

Pugwash Conference, Berlin, 2 July 2011

Thomas Schultz-Jagow, Oxfam

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is an honour to be here at the Pugwash Conference to speak to you on the need for an international treaty to control the global Arms Trade. Pugwash was one of the first international NGOs, and has a long and successful history as a laboratory for the development of concepts for arms control and disarmament which now form the basis of international regime that limits arms across the globe – from the Partial Test Ban Treaty, through the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and SALT and START agreements, the Biological Weapons Convention, the INF treaty and the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the CTBT - Pugwash influenced them all.

This is, then, an expert audience. So where better to lay out our case for the need for an Arms Trade Treaty.

The case is simply put. Globalisation has changed the arms trade. Arms companies, operating from an increasing number of locations, now source components from across the world. Their products are often assembled in countries with lax controls on where they end up. Too easily, weapons get into the wrong hands. Each year, at least a third of a million people are killed directly with conventional weapons and many more die, are injured, abused, forcibly displaced and bereaved as a result of armed violence. Rapidly widening loopholes

in national controls demonstrate how this globalised trade also needs global rules.

As a humanitarian organization with a presence in over 100 countries, Oxfam too often is forced to react to crises that have been caused or exacerbated by the effects of armed conflict or armed violence. And too often, the work Oxfam does in economic and social development, or in crisis aid, is undone by those with guns.

For almost four years, governments have discussed what the treaty might look like. And in that time, we estimate that over 2.1 million men, women, and children have died as a result of armed violence – roughly one person dying every minute. This statistic is well known. But it is just the tip of the iceberg in terms of the economic, social and humanitarian impact that armed violence and conflict wreak on societies

The huge cost of armed violence also goes wider than the number of deaths to include 16 million people severely injured each year, 42 million people displaced by conflict and persecution at the end of 2008, the \$18bn that armed conflicts cost Africa each year, and the 12 per cent of their GDP that armed violence cost Latin American countries each year through the 1990s.

It is these enormous human costs then - and the desire to address them - that brings Oxfam to work actively in the field of arms control, where we have been engaged for almost 20 years in our 70 year history. However, the form of arms

control that we have worked on is not the traditional one that most here would recognize. Most of Pugwash's work has been on arms control between states, or between groups of states. Such arms control is designed to produce stability on international relations, and to enhance the security of the states party to the agreements. This is necessary and vital work.

Oxfam's role has been different. Following our mandate, we have concentrated on agreements based on humanitarian principles to assist in the development of treaties which emphasise the protection the security of individuals and communities rather than that of the state. Although, it must be said, that by promoting the conditions for successful and sustainable economic development, and by reducing the human effects of conflict, humanitarian arms control does much to promote the stability and security of states.

In the conflicts of the post-Cold War world, as deaths and injuries amongst combatants fell, this highlighted the deaths and injuries of civilian victims of armed violence, mostly in countries which were the least able to provide healthcare and support for those that needed it, or to provide social support for those families which lost their breadwinners. Millions of acres of useful agricultural land were put out of use by the consequences of armed conflict. These are the conditions and problems that Oxfam's arms control work has sought to improve.

Humanitarian arms control agreements have provided a mechanism to do just this – in 2009 for example NGOs documented less than 4000 deaths from

explosive remnants of war, or from weapons left behind after conflict. Also in 2009, 198km² of land was cleared of such weapons and returned to good use – an excellent achievement. States and NGOs have worked together on important treaties, and our expertise in the field has been valued and respected by negotiators in the conference rooms of the UN as they negotiate texts. Cooperation of this kind produced, for example, protocol V to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, on the Explosive Remnants of War.

So, humanitarian arms control works. It saves lives. It allows people to be economically productive and provide for themselves. It reduces the impact of war on civilian populations. It is a success story.

The Arms Trade Treaty is a hybrid of classic arms control for the purpose of increasing the security and stability of states, and the new forms of humanitarian arms control. As such, if principles proposed by Oxfam and others are included in the treaty, the ATT will contribute to economic and social development of states by addressing insecurity, reducing the supply of illicit arms and ammunition, and reducing incidences and lethality of armed violence. An effective treaty will also increase transparency and predictability in international security relations between states.

Oxfam, as part of the Control Arms campaign, is calling on the member states of the United Nations to deliver a strong and effective ATT to help save lives, prevent human rights abuses, and protect the livelihoods of people around the world. The Treaty must be an international, legally binding instrument based on

States' existing obligations under international law. It must be properly implemented to reduce the human cost associated with the uncontrolled trade in conventional weapons and ammunition. It must establish binding criteria for analyzing international arms transfers on a case-by-case basis, and clearly determine when an arms transfer is prohibited.

Political will has taken the ATT from an idea dreamt up by Nobel Laureates and NGOs into a UN process. The ATT will happen. The question now is how strong will it be, and will it effectively address these humanitarian problems. We are encouraged by the inclusion of many of the discussions, on the goals and objectives of the ATT.

Current draft texts prepared by the Chair of the Preparatory Process, Ambassador Garcia Moritan of Argentina, call for a wide scope of arms, military equipment and ammunition to be regulated under the ATT. They would also require the regulation of all transfers between states, prohibiting transfers that could lead to serious breaches of human rights or international humanitarian law; or that could fuel or prolong armed conflict. Oxfam is pleased that the treaty would also help to promote development.

We think it is essential that these goals are retained, as only through a very clear articulation of the humanitarian aims can we see a Treaty developed that will reduce suffering – and the number of people who become victims or survivors.

The UN Security Council, only last month, engaged in a debate on the linkages

between security and development. International organisations and institutions alike can fill this room twice over with research and evidence linking conclusively and comprehensively the need to ensure that development and security programming go hand-in-hand – be it in the articulation of a national poverty reduction strategy, security sector reform programmes, or indeed military cooperation, training, and arms transfers.

We have found it positive that in the discussions around scope and parameters of the ATT, there has been a link back to this core purpose of the ATT. It is logical to clearly define the scope, parameters and implementation mechanisms of an ATT based on the goals and objects of the Treaty.

While most states are supportive of the negotiation of an ATT, we understand fully that a number of states have serious concerns about the proposed content of the treaty, and how it would operate in practice. It is vital that we meet those concerns head on to allow a robust treaty to be negotiated.

So, it is important to note that if negotiations are successful, and result in a robust and effective treaty as advocated by many governments, NGOs and industry:

- The ATT will establish a transparent and common set of rules governing international arms transfers which would enhance national, regional and global stability through increased confidence in military relations between states. Predictability in international relations has been proven

time and again to build confidence and to enhance security. The ATT will do this, and allow for other confidence and security building measures, arms control and disarmament agreements to continue to build regional and global security.

- The ATT will also contribute to the security and stability of states through the reduction of national and international terrorism by suppressing the illicit arms trade, particularly through strong controls on the activities of brokers operating in the grey market. States with less capacity to enforce the treaty will benefit through provision of targeted security sector reform funding to prevent diversion of arms, ammunition and equipment, and to allow development of national mechanisms necessary to comply with the treaty. This will further reduce the risk of diversion of arms, and thereby the threat of international terrorism.
- It is important to note that the ATT does nothing to threaten a state's right to self-defence. We recognize that the right to self defence enshrined in the UN charter is indisputable. States will continue to make decisions about necessary levels of arms and equipment for the national defence. States' roles of ensuring peace and security within their own borders and with neighbouring states are critical functions of effective governance and meeting the basic needs of their people. But this right is not an end in itself. It is twinned unambiguously and emphatically with responsibilities to promote and observe human rights and fundamental

freedoms - including civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.
The ATT will achieve these twin goals.

- With an ATT in force, States will continue to be free to provide security assistance to allies. The ATT should prevent discriminatory application of arms export rules by instituting a common, high, global standard for the arms trade. All states will comply with the same regulations. This will replace a system where many states operate differing, even contradictory standards, and rules can be subjectively applied by differing states in differing ways. States which fear the ATT will discriminate against them can be reassured, the rules will be the same for them as for everybody else.
- Through the proposed annual meetings of the Assembly of States Parties, the ATT will provide a mechanism where states can challenge arms supplies to those that threaten regional security and stability. Those who menace international peace will be able to be sanctioned through application of the treaty, as States will consult and act together to preserve the international rule of law. This will further strengthen both the security of the state, and of its citizens and communities.

I should stress that this treaty is not just the dream of unrealistic humanitarian groups. Representatives of the arms industry are generally very supportive of the ATT because it will allow the global regulation of the international trade in arms to provide a stable and secure environment in which the trade can continue.

Industry is conscious of the need to prevent irresponsible arms transfers. They also welcome a uniform global structure within which they can pursue legitimate business.

The success and failures of the Arms Trade Treaty will be felt by developing and developed countries alike. The reality today is that the leading development and humanitarian donors in the world effectively sit side by side in offices with colleagues who are the leading exporters of arms and ammunition. It is therefore crucial that these governments ensure efficient and effective levels of cooperation and dialogue between the various departments.

But the responsibility does not lie with exporters alone. There continues to be little transparency in the development of military budgets, and open, transparent conversations in parliaments and legislatures around the world. Defence and security budgets remain shrouded in secrecy, while ever-shrinking resource envelopes are allocated for national investment in poverty-reduction strategies, infrastructure, and social programming.

Indeed, armed aggressors are a tangible, credible, and dangerous threat to the security and welfare of all citizens. But insecurity generated by poverty, suffering, inequality, gender-based violence, corruption, and unaccountability, also pose threats to the entire global community.

Therefore, I urge all of you in the Pugwash community to support negotiation of an arms trade treaty, and to work with your governments and international organisations to ensure that the 2012 negotiating conference succeeds in bringing a robust, effective ATT into place. To governments who have doubts about the viability of our approach, I say we stand ready to listen to your concerns and to work to answer them. Together, through the ATT, we can help build security and stability for the global community of states, and for local communities everywhere.

Thank you.