

# Conference on Disarmament

English

---

## Final record of the one thousand two hundred and fifty-first plenary meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 6 March 2012, at 10.15 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Hisham Badr.....(Egypt)

GE.12-63219 (E) 210515 220515



\* 1 2 6 3 2 1 9 \*

Please recycle 



**The President:** I call to order the 1251st plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. The first delegation on my list is Algeria.

*(spoke in Arabic)*

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the Algerian Ambassador, Idriss Jazaïry, for all his efforts, and to tell him how proud I am to have worked with him over the past four years in all United Nations forums in Geneva. As for the Conference on Disarmament, I must commend Ambassador Jazaïry for having managed, thanks to his hard work, dedication and wisdom, to achieve a consensus in 2009 which had been absent from the Conference for many years. Having served as President of the Conference, I understand just how difficult that task was. Therefore, special thanks and appreciation go to Ambassador Idriss Jazaïry for having accomplished that difficult undertaking and for all his efforts. I would also like to express my appreciation to him and sincerely wish him success in his future tasks, which will no doubt benefit from his long years of experience.

**Mr. Jazaïry (Algeria)** *(spoke in Arabic)*: Thank you, Mr. President, for your kind words. In my turn, I would also like to begin by saying how happy I feel to see the delegate of the Arab Republic of Egypt assume the presidency of the Conference, being the first Arab country to do so since the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria in 2009.

You are assuming this responsibility with great competence and with the skill we know you possess, at this present delicate and difficult stage for the Conference and the entire multilateral disarmament machinery. This requires all of us to ensure that you have all the support and help you need in order to enable the Conference to discharge the functions entrusted to it. After seven years, my work as Permanent Representative of Algeria to the Conference on Disarmament is coming to an end. I would like to take this opportunity to share with you my assessment and some of the conclusions I have drawn as a result of my experience over that period.

Algeria, against its own wishes, was the stage for French nuclear experiments, whose disastrous effects on people and on the environment persist to this day. It was only natural, then, that Algeria should strive to eliminate all weapons of destruction, primarily nuclear weapons. Algeria has always been present at pivotal moments in the history of nuclear disarmament. In January 1979 — in the person of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika, who was then Algerian Minister for Foreign Affairs — it was the first State to preside over the work of the Committee on Disarmament, which became the Conference on Disarmament in 1984. Likewise, the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice concerning the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, which states that there is an obligation to achieve nuclear disarmament, was issued during the presidency of Mr. Mohammed Bedjaoui, a prominent Algerian official who was President of the Court. Algeria also presided over the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which resulted in the “13 practical steps” to nuclear disarmament.

In the Conference on Disarmament, my country's delegation was one of the participants in the Five Ambassadors' proposal for a programme of work in 2002. My input into these activities posed a challenge that made me aspire to continue along the same path and, with the support of you all, my efforts resulted in the Conference's consensual adoption of the programme of work in May 2009, under document symbol CD/1864. Despite that historic agreement we have subsequently moved backwards and, to date, have been unable to find an alternative solution to overcome the deadlock. In this unproductive atmosphere, differences have again arisen over the priorities to be taken into account in the programme of work. Specifically, the question concerns the degree of importance that should be given to the four core issues, which, as you know, are nuclear disarmament,

banning the production of fissile material, prevention of an arms race in outer space and negative security assurances. In this context, I would like to refer only to the issue of nuclear disarmament, because for the overwhelming majority of members of the Conference the fundamental priority is to work on the elimination of nuclear weapons. A treaty banning the production of fissile material constitutes an inseparable part of that process. According to the 2011 report of the International Panel on Fissile Materials, the global stockpile of plutonium stands at 450 tons and that of highly enriched uranium at 1,440 tons. In view of the vast quantities of these deadly materials, any international agreement in this field which fails to address the question of stockpiles will be of limited benefit.

No one denies that in some way, positive developments have taken place in the field of nuclear disarmament over recent years. We have been happy to note a change in political discourse and the return of nuclear disarmament to the fore. One of the fruits of this was the entry into force of START and the adoption of a programme of work by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Unfortunately the impact of these steps remains limited; they constitute political and diplomatic moves which have yet to take practical shape. Indeed, nuclear disarmament pledges are marred by so-called nuclear deterrence policies, which remove from the horizon any possibility of eliminating such weapons definitively. Various reviews of military doctrines in nuclear-weapon States have confirmed the existence of nuclear deterrence policies inherited from the cold war; those States continue to modernize their nuclear arsenals in order to preserve what they describe as a nuclear deterrence capability, the stated goal of which is to defend their sovereignty and vital interests. Yet do not States which have no nuclear weapons also have sovereignty and vital interests to protect? By virtue of the right to self-defence enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, it is the duty of every State to deter any external threat or aggression, yet this in no way gives anyone the right to continue to monopolize nuclear weapons. This undermines the non-proliferation regime and could encourage other States to imitate nuclear States on the basis of the same logic. The pretext of nuclear deterrence used by nuclear-weapon States leads to differences in degrees of sovereignty among States, which contradicts both the Charter of the United Nations and the spirit of the NPT, especially article VI thereof. This is politically, legally and morally unacceptable.

It is a mistake to believe that the nuclear threat has diminished, and there are no indicators that would make us expect that it will. According to statistics, nine States possess such weapons, whether or not they are included within the framework of the NPT. Yet the truth is that some 60 per cent of the world's population rely on these weapons for their security, either directly or under the cover of the nuclear umbrella. You may imagine the horrific catastrophe that would ensue should a conflict break out in which those weapons were used, either deliberately or by mistake.

In order to eliminate the nuclear threat, a comprehensive and harmonized approach is needed which enjoys the support of all sides and aims to rid the world of nuclear weapons in accordance with a defined timetable. Partial solutions that lack a clear strategy are no longer sufficient for the required purpose, because such measures taken up to now have not produced the necessary qualitative leap. Unfortunately, the gulf between the current reality and the requirements of nuclear disarmament remains wide. In this context, nuclear-weapon States are called to honour the pledges they have made, in particular the unequivocal obligation to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

The first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference is to gather in a few weeks' time in Vienna. I hope that this process will lead to tangible results, in the form of a determination on the part of nuclear States to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in their military policies in a way that leads to their complete elimination. The effectiveness of this Treaty and the realization of its goals both depend on

its public nature. In this context, ridding the Middle East of nuclear weapons is of immense importance. The fact that one party remains outside the Treaty while possessing a nuclear arsenal is a source of tension due to the imbalance of power it causes in the region. The continuation of this state of affairs will give rise to a dispute which could encourage nuclear proliferation as a way to restore the regional strategic balance. The only reasonable solution resides in eradicating the nuclear weapons in the region, then working unwaveringly to prevent any future proliferation. We do, in fact, have a suitable framework in which to achieve this, in the form of the resolution that we adopted at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, on making the Middle East a zone free of nuclear weapons as well as other weapons of mass destruction. Let us work to implement this if we wish to end nuclear proliferation in the region definitively.

In the context of the growing challenges threatening stability and peace in the world, the international community is calling on the Conference and appealing to it to perform its task. Unfortunately, however, the Conference remains unable to respond to that call. It behoves us to pause and think about appropriate solutions for exiting the impasse. Discussions during the last session of the United Nations General Assembly and the draft resolutions presented for discussion concerning the Conference on Disarmament clearly indicate a number of possibilities. I am referring to the ideas presented by Mr. Kassym-Jomart Tokayev during the session of 14 February 2012 concerning a high-level conference and the appointment of special coordinators to review the Conference's agenda and procedures. However, it does not seem to me that another discussion on the agenda or organizational procedures, or moving the negotiations outside the Conference, will resolve the fundamental problem. As I have said before at previous meetings of the Conference, the basic factor upon which progress in our work depends is that of political will, an opinion shared by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters of the United Nations General Assembly in its report A/66/125 of 11 July 2011. The importance of political will in enabling the Conference to carry out its tasks was clear from the very beginning. In this context, I would like to recall the words spoken in January 1979 by Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika, then Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament:

“[The Committee on Disarmament] can play an important role only insofar as States demonstrate political will which, as emphasized in the Final Document of the tenth special session [of the General Assembly], remains the decisive factor for the implementation of genuine disarmament measures, and the [Conference] is precisely the forum in which such [political] will should be demonstrated and given effect.”

Thirty-three years later, there is still a pressing need for such political will. According to the rules of procedure of the Conference, the programme of work is subject to adoption by consensus. However, it should be recalled that there are clear rules and terms of reference to guide our behaviour in this regard. I am referring to the important and highly significant call made by Mr. John Duncan, the predecessor of Ms. Joanne Adamson, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, in his valedictory address to the Conference last year. He emphasized the need to move from a diplomacy of cross-regional coalition and power politics towards a diplomacy based on shared interests and shared values. In reality, we must recall that we are not starting from scratch or elaborating new concepts. In the Charter of the United Nations, we all agreed on the foundations for collective coexistence to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. To this end we have, through the Charter of the United Nations, agreed on certain goals and principles, including respect for national sovereignty, refraining from the threat or the use of force against the political independence of any State, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the right to self-determination. These are the values and principles which should guide us so that the Conference can be revitalized, limit unilateral security ambitions and ensure reliance on multilateral standards in the field of disarmament.

We bear a great responsibility, namely to uphold the credibility of the Conference. This will not be achieved unless we adopt a programme of work that enables the Conference to pursue its core activities. In this regard, I would like to reiterate my deeply held conviction that decision CD/1864, adopted in May 2009, remains the logical basis from which to engage in the search for a solution to our predicament. With this in mind, Mr. President, we hope that your efforts will lead to a consensus wording on a programme of work under your presidency. We encourage you to pursue your consultations on the introduction of limited amendments that would overcome the reservations which prevented the implementation of decision CD/1864. Should this endeavour not produce the hoped-for results, consideration could be given to the proposal I made during the meeting of 31 January 2012 to adopt a simplified programme of work in the framework of the plenary meetings of the Conference. In such a case, it would be helpful if a summary of the deliberations could be introduced into the annual report of the Conference. Were that not possible, a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be convened to address the crisis confronting the multilateral disarmament machinery. We hope that this does not happen, and that a solution is found under your presidency.

Lastly, allow me to say that during the time I have had the great honour to represent Algeria at the Conference, I have enjoyed the acquaintance of an outstanding group of highly professional diplomats. Despite occasional differences of opinion, our deliberations always took place in a congenial atmosphere, unlike other forums in Geneva where discussions are frequently politicized and tense. I take this opportunity to greet the civil society representatives who follow our deliberations from the gallery, expressing their commitment to the cause of disarmament and world peace. I hope that the Conference will become more open to non-governmental organizations in the future and be guided by their contributions.

Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the secretariat of the Conference and to its head Kassym-Jomart Tokayev for the valuable support they have given to our work. I extend my thanks to the interpreters, who act as a bridge permitting us to connect and to engage in dialogue despite our different languages.

**The President** (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank Ambassador Idriss Jazaïry for his valuable words. I would like to reiterate my appreciation and gratitude to you: you have represented your country well in Geneva for seven years, and in the Conference you have defended your principles with great courage and wisdom. I wish you every success in your future efforts. I thank him once again for his work in this Conference, and for the historic agreement which we are still striving to implement.

(*spoke in English*)

And now I give the floor to the representative of South Africa, Ambassador Abdul Samad Minty.

**Mr. Minty** (South Africa): Mr. President, I have the honour of taking the floor on behalf of the seven members of the New Agenda Coalition (NAC): Brazil, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden, Egypt and South Africa.

We would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. We are delighted to see one of our members, and a fellow African, presiding over the work of this body. We are confident that with your sage wisdom, able leadership and diplomatic skills, you will be able to steer us towards finding a solution that could finally end the long-standing stalemate that has prevented this body from fulfilling its mandate as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

As members are aware, the NAC is a cross-regional grouping that was established in 1998 to champion the cause of nuclear disarmament. For the last 14 years, it has worked

relentlessly towards promoting the full and effective implementation of the nuclear disarmament obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We have long maintained that nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are inextricably linked and that progress on both fronts is therefore required. It was this conviction, given the lack of progress on nuclear disarmament in the aftermath of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, that led to the formation of NAC.

The Conference on Disarmament is a key vehicle through which nuclear disarmament objectives can be achieved. We therefore share the concern articulated not only in this chamber but across the international community that the Conference has not been able to undertake substantive work for the last 14 years. Accordingly, the NAC fully supports the initiative taken and efforts made by your presidency towards the adoption of a programme of work that could pave the way for the commencement of negotiations. As a coalition, we believe that such a programme of work should include the establishment of a subsidiary body to deal with nuclear disarmament.

The NAC is committed to the fulfilment of the systematic and progressive efforts and actions agreed to at successive NPT conferences with the aim of constructing a comprehensive framework of mutually reinforcing instruments for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons. In this regard, we support the commencement of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices – a treaty that should serve both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives.

We re-emphasize that the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and the commitment that they would never be produced again, is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of these weapons. Pending their elimination, the NAC underlines the legitimate interest of non-nuclear-weapon States in receiving unequivocal and legally binding security assurances from the nuclear-weapon States, which could strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

We remain convinced that determined and prompt preparations for the achievement of a nuclear-weapons-free world should not be postponed, for tomorrow may be too late. The NAC believes that it is imperative for all stakeholders to redouble their efforts and take urgent steps to implement their commitments in this regard. The NAC encourages all States to work together to overcome obstacles within the international disarmament machinery, including in this Conference, which are inhibiting efforts to advance the cause of nuclear disarmament in a multilateral context.

In conclusion, Mr. President, please be assured of the fullest cooperation and support of the members of the NAC in discharging your mandate.

While I have the floor, allow me in my national capacity to also bid farewell to Ambassador Idriss Jazaïry of Algeria and to congratulate him for his statement. I wish to acknowledge and thank him for his constructive role and enormous efforts during his tenure at the Conference, including during Algeria's presidency in 2009.

Ambassador, although you leave your post without the benefit of witnessing this body resuming its substantive work, your legacy will continue to inspire us to work relentlessly towards achieving progress in multilateral disarmament negotiations and the achievement of a more secure and peaceful world.

As a fellow African, I also wish to thank you for your long friendship and to wish you all the best for your future endeavours. It is a special pleasure to do this on an historic day for Africa when we celebrate the fifty-fifth anniversary of the independence of Ghana.

**The President:** I thank Ambassador Abdul Samad Minty of South Africa for his intervention and for his very kind words to the President, and I hope I can live up to these expectations.

And now I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mr. Mohammed Hassan Daryaei.

**Mr. Daryaei** (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, at the outset, I would like to appreciate the manner in which you are presiding over this august body. I assure you of the full support and cooperation of my delegation. I would like also to join you and the Ambassador of South Africa in bidding farewell to Ambassador Jazaïry and express our deep appreciation for his valuable statement that he delivered today, and we really benefited from his wisdom a lot in this meeting and elsewhere. We wish him all the best for his future in the world.

Since I have the floor I just wanted to respond to some points raised by the distinguished United States Ambassador in the previous meeting about the statement of our Foreign Minister.

First, by reviewing the statement of our Foreign Minister, you can simply comprehend that he attempted to genuinely elaborate the concept of sustainable security and the challenges before the international community to realize this lofty goal.

The main crux of the statement was the total rejection of all nuclear weapons and the need for more constructive engagement in disarmament negotiations, which fall in the mandate and work of this august body.

The hasty reaction of the United States to Iran's committing and promising disarmament statement is therefore rather surprising and disappointing. The United States reaction relies heavily on false and unauthenticated assumptions and fabricated information and gives us ample substance to rightly believe that some never learn from history and bitter past experiences. The adamant adherence of the United States to its rigid reading of Iran's nuclear programme has barred the latter from constructively engaging in any impartial and fair analysis of our peaceful atomic programme.

Second, in his statement, our Foreign Minister attempted conceptually to list the current and telling problems of international security, and means and manners to peacefully settle them so as to ensure a prosperous world free from the horrors and nightmares of nuclear weapons by increased security for all. The United States, however, chose to hastily react to our well-intentioned and constructive statement based on its monolithic stance towards Iran's peaceful atomic programme.

Firstly, it seems that the United States foreign policy has long been taken hostage by its false and fabricated assumptions about Iran. Secondly, its negative reaction may give the impression that the United States is behind, and supportive of, all of these problems and challenges in the world, including the continued existence of nuclear weapons and its malicious ramifications which have paralysed this body.

Three, it is evident that the Iranian peaceful nuclear activity, which has been put under the scrutiny of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) by Iran, even beyond its current obligation, is totally unrelated to nuclear disarmament and the mandate and goal of this body. We are working with IAEA as the competent authority and as yet, contrary to the statement of the United States, there is not even a single evidence of diversion of our peaceful activities towards the military programme. Thus, by making this statement, the United States Ambassador intends to divert the attention of this body from the main problem of the Conference, which is lack of progress in nuclear disarmament.

Fourth, the fuel cycle and enrichment activities referred to in the statement of the United States Ambassador are not prohibited in any way in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Quite the opposite, it is the indelible right of all members of the NPT, as is stipulated in the Treaty. This right covers all aspects of peaceful technology and is not limited to a specific area. In this connection, the 2000 and 2010 NPT review conference final documents reiterated that each country's choices and decisions in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international cooperation agreements and arrangements for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel cycle policies.

Fifth, resorting to such baseless and biased allegations against Iran in no way helps the United States to evade its responsibility and commitment on nuclear disarmament and continue devoting billions of dollars for a vertical proliferation programme of its nuclear arsenal, accelerating testing readiness to enable itself to reduce the time needed for resuming underground nuclear tests to 18 months, benefiting from joint research on nuclear warheads with other nuclear-weapon States, persisting in relying on the obsolete deterrence policy, continuing the deployment of hundreds of nuclear weapons systems in other countries and training the air forces of those countries, mainly non-nuclear States, to deliver these weapons in the framework of military alliances and the nuclear umbrella, and transferring nuclear technology and material to non-parties to the NPT in the Middle East whose nuclear facilities are operating outside the IAEA safeguards.

**Ms. Adamson** (United Kingdom): I take the floor simply to send my warmest greetings to Ambassador Jazaïry and to thank him for the mention of the United Kingdom in his speech. His record in the Conference stands for itself. When I first came here, colleagues referred to Ambassador Jazaïry as the Lion of the Conference on Disarmament, and I have seen that myself. But I think the commitment of Algeria has also been shown recently at the Biological and Toxin Weapons Review Conference, where you took it upon yourself and upon your team and your country to stand up and be the Chair of the Conference in this very important year when we have a platform which we built in December for new work, and I want to thank you personally, but also your team, for the commitment you showed in doing that, which shows that you are willing to range far and wide in Geneva in the things that you support and in your personal investment.

So, we will miss you. We wish you all the best and thank you very much.

**Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America): I have also asked for the floor because I wanted to pay an ad hoc tribute to Ambassador Jazaïry, although I must say that I was not prepared, and certainly after hearing, coming after another, let me say lion of nuclear disarmament, Ambassador Minty, I feel very much at a loss for words. Again, lion is, I think, all too appropriate. Ambassador Jazaïry will always be known for his extraordinary presidency, his achievement in producing CD/1864. I am also in awe of his capabilities across the board where, aside from the other non-disarmament issues he so capably pursues here in Geneva, I know that he serves as his country's representative on nuclear security. He has taken a leading role in the Biological Weapons Convention. In all things he has, I think, been a sage leader, an activist and a committed international servant. So, we will very much miss you Sir, and I wish you all the very best from the bottom of my heart.

I mentioned earlier the other speaker we heard today, Ambassador Minty, and I was going to say it's wonderful to be treated to two thoughtful statements back to back like that in the Conference on Disarmament. I was struck by, for example, Ambassador Minty's reference to the inextricable linkage between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Indeed, it's that linkage, I think, that was part and parcel of my comments at a previous plenary that our colleague from Iran referred to just now, where I wanted to draw the contrast between those.



Now I won't belabour this body with a detailed reaction just now, but let me just comment briefly on the reference to a monolithic stance by the United States. I think I tried to be very careful in my points to talk about the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), this international body whose Board of Governors has on numerous occasions talked about Iran's non-compliance with its obligations, the many Security Council resolutions. So, again, this is not a monolithic or a purely United States policy by any means. And, of course, any country is entitled by treaty to pursue the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

As a matter of fact, I'm delighted to recall that my Secretary of State announced a \$50 million United States pledge to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and challenged the rest of the community to come up with another \$50 million. This is, of course, vital but, as I also indicated earlier, with rights come responsibilities. It is vitally important as we pursue nuclear disarmament that we are equally vigilant in nuclear non-proliferation. I will again say how honoured I am to serve President Obama, who I think has been second to none in terms of pledging his efforts and his Government to the goal of a world without nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Endoni** (Nigeria): Mr. President, it was not the intention of the Nigerian delegation to take the floor at this time as we have undertaken to study the various models proposed by your predecessor, by you and by others, including the Secretary-General of the Conference.

However, since I am taking the floor for the first time in your presidency, allow me to congratulate you, a fellow G-21 member and an African, on the assumption of the onerous task of presiding over this august body. You can count on my delegation's support in your various efforts.

I have taken the floor only to express my delegation's sincere appreciation and gratitude to a diplomat par excellence in the person of Ambassador Idriss Jazaïry. As Ambassador, he was never too far from young diplomats like me, always willing to guide, direct and advise. Also, as an Ambassador, he never differentiated between the senior diplomats and junior diplomats in his invitations, whether at formal or informal gatherings. As I mentioned earlier, a diplomat par excellence. His dedication to the work of the Conference and his in-depth knowledge has impacted positively on the distinguished colleagues here in the Conference, including myself.

And, therefore, Mr. President, through you, let me bid Ambassador Jazaïry farewell and like the South African Ambassador, also congratulate him for his successful tour of duty.

**The President:** I thank the distinguished representative of Nigeria for his intervention and his very kind words to the President. Do I see any other delegation wishing to take the floor at the moment? This does not seem to be the case.

This concludes our business for today. The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 8 March at 9.30 a.m. At that time a representative of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom will address the Conference on the occasion of International Women's Day.

*The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.*