Explanation of Vote on the 3 humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons resolutions, delivered by Germany on behalf of 27 delegations

I take the floor to deliver the following explanation of vote on behalf of the following countries: Australia, Netherlands, Canada, Germany, Denmark, Italy, Belgium, Bulgaria, Latvia, Iceland, Luxembourg, Greece, Hungary, Spain, Poland, Turkey, Slovenia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Albania, Republic of Korea, Croatia, Georgia, Romania, Estonia, the Czech Republic and Portugal which have all been unable to support three humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons resolutions, namely: the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons; the Humanitarian Pledge for the Prohibition and Elimination of Nuclear Weapons; and Ethical Imperatives for a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World.

The states joining this EOV are a diverse group. We have variously abstained or opposed the three resolutions. But we are united in a common purpose: to make concrete progress towards the goal of the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons in a determined but inclusive and pragmatic way.

Let us be clear. As we have outlined in an earlier joint statement supported by 27 countries issued prior to the voting, we wish to register unequivocally that the grave humanitarian consequences of a nuclear weapon detonation are clear and not in dispute.

Moreover, we have all engaged actively and constructively on this important humanitarian consequences dialogue over recent years in the firm belief that this agenda should be a force which unites us and reinforces our common and unshakeable commitment to the ultimate goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

At the same time, security and humanitarian principles co-exist. Realistic progress can only be achieved if both are given due consideration. This is clearly not the case with the present draft resolutions as they do not take into consideration the distinct security situation of various states.

In our collective view, it is now all the more important for the international community to engage in a constructive, open, inclusive and genuine dialogue about nuclear disarmament where all points of view are given due respect and acknowledgement. The slow pace of nuclear disarmament has been disappointing. However, focusing prematurely on legal measures or perceived legal gaps is not a panacea to our steadfast efforts to proceed with a pragmatic approach to nuclear disarmament. All delegations must be able to engage in this important discourse on nuclear disarmament, respecting their distinctive national security situation and other circumstances.

In this vein, we stand ready to work with others to build constructively on the momentum created by the conferences on the humanitarian consequences, be this in the format of an inclusive OEWG or through other appropriate processes, to address next steps. We need to be realistic as we undertake this task, including maintaining an open mind and avoiding prior assumptions about outcomes.

Above all, we should aim to promote areas of agreement and convergence in relation to the humanitarian consequences discourse, rather than accentuating the differences.
Humanitarian consequences considerations should be a positive strand in our dialogue about finding a common way forward to reach our shared goal of a world without nuclear weapons.