapons. Conventional arms are legitimate for states to produce, possess and transfer. Therefore opponents to the Treaty in the United States should not be threatened by the US Administration’s decision to sign it – although they may choose to do so for their own domestic political reasons. Rather, the Treaty’s purpose is to set commonly agreed upon criteria for transfers, based on HRL and IHL. It is the first global agreement to interpret and apply the existing rules of IHL and HRL to arms transfers, with concrete criteria for assessments of transfers, with the explicit aim to reduce human suffering with a global scope. The interpretation of these branches of international law in the Treaty will prove an arduous task for those implementing it. A clear set of guidelines and best practices will have to be created if the Treaty is to be successful.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon stated that the Treaty represents a victory for all peoples. It is so because it will make more difficult the diversion of deadly weapons into illicit markets, and for those warlords, pirates, terrorists, and criminals seeking to acquiring them. The Secretary-General described it as a new powerful tool to prevent human rights abuses and breaches of IHL. The International Committee of the Red Cross has hailed the Treaty as a worthy response and marking historic progress towards stemming human suffering from the easy and abundant availability of weapons.

It is in the American interest to ratify the Treaty as soon as possible because it is a global mechanism for leveling the playing field regarding export controls. Manufacturers in several major arms producing countries are on board, seeing in the Treaty an instrument and a framework making theirs a more legitimate business. Moreover, the Treaty is unique because it sets standards on behavior specifically concerning arms transfers that could facilitate the commission of atrocities during war and ‘peace’. In the current reality of the American political system, marked by polarization and an allergy to ratifications of global treaties, the United States probably will miss the chance to set a good example. It is more likely that other larger and rising arms exporters will do so first. Without the ratification of the United States and Russia, the Treaty will give rise to a process of “drying the demand” for unscrupulous weapons suppliers as countries who ratify will desire to live in a responsible, HRL and IHL abiding arms business world. Russia, in particular, likely will have fewer clients because the group of unprincipled buyers will get smaller. It is

Continued on page 9 >
THE HAGUE APPROACH
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Emblematic of the Hague Approach is the argument that there has been insufficient attention given to access to justice in conflict-affected settings. Establishing the rule of law should be a principal goal of peacebuilders. But for the rule of law to take root not only requires effective institutions, codes and procedures but also a widely shared commitment to rule of law principles. The Peace Palace stands as an abiding monument to the faith of its founders that legal order can provide a means of resolving international disputes. In dealing with today’s conflicts, it is ever clearer that for peace to thrive, the rule of law must be established not just by international institutions, but from the ground up, providing communities with appropriate peaceful means through which to channel grievances. It is for this reason that the rule of law is not a narrowly legalistic aspiration, but one at the heart of a just and peaceful society.

NO MORE ARMS FOR ATROCITIES
Continued from page 8 >

also in the American and Russian interest to be (and to be seen to be) on the right side of the business within this new framework of international law.

The Treaty, the culmination of an extraordinary process and concerted efforts by states, individual leading activists and civil society organizations alike, represents a first major step toward ending the irresponsible arms trade as a prevailing norm of conduct and driver of violence around the world. The new global norms on arms set by the Arms Trade Treaty are a timely contribution and if well implemented will make a difference on human security. The group of more than a hundred countries, including the United States, which signed the Treaty, signals a clear desire: no more arms for atrocities! And it will encourage others to do the same.

It is our hope that these Principles will be a resource for policy-makers in considering the needs of post-conflict societies. Achieving sustainable peace is a complex endeavor requiring patience, ingenuity and vigilance. It requires a concerted, consistent effort by all involved. However, as the findings of our recent research demonstrate, when the lessons of experience are suitably applied, this worthy goal is within our grasp.

The Hague Approach is the result of a long-term research project, undertaken by The Hague Institute for Global Justice in collaboration with the Van Vollenhoven Institute for Law, Governance and Development of Leiden University. The project was commissioned by the City of The Hague. Further copies of The Principles are available from The Hague Institute and can be accessed on its website: TheHagueInstitute.org

* Dr. Abiodun Williams is the President of The Hague Institute for Global Justice and the Chair of ACUNS. Previously, he was the senior vice president of the Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention at the United States Institute of Peace. He also served as the associate dean of the Africa Center for Strategic Studies at the National Defense University. From 2001 to 2007, he served as director of strategic planning in the Office of the United Nations Secretary-General.
A MIDDLE EAST FREE OF NUCLEAR AND OTHER WEAPONS

Continued from page 6

In addition to South Africa, past successes in reversing the nuclear tide include Brazil and Argentina to roll back their nuclear programmes and to create a bilateral verification agency; and the decisions by Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine to transfer nuclear weapons to Russia following the breakup of the Soviet Union. The Middle East needs a similarly bold vision to rid the region of nuclear weapons and solidly put the region on a non-nuclear course.

It is also essential for Iran and the IAEA to intensify their dialogue on the urgent resolution and clarification of all outstanding substantive issues. Iran should comply fully with its obligations under relevant resolutions of the UN Security Council and meet the requirements of the IAEA Board of Governors. A diplomatic solution is the only solution to the Iranian file and the legitimate right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy consistent with the NPT should be respected.

Despite unique challenges, the Middle East will need to follow a similar pattern to other regions that have established nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba all involved negotiation of a treaty text, agreement on verification models with the IAEA and an institution-building process. And like all these zone regimes, a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free-zone should encourage the use of nuclear science and technology for peaceful purposes, and enable states to pursue bilateral, regional and international cooperation on nuclear energy to support their economic, medical and technological development.

In preparation for the Middle East conference, certain technical provisions of the NWFZ and WMD-free zone in the Middle East should be addressed, with particular attention given to dismantling and destroying existing or remaining nuclear weapons capabilities, facilities and devices under international verification mechanisms. Ultimately, all regional facilities producing weapons grade fissile materials in the region will have to be shut down and decommissioned or converted to civilian uses under standard international safeguards.

A substantive approach towards engaging all countries in the region of the Middle East is required in order to guarantee full participation in the conference on the subject of a Middle East zone. The conference on a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) provides a constructive framework for all the states of the region, including all members of the League of Arab States, Iran and Israel. Viewed strategically, this Conference could advance the broader cause of peace and security in the region. The process of establishing a WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East can become a new tool for security.

* Ambassador Dr. Sameh Aboul-Enein is the Deputy Assistant Foreign Minister of Egypt for Disarmament, International Security and Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. He is currently also Adjunct Professor for Disarmament, International Security and Diplomacy at the American University in Cairo, Visiting Professor for International Security and Diplomacy, Diplomatic Academy, University of East Anglia, Visiting Lecturer and Course instructor at the NATO Defense College in Rome and at the Defence Academy of the UK. This presentation is in the author’s personal and academic capacity.
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☐ I would like to receive the ACUNS newsletter electronically
☐ I would like to receive the ACUNS e-update and receive free monthly updates on the latest news, events and activities
☐ I would like to receive information on ACUNS events & activities in Vienna
☐ I would like to receive information on ACUNS events in New York

2 MEMBERSHIP TYPE

Institutional Memberships also are available at acuns.org

ACUNS memberships are based on the January to December calendar year. If you join mid-year, you will receive back issues of Global Governance and the ACUNS quarterly newsletter. If you have any questions regarding joining mid-year, please contact the Secretariat at admin@acuns.org.

Please note that membership fees are in U.S. Funds.

☐ $425 (Extended 5-year Term)  ☐ $155 (Sponsoring)*  ☐ $95 (Over $40,000 income)
☐ $70 (Up to $40,000 income)  ☐ $50 (Retired)  ☐ $50 (Student)

*In addition to your own, sponsor a new one-year membership for a person from a developing country.

3 PAYMENT OPTIONS

☐ VISA  ☐ MASTERCARD  ☐ Enclosed Check (drawn on a US or Canadian Bank)

Card No: _______ _______ _______ / _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______

Expiration Date: _______ / _______  Signature: ___________________________

> For more information, please email admin@acuns.org or call (1) 226.772.3121

Email us to find out how to become an institutional member at admin@acuns.org

RETURN PAYMENT TO:
ACUNS SECRETARIAT
Wilfrid Laurier University
75 University Avenue West
Waterloo, ON N2L 3C5
Canada
OR
Fax: (1) 226.772.3004

RENEW YOUR MEMBERSHIP
OR BECOME A MEMBER ONLINE AT ACUNS.ORG