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Introduction

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, I begin by congratulating you and your bureau and by pledging the full co-operation and substantive support of the Department of Disarmament Affairs for your efforts throughout the important deliberations ahead. I appreciate this opportunity to address the Commission at its first plenary meeting of the new millennium -- on a date that also marks the 55th anniversary of the signing of the UN Charter in San Francisco.

In his opening remarks on 24 April to the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned that much of the established multilateral disarmament machinery has started to rust. He
said that this condition was due not to any inherent flaw in the machinery itself but to the apparent lack of political will to use it. A month before, in issuing his Millennium Report, the Secretary-General stressed that “the United Nations was intended to introduce new principles into international relations, making a qualitative difference to their day-to-day conduct.”

These observations frame the proper context within which we must begin our deliberations. For I am confident that this Commission will have no problems with either rust or obsolescence if its members never lose sight of the collective interests that bind all nations, including the most universal interest of all, the survival of our planet in an age of rapid political and technological change. History is replete with examples of institutions that have failed due to the ascendancy and ultimate triumph of parochial national interests over the common good of humankind. Bitter tragedies all too often result from maximalist approaches to national security, including the pursuit of regional or international supremacy. Such approaches typically are pursued at the expense of common security and set the stage for arms races that can impoverish entire nations.

Our task, therefore, must be to learn from this history. We must re-dedicate ourselves to the collective solution of some of the gravest problems on the international security agenda. As the Secretary-General has suggested, we must re-affirm our joint commitment to make a genuine qualitative difference as a result of our work. The goal here is not simply to produce a paper consensus, but to discover paths to solve concrete problems in an all-too real world. We must in particular build some momentum behind solutions that can be constructively pursued elsewhere in the UN disarmament machinery, ultimately the Conference on Disarmament.

The 2000 Agenda of the UNDC

The first issue on this year’s agenda concerns ways and means to achieve nuclear disarmament, a priority that dates back not just to the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly in 1978, but to the first General Assembly resolution which was approved in 1946 in the shadows of two deadly atomic clouds. Given the horrendous human and environmental effects from the detonation of even one nuclear weapon, the world community has rightfully placed nuclear disarmament at the top of the global security agenda. There is no need for this priority to be re-confirmed by the stimulus of yet another detonation.

Circumstances should be favorable for additional progress in this area. At the last NPT Review Conference, the nuclear-weapon states made an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. This follows a decade-long trend of gradual reductions in the reported or estimated holdings of these -- these most dangerous of all -- weapons of mass destruction. By some indications the stockpiles have dropped by about half in this period, while efforts are underway to improve the physical security
and accountancy controls over the considerable stocks of weapons and materials that remain.

Some states with nuclear weapons have even started the difficult process of lifting the various veils that had long shrouded their weapons programmes. This is seen in the release of new information about the costs of acquiring and maintaining these arsenals, the gross number of weapons and related nuclear materials produced by some countries, and the environmental effects and clean-up budgets, to name a few important subjects.

Though much greater progress must be made in all these areas, credit is due for the enlightened efforts of some states to make such pioneering first steps into this all-too unfamiliar terrain of genuine public accountability -- an essential element of “good governance.” Even in the field of nuclear testing -- and despite the setbacks in South Asia two years ago or the obstacles facing early entry into force of the CTBT -- the moratorium on nuclear testing has held up and, if reason prevails, will last until such tests are finally outlawed both everywhere and forever.

There are, to be sure, many problems ahead relating to both to the remaining weapons themselves and to the ideas and doctrines contrived to rationalize their continued production, modernization, and use. The Cold War nuclear doctrine of “mutual assured destruction” -- though less emphasized today at the global level -- has evolved into a multiplicity of what are called “minimum nuclear deterrence” strategies. Deterrence, it seems, has produced somewhat of a “demonstration effect,” as additional countries have come to use adjectives like “essential” and “vital” to characterize such arms.

Hence a tragic irony: nuclear weapons possessed by some countries beget nuclear weapons pursuits by other countries, which in turn provides new pretexts for the original possessor states to defer concrete nuclear disarmament initiatives pending the emergence of a more peaceful or stable world order. This is a recipe for perpetual global disorder.

Because of its urgency and complexity, the challenge of global nuclear disarmament demands immediate attention. It cannot be consigned to the never-never land of “ultimate goals.” Nor can it be conditioned by the prior achievement of general and complete disarmament, a linkage that fails to acknowledge any strategic -- let alone moral -- distinction between a nuclear warhead and an AK-47. Difficult problems relating to transparency, irreversibility, de-alerting, verification, and enforcement all remain not only unsolved, but are in many cases not yet even on the table for serious multilateral deliberations. Among the most challenging is the need to craft practical solutions to the problem of building the level of mutual trust needed to achieve the disarmament goal, and the problem of ensuring that disarmament will be sustained by strong institutional support and political will.
While recognizing the enormity of these challenges, let us not forget that billions of diverse peoples throughout the United Nations comprise a reservoir of support for nuclear disarmament. What they are demanding are not palliatives merely to reduce the danger of future nuclear wars. They want to eliminate nuclear threats, not simply to manage them.

In short, they want this Commission -- along with other institutions throughout the UN disarmament machinery, relevant regional organizations, and their own national governments -- to get on with the difficult work that lies ahead, not find new excuses for inaction or complacency. Its deliberations must therefore focus on the elaboration of concrete actions that will be necessary to implement agreed norms. The fact that we have come so far is itself an enormous achievement.

The original Disarmament Commission, many will recall, emerged in 1952 after the dissolution of the UN Atomic Energy Commission and the UN Commission for Conventional Armaments. It is fitting, therefore, that the Commission’s 2000 agenda would cover both nuclear disarmament and practical confidence-building measures (CBMs) in the field of conventional arms.

The First Committee has long recognized the importance of CBMs in enhancing international peace and security. For example, eleven of the disarmament-related resolutions approved by the 54th Session of the General Assembly made some reference to CBMs, not including other resolutions that address nuclear weapons issues. They are cited in reference to -- the objective reporting of information on military matters; the consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures; transparency in armaments (2 resolutions); regional disarmament; regional confidence-building measures with respect to activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa; the work of the UN Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean; the strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region; and the stability and development of South-Eastern Europe.

As was the case with nuclear weapons, the record with respect to conventional arms control over the last decade also includes some good news. There were definite trends downward both in the aggregate size of defence budgets and in the volume of arms transfers. The Commission added to this progress by reaching a consensus last year on guidelines on conventional arms control, limitation, and disarmament, with particular emphasis on the consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures. Hard work is now underway in preparation for the 2001 Conference on Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Others are studying the possibility of developing further the UN Register on Conventional Arms.
Meanwhile, regional efforts are seeking to improve controls over the excess stockpiling or illicit sale of a diverse array of conventional weaponry. In Albania, I witnessed first hand the importance of the de-weaponization of a society, where the voluntary surrender and destruction of excess arms has been combined with community development incentives to produce confidence-building dividends for the country at large.

Another noteworthy achievement in this area was the conclusion last year of the Agreement on Adaptation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. More than 70,000 pieces of Treaty-limited equipment have been destroyed under the CFE Treaty and its associated documents, and thousands of on-site inspections have been conducted. The treaty has substantially increased both the transparency and predictability of military forces in Europe, a region that knows all too well the consequences of general conventional war. Efforts to restrict illicit trafficking in firearms in the Americas and the ECOWAS moratorium on small arms in West Africa offer additional illustrations of constructive steps that are underway to reduce both the incidence and consequences of war.

It is not surprising that these and other such efforts have generated worldwide interest in improving national and multilateral efforts to reduce the human and economic costs of unrestrained arms competition. Yet the challenges ahead are truly enormous. There are already some warning signs that the military retrenchment following the end of the Cold War may now be giving way to some alarming new trends dictated both by demand-side and supply-side pressures. On June 14, in announcing publication of its 2000 Yearbook, SIPRI reported that global arms expenditures have once again started to rise. According to their analysis --

“the total world military expenditure increased by 2.1% in real terms in 1999 and amounted to roughly $780 billion. While this is almost one-third less than 10 years earlier, it still represents a significant share of world economic resources: 2.6% of world gross national product (GNP).”

This is an ominous sign indeed, especially in light of the qualitative improvements that are underway in all kinds of conventional weaponry. Though the total volume of international conventional arms trade is still reportedly stable, there seems little question that the mobility, lethality, and accuracy of conventional weapons systems may be advancing faster than existing controls can reasonably regulate. Some countries export arms to achieve expedient political goals that have little to do with national defence. Others continue to produce arms not just for national defence purposes but also to reap bountiful commercial opportunities, a point underscored on 21 June in a UN symposium co-hosted by the Department of Disarmament Affairs on “Restructuring of the Global Arms Industry and Its Implications.”

Further complicating matters, the forces of globalization have for many years been
shaping both the production and distribution of arms, even to the point where the definition of what precisely constitutes an “arms export” becomes blurred and problematic. Several major arms producers or consumers are also continuing to reduce their Cold War-era arms stocks by sending their surpluses off to market. The addition of diamonds and drugs as means of financing illicit arms deals adds further complexity to the challenges ahead, a point stressed in a report issued last week by the World Bank on the economic causes of civil conflict.

Surely further progress in the field of conventional arms control will depend heavily upon the fate of diplomacy and ongoing efforts to achieve the peaceful settlement of disputes. This only underscores further the need for confidence-building measures, which are needed not just to restrain or prevent arms races but also to help in alleviating the underlying political or economic forces that feed such races.

Among the various practical confidence-building measures that might be considered there is the provision of advisory assistance to Member States, at their request, in safeguarding and improving control over their surplus or obsolete weapons stockpiles, particularly with regard to those storage facilities housing small arms and light weapons and their ammunition. In this context, I wish to recall that in its 1997 report, the UN Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms recommended that all States should ensure the safeguarding of such surplus weapons against loss through theft or corruption, in particular from storage facilities.

The Commission should also give some consideration to the potential contributions of technology. Though technology is often held responsible for the growing brutality of modern weaponry, it also offers many potentially valuable contributions to international confidence building. The growing availability of high-resolution satellite imagery at reduced cost, for example, can help as an important supplementary means of reassuring countries against imminent invasion threats. Advancements in aerial and ground sensors can work to build confidence in existing arms control agreements. New telecommunications technologies can be used to reduce the risk of accidents or misunderstandings leading to war. Technology can surely offer no substitute for mutual trust and understanding, but it does offer more than merely the means for mutual annihilation.

The Commission has a difficult road ahead, given the diversity of stakes involved, the variety of motivations for engaging in the arms trade, and the impact of alliance commitments upon national supply policies. There is no inherent reason, however, why a consensus cannot be forged on some specific practical measures that will permit reasonable investments in national security while stemming competitive tendencies leading to arms races and eventually civil or international wars.
Conclusion

The challenges facing this 2000 Disarmament Commission are formidable. So too must be its political will to overcome them. Yet progress in disarmament can have its own remarkable effect upon the political climate. In the words of former Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld:

“... the very study of disarmament may be the vehicle for progress towards greater international political understanding. This is to say, disarmament is never the result only of the political situation; it is also partly instrumental in creating the political situation ... We must, I think, show greater patience in this whole field than ever before.”

This is wise counsel indeed, and helps to explain his conviction that disarmament had become a “hardy perennial” at the United Nations. Though he did not live to see the end of the Cold War, he would surely wish the Commission well in its deliberations and offer us all the hope that this hardy old perennial will finally bear the fruit the world has so long been anticipating. I can think of no better way to commence a new millennium and a new page in the history of the United Nations.
Madam Chairperson, distinguished delegates, I appreciate this privilege of addressing the Commission once again as it opens a new session. I begin by congratulating you and your bureau and by pledging the full co-operation and substantive support of the Department of Disarmament Affairs for your efforts throughout the important deliberations ahead. May I congratulate you in particular, Madam Chairperson, for achieving the unique distinction of being the first woman to chair this Commission -- this marks another welcome breakthrough in the proverbial glass ceiling.

I would like at the outset to recall that the Commission will celebrate its 50th anniversary next year, making it no doubt older than many of the distinguished representatives in this chamber. The global conditions for pursuing disarmament goals have evolved dramatically since 4 February 1952, when the Commission -- then meeting at the Palais de Chaillot in Paris -- opened its first session. It is no small coincidence that just as these conditions have changed, so too has the work of the Commission fluctuated between periods of productivity and relative decline.

The General Assembly's assessment of the conditions in 1952 was spelled out in the preamble of the resolution creating the Commission. In clear and somber terms, the Member States were "Moved by anxiety at the general lack of confidence plaguing the world and leading to the burden of increasing armaments and the fear of war."
Many of these sentiments linger even today, in the light of recent trends of rising military expenditures, mounting civilian casualties in armed conflicts, and the continuing risks of catastrophic wars, up to and including nuclear war. Yet the relevance today of this early resolution extends beyond its tone -- it addresses matters of substance as well. It stated that the Commission was to address "the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments" as well as measures concerning "the elimination of all major weapons adaptable to mass destruction." The close resemblance between the Commission's agendas then and now is a poignant reminder of extraordinary challenges that lie ahead in these important fields.

The challenge of nuclear disarmament is particularly demanding, for as awesome as are the social, economic, and environmental costs of producing nuclear weapons, these costs would pale to those that would arise as a result of a nuclear war. Progress toward achieving literally every goal in the Charter tacitly assumes the non-occurrence of such a war. The States Parties to the NPT agreed last year that this challenge could not be overcome by halfway measures -- instead, they concluded, "the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." The nuclear-weapon States Parties took a positive step in this direction by making an "unequivocal undertaking . . . to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament."

Yet because the NPT is not yet a universal treaty, it is vitally important for the world community to continue its determined efforts to discover the ways and means of achieving nuclear disarmament as soon as possible. The Commission has a unique role to play in this regard. The Conference on Disarmament -- the world's only multilateral negotiating body for disarmament -- has for many years been unable to reach a consensus on a work agenda. As for the First Committee, it considers almost fifty resolutions each year, of which nuclear disarmament is only one among numerous additional issues it must address.

The Commission, however, combines its universal membership with a mandate that allows it to focus its deliberations intensely on two crucial issues relating to nuclear disarmament and conventional arms control. In performing this role, the Commission is playing an extremely important role in the slow, incremental process of building and maintaining global disarmament norms.

Its record of achievement over the last decade -- recognizing that it is exclusively a deliberative body -- is impressive indeed. In 1999, it reached a consensus on two sets of guidelines concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and on conventional arms control, with particular emphasis to the consolidation of peace following armed conflicts. In 1996, it reached agreement on guidelines for international arms transfers. In 1993, it was able to agree on guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security. And in 1992, it issued guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters.
Reaching a global consensus on disarmament matters is never easy, given the inherent sensitivity of the issues -- yet reaching such a consensus five times in a decade is by any reasonable definition an impressive feat. Though the guidelines are not legally binding, they play a key role in establishing agreed ground rules for the conduct of national security policies in an increasingly interdependent global environment.

These agreed guidelines offer individual citizens -- including those who work in legislatures, non-governmental groups, the news media, academia, and religious institutions -- a benchmark against which the actions of states can be assessed. If the Commission is to be faulted for anything, its "sin" is in not doing more to publicize its accomplishments for the entire world to understand and to use. These guidelines are not mere pieces of parchment, but are invaluable, even inspirational tools for concrete national and international initiatives. They deserve to be read by wider publics.

For this reason, I am pleased to say that the Department of Disarmament Affairs has placed on its web site the full texts of all the guidelines and recommendations that the Commission has approved since its re-establishment after the General Assembly's first Special Session on Disarmament in 1978.

Though the last decade was not a time of nuclear war, it was indeed a time of devastating bloodshed involving the use of an ever-expanding variety of conventional arms -- an era also marked by the advent of the so-called "Revolution in Military Affairs." By some estimates, over five million people have been killed in armed conflicts during the post-Cold War era. Military budgets have reportedly grown to around $800 billion a year, about 90 percent of Cold War levels. Arms exports to many highly unstable regions are also on the rise. We continue to witness serious problems in enforcing arms embargoes mandated by the Security Council, particularly in Africa. Illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons has evolved from a national and a regional problem into a crisis of truly global dimensions -- one that will be the focus of a major international conference at the United Nations next July.

This expenditure, this loss of life, and this disrespect for the rule of law, has eroded human security everywhere. It is therefore highly appropriate that the Commission would again focus its attention on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms.

One of the classic measures in this field concerns the importance of enhancing transparency over the production, stockpiling, and transfer of arms. It is worth recalling that the Commission's founding resolution gave some considerable weight to this issue in outlining the key principles that were to guide the work of the commission. Indeed, the first such principle found in that resolution provided that --

In a system of guaranteed disarmament there must be progressive disclosure and verification on a continuing basis of all armed forces . . . and all armaments
Building upon work begun during the League of Nations, the United Nations has continued and progressively expanded its efforts to gather data on the production and trade in arms. The Register on Conventional Arms is one such tool by which this is goal is pursued with respect to seven categories of major conventional weapons systems. Another is the standardized reporting instrument for military expenditures. Perhaps one of the most unfortunate confidence-reduction measures in this field relates to the failure of many states either to use these two specific tools or to use them regularly.

Unlike weapons of mass destruction -- which have either been outlawed internationally or are slated for elimination worldwide -- conventional arms have many legitimate purposes, particularly with respect to implementing "the inherent right to individual or collective self-defense" found in Article 51 of the Charter. Having such legitimate uses, large industries have grown with vested interests in the continued production and export of such arms. Furthermore, such arms are also used for a variety of foreign policy purposes, including the collective defence of international peace and security under Chapter VII of the Charter. These legal, economic, and political factors have made conventional arms control a very difficult challenge indeed, but one worthy of the continued efforts of diplomats and private citizens everywhere.

As intractable as many of these problems have been, it is vitally important for Member States to continue their search for progress. For the same Member States also have enormously significant interests to advance through the success of confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms. Reductions in the production of such arms free resources for use elsewhere in society. Controls that reduce the intensity or duration of armed conflicts enhance prospects for social and economic development. Even the environment stands to gain from progress in these areas. The wider the gains, the wider will be the political support for the new controls, and the greater will be the likelihood that they will be adopted and enforced.

Progress in the field of conventional arms control is therefore an entirely reasonable objective to pursue. One need only look at the enormous reductions in conventional arms that followed from the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. Governments worldwide are becoming more and more receptive to new controls in this field -- this is particularly evident in regional initiatives that have emerged in recent years from Latin America, Europe, the West African ECOWAS moratorium, and other efforts now underway in these regions and elsewhere. Perhaps the cresting interest in the Small Arms conference next July will serve as a further inducement for progress in the Commission's deliberations in the conventional arms field. The interest that non-governmental groups have shown in that event is further evidence of the support that exists in civil society for such progress in the months and years ahead.

As we begin our deliberations today, let us not simply recall, but build upon the broad consensus manifested in the Millennium Declaration and in many other events last year that signaled the collective will of the peoples of the world for a new beginning on disarmament.
issues in the new millennium. Let us make this a new beginning. Let us begin tDDAy.
Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, I begin by congratulating you and your bureau and by pledging the full co-operation and substantive support of the Department of Disarmament Affairs for your efforts throughout the deliberations ahead. I thank Mr. Odei Osei of Ghana and Ms. Gabriela Martinic of Argentina for their good work in chairing the working groups. I appreciate the readiness of Mr. Alaa Issa of Egypt and Mr. Santiago Mourão of Brazil for assuming their responsibilities as the new Chairmen of the working groups at short notice.

Over the last five years that I have served as Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, I have been impressed with the Commission's commitment to its basic purposes and principles, as well as its demonstrated capacity to adapt its practices to meet new demands from the ever-changing international environment. It has, for example, agreed to limit the number of items on its agenda in order to permit more in-depth deliberations. The Commission has also had some very productive sessions, in particular 1999, when it was able to reach a consensus
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on guidelines for establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones and for conventional arms control.

The Commission performs an indispensable role in the evolution of global disarmament norms. Its focused substantive agenda allows it to concentrate its deliberations far more than is possible in the First Committee, which has additional responsibilities that include the consideration of over 50 disarmament-related resolutions each year. If the United Nations is -- as described in the Millennium Declaration -- "the indispensable common house of the entire human family," the Disarmament Commission is the wing of that house where new disarmament norms are discussed and elaborated.

Leaving the task of crafting resolutions and negotiating treaties to other parts of the UN disarmament machinery, the Commission makes its greatest contributions in the realm of ideas -- it serves as a seedbed from which global disarmament norms may ultimately emerge. Being strictly a deliberative forum, it often encounters disagreements amongst its members over policies and priorities. Yet through this deliberative process, areas of common ground do indeed emerge, as they did on several occasions in the Commission's work throughout the decade of the 1990's.

It is undeniable, however, that the Commission -- in common with other parts of the multilateral disarmament machinery -- has faced some difficult times in recent years. Its inability to schedule a substantive session in 2002 -- the year of its 50th anniversary -- was especially regrettable. I hope the Commission never again has to cancel a substantive session. Today, disagreements over the role of force in international relations, the contributions of multilateralism to international peace and security, and indeed the relevance and role of the United Nations in serving a full gamut of global norms, are presenting new challenges for the consensus-building process in the Commission. These hardships are coinciding with the recent trend of rising global military expenditures, which this year will likely exceed $1 trillion -- an unconscionable statistic reminiscent of spending levels during the Cold War.

Yet when times are difficult, the deliberative function of the Commission is all the more important to sustain. This is particularly true with respect to the two issues now on its agenda relating to nuclear disarmament and confidence-building in the area of conventional arms. This year -- which marks the 25th anniversary of that grand consensus in multilateral disarmament at the General Assembly's first Special Session on Disarmament -- the Commission has a unique opportunity to demonstrate its capacity to rise to new challenges, overcome obstacles, and reach common understandings on matters of great importance to all member states.

**Nuclear Disarmament**

The first item on its agenda concerns "ways and means to achieve nuclear disarmament." The difficulty of this challenge is best symbolized by the grim fact that this issue has now been on the UN agenda for 57 years -- starting with the General Assembly's first resolution in 1946. There has, of course, been some recent progress in related areas. Perhaps the most significant...
developments include the bilateral Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, which will -- when it enters into force -- reduce substantially the numbers of strategic nuclear weapons deployed by the United States and the Russian Federation. Another development is the recent commitment of some $20 billion through the G8 Global Partnership to efforts "against the spread of weapons and materials of mass destruction." Several additional achievements are exhaustively documented in the working paper of the chairman of Working Group I.¹

Yet the actual record in achieving the verified dismantlement and destruction of nuclear weapons inspires little confidence, despite the "unequivocal undertaking" by the nuclear-weapon states at the 2000 NPT Review Conference "to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament." Tens of thousands of these weapons reportedly remain, though exactly how many is still unconfirmed given the lack of transparency over these various weapons programmes. The possible development of new weapons and new targeting options to serve aggressive counter-proliferation purposes further undermines this solemn disarmament undertaking, while creating new incentives for clandestine programmes.

This creeping retreat from nuclear disarmament has also been accompanied by recent challenges to global non-proliferation norms, including -- but not limited to -- the decision by the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea to leave the NPT, and the South Asian nuclear tests in 1998. It is also troubling that proliferation has in some cases been accompanied by the spread of various deterrence doctrines to govern the use of such weapons.

Virtually all members agree that verification and compliance are critical to the success of both disarmament and non-proliferation commitments, as is the non-discriminatory enforcement of the relevant norms. Such functions are vital in the evolution of a genuine rule of law to serve international peace and security. Yet how is the world to reach agreement on the ways and means to achieve global nuclear disarmament -- including its mDDAlities for verification and enforcement -- if not through a careful deliberative process? The review process of the NPT is surely one important arena for assessing progress in implementing the global nuclear disarmament norm, but the Disarmament Commission has the advantage of being a fully universal deliberative body, which enables it to complement the goals of the NPT review process. Working in tandem, these two arenas offer great potential to move the global nuclear disarmament agenda forward, at a time when such progress is long overdue.

**Conventional Arms**

With respect to conventional arms, every member of this Commission has heard the dictum that arms do not cause wars and that people cause wars. To the extent that arms are inanimate objects that have no will of their own, there is undeniably some logic in such an assertion. Yet how these weapons are developed, tested, traded, and finally used to cause death and suffering -- can indeed have some profound effects on international peace and security. The specific characteristics of weapons -- such as their lethality, mobility, weight, range, stealthiness, and other such properties -- reveal a lot about the capabilities of the state possessing such arms,
and, to some extent, its intentions as well. Similarly, the sheer volume of weapons, if demonstrably in excess of legitimate security needs, can also serve to breed mistrust in international relations -- at worst, it can lead to conditions triggering preemptive wars. In such an environment, even routine military exercises might be confused as preparations for war.

The problem is further complicated in the conventional arms field because it is legitimate for states to possess such weaponry for their self-defence purposes, and because commercial and political motivations frequently underlie their continued production, perfection, and export. In the Persian Gulf, even the current war in Iraq did not deter the convening last month of a major defence trade exhibition in the region. One official commented after the event, "War might delay a few deals for weeks and maybe months, but will not really affect the sales." Indeed the war might serve as a macabre advertisement of new types of weapons. So the great challenge before this Commission is to find a way to reduce threats to international peace and security posed by such weapons, while protecting the inherent right of all member states to the means for their self-defence.

Since conventional weapons will be with us all for a while to come, it is eminently sensible for states to consult amongst themselves to discover practical confidence-building measures that will at least ensure that the competition to make, test, use, and sell such arms takes place within some generally-agreed constraints. At best, agreement on confidence-building measures may alleviate pressures to acquire such weaponry, to augment existing stockpiles, or to develop new weapons, while reducing the risks of war.

Again, how is the world to arrive at such undertakings if not through a patient, deliberative process? What better place to consider such initiatives on a global scale than in the United Nations, whose first purpose in the Charter is to maintain international peace and security? And what place in the United Nations system is more appropriate and relevant for sustained deliberation of the principles and mechanisms to approach this specific issue than the Disarmament Commission?

Conclusion

Distinguished delegates,

By any definition, these are trying times for advocates of security through disarmament. We meet today in a tragic wartime environment caused by the failure of the Security Council to agree on a collective course of action to achieve the disarmament of Iraq. We face persisting threats from weapons of mass destruction -- actual weapons in the custody of states, and potential weapons in the hands of non-state actors. We see the continued production, storage, and transportation of materials that can be used in the manufacture of such weapons. We see a thriving arms trade and continued reports of civilian casualties from the use of conventional arms around the world. And we see the costs such developments are imposing on the social and economic development of virtually all states.
Yet this must not be all we see. The Commission must never underestimate the actual or potential support that exists among the people for concrete initiatives to liberate them from the prospect of war or the threat of war. Motivated by public expectations, stimulated by enlightened leadership, and recognizing the clear material and social benefits of achieving a world without nuclear weapons and with responsible controls over conventional arms, the Commission -- though in its 51st year -- may have only just begun to demonstrate its full potential.

In this, my last statement to the Commission as Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, I wish you success in your deliberations. I am confident that this institution will indeed fulfill its potential.

_____________________

1 A/CN.10/2003/WG.1/WP.1.
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I. General overview: Importance of nuclear disarmament and interrelationship between nuclear disarmament and international peace, security and stability

1. “The attainment of the objective of security, which is an inseparable element of peace, has always been one of the most profound aspirations of humanity. States have for a long time sought to maintain their security through the possession of arms ... Yet the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind.”

2. Held in 1978, the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, was a turning point in the history of multilateral efforts to attain disarmament, in particular, nuclear disarmament. The unanimous recognition by Member States at the special session that enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry, particularly nuclear weapons, remains valid more than ever.

3. The nuclear disarmament process is closely intertwined with international peace and security. Progress in measures to strengthen the security of States and to improve the international situation in general is essential for disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. Conversely, advancement in the process of disarmament will positively impact on the establishment of a peaceful, secure and stable international environment. It is therefore in the interest of all States to contribute to the pursuit of nuclear disarmament, whether on a unilateral basis or through bilateral, plurilateral, regional or multilateral arrangements.

4. Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. Steps to prevent nuclear proliferation, as well as the proliferation of other forms of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, are important in providing a positive international security environment for the advancement of nuclear disarmament.

5. The objectives of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are also furthered through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The establishment of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned enhances global and regional peace and security, strengthens the nuclear non-proliferation regime and contributes towards realizing the objectives of nuclear disarmament.

6. The importance attached by Member States to nuclear disarmament and to its inter-relationship with international peace, security and stability is further attested by the work of a number of intergovernmental bodies, as illustrated below, as well as by the conclusion of multilateral agreements providing for nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation.

7. The General Assembly has over the years adopted numerous resolutions on the issue of nuclear disarmament, thereby reaffirming the standing commitment of the international community to achieving this goal. Indeed, the first resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 24 January 1946 was on nuclear disarmament, calling for the establishment of a commission to deal with the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy. The terms of reference of the Commission were

---

1 Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, resolution S-10/2, para. 1.
designed to ensure the elimination of atomic and all other weapons of mass destruction, and the use of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes.

8. The programme of action adopted at the tenth special session contains priorities and measures in the field of disarmament that States should undertake as a matter of urgency with a view to halting and reversing the arms race and to giving the necessary impetus to efforts designed to achieve genuine disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The tenth special session further agreed that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization and that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority.

9. While the twelfth and fifteenth special sessions of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, held, respectively, in 1982 and 1988, were unable to adopt consensus documents, both sessions reaffirmed the validity of the agreements contained in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session and considered various proposals and concrete measures to move forward the disarmament agenda, including nuclear disarmament.

10. At the Millennium Summit held at United Nations Headquarters from 6 to 8 September 2000, the heads of State and Government of the States Members of the United Nations resolved to strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and to keep all options open for achieving that aim, including the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers.

11. Since its establishment in 1952, the Disarmament Commission, as the specialized universal deliberating disarmament forum, has agreed to valuable and practical guidelines to facilitate efforts of Member States in establishing multilateral principles and norms in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

12. In particular, the Disarmament Commission has addressed issues related to nuclear disarmament, including from 1991 to 1995, when it had a working group dedicated to an agenda item entitled “Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons”. While the Commission was unable to finalize its work on the subject, it did unanimously adopt in 1993 guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, which included the establishment of zones free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Furthermore, in 1999, the Commission adopted guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. In the same year, pursuant to a mandate from the General Assembly, the Commission decided to establish a working group to deal with an item entitled “Ways and means to achieve nuclear disarmament”. The Group started its deliberations at the 2000 session of the Commission.
13. The Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has had several items on its agenda related to nuclear disarmament. In the past decade, it negotiated the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1996, and agreed on a mandate for the negotiation of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. However, since 1999, the Conference has been unable to make any progress due to a lack of agreement on its substantive programme of work.

14. The Security Council has also been seized of issues relating to the relationship between disarmament and international peace and security. On 31 January 1992, the Security Council held its first meeting at the level of heads of State and Government to address the item entitled “The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of peace and security”. The Council reaffirmed the crucial contribution that progress in the fields of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation could make to the maintenance of international peace and security and underlined the need for all Member States to fulfill their obligations in relation to arms control and disarmament, and to prevent proliferation in all its aspects of all weapons of mass destruction. The Council further stressed that the proliferation of all weapons of mass destruction constituted a threat to international peace and security.

15. Through the years, the growing recognition by Governments of the threat posed by nuclear weapons to international peace and security and their interest in safeguarding the security of their people have led, inter alia, to the conclusion of a number of multilateral treaties providing for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. These treaties include the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (Partial Test-Ban Treaty), the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Outer Space Treaty), the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (Non-Proliferation Treaty), the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (Seabed Treaty), the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Moon Treaty) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Furthermore, nuclear-weapon-free zones were established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco), the South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty (Rarotonga Treaty), the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Treaty of Bangkok) and the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba). There have also been important bilateral treaties, the most recent of which is the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions (Moscow Treaty) between the Russian Federation and the United States of America.

\[2\] The 2002 agenda of the Conference on Disarmament comprised the following items: cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament; prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters; prevention of an arms race in outer space; effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons; new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, radiological weapons; comprehensive programme of disarmament; and transparency in armaments. The Conference has adopted the same agenda for its 2003 session.
II. Achievements and current developments in nuclear disarmament

16. The international community has remained seized of the question of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation as priorities of the United Nations. Progress has been made in promoting nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation at all levels, including unilateral measures, bilateral agreements, and regional and global actions. Nevertheless the record has been mixed. Positive achievements in bilateral and unilateral nuclear arms reductions have not been sufficient to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons. Though some nuclear-weapon States have provided information about their arsenals, the lack of transparency remains a problem with respect to the numbers of weapons, as well as the amounts of nuclear material. Furthermore, efforts to pursue a nuclear-weapon capability by some States, as well as the updating of strategic defence doctrines setting out new rationales for the use of nuclear weapons, represent developments of great concern. The present section outlines recent developments and achievements in the field of nuclear disarmament.

A. Achievements and developments at the unilateral and bilateral levels

17. Progress has been made in reducing nuclear weapons and promoting non-proliferation through unilateral measures taken by the nuclear-weapon States. Some progress has occurred, for example, in the following areas: the dismantlement of strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons and warheads; the reduction of nuclear forces in the status of alert; the withdrawal and dismantlement of delivery vehicles; the closing down and dismantlement of nuclear-weapon-related research and development facilities, nuclear testing sites and uranium enrichment plants; the elimination of medium-and short-range missiles; the disposal of fissile material removed from military programmes; and the withdrawal of nuclear weapons deployed outside their territories.

18. The nuclear-weapon States have also reaffirmed their commitment to Security Council resolution 984 (1995) on security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In addition, one nuclear-weapon State has unconditionally foregone the first use of nuclear weapons and the use or the threat to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

19. At the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the nuclear-weapon States issued a joint declaration wherein they declared that none of their nuclear weapons were targeted at any State. The nuclear-weapon States also committed themselves to placing, as soon as practicable, fissile materials designated by each of them as no longer required for military purposes under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or other relevant international verification arrangements for the disposition of such material for peaceful purposes, to ensure that such material remains permanently outside military programmes. In this connection, they have launched a number of initiatives to provide for the safe and effective management and disposition of such materials.

20. At the same Conference, the nuclear-weapon States reaffirmed their commitment to keeping in force the moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions
or any other nuclear explosions pending the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

21. China acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty on 9 March 1992, declared a moratorium on nuclear testing on 29 July 1996 and signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty on 24 September 1996. At the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, China stated that, since the 1990s, it had gradually cut back its nuclear programme and that it had closed down the research and development site in Qinghai. It also noted that its development of a limited nuclear force was intended solely for defence purposes, aimed at breaking the nuclear monopoly, preventing nuclear war and, ultimately, eliminating nuclear weapons. China further reaffirmed its statement made in April 1995 that it would provide an unconditional negative security assurance to all non-nuclear-weapon States.

22. In April 2002, China declared that its nine nuclear facilities were under IAEA safeguards and that the Additional Protocol had become effective on 28 March 2002, thereby placing China as the first nuclear-weapon State to do so. In December 2002, the Government issued “China’s National Defence in 2002”, which stresses that China consistently upholds the policy of no first use of nuclear weapons and adopts an extremely restrained attitude towards the development of nuclear weapons. The document further affirms that China has never participated in any nuclear arms race and never deployed nuclear weapons abroad. In addition, China has reiterated that its limited nuclear counter-attack ability is entirely for deterrence against possible nuclear attacks by other countries.

23. France acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty on 2 August 1992 and ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty on 6 April 1998. In April 2002, France stated that it had eliminated the surface-to-surface component of its nuclear capability, dismantled all S3D strategic missiles at the Plateau d’Albion and withdrawn the Hades short-range weapons system. It further indicated that it had reduced the total number of nuclear delivery vehicles by over half of the holdings since 1990, reduced the sea-launched component from five to four nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines, de-targeted all nuclear warheads, and closed down and dismantled the nuclear test site in the Pacific. France has also announced the closing down of all nuclear-weapon-related fissile material production facilities in Marcoule and Pierrelatte.

24. In its New Defence 1997-2015 and most recently in the Military Programme Law 2003-2008, France has stated that nuclear dissuasion remains the fundamental guarantee of its security and, for this purpose, stressed the need to maintain the necessary technology to assure the credibility of such nuclear dissuasion. To this end, €2,825 million is to be allocated on average each year to the deterrent force system to allow for renewed modernizing of forces and to ensure the development of a simulation programme. As far as the ballistic component is concerned, France will launch the new-generation nuclear missile-launching submarine SNLE NG No. 3 in 2004. Production of the SNLE NG No. 4 will continue for entry into active service in 2010, carrying the new M51 missile. The Military Programme Law further considers pre-emptive actions a possibility in case of imminent threat.

25. The Russian Federation is a depositary of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty on 30 June 2000. The Russian Federation reported in April 2002 that it had reduced the number of munitions deployed on intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles
and heavy bombers to the level of 6,000 and eliminated 1,200 intercontinental-ballistic-missile and submarine-launched ballistic-missile launchers, more than 2,350 intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, more than 40 nuclear submarines and more than 60 heavy bombers. It further noted that it had dismantled all of its non-strategic (tactical) nuclear weapons from surface ships and multiple-purpose submarines, as well as from its ground-based naval air force, had eliminated more than 30 per cent of nuclear munitions of the total number designed for tactical sea-launched missiles and the naval air force, and had stopped the production of nuclear munitions for tactical ground-launched missiles, nuclear artillery shells and nuclear mines. The Russian Federation also indicated that it had destroyed 50 per cent of its nuclear re-entry vehicles for surface-to-air missiles and 50 per cent of its nuclear air bombs.

26. In January 2000, the Russian Federation issued the “2000 Russian Security Concept”, which states that a vital task of the country is to exercise deterrence to prevent aggression on any scale, nuclear or otherwise, against the Russian Federation and its allies. The Concept further establishes that the strengthening of the regime of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles is one of the principal tasks for ensuring the national security of the Russian Federation. Subsequently, in April of the same year, the Russian Federation issued a military doctrine declaring that it reserved the right to use nuclear weapons in response to the use of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction against itself and its allies, as well as in response to large-scale aggression utilizing conventional weapons in situations critical to the national security of the Russian Federation.

27. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a depositary of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty on 6 April 1998. In 1999, the United Kingdom stated that, since 1992, it had given up the nuclear Lance missile and artillery roles that it had undertaken previously with United States nuclear weapons under dual-key arrangements; its maritime tactical nuclear capability so that its surface ships no longer had the capability to carry or deploy nuclear weapons; and all of its air-launched nuclear weapons. The United Kingdom further announced its decision to maintain fewer than 200 operationally available nuclear warheads.

28. “The Strategic Defence Review” issued by the United Kingdom in 1998 concluded that the country could safely make further significant reductions from cold war levels, both in the number of weapons and in its day-to-day operating posture, while maintaining a nuclear arsenal at the minimum level necessary to provide for its security for the foreseeable future. In “The Strategic Defence Review: A New Chapter”, which was issued in July 2002, the United Kingdom stated that its nuclear weapons have a continuing use as a means of deterring major strategic military threats, as well as a continuing role in guaranteeing the ultimate security of the United Kingdom.

29. The United States is a depositary of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It declared a moratorium on nuclear testing on 23 September 1992 and signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty on 24 September 1996. In April 2002, the United States stated that, since 1988, it had dismantled over 13,000 nuclear weapons, had denuclearized its Army, the Marine Corps and the surface and air components of the Navy, and de-alerted part of its heavy bombers. The United States further noted that
it had removed some fissile material from the United States military stockpile and placed part of it under IAEA inspection and safeguards; it had closed down all fissile material production facilities for nuclear weapons; and it had deactivated and converted excess fissile material to a form unusable in nuclear weapons.

30. In February 2002, the United States Department of Defense issued a summary of its recent “Nuclear Posture Review”, wherein it is stated that nuclear weapons, for the foreseeable future, will remain a key element of the United States national security strategy. It was further indicated that the new approach introduced in the “Nuclear Posture Review” would provide capabilities in a timely fashion to meet emerging threats, which should serve as a credible deterrent at the lowest level of nuclear weapons, consistent with the security interests of the United States and its allies. “The National Security Strategy of the United States of America” released in September 2002 asserts that the United States has long maintained the option of pre-emptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to its national security, and that it will, if necessary, act pre-emptively to forestall or prevent hostile acts by its adversaries. Subsequently, in the “National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction” issued in December 2002, the United States stated that it reserves the right to respond with overwhelming force, including through resort to all of its options, to the use of weapons of mass destruction against the United States, their forces abroad and friends and allies.

31. By December 2001, the Russian Federation and the United States completed reductions of their respective nuclear arsenals to the levels required under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Specifically, when START was signed in 1991, the Russian Federation and the United States each had more than 10,000 deployed strategic nuclear warheads. The START reductions brought those levels down to less than 6,000 deployed warheads each.

32. On 14 December of the same year, the United States announced its unilateral withdrawal from the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty). In announcing the decision, the United States stated that the circumstances affecting United States national security had changed fundamentally since the signing of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 1972 and that, in order to defend its homeland, its forces and friends and allies against new threats, particularly weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means wielded by terrorist and rogue States, the United States must develop the means to deter and protect against them, including through limited missile defence of its territory. The withdrawal became effective on 13 June 2002.

33. In May 2002, the Russian Federation and the United States signed the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions (Moscow Treaty), as well as a Declaration on a New Strategic Relationship. Under the Treaty, the parties agreed to limit to between 1,700 and 2,200 the levels of their deployed strategic nuclear warheads. The Treaty allows each party to determine for itself the composition and structure of its strategic offensive arms, based on the established aggregate limit for the number of such warheads. The Treaty also establishes a Bilateral Implementation Commission that will meet at least twice a year. The Treaty will remain in force until December 2012 and may be extended or superseded earlier by a subsequent agreement.

34. On 14 June 2002, the Russian Federation issued a statement on the “Legal Status of the Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States of America on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms”. In the
A/CN.10/2003/WG.I/WP.1

statement, the Russian Federation noted, inter alia, the refusal of the United States to ratify the START II Treaty and the announcement a day earlier of its unilateral withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, as well as the absence of any prerequisites for the entry into force of START II. In view of that, the Russian Federation declared itself no longer bound by the obligation under international law to refrain from any action that would deprive the Treaty of its object and goal.

35. South Africa acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State in 1991 and has submitted its nuclear programme to IAEA safeguards. South Africa is the only country so far that, after assembling nuclear weapons, has unilaterally renounced and dismantled them, accepting IAEA verification to confirm the termination of its programme.

36. Further to the Lisbon Protocol of 23 May 1992, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine took an unconditional decision to relinquish nuclear weapons and to withdraw them from their respective territories on a voluntary basis. In the course of 1993 and 1994, the three States acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States: Belarus acceded on 9 February 1993, Kazakhstan on 14 February 1994 and Ukraine on 5 December 1994.


38. At the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly in 2002, Cuba announced that, as a signal of its clear political will and commitment to an effective disarmament process that would ensure world peace, its Government had decided to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In doing so, Cuba reaffirmed its hope that all nuclear weapons would be totally eliminated under strict international verification. On the same occasion, Cuba also expressed its intention to ratify the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Subsequently, Cuba ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco on 23 October 2002 and acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty on 4 November 2002.

39. Mongolia declared its nuclear-weapon-free status in 1992 when its parliament adopted legislation defining that status as a unilateral measure to ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons on its territory, bearing in mind its unique conditions. The General Assembly, at its fifty-third session in 1998, adopted a resolution wherein it welcomed the declaration by Mongolia of its nuclear-weapon-free status as an important element in strengthening regional peace, security and stability. On 5 October 2000, the five nuclear-weapon States made a joint statement on security assurances in connection with Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free status, in which they confirmed their respective unilateral negative security assurances.

40. On 20 January 1992, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the Republic of Korea signed the Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. In the Declaration, the two States agreed not to test, manufacture, produce, receive, possess, store, deploy or use nuclear weapons; to use nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes; and not to possess nuclear reprocessing and uranium enrichment facilities. The Declaration further contains a provision on bilateral inspections to verify the denuclearization of the peninsula.
41. On 12 March 1993, the DPRK, invoking the provisions of article X, paragraph 1 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, announced its decision to withdraw from the Treaty. Since 1993, IAEA has been unable to implement its comprehensive safeguards agreement under the Non-Proliferation Treaty with the DPRK, as it has been unable to verify the correctness and completeness of the country’s initial declaration of nuclear material subject to safeguards. On 21 October 1994, the DPRK and the United States concluded the Agreed Framework whereby the two States decided to cooperate to replace the graphite-moderated reactors and related facilities of the DPRK with light-water reactor power plants. The two States also agreed that the DPRK would freeze and dismantle its reactors and related facilities and remain a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The Agreed Framework further provided for the United States to make arrangements to offset the energy foregone from the freezing of the graphite-moderated reactors, pending completion of the first light-water reactor unit.

42. As envisaged in the Agreed Framework, IAEA was to monitor the “freeze” of the graphite-moderated reactor and related facilities of the DPRK to ensure that it came into full compliance with its safeguards agreement with IAEA before delivery of key nuclear components for the light-water reactor. Nevertheless, the Agency has been unable to do so.

43. Following developments that started in October 2002 relating to its nuclear programme and a subsequent escalation of events, on 12 December, the DPRK announced that it was lifting the freeze on its nuclear facilities maintained pursuant to the 1994 Agreed Framework and that it would resume operation of those facilities for power generation. On 27 December, it requested IAEA to remove its inspectors from the country. On 10 January 2003, the DPRK notified the Security Council as well as the States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty of its decision to withdraw from the Treaty. On 5 February, the DPRK announced that it had reactivated the nuclear facilities.

44. Recent resolutions adopted by the IAEA Board of Governors on 29 November 2002 (GOV/2002/60), on 6 January 2003 (GOV/2003/3) and on 12 February 2003 (GOV/2003/14) reiterated the Board’s previous calls to the DPRK to comply fully and promptly with its safeguards agreement and, to that end, to cooperate fully with the Agency. In the most recent of the resolutions, the Board further decided to report, as provided for in article XII.C. of the IAEA statute, through the Director General, the non-compliance on the part of the DPRK and the Agency’s inability to verify the non-diversion of nuclear material subject to safeguards, to all members of the Agency and to the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations, and in parallel stressed its desire for a peaceful resolution of the DPRK nuclear issue and its support for diplomatic means to that end.

45. Nuclear test explosions conducted by India and Pakistan in 1998 brought about strong international censure. The Security Council, in its resolution 1172 (1998), adopted unanimously on 6 June 1998, condemned the nuclear tests and set out a number of steps to be implemented by the States concerned, aimed at reversing the course they had undertaken. Subsequently, the two States declared moratoria on further testing and indicated their willingness to enter into legal commitments not to conduct any further testing by signing and ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. India stated that, although it had already accepted the basic obligations of the Treaty, its accession to the Treaty required the creation of a
positive security environment that would establish the widest possible national consensus. Pakistan stated that its adherence to the Treaty would take place only in conditions free from coercion or pressure and expressed its expectation that the arbitrary restrictions imposed on the country by multilateral institutions and sanctions would be lifted. Pakistan further underlined the need to build up domestic consensus in favour of the Treaty.

46. Subsequent to the nuclear test explosions in South Asia in 1998, India and Pakistan signed an Agreement on the Prohibition of Attacks against Nuclear Installations and Facilities. The Agreement stipulates that India and Pakistan shall refrain from undertaking, encouraging or participating in, directly or indirectly, any action aimed at causing the destruction of, or damage to, any nuclear installation or facility in the other country. The Agreement further provides for each party to advise the other on 1 January, each year, of the latitude and longitude of its nuclear installations and facilities, as well as to inform each other of any other changes whenever they occur.

47. In January 2002, Pakistan stated that it would not adopt a no-first-use policy on nuclear weapons. At the same time, Pakistan declared that it would seek to denuclearize South Asia and to sign a no-war agreement with India.

48. In January 2003, the Cabinet Committee on Security of India, in reviewing the progress in operationalization of the draft nuclear doctrine issued in August 1999, reaffirmed that it would pursue a credible minimum nuclear deterrence for retaliation only. At the same time, it reiterated its commitment to global nuclear disarmament and to the policies of no first use and no use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or those which are not in alliance with nuclear-weapon States. On the same occasion, India announced the establishment of its Nuclear Command Authority, which includes a Political Council as the sole body to authorize the use of nuclear weapons.

49. In its resolution 57/97 of 22 November 2002, the General Assembly called upon Israel to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty without further delay — which it reaffirmed as important in realizing the goal of universal adherence to the Treaty in the Middle East — not to develop, produce, test or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, and to place all its unsafeguarded nuclear facilities under full-scope IAEA safeguards as an important confidence-building measure among all States of the region and as a step towards enhancing peace and security.

B. Achievements and developments at the regional level

50. The important contribution of nuclear-weapon-free zones to the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and the process of nuclear disarmament, as well as to regional and world peace and security, has been universally recognized. To date, numerous States have signed or become parties to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones covering more than 50 per cent of the Earth’s land mass.

51. The importance of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been given added recognition through the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. In 1993, the Commission unanimously adopted guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, which
includes the establishment of zones free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction as regional measures that contribute to disarmament and arms limitation. Subsequently, at its 1999 session, the Commission, again unanimously, adopted guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned.

52. The Antarctic Treaty, which was signed on 1 December 1959 and entered into force on 23 June 1961, established the first continental demilitarized zone. The Treaty prohibits the use of Antarctica for military purposes, as well as any nuclear explosions and the disposal of radioactive waste material in the region. The treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba have contributed towards the achievement of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament objectives, particularly in the southern hemisphere and adjacent areas, and towards keeping the areas covered by those Treaties free of nuclear weapons, in accordance with international law.

53. The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) was the first such Treaty to be established in a populated region of the world. It was opened for signature on 14 February 1967 and has been in force since 25 April 1969. In 1990, the Treaty was amended also to cover the Caribbean region. All 33 States in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean have signed and ratified the Treaty. The nuclear-weapon States have signed and ratified the relevant protocols to the Treaty.

54. The South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty (Rarotonga Treaty) was endorsed by the then South Pacific Forum on 6 August 1985. The Treaty has been ratified by 13 States in the region and entered into force on 11 December 1986. It stresses the deep commitment of the States members of the Forum to the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons and to keeping the Pacific region free of environmental pollution. With the exception of the United States, the nuclear-weapon States have signed and ratified the relevant protocols to the Treaty.

55. The Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Treaty of Bangkok) was signed on 15 December 1995. It has been ratified by all 10 States in South-East Asia and entered into force on 27 March 1997. At the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the nuclear-weapon States declared that consultations with the States parties to the Treaty of Bangkok had been accelerated, so as to pave the way for adherence by the nuclear-weapon States to the protocol on security assurances to that Treaty. Despite those efforts, the nuclear-weapon States have yet to sign the protocol to the Treaty.

56. In June 1995, the then Organization of African Unity (OAU) agreed to establish the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zone Treaty (Pelindaba Treaty). The Treaty was opened for signature on 11 April 1996 and will enter into force on the date of deposit of the twenty-eighth instrument of ratification. To date, 16 States, out of the 50 that have signed the Treaty, have ratified it. The successor to OAU, the African Union, considers the Treaty to be the culmination of the principles on the denuclearization of Africa espoused by the African heads of State and Government since the inception of OAU in May 1963. It has urged its member States to expedite ratification of the Treaty. All nuclear-weapon States have signed the relevant protocols to the Treaty. China and France have also ratified them.

3 In 2000, the South Pacific Forum was renamed as the Pacific Islands Forum.
Since the adoption of the Almaty Declaration in 1997, the five States of the Central Asian region — Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan — have been negotiating the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. By the end of 2002, the negotiations had reached positive results with agreement by the five States, at the expert level, on the text of the treaty. The General Assembly, in its resolution 57/69 of 22 November 2002, welcomed the decision by the five States to sign the Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free-zone treaty as soon as possible.

A proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East was first inscribed in the agenda of the General Assembly in 1974. Since 1980, the General Assembly has annually adopted without a vote a resolution on the subject. The 1995 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference also addressed the issue of the Middle East and adopted a resolution, co-sponsored by the depositary States of the Treaty (Russian Federation, United Kingdom and United States). The resolution reaffirmed the importance of the early realization of universal adherence to the Treaty and called upon all States in the Middle East to take practical steps in appropriate forums aimed at making progress towards, inter alia, the establishment of an effectively verifiable Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological, and their delivery systems, and to refrain from taking any measures that preclude the achievement of that objective. The 2000 Review Conference reaffirmed the importance of the 1995 resolution and recognized that it remained valid until the goals and objectives expressed therein were achieved.

C. Achievements and developments at the multilateral level

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which entered into force in 1970, was indefinitely extended at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. At the same Conference, States parties also adopted decisions on “Strengthening the review process for the Treaty” and on “Principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament”, as well as a resolution on the Middle East (see para. 58 above). At the 2000 Review Conference, States parties agreed on practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the Treaty, including an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under article VI of the Treaty. States parties further reaffirmed that “the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”. With a total of 188 States parties, the Non-Proliferation Treaty is the most widely adhered to multilateral treaty in the area of disarmament.

In 1996, the Conference on Disarmament successfully concluded negotiations on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, which was adopted by the General Assembly on 10 September 1996 and opened for signature on 24 September 1996 in New York. The Treaty has been signed by 166 States and ratified by 97 States, including three nuclear-weapon States. Of the 44 States listed in annex 2 to the Treaty, whose adherence is required for entry into force of the Treaty in accordance with article XIV, 31 States have deposited their instruments of ratification. Article XIV further provides that, if the Treaty has not entered into force three years after
the date of the anniversary of its opening for signature, a conference of ratifying States may be convened to decide what measures consistent with international law may be taken to accelerate the ratification process and to facilitate the entry into force of the Treaty. Two such conferences have been held, in 1999 and 2001, respectively. Final Declarations were adopted at both Conferences, stressing the importance of a universal and internationally and effectively verifiable comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty as a major instrument in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects.

61. Since 1999, the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to agree on a substantive programme of work that would allow it to commence negotiations on new norms in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. These would include the re-establishment of the ad hoc committee to negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, as well as the establishment of an appropriate subsidiary body with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament.

62. On 9 June 1998, the Foreign Ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden issued a joint declaration entitled “Towards a Nuclear Weapon Free World: The Need for a New Agenda”, calling upon the nuclear-weapon States and the nuclear-weapon-capable States to commit themselves unequivocally to the elimination of their respective nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons capability. Since then, those States, comprising what is known as the “New Agenda Coalition”, have sponsored relevant resolutions in the General Assembly, entitled “Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda”. On 13 September 2002, the Foreign Ministers of the coalition issued a further ministerial declaration wherein they expressed their dissatisfaction at the lack of progress in implementing the undertakings made by States parties at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and reaffirmed their view that the indefinite possession of nuclear weapons was incompatible with the non-proliferation regime and with the broader goal of promoting international peace and security.

63. The heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, at their twelfth summit in August 1998 at Durban, South Africa, reiterated that with the end of the cold war, there was no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They further recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests and expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament. In the Final Declaration adopted at the thirteenth summit of the Non-Aligned Movement held in Kuala Lumpur from 20 to 25 February 2003, the heads of State and Government reiterated their previous statements and stressed their concern at the threat to humanity derived from the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use. They underscored the need to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons and emphasized, in that regard, the urgent need to commence negotiations without delay. Furthermore, they reaffirmed that the total elimination of nuclear weapons was the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
64. On 24 April 1999, the heads of State and Government of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) approved the “Alliance’s Strategic Concept”. The document stated that the fundamental purpose of the nuclear forces of the alliance was to preserve peace and to prevent coercion and any kind of war, and that such forces were the supreme guarantee of the security of the Allies. It was further stated that the NATO alliance would maintain for the foreseeable future an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional forces based in Europe. Those forces were to be kept at a minimum sufficient level and up-to-date where necessary. At the same time, NATO stated that it had undertaken a reduction of types and numbers of its sub-strategic forces, including the elimination of all nuclear artillery and ground-launched short-range nuclear missiles; a relaxation of the readiness criteria for nuclear-rolled forces; and the termination of standing peacetime nuclear contingency plans. In addition, NATO declared that its nuclear forces no longer targeted any country.

65. On 27 June 2002, the leaders of the States comprising the Group of Eight (G8) agreed on a Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction. Under that initiative, the G8 Governments committed themselves to raise up to US$ 20 billion over 10 years to support specific cooperation projects, initially in the Russian Federation, to address non-proliferation, disarmament, counter-terrorism and nuclear safety issues.

66. The elimination of missiles and other nuclear-weapon delivery vehicles has long been a goal of the international community, as recognized in the preamble to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The issue of missiles has also been before the General Assembly, which at its fifty-seventh session in 2002 considered a report of the Secretary-General on the issue of missiles in all its aspects (A/57/229). The report, which was prepared by a Panel of Governmental Experts established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 55/33 A of 20 November 2000, noted that issues related to missiles in all their aspects were regarded as serious concerns for international peace and security in the world today. While noting the existence of international measures in the field of missiles, the Panel acknowledged that there are at present no universally accepted norms or instruments specifically governing the development, testing, production, acquisition, transfer, deployment or use of missiles. The report concluded that it is essential to have continued international efforts to deal with the issue of missiles in the interest of international peace and security and that the issues identified therein and all approaches undertaken at the national, bilateral, regional, plurilateral and multilateral levels, including the initiatives described in the report, need to be further explored.

67. In November 2002, the International Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation was launched at The Hague. Under the Code, subscribing States are to ratify, accede to, or otherwise abide by, the Outer Space Treaty, the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects and the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space; to curb and prevent the proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction; and to exercise the maximum possible restraint in the development, testing and
deployment of such missiles. The Code also contains transparency measures on ballistic missile programmes and space-launch vehicle programmes. Currently, 101 States subscribe to the Code.

D. Other initiatives

68. In November 1995, the Government of Australia established the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons as an independent commission to propose practical steps towards a nuclear-weapon-free world, including the related problem of maintaining stability and security both during the transitional period and after the goal is achieved. Composed of statesmen, scientists, diplomats and strategic thinkers, the Commission met from January to August 1996. The Commission, inter alia, called upon the nuclear-weapon States to give the lead by committing themselves, unequivocally, to the elimination of all nuclear weapons and to agree to start work immediately on the practical steps and negotiations required for its realization. It further called upon all other Governments to join that commitment and contribute to its achievement.

69. The Tokyo Forum for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, an independent panel of experts, was established by the Government of Japan in August 1998 with the aim of identifying how the international community could meet the challenges posed by proliferation and increasing nuclear dangers and address the urgent need to halt the decline in regional and international security. At the conclusion of its work in July 1999, the forum issued its report, entitled “Facing Nuclear Dangers: An Action Plan for the Twenty-first Century”, which examines the dangers posed to international peace and security by nuclear weapons and provides recommendations for concrete actions in the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

III. Mechanisms dealing with nuclear disarmament and the role of the United Nations

70. To give effect and provide support to their efforts in the field of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, Governments have created relevant mechanisms and machinery both within and outside the United Nations. They have also, within the framework of specific multilateral agreements, established organizations mandated to implement and contribute to the strengthening of those agreements. The present section provides a brief survey of the existing mechanisms.

A. Mechanisms dealing with nuclear disarmament within the United Nations system

71. The General Assembly of the United Nations devotes special attention to the issue of disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, through the work of its First Committee, as well as the Disarmament Commission. In addition, the Assembly has held special sessions entirely devoted to disarmament. Three special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament have been held thus far, namely, in 1978, 1982 and 1988, addressing issues that included nuclear disarmament, non-
proliferation, peace, security and stability. Paragraphs 1, 2, 8 and 9 above provide further information on the special sessions.

72. Throughout its history, the First Committee has consistently devoted a large portion of its work to the consideration of issues relating to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. At the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly in 2002, 17 items on the agenda of the Committee were related to nuclear issues, resulting in the adoption of resolutions calling for action by Member States and the Secretary-General aimed at furthering nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

73. The Disarmament Commission was originally established in 1952 under the Security Council by General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952 with a general mandate on disarmament questions. However, it met only occasionally after 1959. In 1978, it was re-established by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, as a deliberative body of the General Assembly, with the function of considering and making recommendations on various issues in the field of disarmament and of following up on the relevant decisions and recommendations of the special session. It is a measure of the effectiveness of the Disarmament Commission that in the past decade it has produced five sets of guidelines on important areas, including two on nuclear issues.

74. The Department for Disarmament Affairs was established in 1982 pursuant to a decision by the General Assembly at its twelfth special session and functioned as such until 1992. It was reinstated in 1998. The Department, inter alia, facilitates the process of multilateral deliberation and negotiation and assists Member States in promoting, strengthening and consolidating multilaterally negotiated principles and norms in all areas of disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. It provides support to conferences and meetings of States parties to multilateral disarmament agreements, including the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and supports the effective implementation of those treaties. It promotes the goal of nuclear disarmament with a view to progressive reductions in nuclear weapons and their complete elimination at the earliest possible date. As extensions of the work of the Department for Disarmament Affairs at the regional level, United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament have been established by the General Assembly in Africa (1986), in Latin America and the Caribbean (1987) and in Asia and the Pacific (1988) to provide support to regional approaches to arms control and disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, thereby contributing to enhancing regional security and stability. The regional centres provide technical servicing and substantive assistance on issues of nuclear disarmament, among others, in order to promote transparency and confidence.

75. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters was established in 1978 pursuant to a decision of the General Assembly at its tenth special session and received its current mandate from the General Assembly at its fifty-fourth session.

---

6 At the fifty-seventh session, 19 resolutions and decisions relating to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation were adopted (resolutions 57/55, 57/56, 57/57, 57/58, 57/59, 57/67, 57/68, 57/69, 57/71, 57/73, 57/78, 57/79, 57/80, 57/84, 57/85, 57/94, 57/97, 57/100 and decision 57/515).

7 The Disarmament Commission adopted “Guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security” in 1993 and “Establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned” in 1999.
The functions of the Advisory Board include advising the Secretary-General on matters within the area of arms limitation and disarmament, including on studies and research under the auspices of the United Nations or institutions within the United Nations system, to serve as the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and to advise the Secretary-General on the implementation of the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme. In the area of nuclear disarmament, pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 54/54 K of 1 December 1999 and 55/33 N of 20 November 2000, the Secretary-General sought inputs from the Advisory Board on information with regard to specific measures that would significantly reduce the risk of nuclear war. Relevant reports were submitted to the General Assembly at its fifty-fifth and fifty-sixth sessions, respectively, the more recent one containing seven measures that, in the view of the Advisory Board, should receive particular emphasis for reducing nuclear dangers.

76. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) was established by the General Assembly at its tenth special session in 1978. It undertakes independent research on disarmament and related problems, particularly international security issues. UNIDIR is mandated to provide the international community with more diversified and complete data on problems relating to international security, the arms race and disarmament in all fields, particularly in the nuclear field. The Institute also has the responsibility to assist ongoing negotiations on disarmament and continuing efforts to ensure greater international security at a progressively lower level of armaments, particularly nuclear armaments, by means of objective and factual studies and analyses.

B. Other mechanisms dealing with nuclear disarmament

77. The Conference on Disarmament was established in 1979 (under the name of Committee on Disarmament) as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, further to a decision of the General Assembly at its tenth special session in 1978. It succeeded the negotiating efforts of its predecessors, including the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament (1960), the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (1962-1968) and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (1969-1978). In the nuclear field, the Conference on Disarmament and its predecessors concluded negotiations on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in 1968 and on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in August 1996.

78. Established in 1956, the International Atomic Energy Agency has the objective of seeking to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace,}

---

8 A/55/324 and A/56/400.
9 The seven measures are: (a) promoting a wide-ranging international dialogue on cooperative security; (b) preliminary political and technical measures in preparation for the possibility of convening, at the appropriate time, a major international conference that would help to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers; (c) de-alerting of nuclear weapons; (d) review of nuclear doctrines; (e) further reduction of tactical nuclear weapons as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process; (f) enhancing security at a global and a regional level by promoting increased transparency of all nuclear weapons programmes; and (g) creating a climate for implementing nuclear disarmament measures: Programmes of education and training on the dangers of nuclear weapons would foster an informed world public opinion that would be able to exercise a positive influence on the political will to eliminate nuclear weapons.
health and prosperity throughout the world, as well as to ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose. The Agency is the competent authority to establish and administer safeguards designed to ensure that special fissionable and other materials, services, equipment, facilities and information made available by the Agency or at its request or under its supervision or control are not used in such a way as to further any military purpose; and to apply safeguards, at the request of the parties, to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, or at the request of a State, to any of that State’s activities in the field of atomic energy. To this end, IAEA verifies compliance relating to its safeguards agreements with the States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the Rarotonga Treaty. In May 1997, the IAEA Board of Governors approved the Model Additional Protocol, a strengthened safeguards system, which will provide the Agency with enhanced information about a State’s nuclear activities and complementary access to locations within a State. There are at present 136 comprehensive safeguards agreements in force. Under the Additional Protocol safeguards, there are 74 approvals by the Board of Governors, 67 signatories and 28 contracting States.

79. The Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization was established by the States signatories to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty on 19 November 1996. The Preparatory Commission is mandated to carry out the necessary preparations for the effective implementation of the Treaty and to prepare for the first session of the Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty. Since 1997, the main task of the Preparatory Commission has been the establishment of the International Monitoring System, comprising 337 facilities, and the International Data Centre, as well as the development of operational manuals, including for on-site inspections. These will constitute the global verification regime envisaged in the Treaty to monitor compliance with the comprehensive ban on explosive nuclear testing.

80. The Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL), an intergovernmental agency created to oversee the implementation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, was established in 1967, in accordance with article 7 of the Treaty. OPANAL supervises adherence by States parties to the control system to verify compliance to, and the obligations stemming from, the Treaty.

81. Article 9 of the Rarotonga Treaty provides for a reporting system and for the exchange of information among the States parties under the responsibility of the depositary of the Treaty, the Director of the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Cooperation. Annex 3 to the Treaty provides for a Consultative Committee for consultation and cooperation on any matter arising in relation to the Treaty or for reviewing its operation.

82. Article 12 of the Treaty of Pelindaba provides for the establishment of an African Commission on Nuclear Energy to ensure compliance by States parties with their undertakings under the Treaty. The Commission will be established when the Treaty enters into force.

83. The Commission for the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, comprising the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, was established in accordance with
article 8 of the Treaty of Bangkok and inaugurated in July 1999. The Commission is responsible for implementing the provisions of the Treaty, including the establishment of verification and control procedures.

IV. Ways and means to achieve nuclear disarmament

84. The present section lists proposals made by delegations at the 2000 and 2001 sessions of the Disarmament Commission within the framework of Working Group I.

85. The Disarmament Commission considers the following as possible ways and means to achieve nuclear disarmament:

1. Practical steps from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty:
   
   (a) The importance and urgency of signatures and ratifications, without delay and without conditions and in accordance with constitutional processes, to achieve the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

   (b) A moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

   (c) The necessity of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices in accordance with the statement of the Special Coordinator in 1995 and the mandate contained therein, taking into consideration both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives. The Conference on Disarmament is urged to agree on a programme of work, which includes the immediate commencement of negotiations on such a treaty with a view to their conclusion within five years.

   (d) The necessity of establishing in the Conference on Disarmament an appropriate subsidiary body with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament is urged to agree on a programme of work which includes the immediate establishment of such a body.

   (e) The principle of irreversibility to apply to nuclear disarmament, nuclear and other related arms control and reduction measures.

   (f) An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under article VI.

   (g) The early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems as a cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons, in accordance with its provisions.
(h) The completion and implementation of the Trilateral Initiative between the United States of America, the Russian Federation and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(i) Steps by all the nuclear-weapon States leading to nuclear disarmament in a way that promotes international stability, and based on the principle of undiminished security for all:

(i) Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon States to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally;

(ii) Increased transparency by the nuclear-weapon States with regard to the nuclear weapons capabilities and the implementation of agreements pursuant to article VI and as a voluntary confidence-building measure to support further progress on nuclear disarmament;

(iii) The further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process;

(iv) Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems;

(v) A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination;

(vi) The engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon States in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

(j) Arrangements by all nuclear-weapon States to place, as soon as practicable, fissile material designated by each of them as no longer required for military purposes under IAEA or other relevant international verification and arrangements for the disposition of such material for peaceful purposes, to ensure that such material remains permanently outside military programmes.

(k) Reaffirmation that the ultimate objective of the efforts of States in the disarmament process is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(l) Regular reports, within the framework of the strengthened review process for the Non-Proliferation Treaty, by all States parties on the implementation of article VI and paragraph 4 (c) of the 1995 decision on “Principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament”, and recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 8 July 1996.

(m) The further development of the verification capabilities that will be required to provide assurance of compliance with nuclear disarmament agreements for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

2. Strict observance of the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty by its States parties and the achievement of the goal of universality of the Treaty.
3. The review process of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in accordance with the decision on “Strengthening the review process for the Treaty” adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and in accordance with the provisions for “Improving the effectiveness of the strengthened review process for the Treaty” contained in the Final Document adopted at the 2000 Review Conference.

4. The Global Control System for the Non-Proliferation of Missiles and Missile Technology proposed by the Russian Federation in June 1999 and presented to the General Assembly at its fifty-fourth session.


6. The Missile Technology Control Regime as an informal and voluntary association of countries which share the goals of non-proliferation of unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, and which seek to coordinate national export-licensing efforts aimed at preventing their proliferation.

7. Multilateral negotiations on international agreements on norms against the development of missiles.

8. Consolidation of [support for] the existing nuclear-weapon-free zones and establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, and the guidelines laid down by the Disarmament Commission.

9. Signature and ratification of the Treaties of Rarotonga and Pelindaba by all regional States, as well as the signature and ratification by the nuclear-weapon States that have not yet done so of the relevant protocols to those Treaties, recognizing that security assurances are available to States parties to those Treaties.


11. Establishment of an ad hoc committee on security assurances in the Conference on Disarmament.

12. Achievement of a multilateral, legally binding instrument on negative security assurances.

13. Establishment of an ad hoc group on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in the Conference on Disarmament.

14. Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

15. Commencement of multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.
16. An international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers as recommended by heads of State and Government of the States Members of the United Nations in the Millennium Declaration.

17. Commitment by the nuclear-weapon States to withdraw and not to deploy their nuclear weapons outside their national territories.

18. The nuclear-weapon States to stop [immediately] the qualitative improvement, development, production and stockpiling of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems.

19. The nuclear-weapon States to remove [review] the first-use posture from security doctrines and to agree on an internationally and legally binding instrument on the joint undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and to conclude an internationally and legally binding instrument on security assurances of non-use and non-threat-of-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

20. Consolidation, in an irreversible manner, of the cessation and reversal of the arms race of the cold war, concrete progress towards nuclear disarmament and reinforcement of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime.

21. Universal adherence to international norms and conventions in the area of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

22. Revitalization of unilateral and bilateral nuclear reduction processes, which should be further complemented by reduction within a multilateral framework.

23. Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

[This section is to be completed on the basis of discussions and recommendations made by Member States at the 2003 session of the Disarmament Commission.]
Mr. Chairman,

Excellencies,

Distinguished delegates,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

- I am extremely gratified by this first opportunity in my new capacity as Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, to address the members of this Commission as it begins its work on the important agenda before it. I should firstly like to extend my personal congratulations to you, Mr. Chairman, on your appointment to guide the work of this Commission. I also wish to and assure you all of the fullest cooperation and support from the Department for Disarmament Affairs. I and my colleagues look forward to providing whatever assistance may be required to ensure that this will be a productive session.
- I also wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to the Chairman of the 2005 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, Ambassador Sylvester Rowe of Sierra Leone, for his own strenuous and ultimately successful efforts to reach agreement on a substantive agenda for the 2006 session.

***********************

- We meet at a particularly difficult and challenging moment for disarmament and non-proliferation, and at a time of heightened international concern about weapons of mass destruction – particularly nuclear weapons. In addition to this there is now the possibility of acquisition by terrorists of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the all too numerous everyday tragedies of death from small arms.

- Indeed, the scale of the difficulties we face at the present time should not be underestimated. Last year’s World Summit demonstrated all too eloquently that States could not agree on the way forward on disarmament, non-proliferation, and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

- I believe that the words of the Secretary-General perfectly encapsulate both the nature of our present difficulties and also set them in their wider context. In his address to the World Summit in September 2005 he said:

- “Twice this year - at the NPT review conference, and now at this Summit - we have allowed posturing to get in the way of results. This is inexcusable. Weapons of mass
destruction pose a grave danger to us all, particularly in a world threatened by terrorists with global ambitions and no inhibitions. We must pick up the pieces in order to renew negotiations on this vital issue...”

- Recent developments have further tested the effectiveness of multilateral disarmament machinery. The UN Disarmament Commission plays a unique role. However, the Commission’s recent record has itself been far from satisfactory. In 2003 the session concluded without reaching consensus on concrete proposals to advance nuclear disarmament or confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms. No consensus was achieved on agenda items for its 2004 and 2005 sessions, and no substantive meetings were held in 2005.

- In 2006 I believe that we have to do better. It falls in large measure to this session of the UNDC to provide fresh momentum. One should not lose such an opportunity.

- It is imperative that we draw lessons from the setbacks that we witnessed last year. The lack of consensus on any text on disarmament and non-proliferation in the 2005 Summit Outcome document simply shows how much work remains to be done in this area. We should move forward from lamenting the lack of consensus documents and, as the President of the General Assembly Jan Eliasson encouraged, we make “new and creative thinking in all appropriate fora.”
- By agreeing in December 2005 on the agenda item on “Recommendations for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects, in particular for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament” – in addition to the item on conventional disarmament – the Disarmament Commission now has a substantive agenda for its new three-year cycle of consideration.

- It is our responsibility, more than ever, to use this opportunity to strengthen the disarmament machinery to effectively deal with new emerging threats and challenges.

****************

- It is to be hoped therefore that over the next three weeks you will be able to provide guidance on the fundamental question of complete nuclear disarmament.

- States need to build common and shared understanding of the most immediate nuclear threats and with it a systematic analysis of how changing threat perceptions influence the way we address the challenges of disarmament and non-proliferation.

- As the NPT is a landmark international treaty whose objective it is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament, you may wish, for example, to consider what practical steps might be taken to ensure the continuing relevance and strength of the Treaty. The urgency of international concern about the imminent risk
of proliferation is very evident but it should not be forgotten at the same time that, globally, nuclear weapons continue to be numbered in their thousands.

- Ultimately the outcome will depend on close cooperation between countries from every region of the world as well as international organisations, research institutions and think-tanks. While certainly the NPT review process is the important arena for assessing progress in implementing the global nuclear non-proliferation norm, the Disarmament Commission has the advantage of being a fully universal deliberative body, which enables it to complement the goals of the NPT review process. Working in tandem, these two arenas offer great potential to move the global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation agenda forward. I therefore call on all States to reflect on and implement concerted actions based on pragmatism and realism.

**************************************

- The preponderant focus on the WMD threat should not lessen our attention to the matters relating to the regulation and reduction of conventional arms and armed forces. Despite the fact that much progress has been made by the international community in certain areas, such as for instance in addressing the problem of illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, their proliferation continues to pose a serious threat to peace and security in too many regions of the world. Symptomatic treatment and ad hoc solutions cannot yield durable results; there is a need for increased openness and transparency with regard to legitimate arms transfers for defensive purposes. Such openness will promote confidence. The challenge before the Commission is to consider and adopt measures that will contribute to reducing the threat to international
peace and security posed by conventional weapons, while protecting the inherent right of all Member States to the means of self-defense. I believe that agreement among states on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons may alleviate pressures to acquire such weaponry, and encourage responsible conduct in the transfer of major conventional weapon systems, while reducing the risk of armed conflict.

- I hope that in your consideration on the issue you could build on the achievements of the 2003 session, taking into due consideration the developments since then.

**********************

- In conclusion, I should like to draw your attention to one part of the World Summit Outcome Document on Strengthening the United Nations, which said the following:

“We reaffirm our commitment to strengthen the United Nations with a view to enhancing its authority and efficiency, as well as its capacity to address effectively, and in accordance with the purposes and principles of its Charter, the full range of challenges of our time. We are determined to reinvigorate the intergovernmental organs of the United Nations and to adapt them to the needs of the twenty-first century.”

- The Summit gave renewed emphasis to such efforts, of which I see this session of UNDC as being an integral part. It is for that reason I look forward to the contribution
that can be made by Member States to achieving this wider objective during the coming session. I am confident that you will find ways of making the Commission more effective as part of the overall efforts to reform of the United Nations.

- We meet at a time when there is a continuing – and deeply depressing - stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, due to an inability to reach agreement on a substantive programme of work. It is therefore now all the more important to revitalize and reaffirm the deliberative function of the Disarmament Commission.

- As part of the multilateral disarmament machinery, the UN Disarmament Commission should continue to play its own unique role. For these reasons, I strongly hope that the Commission will be able to commence meaningful deliberations on the substantive issues this year, so as to demonstrate its continuing potential as an important and vital forum for the discussion of disarmament issues. I therefore call on delegations not to add organizational obstacles to the complexity of the issues before the Commission. I strongly encourage all delegations concerned to intensify their consultations on the nomination for the Chairperson of Working Group 1 as soon as possible so that the Commission could begin work on all its substantive agenda items.

- Please accept my very best wishes for an effective, successful and productive session.

- Thank you.
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I am honoured to address the Disarmament Commission as it opens its 2012 substantive session and wish to commend its departing Chairman, Ambassador Hamid Al Bayati, for his competent stewardship of the work of this Commission, and to recognize with appreciation the many efforts of his Bureau. I also wish to congratulate Ambassador Enrique Román-Morey on his election as the Chairman of the 2012 session. The Office for Disarmament Affairs stands ready to assist the Chairman, the Bureau, and all delegations throughout this session.

Because this is my first opportunity to address you in my capacity as High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, I would like to say just a few words of a personal nature, while paying tribute to my distinguished predecessor, Sergio Duarte, who has worked so tirelessly and with such dedication to further our goals in the field of disarmament.

I first began working in the UN Secretariat some 30+ years ago, and later joined the Department for Disarmament Affairs in the 1980s when I had the privilege of working on the World Disarmament Campaign. I have since learned that while you can take the person out of disarmament, you cannot take disarmament out of the person. There is a good reason for this—the fate of humanity very much depends on progress in this field.

While progress has been limited over these years in disarmament—especially nuclear disarmament—the international community has a history of overcoming disappointments in this field, which offers us something on which to build. Let us consider the following.

When I started my career at the UN, four of the world’s five nuclear-weapon-free zones had not yet been established. There was no Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention had less than half its 163 parties today. There was no Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. No indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. No START, no Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, and no New START treaties. No Mine Ban Convention. No Inhumane Weapons Convention. No Convention on Cluster Munitions. No Programme of Action on Small Arms. No General Assembly Special Sessions on Disarmament. No Security Council summits addressing nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation issues. No detailed proposal by a Secretary-General for achieving global nuclear disarmament. And several major regional conventional arms treaties around the world had not yet been concluded.

There has been some welcome progress in disarmament and non-proliferation education, where programmes have succeeded in reaching a new generation who—sooner than we all might realize—will have to bear their own responsibilities in these challenging fields. The challenges ahead in this field are to sustain and expand this progress.

As for the UN Disarmament Commission, by 1977 it had rarely met in the previous 18 years. Yet in the 20 years to follow from 1979 to 1999, it was able to adopt by consensus sixteen guidelines, recommendations, and declarations. As we consider the Commission’s inability to achieve a consensus since 1999, we sometimes forget that progress is possible even amid great differences among policies and priorities of our Member States. If such progress was possible during some of the darker days of the Cold War, surely such progress should be possible today.

The Commission continues to play an important role in the overall UN disarmament machinery, primarily through its deliberations on specific issues relating to nuclear weapons and
conventional arms. The guidelines and recommendations adopted by the Commission have the potential to inspire not only future General Assembly resolutions, but can also potentially lay the conceptual foundations for new multilateral treaties. Fulfilling this potential, however, will require the Commission to be much more than a platform for articulating national policies.

When the Commission has made progress, it has done so because its members have recognized how national interests are advanced by the pursuit of common interests. The greatest obstacles to progress in disarmament have long been the lack of trust or confidence in proposed initiatives due to uncertainties or possibly suspicions about their true motivations. The purely deliberative role of the Commission offers one way of breaking down such suspicions. This may well be the greatest contribution the Commission can make in meeting global disarmament challenges.

If fresh thinking and new ideas are needed, the Commission may wish to re-visit past proposals to invite experts to join our deliberations. I note that at the end of its 2008 session, the Commission discussed the Chairman’s proposal on procedural and organizational elements for the possible participation of experts in the work of the Commission—and also decided to continue the consideration of this issue in the future.

The Commission’s 2012 session is occurring in a dynamic political environment. Soon, the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference will hold its first session. Soon, negotiations will begin at the United Nations on an arms trade treaty. Soon, States will be reviewing the implementation of the Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons. Soon, preparations will be underway to open a new session of the First Committee of the General Assembly. And by the end of this year, a conference will convene to consider the issue of establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Today we are seeing countless initiatives to promote disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and the Commission definitely has its own contributions to make in these areas. Some positive steps forward by the Disarmament Commission could well help in promoting progress elsewhere in the UN disarmament machinery, by showing that progress is indeed possible.

There is no chance that disarmament will cease to be a priority of an overwhelming majority of Member States and billions of people in civil society around the world. It is an issue Dag Hammarskjold called a “hardy perennial” at the United Nations even in back in 1955, and expectations for progress are high and continuing to grow.

The Commission now has a chance to rise to these expectations. By adopting a new three-year deliberative agenda, it can collectively cast its vote for multilateralism, for disarmament as an essential means to strengthen international peace and security, and for the United Nations as an indispensable common forum for the pursuit of common interests.

For even despite the undeniable progress that has been made in the past three decades, there obviously remains much important work to do. Key treaty regimes still fall short of universal membership. Some tens of thousands of nuclear weapons reportedly still remain, sustained by long-term modernization plans and large budgets. The international rule of law has
been unevenly developed in certain fields, including nuclear weapons, conventional arms, and long-range missiles. Unresolved nuclear weapon proliferation concerns continue to foster instabilities in the Middle East, South Asia, and Northeast Asia.

It is my great hope that today the Commission will start a new phase in its evolution within the UN disarmament machinery—an era in which compromises are possible on means, but not on fundamental principles and ends; an era identified by its high level of multilateral cooperation in addressing common interests; and an era known for the fulfilment of hopes rather than the aggravation of fears. I wish the Chairman and all members of this Commission well in your deliberations and look forward to contributing in any way I can to your success.
UN Disarmament Commission
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Australia has a longstanding commitment to disarmament and non-proliferation, and pursuing these goals in the UN fora is a key priority. Two weeks ago, Prime Minister Gillard reaffirmed Australia’s commitment to a world free of nuclear weapons and called for a range of specific measures to reach this goal in a parliamentary motion, supported by the Leader of the Opposition, so this is a unanimous national purpose and will always be. We are therefore committed to working with the Chairman and States to contribute to the achievement of these goals in the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC).

Australia has a substantial history of what we trust has been active, practical engagement, and often leadership, in promoting global disarmament and non-proliferation -- through bringing the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the General Assembly, through establishing the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons and more recently the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, through our active support for extension and implementation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and our active support for the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). Our approach is a practical, realistic and focused on securing real progress. We undertake to continue this approach in this UNDC.

We see the UNDC as important in that it can facilitate non-binding thinking and ideas on our shared nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and conventional arms control goals. We support a focussed agenda on these two areas. We have to move on well worn items and consider creative means to move forward these agendas. Ideally our deliberations would have a positive influence on and provide food for thought for the work of other UN theatres.

Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation is one of the most pressing challenges facing the world -- which is why the UNDC must address this issue. We support the Chairman’s proposals for the agenda, and particularly the compromise solution proposed yesterday. Noting ongoing informal discussions on the agenda, let me be clear that on Australia’s part, we want a world without nuclear weapons, we want a world free of nuclear weapons, we want
total elimination of nuclear weapons, and want a nuclear weapon free world. Because for us, these formulations would essentially achieve the same goal - an end to nuclear weapons. Disarmament and non-proliferation are essential components to this ultimate goal of a world without nuclear weapons and we are looking forward to addressing both in a focussed way this cycle of the UNDC.

The timing of this UNDC is important because it comes ahead of the Preparatory Committee meeting of NPT States Parties for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, to be held in Vienna from 30 April. We are honoured that Australia’s Ambassador for Disarmament, HE Mr Peter Woolcott, will chair the first session in this NPT review cycle. We particularly thank delegations for extending their goodwill and providing their valuable views to Ambassador Woolcott during his consultations. All States should feel proud of the NPT Review Conference in 2010, notably the adoption by States Parties of the consensus action plan spanning the NPT’s three pillars and also addressing the very important matters relating to the Middle East, in particular holding a Conference in 2012 on achieving the Middle East Nuclear and other WMD Free Zone. We have an opportunity to maintain the positive momentum of the 2010 Review Conference and to take stock of implementation of the Action Plan at the Preparatory Committee.

Implementing the 2010 NPT Action Plan is not the work of only a handful of States. All NPT States Parties have a responsibility to do what they can. The UNDC can play a key role in fostering the environment and enabling us to share activities that supports the implementation of the NPT. The UNDC can also look at other complementary measures for a world without nuclear weapons.

For its part, Australia has jointly formed the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI) with Canada, Chile, Germany, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates. The NPDI is devoted to taking forward practical action to achieve the outcomes of the NPT Review Conference. Among the NPDI’s practical initiatives is our development of a draft standard nuclear disarmament reporting form, which we have shared with the nuclear weapon states as a contribution to their discussions on increased transparency and accountability in nuclear disarmament. Other priorities of the NPDI include supporting the commencement of negotiations for a treaty banning the production of fissile material, including by supporting Canada’s General Assembly resolution, and providing support to countries towards the universalisation of the IAEA Additional Protocol and the CTBT.

Entry into Force of the CTBT is a long-standing disarmament priority for Australia and we congratulate Indonesia on its ratification of the Treaty in February this year. Indonesia’s leadership sets an example for the eight remaining states required to ratify for the CTBT to enter into force.

Together with the CTBT, an internationally verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons is a vital step toward the ultimate goal a world free of nuclear weapons. We are therefore profoundly disappointed and frustrated by the recent failure of the Conference on Disarmament (CD), once again, to adopt a program of work. This failure really drives home the need for the UNDC to take advantage of its flexible deliberative nature, and to contribute in some way to the strengthening of the UN disarmament machinery.

We expect the UNDC agenda to enable a discussion on the important role of regional collaboration in supporting multilateral negotiations and the implementation of international
disarmament and non-proliferation obligations. For example, Australia currently chairs the Asia-Pacific Safeguards Network (APSN), an informal network of nuclear safeguards authorities, ministries and other organisations responsible for implementing safeguards in the countries of the Asia-Pacific region. The objective of APSN is to promote safeguards best practice in the region and we hope these sorts of contributions can reinforce the measures required for a nuclear free world.

Turning now to conventional weapons, we all know that in many countries around the world, armed violence is fuelled by the availability of illicit conventional arms. As we speak, civilians are facing death, danger and insecurity and are prevented from making a better life for themselves and their families because of the availability of conventional weapons. This scourge -- for that is what it is -- has a particularly harsh impact on women and children, and leads to deeply troubling outcomes including for people with disabilities.

Australia sees significant value in this UNDC discussing confidence-building measures that will support effective implementation of the UN Programme of Action (UNPoA) and the negotiation of a strong, robust and legally binding Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). These are key priorities for Australia and we are playing an active role in building the capacity of States to implement the UNPoA and to negotiate an effective ATT.

In February, Australia co-hosted a workshop with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and Oxfam to enable Pacific Island Countries produce the fundamentals of a common regional position on the ATT and common approach to the UNPoA Review Conference for endorsement at the Pacific Islands Forum Regional Security Committee Meeting in June. Australia has supported workshops in the Caribbean to support ATT preparations – a third workshop will take place in May. Australia is sponsoring a regional meeting of the African Union on 21-22 May in Addis Ababa, which is being organized by the UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa (UNREC), the African Union and the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA).

Our view is that the ATT Conference provides an opportunity that cannot be missed – we all need to be as prepared as we can, and help others be prepared, to ensure the Diplomatic Conference delivers the kind of ATT that we want and need, as mandated in resolution 64/48. We call on all States to ensure the ATT negotiations proceed in the spirit of trust and goodwill to help see the Treaty achieve its security and humanitarian goals. This forum has an opportunity to support this dynamic and foster understanding of complementary confidence building measures.

In concluding, let me emphasise that Australia shares with all others here the simple, yet important goals: a world free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and a future for citizens and communities that are safer from the misuse and proliferation of conventional weapons. Achieving these goals is – self-evidently – complex and difficult; but not impossible. We just need to act. For the UNDC, it’s not really just a question of political will, but also a question of individual responsibility to be constructive. Let us start by showing more flexibility on the agenda so that we can get down to work on deliberating on the elements required to reach our goals on nuclear and conventional weapons. We commend the flexibility of particular individuals and delegations to find solutions over the past two days and we call on others to reciprocate.

Thank you.
BRAZIL
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Mr. Chairman,

I wish to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the 2012 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). It is a pleasure to see a member of our region presiding over such an important body. Be assured of my delegation's support to you and to the other members of the Bureau in discharging your duties.

I take the opportunity to thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Angela Kane, for her opening remarks and express our support for the work that lies ahead in the disarmament agenda.

I also take the opportunity to thank the former High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte, for his excellent work during his 5 year tenure.

Brazil fully associates itself with the views expressed by the representative of Chile, on behalf of the CELAC.

Mr. Chairman,

The UN Disarmament Commission has a fundamental role in the disarmament machinery. It has the duty to produce guidelines and adopt recommendations on the main issues of the disarmament agenda. In 1999, the Commission adopted a report with guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and on conventional arms control/limitation and disarmament. Unfortunately, it was the last time that the Commission was able to agree on substantive recommendations.

We must refrain from entering into blame games about who has caused this state of affairs. Instead, the international community must engage in constructive discussions to find again the common ground needed to produce substantive and effective results in the area of disarmament. As we enter a new three-year cycle of work of the UNDC, it is important that discussions are focused and concentrated on delimited areas of work. We believe that during the last cycle of the Commission the debate was excessively general and ambitious, making it more difficult to have concrete results.
Mr. Chairman,

Nuclear disarmament must be our utmost priority. The total elimination of nuclear weapons must be a clear and unconditional goal. The unjust and unsustainable divide between haves and have-nots must end. The role of nuclear weapons in military doctrines is no longer justifiable, if ever they were.

While we recognize the importance of unilateral and bilateral initiatives, we believe that it is only through multilateral concerted effort that nuclear weapons will be eliminated, in an irreversible, transparent and verifiable manner, according to an agreed legal framework and specified timelines. Brazil believes that time is ripe for the beginning of discussions on the principles and elements of a nuclear weapon convention and we believe that the UNDC could help in this endeavor.

In addition to supporting full negotiations of a nuclear weapon convention, Brazil favors some intermediate actions. Negative security assurances (NSA) must be given to non-nuclear States. Unilateral declarations do not suffice. Instead, we need to negotiate a NSA multilateral agreement. The necessity of such a comprehensive agreement stems, among other reasons, from the fact that several protocols of nuclear weapon free zones were signed with reserves by nuclear weapon States.

Also, Brazil welcomes the decision of the Eighth NPT Review Conference to encourage the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free-zones, on the basis of freely negotiated agreements among the States in each region, and draws attention to the important decision to hold a Conference in 2012 for the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Another step in the direction of nuclear disarmament would be the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a verifiable treaty to ban the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices, which must take into consideration existing stocks and prohibit future production. It is important that the Disarmament Commission support such measures.
Mr. Chairman,

Brazil has been a steadfast supporter of the UN efforts in the area of conventional weapons. We participate actively in the discussions and send our reports regularly to the UN Register of Conventional Arms, the UN Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures and the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

Such confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons aim at correcting misperceptions and avoiding misunderstandings about military actions and policies that might otherwise lead to conflict. They can gradually foster stable political and diplomatic relations and transform Parties' ideas about their security needs.

Mr. Chairman,

In concluding, I wish to reassure the readiness of my delegation to work with you and with the members of the Bureau for a successful outcome of this session.

Thank you.
Statement by Mr. ZHANG Jun’an  
Head of the Chinese Delegation   
at the General Debate of   
the United Nations Disarmament Commission

(New York, 4 April 2012)
Mr. Chairman,

At the outset, on behalf of the Chinese Delegation, I would like to express congratulations on your assumption of the chairmanship of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). I am convinced that with your rich diplomatic experience and skill, you will lead this session to fruitful results. The Chinese Delegation will cooperate closely with you and other delegations. I also would like to take this opportunity to express appreciations to your predecessor, Ambassador Hamid Al-Bayati of Iraq, for his outstanding work.

Mr. Chairman,

In today’s world, a variety of uncertain and unstable factors are on the rise, and international politics, economy and security are undergoing complex and profound changes. The increasing common interests and deepening interdependence in the field of security have bond all countries to a common destiny. Countries have responsibility to make joint efforts to maintain security through cooperation, promote development through stability, and advance the international security situation and multilateral arms control process. Bearing this in mind, China calls upon each country to embrace a new security concept featuring mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination, fully respect and accommodate the legitimate security concerns of other countries and carry out related dialogue and cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual trust.

This year marks the beginning session of the new three-year deliberation cycle of the UNDC. The Chinese Delegation sincerely hopes that all parties will, in a constructive manner, collectively push this cycle forward to achieve fruitful results, and make new contributions to the international arms control and disarmament process.

Mr. Chairman,
Mr. Chairman,

As Chinese President Hu Jintao declared solemnly at the Seoul Nuclear Security Summit on March 27th, China will, as always, push for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, abide by the policy of not being the first to use nuclear weapons, be committed to the international nuclear non-proliferation efforts, and support the right of countries to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

China, in good faith, fulfills the outcome document of 8th Review Conference of the NPT, supports the 2012 International Conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other WMD, and firmly opposes all forms of nuclear terrorism.

China has all along called for peaceful resolution to the Korean Peninsula and the Iranian nuclear issues through dialogues and negotiation. The relevant diplomatic processes are facing good opportunities nowadays. We hope that all parties could adhere to the right direction of resolving the above issues through diplomatic means, and keep restraint and demonstrate flexibility, so as to push forward continuously the relevant dialogues and cooperation.

Mr. Chairman,

China is supportive of practical and feasible confidence-building measures (CBM) in the field of conventional weapons. For many years, China has always been proactively promoting and participating in international, regional disarmament process and confidence building measures. At bilateral level, as well as in multilateral frameworks such as Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), China has been working with relevant countries to vigorously explore and practice CBMs aiming at enhancing mutual trust and promoting security. China also participated in the UN Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures and the UN Register of
Conventional Arms, and is committed to building confidence in the field of conventional weapons.

The UN conference of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) will be held in July this year. The Second Review Conference on United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects (PoA) will be held in August. China, for its part, subscribes itself to international efforts to adopt proper measures to regulate relevant arms trade and combat illicit arms trafficking. China is willing to participate in the above-mentioned conferences in a constructive manner.

Mr. Chairman,

The First Special Session on Disarmament of the UNGA (SSOD I) established the multilateral arms control and disarmament machinery, including the First Committee of the UNGA, the UNDC and the CD. They are mutually reinforcing and complimentary. As an integral part of this machinery and important deliberative body, the UNDC has made proactive contributions to the cause of multilateral disarmament and arms control in the past. While the UNDC has been confronted with some difficulties in recent years, each party should have a rational and practical attitude toward this and, on the premise of preserving the authority of the UNDC, explore the ways and means to strengthen its role and effectiveness.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman
Press Release
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Mr. Chairman,

Let me begin with congratulating you and other countries on election to the chairmanship and membership of the bureau.

I am fully confident that under your able chairmanship this session of the UNDC will bear a fruitful outcome.

Let me also extend the warmest welcome to Ms. Angela Kane for her recent appointment as the new High Representative for Disarmament.

Mr. Chairman,

The delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea fully associates itself with the statement made by Indonesia on behalf of NAM with focus on the nuclear disarmament as the topmost priority.

The nuclear disarmament directly related to the world peace and security and to the very survival of the mankind, remains yet an issue of the most pressing urgency.

Belonging to the category of the most destructive one out of all the weapons made so far by the humanity, the nuclear weapons are now at the threshold of the red line of rendering the risk of the total elimination of the mankind as a whole.
It is very true that under the signboard of so-called “the world free of nuclear weapons” the modernization of nuclear weapons is pressing ahead to the possible extent of real wartime use in battle fields.

It is also very true that the Missile Defense System development is on the steady and phased progress of expansion.

The Missile Defense System development, which completely deviated from the legally binding bilateral framework in 2002, is having negative implications of undermining the balance of power between nuclear powers, thereby gradually giving way to the potential preemptive or the first use of nuclear weapons.

Such a development of critical situation speaks by itself that the danger is on the increase as days go by, whereby the policy of hegemony with use of force or nuclear blackmails can be put into practice in more practical actions.

Since the nuclear disarmament is an issue directly related to the world peace and security and the survival of the mankind, the DPRK delegation firmly believes that the UNDC should naturally have its focus on discussing and drafting realistic and constructive recommendations thereon.

Certain nuclear weapon states, who are involving themselves in modernization of nuclear weapons and Missile Defense System development thereby challenging the desire of the mankind for nuclear disarmament, should no longer waste time by moving forward towards discussion on nuclear disarmament, with clear understanding that their ongoing adventurous behavior will only result in nuclear arms race and cold war, having themselves fall political and economic victims to a great extent.

In case practical steps are taken for total elimination of nuclear weapons in legally binding framework as the mankind desires, it will have a very positive impact on the eventual denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

Mr. Chairman,

Today, the Korean peninsula is regarded to be the only part of the world under the greatest danger of nuclear war.

Immediately after announcing its new defense strategy which has shifted a focus to the Asia Pacific region last January this year, the United States is driving the situation of the Korean peninsula to the brink of war by holding large scale joint military exercises in south Korea and vicinity at an increased level.

The so called “Key Resolve” and “Foal Eagle” joint military exercises conducted by the United States and south Korea by mobilizing over 200,000 troops was nothing but the show of force or demonstration of power in terms of their figure, scale and nature aimed at making preemptive strikes and holding the position of hegemony in the region by containing the neighboring countries.

What is drawing more particular attention is the timing of the exercises which was started concurrently with the opening of the DPRK-US talks, driving the situation to the brink of war through mobilizing the US occupying troops of south Korea and
reinforcements of its troops from the mainland and its military bases in the region as well as the most sophisticated means of strike.

Since 1950s the United States has deployed over 1,000 nuclear weapons in south Korea in a forward position.

Furthermore, under the pretext of the so called “routine exercises”, the United States has been conducting military exercises every year for over four decades increasing its mobility of troops into south Korea and all different types of weapons of mass destruction like nuclear powered aircrafts and nuclear submarines.

In this process, the US troops have been fully familiarized with the geographical conditions of the Korean peninsula and they are already fully prepared for stepping into a nuclear war at any time.

The reality speaks by itself that the United States is the major source of destabilizing the peace and security in the Korean peninsula.

The more frequent the military moves of the United States are, the more closer the danger of nuclear war is coming on the Korean peninsula, compelling the DPRK and the neighboring countries to get their deterrent more than ever intensified.

In the new year policy of 2012, the DPRK clarified its principled position once again that the United States should pull out its troops from south Korea which is a key obstacle to the way of securing peace on the peninsula.

As far as the role of the presence of the US troops is concerned, they played nothing but the role of imposing persistent division of one nation, making the north-south confrontation aggravated only, with increased danger of war, without any sign of involving itself in the process of reconciliation, cooperation and reunification.

It is noteworthy that over the years the north-south relations has reached its worst stage since the division the country and the holding of military exercises at this critical time by the US in south Korea is regarded an encouraging element for south Korea making them go more towards confrontation with the north.

Mr. Chairman,

The denuclearization of the Korean peninsula is the lifetime intention of the great leader president KIM IL SUNG.

The DPRK remains consistent in its position towards securing peace and security and achieving denuclearization of the Korean peninsula through dialogue and negotiations.

The DPRK showed its consistency and sincerity through reaching the DPRK-US agreement in the three rounds of talks held from 2011 up to the February this year.

In the talks, the DPRK and the US, the key parties to the nuclear issue of the Korean peninsula, discussed in depth and agreed upon the issues related to the confidence building measures(CBM)s for normalized relations, the peace and security on the Korean peninsula and the Six Party Talks.
In view of the DPRK, the talks has laid out positive conditions conducive to enabling ourselves to move forward towards the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

The DPRK remains unchanged in implementation of the agreement in good faith, and its willingness to do so has been demonstrated by extending an invitation to the IAEA delegation as agreed in the talks.

Thank you.
Mr. Chairman,

At the outset, I wish to join the previous speakers in congratulating you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) for the 2012 substantive session. I would also like to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their election. I am sure that your able stewardship will guide us through our deliberations for the next three weeks.

Mr. Chairman,

Last year, my delegation addressed this commission with high hopes, as we had seen a number of positive developments in the previous years. However, that meeting failed to live up to our lofty expectations, and we found ourselves in the same place again. It is indeed regrettable that we had only succeeded in extending the lengthy stalemate of the disarmament machinery for another year. We should keep in mind the message of the UN Secretary General to the CD in January, when he made it clear that the General Assembly is ready to consider other options to move the disarmament agenda forward if the Conference on Disarmament remains deadlocked in 2012. The 66th session of the UN General Assembly First Committee sent the same messages. It is now time for the disarmament machinery to act and to halt its endless debate.
The UNDC is not an exception in this matter. Last year, the three-year cycle ended without any recommendations. The UNDC has failed to live up to its mandate of producing relevant recommendations for the last 12 years. I sincerely hope this year’s deliberations at the UNDC, now at the first stage of a new three-year cycle, will be able to facilitate global efforts on disarmament and non-proliferation, while simultaneously laying a sound foundation to further our common goal of “a world free of nuclear weapons.”

In this regard, I look forward to engaging in meaningful discussions in the following areas during this session.

First, in order to avoid another three years of inertia, the UNDC should engage in serious discussions on how this body can revitalize the global agenda of disarmament and non-proliferation. Given that the UNDC has failed to produce any meaningful outcome for many years, Member States need to have a clear idea and shared understanding of the very rationale of the UNDC and its working methods. In so doing, we have to bear in mind the meaningful outcome of the 2010 High-Level Meeting organized by the Secretary General, as well as the follow-up debate at the General Assembly in July 2011.

Second, we need more focused topics for deliberation. As the next three-year cycle will be held during both the ATT process and the preparatory process of the 9th NPT Review Conference, a more focused topic on the nuclear weapons and conventional weapons should be framed. We are open to any number of specific topics within the field of nuclear disarmament and conventional weapons, with one caveat that discussion of nuclear non-proliferation should be given equal weight with nuclear disarmament.

Third, we should keep exerting our efforts toward resolving current issues, such as normalization of the CD and the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). I will not further delve into the reason why the CD should commence substantive work on an FMCT at the earliest time possible and why the CTBT should enter into force as soon as possible. I just want to stress that we need these not only for nuclear non-proliferation, but also for nuclear disarmament. In addition, along with the ongoing efforts to achieve the universality of the NPT, my delegation believes that the monitoring and verification mechanisms of the Treaty need to be even further strengthened through the universalization of the IAEA Additional Protocol.

Mr. Chairman,
Taking this opportunity, I would like to address another barrier that needs to be overcome for the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the North Korean nuclear issue has long presented a serious challenge to the nuclear disarmament and international non-proliferation regime. Over the years, the DPRK has announced its withdrawal from the NPT, conducted two nuclear tests and even revealed its uranium enrichment program, the existence of which it had long denied.

The Republic of Korea remains committed to realizing the denuclearization of the DPRK in a peaceful manner and in close cooperation with the international community. Unfortunately, however, the DPRK has recently veered again from moving in a positive direction by announcing on March 16 that they will launch a so-called “application satellite” during the period of April 12 to 16. Many UN Member countries expressed grave concern over the plan, since its launch will be a clear violation of UN Security Council Resolution 1874, which demands the DPRK not to conduct “any launch using ballistic missile technology.” Given the fact that the DPRK has developed its WMD capabilities by launching a long-range missile in 2006 and 2009 followed by a nuclear test each time, there should be no doubt that its another launch will pose a greater threat to peace and security on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia. The Government of the Republic of Korea, along with the international community, strongly urges the DPRK to immediately stop such a provocative action and to comply with its international obligations, including those under the UN Security Council Resolutions.

Mr. Chairman,

As you are well aware, the Seoul Nuclear Security Summit was held last week. Leaders from 53 states and 4 international organizations participated in the Summit. They discussed how to strengthen the international nuclear security framework to prevent nuclear terrorism, with the ultimate goal of ‘a world without nuclear weapons’. The Seoul Communiqué translates the declarations of the Washington Summit into concrete actions and provides measures to prevent nuclear and radiological terrorism in a comprehensive way. In particular, participating states agreed, by the end of 2013, to put forward voluntary specific actions to minimize the use of highly enriched uranium. A number of countries also committed to eliminate or return their stock of HEU to the originating countries for disposal. We hope that the Seoul Summit helps nurture transparency and confidence among countries, which is a vital element in generating further momentum in the disarmament and non-proliferation field.
I wish to conclude by reiterating the sincere hope that the UNDC will emerge from its prolonged impasse and once again play the central role which it can and must play in the field of disarmament. It is a task that falls upon all of us and requires our collective wisdom and a shared sense of responsibility.

Finally, Mr. President, we look forward to being guided onto a fruitful path under your excellent leadership. Thank you.
Señor Presidente:
Deseo comenzar transmitiendo las felicitaciones de esta Delegación a usted y a los miembros de la mesa por su elección, al tiempo de reiterar las expresiones de aprecio y confianza del Ecuador en su persona y en su país.

Al mismo tiempo, deseo saludar la presencia de la Alta Representante para Asuntos de Desarme, la señora Angela Kane.

La Delegación del Ecuador desea manifestar su adhesión al discurso pronunciado por Chile a nombre de la CELAC y por Indonesia, en representación del Movimiento de Países No Alineados. Ambos recogen con apropiado detalle los conceptos y puntos de vista de esta Delegación, por lo cual no me referiré nuevamente a todos ellos.

Señor Presidente:
Esta Delegación desea expresar su total compromiso con las decisiones y acuerdos tomados en el marco de la Primera Reunión Especial de la Asamblea General dedicada al Desarme (SSOD-I). Al hacerlo así, también manifestamos nuestro total apoyo a la Comisión de Desarme de las
Naciones Unidas como el órgano deliberativo de la maquinaria de desarme de la Organización, cuya función es la de considerar y formular recomendaciones sobre los distintos problemas en el campo del desarme, así como a la Conferencia de Desarme, como el único foro negociador en materia de desarme.

Para el Ecuador, señor Presidente, en la misma forma como lo han manifestado la CELAC y el Movimiento de Países No Aliados, el desarme nuclear es la prioridad. En tal sentido señor Presidente, y en la misma línea de las ideas expresadas por usted en la sesión de la mañana, para la realidad del Ecuador, Suramérica y Latinoamérica, así como, estoy seguro, para la realidad de la vasta mayoría de las naciones del mundo en vías de desarrollo, las armas nucleares son una opción reprochable y una total contradicción frente a las más elementales necesidades de paz y desarrollo para todos los pueblos del planeta.

Señor Presidente, lo anterior seguramente no resulte novedoso, pero sí es imprescindible que lo tengamos presente todos los días de la vida. Y probablemente no resulta novedoso porque no constatamos que allá afuera algo esté pasando. A pesar de que el Tratado de No Proliferación de Armas Nucleares establece claramente que las partes se comprometen a llevar a cabo negociaciones de buena fe sobre medidas efectivas para el cese de la carrera armamentística y para el desarme nuclear, así como sobre un tratado de desarme general y completo bajo estricto y efectivo control internacional, la comunidad internacional no ha recibido ninguna señal concreta en este sentido. Y tampoco ocurre nada, porque no obstante la existencia de un dictamen de la Corte Internacional de Justicia sobre la legalidad del uso o la amenaza de uso de las armas nucleares desde la perspectiva del Derecho Internacional Humanitario, y sobre la obligación de que se efectúen en buena fe negociaciones y de orientarlas hacia conclusiones conducentes al desarme nuclear en todos sus aspectos, bajo estricto y efectivo control internacional, los Estados que no poseen armas nucleares siguen sin receptor ninguna señal concreta que nos permita afirmar que caminamos en tal dirección.

Señor Presidente, desafortunadamente la humanidad ha tenido que sufrir la atrocidad y la devastación producidas por el uso de las armas nucleares, tal como usted nos relató en días pasados. Y parecería que ello no resulta suficiente para adoptar una posición general y definitiva sobre su total eliminación de una vez por todas. La pregunta es, entonces, señor Presidente, qué es suficiente si no tenemos suficiente con la historia reciente, y si dicha historia no nos sirve ni para percibir que jugamos con fuego ni para desvirtuar por completo el riesgo de tropezar dos veces con la misma piedra. Para un país como el Ecuador está muy claro lo que es suficiente, así como lo creo que está completamente claro para la gran mayoría de pueblos y naciones, y por eso aboga con especial ahínco por el desarme nuclear y la destrucción de todas las armas nucleares sobre el planeta.
A esta situación seguramente responderá el rechazo a que uno de los puntos de la agenda de esta Comisión de Desarme hubiese versado sobre los Elementos para la Declaración de la Cuarta Década del Desarme que nuestro país consideraba debía permanecer como un ítem de la agenda, pues para el Ecuador, resulta inadmisible que, a pesar de lo dicho, sigamos hablando hoy en día de la existencia de miles de cabezas nucleares sobre la Tierra.

En este contexto, entre los varios acontecimientos previstos para este año en materia de Desarme, y reafirmando su calidad de Parte Contratante del Tratado para la Proscripción de las Armas Nucleares en la América Latina y el Caribe o Tratado de Tlatelolco, el Ecuador emite su firme y total apoyo para que se implemente la Resolución sobre el Medio Oriente del año de 1995 que prevé el establecimiento de una Zona Libre de Armas Nucleares en dicha región y augura sus mejores deseos para que la referida Conferencia se celebre en el año 2012.

Señor Presidente, una vez alcanzada una agenda para la Comisión de Desarme, deseo transmitirle el agradecimiento y la felicitación del Ecuador por el trabajo realizado y el esfuerzo desplegado, con lo que hemos podido constatar no solamente su experiencia y conocimiento, sino también su compromiso y transparencia con los trabajos de este órgano. Estos conceptos los transmito también a su equipo de trabajo. Finalmente que no le quepe la duda de la confianza que este país ha depositado en su persona.
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Mr. Chairman

At the outset allow me to congratulate you on your unanimous election to preside over this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). I am confident that under your able guidance and leadership the 2012 UNDC session will succeed in fulfilling the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. I would also like to extend my felicitations to the other members of the Bureau on their election. My delegation would like also to associate itself with the statements of the Non-Aligned Movement delivered by Indonesia and of the African Group delivered by Nigeria.

Mr. Chairman

It is undeniable that the commission is facing difficult times in the last few years. Despite the lack of progress achieved in its activities since the adoption in 1999 of the guidelines for establishing nuclear-weapon-free-zones and for conventional arms control, Egypt believes in the importance of the UNDC as the specialized and deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery that allows in-depth deliberations on specific disarmament issues, leading to the submission of concrete recommendations to the General Assembly. But for this effort to succeed, political will should be stronger with the aim to achieve an agreed vision towards future activities of the Commission.

In the absence of such political will the Commission often encounters disagreements amongst members over policies and priorities. This is clearly reflected in the fact that the commission was unable to agree on its agenda items for this three year cycle 2012-2014. Egypt believes that the Commission must therefore follow a steady course between shared concerns on one hand and joint aspirations on the other.

Although the UNDC dealt with the subject of its methods of work in 2006 and 2009, those discussions did not yield sufficient measures to allow the UNDC to officially fulfill its mandate. It was clear in those discussions that the problems encountered in the UNDC are not related to its methods of work, but rather confirms that the stalemate in various disarmament forums resulting from the lack of political will of some Member States to achieve any progress on matters related to nuclear disarmament is the main obstacle. The question is really how to mobilize the political will to address the threats and challenges in the disarmament field, particularly in nuclear disarmament issues.
Mr. Chairman

The Non-Aligned movement, which Egypt currently chairs, considers that nuclear disarmament should remain the top priority. Egypt therefore expected that the success of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons should help the UNDC and the CD to achieve more substantive outcomes. There is much commitment in the four action plans that were adopted by the 2010 NPT review conference that should be translated into further agreements. Such commitment should have also lead to more political will to advance the ambitious nuclear disarmament and proliferation agenda reflected in the four action plans worldwide.

The fourth action plan of the 2010 NPT Review Conference focused on implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference is also another case at hand. We appreciate the continuous efforts of the UN Secretary-General, the co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, the Government of Finland and the facilitator Mr. Jaakko Laajava in close consultation and coordination with the States of the region, towards the successful convening of the 2012 conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction.

Accordingly, Egypt reaffirms that the letter and spirit of the four action plans adopted by the NPT Review Conference in 2010 should provide sufficient guidance during the current session of UNDC. This requires that the UNDC would issue concrete recommendations on effective measures by the nuclear-weapon States to fulfill the implementation of their obligations undertaken in the 2010 Action Plans.

In order to get closer to our joint goal of having a world free of nuclear weapons, the UNDC should always avoid ambiguity in identifying its agenda items and concentrate its deliberations on an issue that leaves no room for different interpretations, namely the issue of “effective measures to fulfill the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament”, moreover we could also deal with the issue of “Effective measures to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction”.

Regrettably we still witness efforts aimed at giving priority to non-proliferation without achieving parallel progress in nuclear disarmament, we also
note some illusive and baseless linkage between realizing non-proliferation and limiting the benefit of non-nuclear-weapon-States from their inalienable right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This represents a challenge to the principles of the NPT and to the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in the field of nuclear verification, and thus should be avoided in our deliberations.

Within the overarching issue proposed by the Non-Aligned Movement which is “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons”, we should strive to have more focused deliberations on nuclear disarmament issues.

Mr. Chairman

Egypt is of the view that conventional weapons have already got sufficient priority in this year’s disarmament agenda. Having stated that, our preference was to deal with conventional weapons during the next two years’ sessions of the UNDC.

Any deliberations regarding conventional arms must focus on the importance and even the centrality of existing structures in the framework of the United Nations. Furthermore, any discussion on this issue must be in accordance with the relevant principles of the Charter, especially the right of States to manufacture, import and retain conventional arms for purposes of their legitimate self-defense and not to permit the undermining of this right within any context.

Mr. Chairman

In conclusion, I would like to assure Your Excellency that the Egyptian delegation is fully committed to a successful conclusion of the work of the Commission, to achieve the noble objective of general and complete disarmament.

Thank you Mr. Chairman
Commission du Désarmement

Débat général

(4 avril 2012)

Vérifier au prononcé
Monsieur le Président,
Chers Collègues,

Mon pays s'associe au discours que devrait prononcer le Danemark au nom de l'Union Européenne. Je tiens à vous adresser les félicitations de ma délégation pour votre nomination comme Président de cette session, et pour les efforts inlassables que vous avez déployés depuis plusieurs semaines. Je tiens également à remercier le président de l'Assemblée générale, son Excellence Nassir Abdulazziz Al Nasser et Mme Angela Kane, Haut représentant du Secrétaire général pour les affaires de désarmement, que je souhaite féliciter pour sa nomination à ce poste. Je préciserai ici quelques points relatifs à la position française.

Nous voici au début d'un nouveau cycle de trois ans. La France forme le vœu que ce cycle, et en particulier la session de cette année, soit utile et s'inscrive dans la nouvelle dynamique dont la communauté internationale a fait preuve depuis près de deux ans.

Que ce soit en effet le succès de la Conférence d'examen du TNP en 2010, l'entrée en vigueur de la Convention d'Oslo sur les armes à sous-munition et de l'accord New Start, le résultat positif de la Conférence d'examen de la convention d'interdiction des armes biologiques, les avancées obtenues au Sommet de Séoul sur la sécurité nucléaire, ou les progrès du processus préparatoire de la conférence sur le Traité sur le commerce des armes : les succès enregistrés sont autant de signes que nous pouvons avancer en matière de désarmement et de non-prolifération lorsque règne un état d'esprit ouvert et constructif.

Cette nouvelle dynamique montre également que la recherche d'un monde plus sûr est une question qui doit être abordée de manière globale, équilibrée et concrète. La mobilisation demeure en effet nécessaire dans tous les domaines : nucléaire, biologique, chimique, conventionnel, prolifération balistique ou espace.

La France estime que cette approche globale doit être au cœur de nos discussions pour ce nouveau cycle.

Notre première tâche est, à l'évidence, de convenir d'un ordre du jour pour le cycle. L'approche que vous avez suggérée, avec deux points de l'ordre du jour, est utile et constructive. Nous y sommes ouverts et pouvons donc travailler sur cette base.

Il nous faut également mettre davantage à profit le rôle de think tank de l'UNDC en laissant plus de temps aux discussions et à la réflexion. C'est de cette manière que nous pourrons favoriser l'émergence d'éventuelles convergences entre nous.

Monsieur le Président,

Je souhaite à présent revenir sur le contexte dans lequel s'inscrit ce nouveau cycle de trois ans

Dans le domaine nucléaire, notre feuille de route est sans conteste constituée par le plan d'action adopté par consensus à l'issue de la dernière Conférence d'examen
du TNP, qui aborde la question nucléaire de façon globale et équilibrée. L'adoption de ce plan d'action était notre succès collectif ; sa mise en œuvre est de notre responsabilité à tous. Alors que s'ouvre, ici aussi, un nouveau cycle, celui de la conférence d'examen du TNP de 2015, il appartient à chaque État Partie de remplir sa part du contrat pour progresser vers un monde plus sûr.

Le P5 est prêt à assumer sa responsabilité à cet égard. La France a organisé la première réunion de suivi du P5 de la Conférence d'examen du TNP en juin dernier. Cette initiative témoigne de l'engagement de la France à progresser ; elle illustre la volonté du P5 de poursuivre la mise en œuvre d'actions concrètes destinées à assurer le plein respect de leurs engagements à l'égard du TNP. Cette réunion s'inscrit aussi dans la logique de transparence promue par le Président de la République à Cherbourg en mars 2008, et concrétisée à Londres en septembre 2009 entre partenaires du P5.

Nous devons aussi renforcer le cadre multilatéral, en amenant tous les États qui ne l'ont pas encore fait, notamment ceux de l'Annexe II, à ratifier promptement le TICE. Nous nous félicitons à cet égard de la ratification du Traité par l'Indonésie, pays de l'Annexe II, mais aussi par le Guatemala. Nous devons aussi négocier immédiatement à la Conférence du désarmement un traité interdisant la production de matières fissiles pour les armes nucléaires (dit cut off). Cette négociation doit être menée avec l'ensemble des acteurs concernés. Nous appelons également tous les États concernés à établir immédiatement un moratoire sur la production de ces matières fissiles, comme la France l'a fait, avec les États-Unis, le Royaume-Uni et la Russie.

Tous les États doivent contribuer au désarmement en créant l'environnement de sécurité requis. Cela signifie avant tout stopper la prolifération. Je pense notamment à la Corée du Nord et l'Iran. La France continue d'engager dans tous les forums un effort particulier pour prévenir et réduire cette grave menace à la sécurité internationale. Le renforcement du régime de non prolifération est à cet égard une priorité absolue, avec le renforcement des garanties de l'AIEA et la généralisation du Protocole Additionnel. Nous nous félicitons des nouvelles ratifications du Protocole ;

Par ailleurs, la France soutient les efforts relatifs à la mise en œuvre de la résolution de 1995 sur le Moyen-Orient. La conférence d'examen du TNP de 2010 a permis une avancée importante. La désignation à l'automne dernier d'un facilitateur, M. Laajava, et du pays hôte constitue un pas positif. Nous devons tous ensemble travailler aux conditions permettant à la Conférence prévue en 2012 de se tenir, avec tous les acteurs concernés. L'Union européenne y a contribué pour sa part, en organisant un séminaire sur cette question en juillet 2011.

Monsieur le Président,

Je l'ai souligné, la France œuvre dans tous les domaines qui contribuent au désarmement général et complet. Elle déploie des efforts constants pour la mise en œuvre, l'universalisation et le renforcement des instruments multilatéraux dans ces domaines.
Nous nous félicitons du succès obtenu lors de la 7ème conférence d'examen de la convention d'interdiction des armes biologiques, en décembre dernier, qui a permis un renforcement du régime de la CIAB. Nous invitons également tous les États qui ne l'ont pas fait encore à rejoindre la Convention, qui constitue un outil majeur de notre sécurité collective.

La France a par ailleurs soutenu, notamment à l'occasion de sa présidence du G8 l'an dernier, tous les efforts concrets de lutte contre la prolifération des missiles balistiques. C'est un sujet de préoccupation majeur pour la communauté internationale au regard du développement accru de programmes balistiques ces dernières années, y compris sous le couvert de programmes spatiaux, comme nous le rappelle l'actualité.

J'en viens à présent au désarmement conventionnel. La France se félicite de l'atmosphère positive et constructive des travaux qui ont eu lieu jusqu'à présent en ce qui concerne les négociations sur un traité sur le commerce des armes. L'adoption lors du dernier comité préparatoire de règles de procédure nous permet d'aborder la conférence de juillet dans de bonnes conditions, et de nous consacrer pleinement aux discussions de substance. D'ici juillet, la France poursuivra son action dans un esprit de coopération et de transparence. Elle continuera de s'attacher à œuvrer au rapprochement des positions dans le but de parvenir à un instrument juridiquement contraignant, tout en recherchant l'adhésion du plus grand nombre d'États.

De même, nous souhaitons qu'un effort accru soit porté sur les armes légères et de petit calibre, dont le trafic illicite et l'accumulation excessive affectent la sécurité et la stabilité internationales, et alimentent des phénomènes de violence armée qui freinent considérablement le développement de nombreux pays.

Nous avons participé de manière constructive au Comité préparatoire de la conférence d'examen du Programme d'action sur les armes légères et de petit calibre, qui vient de s'achever, et espérons que la Conférence d'août – septembre débouchera sur un résultat positif, à même d'améliorer et de renforcer la mise en œuvre de cet instrument. Par ailleurs, nous avons commencé à travailler à la mise en œuvre effective de la convention d'Oslo, entrée en vigueur en novembre 2010 à Vientiane.

Monsieur le Président,

Ces quelques chantiers montrent ce que nous pouvons faire non pas dans un futur lointain, mais dans les mois et années à venir, pour créer collectivement un monde plus sûr. Nous espérons que nos discussions au cours de cette session et lors de ce cycle refléteront les défis qui sont devant nous. Vous pouvez compter sur le soutien de notre délégation pour participer au débat dans cet esprit constructif.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.
Statement

by

Mr. Vipul,
Counsellor (Disarmament)

Permanent Mission of India
to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

At the 2012
Substantive Session of the United Nations
Disarmament Commission

New York 4 April 2012
Mr Chairman,

The Indian delegation joins other colleagues in congratulating you on the assumption of the Chairmanship of the UNDC. We also congratulate other members of the bureau on their election. You can be assured of the full support of the Indian delegation in discharging your responsibilities towards a constructive session of the Commission this year. Our delegation would also like to thank the United Nations High Representative for Disarmament Affairs for her interest in the work of the Commission.

India associates itself with the statement delivered by Indonesia on behalf of the Non Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,

India attaches high importance to the work of the Disarmament Commission as the specialized deliberative leg of the triad of UN disarmament machinery put in place by the First Special Session on Disarmament. With its universal membership, the Commission provides a unique platform to the international community to discuss pertinent aspects, reach common positions, bridge any differences and adopt concrete recommendations of universal applicability on disarmament issues.

We share the disappointment that the Commission has not been able to achieve consensus on its agenda items for more than a decade now. However, we should bear in mind that the Commission has had several successes in the past when it was able to adopt principles, guidelines and recommendations on specific disarmament issues. We believe that given sufficient political will the UNDC can play an important role in taking forward multilateral disarmament agenda. In the last cycle of meetings there was some progress on the items on the Commission’s agenda even though consensus again eluded us. As we embark on a new three-year cycle of UNDC meetings we call upon all delegations to give a positive impulse to global non-discriminatory disarmament.

Mr. Chairman,

India believes that in the new cycle of work of the UNDC, nuclear disarmament should remain the key agenda item. India attaches the highest priority to nuclear disarmament. India remains committed to the objective of the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan of 1988 and the realisation of its vision of a nuclear weapons free world and non-violent world order. As our Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh said in his address to the 66th UN General Assembly, the Action Plan sets out a concrete roadmap for achieving nuclear disarmament in a time-bound, universal, non-discriminatory, phased and verifiable manner.

The goal of nuclear disarmament can be achieved by a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment and an agreed multilateral
framework that is global and non-discriminatory. There is need for a meaningful dialogue among all States possessing nuclear weapons to build trust and confidence and for reducing the salience of nuclear weapon in international affairs and security doctrines. Measures to reduce nuclear danger arising from accidental or unauthorised use of nuclear weapons, increasing restraints on the use of nuclear weapons and de-alerting of nuclear weapons are essential steps. The progressive de-legitimisation of nuclear weapons is essential to the goal of their complete elimination.

India is committed to working with the international community to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The danger of nuclear weapons and related material falling in the hands of terrorists has made the threat more complex and dangerous. While Member States discharge their primary responsibility to strengthen national measures related to nuclear security, it is also important to strengthen international cooperative efforts to address this critical challenge. The IAEA plays a central role in this regard. India has been an active participant in the Nuclear Security Summit process.

India subscribes to a policy of a credible minimum deterrent. We do not subscribe to any arms race including a nuclear arms race. India has espoused a policy of no first use and non-use against non-nuclear weapon states and is prepared to convert these undertakings into multilateral legal arrangements. India has also supported universalization of the policy of no-first use in a global no-first use treaty. We support negotiations with a view to reaching agreement on effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapons States against the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons.

India remains committed to maintaining a unilateral, voluntary moratorium on nuclear explosive testing. We are also committed to negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty to ban the future production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. The future treaty would have to meet India's national security interests. In accordance with the mandate contained in CD/1299, we believe that CD is the appropriate forum for negotiating the FMCT.

I would like to recall India's recent contributions to the debate on nuclear disarmament in the UN framework. In 2007 we presented a Working Paper on nuclear disarmament to the UNDC containing specific proposals for consideration of the international community. Our resolutions in the UNGA First Committee titled "Convention on the prohibition of use of nuclear weapons" and "Reducing nuclear danger" are adopted with substantial support. India supports efforts for raising public awareness to generate the necessary momentum for realising the goal of a nuclear weapons free world.

Mr. Chairman,

Based on the recommendations of the relevant UNGA resolutions, the last cycle of the UNDC included "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s
as the Fourth disarmament decade" as one of its agenda item. Regrettably, we were not able to achieve consensus on this agenda item despite the best efforts of the working groups. We are now in 2012, already well into the decade of 2010s, and this agenda item may look dated. However, we believe that there is still room for the UNDC to deliberate this item in the meetings of the current cycle to see if there is greater convergence of views and the possibility of achieving consensus. The draft Declaration could provide the requisite impulse on disarmament issues in this decade and could set an aspirational disarmament agenda for the international community keeping in mind the current global realities.

Mr. Chairman,

In the last two cycles of UNDC meetings as well as between 2001-03 consensus eluded us on the agenda item related to conventional weapons, although the discussions were useful and a large measure of common ground was achieved. We are ready to once more engage in deliberations on "Practical CBMs in the field of conventional weapons". India supports practical CBM initiatives at unilateral, bilateral, regional and global levels. Such measures can promote a stable environment of peace and security amongst states by building confidence and enhancing transparency. We believe that a step-by-step approach should be adopted, respectful of the sovereign right of States to choose CBMs best suited to their interests.

Mr. Chairman,

Some delegations have expressed their desire to discuss working methods of UNDC in this year's meetings. We believe that this issue needs to be approached in light of the discussions which have taken place in the UNDC in the past - in 1998, when the decision 52/492 was adopted and in 2006, when UNGA adopted Resolution 61/98 which included additional measures for improving the effectiveness of UNDC's methods of work. It is up to us Member States to put the decisions we have taken into practice. Discussions related to disarmament machinery have also taken place in the UNGA under the item "Revitalizing the work of CD and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations".

We believe that the current impasse in the multilateral disarmament machinery is not due to procedural reasons or indeed due to deficiencies in the machinery itself. Proposals that question the viability or relevance of the disarmament machinery and suggest unrealistic alternatives will not lead to productive results in taking forward the agreed multilateral agenda.

My delegation seeks to actively participate in the deliberations in the days ahead with the hope that we will be able to achieve significant results in this cycle of UNDC meetings.

Thank you.
Check against delivery

Statement by

H.E. Ambassador Desra Percaya
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at the General Debate of the 2012 Substantive Session
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New York, 2 April 2012
Mr. Chairman,

1. I am honoured to speak on behalf of the Non Aligned Movement.

2. NAM congratulates you on your election to chair this year's important substantive session of the UNDC. It also felicitates other Bureau Members on their elections along with the Chairpersons of the respective Working Groups on their assumption.

3. The Movement is confident that under your able stewardship, this session will undertake concrete work to further the globally agreed agenda on disarmament and non-proliferation.

4. On its part, the Movement assures you, the Bureau Members, and all Member States of its determination in working actively and constructively to contributing to the success of this cycle of the UNDC.

5. NAM congratulates Ms Angela Kane on her recent appointment as the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs and expresses the Movement's appreciation for her statement at the opening of this session.

Mr. Chairman,

6. NAM reiterates its longstanding position regarding the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, and expresses its determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard, the Movement reaffirms the relevance and centrality of the UNDC, providing for an in-depth deliberation on the specific disarmament issues with submission of concrete recommendations before the General Assembly.

7. NAM reaffirms the importance and the relevance of the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the sole deliberative body within the UN multilateral disarmament machinery. NAM continues to fully support the work of the UNDC and expresses regret that UNDC was unable to reach agreement on recommendations on its two agenda items during substantive sessions of its two previous cycles ending in April 2008 and April 2011 due to the lack of political will and inflexible positions, in particular of certain Nuclear Weapons States, despite NAM's constructive role and concrete proposals throughout the deliberations, especially in the Working Group on "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons".
8. While recalling the proposals submitted by the Movement during the previous substantive sessions, NAM Member States stand ready to work constructively with other States towards the success of the present cycle of the UNDC. NAM calls upon UN Member States to display the necessary political will and flexibility in order to achieve agreement on its recommendations in the UNDC’s 2012 session.

9. The UNDC has in the past contributed to the field of disarmament and arms control, including when it was able to reach consensus on guidelines for establishing nuclear-weapon-free-zones (NWFZ) and for conventional arms control. The work of the UNDC should therefore be intensified through reinvigorated political will to enable this body to fulfill its role as mandated by SSOD-I. The NAM believes that UNDC can and should contribute substantively to advance the multilateral disarmament agenda, as well as the work of the disarmament machinery, especially in the field of nuclear disarmament.

10. NAM calls for a more results-oriented UNDC Session in 2012, and urges greater political will, flexibility and cooperation by all countries during this new cycle.

Mr. Chairman

11. NAM reaffirms its principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remains its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects, and stresses the importance that efforts aiming at nuclear non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. NAM also underlines that nuclear disarmament, as the highest priority established by SSOD-I and as a multilateral legal obligation, should not be made conditional on confidence building measures or other disarmament efforts.

12. NAM reiterates that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of such weapons, efforts for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon-States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, should be pursued as a matter of urgent priority.

13. In this context, the Movement emphasizes the necessity to start negotiations without further delay on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of
time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction. The Movement therefore once again calls for an international conference to identify ways and means of eliminating nuclear dangers, at the earliest possible date.

14. The Movement underlines that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons violate the commitments undertaken by the Nuclear-Weapons States.

15. NAM reiterates its deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the Nuclear-Weapon States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals in accordance with their relevant multilateral legal obligations and commitments. NAM underscores in this regard the need for the NWS to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they provided in 2000 and further reiterated in 2010 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and emphasizes the urgent need to commence negotiations on comprehensive and complete nuclear disarmament without delay.

16. NAM emphasises that progress in nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security.

Mr. Chairman,

17. NAM stresses the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), including by all NWS, which, inter alia, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. NAM reiterates that if the objectives of the Treaty are to be fully realised, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the NWS, to nuclear disarmament would be essential.

18. NAM reaffirms the importance of the application of the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability by NWS in all measures related to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations.

19. NAM reaffirms the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy, including the right to nuclear fuel cycle, for peaceful purposes without discrimination. The Movement continues to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology,
for peaceful purposes persist. NAM emphasises that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory agreements. In this connection, we confirm that each country's choices and decision in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international co-operation agreements and arrangements for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel-cycle policies.

Mr. Chairman,

20. NAM States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are concerned over the lack of concrete progress by the NWS in implementing their obligations under the Treaty, and their unequivocal undertakings to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to complete nuclear disarmament. NAM States Parties to the NPT call on NWS to implement their obligations under the Treaty and undertakings, as reaffirmed by successive NPT Review Conferences, including the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

21. The Movement reiterates its support for the establishment in the Middle East of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with the Security Council resolution 487 (1981), and paragraph 14 of the Security Council resolution 687 (1991), and the relevant UN General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. Unsafeguarded Nuclear Capabilities of Israel are a matter of serious concern for regional and international peace and security. Pending the establishment of such a zone, the NAM demands Israel, the only country in the region that has neither joined the NPT nor declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the NPT without delay, and to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.

22. Welcoming the adoption by consensus of the detailed plan of action on "the Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East" in the "Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions" of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, NAM States Parties to the NPT strongly urge the UN Secretary-General and co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, in close consultation and coordination with the States of the region, to exert all efforts towards the successful convening of the conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction.
23. NAM States Parties to the Treaty are convinced that it is vital that the action plans adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference on nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle-East are implemented.

24. While emphasising the vital role of strong and genuine political will in multilateral negotiations on disarmament, NAM hopes that our deliberations will contribute to enhancing the political will in support of the United Nations disarmament machinery and the multilateral disarmament negotiations within the UN.

25. In conclusion, the Movement underscores the significance for all UN Member States to work together and display the necessary political will to tangibly implement the globally agreed agenda on disarmament and non-proliferation, thereby yielding peace and security for all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman,
I would like to congratulate you and other members of the Bureau on your election and assure you of the full cooperation of my delegation in achieving a successful outcome at the current session of the Commission.

I would also like to felicitate Ms. Angela Kane for her appointment as the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs and wish her all success.

I wish also to associate myself with the Statement made yesterday by distinguished Representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,
After horrendous nuclear acts to Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, which are the only use of nuclear weapons to date, nuclear disarmament has always been the highest priority of the international community.

For that reason, the very first resolution adopted unanimously by the
General Assembly at its first session on January 24, 1946 called for the total elimination of atomic bomb.

Unfortunately, the continued existence of thousands of deployed and non-deployed strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons around the world still continues to seriously threaten the international peace and security and the very survival of human civilization.

While there is no pretext to justify the possession of nuclear weapons in the hands of any country, it is a source of grave concern that certain Nuclear-Weapon-States still continue to allocate billions of dollars to develop new types of nuclear weapons, build new nuclear weapons production facilities and modernize and replace such weapons.

Equally, those countries, in contravention of their obligations under Article VI of the NPT, continue to resort to obsolete nuclear deterrence policy and promote the role and status of nuclear weapons in their defense and security doctrines.

Despite repeated claims of certain Nuclear-Weapon States in regard to compliance with their legal obligations in the field of Nuclear Disarmament, the latest facts and figures totally question the validity and credibility of such claims.

Mr. Chairman,

The Islamic Republic of Iran, along with the overwhelming majority of States, maintains its principled position that the total elimination of nuclear weapons, as the highest priority, is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

In this regard, while supporting the proposal of Non-Aligned Movement on the adoption of a legal framework for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by 2025, we emphasize the high priority and prime importance of starting negotiations on Nuclear Weapons Convention and a universal and unconditional legally binding instrument on Negative Security Assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States.

In regard to the stated intention by some Nuclear-Weapon-States to reduce part of their nuclear weapons, we are of the view that limited bilateral and unilateral arms reductions are far below the expectations of the international community for real and effective steps towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons and can never be a substitute for
the obligation of Nuclear-Weapon-States for complete elimination of all their nuclear weapons.

Moreover, such reductions should go beyond merely decommissioning of nuclear weapons, and in any way, must be irreversible, transparent and internationally verifiable.

At the same time, the lack of progress in nuclear disarmament is not the only challenge facing the international community, as some Nuclear-Weapon-States are proliferating nuclear weapons horizontally and vertically by continuing Nuclear-Weapon-Sharing arrangements with Non-Nuclear-Weapon-States and other Nuclear-Weapon-States as well.

The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that the best way to guarantee the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is the full and non-selective implementation of the NPT, and assuring its universality, in particular in the Middle East, where the nuclear weapons program of the only non-party to this Treaty, which has been assisted also by France, seriously threatens regional and international peace and security.

To overcome this problem, Iran proposed the establishment of a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East in 1974, but efforts to establish such a Zone have not yet succeeded, due to the persistent refusal of the Zionist regime to join the NPT and to place its nuclear facilities under the IAEA Safeguards System.

In this context, the implementation of relevant Resolution of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT is essential for the establishment of Zone Free from Nuclear Weapons and the universality of the Treaty in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman,

In the Final Document of the SSOD-I, the General Assembly has highly emphasized the need for removal of the threat of nuclear weapons and their total elimination, as well as prevention of proliferation of such weapons, and by identifying nuclear disarmament as the highest priority, mandated the Disarmament Commission to follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations of that Session, including on nuclear disarmament.

Despite many achievements by the Commission, it is regrettable that during its lifetime, this body has not been able to formulate an
exclusive set of recommendations on Nuclear Disarmament and total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Commission therefore is highly expected to accord priority to and focus on nuclear disarmament and total elimination of nuclear weapons as the long-delayed part of its mandate.

For such an obvious reason, the agenda item on nuclear disarmament, as decided by the General Assembly, is of utmost relevance and importance.

In this regard, we fully support the proposal made by the Non-Aligned Movement for the first substantive agenda item of this cycle of the Commission on nuclear disarmament.

My delegation reaffirms the important role and function of the UNDC, as a deliberative body mandated to consider and make recommendations on major disarmament issues.

The formulation of more than a dozen of principles, guidelines and recommendations by the UNDC in the past is indicative of the important role and relevance of this body.

My delegation stands ready to fully cooperate with other delegations during the current cycle of the Commission and to overcome the existing stalemate in this body, which in our view, is rooted in the lack of political will on the part of certain countries.

We are also looking forward Mr. Chairman, to working with you and all delegations in achieving a successful outcome at this session of the Commission.

I thank you Mr. Chairman.
Statement by Ambassador Kazuo Kodama
Deputy Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations
At the Meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission
3 April 2012

Mr. Chairman,

The United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) adopted sixteen guidelines and recommendations prior to 1999, and has played a leading role in the field of disarmament as a deliberative body. However, for more than a decade, the UNDC has not produced many visible outcomes and has failed to make a substantive contribution in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard, we fully share the view expressed by the Chairman in his letter dated 27 March that a lack of political will cannot be an excuse for a continuing stalemate in the UNDC, given its role as a deliberative body to bridge the diverging views of Member States in negotiations.

In light of its universal representation, the UNDC has an important role as a venue where UN Member States can hold candid discussions on specific ideas in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. Japan strongly supports the Chairman's leadership to revitalize the UNDC. In order to assist the efforts of the Chairman and to facilitate the discussion among Member States, Japan intends shortly to submit a working paper. We hope this will assist Member States not only to reach a consensus on the agenda items but also to engage on substantive issues, even in this year's session.

(The role of the UNDC from the broader perspective)

The success of the 2010 NPT Review Conference has built momentum for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. However, once
again this year the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva failed to adopt a program of work, and there are still no prospects for the commencement of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FCMT). With the international conference on establishing a Weapons of Mass Destruction-Free Zone in the Middle East scheduled for this year, we should spare no effort to build momentum for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation within the UNDC as well. In setting the agenda for the UNDC, we must examine what kind of substantive input will be of greatest benefit over this next three-year cycle with respect to the UNDC's relationship to other fora and as we look ahead to the 2015 NPT Review Conference. In this regard, Japan strongly supports the specific ideas presented by Poland in its working paper, which give us clear guidance as to how the UNDC can produce tangible results.

(Substantive agenda to be discussed at the UNDC)

Mr. Chairman,

In the field of nuclear disarmament, while disarmament efforts by some Nuclear Weapon States, including the New START Treaty between the United States and Russia, are under way, the reality is that we still have a long way to go before we achieve a world without nuclear weapons. The positive momentum of the 2010 NPT Review Conference and the recent Seoul Nuclear Security Summit stands in contrast to the continuing proliferation of nuclear materials and nuclear technology and the great threat it poses to individual regions as well as to the world at large. Although sanctions based on UN Security Council resolutions have been implemented, various instances of violations continue to be reported. Efforts not only towards disarmament but also towards non-proliferation are essential. In this connection, we believe that the UNDC should address the issue of non-proliferation and disarmament at the same level. Furthermore, in light of the Chairman's significant expertise in disarmament and non-proliferation, elements such as regional cooperation, which includes the concept of nuclear-weapons-free zone treaties, warrant due consideration.
In addition to the pressing issues of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, issues related to conventional arms also requires due consideration. This is an important year for arms control, as the negotiating conference for an Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and the Review Conference on the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons are both to take place. Japan believes that, given the universal representation within the UNDC, it is meaningful for us to engage in discussion on arms control for conventional weapons, which pose a tangible threat to a great number of countries. Japan welcomes the Chairman's idea to deepen our discussions on improving the role of the UN Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament as well as on measures to build confidence among Member States in the field of conventional weapons.

Mr. Chairman,

Japan believes that this year's UNDC should also engage in a broader discussion which encompasses the widest possible interests of Member States. In this regard, we believe that the strengthening of the functioning of the UNDC as a deliberative body on disarmament and non-proliferation would be an appropriate subject for discussion. It is our view that such an agenda item would also incorporate the strong desire expressed by Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement to consider the effectiveness of the UNDC in a broader context. We also believe such discussion could also take in the issues to be raised in the context of the Fourth Disarmament Decade and the UN Special Session on Disarmament. The UNDC should also seek to determine how it can play a useful role among various fora that deal with issues related to disarmament and non-proliferation. Even if we are not able to reach a common view on this subject, the UNDC should at least express its own understanding of the situation through such ways as the Chairman's summary of the discussion.

(Conclusion)

Mr. Chairman,
This year's deliberations at the UNDC come at an important juncture, which has been described as a watershed moment to determine whether we will be able to carry out meaningful discussion over the course of the next three-year cycle. Japan will extend its full support to the Chairman and contribute to the deliberation in order that the UNDC can produce beneficial guidelines and recommendations on disarmament and non-proliferation, in accordance with its original mandate.

Thank you for your attention.
STATEMENT
by
Mrs. Byrganym Aitimova
Permanent Representative
of the Republic of Kazakhstan
to the United Nations

at the General Debate of 2012 Substantive Session
of the United Nations Disarmament Commission

4 April 2012

New York
Mr. Chairman,
Distinguished Colleagues

I would like to express warmest appreciation to you for your stewardship of the UNDC with vision, transparency and openness in the weeks ahead. Your letter of 27 March is illuminating and sets a different tone for the new cycle of the UNDC and we endorse both items as suggested by you. Our thanks are also due to the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs (ODA) and her Office for the support provided for our deliberations. As we begin a new cycle for the next three years, it is crucial that the recommendations emerging out of our deliberations make the Commission an effective entity of the disarmament machinery. We need to seize the moment for a decisive and firm outcome so that the 12-year long failure gives way to new strides. At the outset we fully support you, Mr. Chairman, and other Member States in revitalizing the UNDC and joining the multilateral action in strengthening the role and functioning of the Commission.

We are also committed to the discussions on improving the methods of work, but also to ensure that recommendations made in the last cycle are also implemented so that new wheels are not reinvented. As the first step, we need to review the past resolutions of the GA and other disarmament fora which spell out how the working methods of the UNDC can be strengthened. The Chair would be in the best position to prepare a short note on some of the salient recommendations from the past for us as a guideline.

Secondly, related to first theme of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, we support an equal focus on both aspects. Likewise, the second item should have a coverage of the conventional arms and small arms and light weapons (SALW), and confidence building measures. Since the range of issues in each of these topics is so vast, a deeper focus within them would yield better results. We are aware that other delegations would opt for a more general forum and so hope that a middle way can be found that satisfies all, including the item of pursuing a Disarmament Decade.

As the first step in disarmament and non-proliferation, Kazakhstan calls for the universalizing of the NPT and CTBT and also to strengthen the verification mechanism of this Agreement and the Additional Protocol. The effective implementation of the Nuclear Weapons Free Zones is imperative. Kazakhstan emphasizes the critical urgency of negative security assurances to be granted to nuclear weapons free zones, and is committed to work with others in the region to guarantee the physical security of nuclear materials and equipment to prevent nuclear proliferation and terrorism. With approval and supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency, my country will host a nuclear fuel bank. We particularly support the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in the Middle East despite the turbulence and threats presented by the region currently,
and lend full support to the 2012 Conference. As a goal towards disarmament, President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan has proposed a Universal Declaration for a Nuclear-Weapon Free World as the first step towards such a Convention aimed at nuclear abolition.

An effective Conference on Disarmament is a *sine qua non*, with every effort to agree on it substantive work programme, failing which the General Assembly should consider reorganizing the disarmament machinery. We cannot wait to commence work to implement the key Action Points arising from the 2010 May NPT Review Conference, drafting the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT), a convention against nuclear weapons and other key issues. The Five-Point Plan of the Secretary-General should also be an integral aspect of this action.

Regarding conventional weapons, the international community has no option but to work towards adoption of the treaty text at the forthcoming ATT Conference in July. A registry of all weapons with proper marking and classification will provide for transparency which will go a long way in building mutual trust and confidence. The regulation of illicit trade in small arms and light weapons (SALW) should be either included in the ATT or in a set of legally binding instruments. Confidence building measures are of crucial value, and so recommendations proposed by the last cycle of UNDC need to given full consideration in the coming three years with a fresh perspective, steering clear of the stalemate though.

Kazakhstan therefore calls for committed political will and support for improved working methods so that UNDC breaks its deadlock and can become a very viable entity in the disarmament machinery so that together we can all promote human advancement, as well as peace, justice and human rights.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Statement

by

Mr. Raza Bashir Tarar
Ambassador/Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan

at the

2012 Substantive Session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission

New York, 4 April 2012
Mr. Chairman,

My delegation congratulates you on your election as Chairman of the UNDC. Given your vast experience, we are confident that you will guide this Commission towards optimum results. We assure you of our support and cooperation.

2. We associate ourselves with the statement made by Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

Mr. Chairman,

3. We are commencing a new three year cycle of deliberations amidst several challenges to the global disarmament and non-proliferation regime as well its deliberative and negotiating fora. Perceptual differences persist in regard to the ways and means of achieving the shared objectives of disarmament and non-proliferation.

4. The recent narrative of positive trends in the international environment appears to be giving way to old expressions of lament and cynicism. Any objective appraisement of these cyclical patterns of hope and despair would reveal that a genuine “conducive international environment” in the field of disarmament emanates from “actions” rather than “words” and through sincere efforts, not opportunism.

5. In the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation the trajectory is negative as evidenced inter alia by the following developments:

   - adherence to the doctrines of nuclear use as well as resistance by some Nuclear Weapons States to foreswearing nuclear weapons;
   - modernization of nuclear weapons;
   - opposition to commencement of multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament;
   - violations of national and international non-proliferation obligations by some major powers;
   - pursuit of selectivity, discrimination and double standards by major powers in the area of non-proliferation, for commercial and strategic considerations;
   - accentuation of asymmetries between the major powers and smaller States through (i) development of ABM systems at tactical, theatre and, soon at the strategic level; (ii) steady militarization of Outer Space often in the guise of peaceful development as well as integration of space technologies into strategic doctrines and; (iii) build-up of conventional forces by major powers and;
   - reluctance of Nuclear Weapon States to provide negative security assurances to non-nuclear weapon states.

Mr. Chairman,

6. In the last two years, considerable debate has taken place on the need to rejuvenate the international disarmament machinery. This Commission and the
Conference on Disarmament are seen by some to be under-performing. In our view, the reasons for impasse in these bodies are self-evident. These include primarily a) the foot-dragging by some NWS on the most important issue of nuclear disarmament and the conspicuous silence of their partners at this obstinacy; b) the selective pursuit of non-proliferation and its use as a substitute to disarmament. It is, therefore, clear that the reasons for lack of progress are rooted in the continued lack of political will of states and double standards.

Mr. Chairman,

7. The Disarmament Commission has successfully evolved several recommendations including on NWFZ and international arms transfer guidelines. These recommendations were agreed with the same rules of procedure and working methods that exist today. There is nothing inherently flawed in these tools. The Commission, like the CD, does not, however, operate in a void. The Commission’s work or lack thereof reflects prevailing realities that are marked by divergences in priorities and perceived or real “betrayals” of the past.

8. Any solution to the current stalemate in the international disarmament machinery should be comprehensive and applicable to all aspects of this machinery, not just the issues that are of priority to some delegations. It should also address the real underlying causes of the stalemate. Pakistan strongly believes in the need to preserve this machinery that has been developed with consensus. Any effort to bypass the disarmament machinery would undermine consensus and legitimacy. We would never be part of any such efforts.

Mr. Chairman,

9. Let me take this opportunity to say a few words on the assertions made with regard to the so-called deadlock in the CD over FMCT. Let there be no mistake. This deadlock did not emerge in 2009. Consensus on FMCT negotiations has eluded CD for 15 years. For over a decade, the major powers did not allow any consideration of the FMCT or any other core agenda item of the CD. Now, with sufficient stocks available, FMCT has become cost free for some of the major powers and hence the mantra about it being the “next logical step” and a “ripe” issue for negotiations. And if time is any measure of judgment for ripeness or importance, the issues of Nuclear Disarmament and Negative Security Assurances have been deadlocked for over two decades.

10. To be sure, the CD was not created to negotiate an FMCT only, as there are a number of equally, if not more, important issues on its agenda. Moreover, if there is no consensus on one issue due to security concerns of states, other issues can and should be taken up.

Mr. Chairman,

11. In our view, any fissile material treaty should address clearly and comprehensively, the issue of asymmetry of existing fissile material stocks. Only then
will it be a treaty that would contribute to nuclear disarmament, ensuring equal security of all states. Pakistan continues to underline the importance of one of the cardinal principles of disarmament negotiations, as enshrined in Paragraph-29 of SSOD-I, which states, “The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage.”

12. Pakistan, along with 120 members of NAM, is ready to support commencement of negotiations on Nuclear Disarmament, an issue that has been a priority for the Non-Aligned Movement for decades. We also support negotiating a legal instrument on Negative Security Assurances that has been on the CD’s agenda for many years, and does not compromise the security of any state. There is also an urgent need to commence work on developing a treaty towards Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS). These steps are vital to ensure the peaceful uses of outer space, on which the international community relies heavily for economic and scientific development. We look forward to Commission’s deliberations on these important subjects.

Mr. Chairman,

13. Given the existing problems besetting global security and the need to overcome the deadlock in the international disarmament machinery, the Commission can and should deliberate on both the manifestations and causes of the current stalemate in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. The Commission should seek to harmonize the differences in perspectives and modalities and evolve agreed recommendations. In this regard, Pakistan fully supports the call of NAM countries to convene the Fourth Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD-IV) as a means to revive the consensus on achieving the agreed goals of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner, keeping in view the security interests of all states.

I thank you.
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Mr. Chairman,

Today we open a regular session of the UN Disarmament Commission.

The long-established traditions and impressive capacity of our Forum to produce recommendations to the UN General Assembly give us significant opportunities not only to address current international security challenges but also to prevent them.

We start a new three-year cycle of the Commission's work. All interested States will have to work intensively. In this connection, I would like to focus on Russia's priorities.

The Russian Federation as a major nuclear power reaffirms its commitment to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT. Russian President D. Medvedev established a long-term strategic objective of our foreign policy which is to build a world free from nuclear weapons. We are therefore resolved to consistently move towards this goal.

The US-Russian Treaty on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START) has become an important milestone in nuclear disarmament. Its implementation enhances international security and stability, and helps strengthen non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and make nuclear disarmament more comprehensive. Both Russia and the US will continue to work hard in order to implement it. We are involved in an unprecedented exchange of notifications and conduct inspection activity in line with the Treaty provisions. To date, we are generally satisfied with the progress in the START implementation.

We are open to discuss further steps towards nuclear reductions. But, in our view, we need to create a favourable international environment to that end.

Russia and the US are not the only states that bear the burden of "nuclear responsibility". Against the background of a significant reduction in nuclear capabilities carried out in the bilateral format the necessity of expanding the nuclear disarmament process and making it multilateral is becoming increasingly apparent.

We are convinced that it would be wrong to limit the nuclear arms reduction process solely to the efforts of the NPT State Parties. All countries with military nuclear capabilities should also engage in the disarmament process.

In our opinion, the achievement of a noble goal of completely eliminating nuclear weapons is possible only through a phased complex approach, through maintaining strategic stability and strictly adhering to the principle of equal and indivisible security for all. Under current conditions further nuclear arms reduction is impossible without due consideration of all factors of international security that can have a negative impact on strategic stability. We see among them the accelerated and unrestricted development of a global missile defense system, plans to implement the concept of a "global prompt strike", lack of considerable progress in the ratification of the CTBT, unwillingness to ban the placement of weapons in outer space, and qualitative and quantitative conventional arms imbalances.

The inextricable link between strategic offensive and defensive arms has been an axiom for Russia and the US for many years. Military experts and politicians from both countries have always assumed that an imbalance in this area is fraught with disastrous consequences for international security and strategic stability. That is precisely why it is once again clearly indicated in the preamble to the new START that there is an interrelation between strategic offensive arms and missile defense. At the current stage of significant reductions in strategic arms the issue of the missile defense systems deployment should be approached in an even more balanced way.

The complexity of solving all these problems is apparent. However, there is no alternative - the laborious work of all interested states is required in order to make progress in this direction.

Russia's initiatives to establish a universal legal regime on the basis of the 1987 INF Treaty aimed at eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles as well as return all nuclear arsenals to the national territories of states owning them and destroy the infrastructure necessary for their deployment abroad are still relevant.
Mr. Chairman,

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is the cornerstone of non-proliferation regime and international security. Contemporary risks and threats to the global regime, including regional challenges, should be addressed solely on the basis of the NPT.

Lately, quite a few measures have been taken to strengthen the non-proliferation regime and, in particular, the Treaty. The decisions of the 2010 NPT Review Conference are a reliable benchmark for further efforts.

They are based on a clear balance of the three NPT components (non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and peaceful use of nuclear energy).

We note with satisfaction our preparedness for the Treaty review process which will be launched with the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference (Vienna, April 30 ~ May 11, 2012).

It is now important to continue the work on the implementation of the decisions taken at the 2010 NPT Conference, as well as on possible steps to reinforce the Treaty. In this regard, we have a list of priorities which, if properly set out, will, in our opinion, help us at the 2015 NPT Conference to agree on yet another package of mutually beneficial measures aimed at strengthening non-proliferation regime.

In particular, it is necessary to ensure that the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) comes into force as soon as possible. We strongly urge all States, primarily those on whom the CTBT entry into force depends, to sign and/or ratify it without delay.

We also believe it essential to continue to jointly support the course, adopted by the international community, towards progressive development of the IAEA safeguards system and universalization of the Safeguards Agreement and its Additional Protocol as a recognized standard of verification of States' compliance with their non-proliferation obligations and a basic prerequisite for nuclear export control.

We note that the international community attaches increasing importance to reliable mechanisms for addressing risks and threats that could emerge if sensitive materials and technologies fall into the hands of non-state actors.

International cooperation on ensuring the security of nuclear facilities and countering nuclear trafficking plays a strategic role. Joint efforts are needed to contribute to the universalization of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. We stress the importance of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the development of “best practices” for nuclear material identification and nuclear forensics. All these efforts deserve targeted support which might be provided, *inter alia*, through our forum.

We highlight the important role of such instrument as the 1980 Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and its Amendment (adopted in 2005). We urge those States that have not yet done so to ratify the Amendment to the Convention as soon as possible.

We pursue efforts in support of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZ) throughout the world. Russia actively supports the States’s activities aimed at establishing such zones. On 20 March, 2011 Russia ratified the Protocols to the African Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (the Treaty of Pelindaba).

The implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the establishment of a zone free from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery (WMDFZ) in the Middle East will remain our short-term priority. Following the decisions of the 2010 NPT Review Conference the depositories of the Treaty (Russia, the UK and the US) together with the UN Secretary General and in consultation with Middle East countries have achieved significant progress in the preparations for the 2012 Conference on the issue of establishing in the region a zone free from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) as well as their means of delivery. We believe that the main objective for the 2012 Conference to be successful is ensuring the
participation in the forum of all countries of the Middle East region.

Our joint efforts with ASEAN Member States and other P5 partners have brought about significant progress in the establishment of an international legal framework of a nuclear-weapon-free zone (NWFZ) in South-East Asia with a view to signing the relevant Protocol to the Treaty on the NWFZ in South-East Asia by all the five nuclear-weapon states in the nearest future.

An important outcome of the 2010 NPT Review Conference consisted in defining best ways to ensure an unhindered access of all NPT States Parties to the benefits of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. There is a growing global awareness of the fact that the exercise of legitimate interests of many countries in this area requires a modern, proliferation-resistant architecture of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, which should be based on rigid control mechanisms of non-proliferation and on multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle that can offer a feasible alternative to the development by States in their own territory of the elements of the nuclear fuel cycle that are costly and sensitive in terms of non-proliferation. It is important to set the right direction for moving forward.

To this end, Russia launched the International Uranium Enrichment Center in the city of Angarsk and created a low-enriched uranium reserve under the IAEA management which can already be used today by any State which complies with its non-proliferation obligations. It is important that the countries in need of long-term fuel supply for their nuclear power plants have different options and the feeling of confidence in their future.

The Fukushima nuclear power plant disaster in Japan showed the necessity of strengthening the international legal framework in order to ensure safety of nuclear facilities in terms of their construction and exploitation. In this regard, in 2011 Russia launched the initiative to amend the Convention on Nuclear Safety and the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident, as well as to strengthen the IAEA nuclear safety standards. We are convinced that an early adoption of our proposals will help avoid or mitigate negative impacts of nuclear accidents in the future.

Mr. Chairman,

To reinforce momentum in the field of international security, it is essential to ensure full-scale functioning of multilateral disarmament mechanisms.

Russia is concerned about the situation at the Conference on Disarmament. We regret that despite their determined efforts the Member States have failed to reach an agreement on the programme of work and to resume negotiations. We believe that it is important to preserve the Conference as a leading multilateral negotiations forum on disarmament and non-proliferation of WMD. In our view, any initiative to hold negotiations on the CD issues at "alternative platforms" is counter-productive. We are ready for further consultations in order to find a compromise on the CD programme of work that would be acceptable for all.

Mr. Chairman,

Prevention of placement of weapons in outer space remains one of the priorities of Russia's foreign policy. We still believe that the best way to achieve this goal today is to conclude a treaty on the prevention of placement of weapons in outer space. Main provisions of this treaty contained in the Russian-Chinese draft are supported by most of the members of the international community. Now, it is high time to hold a substantive discussion of this treaty in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. We support early resumption of work of this important international disarmament forum.

An important element of our efforts towards prevention of placement of weapons in outer space is elaboration of transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs) in outer space activities. The UN Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on TCBMs starts working this year. We hope that experts will build on the existing research with active support of other interested States, and by the end of the next year will present to the international community a final document which would facilitate establishing the rules of conduct by States in outer space.
We are satisfied with the successful outcome of the Seventh Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and adoption of its substantive Final Document, which includes an ambitious plan of action for the intersessional period ahead. We intend to proactively engage in the implementation of decisions adopted at the Conference in order to further strengthen the regime of prohibition of biological and toxin weapons.

Russia stands for a deep modernization of the conventional arms control regime in Europe without any preconditions and reservations.

We think that a possible agreement on the conventional arms control regime in Europe should reflect the balance of interests of all its Parties and take into account the contemporary situation in Europe, while not allowing for a unchallenged military supremacy of any Party and not imposing restrictions on deployment of weapons and military equipment within the national territory, as well as contribute to prevention of an arms race and establish an inspection regime ensuring a reliable verification of compliance with quantitative weapons restrictions.

Mr. Chairman,

The Russian Federation, sharing concerns of the international community, stands for further consolidation, under the UN auspices, of all efforts by the international community to counter uncontrolled proliferation of small arms and light weapons.

In this context, we attach great importance to the Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, scheduled for next August-September. We intend to take an active part in its work. We hope that this Conference will practically contribute to the solution of the acute, pressing issue of illicit SALW trafficking.

As for the transparency issues, we assume that the main objective of the relative mechanisms, including the UN Register of Conventional Arms, is to trace and identify destabilizing accumulations of conventional arms for the purposes of ensuring stability and international security.

We acknowledge the importance of the technical aspects of transparency mechanisms such as expansion and further detailing of weapons categories. At the same time, we think that the priority is attached to their political aspect as a confidence-building measure aimed at fostering a dialogue between states should they have concerns about destabilizing accumulations of arms.

The Conference on an International Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) which is scheduled for July will be one of the most important events in the agenda of this year. We are approaching it in a difficult situation when the spread of opinions on what the potential instrument in the field of conventional arms transfers should look like is rather wide. We believe that in order for the Conference to have positive results, it is necessary to focus on basic elements of a possible document. First of all we mean coming on agreement on its goals and objectives and thereafter we should address other aspects, in particular, the scope and parameters.

For our part we are convinced that the main goal should be "combating illicit arms trafficking." It is just the illicit trafficking that is a problem that the whole world community faces urgently and a major source of numerous human sufferings.

We consider the principles of inclusion and consensus-based decision-making to be exceptionally important in the process of elaboration of the ATT.

We would like to see as the outcome of our joint work a really meaningful and effective document aimed at addressing specific problems and based on the highest international standards.

Mr. Chairman,

The main task, which our Forum faces, is to contribute to solving the most urgent problems of disarmament and non-proliferation. The Russian delegation is ready for constructive cooperation with all interested States in order to find mutually acceptable solutions.
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- CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY -
Mr. Chair,

Let me open by reiterating the full support in your work that you have from the Swedish delegation and myself as vice chair of the commission, and commend you again for your inexhaustible efforts to move us closer to an agenda.

The UNDC was created with a mandate to be a deliberative body, where discussions would lead to recommendations that the General Assembly could consider. It was never meant to be a negotiating forum, but the way the Commission has been working has not reflected this basic fact. The UNDC has sometimes been described as the “think tank” of the disarmament machinery, but such a description presupposes that some constructive thinking ought to actually emerge from our deliberations.

It is in our view deeply regrettable that a forum tasked to deliver recommendations has failed to do so for twelve years and at a high annual cost. This is the reason that Sweden, along with many others, has insisted that it is time we have a discussion on how we go about our business and how our work relates to the role envisaged for the UNDC in the disarmament machinery. We look forward to such a discussion, whether it be as a working group or in the plenary, because we see it as an opportunity for this forum as a whole to come together and consider how we can better make a contribution to solving the central problems of global disarmament and non-proliferation.

I wish to stress here that we have a joint responsibility for this forum and an obligation to the United Nations and to global opinion to find more constructive ways to work. For this reason, Sweden intends to present some thoughts on this topic for the consideration of partners ahead of the three year cycle. We firmly believe it to be within the remit of the UNDC itself to discuss its own methods and how it addresses its mandates, notwithstanding calls for a special session to address the disarmament machinery as a whole. Our discussions this week have shown with only too much clarity just how hard it is for us to make progress even on basic issues, and we think this fact demonstrates the need for reform.

Mr. Chair,

The problem of paralysis is of course not exclusive to the UNDC, but rather characterises much of the disarmament machinery and perhaps nowhere more obviously so than at the Conference of Disarmament. Sweden is among all those who feel deep frustration over this deadlock, which has been going on for much too long. We still believe that the CD ought to be, in principle, the best place for multilateral disarmament negotiations, even if it may be not the only one at all times or under all circumstances.

Of the issues on the CD agenda, on which we want to see substantive negotiations, the FMCT is, to us, the foremost. We need to put a legal cap on production of fissile material for weapons purposes, as well as to deal appropriately with previously produced stocks. The main objective must be to begin substantial negotiations, since a treaty on fissile material, in our view, is an essential stepping stone towards the goal of global zero. Having said this, Sweden remains prepared to move forward also on the other core issues of the Conference on Disarmament.
Mr Chair,

In our discussions on an agenda for the UNDC and in deliberating working methods, we must not forget the reasons why we are here in the first place and why the UNDC exists. Almost seventy years since the indiscriminate and devastating effect of nuclear weapons was shown for the first time, the continuing role of these weapons in security doctrines remains a central security challenge. According to a Global Zero estimate, the world’s de facto nuclear powers are likely to spend a mind-boggling one billion dollars on these weapons of mass destruction in the coming decade.

Sweden has long been an advocate of efforts to prevent further spread of nuclear weapons and to convince current possessors of nuclear weapons to reduce and eventually eliminate their nuclear arsenals. Our overarching goal is a world free of nuclear weapons as well as any other weapons of mass destruction. This will not be achieved in the short term, but important disarmament and non-proliferation steps could — and should — be taken now. Sweden, together with Mexico, has taken on a special role in promoting the CTBT as one of the Coordinating States in the Article XIV process on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the CTBT. We therefore take this opportunity to urge all states, that have not yet done so, to sign and ratify the CTBT without delay.

Mr. Chair,

The IAEA system of safeguards is fundamental to the nuclear non-proliferation regime and to the implementation of the NPT. Sweden encourages all states which have not yet done so to conclude and bring into force an Additional Protocol without delay. Together, the Additional Protocol and the Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement constitute a robust and effective safeguards system which should be considered as the current verification standard.

The international community continues to be confronted with major proliferation challenges, in particular, but not limited to the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. We continue to be gravely concerned about the persistent failure of these countries to comply with their international obligations under the relevant resolutions of the UN Security Council and the IAEA Board of Governors and we urge them to comply with those obligations and cooperate with the IAEA without delay.

Sweden has worked actively for a number of years to advance cooperation on multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle. We look forward to continuing discussions in a non-discriminatory and transparent manner.

Mr. Chair,

On the conventional side, the illicit spread of arms causes massive destruction and human tragedy on a daily basis, endangering both security and development. In data cited by the UNDP, of the approximately 740,000 people who die each year as a result of armed violence, 500,000 are fatalities related to situations of violence other than armed conflicts, essentially related to the use of small arms and light weapons. This July, we look forward to a successful diplomatic conference on an Arms Trade Treaty, leading to a strong and robust treaty that enjoys the support of the international community and that can be signed by as many States as
possible. Later this year, we also hope that the Review Conference on the SALW PoA will be concrete and forward-looking in reviewing the implementation of this important agreement.

In conclusion, Mr. Chair, I want to frame the difficult discussions we are having this week on our agenda and even on individual sentences, in the larger picture of the grave security and humanitarian challenges I have just referred to. I hope that we can work together to find a way for the UNDC to be part of the solution and not part of the problem.

I thank you, Mr. Chair
Monsieur le Président,

Je souhaite en tout premier lieu joindre ma voix à celle des délégations précédentes pour vous féliciter de votre élection à la présidence de la session 2012 de la Commission du désarmement des Nations Unies (CDNU). Je souhaite également vous assurer du plein soutien de la délégation suisse dans la conduite de votre tâche.

La CDNU entame un nouveau cycle de travail de trois ans alors que le mécanisme du désarmement de l'ONU soulève d'importantes inquiétudes.

Alors que les défis se multiplient dans le domaine de la sécurité internationale et du désarmement, les institutions de cette machinerie ne semblent plus être en mesure de répondre aux attentes placées en elles. Les conséquences de ces défaillances sont significatives et se font déjà sentir. Elles s'intensifieront à l'avenir si aucune issue n'y est trouvée.

Plusieurs raisons sous-tendent les blocages affectant la machinerie du désarmement depuis maintenant de nombreuses années. L'absence de volonté politique de progresser ou d'en tirer parti là où celle-ci se matérialise est certainement un facteur d'importance. Mais l'absence de progrès s'explique tout autant par des causes d'ordre institutionnel. Les instances de désarmement ne semblent plus être en mesure de fournir des réponses aux défis qui leur sont posés également en raison du fait qu'un poids prépondérant est octroyé aux considérations de sécurité nationale par de nombreux acteurs,
ceci au détriment des considérations d'ordre global. Or, les efforts de désarmement ont un rôle impor-
tant à jouer dans le renforcement de la sécurité humaine, la protection des droits de l'homme ou le
développement économique.

Des approches restrictives ne sont plus appropriées, car aujourd'hui les intérêts nationaux et la sécuri-
té au sens global du terme ne peuvent plus être séparés. Dans cette situation, il nous semble qu'il
devient de plus en plus difficile de maintenir qu'une profonde révision de la machinerie de désarme-
ment ou une approche nouvelle dans ce secteur ne sont pas nécessaires. Agir est aujourd'hui deve-
nu une nécessité.

Monsieur le Président,

La fonction de la CDNU, comme forum spécialisé et délibératif au sein du mécanisme de désarme-
ment des Nations Unies, est d'élaborer des normes de désarmement en soumettant des recomman-
dations concrètes à l'Assemblée générale. Celles soumises par le passé démontrent la valeur ajoutée
de la Commission. Cet organe n'a cependant pas été en mesure d'adopter de telles recommandations
de substance depuis maintenant plus de douze ans. La valeur ajoutée qu'elle apporte aux processus
de désarmement et de maîtrise des armements est aujourd'hui sujette à caution.

Au vu de cette situation, il nous semble impératif que la CDNU se penche dès cette année sur la ma-
nière de conduire ses travaux. En d'autres termes, il conviendrait qu'elle inscrive ce thème comme
point à son ordre du jour. Lors de sa dernièresession, l'Assemblée générale a appelé les Etats à
examiner et étudier dans les instances appropriées les options et éléments d'une revitalisation du
mécanisme du désarmement de l'ONU, ceci dans le cadre de la résolution intitulée revitaliser les tra-
vaux de la Conférence du désarmement et faire avancer les négociations multilatérales sur le désar-
nement. La CDNU nous semble pleinement correspondre à ce qualificatif d'instance appropriée.

Dans le cadre d'un tel exercice, la CDNU devrait approfondir toute une série de questions.

Elle devrait notamment se pencher sur la question de son ordre du jour. Les blocages de la CDNU
sont en partie liés au fait que deux thématiques y apparaissent, l'une sur le désarmement nucléaire et
l'autre sur le désarmement conventionnel. Ceci crée une situation peu propice à des avancées car
l'absence de progrès dans un domaine génère des blocages dans l'autre. L'option d'avoir un thème
annuel unique à l'ordre du jour de la Commission mériterait donc d'être explorée.

De plus, il conviendrait de définir s'il ne serait pas plus approprié que les points à l'ordre du jour porte
sur des thématiques précises et circonscrites plutôt que sur des thèmes génériques tels que désar-
tement nucléaire ou désarmement conventionnel. À ce sujet, il nous semblerait opportun que la
CDNU focalise son action à venir dans le domaine du désarmement nucléaire sur les assurances
négatives de sécurité, les zones exemptes d'armes nucléaires ou sur les armes nucléaires non-
stratégiques. En ce qui concerne les armes conventionnelles, elle pourrait se concentrer sur la thématique des mécanismes de vérification ou des mesures de confiance sur le plan régional.

La CDNU devrait également se pencher sur la possibilité d'ouvrir ses travaux à des échanges avec les représentants du monde académique et de la société civile. Une plus grande interaction avec ces acteurs pourrait servir à donner un nouvel élan aux travaux de cette enceinte et faire en sorte que celle-ci prenne en considération toutes les préoccupations liées aux questions de désarmement.

Un autre élément qui mériterait d'être approfondi par la CDNU a trait à la transmission à l'Assemblée générale d'un rapport reflétant les échanges de vue sur les questions de substance. Les blocages de ces dernières années ont eu pour effet que cette transmission d'information a été impossible. La possibilité pour la Présidence en exercice de la Commission de transmettre en son nom propre un rapport à l'Assemblée générale reflétant les discussions et les différentes opinions exprimées devrait être envisagée.

Bien entendu, les quelques sujets que je viens d'énumérer ne représentent pas une liste exhaustive des thèmes qui mériteraient d'être approfondis par la CDNU dans le cadre d'un examen de ses procédures de travail. D'autres thématiques s'imposeraient également.

Monsieur le Président,

S'il est certain que la CDNU devrait se pencher sur ses propres méthodes de travail, nous sommes également convaincus qu'elle devrait aborder la question du mécanisme de désarmement des Nations Unies dans son ensemble. La Commission est en effet une instance particulièrement appropriée pour ce faire, du fait qu'elle réunit l'ensemble des États membres de l'ONU.

La CDNU devrait donc se pencher non seulement sur son propre cas mais également sur celui d'autres instances. La Conférence du désarmement (CD) est la pièce maîtresse de la machinerie du désarmement. Elle reste à ce jour le seul forum multilatéral permanent de négociation dans le domaine du désarmement. De ce fait, elle est un instrument essentiel pour l'ensemble de la communauté des États, pour les pays membres ou pas de cette institution. Son incapacité depuis maintenant plus de quinze ans à entamer des travaux de substance est donc source de préoccupation pour l'ensemble des États membres de l'ONU.

Dans le cadre de cet exercice global, la CDNU pourrait également se pencher sur le rôle respectif des différents organes de la machinerie du désarmement, sur leur interaction et sur la manière de l'améliorer si cela est possible. Enfin, dans le cadre de cette approche, la CDNU pourrait également se pencher sur les processus nécessaires à la réalisation d'une réforme de la machinerie existante et de la manière de créer les conditions nécessaires à un tel exercice.
Monsieur le Président,

Nous saluons le fait que des démarches visant à s'attaquer enfin aux blocages affectant les mécanismes de désarmement aient commencé à voir le jour. Un processus sur plusieurs niveaux représente la meilleure manière d'avancer au vu de la présente situation.

La réunion de haut niveau du 24 septembre 2010 convoquée par le Secrétaire général de l'ONU a représenté le premier jalon, suivi par un débat de la plénière de l'Assemblée générale en juillet 2011. La question a également été abordée dans le cadre de la 1ère Commission lors de la 65ème et 66ème sessions de l'Assemblée générale. Comme je l'ai déjà indiqué, cette dernière a appelé dans le cadre d'une résolution que les différentes options pour une réforme de la machinerie du désarmement fassent l'objet d'un approfondissement.

L'étape suivante consistera à évaluer la mise en œuvre de cette résolution lors de la prochaine session de l'Assemblée générale. Cette appréciation devra bien entendu prendre en considération le déroulement et les résultats de la session 2012 de la CDNU. Cette évaluation servira de base à l'Assemblée générale pour prendre les décisions qui s'imposent.

De ce fait, la session 2012 de la CDNU revêt une importance particulière. Celle-ci a un rôle important à jouer en vue de fournir une réponse à la paralysie du mécanisme onusien du désarmement. Nous ne pouvons que l'inviter à prendre pleinement ses responsabilités.

Monsieur le Président,

Je vous remercie de votre attention.
Mr Chairman,

I would like to start by joining with previous delegations in congratulating you on your election to the chair of the 2012 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). I would also like to assure you of the full support of the Swiss delegation in your task.

UNDC is commencing a new three-year cycle at a time when the UN disarmament machinery is raising serious concerns.

As challenges to international security and disarmament are growing, the institutions that make up this machinery seem to be increasingly unable to meet the expectations vested in them. These failures have significant consequences that are already being felt. If no solutions are found, their impact can only intensify in the future.

Several underlying reasons contribute to the deadlock that has blocked the disarmament machinery for a number of years now. A significant factor is that the political will to make progress is often lacking, and where it does exist, it is often not effectively capitalized upon. But the lack of progress is just as much due to causes that are institutional in nature. The disarmament forums no longer appear capable of providing answers to the challenges they face because many of the nations involved give precedence to questions of national security, to the detriment of global considerations. However, efforts to promote disarmament play an important role in strengthening human security, the protection of human rights, and economic development.

Restrictive approaches are no longer appropriate, because in today’s world, national interests and security in a global sense can no longer be separated. In this situation, we feel it is becoming increasingly difficult to deny the need for an in-depth review of the whole disarmament machinery, or of a new approach in this area. Today, action has become a necessity.

Mr Chairman,

The function of the UNDC, as a specialised forum for deliberations within the United Nations’ disarmament apparatus, is to develop disarmament norms by submitting concrete recommendations to the General Assembly. The recommendations put forward in the past demonstrate the added value of the Commission. However, for over twelve years now, this body has not been able to adopt such recommendations of substance. The added value that the Commission brings to the process of disarmament and arms control today is questionable.

In light of this situation, we consider it imperative for UNDC to focus its attention as of this year on the way it conducts its operations. In other words, it should include this question as an agenda item. At its
last session, the General Assembly called on member states to explore and consider, in the appropriate forums, options and elements for a revitalisation of the UN’s disarmament apparatus, this within the framework of the resolution entitled *revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations*. In our opinion, the UNDC fully meets this qualification of appropriate forum.

In the context of such an exercise, UNDC should look in-depth at a whole series of questions.

In particular, it should examine the issue of its own agenda. The stalemate UNDC is facing is in part related to the fact that two themes appear on its agenda, one on nuclear disarmament and the other on conventional disarmament. This creates a very unpropitious situation for progress because any impasse in one of these areas impedes the other. Thus, the option of adopting a single annual theme on the Commission’s agenda warrants consideration.

In addition, it would be helpful to determine whether it would be more appropriate to have the agenda focus on specific, circumscribed themes rather than on generic issues such as nuclear disarmament or conventional disarmament. On this subject, we feel it would be opportune for the UNDC to focus its action within the field of nuclear disarmament on negative security assurances, nuclear weapons free zones, or on non-strategic nuclear weapons. Regarding conventional weapons, the UNDC could concentrate on the issue of the verification mechanisms or of confidence-building measures on the regional level.

UNDC should also examine the possibility of opening up its proceedings to exchanges with representatives from the academic world and civil society. Greater interaction with these actors could give new impetus to the work of this organ and enable it to take into account all the concerns related to disarmament issues.

Another item that warrants further attention from the UNDC concerns the submission of a report to the General Assembly that reflects the exchanges of a substantive nature. The stalemate of recent years has rendered this transmission of information impossible. The possibility should be envisaged for the Commission’s incumbent Chairperson to submit, in his or her own name, a report to the General Assembly that reflects the discussions and the different opinions expressed.

Of course, the various matters that I have just enumerated do not constitute an exhaustive list of the themes that warrant further attention from the UNDC in the context of an examination of its working procedures. Other themes will also need to be looked at.
Mr Chairman,

If it is clear that the UNDC should review its own working methods, we are also convinced that it should address the issue of the United Nations' disarmament machinery in its entirety. The Commission is actually a most appropriate body for this task, because it draws together all the Member States of the United Nations.

Therefore, UNDC should not only examine its own case, but also that of other bodies. The Conference on Disarmament (CD) is the cornerstone of the disarmament machinery. To this day, it is still the single permanent multilateral forum for negotiation in the field of disarmament. For this reason, it is an essential instrument for the whole community of States, whether or not they are members of this organ. Its incapacity for over fifteen years now to undertake any substantial work is therefore a source of concern for all the Member States of the UN.

In the context of this global exercise, UNDC could also examine the respective roles of the various organs of the disarmament machinery, their interaction and the way it could possibly be improved. Finally, in the framework of this approach, UNDC could also examine the processes that would be required to carry out a reform of the existing machinery and ways of creating the conditions that would make this exercise possible.

Mr Chairman,

We applaud the fact that initiatives have begun to emerge that aim, at long last, to tackle the stalemate that blocks the disarmament machinery. In light of the present situation, a multi-tiered process represents the best way of moving forward.

The high-level meeting of 24 September 2010 convened by the Secretary General of the United Nations represented the first milestone, followed by a debate in the plenary session of the General Assembly in July 2011. The issue was also raised in the context of the 1st Commission during the 65th and 66th sessions of the General Assembly. As I have already mentioned, the 66th session of General Assembly has called in a resolution to explore various options for a reform of the disarmament apparatus.

The next step will be to assess the implementation of this resolution during the next session of the General Assembly. This evaluation will of course take into account the proceedings and the results of the 2012 session of UNDC. This assessment will serve as the foundation for the General Assembly to make the decisions that are called for.
For this reason, the 2012 session of UNDC is invested with a particular significance. It has an important role to play in providing a response to the paralysis of the UN's disarmament machinery. We can only encourage it to fully assume its responsibilities.

Mr Chairman,

Thank you for your attention.
2012 UN Disarmament Commission

U.S. Opening Statement

by:

Mr. John A. Bravaco
U.S. Representative

April 4, 2012
New York City

Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. Good afternoon everyone.

On behalf of the United States Delegation, let me congratulate Peru on its election to the Chairmanship of the 2012 session of the UN Disarmament Commission. It is my great pleasure to be working with you again, sir. You may count on the full support of the United States as you fulfill your important responsibilities.

We also congratulate the other members of the Commission's Bureau for their elections. And we warmly welcome the new High Representative for Disarmament, Ms. Angela Kane, and express our gratitude for the contributions of the previous High Representative, Sergio Duarte.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Disarmament Commission is meeting on the eve of the first Preparatory Committee meeting for the 2015 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference (NPT). Please allow me to touch on some of the activities, achievements, and commitments of the United States in the field of arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament.

The NPT is the Cornerstone

Mr. Chairman, in the forty-two years since the NPT entered into force it has become the most widely adhered to nonproliferation and disarmament agreement the world has ever known. As U.S. President Barack Obama said on April 5, 2009 in Prague: “The basic bargain is sound: Countries with nuclear weapons will move towards disarmament, countries without nuclear weapons will not acquire them, and all countries can access peaceful nuclear energy.” Working together at the 2010 NPT Review Conference, States Party achieved agreement on an ambitious and forward-looking Action Plan across all three pillars of the NPT.
As the 2015 Review Process begins, the United States looks forward to working with its NPT partners to strengthen implementation of all aspects of the Treaty and the international nuclear nonproliferation regime.

New START and Beyond

Two agreements between the United States and the Russian Federation that came into force last year serve as essential evidence of the United States’ commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons. The U.S.-Russia Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement will result in the disposal of enough weapons-grade plutonium for many thousands of nuclear weapons. And the New START Treaty, the implementation of which is now well underway, will, we anticipate, set the stage for the pursuit of a future agreement with Russia for broad reductions in all categories of nuclear weapons – strategic, non-strategic, deployed and non-deployed. As we consider next steps, close consultations with Russia, as well as our allies, will remain essential.

P5 Transparency and Confidence Building on Nuclear Disarmament

Mr. Chairman, Action 5 of the 2010 NPT Review Conference Final Document Action Plan calls on the Nuclear Weapons States to engage on further reducing nuclear weapons and diminishing their role, reducing the risk of nuclear war, and enhancing transparency and mutual confidence. Building on the NPT RevCon and the engagement initiated at the 2009 London and 2011 Paris conferences, the P5 have continued discussions on these and other nonproliferation and disarmament issues, including reporting by the P5 to other NPT Parties on disarmament-related matters. This process continues. The United Kingdom is hosting a P5 verification working group, as agreed at last year’s Paris P5 Conference. And this summer, the United States is pleased to be hosting the next P5 verification, transparency, and confidence building conference in Washington, DC.

Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty

Mr. Chairman, a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) remains an absolutely essential step on the path to global nuclear disarmament, one repeatedly endorsed by the international community. The reality of the situation is simply this: the longer an effectively verifiable FMCT is delayed, or more accurately, denied, the longer a world free of nuclear weapons will remain out of reach.
For this reason, we regret that the Conference on Disarmament (CD) did not agree to the recent compromise Program of Work that would have advanced efforts toward an FMCT, along with serious work on other important issues. We are disappointed at this lost opportunity, but appreciate the vigorous efforts of Egypt and the other “P-6” CD Presidency countries to move this issue forward. We are currently consulting with our P5 partners and others on the most appropriate next steps for an FMCT.

Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

The United States also remains committed to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) as another critical element of the nuclear disarmament process. The Administration is continuing its engagement with the United States Senate and the American public on the merits of the Treaty. As we move forward with our efforts to promote ratification, we call on all governments to declare or reaffirm their commitments not to conduct nuclear explosive tests. We thank and congratulate Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, and Indonesia for their recent ratifications of the Treaty. And we ask all the remaining States required for the Treaty’s entry into force to join us in moving toward ratification.

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

Mr. Chairman, over the last several years, the United States has reinvigorated its efforts to support nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties as an important part of the multilateral arms control and nonproliferation architecture. On May 2, 2011, the Administration transmitted the relevant Protocols of the African and South Pacific Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaties to the U.S. Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. Also last year, the Nuclear Weapon States and the states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations resolved long standing differences related to the South East Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone’s Protocol language. Upon completion of some procedural steps, we hope to be able to sign the Protocol to the Southeast Asian zone treaty this year. Regarding the Treaty of Semipalatinsk in Central Asia, we have had preliminary discussions with Kazakhstan and our P5 partners to consider ways to address outstanding issues. And, along with the other NPT depositary states, we strongly support the efforts of Finnish Under Secretary Jaako Laajava, the facilitator for the Middle East Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone Conference.
Outer Space

Mr. Chairman in an effort to strengthen the long-term sustainability, stability, safety, and security of space, the United States earlier this year announced its decision to formally work with the European Union and spacefaring nations to develop and advance an “International Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities.” The European Union’s draft Code of Conduct is a good foundation for the development of a non-legally binding International Code of Conduct, which, if adopted, would establish guidelines for responsible behavior to reduce the hazards of debris-generating events and increase the transparency of operations in space to avoid the danger of collisions. We also look forward to practical work in the UN’s Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on outer space transparency and confidence-building measures that is scheduled to begin this summer.

The UNDC’S Agenda

Mr. Chairman, as we work to finalize agreement on the Commission’s agenda for the 2012-2014 issue cycle, please allow me to express my confidence in your ability to foster a compromise that takes account of the views of all delegations.

Conclusion

Once our agenda is agreed, the United States looks forward to addressing the issues before the Commission in the coming years, and will do its part to facilitate a positive outcome.

Mr. Chairman, this statement will be made available on the website of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations.

Thank you for your attention.
Mr. Chairman,

Let me join the others in congratulating you on your election as Chairman of this important substantive Session. My delegation is confident that under your wise guidance and experienced leadership, the work of the Commission will achieve a successful outcome. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate Ms. Angela Kane on her recent appointment as the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs. Viet Nam aligns itself with the statement made by the distinguished representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,

Our Session commences at an important juncture, when the Commission marked its sixtieth anniversary and began a new three-year cycle of work. Over the past year, we have witnessed some positive developments in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, the recent conclusion of review conferences of biological weapons convention, the chemical weapons convention as well as Conference of the UN Program of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons. More international conferences and meetings related to arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation will take place in 2012, like the First Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, the UN Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty and the long-awaited 2012 Conference on a Middle East Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone. These positive developments showed that there are commitments and political will in pursuing the disarmament agenda.
Without denying these positive developments, we have to face the fact that challenges are remain enormous and far from over. There still exists a nuclear stockpile capable of destroying the entire world many times over. The situation of proliferation of nuclear weapons is undergoing new and complex developments. During the substantive Sessions of two previous cycles, it is regrettable that the UNDC has failed to achieve intended results. To effectively break the deadlock, it is crucial that member states should pursue good-faith, flexibility and redouble efforts to reach agreement on the agenda, supporting the aims of the UNDC for the cause of disarmament, especially towards the total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. Due to time constraints, I wish to highlight a number of issues:

First, we share the view that nuclear weapons today continue to pose as the most serious threat to international peace and security. Given the exceptionally catastrophic consequences of these horrific weapons for mankind, the only absolute guarantee against nuclear war is the total elimination of nuclear disarmament. In this connection, we emphasize the need to start negotiations on this issue without further delay. Negotiation process should be based on fundamental principles agreed at the First Special Session of the UN General Assembly (SSOD-I) and aimed at strengthening peace and international security, achieving the ultimate goal of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war and the implementation of measures to halt and reverse the arms race.

Second, Viet Nam values the role of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation regime. The full implementation of the Treaty in a balanced manner would safeguard the world from potential devastation of nuclear weapons. In this regard, we urge the Nuclear Weapons States to undertake the implementation of 64 sets of concrete actions contained in the Outcome Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. We call for efforts aimed at non-proliferation to be made in tandem with efforts aimed at disarmament.

Third, Viet Nam wishes to reaffirm the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. We calls on the CD to agree on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work as soon as possible. It is important to start negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, as well as to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction. Viet Nam attaches great importance to the immediate
commencement and early conclusion of the negotiations on a Treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons (FMCT).

_Fourth_, my delegation underlines the importance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We are happy to note that there is a steady increase in the number of signatory and ratifying States to the Treaty. To enable the CTBT to enter into force without any further delay, we are convinced that the Nuclear Weapons States should take a leading role in the field of global peace and security and their ratifications would pay the way and further encourage the remaining countries to follow suit. Meanwhile, pending the CTBT's entry into force, all States should maintain a moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions or any other nuclear explosions, and refrain from acts that would undermine the objectives and purposes of this Treaty.

At the same time, my delegation wishes to reiterate that the legitimate rights of all states to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination should be fully respected in conformity with Article IV of the Treaty and IAEA safeguards system.

_Mr. Chairman_,

It is a consistent policy of Viet Nam to strive for peace and support non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction towards general and complete disarmament. Viet Nam has acceded to all major multilateral treaties on prohibiting weapons of mass destruction and has been an active member of many United Nations disarmament bodies. In the region of South East Asia, it is also closely working with other Member States of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and other partners in the implementation of the Treaty on the South East Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (SEANWFZ) and its Plan of Action. I assure you that Viet Nam will fully cooperate with other member states to bring the UNDC to a satisfactory outcome, contributing to the maintenance of world peace and security.

I thank you.
Disarmament Commission
2013 substantive session
New York, 1-19 April 2013
Agenda item 1

Preventing the use of nuclear weapons

Working paper submitted by the United States of America

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.

(President John F. Kennedy, 10 June 1963)

1. Since the darkest days of the cold war, the United States has fully understood the potential serious consequences that would result from the use of nuclear weapons. We continue to accord the highest priority to avoiding such use. As President Ronald W. Reagan said in April 1984, “A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.”

2. In April 2009 in Prague, President Barack Obama clearly articulated the United States commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons. He outlined the continuation of a practical, step-by-step United States approach to disarmament, an approach that has proved over time to be the most effective means to increase stability, reduce nuclear dangers, fulfil our commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and strengthen the global nuclear non-proliferation regime.

Responsibly forging ahead on our disarmament commitments

3. President Obama’s 2009 Prague speech was not a call to unilaterally disarm, nor did it assume that the world would change overnight. It was a road map to the
future — a step-by-step, measured strategy that takes into account the changed and changing security landscape of the twenty-first century. The 2010 United States Nuclear Posture Review rightly emphasized that today, our greatest nuclear threat is no longer a large-scale nuclear exchange, but the danger that terrorists could acquire nuclear materials or, worse, a nuclear weapon.

4. In addition to working on the prevention of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, we have taken steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons in the United States national security strategy. We are not developing nor are we planning to develop new nuclear weapons. Moreover, the life extension programmes for our nuclear weapons will not support new military missions. We have committed not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States that are party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and are in compliance with their nuclear non-proliferation obligations. And, we have clearly stated that it is in the United States interest and that of all other nations that the nearly seven-decade record of non-use of nuclear weapons be extended forever.

5. The step-by-step approach that the Obama Administration is pursuing is suited for our security needs and tailored to address twenty-first century global security threats. By maintaining and supporting a safe, secure and effective stockpile — sufficient to deter potential adversaries and reassure United States non-nuclear allies and partners — at the same time that we pursue responsible reductions through arms control and work to stem and prevent nuclear proliferation, we will make this world a safer place.

New START and next steps

6. The New START Treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation entered into force in February 2011. It is the most comprehensive nuclear arms control agreement in almost 20 years. As of 1 September 2012, the number of deployed strategic warheads for the United States stood at 1,722. For the Russian Federation, the figure was even lower — 1,499. By any measure, this represents significant, demonstrable disarmament progress. When the New START Treaty is fully implemented, the United States and the Russian Federation will each have no more than 1,550 deployed strategic warheads — the lowest levels since the 1950s. The implementation of the New START Treaty is going very well, and its robust verification system is providing the predictability and mutual confidence that will be essential to any future nuclear reduction plans.

7. When President Obama signed the New START Treaty in Prague in 2010, he stressed his intention to pursue further reductions in strategic, non-strategic, deployed, and non-deployed nuclear weapons. The United States and the Russian Federation are engaged in a bilateral dialogue to promote strategic stability and increase transparency on a reciprocal basis. We are hopeful that our dialogue will lead to greater reciprocal transparency and negotiation of further nuclear weapons reductions.

8. One of the specific priorities in this arena is controlling non-strategic nuclear weapons. Consistent with the United States Senate stipulation in its Resolution of Ratification of New START, the United States seeks discussions with Russia to address the disparity between the non-strategic nuclear weapons stockpiles of Russia and the United States.
9. In the NATO May 2012 Deterrence and Defence Posture Review, the United States and our NATO allies also made clear that NATO is prepared to consider further reducing its requirement for non-strategic nuclear weapons in the context of reciprocal steps by Russia, taking into account the disparity between Russian and United States non-strategic nuclear weapons stockpiles in Europe and the broader security environment. The Review also stated that the allies look forward to discussing transparency and confidence-building ideas that can be developed and agreed cooperatively with the Russian Federation in the NATO-Russia Council. Such dialogue would advance our shared goal of enhancing European security and stability through increased mutual understanding of the non-strategic nuclear force postures in Europe of NATO and the Russian Federation.

10. In this regard, the United States expresses its appreciation to the Governments of Poland and Norway for supporting the 7 and 8 February 2013 “Warsaw workshop: prospects for information-sharing and confidence-building on non-strategic nuclear weapons in Europe”, which was jointly hosted by the Polish Institute of International Affairs, the Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This excellent workshop examined the prospects for information-sharing and confidence-building on non-strategic nuclear weapons in Europe. The event was attended by representatives from 18 NATO Governments, including eight Ministry of Foreign Affairs Security Directors, as well as experts from think tanks in France, Italy, Germany, Norway, Poland, Russia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The discussions were a useful, initial look at the opportunities and challenges we face in this complex, but important area.

11. The United States is also working to update the legal framework for cooperative threat reduction activities with the Russian Federation. We have been working closely with Russia over the past year to continue our cooperation under an updated legal framework that reflects our maturing bilateral partnership and allows us to build on the achievements made under the expiring cooperative threat reduction agreement.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the path before us

12. With the second (22 April-3 May) Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee meeting for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons fast approaching, the United States reaffirms its commitment to the shared goal of nuclear disarmament. We continue to implement the 2010 Review Conference action plan across all three pillars of the Non-Proliferation Treaty — disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The grand bargain of the Treaty, where nuclear weapon States pursue disarmament, non-nuclear weapon States abstain from the pursuit of nuclear weapons, and all countries are able to access the benefits of peaceful nuclear energy, sets an enduring standard that is as relevant today as it was at the Treaty’s inception.

13. Despite our past successes, there are very pressing challenges before us. Most critically, the United States is gravely concerned about the actions of a few countries. North Korea, Iran, and Syria have violated their Non-Proliferation Treaty obligations and have failed to take the steps necessary to rectify these violations. These transgressions threaten international security and undermine confidence in the non-proliferation regime. They also stand directly in the way of our shared
disarmament goals. We will work with all Non-Proliferation Treaty States parties to appropriately address these violations.

**The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and a fissile material cut-off treaty: essential multilateral steps for nuclear disarmament**

14. The United States fully supports the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Ratification of the Treaty remains a top priority for the United States. In the interim, robust United States support for completion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization’s International Monitoring System will continue. The last United States test of a nuclear explosive device was conducted in September 1992. Since then, the United States has maintained a voluntary moratorium on the explosive testing of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. The United States remains committed to this moratorium, and calls upon all States to refrain from nuclear explosive testing. The 2010 Nuclear Posture Review reiterated that the United States no longer requires nuclear explosive testing to ensure the safety and effectiveness of its remaining nuclear weapons, relying instead on its long-standing stockpile stewardship programme. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty will hinder States that do not have nuclear weapons expertise and experience from advancing their nuclear weapons capabilities, impede States with more established nuclear weapons capabilities from confirming the performance of advanced nuclear weapon designs that they have not tested successfully in the past and constrain regional arms races in the years ahead.

15. Regarding a fissile material cut-off treaty, the 2010 Review Conference action plan reaffirms that such a treaty is the logical and essential next multilateral step on the path towards global nuclear disarmament. The United States stresses the importance of commencing negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty without further delay. A non-discriminatory and internationally verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty that halts the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices would be an important international achievement, both for non-proliferation and disarmament. The longer production is not banned, the more stocks will accrue in countries, unlike the United States, that have not imposed a moratorium on production. A fissile material cut-off treaty would effectively cap the fissile materials available for use in nuclear weapons. In tandem with the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, a fissile material cut-off treaty would establish additional constraining measures on the technological sophistication and size of nuclear arsenals. It would also place additional enrichment and reprocessing facilities under international monitoring and verification. A fissile material cut-off treaty would help to consolidate the advancements made in arms control since the end of the cold war, and provide the basis for further, deeper reductions in nuclear arsenals globally. Consistent with the 1995 Shannon report and the mandate contained therein (CD/1299), the ultimate scope of a fissile material cut-off treaty will be an issue for negotiations. The United States position on the scope — in keeping with a practical, step-by-step approach — is that treaty obligations, including verification obligations, should cover new production of fissile material.

16. The Conference on Disarmament remains our preferred venue for negotiating a fissile material cut-off treaty, since it includes every major nuclear-capable State and operates by consensus, ensuring that the national security concerns of Conference on Disarmament member States are protected. The United States remains
disappointed that the Conference continues to be prevented from agreeing on a comprehensive programme of work, including work on a legally binding, verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty. In 2011, the United States initiated consultations among the permanent five and other relevant States on unblocking negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament and on preparing our own countries for what we expect would be a challenging negotiation. The “permanent five plus” group has the potential to move the treaty forward. We will continue to try to convince others that commencement of Conference on Disarmament negotiations is not something to fear.

17. In considering whether to support Canada’s 2012 resolution on a fissile material cut-off treaty (see General Assembly resolution 67/53) to establish a United Nations group of governmental experts, the United States assessed that the resolution was balanced, consensus-based, and was supportive of future negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament. We consider the group of governmental experts to be a vehicle to foster, and not substitute for, negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament. On this basis, we intend to actively participate in the work of the group if invited, and encourage other countries that would be directly affected by a fissile material cut-off treaty to do the same.

**Dealing with existing stocks of fissile material**

18. Existing stockpiles of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices can and should be dealt with separately, through other agreements and through voluntary measures, and that is why the United States has chosen to address existing stocks by other means. Bilateral and other voluntary measures have been effective and should continue, since attempts to address existing stocks multilaterally and link them to a ban on new production for weapons purposes will only complicate consensus in the Conference on Disarmament on beginning a negotiation on a fissile material cut-off treaty. The United States has not produced highly enriched uranium for weapons since 1964 or produced plutonium for weapons since 1988. The United States has also acted unilaterally and in cooperation with Russia for a number of years to remove from United States defence stocks fissile material in excess of its military needs that could be used in nuclear warheads. In 1994, 174 tons of highly enriched uranium were removed, of which 135 tons have been downblended. In 2005, the United States announced that an additional 200 tons would be removed from the weapons programme, which would be enough for more than 11,000 nuclear weapons. Of that amount, 160 tons were designated for use as naval reactor fuel, 20 tons were designated for research and space reactor requirements, and an additional 20 tons were designated for downblending to low enriched uranium.

19. Under the 1993 United States-Russian Federation Highly Enriched Uranium Purchase Agreement, 472 tons of weapon-origin Russian highly enriched uranium has been downblended into low enriched uranium for use as commercial reactor fuel in the United States. Based on current schedules, United States transparency monitoring at four nuclear material processing facilities in Russia will continue until October 2013. By the end of calendar year 2013, it is anticipated that the 500-ton highly enriched uranium downblending goal of the 1993 Agreement will be met. Five hundred tons of highly enriched uranium is equivalent to the material necessary for roughly 20,000 nuclear weapons.
20. In addition, more than 60 tons of plutonium were removed from United States defence stocks, of which 34 tons were included in the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement between the United States and Russia. In July 2011, the United States and Russia brought the Agreement and its 2006 and 2010 Protocols into force. The amended Agreement commits each country to dispose of at least 34 tons of excess weapon-grade plutonium, enough in total for approximately 17,000 nuclear weapons. Disposition will be subject to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) monitoring and will transform the material into forms that are unattractive for use in nuclear weapons.

Nuclear security summits help to avoid nuclear dangers

21. The United States has accompanied this steady drawdown of fissile material stocks with an accelerated, high-level, international focus on securing fissile material worldwide — initiated at the Nuclear Security Summit held in Washington, D.C., in 2010, followed by the 2012 Nuclear Security Summit in Seoul. We look forward to the next summit in 2014 in The Hague.

22. In anticipation of The Hague Summit, we will continue to build on pledges that are resulting in more nuclear material being secured, removed and eliminated. These are real and durable achievements that help to protect nations against the threat of nuclear terrorism. We will continue to use the Summits to strengthen the global architecture — the treaties, institutions, norms and rules — that governs nuclear security, and to promote the concept of “assurance”, that is, States executing their sovereign security responsibilities in ways that assure neighbours, allies and rivals that they are doing so effectively.

The permanent five process

23. The five Non-Proliferation Treaty nuclear weapon States are engaged in a high-priority, regularized dialogue that is breaking new ground. Through this process, the five States are engaging in discussions of issues related to nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation, transparency and confidence-building, along with the associated verification challenges, while contributing to our collective progress on the 2010 Review Conference action plan. The process is promoting political dialogue and new forms of cooperation on nuclear weapons issues to an extent unseen in prior years.

24. The first conference of the permanent five was hosted by the United Kingdom in 2009, followed by a second in 2011 hosted by France. The United States hosted the third in Washington, D.C., in June 2012. We look forward to continuing these discussions at the next conference, to be hosted by the Russian Federation in Geneva on 18 and 19 April 2013.

25. In addition to providing a senior-level policy forum for discussion and coordination among the permanent five on a number of issues, this process has spawned a series of discussions during the “intersessional period” among policy and expert levels. China is leading a permanent five working group on nuclear definitions and terminology. The permanent five are discussing our national approaches to Non-Proliferation Treaty reporting, and we are also beginning to engage at expert levels on some important verification and transparency issues. In the future, the United States would like the permanent five conferences and
intersessional meetings to expand and to develop practical transparency measures that build confidence and predictability.

**Nuclear-weapon-free zones make an important contribution**

26. Building on the United States pledge in the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy, we continue to make strong efforts to support nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties. In 2011, the Obama Administration sent the Protocols to the African and South Pacific nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties, which we have signed, to the United States Senate for its advice and consent to their ratification.

27. The permanent five and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations have developed a revised Protocol to the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone that resolved outstanding differences. We hope that the Protocol signing can take place as soon as possible. The United States also remains committed to consulting with the parties to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia to resolve differences that would then allow the United States — along with the rest of the permanent five — to sign the Protocol to that treaty.

28. A longer-term goal is achievement of a Middle East zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. The United States supports this goal and stands ready to help facilitate discussions among States in the region at the proposed Helsinki conference. But we do so recognizing that the mandate for a zone can only come from within the region; it cannot be imposed from outside or without the consent of all concerned States. We regret that the Helsinki conference could not be convened in 2012 but remain committed to working with our partners to create conditions for a successful event.

**Strong United States support for the International Atomic Energy Agency and peaceful uses of nuclear energy**

29. We also support new frameworks for enhancing civil nuclear cooperation while assisting States in pursuing the benefits of peaceful nuclear energy in accordance with the highest standards of safety, security and safeguards. The 2010 decision to establish an IAEA fuel bank, along with other international and national fuel assurance mechanisms, represent important steps forward, as they can help to assure the reliability of nuclear fuel supply and avoid the unnecessary investment in indigenous enrichment. We also strongly support the peaceful application of the non-power aspects of nuclear energy to foster global development in the areas of human health, water resource management, food security and environmental stewardship. Support for the IAEA peaceful uses initiative is one of our primary efforts in this area.

**Developing new arms control tools for a new era**

30. The United States remains committed to innovation, and the arms control and non-proliferation arenas are no exception. To respond to the challenges we face, we are thinking about creative ways to use technologies — including open-source technologies — to tackle long-standing verification and monitoring problems.
The step-by-step approach works

31. United States arms control, non-proliferation, and disarmament policies are predicated on preventing the use of nuclear weapons ever again. Thanks to the important role that civil society plays in providing information to national Governments and publics alike, the United States record of accomplishment on this score is well known. The United States remains committed to achieving the safety and security of a world without nuclear weapons. But the only practical path is a careful, step-by-step approach to verifiably reach this objective.

32. The United States will continue to use existing multilateral mechanisms to inform the international community on the progress we are making and to build support for continued successes. There is no “quick fix” to achieving nuclear disarmament. As the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review states:

> The conditions that would ultimately permit the United States and others to give up their nuclear weapons without risking greater international instability and insecurity are very demanding. Among those conditions are success in halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons, much greater transparency into the programs and capabilities of key countries of concern, verification methods and technologies capable of detecting violations of disarmament obligations, enforcement measures strong and credible enough to deter such violations, and ultimately the resolution of regional disputes that can motivate rival states to acquire and maintain nuclear weapons. Clearly, such conditions do not exist today.

(2010 Nuclear Posture Review, p. xv.)

33. The United States is devoting its time, efforts, resources and attention to creating the conditions for the further reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. While we have made significant progress, more hard work remains. In this step-by-step endeavour, the United States values its partnerships with committed States and civil society. Even if we may differ from time to time on the most appropriate road map for moving towards the goal of a world without nuclear weapons, we all share the same vision.
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Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons

Working paper submitted by the Chair

The Commission:

1. Urges all States to continue to commit to the promotion of international peace and security and to remain determined to achieve a world without nuclear weapons;

2. Reaffirms the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, and urges the Conference to agree on and implement as soon as possible a balanced and comprehensive programme of work;

3. Encourages member States to explore options for facilitating the substantive work of the Conference on Disarmament on priority issues and for revitalizing the disarmament machinery. To this end, consultations on convening a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be intensified, in particular on its objectives. Other measures to support such revitalization include the open-ended working group on nuclear disarmament, which will meet in 2013 to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons; the establishment of a group of governmental experts in 2014, which will make recommendations on possible aspects that could contribute to but not negotiate a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices on the basis of document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein; and the high-level meeting of the General Assembly to be held on 26 September 2013, to contribute to achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament;

4. Urges member States to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to nuclear disarmament and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control;
5. Notes the relevance of the five point proposal for nuclear disarmament of the Secretary-General of the United Nations;

6. Recognizes the need to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in security policies and to commit to further reducing the operational status of their nuclear weapon systems. In addition, the Commission urges reduction of the risk of unintentional or accidental use of nuclear weapons including through their detargeting and de-alerting, where appropriate;

7. Urges all States not to carry out nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions and to maintain their moratoriums in this regard, also urges the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, and to this end further urges those that have not yet done so to sign and/or ratify the Treaty;

8. Encourages all concerned States to sign and/or ratify the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties and their relevant protocols and to constructively consult and cooperate to bring about the entry into force of the relevant legally binding protocols of all such nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties, which include negative security assurances, and also encourages all concerned States to withdraw any related reservations or unilateral interpretative declarations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of such treaties;

9. Reaffirms that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and recognizes, pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the legitimate interest of States to receive legally binding security assurances;

10. Calls upon all States concerned, pending the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty, to declare and uphold, on a voluntary basis, a moratorium on the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices, and encourages all States concerned to exert their utmost efforts, on the basis of the comprehensive and balanced programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament, to start and conclude as soon as possible a fissile material cut-off treaty in accordance with the Shannon report (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein;

11. Calls upon all States to commit to strengthening the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as the competent authority responsible for verifying compliance with IAEA safeguards agreements;

12. Stresses the importance of all States concluding safeguards agreements with IAEA in accordance with their respective obligations;

13. Encourages that further efforts be taken to conclude the Model Protocol Additional to the agreements between State(s) and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards, approved by the Board of Governors of the Agency on 15 May 1997;

14. Recognizes the importance of preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles to non-State actors, and encourages States to fully implement relevant Security Council resolutions, including resolution 1540 (2004) of 28 April 2004;
15. Reaffirms the inalienable right of all States to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with their non-proliferation obligations, and further stresses the importance of ensuring that IAEA resources for technical cooperation activities are sufficient, assured and predictable;

16. Urges Member States to refrain from exporting nuclear-related equipment, materials and scientific and technological information to any State not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and without a comprehensive safeguards agreement with IAEA;

17. Recalls that the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons decided, inter alia, that “the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the co-sponsors of the 1995 resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, would convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region and with the full support and engagement of the nuclear-weapon States”, and urges the Secretary-General and the co-sponsors of the 1995 resolution, in consultations with the States of the region, to continue working with the facilitator to convene the Conference without any further delay and as soon as 2013, if feasible, in order to preserve the relevance and credibility of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to contribute to the success of its 2015 review process. [Calls upon the concerned parties to engage constructively in order to ensure the future holding of the Conference, and in this context notes the decision by one non-State party to the Treaty to abstain from participating in 2012];

18. Recognizes that the responsibilities associated with nuclear security rest with the individual States, encourages efforts towards strengthening nuclear security and reducing the threat of nuclear terrorism and securing all nuclear and radiological material as well as sensitive nuclear information, and calls upon all States to work cooperatively as an international community to advance nuclear security, while requesting and providing assistance, including in the field of capacity-building, as necessary;

19. Commends and further encourages the constructive role played by civil society in promoting nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, encourages all States to promote, in cooperation with civil society, disarmament and non-proliferation education, which, inter alia, contributes to raising public awareness about the tragic consequences of the possible use of nuclear weapons, and urges strengthening of the international efforts to promote nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation towards achieving the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.
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General guiding elements for achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation

Working paper submitted by the Chair

1. The principles and purposes contained in the Charter of the United Nations together constitute the universal foundation for the maintenance of international peace and security in the pursuance of disarmament. Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are essential for achieving global peace and security and a world free of nuclear weapons. The objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons must, therefore, be fully supported by all States as a matter of priority in order to meet the overall ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament.

2. The Commission reaffirms the close interrelationship between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and that they are mutually reinforcing in achieving a world without nuclear weapons. Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all their aspects are essential to strengthening international peace and security and should not be seen as mutually exclusive.

3. The Commission recognizes that multilateralism, including multilateral diplomacy, is essential for achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Unilateral, bilateral, subregional and regional initiatives that are consistent with internationally agreed principles and objectives also contribute to the achievement of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation objectives.

4. The Commission underscores the importance of full compliance by all States with their nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation obligations and their undertaking to work towards general and complete disarmament. The establishment and maintenance of universal and non-discriminatory legal instruments and other arrangements serve these objectives.

5. The Commission notes that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime, and underlines the need for its full implementation. The Commission notes the outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation
of Nuclear Weapons, particularly the recommendations for follow-on actions and the importance of convening a 2012 conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

6. The Commission acknowledges that the reductions made in nuclear stockpiles since the end of the cold war have contributed to international peace and security. The Commission welcomes the conclusion and entry into force of the Treaty on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (the New START Treaty) between the United States of America and the Russian Federation and the unilateral declarations by other nuclear-weapon States, and reaffirms the need for further efforts in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

7. The Commission highlights the indispensable role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in verifying States’ compliance with their nuclear non-proliferation obligations. The Commission underscores the importance of achieving universal conclusion of safeguards agreements and additional protocols in order to strengthen the IAEA verification regime.

8. The Commission recognizes that the establishment of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among all States of the region concerned and, as appropriate, in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session, enhances regional and international peace and security. Thus, efforts to strengthen existing nuclear-weapon-free zones, as well as to establish new zones, enhance global and regional peace and security, strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime and contribute towards realizing the objectives of nuclear disarmament.

9. The Commission reaffirms the importance of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and recalls that the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is an integral and essential part of the decision to extend the Treaty indefinitely. The Commission reaffirms the validity of the 1995 resolution and expresses grave concern that the conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction was not convened in 2012, as stipulated in the decision adopted by the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

10. The Commission expresses deep concern at the growing risk of linkages between terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, and in particular at the fact that terrorists may seek to acquire weapons of mass destruction through illicit means. The Commission recognizes that the most effective way to address this concern is the total elimination of such weapons, the establishment of nuclear security measures and the implementation of relevant treaties and appropriate United Nations resolutions, especially Security Council resolution 1540 (2004).

11. The Commission recalls the achievements of the disarmament machinery established by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, but expresses grave concern about the current status of the disarmament machinery, including the lack of substantive progress in the Conference on Disarmament for more than a decade. The Commission welcomes the efforts by Member States to secure progress in multilateral disarmament.
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**Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons**

**Working paper submitted by Egypt**

**Introduction**

1. Egypt strongly believes in the potential of the Disarmament Commission, as a deliberative body aiming at making recommendations on critical subjects in the field of disarmament. The Commission should be the nurturing ground for new ideas and the launching pad for new initiatives. It should also enable us to continue discussions on “unfinished business”, in a further attempt to bring positions closer, hoping to reach consensus. There are many simple ideas that can further strengthen the unique character of the Commission in the multilateral disarmament machinery.

2. Egypt has proposed a number of such ideas with the aim of enhancing the Commission’s ability to make use of the vast knowledge base that it has built over the years. Egypt highlights in this regard the development of a portal that contains all former proposals and working papers that were discussed in earlier sessions. It would provide an institutional intellectual memory for the Commission and allow us to build on previous discussions. That will be the case even where the Commission was unable to reach consensus on earlier work. Another idea is to hold side events on the margins of Disarmament Commission meetings where fresh ideas can be tested and conclusions shared with the Commission. These are simple ideas, yet they promise to inject some energy into the Commission, with a view to increasing its efficiency and effectiveness.

**With regard to Working Group I: recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons**

3. When considering recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it should be underscored
that nuclear disarmament is the highest priority, as established by the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

4. We should highlight the necessity of implementing the multilateral commitments in the field of nuclear disarmament. In this regard, meeting the deadlines set by the action plan of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is the highest priority with regard to the preparation of the upcoming review process. The first such deadline was the convening of the 2012 conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. This deadline was not met. Non-compliance with the 2010 commitments will undermine the Treaty review process. Despite the confirmation of participation by all States in the region except one, the Conference was not held on its agreed date. The League of Arab States has continuously urged the conveners to fulfil their commitments. This is the only way to restore the credibility of the non-proliferation regime and ensure success for the 2015 review process. Egypt is watching closely the developments in this regard and will be acting accordingly. This issue should occupy the place it deserves in the work of the Commission. We expect a conclusion highlighting ways to ensure the implementation of the 2010 Review Conference commitments and to convene a conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East in 2013.

With regard to Working Group II: practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons

5. The issue of practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons is now even more relevant in the light of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. Any serious confidence-building process needs to address the following issues:

- Overproduction and ever-increasing stockpiles of conventional weapons in the hands of major arms exporters and producers. Every effort must be exerted to bring production and stockpiles in major arms-producing States under international scrutiny.

- Mutual international accountability, as it is the only guarantee against potential abuse of the existing imbalance between major arms producers and the rest of the world.

- Addressing protracted threats to international peace and security. In this regard, there is no more profound threat to peace and stability, international law, international humanitarian law, human rights law and the core principles of the Charter of the United Nations itself than the crimes of aggression and foreign occupation which employ arms arsenals to threaten and dominate peoples and deny them their most basic human rights.

6. The role of the Disarmament Commission is crucial in developing such “confidence-building measures” that go beyond the traditional sense of the term often used to restrict the agenda in order to protect the narrow interpretation of a limited but privileged group of countries.
STATEMENT BY THE CHAIR OF THE 2013 SESSION
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CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

High Representative for Disarmament Affairs,

Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates,

It is an honour for me to address you today in my capacity as Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for 2013.

I would like to begin by once again thanking Member States for electing me as Chairman of this Commission and to reiterate my determination to register progress on the agenda before us.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey, the Permanent Representative of Peru to the United Nations, for the manner in which he led the Commission during 2012 and for his strenuous efforts to move forward our work.

Allow me also to pay tribute to the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, ably led by the High Representative Mrs. Angela Kane, for its efforts to strengthen multilateral cooperation in disarmament matters.

Distinguished Delegates,

In recent years, meaningful progress in some areas of our disarmament agenda has been accompanied by equally significant setbacks in others. At one end of the spectrum we have witnessed the successful completion of a number of Review Conferences including the 2010 NPT Review Conference, the Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference and the Conference to Review the Implementation of the Programme of
Action on SALW last summer. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones in Africa and Central Asia have come into force making an important contribution to peace and security in both regions and beyond. The United States and the Russian Federation have reduced their strategic nuclear arsenals and the recent announcement by the United States to seek further cuts is encouraging and welcome.

At the other end of the spectrum the risk of nuclear weapons proliferation continues to threaten international peace and security while the technology transfer required for their development, including to individual terrorists or groups remains a very grave concern. The disappointment and frustration we all share following a further failed attempt to adopt an Arms Trade Treaty is still very fresh in our minds. Serious obstacles continue to stand in the way of the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which should finally ensure that nuclear tests will be permanently and universally abolished. New levels of trust created by the successful outcome of the 2010 NPT Review Conference have regrettably been weakened by the recent postponement of the conference on the establishment of a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in the Middle East. All States in the region together with the rest of the international community must now work tirelessly to convene the Conference without delay and restore the trust much needed as we approach the start of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NPT PrepCom later this month.

High Representative, Distinguished Delegates,

I believe that we are at a watershed moment. While general and complete disarmament remains high on the agenda of the international community the multilateral disarmament machinery continues to deliver very little. Nuclear disarmament continues to be a global priority. Paradoxically however, the international community continues, almost recklessly, to pursue a path that could lead to mankind’s destruction. The time for taking meaningful steps that move forward the disarmament agenda is now.

We meet at a critical moment. The challenges before us are unprecedented, both in terms of their nature and scope. Significant progress in nuclear disarmament is urgently needed.
Equally urgent is the need for more effective controls against the proliferation or possible acquisition by terrorists of all types of weapons of mass destruction. It is crucial that this Commission makes progress towards the adoption of recommendations concerning next steps for achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

At the same time progress is needed on the other substantive item regarding practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. Let us find the balance between the inherent right of all States to means to defend themselves and recommended measures on conventional arms that reduce risks to international peace and security. The adoption of such measures will alleviate pressure to acquire conventional arms and encourage responsible conduct in their transfer. It will also mark a considerable contribution towards reducing mistrust and tension, significant factors behind the international build-up in conventional arms.

Against this backdrop allow me to briefly turn to the role of this Commission in addressing the challenges on our agenda.

Distinguished Delegates,

The Disarmament Commission is meeting for the second year in its three-year cycle. The agenda items to be discussed over the three years were adopted last year and a productive exchange was held in 2012 in the respective Working Groups. We however need to do much better if we are going to deliver recommendations by the end of this session or indeed by the end of the cycle.

Let us be honest. The record of this Commission in the last few years has hardly been flattering. Member States have failed to adopt recommendations since 1999. In our deliberations we must inject fresh thinking and innovative ideas to register progress and deliver a product at the end of these three weeks that will enjoy our support. I encourage both Working Group Chairs to look for ways in which this can be achieved. A successful
outcome at the United Nations Disarmament Commission would send a positive signal and could also spur progress in the disarmament machinery as a whole.

We should be concerned that with each failed attempt to reach consensus the risk of this body becoming irrelevant draws ever closer. We need to restore a common sense of purpose that transcends narrow national positions...to recognize that reaching common understandings on some of the world’s most intractable problems is also very much in the national interest. Our task is to identify ways in which to address real challenges, to provide direction and momentum that can be taken forward in other fora.

I call on delegations to muster the political will needed to move away from intransigent national positions that have blocked the work of this body for far too long, to identify the middle ground on those specific areas in which progress can be achieved.

Let us not forget that this is not a negotiating body but a deliberative instrument. Its value lies in its universal character and the possibilities it provides for frank and open debate. It plays an important role in the process of developing and maintaining global norms in the area of disarmament. The Commission is a unique forum where issues that affect our common security can be discussed in a setting in which the stakes and constraints normally associated with negotiating bodies are far less pronounced.

Dialogue builds trust that in turn will open doors to tangible progress, hopefully in the form of agreed recommendations that increase accountability and transparency in the areas under consideration in this Commission. In our deliberations over the next three weeks we must make every effort to bring down those barriers to trust that have taken control of this Commission now for well over a decade.

Distinguished Delegates,

Desperately we need to restore the credibility of UNDC and work towards eliminating threats to our very existence. It is our responsibility to ensure that this body is delivering
on its mandate…no one else’s. All delegations in this room have a responsibility to move forward our work. This is our Commission. Let us get down to work and recommit ourselves to ensure that this year this Commission delivers on its mandate.
Statement before the Disarmament Commission

Angela Kane
High Representative for Disarmament Affairs
1 April 2013

I am honoured to address the Disarmament Commission as it opens its 2013 substantive session and wish to commend its departing Chairman, Ambassador Enrique Román-Morey, for his competent stewardship of the work of this Commission, and to recognize with appreciation the many efforts of his Bureau. I also wish to congratulate Ambassador Christopher Grima on his election as the Chairman of the 2013 session. The Office for Disarmament Affairs stands ready to assist the Chairman, the Bureau, and all delegations throughout this session.

The Commission’s substantive work this year is commencing in a very complex international environment—one that combines both old challenges and new opportunities.

We often forget that this Commission is the oldest component of the UN disarmament machinery, having been established in a different form and with a different mandate 61 years ago. Some of us here today may experience a sense of *déjà vu* in recalling the first paragraph of the resolution\(^1\) creating this Commission, in which the General Assembly declared that it was:

*Moved by anxiety at the general lack of confidence plaguing the world and leading to the burden of increasing armaments and the fear of war]*

In many ways, we are still facing today this problem of “lack of confidence”, and many of the gravest challenges to international peace and security are merely reflections of this underlying condition. It is a factor that feeds instability in the Middle East, South Asia, and Northeast Asia. It helps to explain both the slow rate of progress in achieving global nuclear disarmament and the robust growth of long-term nuclear weapon modernization programmes. It underlies the relentless expansion of military budgets, in the face of unmet social and economic needs. It accounts for deeply divided votes in the General Assembly on many disarmament resolutions, especially pertaining to nuclear weapons, and it is also a root cause of the stalemate at the Conference on Disarmament.

---

\(^1\) Resolution 502(VI), 11 January 1952.
Now it cannot possibly be that the function of entire UN disarmament machinery is simply to provide various arenas in which States can assemble to voice their insecurities and mutual mistrust. Quite the opposite. This machinery is intended to provide a process for building confidence through the establishment and elaboration of global norms in disarmament. And the Commission, through its purely deliberating role, serves a vital role in the early stages of developing such norms.

This is apparent in the first item on your agenda, “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.” The Commission’s deliberations last year on this issue have revealed that while many differences persist, there is also a lot of common ground even on this difficult subject. A positive result from this session would set the stage for a new consensus on nuclear disarmament when the Commission concludes its three-year cycle next year. What a tremendous achievement that would be, especially coming on the eve of the 2015 NPT Review Conference and given the persisting difficulties in commencing negotiations on nuclear disarmament at the Conference on Disarmament.

Throughout the history of UN efforts in disarmament, efforts to eliminate weapons of mass destruction have been pursued in parallel with efforts to regulate and reduce conventional arms. This is because they are mutually reinforcing goals. Together, they are part of an integrated approach to fulfilling the Charter’s goals of disarmament and the regulation of armaments—what was later called “general and complete disarmament under effective international control”. The fact is, we need concrete progress in both of these fields and this Commission has its own contributions to make.

With respect to the second item on your agenda, “Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons”, you have a splendid opportunity to build on the recent progress made last month in negotiating the Arms Trade Treaty. As efforts continue to conclude that treaty, the fulfillment of the larger Charter-based objective of the “regulation of armaments” will also require many additional initiatives, especially in the field of confidence-building.

To a considerable extent, many practical confidence-building measures relate to transparency, which the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs has worked to improve over the years. This is seen in our work in maintaining the United Nations Report on Military Expenditures, along with the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, an electronic database of information provided by Member States on CBM’s, and another database on national legislation, regulations and procedures on the transfer of arms. I would like to take this opportunity to encourage all Member States to make good use of these transparency measures precisely because of their value in building the indispensable confidence needed to strengthen international peace and security.

While the issues I have addressed today are substantive, I know that the administrative and procedural aspects of your work are also important. Regardless of the component of the UN disarmament machinery, it is always possible to improve existing methods of work. A worthy goal here would be to revive the productivity of the Disarmament Commission as an international resource for cultivating what might be called the seeds of future global disarmament norms—guidelines, standards, and recommendations that someday have the potential to flourish into customary practices observed by all Member States.
In the 20 years since its re-establishment in 1979, the Commission—on no less than sixteen occasions—was able to reach a consensus to adopt guidelines or recommendations on wide variety of disarmament subjects. It is of course true that the Commission’s procedures alone certainly do not explain why it has been unable to adopt any new guidelines since 1999—one must also consider the differences of policy priorities of States. Even so, the Commission has a legitimate continuing interest in examining whether there are alternative procedures to assist the Commission in achieving concrete results. In the end, history will judge the Commission’s record less by the volume of its words than the quality of its outcomes.

I recognize that the issues on your agenda are profoundly difficult on many levels—but that is why they are there. If they were easy they would have already been solved. They are there because they are important and because the General Assembly has confidence in this Commission to reach a positive outcome in its deliberations. I wish you all the very best as you commence your work and know that this confidence has not been misplaced.
STATEMENT

BY

AMBASSADOR USMAN SARKI

DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
PERMANENT MISSION OF NIGERIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ON BEHALF OF THE AFRICAN GROUP

AT THE SUBSTANTIVE SESSION OF THE 2013 UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION (UNDC)

NEW YORK, MONDAY 1 APRIL 2013
Mr. Chairman,

The African Group wishes to congratulate you on your election as the Chairperson of this year’s session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. In view of your rich experience, we are positive that constructive deliberations on disarmament and non-proliferation issues will be achieved under your leadership at this session.

The Group seizes this opportunity to congratulate other esteemed members of the Bureau, on their election, and assure them of full cooperation. The Group expresses appreciation to H.E. Mr. Enrique Roman-Morey, Permanent Representative of Peru to the UN and the immediate past Chair, for his efforts as President of the 2012 Substantive Session of UN Disarmament Commission. It was a measure of his leadership and contributions towards advancing the work of the UNDC, which led to the adoption of the agenda items for the current cycle of meetings.

Mr. Chairman,

The African Group aligns itself with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement, delivered by the distinguished Permanent Representative of Indonesia. We underscore the important role of the UNDC as the sole specialized deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery. We are confident in its ability to articulate all concerns and issues related to phases of disarmament.

The African Group is committed to the principle and validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. We wish to also submit that disarmament and proliferation issues are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory agreements. In this regard, the UNDC has measurably contributed to deliberations on nuclear disarmament; as the highest global
priority on disarmament, as well as related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects.

The continent of Africa remains a nuclear weapons free zone since the entry into force of the Pelindaba Treaty and our States will continue to observe and honour this status. We wish to therefore seize this opportunity, to encourage remaining States, particularly the NWS that have not yet ratified the Protocols, to do so, without delay. We believe such action will significantly enhance the status of the Treaty and contribute to efforts to replicate this measure in the remaining parts of the world.

The Group calls for deepened effort and unyielding determination to truly address the threat of nuclear weapons and achieve the end-goal of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). In this respect, we reaffirm the application of the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability by Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) in relation to nuclear disarmament measures. We believe this is essential to promoting the fulfillment of the obligations in Article VI of the NPT and in consonance with relevant multilateral legal obligations.

We reiterate deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and what appears as a lack of concrete attempt to accomplish the goal of total elimination of nuclear arsenals. The efforts recorded during the 2012 substantive session were well highlighted in its outcome and report.

**Mr. Chairman,**

We hope that in the 2013 session, the Commission will be able to steer these deliberations towards concrete recommendations on the issues under its agenda: "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms". We therefore call for more flexibility in order to achieve agreement on recommendations emanating from the UNDC's 2012 session.
The African Group reiterates commitment for a high level international conference to identify ways and means of eliminating nuclear weapons, prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

We underline that all attempts to improve existing nuclear weapons and developing new types of nuclear weapons contradict the objective of achieving nuclear disarmament as a multilateral legal obligation, as well as the commitments undertaken by the NWS in this regard.

The Group welcomes the convening of a General Assembly High-level meeting on nuclear disarmament on 26th September, 2013. As a measure of our dedication to the process, the African Group will reach across all regions to promote its success and wishes to encourage all Member States to become actively involved in this important meeting at the highest level.

The African Group reiterates the need for the full implementation of the action plans adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference on nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle-East, which is an integral and essential part of the package of consensus decisions and one which enabled the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995.

We recall the consensus decision contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on convening, in 2012, a Conference on the establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East, and express deep disappointment on the failure to convene the Conference in late 2012 as envisaged. In our view, this is contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East. We therefore call for the convening of this important conference, without any further delay.

Mr. Chairman,

There is no doubt that the UNDC has contributed to promoting multilateral disarmament at all levels, including those on Conventional Weapons. We commend the successful conclusion of the Second Review Conference of the United Nations Programme of Action (UNPoA) to prevent, combat and
eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons (SALW), as a politically binding document which deals with illicit SALW in all its aspects.

We note the lack of consensus on a final text at the just-concluded Final UN Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and call for continued dialogue on adequate measures for regulating global transfer of conventional arms and prevent their diversion to the illicit market.

The African Group wishes to highlight efforts by the UN Regional Centers for Peace and Disarmament in terms of contributions to disarmament issues, including future needs and challenges. We continue to stress the need to further strengthen these regional centers for disarmament to fully discharge their mandates.

We appeal for a sustained but meaningful dialogue as we begin debates on major issues, and look forward to fruitful discussions towards achieving peace and security for all.

I thank you.
DÉCLARATION
DE
S.E.M. DJAMEL MOKTEFI
AMBASSADEUR,
REPRÉSENTANT PERMANENT ADJOINT
DEVANT
LA COMMISSION DU DÉSARMEMENT

NEW YORK, LE 1ER AVRIL 2013
Monsieur le Président,

Permettez-moi, tout d'abord, de vous présenter les vives félicitations de la délégation algérienne pour votre élection à la présidence de la Commission du Désarmement. Ma délégation n'a point de doute que, sous votre active direction, la Commission sera en mesure de réaliser des progrès significatifs.

Nos félicitations s'adressent également aux autres distingués membres du Bureau de la Commission ainsi qu'aux Présidents des Groupes de travail.

Je voudrais, de même, exprimer nos sincères appréciations à l'Ambassadeur Enrique Roman-Morey, Représentant Permanent du Pérou, qui a réussi grâce à ses efforts inlassables à faire adopter par la Commission les questions de son ordre du jour retenues pour le présent cycle triennal.

La délégation algérienne s'associe aux déclarations prononcées aux noms du Mouvement des Non Alignés et du Groupe africain respectivement par les distingués Représentants de l'Indonésie et du Nigéria.

Monsieur le Président,

Ma délégation voudrait réaffirmer le rôle central de l'ONU en tant que cadre multilatéral universel pour l'examen des questions de désarmement. A ce titre, elle est convaincue de l'importance de la revitalisation des mécanismes multilatéraux de désarmement. C'est pourquoi l'Algérie n'a jamais ménagé le moindre effort pour la relance effective de la Conférence de Désarmement (CD), qui est le seul mécanisme multilatéral de négociation sur les questions de désarmement.

Dans ce cadre, l'Algérie accorde une importance particulière à la Commission du Désarmement. La Commission joue, en effet, un rôle irremplaçable en tant qu'organe de réflexion et de proposition. Ses attributions offrent ainsi aux États Membres l'opportunité de délibérer en profondeur et d'examiner toute question relative au désarmement, dont le désarmement nucléaire.

Dans la perspective de mettre fin à l'incapacité de la Commission, depuis plus d'une décennie, d'adopter, par consensus, des recommandations concrètes, il est impératif que tous les États Membres saisissent ensemble cette nouvelle opportunité pour insuffler, sous votre présidence, l'élan nécessaire à nos délibérations, en faisant preuve d'un véritable esprit de coopération et de compréhension mutuelles. Il convient, cependant, de souligner que les raisons de blocage de la Commission du Désarmement sont dues essentiellement au manque de volonté politique.

En tant qu'organe unique spécialisé de délibération dans le cadre de l'architecture multilatérale de désarmement des Nations Unies, la Commission du Désarmement peut, quand toutes les conditions sont réunies, assumer pleinement son rôle. La Commission pourrait, dès lors, affirmer son leadership, comme cela fut le cas en 1999, et apporter sa contribution à la réactivation des mécanismes de désarmement de l'ONU.
La présente session de fond de la Commission du Désarmement revêt, par conséquent, une importance toute particulière du fait qu'elle intervient au milieu du cycle triennal. En effet, cette session doit permettre la poursuite des discussions entamées l'an dernier sur les questions de désarmement et de non-prolifération nucléaires, ainsi que sur les mesures de confiance pratiques dans le domaine des armes conventionnelles. Ces délibérations devraient susciter une dynamique positive qui aboutirait à la prochaine session, au terme du cycle, à la formulation de recommandations concrètes.

**Monsieur le Président**

En cette occasion, l'Algérie réitère sa position de principe sur l'objectif ultime du Traité de non-prolifération des armes nucléaires qui est l'élimination totale des armes nucléaires. L'engagement effectif et continu de l'ensemble de la Communauté internationale, en particulier les États dotés de l'arme nucléaire, est indispensable pour la réalisation de cet objectif. L'existence même des armes nucléaires constitue un danger permanent pour l'humanité tout entière que la persistance de doctrines militaires de certains États nucléaires tend à pérenniser.

Il est important donc que les États dotés de l'arme nucléaire se conforment à l'Article VI du TNP et aux engagements contractés par ces États lors des conférences d'examen de 1995, de 2000 et de 2010. Les mesures de désarmement devraient être menées, à cet égard, conformément aux principes de transparence, de vérifiabilité et d'irréversibilité.

Si la non-prolifération nucléaire constitue l'un des piliers du TNP, elle doit aller de pair avec l'application des autres dispositions du Traité, notamment l'Article IV sur les droits des États à la recherche, le développement et l'utilisation de l'énergie nucléaire à des fins pacifiques. L'Algérie considère, en effet, que seule une approche équilibrée, qui assure une mise en œuvre effective et continue des trois piliers du TNP qui se soutiennent et se renforcent mutuellement, permettra de promouvoir cet instrument international en vue d'atteindre son objectif ultime.

Dans cette perspective, l'entrée en vigueur du Traité d'interdiction complète des essais nucléaires (CTBT) et la conclusion d'un Traité internationalement vérifiable pour l'interdiction de la production des matières fissiles (FMCT), revêtent un caractère prioritaire. Il en est, de même, pour ce qui concerne de la conclusion d'un instrument international juridiquement contraignant par lequel les États dotés de l'arme nucléaire accorderaient des garanties de sécurité aux États non dotés de l'arme nucléaire.

Dans ce contexte, et en vue d'aboutir à l'élimination complète des armes nucléaires, l'Algérie tient à souligner la nécessité de commencer les négociations relatives à une Convention sur les armes nucléaires en vue d'interdire leur développement, production, acquisition, test, stockage, transfert, utilisation ou menace d'utilisation, et leur destruction.

Dans cette optique, la délégation algérienne se félicite de la tenue, en septembre prochain, d'une Réunion de haut niveau de l'Assemblée générale consacrée au désarmement nucléaire. Les débats, à cette occasion, entre les États Membres, vont représenter, sans nul doute, une contribution importante dans la voie de la réalisation du but ultime de l'élimination totale des armes nucléaires.
Il convient de rappeler également l’exigence de l’établissement d’une zone exempte d’armes nucléaires et de toutes autres armes de destruction massive au Moyen Orient qui serait de nature à faire avancer la cause du désarmement nucléaire et à préserver la paix et la stabilité dans cette région. La concrétisation de la résolution de 1995 sur le Moyen Orient, en tant qu’engagement de la Communauté internationale, revêt pour l’Algérie une dimension prioritaire. C’est pourquoi la délégation algérienne ne peut qu’exprimer sa profonde préoccupation devant le retard mis dans la mise en œuvre de la dite résolution.

Ma délégation tient, de même, à faire part de sa grave déception devant le fait que la Conférence sur l’établissement au Moyen Orient d’une zone exempte d’armes nucléaires et de toutes autres armes de destruction massive, n’a pas pu se réunir à la date prévue. La non-convocation de cette Conférence, à la date convenue, constitue une violation de l’accord collectif des États Parties contenu dans le Document Final de la Conférence d’examen du TNP de 2010. Elle exhorte donc le Secrétariat général des Nations Unies et les trois co-parrains de la résolution de 1995, en consultation et coordination étroites avec les États de la région, de convoquer, sans tarder, ladite Conférence.

La délégation algérienne voudrait, enfin, vous réitérer, Monsieur le Président, sa volonté et disponibilité à collaborer, de manière constructive, avec vous et l’ensemble des délégations pour assurer le plein succès de cette présente session de la Commission du Désarmement.

Je vous remercie.
Debate General

Intervención de la Delegación Argentina ante las Naciones Unidas

Comisión de Desarme
Sesiones Sustantivas 2013

Nueva York, 1° de abril de 2013
Sirvase verificar contra lectura

General Debate
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SEÑOR PRESIDENTE,

PERMITAME EN PRIMER LUGAR HACERLE LLEGAR LAS FELICITACIONES DE MI DELEGACIÓN POR SU ELECCIÓN PARA PRESIDIR LAS LABORES DE ESTA COMISIÓN, FELICITACIONES QUE HACEMOS EXTENSIVAS A LOS RESTANTES INTEGRANTES DE LA MESA. PUEDEN CONTAR USTEDES CON LA PLENA COOPERACIÓN DE LA DELEGACIÓN ARGENTINA.

LA OPORTUNIDAD ES PROPICIA ADEMÁS PARA AGRADECER AL EMBAJADOR DEL PERÚ, SR. ENRIQUE ROMÁN MOREY POR SU DESEMPEÑO DURANTE EL PASADO PERÍODO DE SESIONES, QUIEN CON SU CAPACIDAD, TRAYECTORIA Y VASTA EXPERIENCIA DIPLOMÁTICA SENTÓ LAS BASES DE ESTE PROMISORIO CICLO DE LA COMISIÓN.

QUISIERA TAMBIÉN AGRADECER LA PRESENCIA E INTERVENCIÓN DE LA ALTA REPRESENTANTE DEL SECRETARIO GENERAL PARA ASUNTOS DE DESARME, SRA. ANGELA KANE, ASÍ COMO LA LABOR Y DEDICACIÓN DE TODO SU EQUIPO.

SEÑOR PRESIDENTE,

LA DELEGACIÓN ARGENTINA SE ASOCIA PLÁCIDAMENTE A LA INTERVENCIÓN QUE PRONUNCIARA EL REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE CUBA, EMB. DE LA COMUNIDAD DE ESTADOS LATINOAMERICANOS Y CARIBEÑOS (CELAC). SIN PERJUICIO DE LO ANTERIOR, MUY BREVEMENTE MI DELEGACIÓN DESEA APORTAR ALGUNOS ELEMENTOS PARA LAS DELIBERACIONES QUE NOS OCUPAN.

EN MOMENTOS EN QUE NOS ENCONTRAMOS AUNANDO EFORTOS PARA ALCANZAR LOS OBJETIVOS DE DESARROLLO DEL MILENIO Y DEFINIR LOS OBJETIVOS DE DESARROLLO SUSTENTABLE POST 2015, NO PODEMOS NI DEBEMOS DEJAR DE LADO EL TRABAJO QUE TENEMOS POR DELANTE EN MATÉRIA DE DESARME, NO PROLIFERACIÓN Y CONTROL DE ARMAMENTOS.

DESE NINGÚN PUNTO DE VISTA ES POSIBLE JUSTIFICAR ANTE LA OPINIÓN PÚBLICA EL GASTO MUNDIAL EN ARMAMENTOS QUE PARA EL AÑO 2012 ASCENDIÓ A 1.7 TRILLONES DE DÓLARES, MIENTRAS HAYA GENTE VIVIENDO EN LA POBREZA EXTREMA.

ESTA REALIDAD ES LA QUE HACE ABSOLUTAMENTE NECESARIO QUE PERSISTAMOS EN NUESTROS ESFUERZOS PARA MEJORAR LAS CONDICIONES DE LA PAZ Y LA SEGURIDAD INTERNACIONALES EN ESTE MUNDO ARMADO POR DEMÁS.

VINIENDO DEL SUR Y DE UNA ZONA DE PAZ, LIBRE DE ARMAS DE DESTRUCCIÓN MASIVA, ARGENTINA SIEMPRE HA TRABAJADO PARA HACER DE ELLO, UNA REALIDAD PARA EL MUNDO ENTERO.

Y UNA REALIDAD COMO LA DE MI REGIÓN SE CONTRUYE A PARTIR DE LA CONFIANZA BASADA EN LOS INTERESES COMPARTIDOS RESPECTO DE UN FUTURO COMÚN.

DE ALLÍ LA RELEVANCIA Y OPORTUNIDAD DE LOS DOS TEMAS BAJO CONSIDERACIÓN DE ESTA COMISIÓN. A TRAVÉS DEL DIALOGO FRANCO QUE NOS PERMITE ESTE FORO DELIBERATIVO, DEBEMOS SER CAPACES DE IDENTIFICAR MEDIDAS QUE NOS PERMITAN AVANZAR EN EL DESARME NUCLEAR Y CREAR CONFIANZA RESPECTO DE LOS OBJETIVOS DE TRANSPARENCIA, COOPERACIÓN Y PAZ QUE A TODOS SIN DISTINCIÓN, NOS ANIMAN.

SEÑOR PRESIDENTE,

EN ESTE CONTEXTO, HACEMOS UN LLAMADO A TODAS LAS DELEGACIONES PARA AUNAR ESFUERZOS Y ADOPTAR UN ENFOQUE PRAGMÁTICO QUE NOS PERMITA ALCANZAR UN DESARME SUSTENTABLE.

MUCHAS GRACIAS
MR. PRESIDENT,

ALLOW ME FIRST TO CONGRATULATE YOU ON BEHALF OF MY DELEGATION FOR YOUR ELECTION TO CHAIR THE WORK OF THIS COMMISSION, WE ALSO EXTEND OUR CONGRATULATIONS TO THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU. YOU CAN COUNT ON THE FULL CO-OPERATION OF DELEGATION OF ARGENTINA.

I WOULD ALSO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO THANK THE AMBASSADOR OF PERU, MR. ENRIQUE ROMAN MOREY FOR HIS PERFORMANCE DURING THE PAST SESSION, WITH HIS CAPACITY, TRAJECTORY AND VAST DIPLOMATIC EXPERIENCE SET THE FOUNDATION OF THIS PROMISING CYCLE OF THE COMMISSION.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO THANK THE PRESENCE AND INTERVENTION OF THE HIGH REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS, MS. ANGELA KANE, AS WELL AS THE WORK AND DEDICATION OF ALL MEMBERS IN HER TEAM.

MR. PRESIDENT,

THE DELEGATION OF ARGENTINA FULLY ASSOCIATES ITSELF WITH THE INTERVENTION MADE BY THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CUBA, AMB. ENRIQUE ROMAN, ON BEHALF OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN COMUNITY OF STATES (CELAC). WITHOUT PREJUDICE OF THAT, VERY BRIEFLY MY DELEGATION WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE SOME ELEMENTS FOR OUR DISCUSSIONS.

AT A TIME IN WHICH WE ARE JOINING EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE THE MILLENIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND TO DEFINE THE POST 2015 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS, WE CANNOT LEAVE ASIDE THE WORK THAT WE HAVE IN FRONT OF US IN THE FIELD OF DISARMAMENT, NON PROLIFERATION AND ARMS CONTROL.

IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO JUSTIFY FROM ANY POINT OF VIEW TO THE PUBLIC OPINION THE WORLD’S ARMAMENTS EXPENDITURES, WHICH FOR THE YEAR 2012 WAS 1.7 TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS, WHILE THERE ARE PEOPLE LIVING IN EXTREME POVERTY.

THIS REALITY IS THE ONE THAT MAKES ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY THAT WE PERSIST IN OUR EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY CONDITIONS IN THIS WORLD SO MUCH ARMED.

COMING FROM THE SOUTH AND FROM A ZONE OF PEACE, FREE FROM WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, ARGENTINA HAS ALWAYS BEEN WORKING TO MAKE THAT A REALITY FOR THE ENTIRE WORLD.

AND A REALITY LIKE THE ONE OF MY REGION IS BUILT UPON CONFIDENCE BASED ON SHARED INTERESTS OF A COMMON FUTURE.

THERE COMES THE RELEVANCE AND OPPORTUNITY OF THE TWO ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THIS COMMISSION. THROUGH THE FRANK DIALOGUE THAT THIS DELIBERATIVE FORUM ALLOWS US TO CARRY ON, WE HAVE TO BE CAPABLE OF IDENTIFYING MEASURES THAT ALLOW US TO ADVANCE IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT AND CREATE CONFIDENCE WITH REGARD TO THE OBJECTIVES OF TRANSPARENCY, COOPERATION AND PEACE THAT MOTIVATE US ALL WITHOUT DISTINCTION.

MR. PRESIDENT,

IN THIS CONTEXT, WE CALL UPON ALL DELEGATIONS TO JOIN EFFORTS AND ADOPT A PRAGMATIC APPROACH THAT ALLOW US TO ACHIEVE A SUSTAINABLE DISARMAMENT.

THANK YOU
Mr Chairman,
At the outset, allow me to congratulate you for the assumption of the chairmanship of the 2013 session of the Disarmament Commission. Building on the successful start last year under the encouraging chairmanship of Peru, we are fully confident that under your stewardship this year the Commission will continue its deliberations on the two topics on its agenda in a constructive manner, with a view to fostering consensus on recommendations to be eventually agreed upon in the course of the current triennial cycle next year. Given the specific mandate of the Disarmament Commission set out in paragraph 118 of the SSOD 1 Outcome Document as a deliberative body and subsidiary organ of the General Assembly working under the consensus principle, Austria encourages delegations to focus potential elements of recommendations which are agreeable to the UN membership at large.

As disarmament is among the key priorities for Austria in the context of the United Nations and beyond, allow me to add a few remarks in addition to the EU statement already delivered. In the context of the United Nations, our collective efforts towards disarmament are directly guided by Article 11 paragraph 1 of the Charter. In this spirit, Austria tabled resolution 65/93 in 2010, following up on the HLM convened by the Secretary General on Revitalising the work of the Conference on Disarmament. In 2011 and 2012, Austria pursued together with Norway and Mexico an initiative leading to resolution 67/56 on Taking Forward Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament Negotiations, adopted by the General Assembly with a solid three quarters majority. The OEWG set up by this resolution already held its organisational session in Geneva in March and we count on the continued constructive engagement of the entire membership in the months ahead. Likewise, Austria looks forward to the HLM on nuclear disarmament to be held by the General Assembly on 26 September 2013 in New York.

Today, we witness an increasing awareness among states as well as in civil society that the nuclear weapons debate should go beyond the narrow scope of military security concepts. Due to the catastrophic global effects resulting from any potential use of nuclear weapons, more emphasis should be placed on taking into consideration the humanitarian, economic and ecological consequences. From a legal perspective, we have to keep reminding ourselves of the unanimous conclusion of the ICJ in its Advisory Opinion of 1996, which clearly stated the obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. In 2008, the Secretary General presented a Five Point Proposal on nuclear disarmament, which provides from our perspective a pertinent guidance for the achievement of a world without nuclear weapons. In this context, the Secretary General also warned against the contagious doctrine of nuclear deterrence, making non-proliferation more difficult, which in turn raises new risks that nuclear weapons will be used. Following the reasoning of the Secretary General, the concept of nuclear deterrence turns out to be a catalyst of insecurity for all, including for the nuclear weapon powers.
It needs to be emphasized that the majority of the UN membership already categorically outlawed nuclear weapons by setting up nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Disarmament Commission contributed to this goal by elaborating in 1999 a consensus text on the “Establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned”. Given the intrinsic link between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, Austria deems the topic of “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons” on the agenda for Working Group I to be highly topical and more than timely.

Due to the potentially uncontrollable risks inherent in any use of nuclear power – be it for peaceful energy purposes or military explosive devices – a constitutional law categorically bans in Austria both nuclear weapons and facilities with the purpose of obtaining energy by nuclear fission. This position was recalled at the highest political level by the Federal President of Austria at the Security Council Summit on nuclear non-proliferation, disarmament and security in September 2009 in the context of the adoption of resolution 1887. Last year, the Permanent Representative of Austria explained our position in detail in the Working Group on Nuclear Disarmament. I therefore just would like to emphasize that Austria fully acknowledges the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, but will not subscribe to any promotion of such uses for power generation. This principled position will be upheld by our delegation throughout this triennial cycle and beyond, consistent with our policy pursued in other relevant forums.

Turing to conventional weapons, the disarmament community just concluded intense negotiations in the context of the UN Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. Its President will report tomorrow to the General Assembly. Austria looks forward to a swift and successful finalisation of this important process. In this context, it is worthwhile noting that the preamble of the treaty to be adopted refers to the guidelines for international arms transfers elaborated by the Disarmament Commission in 1996. This shows the potential of the Disarmament Commission to consider and make recommendations, consistent with its mandate, on various problems in the field of disarmament that might eventually contribute to the elaboration of other instruments. “Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons”, on the agenda for Working Group II, is therefore a topic meriting diligent discussion. In this context, Austria hopes that the EU Working Paper mentioned before will be considered as a constructive input for our collective deliberations.

Austria notes with appreciation the constructive tone in which many delegations addressed the Commission in the morning. As you, Mr Chairman, and the High Representative rightly pointed out, progress is possible if our focus is shifted towards the common ground where consensus is achievable. Let me conclude by stressing that Austria, also as a member of the Bureau, will do its utmost to contribute to a successful outcome of our collective deliberations during the current session.

I thank you.
United Nations Disarmament Commission
General Debate

1 April 2013

Statement by H.E. Ambassador Maria Luiza Ribeiro Viotti,
Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations

(check against delivery)
Mr. Chairman,

I wish to congratulate you on your election to chair this year’s substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Be assured of my delegation’s support to you and the other members of the Bureau.

Let me also take this opportunity to thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Angela Kane, for her opening remarks.

Mr. Chairman,

The UNDC is an important part of the multilateral disarmament machinery. Member States have produced, in this Commission, important outcomes such as guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free-zones and guidelines on conventional arms control. It is regrettable, however, that for the last 13 years we have not been able to agree on substantive recommendations.

It is well known that the adoption of an outcome by consensus is always a hard endeavor. But we must find the common ground needed to advance the discussions and produce substantive results in the field of disarmament.

We agree that the methods of work of the Commission need to be improved. For that purpose, we have been favoring the convening of the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV), in which the issue could be tackled in a comprehensive way. Nevertheless, there is already much we can do, since we have agreed on the substantive agenda for the current cycle. We should keep our discussions in the UNDC focused and concentrated on delimited areas of work.

Mr. Chairman,

In the disarmament area, nuclear disarmament remains our utmost priority. We believe that it is only through multilateral concerted effort that nuclear weapons will be totally eliminated, in a transparent, irreversible and verifiable manner, according to an agreed legal framework and a specified timeframe. It remains a reason of grave concern that nuclear weapons still play a central role in security doctrines of some Nuclear-Weapon States and military alliances. This situation must change. The implementation of NPT obligations on nuclear disarmament is long overdue.

Furthermore, the maintenance and modernization of nuclear weapons are costly, their use is inconsistent with International Humanitarian Law, and their possession by some States contributes to the continued risk of proliferation.

Brazil reaffirms its support to the beginning, with a sense of urgency, of discussions on the principles and elements of a Nuclear Weapons Convention and considers that the UNDC could play an important role in this regard.
The Disarmament Commission could also build upon the guidelines agreed in 1999 on nuclear-weapon-free-zones by devoting attention to a fundamental aspect of the issue: the Negative Security Assurances (NSA). Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, it is a legitimate interest of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States to be granted unequivocal legally binding assurances from Nuclear-Weapon States that such weapons will never be used or threatened to be used against them. This must be done through a multilateral agreement. Such an agreement is important because, inspired by a Cold War mentality, some of the Nuclear-Weapons States keep reservations or interpretative declarations which undermine the value of Protocols to Treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free-zones.

We regret the postponement of the Conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. We must always remember that the goal of achieving a Middle East without such weapons has been a key element for the package of decisions taken for the indefinite extension and strengthened review process of the NPT 1995 Conference, as well as for the action-oriented outcome documents agreed at the 2000 and 2010 Conferences. We expect the Conference to be held as soon as possible. We urge all countries of the region to attend this Conference and to renew efforts to its successful convening, which could represent the beginning of a promising process, designed to foster confidence-building measures among neighboring States.

Mr. Chairman,

Brazil fully supports multilateral efforts under the auspices of the UN to build confidence measures in the field of conventional arms. We are committed to the UN Register of Conventional Arms and the UN Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures, and have also been submitting national reports on our implementation of the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons.

At the regional level, particularly in the framework of UNASUR, Brazil and its neighbors in South America are progressively strengthening confidence and enhancing transparency in defense policies, including information on military expenditures and conventional arms.

As regards the Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, we reaffirm our support to the text achieved last week and underline the relevance of a legally binding multilateral instrument for regulating international transfers of conventional weapons. We look forward to developments that will allow us to reach agreement towards the adoption and implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty.

Thank you.
Statement by the Chinese Delegation
at the General Debate of
the United Nations Disarmament Commission

(New York, 1 April 2013)
Mr. Chairman,

At the outset, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). I believe that your rich diplomatic experience and wisdom will guide the meeting to positive achievements. I would like to assure you Chinese delegation's full cooperation with you and other delegations. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey, Permanent Representative of Peru, for his outstanding work.

Mr. Chairman,

The world today is undergoing profound and complex changes. We are faced with growing comprehensive international security challenges, traditional and non-traditional factors intertwined. Against such backdrop, countries are increasingly interdependent and bonded by rising common interests. China has all along advocated that the international community should adopt a new security concept featuring mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination, and work together to address diverse security challenges, settle disputes through diplomatic and peaceful means, so as to create a peaceful and stable international and regional security environment conducive to promoting the multilateral arms control and non-proliferation process.

Mr. Chairman,

China has been earnestly fulfilling its nuclear disarmament obligations, actively promoting and making unique contributions to the international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation undertakings.

—China stands for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and firmly pursues a nuclear strategy of self-defence. In the development of nuclear weapons, China has always exercised utmost
restraint, has not and will not participate nuclear arms race in any form and will maintain its own nuclear forces at the minimum level necessary for national security needs.

— China has adhered to the policy of no-first-use of nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances, and made the unequivocal commitment that it will unconditionally not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states and nuclear-weapon-free zones.

— China is of the view that the international nuclear disarmament process should be actively promoted under the premise of maintaining global strategic stability and undiminished security for all. Countries with the largest nuclear arsenals should continue to make drastic and substantive reductions in their nuclear arsenals.

— China supports the early entry-into-force of The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and will continue its positive efforts to this end. China will stick to its commitment on nuclear test moratorium.

— China is of the hope that the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva (CD) could reach consensus on the Programme of Work at an early date so as to start its substantive work as soon as possible, including conclusion of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable FMCT.

— China supports Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) review process, and hopes that all parties implement the outcomes of the Review Conferences in a comprehensive and balanced manner. China has actively participated in the previous P5 conferences on implementation of the NPT and will continue its positive efforts in chairing the P5 Working Group on Glossary of Definitions for Key Nuclear Terms.

— China firmly opposes the proliferation of nuclear weapons, supports upholding and strengthening the international nuclear non-proliferation regime, and advocates peaceful solutions to regional nuclear issues through dialogue and negotiations.
To maintain peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in the Northeast Asia is in the common interests of the international community. China urges relevant parties to remain calm and exercise restraint, avoid moves that could lead to further escalation of the situation. China calls on all parties continue efforts on denuclearization of the Peninsula in the framework of the six-party talks. China will make unremitting efforts to this end.

China all along believes that dialogue and cooperation is the only correct way to proper resolution of the Iranian nuclear issue. Parties concerned should adhere to the path of dialogue and negotiation. For the sake of making early progress, parties shall accommodate each other's concerns, gradually bridge differences and expand common ground on the basis of enhancing mutual trust. China is ready to continue playing a constructive role to this end.

Mr. Chairman,

China has always supported practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms control, made continued efforts on promoting related international and regional disarmament process and exploration of confidence-building measures.

—China has devoted to transparency and confidence-building in the field of conventional arms control and has been an active participant in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and the United Nations Military Expenditures. China supports necessary adjustments to the Register in line with the development of international and regional security situation while taking into account the concerns of all parties. One of the most pressing tasks is to improve the coverage of the Register, i.e., to increase the number of participating countries.

—China attaches great importance to the fight against illicit trade of small arms and light weapons (SALW), earnestly implements the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (PoA). China has
adopted a series of measures on legislation, law enforcement, capacity building, international exchanges and cooperation, yielding remarkable results. China participated in the Second Review Conference on the PoA held last year in a constructive manner and made positive contributions to the success of the conference.

Mr. Chairman,

The current multilateral disarmament machinery, including the UNGA First Committee, the UNDC and the CD, were established on the First Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament (SSOD-I) and has made tremendous contribution to safeguarding world peace and promoting arms control process over the past decades. As the unique deliberative body of the machinery, the UNDC has played an important role in setting priority agenda for multilateral disarmament negotiations. China hopes that member states view the role and status of the UNDC from a rational and practical perspective, conduct work in a pragmatic manner for positive progress of this deliberative circle.

Mr. Chairman,

Recently, H.E. Mr. Xi Jinping, China's newly-elected President, reiterated on the Twelfth National People's Congress that China will unwaveringly take the road of peaceful development and continue to work with other countries for the lofty cause of human peace and development. We are ready to join hands with other countries to promote multilateral arms control process, thus making new contributions to the cause of safeguarding world peace and stability.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.
GENERAL DEBATE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

STATEMENT BY PERMANENT MISSION OF CUBA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

ON BEHALF OF THE COMMUNITY OF LATINOAMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN STATES (CELAC)

New York, 1 April 2013
Statement by CELAC to the United Nations Disarmament Commission
1 April 2013

Mr. Chairman,

1. I have the honor to speak on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC).

2. First, CELAC wishes to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the 2013 Substantive Session of the Disarmament Commission. We also extend our congratulations to the other members of the Bureau.

3. The Community wishes as well to express its appreciation to Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey of Peru, for his tireless work as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission last year, as well as for his concrete recommendations for the Agenda and Programme of Work of the Commission.

4. CELAC reiterates its willingness to work constructively to fulfill the complex tasks entrusted to this Commission. We hope this session will achieve substantive progress, so that we can adopt specific recommendations on agreed agenda items of the Commission, with a view to submitting them to the UN General Assembly.

5. CELAC members welcome once more the adopted agenda items of the Disarmament Commission, which were agreed for the current cycle of substantive sessions (2012-2014), concerning: Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

6. CELAC reaffirms the importance of the Disarmament Commission as the specialized, deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery that allows for in-depth deliberations on specific disarmament issues, leading to the submission of concrete recommendations to the General Assembly.

7. The Community regrets the lack of agreement to make recommendations on the agenda items of previous cycles of the Disarmament Commission and thus reaffirms the importance that the Disarmament Commission fulfills its mandate as expressed by the First UN Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD1). We call upon UN Member States to show the necessary flexibility and political will to advance on recommendations for this new cycle.

8. CELAC reiterates its firm position in favor of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects, as well as its deep concern at the threat to humanity...
posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use. In this regard, the Community reaffirms that the only guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination. The Group reaffirms the importance of complete, transparent, verifiable and irreversible nuclear disarmament as the highest priority, and also reiterates the priority attached to nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects.

Mr. Chairman,

9. CELAC countries have a long tradition of involvement in disarmament issues and consider them to be one of their priorities in the United Nations agenda. We consider disarmament an essential component in the efforts to promote and maintain international peace and security.

10. At the Founding Summit of CELAC, Heads of State and Government adopted a Special Communiqué on the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, in accordance with its long standing position in support of a world free of nuclear weapons.

11. At the time of establishing the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, we confirmed the pride of our region in being the first densely populated area in the world to be declared a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (NWFZ), through the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco). We wish to reiterate that the establishment of internationally recognized Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones strengthens international peace and security, as well as the non-proliferation regime, and constitutes an important contribution to the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

12. We urge the Nuclear-Weapons States to withdraw all reservations to the Protocols of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and to respect the denuclearized character of the Latin American and Caribbean region, thus helping to eliminate the possible use of nuclear weapons against the countries of the region.

13. CELAC regrets the noncompliance on the agreement on holding the International Conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, last December. CELAC recalls that convening this Conference is an important and integral part of the Final Outcome of the 2010 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Review Conference.

14. Besides making an important contribution to the achievement of the goal of nuclear disarmament, CELAC strongly believes that the establishment of such zone would be a significant step in the peace process in the Middle East region. CELAC urges to hold this Conference as soon as possible, as agreed by the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in 1995, 2000 and 2010.
15. In this context, CELAC wishes to offer as a contribution its experience with Tlatelolco and OPANAL in order to help making such zone a reality.

Mr. Chairman,

16. CELAC members reaffirm the need to advance towards the primary objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and to achieve and sustain a world free of nuclear weapons. In this context, we emphasize our commitment to participate actively and introduce a common position within the framework of the High Level Meeting of the UN General Assembly on Nuclear Disarmament, to be held in New York on 26 September 2013.

17. CELAC members express their opposition to the enhancement of existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons, which is inconsistent with the obligation of nuclear disarmament.

18. CELAC reiterates the need to eliminate the role of nuclear weapons in strategic doctrines and security policies.

19. CELAC members reaffirm that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons constitutes a crime against humanity and a violation of international law, including international humanitarian law, and of the Charter of the United Nations. As it was recognized by 127 States in the Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons held in Oslo 4–5 March 2013, it is unlikely that any State or international body could address the immediate humanitarian emergency caused by a nuclear weapon detonation in an adequate manner and provide sufficient assistance to those affected.

20. We reaffirm the commitment of our States to the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), and to the full implementation of its three main pillars: nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation, and peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We express our strong support to the conclusion of legally binding instruments that lead to effective, irreversible and verifiable nuclear disarmament, in order to achieve the goal of complete elimination of all nuclear weapons.

21. CELAC recalls the holding of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in May 2010, and the adoption of a final substantive document after years of stagnation.

22. However the Community reiterates the urgent need for an accelerated progress towards the full implementation of the commitment of the Nuclear-Weapon States to achieve the priority goal of nuclear disarmament and the elimination and
prohibition of nuclear weapons, through irreversible, transparent and verifiable initiatives.

23. CELAC emphasizes the importance of achieving the universality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and therefore urges States that have not yet done so to accede to this Treaty as Non-Nuclear States.

24. We urge Nuclear-Weapon States to comply with their commitments under Article VI of the Treaty, and to advance towards the complete elimination of those weapons. We urge them to fully and immediately implement the 13 practical steps towards nuclear disarmament agreed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, as well as the Action Plan adopted at the 2010 Review Conference.

25. We reaffirm the inalienable right of States to develop research, production and the peaceful use of nuclear energy without discrimination, and in conformity with Articles I, II, III and IV of the NPT. The Community also reaffirms the commitment of all Parties to the Treaty to facilitate the participation in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

26. CELAC welcomes the successful conclusion of the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, held from 30 April to 11 May 2012 in Vienna. At the same time, CELAC members demand a renewed commitment on the process and to constructively participate in the second session of the Preparatory Committee to be held in Geneva, from 22 April to 3 May 2013.

27. We reaffirm our commitment to the application of IAEA safeguards requested by the NPT, and urge all States to implement those safeguards in accordance with their international obligations.

28. CELAC urges those States whose ratification is essential for the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) to accelerate their process of signing and/or ratifying this instrument, as a matter of priority, as evidence of their political will and commitment to international peace and security.

29. We reiterate our strong commitment to work for convening an international high-level conference to identify ways and methods of eliminating nuclear weapons as soon as possible. The objective of this conference would be to agree on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, and use or threat of use, and also stipulate their destruction.
Mr. Chairman,

30. CELAC members welcome the important deliberations held on the agreed agenda items during the first year of the new cycle of substantive sessions of the Disarmament Commission.

31. During these debates, the Chairs of the Working Groups submitted Non-papers that need to be discussed and further refined, with a view to their adoption by the Commission.

32. With respect to the issue of *Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons*, CELAC supports these measures as a way of strengthening international peace and security, in strictly observance of the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and respecting their voluntary nature and the particular security concerns of States.

33. At the same time, CELAC is convinced that the relationship between the development of confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms and the international security environment can also be mutually reinforcing, and in that regard, encourages Member States to continue to adopt and apply such measures as appropriate, and to consider to provide information in that regard. The Community welcomes all confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms already voluntarily undertaken by concerned States in their respective regions or subregions, as well as the information on such measures voluntarily provided. CELAC considers that those measures, adopted on the initiative and with the agreement of the States concerned, contribute to the improvement of the overall international peace and security situation and play an important role in creating favourable conditions for progress in the field of disarmament. In this regard, the UNDC’s Working Group provides an opportunity for the dialogue on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms.

34. CELAC reaffirms its readiness to cooperate with the members of this Commission in achieving concrete results during this session. The Community calls on all delegations to show the necessary political will to enable this UN deliberative body to fulfill its mandate and formulate substantive recommendations to the General Assembly.

Thank you.
Discurso de la CELAC ante la Comisión de Desarme de las Naciones Unidas
1 de abril de 2013

Sr. Presidente:

1. Tengo el honor de hablar en nombre de los miembros de la Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños, CELAC.

2. En primer término, la CELAC desea felicitarlo por su elección como Presidente de la Comisión de Desarme para sus Sesiones Sustantivas correspondientes al año 2013; y hacemos extensiva también esta felicitación a los miembros de la Mesa.

3. La Comunidad desea, además, expresar su aprecio al Embajador del Perú Enrique Román-Morey, por su trabajo incansable como Presidente de la Comisión de Desarme el pasado año; así como por sus recomendaciones concretas para la Agenda y el Programa de Trabajo de la Comisión.

4. La CELAC reitera su voluntad de trabajar constructivamente para cumplir con las complejas tareas confiadas a la Comisión. Esperamos que esta sesión logre progresos sustantivos que nos permitan adoptar recomendaciones específicas sobre los temas acordados en la Agenda de la Comisión, con vistas a presentarlas a la Asamblea General de las Naciones.

5. Los miembros de la CELAC una vez más acogen con beneplácito los temas aprobados en la Agenda de la Comisión de Desarme, acordados para el presente ciclo de sesiones sustantivas (2012 – 2014) referidos a: “Recomendaciones para alcanzar el objetivo del desarme nuclear y la no proliferación de las armas nucleares”, y “Medidas prácticas de fomento de la confianza en la esfera de las armas convencionales”.

6. La CELAC reafirma la importancia de la Comisión de Desarme como el órgano especializado y deliberativo dentro del mecanismo multilateral de desarme de las Naciones Unidas que permite deliberaciones a fondo en cuestiones específicas de desarme, con vista a la presentación de recomendaciones concretas a la Asamblea General.

7. La Comunidad lamenta la falta de acuerdo para elaborar recomendaciones sobre los temas de la agenda de ciclos anteriores de la Comisión de Desarme y reafirma por tanto la importancia de que la Comisión de Desarme cumpla su mandato según lo expresado por la Primera Sesión Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre Desarme (SSODI). Hacemos un llamado a los Estados Miembros de las Naciones Unidas a mostrar la necesaria flexibilidad y voluntad política para avanzar en las recomendaciones para este nuevo ciclo.
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8. La CELAC reitera su firme posición en favor del desarme nuclear y la no proliferación en todos sus aspectos, así como la profunda preocupación por la amenaza que representa para la humanidad la continuación de las armas nucleares y su posible uso o amenaza de uso. En este sentido, nuestro Grupo asegura que la única garantía contra el empleo o la amenaza del uso de las armas nucleares es su total eliminación. La Comunidad reafirma la importancia del desarme nuclear completo, transparente, verificable e irreversible como la más alta prioridad, y reitera también la prioridad otorgada a la no proliferación nuclear en todos sus aspectos.

Sr. Presidente:

9. Los países miembros de la CELAC tienen una larga tradición de participación en las cuestiones de desarme y las consideran como una de sus prioridades en la agenda de las Naciones Unidas. Consideramos que el desarme es un componente fundamental en los esfuerzos por promover y mantener la paz y la seguridad internacionales.

10. En la Cumbre Constitutiva de la CELAC, los Jefes de Estado y de Gobierno aprobaron un Comunicado Especial sobre la Eliminación Total de Armas Nucleares, de acuerdo con su posición de larga data en apoyo de un mundo libre de armas nucleares.

11. Al momento de poner en marcha la Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños, confirmamos el orgullo de nuestra región por ser la primera área densamente poblada en el mundo que se declaró como Zona Libre de Armas Nucleares (ZLAN), por medio del Tratado para la Prohibición de las Armas Nucleares en América Latina y el Caribe. (Tratado de Tlatelolco). Queremos reiterar que el establecimiento de Zonas Libres de Armas Nucleares reconocidas internacionalmente fortalece la paz y la seguridad internacionales, así como el régimen de no proliferación, y constituyen una contribución importante para el logro del desarme nuclear.

12. Instamos a los Estados poseedores de Armas Nucleares a que retiren todas sus reservas a los Protocolos del Tratado de Tlatelolco y a respetar el carácter desnuclearizado de la región latinoamericana y caribeña; contribuyendo así a eliminar la posibilidad del uso de armas nucleares contra los países de la región.

13. La CELAC lamenta el incumplimiento del acuerdo sobre la celebración de la Conferencia Internacional para el establecimiento en el Medio Oriente de una zona libre de armas nucleares y otras armas de destrucción masiva, el pasado diciembre. La CELAC recuerda que la celebración de esta Conferencia es parte...
importante e integral del resultado final de la Conferencia de Revisión del Tratado de No Proliferación de las Armas Nucleares de 2010.

14. Además de ser una contribución importante al logro del objetivo del desarme nuclear, la CELAC está firmemente convencida de que el establecimiento de dicha zona significaría un paso trascendental para el proceso de paz en la región del Medio Oriente. La CELAC insta a que esta Conferencia se efectúe lo más pronto posible, de conformidad con lo acordado por los Estados Partes del Tratado sobre la No Proliferación de Armas Nucleares en 1995, 2000 y 2010.

15. En ese contexto, la CELAC desea brindar como una contribución su experiencia con Tlatelolco y OPANAL con el fin de ayudar a hacer realidad esa zona.

Sr. Presidente:

16. Los miembros de la CELAC reafirman la necesidad de avanzar hacia el objetivo prioritario del desarme nuclear y la no proliferación; y alcanzar y sostener un mundo libre de armas nucleares. En ese contexto, enfatizamos nuestro compromiso de participar de manera activa y de presentar una posición común en el marco de la Reunión de Alto Nivel de la Asamblea General de la ONU sobre Desarme Nuclear, que tendrá lugar en Nueva York, el 26 de septiembre de 2013.

17. Los miembros de la CELAC expresan su oposición al perfeccionamiento de las armas nucleares existentes y al desarrollo de nuevos tipos de armas nucleares; lo que es inconsistente con la obligación de desarme nuclear.

18. La CELAC reitera la necesidad de eliminar el rol de las armas nucleares en las doctrinas estratégicas y en las políticas de seguridad.

19. Los miembros de la CELAC reafirman que el uso o la amenaza de uso de armas nucleares constituye un crimen contra la humanidad y una violación del derecho internacional, incluyendo el derecho internacional humanitario y de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas. Como fue reconocido por 127 Estados en la Conferencia sobre el Impacto Humanitario de las Armas Nucleares, celebrada en Oslo 4-5 marzo 2013, es poco probable que un Estado o un organismo Internacional pueda enfrentar la emergencia humanitaria inmediata causada por la detonación de un arma nuclear, de manera adecuada y prestando la asistencia suficiente a los afectados.

20. Reafirmamos el compromiso de nuestros Estados con el Tratado de No Proliferación de las Armas Nucleares y la plena aplicación de sus tres pilares fundamentales: el desarme nuclear, la no proliferación y el uso pacífico de la energía nuclear. Manifestamos nuestro firme apoyo a la conclusión de
instrumentos legales vinculantes que conlleven al desarme nuclear de manera efectiva, irreversible y verificable con miras a alcanzar el objetivo de la completa eliminación de todas las armas nucleares.

21. La CELAC destaca la realización de la Conferencia de Examen entre las Partes del Tratado de No Proliferación de Armas Nucleares en mayo de 2010; y la adopción de un documento final sustantivo tras años de estancamiento.

22. Sin embargo, la Comunidad reitera la urgente necesidad de avanzar con mayor celeridad hacia la total implementación por parte de los Estados poseedores de armas nucleares de sus compromisos para alcanzar la meta prioritaria del desarme nuclear, y la eliminación y prohibición de las armas nucleares, con iniciativas irreversibles, transparentes y verificables.

23. La CELAC enfatiza la importancia de alcanzar la universalidad del Tratado de No Proliferación de Armas Nucleares y, por lo tanto, insta a los Estados, que no lo hayan hecho, a adherirse al Tratado como Estados No Nucleares.

24. Urgimos a los Estados poseedores de Armas Nucleares a cumplir con los compromisos asumidos en virtud del Artículo VI del Tratado y, avanzar hacia la eliminación total de esas armas. Los instamos a la plena e inmediata aplicación de las 13 medidas prácticas hacia el desarme nuclear acordadas en la Conferencia de Examen del TNP de 2000, así como el Plan de Acción aprobado en la Conferencia de Examen de 2010.

25. Reafirmamos el derecho inalienable de los Estados a desarrollar la investigación, la producción y el uso pacífico de la energía nuclear sin discriminación y de conformidad con los Artículos I, II, III y IV del TNP. La Comunidad reafirma, además, el compromiso de todas las Partes signatarias del Tratado de facilitar la participación en el intercambio más completo posible de equipos, materiales e información científica y tecnológica para el uso pacífico de la energía nuclear.

26. La CELAC acoge con beneplácito la conclusión exitosa de la primera sesión de la Comisión Preparatoria para la Conferencia de Examen del TNP de 2015 realizada del 30 de abril al 11 de mayo de 2012 en Viena. Al propio tiempo, los miembros de la CELAC exigen un compromiso renovado respecto del proceso y a la participación constructiva en la segunda sesión de la Comisión Preparatoria que tendrá lugar en Ginebra del 22 de abril al 3 de Mayo de 2013.

27. Reafirmamos nuestro compromiso con la aplicación de las salvaguardias de la OIEA que exige el TNP, e instamos a los Estados a que apliquen las salvaguardias de acuerdo con sus respectivas obligaciones internacionales.
28. La CELAC insta a los Estados, cuya ratificación es imprescindible para la entrada en vigor del Tratado de Prohibición Completa de los Ensayos Nucleares (TPCEN), a que aceleren su proceso de firma y/o ratificación de este instrumento, como una cuestión prioritaria, como muestra de su voluntad política y de su compromiso con la paz y la seguridad internacionales.

29. Reiteramos nuestro compromiso firme de trabajar en la convocatoria de una conferencia internacional de alto nivel con el fin de identificar los medios y los métodos para eliminar las armas nucleares lo más pronto posible. El objetivo de esta conferencia será el de acordar un programa por etapas en favor de la eliminación total de armas nucleares dentro de un marco de tiempo específico. Este programa deberá prohibir el desarrollo, la producción, la adquisición, los ensayos, el almacenamiento, la transferencia, el uso o la amenaza del uso, así como estipular su destrucción.

Sr. Presidente:

30. Los miembros de la CELAC ven con satisfacción que durante el primer año del nuevo ciclo de sesiones sustantivas de la Comisión de Desarme, se haya logrado desarrollar importantes deliberaciones sobre los temas que fueron acordados en la agenda.

31. Durante estos debates, los Presidentes de los Grupos de Trabajo presentaron documentos oficiosos que necesitan mayor elaboración y debate con vistas a que sean adoptados por la Comisión.

32. Con respecto al tema de las Medidas prácticas de fomento de la confianza en la esfera de las armas convencionales, la CELAC apoya estas medidas como una vía para fortalecer la paz y la seguridad internacionales, en cumplimiento estricto de los propósitos y principios de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas y respetando su carácter voluntario, y las preocupaciones específicas de seguridad de los Estados.

33. Al propio tiempo, la CELAC está convencida de que la relación entre el desarrollo de las medidas de fomento de la confianza en la esfera de las armas convencionales y el ambiente de seguridad internacional también puede reforzarse mutuamente y, en ese sentido, exhorta a los Estados Miembros a continuar adoptando y aplicando dichas medidas según proceda, y a considerar proporcionar información a este respecto. La Comunidad acoge con satisfacción todas las medidas de fomento de la confianza en la esfera de las armas convencionales que ya han sido adoptadas voluntariamente por Estados interesados en sus respectivas regiones o subregiones; así como la información sobre dichas medidas voluntariamente ofrecida. La CELAC considera que tales medidas adoptadas por iniciativa y con el acuerdo de los Estados interesados,
contribuyen a mejorar la situación general de paz y seguridad internacionales y desempeña un papel importante en la creación de condiciones favorables para el progreso en la esfera del desarme. En este sentido, el Grupo de Trabajo de la Comisión de Desarme ofrece una oportunidad para el diálogo sobre las medidas de fomento de la confianza en la esfera de las armas convencionales.

34. La CELAC reafirma su disposición de cooperar con los miembros de esta Comisión a fin de alcanzar resultados concretos durante esta sesión. La Comunidad hace un llamado a todas las delegaciones a mostrar la voluntad política necesaria en aras de posibilitar que este órgano deliberativo de las Naciones Unidas cumpla su mandato y formule recomendaciones sustantivas a la Asamblea General.

Muchas gracias.
STATEMENT by
H.E. Ambassador Ri Tong II
Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of
the DPRK To The United Nations
UN Disarmament Commission
1 April 2013

Mr. Chairman,

Allow me first congratulate you for your election to the chairmanship of this meeting and wish the meeting success under your able chairmanship.

Let me also associate myself with the statement made by distinguished representative of Indonesia on behalf of NAM.

Mr. Chairman,

The UN Disarmament Commission adopted last year its agenda of three year cycle freeing itself from state of stagnation lasting three years.

What can be considered as a success in the last year’s meeting is the reflection of the issue of “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons” as the first of its agenda items to be discussed.

The nuclear disarmament still remains the most important and pressing issue of disarmament as it is directly related to the world peace and security and the very survival of the mankind. The ongoing lack of progress in the nuclear disarmament is due to the policy of strong muscles based on the increased role of nuclear weapons being more openly executed and the their modernization being pushed ahead. Furthermore, the global Missile Defense System under headway is inevitably inviting nuclear arms race between nuclear powers being unfolded as a reality before our eyes making the prospect of nuclear disarmament ever hard to be achieved.

It is imperative therefore that the UN Disarmament Commission pays close attention to the demand of NAM countries on concluding a treaty on total elimination of nuclear weapons and the recommendation on nuclear disarmament duly reflect relevant elements.
Mr. Chairman,

The situation on the Korean peninsula is representing the pressing demand of global nuclear disarmament. On the Korean peninsula today is developing the touch and go danger of nuclear war situation with the increased nuclear blackmails of the United States, the largest nuclear weapon state.

In this regard, the delegation of the DPRK would like to clarify its position as follows.

First, the so called “north Korea threats” or “north Korea provocation” being intentionally spread by the US with regard to the situation on the Korean peninsula is nothing but ridiculous sophism exactly the same as the saying goes “the thief turns on the master with a club”.

Provocations and threats are not coming from the DPRK but they are coming from the US. The US and its followers have committed ferocious hostilities of fabricating brigandish “resolution on sanctions” of the UNSC taking issue of our peaceful satellite launch conducted last December, thereby making illegal the legitimate right of a sovereign state to satellite launch. It is none other than the US who is notorious for being the first ranking country in terms of the number of military and intelligence satellite launches throwing the outer space, the common province of humanity into the space of militarization. Therefore, raising the satellite launch of other country is the extreme shamelessness nobody can match and an extraordinary provocation.

Under the prevailing situation, we had no other option but to conduct the third underground nuclear test in order to safeguard the sovereignty and security of the country.

However, the US in spite of itself being the one who pushed us to nuclear test, brought it to the UNSC again to fabricate another “resolution on sanctions”, not fully satisfied, going so far as to open dangerous joint military exercises with south Korea involving over 200,000 troops and different types of strategic nuclear strike delivery means starting from the first of March for a period of two months. In particular the US for the first time in history of joint military exercises brought stealth strategic bombers like B-2A into south Korea driving the situation to the danger of nuclear war breakout by heightening the level of the nuclear blackmails. Thus the standing realities well prove that the US is the source of provocations and war threats exposing its true colour to be a cancer to be removed for the reunified Korea and regional peace.

Second, the military counter actions being taken by our Republic is a just step of self defense in the face of the war provocations by the US.

On March 11, 2013 the DPRK nullified the Korean Armistice Agreement in response to the entrance into the full scale stage of “Key Resolve” by the US and south Korea on the very same day. In addition to it the DPRK has taken crucial steps of nullifying the non-aggression declaration and joint declaration of denuclearization adopted between the north and south Korea.
On the other hand the Korean People’s Army Supreme Command has put on the highest alert all the field artillery units including strategic rocket units and long-range artillery units which are assigned to strike bases of the US troops in the US mainland and on Hawaii and Guam and other operational zone in the Pacific as well as all the enemy targets in south Korea and its vicinity. At the same time the DPRK openly informed the UNSC that the Korean Peninsula is now in a touch-and-go situation due to the nuclear war provocation moves of the US and south Korea while declaring that the north-south relations is from now on put at the state of war.

The situation on the Korean peninsula turning into touch-and-go state is the product of the US extreme hostilities which have been implied by rejection of the legitimate right of a sovereign state to satellite launch and driving the situation towards full scale war against the DPRK. The purpose being pursued by the US is to disarm the DPRK and bring about “regime change” at all costs. However what the US will eventually have, will be a bloody lesson that the DPRK is neither Iraq nor Libya.

Third, As long as the US, the largest nuclear weapon state is posing consistent threats to us, we will have a steadfast holding of the almighty sword of the nuclear weapons and expand and beef up nuclear armed forces qualitatively and quantitatively until the denuclearization of the world is realized.

Yesterday on the 31 March 2013, the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Workers’ Party of Korea set forth a new strategic line on carrying out economic construction and building nuclear armed forces simultaneously under the prevailing situation. This line is the most revolutionary and people oriented, aimed at directing more energy to national economy while strengthening self defensive nuclear armed forces and consolidating the country’s defense power rock firm, thereby establishing thriving and powerful socialist state.

The DPRK’s nuclear armed forces represent the nation’s life which can never be abandoned as long as the imperialists and nuclear threats exist on earth. They are a treasure of a reunified country which can never be traded with billions of dollars. The DPRK’s possession of nuclear weapons is fixed by law. The Korean People’s Army will perfect the war method and operation in the direction of raising the pivotal role of the nuclear armed forces in all aspects concerning the war deterrence and the war strategy, and the nuclear armed forces will round off the combat posture. As a responsible nuclear weapon state, the DPRK will make positive efforts to prevent the nuclear proliferation, ensure peace and security in Asia and the rest of the world and realize the denuclearization of the world.

The delegation of the DPRK is of the view that under the current agenda item of nuclear disarmament, special attention be given to the serious impact of the nuclear blackmails by the largest nuclear weapon state and be followed by substantial consideration towards denuclearization of the world.

Thank you.
INTERVENCIÓN
Embaqador Xavier Lasso Mendoza
Representante Permanente del Ecuador ante las Naciones Unidas

Comisión de Desarme de las Naciones Unidas

Nueva York, 3 de abril de 2013

Verificar contra el discurso pronunciado

Señor Presidente:
Deseo comenzar transmitiendo las felicitaciones de mi Delegación a usted, a los miembros de la mesa por su elección, así como a los Presidentes de los Grupos de Trabajo, por su designación. Al mismo tiempo deseo reiterar las expresiones de aprecio y confianza del Ecuador a usted, Embajador Grima, y a su país, Malta. También deseo dejar constancia de nuestro agradecimiento al Embajador Enrique Román-Morey, de Perú, por el trabajo en el período anterior.

La Delegación del Ecuador desea manifestar su adhesión al discurso pronunciado por Cuba a nombre de la CELAC y por Indonesia, en representación del Movimiento de Países No Alineados. Ambos recogen con apropiado detalle varios conceptos y puntos de vista de esta Delegación, razón por la cual no me referiré nuevamente a todos ellos.

Esta Delegación desea expresar su total compromiso con las decisiones y acuerdos tomados en el marco de la Primera Reunión Especial de la Asamblea General dedicada al Desarme (SSOD-I). Al hacerlo así, también manifestamos nuestro total apoyo a la Comisión de Desarme de las Naciones Unidas como el órgano deliberativo de la maquinaria de desarme de la Organización, cuya función es la de considerar y formular recomendaciones sobre los distintos problemas en el campo del desarme, así como a la Conferencia de Desarme, como el único foro negociador en esta materia.
Señor Presidente:

El Ecuador es el primer país en el mundo, que en su Constitución reconoce derechos a la naturaleza, con lo cual ésta deja de ser un objeto para convertirse en un sujeto. La misma Constitución señala que la naturaleza, esa entidad al interior de la cual se reproduce y realiza la vida, tiene el derecho a que su existencia, mantenimiento y la regeneración de sus ciclos vitales, estructura, funciones y procesos evolutivos sean respetados integralmente. Al reconocer estos derechos, estamos cerrando el círculo de la relación integral y complementaria con los derechos de los seres humanos. En este marco, el Ecuador reprocha y condena la sola existencia de armas de destrucción masiva sobre la faz de la tierra y considera que su uso o amenaza de uso constituirían un crimen contra la naturaleza y contra la humanidad.

En tal sentido, el Ecuador considera, como muchos otros Estados, que el Desarme Nuclear y la No Proliferación Nuclear deben ser procesos paralelos, interrelacionados y concluyentes. Nuestro objetivo deber ser precautelar el régimen establecido a través del Tratado de No Proliferación de Armas Nucleares (TNP). El incumplimiento de sus cláusulas y disposiciones encierra el peligro de que todo el régimen y sus tres pilares queden irreparablemente resquebrajados. Es más, mi país mira con mucha preocupación como dichos incumplimientos exponen innecesariamente a los pilares que sostienen la estructura del régimen constituido por el Tratado de No Proliferación, a un proceso de erosión paulatino y silencioso.

En este marco, sin perjuicio de las negociaciones y acuerdos multilaterales que se encuentran pendientes, particularmente la Convención sobre armas nucleares, mi Delegación aspira a una pronta concreción de Zonas Libres de Armas Nucleares en aquellas regiones que carecen de las mismas, pues de esa manera estaríamos dando substanciales pasos en el campo del desarme y la no proliferación nuclear. En este mismo sentido, mi delegación apoya firmemente la ejecución de la Resolución sobre el Medio Oriente del año de 1995 así como la decisión de la Conferencia de Revisión de 2010 al respecto, y, en tal sentido, exhorta a los involucrados a desplegar todos sus esfuerzos para la realización de la Conferencia para la creación de una Zona Libre de Armas Nucleares en el Medio Oriente, lo más pronto posible.

Señor Presidente,

El Ecuador considera relevante que la Comisión de Desarme haya asignado al Grupo de Trabajo II las deliberaciones sobre el tema de medidas prácticas de fomento de la confianza en el campo de las armas convencionales. Para el Ecuador este tema resulta fundamental, pues considera que dichas medidas son un soporte muy importante para la paz, la seguridad y la estabilidad, especialmente al nivel regional, subregional y bilateral. Es más, considera que dichas medidas alcanzan su sentido más auténtico a dichos niveles, sin perjuicio de los avances a los que se pueda llegar en el ámbito multilateral.

En esta línea de ideas, el Ecuador junto con los demás países de la Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR) viene promoviendo e impulsando las así denominadas Medidas de Fomento de la Confianza y la Seguridad, y que se resumen en las siguientes categorías: el intercambio de información y transparencia, tanto en lo relativo a sistemas de defensa como a los gastos de defensa; las notificaciones
sobre actividades militares; un segmento dedicado a medidas en el ámbito de la seguridad; una sección de garantías; y, medidas de cumplimiento y verificación. Se trata, señor Presidente, de un proceso joven, pero que cuenta con el soporte de todos los países de la región suramericana, por supuesto con el decidido apoyo del Ecuador.

De otra parte, el Ecuador comparte y apoya de manera decidida los objetivos del Programa de Acción para prevenir, combatir y erradicar el comercio ilícito de armas pequeñas y ligeras en todos sus aspectos (PoA). En este contexto expresa su satisfacción por los acuerdos alcanzados en la Conferencia de Revisión de 2012 del Programa de Acción, y manifiesta su total adhesión a los compromisos derivados de tales acuerdos.

En este mismo sentido, el Ecuador defiende la posición de que armamentos como las minas antipersonal y las municiones en racimo representan aislamiento y exclusión y son una amenaza para inocentes civiles, como sucede en algunas zonas de frontera de mi país. El Ecuador concibe a sus fronteras como regiones de integración y desarrollo, lo cual exige de niveles mínimos de seguridad para sus ciudadanos y para los flujos de orden económico, comercial, cultural o social que diariamente le dan vida a esas fronteras, y que las convierte en regiones de valores propios, fruto de las confluencias que ahí se gestan.

Finalmente, señor Presidente, la confianza se construye, entre otros aspectos, sobre la base de un adecuado balance de derechos y deberes entre los Estados, siempre en el marco de los principios y derechos de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas. El Ecuador ha respetado siempre los principios de igualdad soberana de lo Estados, no injerencia en los asuntos internos de los otros Estados, la soberanía e integridad política y territorial, la autodeterminación, así como el derecho a la defensa propia. En esa medida, espera igual retribución de parte de los demás Estados. La observancia de estos fundamentos es substancial en todo proceso que se asiente sobre la base del consenso. Consideramos que la adopción del Tratado de Comercio de Armas por votación, mas no por consenso, se debe, entre otras razones, a que su texto debilitaba estos principios. Por ende señor Presidente, la futura adopción de instrumentos internacionales en materia de seguridad sin el consenso requerido, contribuirá solamente a generar más escepticismo y desconfianza de la que existe actualmente en la comunidad internacional. No obstante, señor Presidente, mi delegación ha acuñado a esta cita con un espíritu esperanzador en las posibilidades que ofrecen foros multilaterales como el que nos congrega.

Gracias Señor Presidente.
Mr. Chairman,

1. I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for your election to preside this year’s substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Likewise, I would like to extend our congratulations to other Members of the Bureau for their election and to the Chairpersons of the Working Groups. I would like to assure you of my delegation’s full support and cooperation.

2. At the outset, I would like to associate myself with the statements delivered by Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, and Nigeria on behalf of the African Group. I will focus my remarks on three main issues: The contribution of the UNDC to the multilateral machinery on disarmament and the topics of the Working Groups on “Recommendations for Achieving the Objective of Nuclear Disarmament and Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”, and “Practical Confidence-Building Measures in the Field of Conventional Weapons”, respectively.

3. Egypt strongly believes in the potential of the UNDC, as a deliberative body aiming at making recommendations on critical subjects in the field of disarmament. The UNDC should be the nurturing ground for new ideas and the launching pad for new initiatives. It should also enable us to continue discussions on ‘unfinished business’, in a further attempt to bringing positions closer, hoping to reach consensus. There are many simple ideas that can further strengthen the UNDC unique character in the multilateral disarmament machinery. We have proposed a number of such ideas with the aim of enhancing UNDC’s ability to make use of the vast knowledge base that it has built over the years. I highlight in this regard, the development of a portal that contains all former proposals and working papers that were discussed in earlier sessions. It would provide an institutional intellectual memory for the Commission and allow us to build on previous discussions. That will be the case even where the Commission was unable to reach consensus on earlier work. This unfortunately has been the case too often and for too long. Another idea is to hold side events on the margin of UNDC meetings where fresh ideas can be tested and conclusions shared with the Commission. These are simple ideas. Yet, they promise to inject some energy into the UNDC, with a view to increasing its efficiency and effectiveness.

4. In order for the UNDC to be able to realize its potential, Member States are required to exercise the necessary political will to utilize this important mechanism to further the cause of disarmament. This is particularly applicable to the topics of the two working groups. When considering “Recommendations for Achieving the Objective of Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”, we should all be aware that nuclear disarmament is the highest priority established by SSOD I. This is not sufficiently reflected in the work of the multilateral disarmament machinery. The Conference on Disarmament remains stalled due to the lack of political will. This year, however, the UN will witness an important initiative that
the NAM brought before the General Assembly. The convening of the High Level Meeting of the General Assembly on 26 September should galvanize support and mobilize political will behind global nuclear disarmament. Given the UNDC’s deliberative role, we expect the work of the first Working Group to provide creative and concrete ideas on a phased program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which can then be carried to the High Level Meeting for endorsement by the Heads of State and Government.

5. Equally important for the Working Group is to highlight the necessity to implement the multilateral commitments in the field of nuclear disarmament. In this regard, there is no priority higher than meeting the deadlines set by the action plan of the 2010 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The first such deadline was the convening of the 2012 Conference on the Establishment of a Zone Free of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East. This deadline was not met. Non-compliance with the 2010 commitments will undermine the NPT review process. Despite the confirmation of participation by all States in the region except one, the Conference was not held at its agreed date. The Arab League has continuously urged the conveners to fulfill their commitments. This is the only way to restore the credibility of the non-proliferation regime and ensure success for the 2015 Review Process. Egypt is watching closely the developments in this regard and will be acting accordingly. This issue should occupy the place it deserves in the work of the Commission. We expect a conclusion by the Group highlighting ways to ensure the implementation of the 2010 Review Conference commitments.

Mr. Chairman,

6. The issue of “Practical Confidence-Building Measures in the Field of Conventional Weapons” is now even more relevant in light of the outcome of the UN Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. Any serious confidence building process needs to address the following issues:

- Over production and ever-increasing stockpiles of conventional weapons in the hands of major arms exporters and producers. Every effort must be exerted to bring production and stockpiles in major arms producing States under international scrutiny.
- Mutual international accountability; as it is the only guarantee against potential abuse of the existing imbalance between major arms producers and the rest of the world.
- Addressing protracted threats to international peace and security. In this regard, there is no more profound threat to peace and stability, to international law, international humanitarian law, human rights law and to the core principles of the UN Charter itself than the crimes of aggression and foreign occupation which employ arms arsenals to threaten and dominate peoples and deny them their most basic human rights.

7. The role of the UNDC is crucial in developing such ‘confidence building measures’ that go beyond the traditional sense of the term often used to restrict the agenda in order to protect the narrow interpretation of a limited but privileged group of countries.

Mr. Chairman,

8. I have presented a number of ideas that attempt to think ‘outside the box’ with regards to issues that are most salient on the multilateral disarmament agenda. By doing so, we make the UNDC more pertinent as it allows for a free open minded reflection that is relevant and timely to other processes. Such cross fertilization will enhance the impact of the UNDC on the rest of the UN disarmament machinery. A task that we are confident you will be able to undertake successfully.

Thank you for your attention.
EU Opening Statement
for the
United Nations Disarmament Commission

By

Mr. Colm Ó Conaill,
First Secretary,
Permanent Mission of Ireland

United Nations
New York
1 April 2013

- CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY -
Mr. Chairman,

1. I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Acceding country Croatia*, the candidate countries Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, Montenegro* and Serbia*, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

2. First, allow me once again to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the 2013 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission as well as all members of the Bureau. The EU looks forward to working closely with you to achieve a successful outcome of our session.

3. We look forward to continued discussion on recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear-weapons; and on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

Mr Chairman,

4. The Treaty on the Non–proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament in accordance with Article VI of the NPT. Reinforcing the non-proliferation regime should be a key priority for all States. Non-compliance with the Treaty’s provisions by states party to the Treaty, undermines non-proliferation and disarmament efforts. Furthermore, we call once again on those States not yet Party to the NPT to join the Treaty as Non Nuclear Weapons States and, pending their accession to the NPT, to adhere to its terms and pledge commitments to non-proliferation and disarmament.

5. States should pursue the early entry into force and universalisation of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Equally important is the immediate launch of negotiations on a Treaty Banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices at the Conference on Disarmament, in the absence of which all concerned States that have not yet done so should declare and uphold an immediate moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons.

6. To address the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction the States should be guided by, i.a.:
   - conviction that a multilateralist approach to security, including disarmament and non-proliferation, provides the best way to maintain international order;

---

* Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.
- commitment to uphold, implement and strengthen the multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and agreements;
- support to the multilateral institutions charged respectively with verification and upholding of compliance with these treaties;
- commitment to strong national and internationally-coordinated export controls.

At the same time, the root causes of instability should also be addressed.

Mr Chairman,

7. With regard to conventional weapons, last year has seen some important developments. At the end of last summer we had the Review Conference on the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons. We warmly welcome the successful outcome of the Review Conference. At the same time, we regret that the UN Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty did not manage last month to finalize negotiations on this new international instrument, aiming at making trade in conventional arms more responsible and transparent. There is great momentum to be seized to conclude the elaboration of an ATT and swift action should be taken to this end.

8. There are several types of practical confidence building measures in the field of conventional weapons. The EU has prepared a working paper outlining our thoughts on the measures and we look forward to sharing these views in the weeks to come.

Mr Chairman,

9. The EU would like to reiterate its willingness to continue engaging in a constructive manner to facilitate consensus agreements in order to advance the work of the Commission. We will do our best for the working group discussions to be focused and in-depth and encourage other delegations to do the same. We look forward the discussions in the two working groups to bring about concrete and comprehensive recommendations.

10. In conclusion we would like to wish you, Mr. Chairman, every success in your future work and reiterate to you the full support of the European Union.

I thank you.
Monsieur le Président,
Chers collègues,

La France s’associe au discours prononcé par l’Irlande au nom de l’Union européenne. Je tiens à vous adresser les félicitations de ma délégation pour votre nomination comme Président de cette session, et pour vos efforts lors de ces dernières semaines.

Je souhaite préciser ici quelques points relatifs à la position française.

Nous espérons que cette session s’inscrive dans la dynamique constructive dont la communauté internationale fait preuve depuis trois ans. Que ce soit le succès de la Conférence d’examen du TNP en 2010, l’entrée en vigueur de la Convention d’Oslo et de l’accord New Start, les progrès obtenus lors des Sommets sur la Sécurité nucléaire, les succès enregistrés démontrent que nous pouvons faire avancer l’agenda du désarmement et de la non-prolifération lorsque règne un état d’esprit constructif et pragmatique.

Cette dynamique montre aussi que la recherche d’un monde plus sûr doit être abordée de manière globale, et les efforts doivent être déployés dans tous les domaines : nucléaire, chimique, biologique, conventionnel, prolifération balistique et l’espace.

La session de l’année dernière a été riche et utile. Nous avons adopté un agenda pour ce cycle, et eu des discussions importantes sur les questions de désarmement. Cela répond à notre souhait que la Commission soit un espace de réflexion, de débat et d’échange d’idées.

Monsieur le Président

Dans le domaine nucléaire, notre feuille de route demeure le plan d’action adopté lors de la dernière Conférence d’examen du TNP en 2010. La mise en œuvre complète de ce plan d’action, global et équilibré, est la responsabilité de tous les Etats Parties, notamment dans la perspective de la Conférence d’examen 2015. Notre réussite à ce moment là sera mesurée à l’aune des progrès que nous aurons réalisé dans sa mise en œuvre.

Les Etats dotés d’armes nucléaires au sens du TNP ont une responsabilité particulière. Après la première réunion de suivi du P5 de la Conférence d’examen du TNP organisée par la France l’année dernière, la Russie organisera la prochaine réunion les 19 et 20 avril. Cette initiative témoigne du sérieux des Etats dotés dans la la mise en œuvre du plan d’action, et vis-à-vis de leurs engagements à l’égard du TNP.

Mais tous les Etats doivent contribuer au désarmement en créant l’environnement de sécurité requis. Cela passe notamment par la résolution des deux principales crises de prolifération qui menacent aujourd’hui la paix et la sécurité internationales. La Corée du Nord poursuit ses programmes balistique et nucléaire, en violation des résolutions du CNSU. Le troisième essai nucléaire nord-coréen il y a quelques semaines nous rappelle la gravité de la situation. L’Iran, pour sa part, continue ses activités nucléaires en violation des résolutions du CSNU et du Conseil des
Gouverneurs de l'AIEA. Les développements récents du programme nucléaire iranien, notamment l'installation de centrifugeuses de nouvelle génération, sont particulièrement préoccupants. Les E3+3 demeurent bien entendu engagés dans la recherche d'une solution diplomatique, mais force est de constater que la première réunion à Almaty n'a pas débouché sur des résultats tangibles. Nous espérons que lors de la prochaine réunion, qui doit se tenir à la fin de la semaine, l'Iran démontrera sa volonté réelle de répondre par des gestes concrets aux préoccupations de la communauté internationale.


Nous devons aussi renforcer les autres aspects du cadre multilatéral, en amenant tous les États qui ne l’ont pas encore fait, notamment ceux de l’Annexe II, à rejoindre le TICE. A cet égard, nous félicitons la récente ratification du traité par le Tchad.

Nous devons aussi négocier un traité interdisant la production de matières fissiles pour les armes nucléaires à la Conférence du Désarmement. Nous espérons que le Groupe d’Experts Gouvernementaux, dont la création a été décidée lors de la Première Commission l’année dernière, facilitera par la suite le lancement rapide de négociations, dans le cadre de la conférence du Désarmement, sur un traité incluant l’ensemble des acteurs concernés. Nous saisirons par ailleurs cette occasion pour appeler tous les États concernés à établir sans délai un moratoire sur la production de ces matières fissiles, comme la France, les États-Unis, le Royaume Uni et la Russie l’ont déjà fait.

Par ailleurs, la France soutient les efforts relatifs à la mise en œuvre de la résolution de 1995 sur le Moyen Orient. Nous regrettons que la Conférence sur une ZEADM au Moyen Orient n’ait pas pu se tenir en 2012 comme cela était prévu dans le plan d’action du TNP, et réaffirmons notre soutien aux efforts du facilitateur, M. Laajava, pour que cette Conférence se tienne dès que possible avec tous les acteurs concernés. Nous appelons tous les pays de la région à œuvrer de façon constructive en ce sens, en s’abstenant de toute initiative qui nous éloignerait du but recherché.

Monsieur le Président,

La France déploie des efforts constants pour faire progresser le désarmement général et complet. Comme je l’ai rappelé, ces efforts portent sur tous les domaines, et visent à l’universalisation et au renforcement des instruments multilatéraux existants.

La troisième conférence d’examen de la Convention d’Interdiction des Armes Chimiques qui aura lieu dans une semaine à La Haye constitue un des grands rendez-vous de l’année. Cette Convention constitue une réussite indéniable dans le domaine du désarmement et de la non-prolifération. Nous devons poursuivre nos efforts pour rendre cette Convention universelle, et appelons les États non signataires à la rejoints sans délai. L’emploi de ces armes inhumaines reste malheureusement un sujet d’actualité, au regard des récentes allégations d’emploi.
en Syrie. Je saisiss cette occasion pour saluer la décision du Secrétaire Général de lancer une enquête sur toutes les allégations d’emploi de ces armes en Syrie.

Nous saluons également des résultats de la 7ème conférence d’examen de la convention d’interdiction des armes biologiques, et les efforts déployés en vue de sa mise en œuvre. Nous saluons la récente ratification par le Cameroun, les Îles Marshall, et Nauru, et invitons tous les États qui ne l’ont pas encore fait à rejoindre la Convention, qui constitue un outil essentiel de notre sécurité collective.

La France demeure attachée à renforcer les efforts de lutte contre la prolifération des missiles balistiques. C’est un sujet de préoccupation majeur pour la communauté internationale, au moment où se développent des programmes balistiques interdits, y compris sous le couvert de programme spatiaux. A cet égard, la France souhaite appeler à l’universalisation du Code de Conduite de La Haye, qui renforce la confiance et la transparence dans ce domaine.

J’en viens à présent au désarmement conventionnel.

La France souhaite l’adoption, hier, par l’Assemblée Générale du traité sur le commerce des armes à une très large majorité. Le texte auquel nous sommes parvenus correspond aux attentes de la France. Nous souhaitons rendre un vif hommage au Président de la Conférence, l’Ambassadeur Peter Woolcott, et à son prédécesseur, l’Ambassadeur Roberto Garcia Moritan, pour leurs efforts inlassables, pour mener cette négociation à son terme.

Nous saluons les résultats positifs de la Conférence d’examen du Programme d’Action sur les armes légères et de petit calibre, qui a eu lieu à la fin de l’été 2012. Le travail accompli permettra d’améliorer et renforcer la mise en œuvre de cet instrument dans les mois et années à venir, et mettre un frein au trafic illicite et à leur accumulation excessive qui portent atteinte à la sécurité et stabilité internationales.

Monsieur le Président,

Tous ces chantiers illustrent ce que nous pouvons faire, non pas dans un avenir reculé, mais dans les mois et années à venir pour construire ensemble un monde plus sûr. Nous espérons que les discussions au cours de cette session pourront aborder tous ces défis. Vous pouvez compter sur le soutien de notre délégation pour participer au débat dans cet esprit constructif.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.
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Mr. Chairman,

Please accept our felicitations on your election as Chairman of this year’s UNDC meetings. I would also like to congratulate other members of the bureau on their elections. Let me assure you of the full support of my delegation in the discharge of your responsibilities. I would also like to place on record our appreciation for the work done by the UNDC Chair of last year as also the Chairs of the two Working Groups.

India associates itself with the statement made by Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,

India attaches high importance to the UNDC which is the deliberative leg of the triad of disarmament machinery put in place by the First Special Session of General Assembly on Disarmament. The Commission plays a unique role as the only body with universal membership for in-depth deliberations on relevant disarmament issues. We cannot over emphasise the role of this body at a time when both the disarmament agenda and the disarmament machinery face numerous challenges.

The UNDC offers an opportunity for Member States to collectively make progress on important disarmament issues by infusing coherence and consensus in disarmament debate which is extremely important if we are to address security challenges of our times. While we share the disappointment at the UNDC not being able to adopt substantive recommendations for more than a decade, we continue to have belief in the inherent value of this forum. It is up to us Member States to realize the value of UNDC by giving importance to its work and showing greater political commitment on disarmament issues.
Mr. Chairman,

The General Assembly in its resolution 52/492 of 1998 had decided that nuclear disarmament will constitute one of the agenda items of UNDC every year. However, it was only after considerable deliberations last year that the Commission was able to adopt its agenda for the 2012-14 cycle of its meetings, with nuclear disarmament as one of the agenda items. Nonetheless, we now have two agenda items for this cycle on which a large measure of ground has already been covered in previous years. We believe that elements on which substantial agreement was reached among Member States in the past should be preserved.

At this stage, we would like to share some thoughts on the two issues on our agenda. We will further elaborate our positions in the meetings of the two Working Groups in the coming three weeks. We attach high importance to the agenda item “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons”. The complete elimination of nuclear weapons is a long cherished goal of the international community. The UN General Assembly in its very first resolution, adopted unanimously in 1946, sought the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction. The final document of SSOD-I adopted by consensus by the international community, also accorded the highest priority to nuclear disarmament.

India attaches the highest priority to global, non-discriminatory verifiable nuclear disarmament, a principle which has strong and consistent domestic support in our country. India is convinced that the goal of nuclear disarmament can be achieved through a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment and an agreed multilateral framework that is global and non-discriminatory. There is need for a meaningful dialogue among all states possessing nuclear weapons to build trust and confidence and for reducing the salience of nuclear weapons in international affairs and security doctrines.
In the current international climate there is greater support for progressive steps for delegitimization of nuclear weapons. Measures to reduce nuclear danger arising from accidental or unauthorised use of nuclear weapons are pertinent in this regard. India’s resolutions in the First Committee give expression to some of these ideas and have found support from a large number of States. Our Working Paper tabled in the UNDC in April 2007, which was developed in the spirit of the 1988 Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan, also suggested specific measures, including a Global No First Use Agreement and a Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons.

We believe that the UNDC must send a strong signal of the international community’s resolve for achieving the goal of global, non-discriminatory and verifiable nuclear disarmament. Member States should use this forum to intensify dialogue in this regard. We can demonstrate our commitment by adopting consensus recommendations on the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

As regards the second agenda item “Practical CBMs in the field of conventional weapons”, let me state that India supports practical CBMs initiatives whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or global. We believe that CBMs can build trust and confidence and enhance transparency to minimize misunderstandings and misperceptions thereby promoting a suitable environment of peace and security among States. India has initiated several CBMs with the countries in our neighbourhood.

We believe that the initiation of a confidence building process must be decided upon by States freely and in the exercise of their sovereignty. Confidence building must be a step-by-step process and should evolve at a pace comfortable to all participating states. CBMs in specific regions should fully take into account the political, military and other conditions prevailing in the region. CBMs in a regional context should be adopted on the initiation and with the agreement of the
States of the region concerned. In elaborating practical CBMs in the field of conventional weapons, we should take advantage of the guidelines on CBMs endorsed by the UNGA at its 41st session on the recommendation of the UNDC.

We believe that significant amount of work needs to be accomplished on this agenda item in our meetings this year and the next. The discussions last year were sketchy perhaps in anticipation of the results of the ATT negotiations as well as the Review Conference of the UNPOA on SALW. We also believe that discussions on CBMs in the field of conventional weapons should not become a tool for pursuing political agendas or for promoting instruments that do not enjoy universal support.

Mr. Chairman,

Being the second year of this cycle of UNDC meetings, this year is crucial for us to be able to adopt substantive recommendations at the conclusion of the cycle next year. Since we have only two items on our agenda, unlike three in the past cycle, there is a possibility for in-depth exchange of views on all aspects related to these agenda items this year. We are therefore hopeful of good progress in our work.

Thank you.
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Mr. Chairman,

1. I am very pleased to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

2. NAM congratulates you on your election as Chair of this year's substantive session, as well as other Bureau Members on their elections, and the Chairpersons of the Working Groups on their assumption.

3. NAM is confident that under your able stewardship and with constructive engagement and display of necessary political will by all Member States, this UNDC session can achieve positive results to advance global disarmament and non-proliferation.

4. NAM would also avail itself of this opportunity to express its appreciation to Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey, Permanent Representative of Peru, for his tireless efforts as President of the Disarmament Commission last year. Thanks to his leadership, the UNDC was able to adopt the agenda items for its current cycle of meetings.

5. NAM reiterates its longstanding position regarding the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, and expresses its determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard, the Movement reaffirms the relevance and centrality of the UNDC, with universal membership, as the sole specialized and deliberative body within the UN multilateral disarmament machinery, to consider specific disarmament issues and submit concrete recommendations before the General Assembly.

6. The UNDC has contributed in the past to the field of disarmament and arms control, including by reaching consensus on guidelines for establishing nuclear-weapon-free-zones (NWFZ) and for conventional arms control. NAM expresses regret that the UNDC was unable to reach agreement on recommendations on its three agenda items during the substantive sessions of its three year cycle ending in April 2011 due to the lack of political will and inflexible positions in particular of certain Nuclear-Weapons States (NWS), despite NAM's constructive role and concrete proposals throughout deliberations, especially in the Working Group on "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation of nuclear weapons".

7. While highlighting the importance of the discussions held last year, the Movement expresses the hope that the Commission will be able to steer these deliberations towards concrete recommendations on the issues under its agenda: "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms".

8. NAM calls for a more results-oriented UNDC session in 2013, and urges all UN Member States to display the necessary political will and flexibility in order to achieve agreement on recommendations during the substantive sessions of the UNDC three year cycle ending in 2014.

9. On its part, NAM is committed to working actively and constructively and intends to submit a working paper on "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons".
Mr. Chairman,

10. NAM reiterates its deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals in accordance with their relevant multilateral legal obligations. The Movement underscores the need for the NWS to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they provided in 2000 and further reiterated in 2010 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and emphasizes, in this regard, the urgent need to commence and to bring to a conclusion negotiations on comprehensive and complete nuclear disarmament without any further delay.

11. NAM emphasizes that progress in nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security. The Movement reaffirms that efforts toward nuclear disarmament, global and regional approaches and confidence building measures complement each other and should, wherever possible, be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security. In this context, the Movement stresses that nuclear disarmament, as the highest priority established by SSOD-I and as a multilateral legal obligation, should not be made conditional on confidence building measures or other disarmament efforts.

12. NAM emphasizes the necessity to start negotiations without further delay on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. NAM reiterates its firm commitment to work for convening a high level international conference to identify ways and means of eliminating nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

13. In this context, the Movement welcomes the convening of the High-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament on September 26, 2013, and encourages all Member States to participate in this important meeting at the highest level. The Movement looks forward to constructive deliberations to contribute to achieving the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

14. NAM reaffirms that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and reaffirms further that all Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (NNWS) should be effectively assured by NWS against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, NAM reaffirms the need for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to all NNWS as a matter of high priority.

15. The Movement underlines that improving existing nuclear weapons and developing new types of nuclear weapons contradict the objective of achieving nuclear disarmament as a multilateral legal obligation, as well as the commitments undertaken by the NWS in this regard.

16. NAM reaffirms the importance of the application by NWS of principles of transparency, irreversibility and international verifiability in all measures related to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and undertakings.
Mr. Chairman,

17. NAM reaffirms the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy, including the sovereign right to develop full national nuclear fuel cycle, for peaceful purposes without discrimination, and to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. However, NAM notes with concern the continued imposition of undue restrictions on exports of material, equipment and technology to developing countries for peaceful purposes and calls for their immediate removal.

18. NAM again emphasizes that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development.

19. NAM stresses that the issues related to proliferation should be resolved through political and diplomatic means, and that measures and initiatives taken in this regard should be within the framework of international law, relevant conventions and the UN Charter, and should contribute to the promotion of international peace, security and stability.

20. NAM States Parties to the NPT stress that it is essential that the action plans adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference on nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle-East, which is an integral and essential part of the package of decisions reached without a vote that enabled the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995, are implemented and reaffirms that the Resolution remains valid until its objectives are achieved.

21. NAM State Parties to the NPT express their serious concern over the long delay in the implementation of the 1995 Resolution and urge the three cosponsors of the Resolution to take all necessary measures to fully implement it without any further delay. Recalling the consensus decision contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on convening, in 2012, of a Conference on the establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East, NAM State Parties to the NPT express their profound disappointment on not convening the conference in 2012 as scheduled, and are of the view that the failure to convene the Conference in 2012 is contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East and contradicts and violates the collective agreement of the States Parties contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They strongly reject the alleged impediments presented by the Conveners for not convening the Conference on schedule, and express their serious concern that the Conference has not been convened until this moment, prior to the 2nd PrepCom for the 2015 NPT RevCon. They urge the UN Secretary General, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation, to convene the Conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, its 2015 Review process and the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole.

22. In this regard NAM recalls that in the Final Document of Tehran Summit in August 2012, the Heads of State or Government, while recalling the initiatives by Iran, Egypt and Syria on the establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East, called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment,
demanded on Israel, the only country in the region that has not joined the NPT nor declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the NPT without precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA full-scope safeguards and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel.

23. While emphasizing the vital role of strong and genuine political will in multilateral negotiations on disarmament, NAM hopes that our deliberations will contribute to enhancing the political will in support of the United Nations disarmament machinery, in particular the UNDC and the Conference on Disarmament, which the Group reaffirms remains the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body.

24. In conclusion, the Movement continues to fully support the work of the UNDC, which should be intensified through reinvigorated political will to enable this body to fulfill its role and underscores the imperative for all UN Member States to work together and display the necessary political will to tangibly implement the globally agreed agenda on disarmament and non-proliferation, thereby yielding peace and security for all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Islamic Republic of
IRAN
Permanent Mission to the United Nations
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Statement by H.E. Ambassador Golamhossein Dehghani
Deputy Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations
Before the 2013 Substantive Session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission
New York, April 2, 2013

In the name of God, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful

Mr. Chairman,
I would like to congratulate you and other members of the Bureau on your election and assure you of the full cooperation of my delegation in having a successful meeting.

I also fully associate myself with the statement made by the distinguished representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,
Although nuclear sciences is among humanity’s greatest achievements and can and should be used to serve the well-being of all human societies, it is equally associated with the most appalling event in history and the greatest genocide and misuse of humanity’s scientific achievements.

Since the horrendous nuclear attacks to Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, nuclear disarmament has always been the highest global priority and the very first resolution adopted unanimously by the General Assembly at its first session on January 24, 1946 called for the total elimination of atomic bomb.

Unfortunately, the continued existence of thousands of deployed and non-deployed strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons around the world seriously threatens the international peace and security and the very survival of human civilization.

While considering agenda item on “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons”, Disarmament Commission should set this as a principle that “there is no legal, political or security reason to justify the possession of nuclear weapons by any country and their total elimination is the only absolute grantee against the threat posed by such weapons”.

622 Third Ave, New York, NY 10017 Tel: (212) 687-2020 Fax: (212) 867-7086 email: iran@un.int
As Secretary-General has recently put it, "There are no right hands for wrong weapons".

We need to make every effort to materialize the commitment made by the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to undertake effective measures to achieve nuclear disarmament.

It is a source of grave concern that certain Nuclear-Weapon-States still continue to allocate billions of dollars to conduct nuclear weapon tests -- no matter which means they choose for such tests -- to develop new types of nuclear weapons, build new nuclear weapons production facilities and modernize and replace such weapons.

Equally, those countries, in contravention with their obligations under Article VI of the NPT, continue to resort to obsolete nuclear deterrence policy and promote the role and status of nuclear weapons in their security doctrines.

This is also applicable to the Strategic Concept for the Security of the NATO members, which justifies the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and maintains unjustifiable concepts on international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and nuclear deterrence policies.

We strongly call upon all those States to comply with their explicit legal obligations under the NPT and to exclude completely the possession, use or threat of use of nuclear weapons from their military and security doctrines.

It is worth mentioning in this context that despite repeated claims of certain Nuclear-Weapon States in regard to compliance with their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, the latest facts and figures totally question the validity and credibility of such claims.

In this regard we strongly believe that limited bilateral and unilateral arms reductions and merely decommissioning of nuclear weapons are far below the real and effective steps for the total elimination of nuclear weapons and can never be a substitute for the obligation of Nuclear-Weapon-States for complete elimination of all their nuclear weapons in an irreversible, transparent and internationally verifiable manner.

We also believe that the lack of progress in nuclear disarmament is not the only challenge, as some Nuclear-Weapon-States, in clear non-compliance with their legal obligations, are proliferating nuclear weapons horizontally and vertically, including by continuing Nuclear-Weapon-Sharing arrangements with Non-Nuclear-Weapon-States and other Nuclear-Weapon-States as well.

Mr. Chairman,
The Islamic Republic of Iran, along with the overwhelming majority of States, maintains its principled position that the total elimination of nuclear weapons, as the highest priority, is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

In this regard, we emphasize the high priority and urgency of starting negotiations on Nuclear Weapons Convention to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.
Likewise, we call for starting negotiations, without any further delay, on a universal legally binding instrument on effective, unconditional, non-discriminatory and irrevocable security assurances by all Nuclear-Weapon States to all Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Parties to the NPT against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

Mr. Chairman,
The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that the best way to guarantee the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in addition to the full and non-selective implementation of all NPT provisions, is to assure its universality, in particular in the Middle East, where the nuclear weapons program of the only non-party to this Treaty, assisted by certain Nuclear-Weapon States, seriously threatens regional and international peace and security.

To overcome this problem, Iran proposed the establishment of a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East in 1974. Nevertheless, despite the adoption of numerous resolution by the General Assembly and also adoption of the Resolution on the Middle East by the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, efforts to establish such a zone have not yet succeeded due to the persistent refusal of the Israeli regime to join the NPT and to place all its nuclear facilities under the IAEA comprehensive safeguards.

In this regard and as an important development, I should refer to the cancellation of the 2012 Conference on the Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East.

Although, in its relevant statement, the United States claimed that “States in the region have not reached agreement on acceptable conditions for a conference”, the truth is that the Islamic Republic of Iran and all Arab countries had already announced their readiness to participate in the Conference, and the Israeli regime was the only party which rejected to take part in that Conference; a fact that even the United States itself could not cover it up and stated in its statement that the United States “would not support a conference in which any regional state would be subject to pressure or isolation.”

The Islamic Republic of Iran continues to strongly reject any precondition regarding the Conference, whatsoever and by whomsoever, including for the participation therein, and stresses that there should be strong pressure on that regime, to participate in the Conference without any precondition.

We fully associate ourselves with the relevant statement issued then by the Non-Aligned Movement in which NAM strongly rejected the alleged impediments presented by the Conveners for not convening the Conference on schedule, and urged them all to convene the Conference in accordance with the mandate entrusted to them by the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, its 2015 Review process and the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole.

The Islamic Republic of Iran once again would like to make it clear that the decision on the 2012 Conference was adopted consensually by the NPT States Parties and accordingly, not only any decision on that shall be made by the NPT Review Conference itself, but also the Rules of Procedures of the NPT Review Conferences shall fully apply to the Middle East Conference, including its preparatory process.
Mr. Chairman,
In the Final Document of the SSOD-I, the General Assembly has highly emphasized the need for removal of the threat of nuclear weapons and their total elimination, as well as prevention of proliferation of such weapons, and by identifying nuclear disarmament as the highest priority, mandated the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) to follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations of that Session, including on nuclear disarmament.

Despite many achievements by the Commission, it is regrettable that during its lifetime, this body has not been able to formulate an exclusive set of recommendations on Nuclear Disarmament and total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Commission therefore is highly expected to accord priority to and focus on nuclear disarmament and total elimination of nuclear weapons as the long-delayed part of its mandate.

For such an obvious reason, the UNDC agenda item on nuclear disarmament, as decided by the General Assembly, is of utmost relevance and importance.

In conclusion, my delegation reaffirms the important role and function of the UNDC, as the deliberative body of the General Assembly mandated to consider and make recommendations on major disarmament issues.

Indeed, the formulation of more than a dozen of principles, guidelines and recommendations by the UNDC in the past is indicative of its important role and relevance.

The Islamic Republic of Iran stands ready to fully cooperate with other delegations during the current cycle of the Commission to overcome the existing stalemate in the Commission, which in our view, is rooted in the lack of genuine political will on the part of certain countries.

We are also looking forward, Mr. Chairman, to working with you and all delegations to have a successful session of the Commission.

I thank you Mr. Chairman.
(Check against delivery)

Statement by H.E. Mr. Kazuyoshi Umemoto
Deputy Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations
At the Meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC)
Monday, 1 April 2013

(Introduction)

First of all, allow me to congratulate Ambassador Christopher Grima of Malta on his assumption of the chairmanship of the UNDC as well as the newly elected vice-chairs. Japan will do its utmost to support the work of the Chairman and Bureau.

The UNDC has adopted sixteen documents on guidelines and recommendations, including “Guidelines for the Establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones.” However, since its adoption of “Guidelines on Conventional Arms Control” in 1999, the UNDC has remained in deadlock for more than 10 years. This is the second year of the current three-year cycle, and our primary objective is to deepen substantive discussion on the topics agreed upon at last year’s session, thereby laying a foundation for the guidelines and recommendations to be issued next year.

I would like to express Japan’s views on two main areas which will be discussed at the UNDC this year.

(Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation)

Mr. Chairman,

While the international community aspires to realize a world without nuclear weapons, progress in nuclear disarmament has been slow, and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva seems incapable of breaking out of its prolonged stalemate. Furthermore, in spite of the repeated adoption of UN Security Council resolutions on nuclear and missile-related activities by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and Iran, the international
disarmament and non-proliferation regimes under the NPT continue to face serious challenges, including numerous cases of violations.

To maintain and strengthen the NPT regime, it is essential that we take practical and realistic steps to promote both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI) which Japan promotes has been working for this very purpose. The NPDI has submitted working papers to the NPT Review Conference Preparatory Committee on topics such as the CTBT, FMCT, non-strategic nuclear weapons, export controls, as well as disarmament and non-proliferation education.

Japan also submits resolutions to the UN General Assembly every year to accelerate international efforts for nuclear disarmament. Last year’s resolution, entitled “United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons” had 99 co-sponsors and was adopted with the support of 174 states, setting the international standard in the field of disarmament.

The early entry into force of the CTBT and the immediate commencement of negotiations on an FMCT are of pressing importance. Accordingly, Japan supported the Conference on Facilitating the Early Entry into Force of the CTBT in 2011 and the “Friends of the CTBT” Foreign Ministers Meeting at the UN last year. We stress the need to take the next logical step following the CTBT and initiate negotiations on an FMCT. As indicated by the General Assembly resolution on the establishment of an FMCT Group of Government Experts (GGE) adopted last year, the UN plays an increasingly significant role in this area.

Japan believes all these key developments should be duly reflected in this year’s deliberations at the UNDC.

(Conventional weapons and confidence-building measures)

Mr. Chairman,

The UNDC should also take into account recent developments in the areas of conventional weapons and confidence-building measures. The success of last year’s Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons Review Conference was certainly a welcoming progress in this regard. The outcome document will give the international community a clear goal and timeline to strengthen its efforts to combat and eradicate the illicit trade of arms.
Enhanced transparency of armaments in all States reduces miscalculation, miscommunication, and mistrust between States, building greater confidence. The UN Register of Conventional Arms and UN Report on Military Expenditures plays an important role in promoting such transparency and confidence among States. During this session of the UNDC, Japan hopes to sponsor a side-event to stimulate the discussion on global military expenditure similar to the event we convened last year.

The failure to adopt the Arms Trade Treaty at the Final UN conference last week was regrettable. Along with the other six original co-authors, Japan has worked hard for the last few years to realize the goal of strengthening international rules on the arms trade. However, we should not be discouraged by the attempt to hamper the aspirations of an overwhelming number of States. Japan is confident that the treaty will be adopted very soon and that the UN continues to play a central role in suppressing illegal trade of conventional weapons to save lives.

(Conclusion)

Mr. Chairman,

Last year, the General Assembly adopted a number of resolutions which mandated the UN to take specific actions. Among these were decisions to establish an open-ended working group to advance multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, to convene a high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament, and to create an FMCT Group of Governmental Experts. These developments are clear examples of the will of Member States to make better use of this universal organ to reinvigorate disarmament and non-proliferations efforts.

Being a part of the UN body, the UNDC must also produce meaningful outcomes in order to reclaim its place in the global deliberations on disarmament affairs. We all need to prove that the UNDC is worthy of allocating substantial human and financial resources. The UNDC already laid the groundwork for action based on the deliberations last year. Participating States should engage themselves in identifying the next steps. Japan will fully support the Chairman and spare no effort to ensure that this second-year conference leads to a positive outcome next year.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman
STATEMENT

by

H.E. Ambassador Byrganym Aitimova,
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Kazakhstan
to the United Nations

at the opening meeting of the 2013 session of the Disarmament Commission

1 April 2013
New York
Mr. Chairman
Distinguished Colleagues,

I would like to express my delegation’s warmest appreciation for your leadership of the UNDC and wish a successful outcome for the 2013 Substantive Session. Our thanks are also due to Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, and her Office for the support provided for our deliberations.

With over a decade of stalemate in UNDC, we must seize this opportunity to revitalize the role and effectiveness of the disarmament machinery so as to address the many new threats and challenges encountered today. Kazakhstan assures its support in efforts to improve UNDC’s work methods, based on earlier resolutions of the General Assembly and other platforms with a view to consolidate the past.

As regards nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, we support an equal focus on both aspects in the context of recent political developments in some regions of the world. Greater emphasis will have to be given to conventional arms considering that no Treaty was adopted at the Final Conference of the Arms Trade Treaty. We trust that all member states will renew their commitment so that such a vital treaty will come into effect. Trust and confidence building measures are crucial in all aspects of disarmament and need to be reviewed as well.

In light of several regional tensions escalating in various parts of the world, Kazakhstan calls for universalization of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its Additional Protocol, as well as, the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. The need for an enhanced and strengthened verification mechanism and follow up of the 2010 NPT Review Conference cannot be overstated.

The effective implementation of the Nuclear Weapon-Free-Zones is imperative. Kazakhstan emphasizes the critical urgency of negative security assurances to be granted to nuclear weapons free zones, and is committed to work with others in the region to guarantee the physical security of nuclear materials and equipment to prevent nuclear proliferation and terrorism. With approval and supervision by the International Atomic Energy Agency, my country will host a nuclear fuel bank.

We particularly support the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in the Middle East. And, despite the political turbulence and threats in the region, to hold a Conference on the Middle East at the earliest possible moment. To further the goal of disarmament on a global level, President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan has proposed a Universal Declaration for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World as the first step towards such a Convention aimed at nuclear abolition.

A well functioning Conference on Disarmament is a *sine qua non* and it is clear we must begin to fully implement the key Action Points of the 2010 NPT
Review Conference, draft a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT), a convention against nuclear weapons, and the Five-Point Plan of the Secretary-General.

In addition, the growing possible use of other weapons of mass destruction should be averted at all costs, including biological and chemical weapons, which violate international humanitarian law. Under the present circumstances, greater support should be given by us for the work of the OPCW.

In the absence of full consensus at the Final Conference on the ATT, which has disappointed all of us, Kazakhstan hopes that it will receive the support of the vast majority of the Member States.

Regional efforts of ODA need to be given full recognition and strengthened as they contribute to the vision of ONE UN in arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation at the country and regional levels, for global policies to be realized.

Kazakhstan stands ready to be part of the multilateral effort to break the deadlock and make the disarmament machinery viable again, so that together we can all promote human advancement, peace, justice and human rights.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
STATEMENT BY H.E. AMBASSADOR HUSSEIN HANIFF, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF MALAYSIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT THE 2013 SUBSTANTIVE SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION, 1 APRIL 2013, NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman,

Malaysia extends our warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the Chairmanship of the 2013 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Allow me also to congratulate other Bureau members on their elections, as well as the Chairpersons of the respective Working Groups on their assumption.

My delegation would also like to thank Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey of Peru for his contribution and efforts as President of last year’s Disarmament Commission, during which we were able to adopt the agenda items for this current cycle. Malaysia associates itself with the statement made by Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,

2. Malaysia, like many other delegations here, recognises the difficulties in realising the disarmament agenda. This perennial deadlock has beleaguered the Disarmament Commission, and the Conference of Disarmament, for over a dozen years now. In spite of this my delegation views these challenges as an opportunity for all of us to reinvigorate this process, and we reiterate our call for all parties to renew their positions, in order to achieve general and complete disarmament with the goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons.

3. In this regard, Malaysia continues to believe in the continuing relevancy of the Disarmament Commission as the sole specialised body with universal membership in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. The all-inclusive and comprehensive approach which the Disarmament Commission provides is important to my delegation, as we seek to achieve an outcome which enjoys the broadest possible support.
4. On that note, my delegation expresses its hope for a more results-oriented session in 2013, and calls on all member States to exercise flexibility and political will so as to rejuvenate our negotiations to move forward on substantive matters and towards a successful conclusion. My delegation also wishes to emphasize that the Non-Aligned Movement will be submitting a working paper on “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons”, which we hope will provide an impetus for substantive progress this year on this agenda item.

Mr. Chairman,

5. In a few weeks’ time, many of us here will be departing for Geneva to participate in the Second Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. For Malaysia, we believe that this year’s Prepcom should continue the momentum towards greater cooperation in achieving the NPT’s objectives in nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

6. Malaysia remains concerned on the slow progress in the reduction of strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons, and we are deeply disturbed that the Nuclear Weapon States continue to modernise and upgrade their nuclear arsenals. Malaysia also reiterates its call for the urgent conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances.

7. However, my delegation is particularly disappointed on the postponement of the Conference on the establishment of a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in the Middle East. This failure to convene the Conference by 2012 may have serious implications in the run-up to the 2015 NPT Review Conference, and even the Treaty itself. In this regard, my delegation joins others in urging the Secretary-General as well as the concerned States to convene the Conference at the earliest possible opportunity, with the active participation of all states in the region.

8. Again, we find ourselves in a situation where we recognise the difficulties faced by all parties in achieving this goal. However, my delegation is convinced that this is a necessary step to take, indeed one of many steps, in the long journey towards peace and stability in that region. As such, it is our considered belief that all states should approach the Conference with an open mind and without prejudice on the different security concerns of others.

Mr. Chairman,

9. In relation to the topic of nuclear weapons free zones, Malaysia continues to believe that such zones contribute significantly to global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation objectives. In this regard, we are pleased to note the progress in concluding negotiations between ASEAN and the five Nuclear Weapons States on the Protocol to the Treaty on Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone (SEANWFZ). My delegation
joins others in looking forward to the signing of the Protocol to the Treaty and its related documents as early as possible.

10. Also on developments in the region, Malaysia welcomes the recent ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty by Brunei Darussalam. Nevertheless, it is coming to 17 years since the CTBT was opened for signature and yet it still remains non-operational. Malaysia continues to believe that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are two sides of the same coin, and in this regard calls upon all States, particular the Annex II States, to work towards the entry into force of the CTBT.

Mr. Chairman,

11. With regard to conventional weapons, my delegation welcomes the successful outcome of the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradication the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects held in New York last year. Malaysia is of the view that the UN Programme will promote and facilitate international cooperation, which will enhance the effectiveness and complement existing bilateral, regional and international agreements to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.

12. My delegation reiterates its concern that the danger posed by conventional weapons, in particular when used in conflict situations, is overwhelming in terms of number of deaths and injuries. In this regard, Malaysia will continue to support confidence building measures in the field of conventional weapons at all levels, as this would contribute to strengthening international peace and security.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

(Check against delivery)

Mr. Chairman,

Let me join the others in congratulating you on your election as Chairman of the 2013 Session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission as well as the members of the Bureau. My delegation is confident that under your able leadership, the work of the Commission will achieve a successful outcome. My delegation assures you of its full cooperation in discharging your future responsibilities.

I also wish to extend our sincere appreciation to Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey of Peru for his contribution for the year 2012. I thank Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs for her presentation before the Commission.

Nepal aligns itself with the statement made by the distinguished representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,

The United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) has a fundamental role in disarmament affairs. It is mandated to shape policies, principles and guidelines and adopt recommendations on the main issues of the disarmament. The UNDC has succeeded in delivering many concrete results by formulating consensus principles, guidelines and recommendations on a range of issues. But, past decade was not satisfactory because our deliberations in the UNDC have not transformed into any concrete result.

We all know that disarmament is not a choice, it is a compelling security imperative as global peace and security lies in collective prosperity, not in race for armaments. A peaceful and stable world will never be achieved in the midst of grinding poverty and hunger, diseases and disparity around the world. Moreover, there is a constant danger of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of terrorists and radical extremists.

Less than 60 years ago there were no nuclear weapons in the world. Today the world has a large stock of nuclear weapons that could destroy the entire human civilizations. The world will not remain safe unless nuclear weapon states give up their nuclear arsenals. The military expenditures have never stopped from increasing every year. The production, transfer and trading of conventional weapons including small arms and light weapons have increased several folds. Many conflict-ridden countries have bear the heavy burnt of small arms and light weapons.
Mr. Chairman,

Nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security. Nepal strongly believes in complete disarmament of all weapons of mass destruction including biological, chemical, nuclear, radiological weapons in a time bound manner. We also support the non-proliferation of small arms and light weapons while maintaining the position that every State has the legitimate right to acquire such weapons for defence.

As a party to NPT and CWC, Nepal believes that these treaties form the bedrock of the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and underlines the need to make it universal. It is our view that the three pillars of nuclear disarmament: nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation, and peaceful uses of nuclear energy are equally important and mutually reinforcing, so their sanctity has to be fully preserved. We also believe that the ultimate objective, as set forth in the first Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD-I), of the international community should be geared toward achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Similarly, as a corollary to nuclear disarmament, universal adherence to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is another critical element of the nuclear disarmament. In the same vein, Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT) remains an absolutely essential step on the path to global nuclear disarmament. We strongly oppose weaponization of the outer space and support the establishment of nuclear-weapons-free-zones in the various regions which is critically important to give a genuine meaning to disarmament.

Mr. Chairman,

The United Nations has to play a facilitating role as a truly global forum for maintaining international peace and security. The General Assembly, Security Council and other bodies such as International Atomic Energy Agency, Conference on Disarmament, and Disarmament Commission, in which member states could seek common approach to the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, have to be fully utilized.

Similarly, the other UN machineries such as Regional Centers for Disarmament and United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research have to be mobilized in facilitating member states towards disarmament. In this respect, the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament have a meaningful role to play. As host to the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, Nepal believes that unilateral, bilateral and regional commitments are the building blocks towards disarmament at the global level.

Nepal attaches high importance to the multilateral negotiations in disarmament and non-proliferation that promotes collective ownership, deliberations and responsibility for collective global action. The process might be difficult and challenging, but not impossible. As there is no alternative to forging consensus, sooner or later, based on the idea of common security, it is better done today than tomorrow. Time has come to widen and deepen the collaboration among states for building confidence, trust and stability which would enable the states to spare precious resources for the development of global commons.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Statement

by

Ambassador Masood Khan,
Permanent Representative of Pakistan

at the

2013 Substantive Session of the
United Nations Disarmament Commission

New York, 01 April 2013
Mr. Chairman,

I congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the Commission this year. I also commend the efforts of Ambassador Enrique Roman-Moray as the departing Chairman. On behalf of the Pakistan delegation, I assure you and the newly elected Bureau of our full support and cooperation.

2. We associate ourselves with the statement made by Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

Mr. Chairman,

3. The Commission proceedings are taking place against a turbulent global security backdrop. Old regional conflicts continue to fester, as new ones flare up. There are also signs of growing global tensions and confrontation.

4. This complex global political landscape has had a negative impact on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime. Differences on perspectives, approaches and modalities persist.

5. The hostile use of cyber and other emerging technologies are worrying trends.

Mr. Chairman,

6. This Commission holds immense promise to meet some of the complex contemporary challenges. The UNDC has successfully produced several useful guidelines and CBMs, which later laid the foundation for regional and global instruments. It can and should be enabled to play its deliberative role to harmonize the differences among Member States.

7. For several years now, Pakistan has called for evolving a new consensus on disarmament and non-proliferation with a view to reconciling the diversity in perspectives.

8. I outline some of the issues which this Commission could consider:

   One, in evolving a new approach, we need to start from a basic premise - recognition of the right to equal security for all States. The SSOD-I adopted the principle of "equal security" for all States, in the non-conventional and conventional fields and at regional as well as international levels.

   Two, we need to address the motives that drive States to acquire weapons to defend themselves. These motives include perceived threats from superior conventional or non-conventional forces; the existence of disputes and conflicts; and discrimination in the application of international norms and laws.

   Three, the Nuclear Weapon States must demonstrate a renewed commitment to achieve nuclear disarmament within a reasonable timeframe.
Four, until nuclear disarmament is achieved, non-nuclear weapon states should have the assurances that they will not be threatened with the use of nuclear or even conventional weapons. The security assurances offered by nuclear weapons states need to be translated into a universal, unconditional and legally binding treaty.

Five, we must evolve a universal and non-discriminatory agreement for addressing concerns arising from development, deployment and proliferation of missiles and Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) systems, which are inherently destabilizing. And finally,

Six, an agreed approach needs to be evolved for the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under appropriate international safeguards, in accordance with the international obligations of States and on a non-discriminatory basis. The advances in technology as well as an improved IAEA inspections regime have made it possible to promote "proliferation resistant" nuclear energy. However, in building a new inspection regime, it would be vital to ensure that it is applied equitably, both to nuclear and non-nuclear weapons states, in accordance with their obligations.

Mr. Chairman,

9. In the area of conventional weapons, it is essential to address the issues of their excessive production and sales, as well as their reduction in a comprehensive and balanced manner. States motivations for acquisition of arms for security needs cannot be separated from arms-production-and-sale that are driven by profit and political considerations.

10. It is also important to make concerted efforts for balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. As laid down in the Final Document of SSOD-I, these negotiations should be conducted with particular emphasis on militarily significant states. The increase in the number of conventional weapons as well as their growing sophistication have a direct causal relationship with the continuing reliance on nuclear weapons.

11. The recent lack of consensus on the Arms Trade Treaty negotiations reminds us of the principle of SSOD-I which enunciates that “The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage.”

Mr. Chairman,

12. Some points, from Pakistan’s policy on nuclear and conventional arms issues:

First, For its part, Pakistan has been pursuing a strategic restraint regime in South Asia comprising nuclear restraint, conventional balance, and conflict resolution. In the past several years, our focus has been on Confidence Building Measures. Only recently, Pakistan and India reviewed implementation and strengthening of existing nuclear CBMs, such as Pre-Notification of Flight Tests
Second, Pakistan is working towards promoting conventional stability and restraint in South Asia. In the United Nations, we will continue to advocate for regional and sub-regional CBMs on conventional arms and the need for balanced reductions in conventional forces and armaments.

Third, Pakistan needs nuclear technology to meet its growing energy needs. We have therefore been urging the international community to give Pakistan access to nuclear technology for peaceful uses on a non-discriminatory basis.

Fourth, Disarmament and non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing processes. A single-minded focus on FMCT is not a panacea. A balanced approach must be adopted towards the four core issues on the CD's agenda. A lop-sided pursuit of FMCT from the non-proliferation prism while ignoring its disarmament imperatives, such as existing stocks, and shelving the equally, if not more, important issues, such as nuclear disarmament, negative security assurances and prevention of arms race in outer space, has not worked before. Neither will it work in the future. They need to be promoted in tandem in order to promote international peace, security and stability.

Fifth, There is nothing wrong with the rules of procedure or the working methods; nor with the institutions and their membership dealing with disarmament. The same rules, methods, and institutions have, in the past, produced the CWC and CTBT, as well as guidelines on NWFZs and international arms transfers. All these achievements owe a great deal to the cardinal precept of consensus rule. What we need is due diligence for consensus not attempts to rewrite the rules of procedure. What we need is political will, especially by the major powers, to achieve the goals of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner.

Mr. Chairman,

13. To conclude, we express our full support for the call of NAM countries to convene the Fourth Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD-IV) as a means to revive the consensus on achieving the agreed goals of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

I thank you.
Statement by Ambassador SHIN Dong-Ik
Deputy Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea
UN Disarmament Commission

1 April 2013
New York

Mr. Chairman,

Let me begin by joining the previous speakers in congratulating you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) for the 2013 substantive session. I would also like to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their election. I am sure that your able stewardship will guide us through our deliberations for the next three weeks and I assure you the full support of my delegation.

Mr. Chairman,

The Republic of Korea deplores the fact that the multilateral disarmament machinery of the UN has been in a long-standing stalemate. We have been inactive while various threats remain ever more active. As UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon put it, “delay comes with a high price tag.”

We believe, however, that the various resolutions adopted at the 67th General Assembly last year in search of possible breakthroughs reflected that many of us now share this sense of alarm and urgency. To maintain the coherence of existing mechanisms and keep our discussions focused, it is most important that the three disarmament platforms of the UN, namely the UNDC, Conference on Disarmament (CD), and the UN First Committee, faithfully play their respective roles towards achieving the common goal of international peace and security.

With this sense of urgency, as well as the lofty expectations placed on us, the UNDC must now seize the opportunity to revitalize the global agenda for disarmament and non-proliferation. In particular, as this is the middle session in our triennial discussion cycle, it should play a pivotal role in living up to its name as a specialized, deliberative body for submitting recommendations to the UN General Assembly. The Republic of Korea looks forward to the spirit of cooperation and compromise, as well as the political will of all Member States to this end.

Mr. Chairman,

As the host of the 2012 Seoul Nuclear Security Summit, the Republic of Korea looks towards a world without nuclear weapons. To achieve this goal, we believe that we must return to the basics. In
accordance with the Nuclear non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), nuclear weapons states should faithfully implement their obligations for nuclear disarmament and non-nuclear weapons states should abide by their non-proliferation obligations.

As such, it is crucial for all Member States to implement practical measures step by step as outlined in the consensus Action Plan adopted at the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Meanwhile, the Republic of Korea would like to stress that the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the negotiation for a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) are not only indispensable for nuclear non-proliferation, but also for nuclear disarmament. In addition, along with the ongoing efforts to achieve the universality of the NPT, my delegation believes that the monitoring and verification mechanisms of the Treaty need to be even further strengthened through the universalization of the IAEA Additional Protocol.

Mr. Chairman,

Confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons also warrant our full attention as we collectively strive to achieve international peace and security. In this connection, the Republic of Korea finds it most regrettable that the consensus on the Arms Trade Treaty was blocked last Thursday by three delegations. Nonetheless, we must not stop here. We believe that robust and effective ATT would make a difference to the lives of the many people by setting up high standards to regulate international trade in conventional arms. The General Assembly should act swiftly to bring the treaty into reality.

Mr. Chairman,

North Korea’s launch in December last year and its third nuclear test in February of this year, in violation of UN Security Council resolutions, pose a serious challenge to realizing nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation as well as confidence-building. Moreover, North Korea further undermined peace by repeatedly making inflammatory statements such as the unilateral nullification of the Armistice Agreement and the Joint Declaration of the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, and threatening of preemptive nuclear strikes and of “touch-and-go situation” for a nuclear war on the Korean Peninsula. This is simply not acceptable. The fact that two new Security Council resolutions, 2087 and 2094, were adopted within two months this year clearly reflects the seriousness with which the international community regards the issue.

In particular, UN Security Council resolution 2094 strongly condemned North Korea’s ongoing nuclear activities, including its uranium enrichment, noting that all such activities are in violation of relevant Security Council resolutions. We also recall that the resolution explicitly stated that there will be “further significant measures” in the event of any further provocation. North Korea should clearly understand that it cannot achieve anything by developing its nuclear program and continuing its provocative acts. It should behave as a responsible member of the international community.

Mr. Chairman,

I wish to conclude by reiterating my delegation’s sincere hope that the UNDC will emerge from its prolonged impasse and once again play the central role which it can and must occupy in the field of disarmament. It is a task that falls upon all of us and requires our collective wisdom and a shared sense of responsibility for our future generations.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we look forward to being guided onto a fruitful path under your excellent leadership. Thank you. /END/
STATEMENT

by H.E. Mr. Vitaly Churkin,
Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation
to the United Nations,
at the 2013 Substantive Session of the Disarmament Commission

Mr. Chairman,

The Russian Federation considers the UN Disarmament Commission to be one of the integral elements of the UN disarmament mechanism aimed at working out effective recommendations in the field of arms control and non-proliferation of WMD. Long-standing traditions and considerable potential of the Commission should be used in every possible way to find balanced solutions to the current problems in the sphere of ensuring international stability based on the principles of equal and indivisible security for all.

There are two items on this Session's agenda: recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. We believe that the discussion of such important and rather sensitive issues demands a thorough analysis of the general situation in the sphere of arms control.

The Russian Federation as one of the major nuclear powers is committed to its obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and is gradually
advancing towards the creation of the conditions necessary for the step-by-step and consistent accomplishment of our strategic task - to build a world free of nuclear weapons.

The implementation of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START) substantially contributes to the consolidation of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and facilitates the strengthening of international security and stability.

We are also open to discussion on further steps towards the reduction of nuclear weapons. However, we should take into account the reality we currently live in: in nowadays conditions further reduction of nuclear weapons is impossible without proper consideration of all the factors of international security that could have a negative impact on strategic stability. Such factors, in our opinion, include the unilateral and unlimited build-up of the global anti-missile defense system, lack of any substantial progress in the ratification of CTBT, unwillingness to renounce the possibility of placement of weapons in outer space, quantitative and qualitative imbalances in the field of conventional arms, etc.

We are convinced that every current global or regional threat to the nuclear non-proliferation regime should be eliminated exclusively on the basis of the NPT while maintaining precise balance between its three key elements: non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Our main focus is still on preventing non-state actors, primarily terrorists, from getting hold of nuclear materials and corresponding technologies. We have to build up the potential of international cooperation based on the UN Security Council resolution 1540 and such multilateral mechanisms as the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism and international export control regimes.

We would like to emphasize the need to develop the means to implement already made decisions aimed at strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime in the Middle East. Russia has done everything it could to fulfill its obligations to promote holding a Conference on establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons and other WMD and their means of delivery in the Middle East (MENWFZ) in 2012. It is not our fault that this objective has not yet been accomplished. We intend to continue making every possible effort to ensure that such event takes place as early as possible. We also call upon the other States which the holding of this conference directly depends on to do the same.

Resolving the stagnating situation at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and revitalizing other multilateral forums remains one of the more urgent tasks. Further degradation of the CD and the whole multilateral disarmament mechanism that could eventually lead to its collapse hardly
corresponds to our common strategic interests. This is why we consider it important to preserve, by means of reasonable compromise, the Conference and the very prospect of negotiations on the matters of priority.

We are convinced that rather than trying to radically reorganize this unique and well-respected forum or dilute it by the efforts to establish "alternative" discussion formats, the international community should strive to mobilize joint efforts to unblock the work of the Conference with a view to fulfill the strategic task of strengthening the multilateral disarmament mechanism and making it more efficient. We have a good basis for this - the Joint Statement by Interested States Countries in Support of the CD adopted by the First Committee on 2 November 2012.

Mr. Chairman,

The prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space remains one of Russia's foreign policy priorities. In our view, the Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space could become the best international instrument in this sphere. The main ideas of the Treaty, reflected in the relevant Russian-Chinese draft, are supported by an overwhelming majority of members of the international community. Evidently, it is extremely difficult to have a serious dialogue aimed at solving space security problems without a legally binding agreement that could serve as a barrier to the weaponization of outer space.

As an important step towards the conclusion of the Treaty we call upon all responsible states to follow our example and commit themselves to the policy of "no first placement" of weapons in outer space. We are convinced that such a political commitment could become an important confidence-building measure for ensuring predictability and security of space activities.

In modern conditions transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs) in outer space activities are getting increasingly important and relevant as means of increasing awareness about space policies and practices of space exploration by specific space faring nations. TCBMs create conditions for increasing predictability of strategic situation in space, contribute to the prevention of military confrontation and enhanced global stability. TCBMs pave the way for solving the major problem of keeping outer space weapons-free. The UN Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Space TCBMs focuses its work exactly on achieving these goals.

Mr. Chairman,

The Russian Federation supports in every possible way the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction (BTWC). We believe that the BTWC is one of the fundamental mechanisms for multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation which plays an important role in
ensuring global security. Compliance with the commitments under the Convention is one of the priorities of Russia's national policy.

Russia stands for thorough modernization of the conventional arms control regime in Europe without any preliminary conditions or reservations. We consider that an eventual agreement on the conventional arms control regime should reflect the balance of interests of all participants, meet modern European realities, rule out the possibility of the prevailing military dominance of a certain party and that of imposing limitations on the deployment of weapons and military equipment within national territory, and contribute to the prevention of an arms race.

The draft Arms Trade Treaty worked out at the Final Conference on ATT which was concluded last week could add new positive aspects, as we would hope, to the international arms trade. However, it is far from being consistent with the highest common international standards that we had in mind to set. Anyway, the standards set by the draft treaty are lower than those set by the Russian military and technical cooperation system. When considering the expediency of adherence to such a treaty, we will take into account the above stated, as well as all other circumstances.

Russia is in favour of preserving without any conditions the leading role of the UN in dealing with trafficking in small arms and light weapons (SALW). Further consolidation of international efforts under the auspices of the United Nations is needed to counteract uncontrolled SALW proliferation.

We come out in support of the UN Register of Conventional Arms which remains the only global transparency instrument that makes it possible to monitor the destabilizing accumulation of conventional arms. The UN Register offers additional possibilities for fostering effective dialogue between states with a view to addressing concerns that may arise. We do not deny the importance of a technical aspects related to clarification and concrete definition of the scope of the categories of arms. At the same time, we believe that a key is a political meaning of this instrument as a measure of confidence-building and developing a dialogue between states in case they have concerns about destabilizing accumulations of weapons.

Mr. Chairman,

I would like to assure you that the Russian delegation intends to carry out intensive and fruitful work and is eager to cooperate in a constructive way with all interested states in order to achieve our common goal - help tackle most pressing issues related to disarmament and non-proliferation.
STATEMENT BY SOUTH AFRICA
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Mr Chair,

Allow me to congratulate you on assuming your position as Chair of the 2013 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We also wish to extend our congratulations to the Members of your Bureau on their election and we assure you of South Africa’s full support. We also express our appreciation to Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey, Permanent Representative of Peru, for his unstinting efforts as Chairman of the UNDC last year.

South Africa wishes to align itself with the statements delivered this morning by the distinguished representatives of Indonesia and Nigeria on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and the African Group respectively.

Mr Chair,

Multilateralism, with the United Nations and the Charter at its centre, remains central to our efforts to find sustainable solutions to the challenges to international peace and security. South Africa therefore continues to attach great importance to the work of the Disarmament Commission with its mandate as the sole deliberative body of the multilateral disarmament machinery.

Regarding the agenda item on achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear disarmament, South Africa remains concerned at the slow rate of progress in achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament. My delegation wishes to reaffirm its commitment to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as the foundation of the nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation regime. As the only legally-binding international instrument that establishes a universal norm against the further proliferation of nuclear weapons, contains a legally-binding commitment by the nuclear-weapon States towards the elimination of their nuclear arsenals, while recognizing the inalienable right of States to pursue nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, we remain fully committed to promoting full compliance with all its provisions and their universal application.

While we welcome the significant progress that has been made towards realising the non-proliferation objectives of the Treaty, we continue to be concerned about the lack of progress towards nuclear disarmament in fulfilment of Article VI of the Treaty, particularly following the unequivocal undertaking made by the nuclear-weapon States in 2000 towards nuclear disarmament.

For South Africa, the outcome of the 2010 NPT Review Conference was therefore of particular importance. Significantly, the 2010 Final Document reconfirms the validity of the agreements reached in 1995 and 2000, including the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. In this context, it also contains a number of important measures aimed at achieving our goal of a world free from the threat posed by nuclear weapons.
South Africa continues to support the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones in other parts of the world, including in the Middle East. As stated by Indonesia on behalf of the NAM this morning, South Africa as one of the NAM States Parties to the NPT expresses its profound disappointment on the delay in the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East and on the decision of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on the convening of a Conference to establish a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East. We urge the Convenors to convene this Conference as a matter of urgency.

Mr Chair,

The first Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference that took place last year ensured a smooth start to the Review Cycle. It is imperative that we build on the success of this meeting that has laid the groundwork for monitoring the fulfilment by all States Parties of their commitments in the 2010 Review Conference action plan, including those by the nuclear-weapon States to accelerate concrete progress on the steps leading to nuclear disarmament.

Mr Chair,

Regarding our conventional arms agenda item on practical confidence-building measures, this year sees an opportunity for the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) to review the operation of the UN Register of Conventional Arms and its possible further expansion. We believe that the momentum built in the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) process will serve as much food for thought in the work of the GGE in ensuring the relevance of this instrument in the field of confidence-building. Likewise, we believe that the UNDC's consideration of this agenda item could further stimulate the work of that GGE.

As far as the ATT process is concerned, we are disappointed that our seven-year long deliberations did not yield any tangible results at the end of last week, but we are confident that all is not lost. While the 27 March 2013 ATT text is not perfect in the eyes of all delegations, it represents a good basis for a Treaty on the regulation of conventional arms transfers. Under the ATT, States Parties will be required to take a number of concrete measures at the respective national levels, thereby further enhancing practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

Mr Chair,

South Africa had the honour, during this present session of the UN General Assembly, to introduce, on behalf also of Colombia and Japan, the annual so-called omnibus small arms and light weapons draft resolution. We believe that, together with the practical measures set out in the UN Programme of Action to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects and through the regular submission of national reports, this also contributes to building confidence amongst States in the field of conventional arms.

In conclusion, Mr Chair, the UNDC has faced the challenge of not being able to make any progress for several years now. We hope that all delegations are able to display the necessary political will and that we may be able to make real progress during this session.

I thank you.
Intervención en la Comisión de Desarme de la Jefa de la Delegación de España
Dña. Victoria González Román
Ministra Consejera de la Misión de España ante las Naciones Unidas

Sr. Presidente:

En primer lugar, me gustaría felicitarte por su elección como Presidente de la Comisión de Desarme de Naciones Unidas de este año, así como a los miembros de la Mesa. España quiere expresar su voluntad de trabajar estrechamente con usted para alcanzar un resultado satisfactorio en esta segunda sesión del ciclo.

Asimismo queremos expresar nuestro agradecimiento y aprecio por la labor realizada por el anterior Presidente de la Comisión Embajador Enrique Román Morey.

Mi delegación apoya en su totalidad la intervención realizada por la Delegación de Irlanda en nombre de la Unión Europea y quisiendo destacar algunos aspectos en su calidad nacional.

España reconoce a esta Comisión de Desarme como el órgano deliberativo especializado dentro de la estructura multilateral de desarme de Naciones Unidas, que permite debatir en profundidad sobre temas específicos de desarme. A pesar de la experiencia de pasadas sesiones y con el fin de superar los obstáculos que han impedido a la Comisión cumplir adecuadamente con su mandato, mi delegación está dispuesta a trabajar con otras delegaciones y realizar esfuerzos con el objetivo de debatir y formular recomendaciones en el ámbito del desarme nuclear y la no proliferación de armas nucleares; así como sobre las medidas prácticas de fomento de la confianza en materia de armas convencionales.

Respecto del primero de los temas de esta sesión, queremos destacar el Tratado de No Proliferación de las Armas Nucleares (TNP), basado en sus tres pilares complementarios de no proliferación, desarme y uso pacífico de la energía nuclear, como marco único e insustituible para mantener y fortalecer la paz, la seguridad y la estabilidad internacionales. A la luz de los desafíos actuales en el campo de la seguridad internacional, en particular el riesgo de proliferación, España está convencida de que el TNP es más importante que nunca. Este mes de abril tenemos una importante cita en Ginebra, la Segunda Comisión Preparatoria para la Conferencia de Examen del TNP, y debemos hacer un esfuerzo colectivo para reafirmar las obligaciones derivadas de este tratado como piedra angular del régimen de no proliferación nuclear.

Igualmente, el Tratado para la Prohibición Completa de Ensayos Nucleares (CTBT) tiene una importancia crucial para el desarme y la no proliferación nuclear. Los compromisos políticos renovados para conseguir más ratificaciones de este tratado, especialmente de algunos países de su Anexo II, y los recientes progresos para reforzar su régimen de verificación dan un nuevo impulso a nuestros esfuerzos para conseguir, lo antes posible, la entrada en vigor de este importante Tratado. Hasta ese momento, instamos a todos los Estados a que respeten una moratoria y se abstengan de cualquier acción que sea contraria a las obligaciones y disposiciones de ese Tratado.

Finalmente, quisiera destacar nuestro interés en los asuntos relativos al desarme y la no proliferación en la región de Oriente Medio. El establecimiento en Oriente Medio de una zona libre de armas nucleares y de otras armas de destrucción masiva y sus vectores de lanzamiento, que sea verificable de forma efectiva, es considerado por mi delegación como un medio de incrementar la seguridad y la estabilidad en
la región y en el contexto internacional, como lo han hecho las Zonas Libres de Armas nucleares en otras regiones.

En relación con las armas convencionales, España está firmemente comprometida a dar una respuesta adecuada a estas amenazas en los planos internacional y regional. Hemos apoyado de manera continuada los esfuerzos para alcanzar un Acuerdo sobre el Tratado del comercio de Armas y deploramos que tres países hayan bloqueado la adopción por consenso del texto del Tratado que confiamos sea aprobado próximamente por la AG.

Igualmente, consideramos el Programa de Acción de las Naciones Unidas para Prevenir, Combatir y Erradicar el comercio ilícito de armas pequeñas y ligeras en todos sus aspectos como un instrumento importante para prevenir la proliferación de estas armas, que causan cada año más de medio millón de víctimas en distintos tipos de violencia armada. Abogamos por la aplicación del Instrumento Internacional de identificación y localización y continuaremos haciendo frente a las amenazas que representan las actividades relacionadas con el tráfico ilícito de estas armas.

Igualmente, en el ámbito de las armas convencionales, el Registro de Armas convencionales de Naciones Unidas y la información sobre armas pequeñas y ligeras, es un componente clave para luchar contra la propagación incontrolada de este tipo de armas, y fomentar así una atmósfera de confianza y seguridad, al que también contribuiría una mayor transparencia en los gastos militares.

Como ha sido anunciado por la delegación de Irlanda, la UE ha preparado un documento de trabajo con el fin de compartir con otras delegaciones ideas y reflexiones sobre medidas prácticas de fomento de la confianza en materia de armas convencionales.

Sr. Presidente,

España está firmemente comprometida en reforzar el sistema multilateral. Las organizaciones internacionales, los tratados, convenciones y otros instrumentos deben constituir el eje de nuestros esfuerzos comunes para afrontar las amenazas a la paz y la seguridad internacionales. Necesitamos universalizar y poner en práctica estos instrumentos para asegurar el cumplimiento por parte de todos los Estados de sus respectivas obligaciones internacionales. El reforzamiento de la autoridad de Naciones Unidas y del régimen de tratados jurídicamente vinculantes debe ser una prioridad para todos los países.

Sr. Presidente,

Confiamos en su experiencia y capacidad para liderar esta Comisión para encontrar el consenso necesario para obtener los resultados que no fueron posibles durante un largo periodo. Coincidimos en que seguir como siempre no es una opción para la Comisión de Desarme y mi delegación está dispuesta a trabajar con todas las delegaciones aquí presentes para debatir y formular recomendaciones sobre los temas de la agenda.

Muchas gracias.
Mr. President,

First of all, I would like to congratulate you on your election as President of the United Nations Disarmament Commission this year, as well as the Members of the board. Spain would like to express its will to continue working closely with you to achieve satisfactory results in this session.

Moreover, we would like to express our gratitude and appreciation for the work done by the previous President of the Commission Ambassador Enrique Román Morey.

My Delegation supports in its entirety, the intervention made by the Delegation of Ireland on behalf of the European Union and I would like to highlight a couple of aspects on my national capacity.

Spain recognises this Commission as the deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament structure, which consents to debates on specific disarmament issues. Despite the experience in the past sessions and with the purpose to overcome the obstacles that have disabled the Commission to achieve its mandate suitably, my Delegation is prepared to work with other Delegations and make efforts with the objective to debate and formulate recommendations in the field of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as on the practical measures to foment the confidence in relation with conventional arms.

The strengthening of the non-proliferation regime must be a priority for all States, in order to prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, which represent a potential serious threat to our common security. We are convinced that all States must take a decisive joint action to ensure the strict compliance of their obligations regarding non-proliferation, and to respond in a prompt and efficient way to non-compliance.

In respect with the first topic of this session, The Non Proliferation Treaty of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), based on their three complementary pillars of non-proliferation, disarmament and peaceful use of nuclear energy, embodies a unique and irreplaceable framework to maintain and strengthen international peace, security and stability. In light of the present challenges in the field of international security, in particular the risk of proliferation Spain is convinced that the NPT is more important than ever. During this month of April we have the important date in Geneva, the Second session of the Preparatory Committee for the Review Conference of the NPT and we must make a collective effort to reaffirm the obligations resulting from this treaty as a cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

The Treaty for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty has a crucial for disarmament and nuclear-non proliferation. The renewed political commitments to reach more ratifications of this treaty, mainly from some countries in Annex II, and the recent progress achieved in the reinforcement of their verification regime give new impetus to our efforts to achieve, as soon as possible, the entry into force of this important Treaty. Until this moment, we urge all States to respect a moratorium and to avoid any action contrary to the obligations and provisions of this Treaty.

Spain attaches a special importance to the subjects related to non-proliferation and disarmament in the Middle East region. Spain considers the establishment of a nuclear and mass destruction weapons-free zone, effectively and verifiable delivery, as a way to increase the security and stability in that region as was achieved in other regions of Nuclear Weapon Free Zones.

In relation to conventional weapons, Spain is aware of the harmful and destabilizing effects that unregulated transfer of these weapons and their illicit trafficking, as well as the humanitarian
consequences of the use of landmines and cluster bombs, we are firmly committed to adequately respond to these threats at international and regional levels.

We have firmly supported the concept of an Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and actively participated and promoted the process that would lead to its conclusion and we lament that three countries have blocked the consensus of the Treaty text which we are confident that will be approved shortly by the General Assembly.

In relation with conventional arms, we consider the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects as an important instrument to prevent the proliferation of these weapons, that each year cause over half million of victims in certain types of armed violence. We argue in favour of implementing the International Instrument of Identification and Localization and we shall continue to confront the threats posed by the activities related to the illicit traffic of these weapons.

Transparency in the field of conventional weapons through the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and information on small and light weapons, continue to be a key component to fight against the uncontrolled spread of such weapons and to foster an atmosphere of trust and security. This atmosphere would also be favoured by greater transparency in military expenditures.

As the Delegation of Ireland has announced, the European Union has prepared a work document for the purpose of sharing ideas and thoughts with other Delegations on practical measures to foment the confidence in relation with conventional arms.

Mr. President,

Spain is firmly committed to reinforce the multilateral system. International organisations, Treaties, Conventions and other instruments must constitute the focal point of our common efforts to face the threats to international peace and security. We need to universalise and put into practice these instruments to ensure all States compliance of their respective international obligations. The reinforcement of the United Nations authority and the regime of legally binding treaties must be a priority for all countries.

Mr. President,

We are confident with your expertise and capacities to lead this Commission to find the consensus necessary to obtain the results that were not achieved during a long period. We agree that following the same path is not an option for the Disarmament Commission and my Delegation is prepared to work with other Delegations here present to debate and formulate recommendations on the items of the agenda.

Thank you.

New York, 1 April 2013
Commission du désarmement

Session de fond

Débat général

New York, le 1er avril 2013

S.E. M. Paul Seger
Représentant permanent de la Suisse

Monsieur le Président,

Je souhaite en premier lieu joindre ma voix à celle des délégations précédentes pour vous féliciter de votre élection à la présidence de la session 2013 de la Commission du désarmement des Nations Unies (CDNU). Je tiens à vous assurer du plein soutien de la délégation suisse dans la conduite de votre mandat.

Nous avons l'espoir que les échanges soient constructifs, afin de tendre vers des recommandations et principes de consensus sur les sujets de substance à notre programme, à savoir « Recommandations en vue de réaliser le désarmement nucléaire et la non-prolifération des armes nucléaires » et « Mesures de confiance concrètes dans le domaine des armes classiques ». La délégation suisse va s'engager activement au sein des groupes de travail et se réjouit de continuer les travaux sur les notes des Présidents des groupes de travail respectifs.

Les questions afférentes au désarmement et à la sécurité internationale sont en constante évolution et la communauté internationale est confrontée à de nouveaux défis de plus en plus complexes.

Alors que les défis se multiplient, les institutions onusiennes du désarmement ne semblent plus être en mesure de répondre adéquatement aux attentes placées en elles. Les conséquences de ces défaillances sont significatives et se font clairement sentir par la pression montante d'aboutir à des solutions concrètes dans les plus brefs délais.

La CDNU est le forum spécialisé et délibératif au sein du mécanisme de désarmement des Nations Unies qui doit élaborer, sur la base du consensus, des principes, des lignes directrices et des
Recommandations sur de nombreux sujets de désarmement qui doivent être adoptés par l'Assemblée générale. Cependant, ce forum a certes produit des résultats mais n'a plus été en mesure d'adopter des recommandations de substance depuis maintenant plus de treize ans. La valeur ajoutée que la CDNU apporte aux processus de désarmement et de maîtrise des armements est aujourd'hui sujette à caution.

La situation de la Commission n'est malheureusement pas un cas isolé. La Conférence du Désarmement, elle aussi, subit un blocage et risque de connaître une nouvelle année de disette.

Plusieurs raisons sous-tendent les blocages affectant le mécanisme du désarmement. A ce titre, le manque de volonté politique de progresser ou d'en tirer parti là où celle-ci se matérialise est certainement un facteur d'importance. Mais l'absence de progrès s'explique tout autant par des causes sur le plan institutionnel.

Il est certain qu'un défi de taille pour la communauté internationale est de déterminer comment les dysfonctionnements du mécanisme de désarmement peuvent être abordés, collectivement, effectivement et dans un calendrier judicieux.

En 2011, l'Afrique du Sud, les Pays-Bas et la Suisse ont soumis la résolution A/RES/66/66, « Revitaliser les travaux de la Conférence du désarmement et faire avancer les négociations multilatérales sur le désarmement ». Cette résolution invite notamment les Etats à examiner, étudier et combiner les éléments d'une revitalisation du mécanisme de désarmement des Nations Unies. Bien que le débat ait pu être lancé, et qu'un grand nombre de délégations y aient participé activement, il reste à trouver des moyens de déployer des efforts plus concrets afin de redonner un nouveau souffle au processus. La Suisse reste persuadée qu'un débat de fond sera nécessaire, afin de développer et de faire progresser les propositions que nous avons discutées jusqu'ici. Nous espérons qu'il sera possible de procéder d'une manière structurée – notamment au sein de la CDNU et de la CD.

Il nous semble impératif que la CDNU se penche sur la manière d'appréhender ses travaux comme ce fut le cas en 2012, lorsque des réunions informelles sur les méthodes de travail de la Commission avaient été organisées.

- Dans une perspective de revitalisation, la CDNU devrait premièrement continuer une réflexion quant à la manière d'approcher l'ordre du jour pour les cycles de travail. Les blocages de la Commission sont en partie liés au fait que deux thématiques y apparaissent, l'une sur le désarmement nucléaire et l'autre sur le désarmement conventionnel. Ceci crée une situation peu propice à des avancées car l'absence de progrès dans un domaine génère des blocages dans l'autre. La Suisse propose d'avoir un thème annuel unique à l'ordre du jour de la Commission.
Deuxièmement, la CDNU devrait également se pencher sur la possibilité d’ouvrir ses travaux à des échanges avec les représentants du Secrétariat, du monde académique et de la société civile. Une plus grande interaction avec ces acteurs pourrait servir à donner un nouvel élan aux travaux de cette enceinte et faire en sorte que celle-ci prenne en considération toutes les préoccupations liées aux questions de désarmement.

Un troisième élément qui mériterait d’être approfondi par la CDNU a trait à la transmission à l’Assemblée générale d’un rapport reflétant les échanges de vue sur les questions de substance. Les blocages de ces dernières années ont eu pour effet que cette transmission d’information a été impossible. La possibilité pour la Présidence en exercice de la Commission de transmettre en son nom propre un rapport à l’Assemblée générale reflétant les discussions et les différentes opinions exprimées devrait être envisagée.

Ces réflexions vont nécessiter du temps. Toutefois, nous sommes d’avis qu’il ne faut épargner aucun effort afin d’améliorer nos méthodes de travail. Nous vous encourageons, Monsieur le Président, à trouver les modalités pour entreprendre cet exercice.

Entre-temps, l’impatience et les frustrations ont amené l’Assemblée générale à prendre des décisions inédites à ce jour. Par exemple, elle a établi un groupe de travail à composition non limitée chargé de faire avancer les négociations multilatérales sur le désarmement nucléaire. Ceci devrait être un signal clair pour ce forum.

D’autres initiatives qui ont rencontré un certain intérêt récemment sont certes moins directement liées à l’incapacité de la CDNU à fournir des résultats, mais restent pertinentes pour nos discussions.

Il y a quelques semaines, de nombreux États représentant deux tiers des membres de l’ONU ainsi que des organisations internationales et non-gouvernementales clefs se sont réunis à Oslo en Norvège. Ils y ont considéré en détail la sérieuse préoccupation des conséquences humanitaires catastrophiques de tout usage d’armes nucléaires comme exprimée par toutes les parties au traité de non-prolifération nucléaire dans son résultat final de la conférence d’examen du TNP 2010.

Monsieur le Président,

Pour conclure, il nous semble qu’il devient de plus en plus difficile de maintenir qu’une profonde révision de la machinerie de désarmement ou une approche nouvelle dans ce secteur ne sont pas nécessaires. Agir est aujourd’hui devenu une priorité.

Je vous remercie.
Mr. Chairman,

I would like to begin by adding my voice to that of the preceding delegations in congratulating you on your election to the chair of the 2013 Session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). I would also like to take this opportunity to assure you of the Swiss delegation's full support in the conduct of your mandate.

It is our hope that the exchange of views will be constructive so as to reach consensual recommendations and principles with regard to the matters of substance on the agenda, namely the "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" and "Confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms". The Swiss delegation intends to play an active role in the working groups and looks forward to continuing the work on the notes of the chairs of the respective working groups.

Questions relating to disarmament and international security are constantly evolving, confronting the international community with new and increasingly complex challenges.

As these challenges pile up, the UN institutions dealing with disarmament no longer seem able to respond adequately to expectations. The consequences of these failings are significant and clearly reflected in the growing pressure to achieve meaningful solutions in the shortest possible time.

The UNDC is a specialized forum for deliberations within the United Nations disarmament machinery, which, on the basis of consensus, is expected to elaborate principles, guidelines and recommendations concerning the various aspects of disarmament for adoption by the General Assembly. Although this forum has indeed produced results, it has failed to adopt any recommendations of substance for what has now been 13 years. The value added to the process of disarmament and arms control by the UNDC is today questionable.

Unfortunately, the predicament in which the Commission finds itself is not an isolated case. The Conference on Disarmament is itself stymied and risks facing yet another year of frustration.

There are several reasons for the paralysis of the disarmament machinery. The absence of political will to move forward or to take advantage of such a will when it does manifest itself, is certainly an important factor. However, there are also causes at the institutional level for this lack of progress.

Determining how to approach the dysfunctions of the disarmament machinery collectively, effectively, and in accordance with a judicious timetable clearly presents the international community with a major challenge.
In 2011, South Africa, the Netherlands and Switzerland introduced resolution A/RES/66/66 entitled "Revitalizing the Work of the Conference on Disarmament and Taking Forward Multilateral Disarmament Negotiations". This resolution invited States, *inter alia*, to explore, consider and consolidate elements for revitalization of the UN disarmament machinery. While it was possible to launch such a discussion and many delegations participated actively, it still has to be determined how more concrete efforts can be made to mobilize a thorough revitalization process. Switzerland remains convinced that a thorough debate will be necessary in order to act on the suggestions that have been discussed. We hope that the process can be advanced in a structured manner, particularly in the UNDC and the CD.

In so far as the UNDC is concerned, we feel it is imperative that it reflect on how to approach the tasks facing it, as it did in 2012 when informal meetings were held concerning the Commission's working methods.

- In an effort of revitalization, the UNDC needs to continue to reflect on the best way to approach the agenda for these cycles. One of the reasons the machinery has ground to a halt is the duality of topics, one being nuclear disarmament and the other conventional disarmament. This leads to a situation that is not particularly conducive to progress, the absence of which in one area causes paralysis in the other. Switzerland proposes that the Commission's annual agenda focus on just one of the two topics.

- The UNDC should also reflect on the possibility of opening its deliberations to exchanges with representatives of the Secretariat, academia and civil society. Greater interaction with these players could help breathe new life into the efforts of this forum and enable it to take into consideration all of the preoccupations linked to disarmament issues.

- Furthermore, the UNDC also needs to give greater thought to submitting to the General Assembly a report reflecting exchanges of view on questions of substance. The paralysis of the machinery that has occurred in recent years has rendered the submission of such information impossible. Thought also needs to be given to the possibility of the sitting Commission chairman submitting in his own name a report to the General Assembly that reflects the discussions and the views expressed.

Such reflections will take time. Nonetheless, we feel that no effort should be spared when it comes to improving our working methods. We encourage you, Mr. Chairman, to find ways to move forward on this matter.

In the meantime, the impatience and frustration generated by such long-standing failures has finally prodded the General Assembly into making decisions unheard of to this day.
It has, for example, created a working group of unrestricted composition whose task is to move forward the multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This should send a clear signal to this forum.

Other initiatives have recently been in the spotlight, which while less directly linked to the UNDC’s inability to produce results, are still of relevance to our discussions.

A few weeks ago, two-thirds of the UN Membership, as well as key international and non-governmental organizations, met in Oslo (Norway) to give further consideration to the deep concern expressed by all Parties to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) at the outcome of the 2010 NPT review conference regarding the catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from any use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman,

In conclusion, it seems to us increasingly difficult to argue against the need for a complete overhaul of the disarmament machinery and a new approach in this sector. The need for action must now be a priority.

Thank you for your attention.
UK STATEMENT TO THE UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION
1 April 2013

Mr Chairman,

I would like to take this opportunity to once again to congratulate you on your Presidency, and to assure you of the full support of the United Kingdom delegation.

In recent years we have seen tangible progress toward the goal of a world without nuclear weapons, and it is important that we take the time to acknowledge these successes and to recognise just how far we have come since the darkest days of the Cold War.

But we need to focus on our commitment to a shared future where we each are prepared to do our part, across each of the three pillars of the NPT, to build a safer and more stable world, a world in which those without nuclear weapons do not feel any need to seek to possess them and in which those who have them no longer feel that they need them.

The UK Government remains absolutely committed to the long term goal of a world without nuclear weapons.

UK record on disarmament

Mr Chairman,

The UK has, through its own unilateral actions, made a significant contribution to building the conditions that will allow for further nuclear disarmament and is taking every opportunity to pursue progress at an international level. We have shown considerable leadership and call on others to follow the example that the UK has set.
We have a strong record on fulfilling our nuclear disarmament commitments and of meeting the international legal obligations which stem from our membership of the NPT as a Nuclear Weapons State.

Our 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review set out a number of new disarmament measures, announcing that we are:

Firstly, reducing the number of warheads onboard each of our nuclear deterrence submarines from 48 to 40 and reducing the number of operational missiles on our submarines to no more than 8;

Secondly, reducing the requirement for operationally available warheads to no more than 120;

Thirdly, reducing our overall nuclear weapons stockpile to no more than 180.

We also announced in the SDSR a new, stronger security assurance that the UK will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against Non-Nuclear Weapons States Party to, and in compliance with their obligations under, the NPT.

The UK has demonstrated a high level of transparency in making these announcements, both about the capabilities that we possess and the limited role that they play within UK defence doctrine.

While there continue to be significant risks of further proliferation, and while other states retain much larger nuclear weapons arsenals, the UK will retain a minimum credible nuclear deterrent as the ultimate guarantee of our security. We have been clear that the UK would only consider using nuclear weapons in extreme circumstances of self-defence, including the defence of our NATO allies.

**Building trust and mutual confidence**

Mr Chairman,
Unilateral action alone will only get us so far towards our goal of a world without nuclear weapons. It is only through moving forward together, through balanced and reciprocal disarmament, that we will achieve a world without nuclear weapons.

And we can only achieve this by building the trust between states that will convince all of them that they can safely disarm.

That is why the UK instigated a dialogue among the P5 states in London in 2009, where we reaffirmed our unconditional support for the Non-Proliferation Treaty and engaged in meaningful dialogue, aimed at building the mutual understanding needed to help us take forward our shared disarmament commitments.

Since then, we have held further conferences – in Paris in 2011 and Washington last year – and met in-between to discuss disarmament issues. The P5 will hold a fourth conference, hosted by Russia, in April of this year.

Building confidence between nuclear weapons states and between us and non-nuclear weapon states are equally important if we are to find a realistic route towards global disarmament.

To that end, we have been conducting ground-breaking work with Norway on the verification of warhead dismantlement, which will be a crucial aspect of any future global disarmament regime. This initiative has been the first time that a nuclear weapons state has engaged in such an open way with a non-nuclear weapons state on such a sensitive issue.

In 2011, we were pleased to host, in partnership with Norway, a technically focused workshop in London to develop this work and to share our progress with delegates from a number of non-nuclear weapon states that had expressed an interest in the research conducted under the initiative. Over three days we had some very productive discussions, and released a report on the outputs of the workshop at the NPT PrepCom meeting last year [which is available on UK MOD website].
Last April we hosted a meeting in London to brief P5 partners on the initiative and hear their views on our work so far and we are looking forward to presenting further updates on our progress at the upcoming 2013 PrepCom. We will continue to share developments as we move forward.

Both we and Norway have learnt a huge amount through this initiative about how nuclear and non-nuclear weapons states can work together effectively in pursuit of our shared goal.

Building on this first, we are also working with Brazil to develop a disarmament-focused dialogue.

The UK is unique amongst the P5 in launching such initiatives with non-nuclear weapon states. It is a crucial part of our contribution towards building the right environment for multilateral disarmament.

**Make it difficult to develop and produce nuclear weapons**

Mr Chairman,

As well as improving collective trust and understanding, we need to continue our efforts to make it as difficult as possible to develop and produce nuclear weapons, particularly by those who pose a threat to global security.

On this the UK is making a strong contribution. We have signed and ratified the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty – indeed we were, along with France, the first to do so. We are vocal campaigners for the entry into force of the Treaty, and will continue to take every opportunity to urge all those who have not yet signed and ratified it to do so. We welcome and congratulate Brunei Darussalam and Chad on their ratification during the past year.
The UK strongly supports the work of the CTBT Organisation in building up the treaty’s global verification regime. We have provided expert advice in seismology, radiochemistry and on-site inspection to help establish a viable and credible verification regime which is ready for entry into force. To this end, we hosted a P5 Technical Experts Meeting in Vienna last month to explore in what areas the P5 could collaborate to enhance the implementation and effectiveness of the verification regime.

We continue to actively support the need to negotiate an international Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty, which would put an end to the future production of the material needed to make nuclear weapons. We call for the immediate start to negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament.

The UK believes that Nuclear Weapons Free Zones contribute greatly to strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and to enhancing regional and international security. They literally shrink the geographical space that nuclear weapons can exist within.

We have signed and ratified the protocols to three nuclear weapons free zones, in South America and the Caribbean, in Africa and in the South Pacific, and are working hard with ASEAN and P5 partners to sign the protocol to the Treaty of Bangkok.

The UK is committed to the objective of achieving a Middle East Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone. We take our role as co-convenor very seriously. We regret that it was not possible to hold the Conference on the Middle East WMD Free Zone in 2012, and would like to be able to convene the Conference as soon as possible this year.

We strongly support the work of the Facilitator - Ambassador Laajava -, who has been working tirelessly. He has conducted more than 100 outreach visits to the region, and is seeking to build agreement between the states of the region on the way forward. We have supported a series of civil society events, including by funding events to build understanding between all parties.
We remain committed to working with all states in the region to encourage agreement around the modalities for the Conference. A successful outcome will require all countries to demonstrate a willingness to meet, to engage on very sensitive issues, and to work together to build confidence necessary to underpin the zone:

The UK is also active in seeking to reduce the risk of proliferation from the civil nuclear sector, and strongly supports a universal safeguards system to uphold the NPT's non-proliferation regime.

The IAEA’s Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement and Additional Protocol should be the universal verification standard for all Non-Proliferation Treaty states parties. We continue to urge all those who have not yet done so to sign and ratify it.

Nowhere is the challenge to our collective endeavour and need for collective responsibility more evident than the threats posed by the nuclear programmes of Iran and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK).

The international community continues to have serious concerns about the DPRK’s development of its nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities which pose a real threat to regional and international peace and security.

North Korea once again violated its international obligations by conducting its third nuclear test on 12 February, which was met with a robust and united international response through the adoption of UNSCR 2094. North Korea also poses a significant threat to international security through its external proliferation activities.

Iran continues to enrich uranium, increase its stockpile of near 20% enriched uranium and develop its ability to enrich more material and to do so more quickly. By doing so, Iran is failing to comply with its obligations under six UN Security Council resolutions, as well as IAEA Board of Governors resolutions. It is important to show Iran that the international community is united in its concerns about their nuclear programme, and that the onus is on them to address these concerns.
We, in the E3+3 continue to reaffirm our desire for a peaceful and negotiated resolution to the Iranian nuclear issue. We call on Iran to engage meaningfully with these talks and take the necessary concrete steps that would re-build international confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of their programme. In line with the dual-track policy of engagement and pressure, so long as Iran fails to take concrete steps, it will face mounting economic and political pressure from the international community.

Once this international confidence is restored, we have expressed a readiness to treat Iran’s nuclear programme in the same manner as that of any Non-Nuclear Weapon State Party to the NPT. The international community must stand together in calling on the DPRK and Iran to comply with international law, to work with the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to refrain from any further provocative actions.

ATT

Mr Chairman,

We have a strong Arms Trade Treaty text which will come before the UN General Assembly tomorrow. This is a historic moment in which we can demonstrate to the world that we will match our words about saving lives with practical action. Tomorrow is the first, but key step on the road to implementation.

It is also an important moment for a UN disarmament machinery beset with challenges. We need a success. The ATT will give us that success. So the stakes are high and the United Kingdom hopes that every country will choose to send a positive message through a vote in favour of the ATT. It's that simple. Vote yes tomorrow.

No member state has got everything it wanted. For example, the United Kingdom was disappointed to lose the reference to socio-economic development. But working in the UN means compromise is necessary. We have had two weeks' of intense
negotiations at which delegations showed the best of the United Nations, working late together, arguing the points strongly, but also striving to improve the text of the treaty for all of us. The President of the Final Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty took us through a rigorous, transparent process and he expected high standards from all. We can repay him tomorrow, and speak with one voice to an expectant world, by simply saying yes.

**Conclusion**

Mr Chairman,

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission today. I will conclude by reiterating the UK’s commitment to continue to work with all states to strengthen the NPT as the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation and disarmament regime. We must all work together to make progress in building the conditions for multilateral disarmament, to remove the incentives and opportunities for proliferation, and, in doing so, to move towards our goal of a world without nuclear weapons.
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Introduction:

Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. Good afternoon everyone.

Mr. Chairman, the United States congratulates Malta on its election to Chair the 2013 session of the UN Disarmament Commission. As you work to facilitate a successful outcome for this important body, you may count on the full support of the U.S. Delegation. We thank both you and High Representative for Disarmament Affairs Kane for your thoughtful remarks this morning.

We also congratulate the other members of the Commission’s 2013 Bureau on their elections, and express our gratitude to Peruvian Ambassador Román-Morey for his tireless efforts last year to advance the Commission’s objectives.

This session, we will resume work on two agenda items that have received considerable attention in recent years, namely, in Working Group I, “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons,” and in Working Group II, “Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.” We strongly support the efforts of the Working Group Chairs, Saudi Arabia in Working Group I and first Canada and now Norway in Working Group II, and thank all of them for their willingness to serve.

Conventional Weapons CBMs:

Before addressing nuclear matters, let me mention the importance of conventional weapons confidence-building measures, or CBMs. CBMs can enhance security and predictability, foster cooperation and trust among states, and strengthen regional relations among armed forces and security forces. Promoting openness and transparency in military forces and activities helps to enhance mutual understanding and confidence. For these reasons, we believe pursuit by the Commission of consensus recommendations in this area is a worthwhile effort.
Nuclear Disarmament, Nonproliferation, and the Step-by-Step Approach:

Mr. Chairman, once again this year, our work takes place just before a Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) session for the 2015 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference. With this second NPT PrepCom set to begin in Geneva on April 22, the United States reaffirms its commitment to the shared goal of nuclear disarmament. We continue to implement the 2010 NPT Review Conference Action Plan across all three pillars of the NPT – disarmament, nonproliferation, and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The grand bargain of the NPT, where nuclear weapon states pursue disarmament, non-nuclear weapon states abstain from the pursuit of nuclear weapons, and all countries are able to access the benefits of peaceful nuclear energy, sets an enduring standard that is as relevant today as it was at the Treaty’s inception.

President Obama’s 2009 Prague speech clearly reaffirmed the United States’ commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons. But it was not a call to unilaterally disarm, nor did it assume that the world would change overnight. It was a road map to the future – a step-by-step, measured strategy that takes into account the changed and changing security landscape of the 21st century. The 2010 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review rightly emphasized that today, our greatest nuclear threat is no longer a large-scale nuclear exchange, but the danger that terrorists could acquire nuclear materials or, worse, a nuclear weapon.

In addition to working on the prevention of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, we have taken steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons in U.S. national security strategy. We are not developing nor are we planning to develop new nuclear weapons. Moreover, the life extension programs for our nuclear weapons will not support new military missions. We have committed not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states that are party to the NPT and are in compliance with their nuclear nonproliferation obligations. And we have clearly stated that it is in the U.S. interest and that of all other nations that the nearly seven decade record of non-use of nuclear weapons be extended forever.

The step-by-step approach that the United States is pursuing is suited for our security needs and tailored to address 21st century global security threats. By maintaining and supporting a safe, secure, and effective stockpile – sufficient to deter potential adversaries and reassure U.S. non-nuclear allies and partners – at the same time that we pursue responsible reductions through arms control and work to stem and prevent nuclear proliferation – we will make this world a safer place.

Mr. Chairman, there is no “quick fix” to achieving nuclear disarmament. The United States remains committed to achieving the safety and security of a world without nuclear weapons. But the only practical path is a careful, step-by-step approach to verifiably reach this objective. The United States will continue to use existing multilateral mechanisms to inform the international community on the progress we are making and to build support for continued successes. Thanks to the important role that civil society plays in providing information to national governments and publics alike, the United States record of accomplishment on this score is well known.

The United States is devoting its time, efforts, resources, and attention to create the conditions for the further reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. While we have made
significant progress, more hard work remains. In this step-by-step endeavor, the United States values its partnerships with committed states and civil society. Even if we may differ from time to time on the most appropriate roadmap for moving toward the goal of a world without nuclear weapons, we all share the same vision.


Mr. Chairman, as a contribution to the Commission’s ongoing substantive efforts on nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation, this session the United States is pleased to submit a formal Commission Working Group I paper entitled, “Preventing the use of nuclear weapons.”

This document, which should be available shortly from the Secretariat, details the United States record of accomplishment in achieving the safety and security of a world without nuclear weapons and forestalling their use. We hope that the numerous facts, figures, policies, and positions it contains will be taken into account as Working Group I moves to develop consensus recommendations.

The Consequences of Nuclear Use:

Mr. Chairman, since the darkest days of the Cold War, the United States has fully understood the potential serious consequences that would result from the use of nuclear weapons. For as President John F. Kennedy said nearly fifty years ago, in June of 1963:

“I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.”

Mr. Chairman, United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policies are predicated on preventing the use of nuclear weapons ever again. We continue to accord the highest priority to avoiding such use.

Conclusion:

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as efforts to develop consensus recommendations in both Working Groups proceed, let me suggest that even a modest, incremental advance is better than no progress at all. As the Commission embarks on its 2013 deliberations, we respectfully urge all delegations to exercise flexibility in national or geopolitical group positions to the extent possible, as well as a willingness to consider potential compromise language. The reality is that absent a genuine, collective effort to forge common ground, this Commission’s inability to fulfill
its mandate as the arms control and disarmament “think tank” of the international community will regretfully endure. For our part, the United States delegation pledges its best efforts to promote a successful outcome.

Mr. Chairman, this statement will be made available on the website of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations.

Thank you, Sir.
Mr. Chairman,

At the outset, allow me on behalf of the Vietnamese delegation to extend our warmest congratulations on your election as Chairman of the 2013 Substantive Session of the UN Disarmament Commission. My delegation is strongly convinced that under your able leadership, this year’s session will arrive at a successful outcome. My delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the distinguished Ambassador of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Mr. Chairman,

Since the conclusion of the 2012 substantive session, we have born witness to encouraging developments in the field of disarmament. These include the successful conclusion of the first session of the Preparatory Committee of the 2015 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Second Review Conference on the United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons and the adoption, last December, of a number of resolutions by the General Assembly on establishing working groups on nuclear disarmament and on a fissile material treaty. The two United Nations conferences on the Arms Trade Treaty, though failed to produce a consensual outcome, have laid significant grounds for an ATT which was adopted by the General Assembly yesterday, in which positive elements have been codified, such as the recognition of the legitimate interests of States to acquire conventional arms to exercise their right to self-defense and for peacekeeping operations and to produce, export, import and transfer conventional arms, as well as the need to prevent and eradicate the illicit trade in conventional arms.
Challenges remain enormous, however. The key priority of nuclear disarmament has not been allocated deserved attention as much as the other two pillars of the NPT, namely nuclear non-proliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Nuclear weapons continue to hold a key position in strategic doctrine of a number of countries and there are few signs that it will not be the case in the foreseeable future. These limitations are furthermore coupled with the continued stalemate of the successive sessions of the UN Disarmament Commission over the last decade. The Commission, as a result, has not been able to fulfill its overarching function as the sole deliberative forum on disarmament entrusted by the international community.

Mr. Chairman,

In this regards, I would like to highlights a few key issues that in our view are critical for further successes in the field of disarmament in general and in the work of the Commission in particular.

First, disarmament deliberation and negotiation within the UN framework should be conducted in good faith and accordance with basic principles and practices in this area. These guiding principles were consensually agreed at the First Special Session of the General Assembly on disarmament and have been widely upheld ever since. These are the outcome of a long process of constructive engagement of countries in the post World War II period and serve as a strong mechanism through which legitimate interests of countries are taken into account and adequately addressed. While welcoming new initiatives to overcome current stalemate in disarmament bodies, we should bear in mind that the central role of the UN Disarmament Commission, the Conference on Disarmament, other relevant UN bodies as well as their established rules of procedures are critical to past successes.

Second, while allocating adequate attention and resources to a number of issues of great urgency in the field of disarmament, we should accord highest priority to nuclear disarmament, the ultimate goal of the human kind. In this connection, we urge for a balanced implementation of the 64-point Plan of Action adopted at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, of which the earliest possible convening of a conference on the establishment of a Middle East Zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction is crucial. We also call for the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty without any delay, and urge Nuclear Weapons States to take the leading role in the ratification of the treaty.
Pending its entry into force, all states should maintain a moratorium on nuclear test and other nuclear explosions. We also support and take part in international efforts aimed at nuclear non-proliferation as well as abiding by internationally agreed technical standards in the promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Third, deliberation on measures in the field of conventional arms should take into account the legitimate right to self defense of states, and thus, the right to import, maintain and produce conventional arms for legitimate defense and security needs. As a country that has gone through and greatly suffered from conflicts and inhumane use of weapons, Viet Nam understands firsthand the utmost need for the maintenance of international and regional peace and security, which in turn ultimately rests on the establishment of environments conducive to confidence building, peaceful resolution of disputes and the principle of non-use of force in international relations. All states should redouble efforts aimed at this goal for future concrete results in the field of disarmament.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate our strong support to you and firm commitment to final success of this important session.

Thank you for your kind attention./.