Mr. Chairman,

1. The delegation of Egypt associates itself with the statements made by the delegations of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Ireland on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition.

Mr. Chairman,

2. As obviously reflected by the negotiation records, the NPT was basically formulated to bring about the goal of nuclear disarmament while promoting at the same time non-proliferation. It was logical to identify the mutually reinforcing relationship between non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. The Treaty had to make sure that horizontal proliferation is effectively stopped, while those who have already developed nuclear weapons commit to the progressive and un-delayed elimination of their arsenals in fulfillment of the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timeframe of 25 years, the original duration of the Treaty.

3. The original specification of a limited duration of 25 years for the Treaty only reflects the nature of this deal, as much as it reflects the transitional nature of the NPT with regard to nuclear disarmament. Neither the letter nor spirit of the Treaty, nor States which have joined it as Non-Nuclear-Weapons-States, expected or accepted at any stage the continued possession of few States of nuclear weapons indefinitely. This would have undermined the basic foundations of the principle of equality among States and the already identified highest priority of nuclear disarmament the Treaty seeks to materialize.

4. Against this background, and after the continued efforts at each and every Review Conference to date to seek progress in nuclear disarmament, the Review Conference next year will take place 45 years after the entry into force of the NPT, and 20 years after its indefinite extension and just five years since the 2010 outcome put forward a plan of action to be pursued in this regard. Regrettably, even at this point in history, some 17 thousand nuclear weapons continue to exist and we are nowhere near a systematic practical process towards nuclear disarmament within a specified timeframe. This should not go on forever.

5. Article VI, remains far from realized, although it has been very encouraging that the future looking outcome document of the 2010 Review Conference identified a Nuclear Weapons Convention as a route to realizing this objective. It has also been equally encouraging that the
humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons have been brought to the forefront in that document for the first time. The effort culminating in the Nayarit Conference, hosted by Mexico, last February, and attended by 146 States –while boycotted by the Nuclear-Weapon-States, revealed the extent of disappointment of the international community with the continued existence of nuclear weapons, confirmed that the arguments in defense of nuclear weapons are contrary to human dignity and reflected that the time has come to initiate a diplomatic process within a given timeframe to rid the world of the unacceptable threat represented in the continued existence of nuclear weapons.

6. But where do we stand on this within the NPT? It is clear we have article VI of the Treaty which remains far from implemented. We also have the Decision on “Principles and Objectives of Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament” adopted at the indefinite extension of the Treaty in 1995, which identified the Universality of the Treaty as an urgent priority, and put forward a programme of action that has not been implemented as well agreed restrictions on new supply arrangements for nuclear material and equipment which have not been observed.

7. In 2000, the 13 practical steps represented a serious promise to advance nuclear disarmament, yet little progress has been witnessed in the implementation of these steps to date.

Mr. Chairman,

8. The time has come for Nuclear-Weapon-States to change course, if the NPT is to continue to embrace the vision of nuclear disarmament and the balance required between the three pillars of the Treaty. Their efforts cannot be solely dedicated to their own arsenals but also to existing arsenals in States non-members of the Treaty, in particular in the Middle East, as clearly envisioned in the 1995 Resolution of the Middle East.

9. One year remains before the 2015 Review Conference, and if political commitment exists, a lot can be achieved in one year. This year will stand to witness if there exists, or existed at any time, a true intention to dismantle nuclear arsenals and to work effectively to bring non-members of the Treaty, particularly in the Middle East, into its membership as Non-Nuclear-Weapon-States. This year will show if the value of nuclear deterrence and cooperation with non-members will continue to outweigh in their importance that of the future of the Treaty.

10. These are times which require leadership and courage but the reward is valuable, namely to save the Treaty from becoming obsolete and to make sure it continues to address the interests of its collective membership rather than those of a few States. An NPT which will become a Treaty to indefinitely preserve the acquisition of nuclear weapons by a few States, is neither one that can survive the test the time, nor is it one which will achieve the objectives which its overwhelming membership sought to support. A successful 2015 will undoubtedly depend on progress in nuclear disarmament that we all encourage and anticipate.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman