

defeat its object and purpose in the meanwhile.” As argued later in this report, this phrase has tremendous resonance for prospects for the future of the Treaty, and its possible “provisional” implementation.

Since that first facilitating conference in 1999, several integral states, including Bangladesh, Chile, Russia, Ukraine, and Turkey have ratified the Treaty; however, other key states remain holdouts. After that conference, certain principal states such as India, Pakistan, and the United States have undertaken policies that hedge between support for and resistance to the CTBT. These actions appear to if not “defeat the object and purpose” of the CTBT, at least contribute to the current state of inertia among vital potential members of the CTBT, while at the same time declaring their support for a broad-based regime for non-testing. This has contributed to a general sense of uncertainty regarding prospects for a CTBT.

The second EIF conference was originally to be convened at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 25 to 27 September 2001. However, it was postponed due to the September 11 attacks until 11-13 November 2001. At that conference, 109 states were represented, but none of the remaining 13 Annex 2 states have ratified the treaty since. In addition, the United States did not attend the 2001 facilitating conference.² The second conference, which many thought would present an opportunity to expedite the ratification process, was clearly influenced by the United States-led war on terrorism, and prospects for ratification by many key states are not encouraging. However, there is some anticipation that Colombia, Indonesia, and Vietnam may ratify imminently.

Notwithstanding the current CTBT impasse, the CTBT process thus far has been a success, largely due to the productive developments of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) in Vienna, Austria, and the considerable success that the Provisional Technical Secretariat (PTS) of the CTBTO has had in establishing what is surely the world’s most extensive verification and monitoring system. This system, unprecedented in arms control regimes, comprises a worldwide network of observation stations – the International Monitoring System (IMS) – as well as materials processing facilities in Vienna – the International Data Centre (IDC). Since 1996, the status of the CTBT has been largely in a state of suspended

²Non-ratifying states are not required to attend the facilitating conferences, though many attend as observers. Moreover, despite the general impression that the United States does not support the Treaty (which has become more of a concern under the Bush Administration), Washington has not actively sought to remove itself from the Treaty, nor has it disavowed the CTBT. As one official put it, there is always “turnover” in the American Department of State, and support for the CTBT in the Administration could increase, just as it has decreased. Interview, States Party Mission official, Vienna, Austria, 15 July 2002.