



**Statement of the delegation of Brazil  
at the General Debate of the First Committee.  
LIX UNGA, 7<sup>th</sup> October 2004**

Señor Presidente,

En primer lugar desearía hacerle llegar las felicitaciones de la delegación de Brasil por su elección para la presidencia de esta Comisión, extensivas a los demás miembros de la Mesa. Sepan Ustedes que pueden contar con la entera cooperación de la delegación brasileña.

My delegation has already had the opportunity to address this audience speaking for the Rio Group. We also fully associate ourselves with the views expressed by the distinguished representative of Sweden on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition. During the thematic debate, the Brazilian delegation representing MERCOSUR will specify some aspects of interest for the group. Today I wish to highlight a few elements of the agenda that are of particular significance to Brazil.

Mr. Chairman,

Brazil shares the concerns expressed by different delegations during this general debate with regard to the serious threats to peace and security represented by terrorism and by the possible proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Undoubtedly, there is a widespread concern about the risk that WMDs fall into the hands of non-state actors.

In this general debate, there seems to be a growing perception that the multilateral system devoted to disarmament and non-proliferation is facing a credibility crisis. In Brazil's view, this situation stems from the fact that a lack of political commitment is perceived, especially on the part of nuclear

weapon States, with regard to the implementation of the basic understanding underlying the NPT. As the New Agenda Coalition has stated earlier, NPT commitments cannot be complied with selectively. In this connection, Brazil - along with the overwhelming majority of countries - believes that the only real guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination, and the assurance that they will never be produced again.

Brazil does not participate in any strategic alliance or security system that includes the possibility of use of nuclear weapons. Our commitment to non-proliferation has been consistent and remains unabated. Long before its accession to the NPT, Brazil had already decided that national security should not be predicated upon the development of nuclear armament. In the sixties, we were involved in the negotiations that led to the creation of the first nuclear-weapon-free-zone in an inhabited area - the Tlatelolco Treaty. In the eighties, the Brazilian constitution prohibited the use of nuclear energy for other than exclusively peaceful purposes. In the early nineties, Brazil signed a Quadripartite Agreement with Argentina, the Brazilian-Argentinean Accounting and Control Agency and the IAEA placing all our nuclear facilities under comprehensive safeguards. We are active members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

Mr. Chairman,

The growing emphasis on strengthening non-proliferation mechanisms in the current international scene must be accompanied by similar efforts in terms of disarmament and enhancement of international cooperation for the development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Instead, regrettably, we see that new rationales are sought for the maintenance or development of new and more sophisticated nuclear weapons. The unfortunate consequence of such development is that countries may be led to see nuclear weapons as security enhancers.

In order to curb proliferation, a number of countries believe that by avoiding time-consuming diplomatic negotiations and resorting to arrangements of limited participation and more flexible implementation they will address sensitive questions in a more efficient manner.

In Brazil's view, ad hoc mechanisms cannot replace the efficiency and legitimacy of multilaterally negotiated instruments. Mechanisms negotiated among a relatively reduced number of countries tend to hamper even further the credibility of the existing instruments we should strive to preserve.

Mr. Chairman,

We face the task of reviewing in May next year the implementation of the instrument devoted to disarmament and non-proliferation with the widest membership - the NPT. Despite increasing signs of frustration and recent doubts in some quarters about its relevance to deal with persistent and new threats, we all agree that the NPT is a necessary and irreplaceable instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The strength, credibility and long lasting validity of the NPT rest on a fine balance among its three pillars: nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. That fundamental understanding must be upheld if we want the Treaty to remain relevant for the international community. Efforts with a view to universalizing the Treaty should also be constantly pursued.

International peace and security can only benefit from the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Disregard for the provisions of Article VI may ultimately affect the basic credibility of the Treaty.

At the same time, the exercise of the right of all NPT Parties to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination cannot be in any way jeopardized by attempts to rewrite or reinterpret Article IV.

In the same vein, no new obligations under Article III can come to existence without proper and explicit decision by the membership of the Treaty.

Looking ahead to 2005 we are convinced that the success of the forthcoming NPT Review Conference will rest on its ability to achieve progress on the inextricably related issues of nuclear

disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, while at the same time reaffirming explicitly the right of all Parties to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Chairman,

The continued paralysis of the Conference on Disarmament brings up the regretful perception that there is a progressive disengagement on the part of key players. The deadlock of the CD is to no one's benefit. Brazil stands committed to the CD as the single multilateral negotiating forum in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Brazil has indicated its full support to the Five Ambassadors Proposal and has also expressed its disposition to participate in informal discussions of new issues related to the agenda of the CD.

The perspective of negotiation of a verifiable fissile material treaty represents an important step to bring the CD back to the negotiation arena. At the same time the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament is imperative in order to fulfill the mandate of the Conference.

Brazil fully supports the CTBT. Unfortunately, however, there seems to be no sense of urgency regarding its entry into force. We are confronted with the paradox that while no such prospects are foreseeable, the establishment of the International Monitoring System is well advanced. This system cannot function without the corresponding legal obligations it has been conceived to monitor. We call upon on all States and particularly on those required to bring the Treaty into force to adhere to it and promptly ratify the CTBT.

The enormous challenges confronting the I Committee call upon us all to demonstrate a deep sense of responsibility and commitment to uphold the integrity of the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we are convinced that the concept of disarmament is closely related to that of development. There can be no doubt, for instance, that arms expenditures divert substantive financial, material and human resources that could be otherwise invested in social programs.

In this regard, let me recall that one hundred and eight countries supported last September 20th the "New York Declaration on the Action Against Hunger and Poverty". This Declaration encourages the international community to give careful consideration to the report that has been prepared by the Technical Group on Innovative Financing Mechanisms, which explores ways to find new resources for development. These new and innovative financing mechanisms would raise funds urgently needed to meet the Millennium Development Goals, while complementing and ensuring stable and predictable long-term resources.

Mr Chairman,

In relation to the ongoing debate on the revitalization of the First Committee, the Brazilian delegation would like to recall its comments already presented on this issue. The re-organization of the agenda of the First Committee in a reduced number of clusters could make it more clear and understandable. An early election of the Bureau could facilitate the follow-up of agreed subjects, as well as allow for the convening of advanced consultations with views to the following session. Considerations about the better use of time should be respectful of the right of delegations to express freely whatever they deem is important and of the need to grant to each of them the appropriate amount of time. The possibility of excluding some items of the agenda should be carefully examined case by case. Suggestions on the biennialization or triennialization of resolutions could come from the Chair, but decisions on this regard must be taken with the backing of Member States. Better use should be made of the provisions contained in Articles 11 and 13 of the UN Charter regarding cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Thank you