



**PERMANENT REPRESENTATION OF BRAZIL TO THE CONFERENCE ON  
DISARMAMENT**

**THIRD SESSION OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE 8<sup>TH</sup>  
REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION  
OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

**Statement by the Head of the Delegation of Brazil,  
Ambassador Luiz Filipe de Macedo Soares  
New York, May 4, 2008**

**GENERAL DEBATE**

My delegation entirely subscribes to the intervention by Sweden on behalf of the seven States Members of the New Agenda Coalition and draws the attention of this Prepcom to the working paper that the NAC is presenting at this III Session. This working paper adds to the two working papers circulated in the two previous Sessions. The NAC, comprising non-nuclear weapon States of different regions, significantly contributed to the substantive results of the VI Review Conference in 2000. We have a similar objective for next year's Conference.

Mr. President,

We face a daunting challenge in these two weeks, namely to reach agreements that concretely pave the way to the 2010 Conference. A ten year gap separates us from the last time we were able to reach political consensus.

Indeed, looking back at this period, we see a barren landscape of virtually no progress in the implementation of the NPT. There blow favorable winds now but, after the doldrums, can we set sail in the right direction? In order to chart our course we have to consider the present condition of our vessel, the Treaty, and then, the political environment.

The architecture of the NPT is not simple. The three pillars we got used to invoke have the same legal nature and value. All of them are undertakings, obligations that bind the Parties. The first pillar – non-proliferation – is a negative undertaking, whereas the second pillar represents a positive undertaking to pursue negotiations towards nuclear disarmament. The third pillar is an undertaking to uphold the right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The appraisal regarding the first pillar corresponds to a successful instrument whose Parties have by and large avoided proliferation. The observance of this obligation has been reinforced by additional measures, among them the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The second pillar scores much lower, in the sense that relatively little was done in the direction of a world free of nuclear weapons. Anachronistic concepts such as “credible deterrent” are still uttered, even though they could lead to convince non-nuclear weapon States of the usefulness of those weapons.

Somewhat cynical comments like the impossibility to disinvent nuclear weapons are often heard as if the international community had not “disinvented“ other weapons of mass destruction like chemical weapons.

Comparing the two pillars, we notice that the static obligation (not to do) which is the non-proliferation shows movement, initiatives. On the other hand, the dynamic obligation of disarmament is virtually inert.

In the present positive atmosphere we realize that promises to disarm are generally accompanied by new ideas to tighten access to nuclear energy. The safeguards system in charge of the IAEA remains of the utmost importance. Verification has to be an integral part of every instrument concerning weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President,

Brazil is confident that the III Session will reach the basic agreements to assure a successful Review Conference since it is firmly convinced of the importance of the NPT.

It is often said that the NPT is founded on an essential bargain. We do not deny it. However, Brazil did not become a Party on the basis of a bargain since it had beforehand renounced nuclear weapons by means of the highest legal level, that is its Constitution. Moreover, comprehensive safeguards were accepted before Brazil’s adherence to the Treaty.

Those are reasons that reinforce our conviction that the NPT has to be valued and implemented.

