



**Statement
by
HE. Mr. Rezlan Ishar Jenie
Permanent Representative
of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations**

**at
the General Debate
of the First Committee**

New York, 4 October 2004

Please check against delivery.....

PERMANENT MISSION OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

325 East 38th Street, New York, NY 10016 • Tel. (212) 972-8333 • Fax. (212) 972-9780

www.indonesiamission-ny.org email: ptri@indonesiamission-ny.org

Mr. Chairman,

First of all, may I join other delegations in congratulating you and members of the Bureau on your election to preside over our deliberations. We remain confident that under your vast experience and able guidance, we will make substantive progress in dealing with the important issues on our agenda. Let me also avail of this opportunity to express our appreciation to Ambassador Abe, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, for his illuminating remarks on various disarmament issues.

Mr. Chairman,

We are meeting at a time when multilateral arms control and disarmament regimes are at a cross-road. Events of the past year have shown that the multilateral system is under increasing stress on multiple fronts and has made clear that concrete steps are urgently required to preserve and strengthen it in the midst of numerous and persisting dangers.

We are also facing unprecedented threats to security which have become a preoccupation of all member states. We remain concerned at the challenges posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the clandestine transfer of WMD-related technologies and materials, the development of new types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, the weaponization of outer space and the threat posed by terrorist of acquiring WMD. In addition, the apprehension concerning nuclear disarmament has been aggravated by the reiteration of strategic doctrines, by the continuing role accorded to nuclear weapons in security policies, by the sole emphasis on non-proliferation to the exclusion of other disarmament measures and by the tendency to consider this very issue only in the context of terrorism.

Those concerns have called for concerted efforts under multilateral auspices which offer the only legitimate and lasting solutions. Such an approach is not an option but a necessity in reviving our efforts to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons and in preventing the further erosion of existing multilateral arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament regimes. Yet, we are faced with limited avenues and selective mechanisms to deal with disarmament and non-proliferation issues.

Mr. Chairman,

The NPT and the non-proliferation regime has been beset by a retreat from disarmament obligations and consensus documents of the last two Review Conferences held in 1995 and 2000. Despite the high stakes involved, the Third Prep.Com session for the 2005 NPT Review Conference held last April was unable to agree on the provisional agenda and substantive recommendations as it was mandated. In this regard, Indonesia has long actively supported and participated in the efforts to further enhance the credibility of the NPT. The forthcoming Review Conference in 2005 offers opportunities to deal effectively with a myriad of issues based on the three pillars under the NPT, namely, nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) with the participation of all nuclear weapon states has continued to elude us. Inordinate delay in achieving this goal may well lead to the resumption of testing. The Final Declaration adopted by the Third Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the CTBT held last year had identified measures to attain this objective. We hope that unilateral moratoria will continue with a view to pursuing a permanent and legally binding commitment to end nuclear testing in all its aspects.

In spite of delays and difficulties in the implementation of Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), states are firmly committed to destroying their stockpiles within the time-frames established by the Convention. It is particularly gratifying to note that the verification regime is being applied in an equitable manner without hampering the economic and technological development of States Parties to the CWC.

With regard to biological weapons, we note with disappointment that efforts to formulate measures for preventing and controlling deliberate biological or toxin attacks have not been productive. We do hope, however, that the outcome of the annual meetings of State Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) will contribute to promote common understanding and effective action to better implementation of the BWC towards the convening of the 2006 Review Conference.

Positive developments continued in regional disarmament endeavors in some parts of the globe. We are gratified that differences among the intra-regional states and between them with external powers for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free-zone in Central Asia are being resolved to the satisfaction of the parties concerned. As far as the Bangkok Treaty is concerned, consultations with nuclear-weapon-states are particularly important to seek a mutually satisfactory solution for their accession to Protocol. Indonesia and other signatories to this Treaty remain hopeful that the on-going efforts with nuclear powers will be productive in the foreseeable future in the context of strengthening the efficacy of Southeast Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free-zone.

Mr. Chairman,

In a renewed effort by the United Nations to address the question of missiles, the second Panel of Governmental Experts was expected to deal with missiles related concerns, explore modalities to combat the danger of its proliferation and consider the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent and non-discriminatory regime under the auspices of the UN. But, unfortunately, given the complexity of the issues, the Group was unable to submit a final report.

My delegation was also encouraged by the work of the Group of Experts on the relationship between disarmament and development with the objective to keep the military spending at the lowest possible level to meet disarmament and development commitment. We welcome the recommendations by the Group, among others, on the importance of exercising restraint in military spending with a view to provide resources that can be utilized for social and economic development.

In the case of small arms and light weapons, the First Biennial Meeting held last year has facilitated the sharing of national reports and provided a clear picture of the international community's commitment in combating this menace which is linked with terrorists, separatist groups, drug trafficking and other forms of violence. We commend in this regard the establishment and the work of the Open-Ended Working Group to negotiate an international instrument on marking and tracing of the illicit trade of such weapons. We also look forward to the Second Biennial Meeting of the United Nations Program of Action in Small Arms and Light Weapons to be held in 2005.

The Convention on Anti-Personnel Mines (The Ottawa Convention) continues to be implemented as many states have abandoned their production, many stockpiled mines have been destroyed and humanitarian mine action endeavors have registered a substantial increase

in many regions of the world. The First Review Conference to be held in November this year in Nairobi, will provide an opportunity to reassess our achievements and intensify our efforts to mobilize resources to the unfinished task of mine clearance, stockpile destruction and victim assistance, leading ultimately to a world that will be free from anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Chairman,

In recent years, we have witnessed diminished commitment to multilateral agreements and cooperation. The centrality of multilateralism as the core principle in arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation is being undermined. The disarmament machinery is leading to its erosion and precipitating a crisis of unprecedented magnitude.

Many member states have acknowledged the utility of the UNDC as a universal deliberative forum for in-depth consideration of issues, for elaborating the proposals contained in its agenda and for reaching consensus recommendations. Yet, the Commission has been deadlocked and prevented from making substantive proposals on nuclear disarmament and conventional armaments as mandated by Decision 52/492. The unfortunate situation was repeated once again this year when the substantive session of the Commission could not take place because differences still exist among member states to determine the agenda items.

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) continues to be paralysed for eight years in a row. Despite intense consultations and the initiation of positive suggestions, such as the Five Ambassadors' proposal, it remains unable to break the impasse and to agree on a program of work. Such a prolonged stalemate is symptomatic of a much deeper malaise concerning the role of multilateralism in dealing with disarmament issues.

Adding to these dismay and disappointment, questions have been raised with regard to the role and functioning of the First Committee as an integral part of the multilateral disarmament machinery to deal with the questions of disarmament and related international security issues. Although it has been discussed for more than twenty years, it is now widely acknowledged that the First Committee should undergo an improvement of its methods of work to further facilitate the international community's endeavors in addressing these issues.

It is a truism that there can be no lasting security without disarmament. The UN disarmament machinery cannot afford to allow its agenda to remain suspended. Our disarmament agenda should be revived on an urgent basis and the highest priority should be attached to the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. However, we are of the view that any change in the disarmament agenda and the disarmament machinery, including the First Committee as a subsidiary body of the UN General Assembly, should be made in the context of SSOD IV in which all states can participate effectively in a comprehensive manner on the basis of equality.

Therefore, we believe that the convening of the SSOD-IV would be both timely and appropriate to address the existing and new threats to global security as well as to review the existing disarmament agenda and the disarmament machinery as stipulated in the Final Document of SSOD-I. In this way, like any other special session of the General Assembly, the utility of multilateral disarmament diplomacy through the convening of the SSOD-IV will be recognized and the role of multilateral system based on compromise will be strengthened.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.