



**United Kingdom
Permanent Representation
to the
Conference on Disarmament**

**UK Statement on Draft Recommendations
NPT/CONF.2010/PC.III/CRP4
to the 2009 Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee**

**by
Ambassador John Duncan**

Ambassador for Multilateral Arms Control and Disarmament

NEW YORK, May 2009

UK STATEMENT ON DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS
NPT/CONF.2010/PC.III/CRP4

Mr Chairman

The United Kingdom delegation endorses the intervention made on behalf of the European Union. I would now like to make a few additional remarks in my national capacity.

Mr Chairman

Following the successful agreement on the proposed Review Conference Agenda, we welcome your bold effort to respond to the 1995 Review Conference decision 1 for the Third Preparatory Committee “ taking into account the deliberations and results of its previous sessions, to make every effort to produce a consensus report containing recommendations to the Review Conference”.

Bold because over the past fourteen years, no previous PrepCom has succeeded in meeting this mandate and also because the substantive discussion, as opposed to the reading out of prepared national, or group positions has to our regret been more limited than we would have hoped during the current review cycle. We note however the long list of position papers that you have drawn on in compiling your draft recommendations.

Mr Chairman

The United Kingdom delegation confirms that we are willing to engage in a detailed discussion with all concerned to identify where we can achieve consensus on recommendations as provided for under the 1995 RevCon mandate.

In approaching this task we will be guided by the following general principles:

Balance: Our esteemed Secretary General at the start of this meeting drew attention to “The rising chorus demanding action on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Concerns about nuclear terrorism, a new rush by some to possess nuclear arms, and renewed interest in nuclear power as an alternative to fossil fuels” which he rightly pointed out “ have only heightened the need for urgent action.” Action is as the Secretary General makes clear is required under all three pillars and this should be fully reflected in the recommendations.

Rights and obligations: We have heard much during our discussion about “inalienable rights” and rightly so. The NPT is, at its heart, an agreement where states parties have agreed to constrain their rights, for example one of the most inalienable rights of all, is the Right to Self Defence, as well as the more frequently heard right to develop new technologies. So again we need to

reflect in our recommendations the essential bargain where all parties took on obligations and the scope for increased effort by all to meet their side of the bargain.

The need to avoid Prejudicial Language. In your draft preamble you underscore that these proposed recommendations are “Without prejudice to other initiatives that States Parties may wish to offer”. This is an important point, but equally we must avoid inadvertently bringing prejudice to the current situation.

It is not the purpose of this document to take decisions on issues currently under discussion, or that are properly left to discussion elsewhere.

Equally, and this is related to the previous principle, it would be quite inappropriate for this document to seek to make firm recommendations on issues which are reserved for national sovereign decision.

Finally Mr Chairman

We appreciate the considerable work that has gone into the preparation of this paper. Nonetheless it is clear that some updating will be needed to take account of discussions we had in our meeting last week, notably on the section covering the Middle East Zone Free from Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Thank you Mr Chairman