I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/65/L.28/Rev.1.

My delegation fully subscribe to the Explanation of Vote put on the record by the distinguished Representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement on this draft resolution.

Mr. Chairman,

Since the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States, the world was under the dreadful shadow of nuclear weapons. The conclusion of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968 stipulating particularly in its Article VI that “Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament” had given hope to get rid of such inhumane weapons. However, after more than 40 years, there are still thousands of nuclear warheads in the stockpiles of nuclear weapons States.

The indefinite extension of the NPT was agreed in 1995 based on a package of decisions, including the commitment by Nuclear Weapons States to fulfill their obligations under Article VI for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The reaffirmation of the 2000 and 2010 NPT Review Conference on the unequivocal undertakings of the nuclear weapons States for the total elimination of nuclear weapons were a clear
manifestation of the international community’s resolve for complete nuclear disarmament.

From the legal aspect, the 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice unanimously concluded that “There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.” The conclusion of the Advisory Opinion clearly stated that nuclear weapon States Parties to the NPT have a legal obligation not only to pursue but also bring such negotiations to an early conclusion.

Mr. Chairman,

By saying that, my delegation believes that the draft resolution L.28/Rev.1 is not a balanced text in terms of obligations of nuclear weapons States and the agreement reached by consensus in 1995, 2000 and especially in 2010 in the NPT Review Conferences.

The New START treaty lacks the application of the basic principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability. It is not even aimed at the nuclear disarmament and total elimination of such weapons.

One of the parties to this treaty has officially announced the allocation of more than 100 billions of dollars for modernization of nuclear warheads and construction of new facilities for development of nuclear weapons. According to the bilateral agreement, the parties only change the status of the warheads from “high-triggered alert” into “the store rooms”. It seems the saving costs goes to “modifying some components” and development of more reliable life-extended warheads with the “service life of 85 to 100 years or more” which is stipulated in the nuclear program of one of the parties. It is ironic to call it “nuclear disarmament” and talk about “a world free from nuclear weapons”.

International community cannot turn a blind eye to these very clear and obvious facts. The Non-Aligned member States has already made its position very clear by its explanation of vote that “the reductions in
deployment” cannot substitute for “total elimination of nuclear weapons”.

Given the above-mentioned reasons, my delegation would not take part in the voting process of the Committee on the draft resolution L.28/Rev.1 as a whole.

I thank you Mr. Chairman.