



Security Council

Seventy-seventh year

9112th meeting

Monday, 22 August 2022, 10 a.m.

New York

Provisional

President: Mr. Zhang Jun/Mr. Geng Shuang (China)

Members:

Albania	Mr. Hoxha
Brazil	Mr. Costa Filho
France	Mrs. Gasri
Gabon	Mr. Biang
Ghana	Mr. Agyeman
India	Mrs. Kamboj
Ireland	Ms. Moran
Kenya	Mr. Kimani
Mexico	Mr. Gómez Robledo Verduzco
Norway	Ms. Heimerback
Russian Federation	Mr. Nebenzia
United Arab Emirates	Mrs. Nusseibeh
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Kariuki
United States of America	Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield

Agenda

Maintenance of international peace and security

Promote common security through dialogue and cooperation

Letter dated 12 August 2022 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2022/617)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

22-46800 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Maintenance of international peace and security

Promote common security through dialogue and cooperation

Letter dated 12 August 2022 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2022/617)

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Gustavo Zlauvinen, President of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2022/617, which contains the text of a letter dated 12 August 2022 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept note on the item under consideration.

As indicated in the letter, the Security Council was established to achieve common security for all, and the maintenance of international peace and security also features regularly on the agenda of the United Nations. In recent years, this regular topic has become more and more urgent, and the security dilemma increasingly difficult to solve. Security challenges such as political instability, military conflicts, terrorist threats, the coronavirus disease pandemic, natural disasters and energy and food crises are complex and intertwined, and the world is far from peaceful. It seems that every country is striving for its own security, only to see an increasing sense of insecurity among all countries. In the face of this new situation, it is necessary for the Council to revisit its original mission in order to better respond to the expectations of all parties and fulfil its responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. That is of vital importance in the current context.

The theme of today's debate was set as "Promote common security through dialogue and cooperation" in the hope that all parties will, through calm and rational dialogue, give in-depth consideration to such international security-related questions as "what kind of international security do we really need?"; "how can we, in the current circumstances, emerge from conflicts and turmoil and avoid a larger-scale security disaster?"; and "what role can the United Nations play?". I look forward to all of us focusing on today's theme and contributing our insights with a forward-looking vision and a responsible attitude.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Secretary-General António Guterres.

The Secretary-General: I thank you, Sir, for convening the Security Council on such an essential topic. Our collective security demands that we seize every moment to forge a common understanding of the threats and challenges before us and, most important, to shape united responses to them.

As the focus of this briefing makes clear, the path to peace is forged by dialogue and cooperation. I just returned from Ukraine, Türkiye and Moldova, and I look forward to speaking further about that visit on Wednesday. There, I saw the Black Sea Grain Initiative — an initiative to get grain and other vital food supplies moving again through Ukrainian ports — in action. In parallel, we have an agreement to facilitate unimpeded access to global markets for food and fertilizers originating from the Russian Federation. That comprehensive plan is crucial for the world's most vulnerable people and countries, who are desperately counting on those food supplies. Above all, it is a concrete example of how dialogue and cooperation can deliver hope, even in the midst of conflict.

The same commitment to dialogue and results must be applied to the critical situation at the Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant. I reaffirm that the United Nations in Ukraine has the logistics and security capacities to support an International Atomic Energy Agency mission from Kyiv to Zaporizhzhya. We continue the relentless search for peace in Ukraine and across the globe in line with the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

The Security Council represents a vital part of the process of peace and prevention through resolutions to ease conflicts, support reconciliation and provide humanitarian assistance and support to

millions of people in need. However, today's collective security system is being tested like never before. Our world is riven by geopolitical divides, conflicts and instability, from military coups to inter-State conflicts, invasions and wars that stretch on year after year. Lingering differences between the world's great Powers — including in the Council — continue to limit our ability to respond collectively.

Humanitarian assistance is stretched to breaking point. Human rights and the rule of law are under assault. Trust is in short supply. Many of the systems established decades ago are now facing challenges that were unimaginable for our predecessors, including cyberwarfare, terrorism and lethal autonomous weapons. The nuclear risk has risen to its highest point in decades.

The tools that have kept us from catastrophic world war are more important than ever, but they must be fit for today's rapidly deteriorating international peace and security environment. We need to reforge a global consensus around the cooperation required to ensure collective security, including the work of the United Nations. That is also the driving force behind my proposal for a New Agenda for Peace, as contained in the report entitled *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982). Through it, we are exploring the diplomatic toolbox of the Charter of the United Nations to end conflicts, especially the Chapter VI provisions on negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement.

We are also placing a focus on prevention and peacebuilding. That includes strengthening our foresight of future threats and anticipating flashpoints and long-standing conditions that could explode into violence. It includes exploring new and expanded roles for regional actors and groups, particularly as cross-border threats to peace and security emerge. It includes putting human rights first in political and financial investments that can address the root causes of conflict, from social protection and education to programming to end violence and discrimination and to increase women's participation across civic and political life. It includes the capacity to establish new social contracts that build and strengthen the bonds of trust between people who inhabit the same borders, as well as in the Governments and institutions representing them, so that all people can lend their hands to building peace. It includes joint efforts to gather countries around the

need to reduce the risks stemming from cyberwarfare and lethal autonomous weapons.

And it includes accelerating efforts to eliminate the nuclear threat once and for all. The tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which meets this month, must demonstrate that progress is possible. I renew my call on all States parties to demonstrate flexibility and a willingness to compromise across all negotiations. Countries with nuclear weapons must commit to the principle of no first use of those weapons. They must also assure States that do not have nuclear weapons that they will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them and that they will be transparent throughout. Nuclear sabre-rattling must stop. We need all States to recommit to a world free of nuclear weapons and to spare no effort when coming to the negotiating table to ease tensions and end the nuclear arms race once and for all.

(spoke in French)

The future of humankind is today in our hands. At this juncture of maximum risk to our world, it is time to renew our commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and the ideals it represents. The best way to fulfil the Charter's promise to save future generations from the scourge of war is to replace division with dialogue and diplomacy, to negotiate and compromise and to be accountable for the future.

The Council and our Organization represent the nations of the world and humankind's best hope for building a better and more peaceful future. As we develop our New Agenda for Peace, let us prove that we have learned the lessons of the past. Let us reiterate our commitment to the eternal instruments of peace, namely, dialogue, diplomacy and mutual trust.

The President *(spoke in Chinese)*: I thank the Secretary-General for his briefing and for his thoughts, suggestions and insights.

I now give the floor to Mr. Zlauvinen.

Mr. Zlauvinen: Allow me to start by thanking you, Mr. President, for the invitation to speak today on such an important topic.

For the past three weeks, just across the hallway, the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) have been engaged in an in-depth discussion on how to strengthen that essential

instrument of our common security. I am aware that not all members of the Security Council are parties to the NPT; nevertheless, it is my hope that all Council members can appreciate the important role played by the Treaty as a contribution to the betterment of the international security environment.

Since its entry into force in 1970, the NPT has proven to be a bulwark of international peace and security and a key facilitator of the benefits of nuclear energy and nuclear applications. Over its 52-year history, the Treaty has proven itself remarkably resilient and adaptable. Its near-universal membership speaks for itself. The States parties' current engagement on discussions speaks volumes about the Conference's status as the de facto multilateral negotiating forum on all things related to nuclear weapons.

As a consequence of the geopolitical turmoil that has rocked our world since February of this year, the NPT faces a raft of challenges, the diversity and scope of which are unlike anything that has come before. Still, throughout the past three weeks, I have witnessed State parties come together resolved to strengthen the global regime that spans the three pillars of the Treaty, namely, nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

As far as priorities are concerned, the implementation of the Treaty's provisions is front and centre for many, if not most, of the States parties. Ensuring the fulfilment of the Treaty's core commitments and obligations is seen as being essential to the Treaty's enduring success. For many, that is especially the case for nuclear disarmament commitments, including those made at prior Review Conferences, such as the unequivocal undertaking to eliminate nuclear arsenals.

There are few issues more vital to our common security than preventing the use of nuclear weapons and, as many believe, the only way to completely eliminate the risk of nuclear weapons being used again is to completely eliminate those weapons. That is the crux of the issue that the NPT States parties are grappling with — how to reinforce the seven-decades-old norm on the non-use of nuclear weapons and take urgently needed steps towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

In my view, whether or not the States parties can make progress and strengthen the implementation of all three pillars of the NPT depends on reaching agreement on several key areas.

First, given the current global conditions and recent events, it should be no surprise that concerns have only grown regarding the need for urgent action on the first pillar of the Treaty — nuclear disarmament. Such measures are needed to reverse dangerous trends, increase confidence and ensure that mistakes or miscalculations do not lead to escalation and catastrophe. In addition, the current global security environment has revived the narrative that nuclear weapons provide the ultimate security guarantee. That is an extremely damaging narrative and dangerous for non-proliferation, especially when coupled with other challenges to non-proliferation, such as hedging and emerging technology that can lower barriers to the acquisition of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles.

Secondly, with regard to near-term measures to reduce the risk of nuclear weapons, the norm against the use of nuclear weapons is one of the most important achievements of the post-Second World War era, but it is increasingly threatened. On one hand, the heightened nuclear risk has strengthened calls for immediate risk reduction measures and, on the other, been taken by many as further evidence of the urgent need to accelerate nuclear disarmament. It has also brought back to the fore questions about how to strengthen security assurances — a long-standing concern of non-nuclear weapon States that will now be front and centre of our minds.

As I said, risk reduction remains a priority for many, especially at the intersection between nuclear weapons and new domains in cyberspace and outer space and with new technologies, from artificial intelligence to hypersonic weapons. However, many others have argued that risk reduction is not enough. They believe that circumstances demand immediate action on irreversible and verifiable nuclear disarmament. There is every likelihood that such action will include calls for strong language on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, as well as new agreements to reduce the global number of nuclear weapons and arsenals.

Thirdly, how do we support the resolution of the regional proliferation crisis, especially in Asia and the Middle East? There is broad agreement on the need to strengthen the non-proliferation regime against an array of emerging challenges. Assisting in resolving regional proliferation challenges therefore remains a high priority for States parties. From the Middle East to North-East Asia, the introduction of nuclear weapons into any regional conflict will amplify the danger by

an order of magnitude. States parties are all too aware that failure to address those cases weakens the entire non-proliferation regime.

Fourthly, how do we broaden access to the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear science and technology? The NPT has proven to be a facilitator of the peaceful uses of nuclear science and technology, whose benefits continue to grow. That nexus between development and security adds a new dimension to the Treaty. It is one that reflects its continuous centrality in the international system. As the role of nuclear technology becomes ever-more prominent in several areas, from agriculture to medicine, ensuring the widest possible reach of those benefits becomes increasingly important, especially as a catalyst for fulfilling the Sustainable Development Goals.

Fifthly and finally, how do we ensure the safety and security of nuclear power plants in conflict zones? Recent events have focused attention on those issues, as the world has been forced to confront, for the first time, the challenges posed by nuclear safety and security in a zone of armed conflict.

The Review Conference is a unique opportunity to strengthen an instrument of common security in a forum of dialogue and cooperation. It is not an opportunity that should be squandered. When we talk about the need to find common ground, we forget that the NPT is common ground. Protecting it, keeping it fit for purpose and making sure that it can continue its role as a bastion of international peace and security is and must be a priority for all.

For more than 50 years, the NPT has proven itself to be an essential and adaptable element of every State party's security. That is why, and despite the current circumstances, I have made every effort — during this year's Review Conference and before that, and I will continue to do so until we reach the end of the process this Friday — to promote dialogue and cooperation among States parties as the main foundation of negotiations. I believe it is essential to stress the importance of focusing on the elements that unite us and not on those that divide us. We need flexibility and political will to negotiate in good faith to support an outcome of the Review Conference that ensures that the NPT remains fit for purpose in these turbulent and troubling times and, in turn, further strengthens our common security.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I thank Mr. Zlaouinen for his briefing.

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements.

Mrs. Nusseibeh (United Arab Emirates): First of all, I would like to thank China for organizing today's important meeting and to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General and to Mr. Gustavo Zlaouinen for their invaluable briefings.

A press item covering the 1945 San Francisco Conference reported that the delegates had signed "a charter written for a world of power, tempered by a little reason". The architects of the United Nations needed only to look around them for insight into the ruin wrought by unrestrained power. The story of short-sighted ideological and hegemonic pursuits had echoed across human history, each time with greater dissonance. In an act of necessary but extraordinary ambition, they committed to building something better.

They envisioned an international order in which people express their right to self-determination through equally sovereign States that resolve their differences with dialogue and without the threat of wars of aggression. They sought to temper power by binding together in common security and prosperity those who may wield it and those who may suffer it. Since then, with pragmatism, creativity and leadership and despite many challenges to those lofty ideals, the system has held. That achievement in itself should give us some comfort in this moment of rising polarization and fragmentation.

As the bold vision of an open, cooperative and inclusive world order is vindicated by the scale of our global challenges, we cannot entertain abandoning it, whether through revisionism or retrenchment. Instead, the United Arab Emirates firmly believes that this must be a moment of renewal for the international system. Our cooperation is necessary if we are indeed to address the world's most urgent threats, and the crises on the Council's agenda will not relent in their demands for our collective efforts.

As we grow ever-more reliant on each other, our first and only truly global multilateral system is still our last best hope. However, it cannot remain frozen in time. It must adapt to a world with more countries, an increasingly diverse set of influential actors, a shifting balance of power, an expanding role for regional institutions and the growing risk of tensions among major Powers. It is to the credit of this inclusive system

that it now relies on a much wider circle of members and stakeholders than it did at its creation.

They include 80 countries that secured independence during decolonization, as well as the engagement of private-sector and philanthropic actors and local and global networks of youth, women and civil society. But, in order to fully reap the benefits of that progress, institutional responsibility must also expand. For example, the multilateral system has long been divided between the so-called norm-makers and -takers. However, wider ownership of the system could ensure greater investment in its success. Countries historically limited to merely norm-taking have the capacity to play a more active role in setting and upholding the agenda.

Collectively, we must fashion a more inclusive system of norm-setting and decision-making to allow for the views of all to shape our inextricably bound future. As others have said, in doing so, we must be pragmatic, incremental and results-oriented. We should prioritize the common challenges that genuinely concern all of us and that can be resolved only if we work together — climate change, pandemics, food and water insecurity, poverty, gender inequality, energy supply, terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

We should actively seek out our partnerships, especially with those with whom we may not always agree. We cannot sacrifice crucial agreement for complete agreement. Broadening responsibility also means systematically empowering regional organizations to solve regional problems. They are often better placed to find sustainable solutions, as they bring with them a nuanced understanding and greater willingness to compromise. And the Council should creatively and intentionally leverage the tools at its disposal to support such organizations and reinforce their efforts with the financial support needed for those changes, not only paying it lip service.

More than anything, this is a time and a place for determined leadership. The issues on our agenda are not zero-sum games. In the long term, cooperation leads to better outcomes for all, but self-interest begets self-interest. That must inform the efforts to reverse its corrosive effects. We need leadership that can overcome the binary approach to coalition-building. The us-versus-them lens may clarify current divides, but at the risk of obscuring the urgency of longer-term challenges.

We all have a stake in the preservation and success of the multilateral system, but the stakes are clearly not equal for some, including those caught up in the geostrategic crossfire. What is at stake is their very survival. Cognizant of that fact, the most effective of our predecessors in these chairs tried to manage their differences and disagreements in a way that enables the United Nations to remain responsive to those who need it the most. The world looks to this Chamber to summon that spirit once again and, in the process, usher in the necessary renewal of an open, cooperative and inclusive world order.

Mr. Costa Filho (Brazil): I would like to thank China for convening this briefing, and the Secretary-General for his important remarks. I would also like to thank Ambassador Gustavo Zlauvinen for his insightful intervention.

While it is important to clarify that the decisions concerning the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) review process are the exclusive and collective competence of the States parties to the Treaty, the fact that, for the first time, the President of an ongoing Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty is briefing the Security Council in an official meeting is a positive sign. It shows that the organ that bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is attentive to the main multilateral discussions taking place beyond the walls of this Chamber. Ambassador Zlauvinen can rest assured of Brazil's full support for his efforts to reach a balanced, meaningful and consensual outcome document for the Conference. Brazil is convinced that we are in the best hands to lead the way.

We need to take certain steps for achieving a safer and a more peaceful world.

First, we need to overcome once and for all the false narrative that nuclear weapons make the world a safer place. In reality, such weapons spawn an elusive and precarious security. Their mere existence invites further proliferation, undermines global stability and compromises international security, putting the whole world at existential risk. The substantial increase in nuclear tensions since the beginning of this year is a powerful demonstration of that fact.

As we kick-start the final week of NPT Review Conference, we cannot lose sight of our common objective of achieving a world without nuclear weapons.

Nuclear disarmament is not a concession on the part of nuclear-weapon States. It is an unequivocal commitment and a binding obligation in accordance with article VI of the NPT. While nuclear risk reduction measures are important and necessary, they are by no means a panacea for our atomic malady, let alone a substitute for nuclear disarmament. We must always keep in mind the fragile balance among the three pillars that allowed for the adoption of the NPT. That balance is the only way to ensure that the Treaty can remain relevant.

Secondly, prevention is better than cure, as conventional wisdom reminds us. The international community should make more frequent use of preventive diplomacy and mediation. It should focus more on Chapter VI rather than Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It should condemn the abusive use of Article 51. The law of action and reaction is especially applicable to the use of force, which tends to generate further use of force in a chain reaction. Insisting on the peaceful settlement of disputes is the only way to get out of that vicious circle.

Thirdly, there can be no stability where the rule of law does not prevail. Respect for international law is crucial for peaceful international relations. International law is the language that we must speak when differences arise among us. International humanitarian law protects us from further damage when conflict regrettably breaks out. By protecting individual rights and thus saving lives, international human rights law and international refugee law may avoid trauma and resentment, which are among the root causes of conflict, and they are key to any reconciliation process.

Fourthly, it is of paramount importance to acknowledge the strong and reinforcing relationship between peace and economic and social development. There can be no development without peace, and no lasting peace without development. The New Agenda for Peace will be successful only if its foundations are based on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A strong economic foundation and robust productive capacities are the path to job and wealth creation, solid fiscal revenues, debt sustainability, political and social stability and, ultimately, peace.

Strengthening international cooperation, investing in productive capacities and combating poverty and hunger must remain at the heart of our deliberations within the Organization. In addition,

we must not forget that developing countries are manifestly underrepresented in peace and security decisions. There is a pressing need to move forward the discussions on the Council's reform, and we invite all Member States to constructively engage in the intergovernmental negotiations.

Fifthly, durable peace requires comprehensive approaches, which could benefit significantly from the support of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). The PBC is well suited to work as a platform to promote greater coordination among relevant partners of a particular country at risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict. Additionally, it can mobilize regional organizations and international financial institutions and foster South-South and triangular cooperation arrangements in support of national peacebuilding initiatives. The Commission can also support the implementation of peacebuilding activities by peacekeeping operations and help mobilize political support to promote reconciliation, the women and peace and security agenda, institution-building and other nationally defined peacebuilding priorities.

This briefing brings about a timely discussion. We look around and we see war, conflict, terrorism, pandemic and poverty. The fear of nuclear devastation looms at our doors, and that fear is currently heightened. As the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute pointed out, inter-State conflict has been on the rise. Wars and ill-devised sanctions regimes disrupt supply chains, spread scarcity, raise inflation, result in food insecurity and ultimately affect those most in need in a disproportionate way.

There are myriad factors that we can point to as causes of international instability and insecurity. As the Security Council has recognized, sustainable peace can be achieved only by promoting security and development. We need comprehensive approaches that integrate political, security, development, human rights and rule-of-law activities and address the underlying causes of each conflict.

Mr. Biang (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank China for the initiative to hold this meeting, which gives us an opportunity to address the importance of promoting the key principles of dialogue and cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security. I thank Secretary-General António Guterres for defining the scope for this discussion in

the current context. I would also like to thank President Gustavo Zlauvinen for his enlightening briefing.

We are at a turning point in the international system and a historic inflection point. The world is recovering with great difficulty from a pandemic that has exacerbated its individual and systemic vulnerabilities and is facing a multidimensional crisis that challenges the current international order. The international context is marked by the emergence of new poles of influence, which seek to reconfigure the balance and approaches of national and international governance. The increasingly multipolar world is consolidating in terms of geopolitical competition among a number of major actors.

Clearly, the future of the world is becoming more politically and ideologically diverse. The emerging international order seems to make space for a diversity of values and requires permanent dialogue to achieve a comprehensive consensus as we approach these competing issues within the Security Council and beyond.

In the face of rivalries between Powers, in the face of the risk of the use of or proliferation of nuclear weapons, in the face of a devastating pandemic, climate insecurity and the development of cyberspace, which are emerging as new threats, it would be dangerously naive to rely on relationships of force or unilateral posturing.

The effectiveness of international action is difficult to guarantee in bloc confrontations based on the Cold War model. The interdependence of global issues and the interconnection of national economies, financial markets and supply chains require that we work together, engage in dialogue, listen to each other and to reach agreements in order to respond appropriately, effectively and, above all, collectively to the most serious threats to international peace and security.

We are helplessly witnessing the harsh reality that the disagreements of great Powers over hierarchy, ideology and their strategic interests are fertile ground for major conflicts, wars of choice, proxy wars and wars over resources that destabilize fragile States, especially in Africa. The Security Council is the ideal framework for promoting dialogue at the international level for addressing the most complex challenges and for stabilizing geopolitical and ideological competition.

My country, which has never experienced war or armed conflict, will continue to work to promote greater

diplomatic inclusiveness and genuine and lasting dialogue in order to mitigate and manage the inevitable geopolitical and ideological differences, rifts and competing interests that sometimes give the impression that the Security Council is a formal and bureaucratic forum that is often paralysed by disputes among its permanent members exercising their veto power.

Our pursuit and impetus for sustained dialogue must ensure that we mobilize the necessary efforts to find a way out of emerging crises, while ensuring that urgent issues do not draw international attention away from the important operational challenges that are undermining the security and dignity of the world's peoples.

The alternatives to sustained dialogue and multilateralism lack credibility within the current international order. Dialogue among nations and within international institutions is the key to fostering greater international stability through ongoing consultations and negotiations to manage emerging conflicts.

The benefits of dialogue include advancing coordination among poles of influence, maintaining international stability and promoting a rules-based order. It represents a pragmatic middle ground, the circumvention of which leads to risky or dangerous alternatives.

Cooperation of course implies acting together, consulting with each other regularly, in times of peace as in times of war, and easing our differences. That means we must consider or take into account each other's expectations and ease tensions with a view to seeking a peaceful settlement of disputes.

My country will always favour dialogue over breakdown, cooperation over isolation and political and diplomatic solutions over the use of force and confrontation. That vision of diplomacy guides our international involvement and remains at the heart of our narrative in the search for lasting solutions to the multifaceted crises plaguing the world.

We are firmly convinced that regional and subregional organizations are key players for initiating dialogue to prevent conflicts and in the effective and sustainable response to international crises. That is the essence of our desire to provide African solutions to African problems, as endorsed by the African Union and its members. Of course, we remain clear on the need to find collective solutions to the crises we are

facing around the world, because their consequences often have a direct or indirect impact on the future of each of our countries and threaten the values we share and defend within the United Nations.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my country's solemn appeal to every member of the Security Council and, beyond that, to every member of the international community to build bridges of dialogue and to break down the walls that divide us and undermine the aspirations of humankind.

We must urgently reconcile ourselves with our calling to together ensure international peace and security for the peoples of the world. That is what we committed to when we signed the United Nations Charter.

We must tirelessly and without further delay cooperate and dialogue within the Security Council with frankness and determination, commensurate with the commitments undertaken and the responsibilities assumed for the maintenance of security and peace in the world.

Mrs. Gasri (France) (*spoke in French*): I join others in thanking the Secretary-General and Mr. Zlauvinen for their briefings.

As you said in your opening remarks, Mr. President, the continuous deterioration of our security environment and the return of strategic and military competition are challenging our international system built on the rule of law, dialogue and cooperation. The Security Council is the keystone of this system. It is the Council's responsibility to use the full extent of the prerogatives entrusted to it by the United Nations Charter to preserve it.

We fully support the call of the President-designate of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to preserve the centrality and primacy of the Treaty as the cornerstone of the international non-proliferation architecture and our strategic stability. It is a bulwark in an unprecedented international context marked by Russian aggression against Ukraine, in violation of its security guarantees, and by the persistence of crises of proliferation.

I would like to highlight three points.

First, some States are openly favouring bellicose postures. Russia's aggression against Ukraine

demonstrates its contempt for the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, which are at the heart of our international system. Today, the situation at the Zaporizhzhya power plant threatens the whole of Europe. We support the ongoing dialogue between the parties and the International Atomic Energy Agency to allow an inspection mission to be sent while respecting the sovereignty of Ukraine. In this regard, we commend the Secretary-General's efforts, which have opened the way to a positive perspective.

Secondly, in addition to open warfare between States, the persistence of internal conflicts and the scourge of terrorism are having a lasting effect on civilian populations, particularly women and children. The crises are intensified by climate change, whose impacts on security, particularly in the Sahel, are no longer in question. As they weaken States, these crises can allow militias or mercenaries to prosper and further destabilize conflict zones.

There is a third worrisome trend: cyberspace and outer space are becoming fields of strategic rivalry and even armed conflict. The manipulation of information to deceive our citizens and undermine our democracies is amplified by hyperconnectivity. Several States seek to destabilize political systems and increase their own influence, while others lock up information to avoid dissent. This is an area in which we must go beyond our usual practices. We must reflect on the contours of a renewed dialogue to refine our common understanding of these new fields, strengthen international governance and define rules of responsible behaviour by closely involving civil society and businesses. France will continue to be fully committed to ensuring that these spaces remain open, secure, stable and peaceful.

In conclusion, allow me to echo the Secretary-General's call to preserve the promise of the United Nations Charter. For France, this means promoting effective multilateralism that respects human rights, fundamental freedoms and democratic principles.

Mr. Kimani (Kenya): I thank Secretary-General António Guterres and Mr. Gustavo Zlauvinen, President of the tenth Review of the Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, for their briefings.

I commend you and your delegation, Mr. President, for the choice of topic for today's briefing. We embrace the discussion, believing that the survival of our species is dependent on the establishment of security based on

dialogue and cooperation, not the combative threat of mutual and worldwide nuclear annihilation.

Unfortunately, the international community is facing an increasingly dangerous confrontation between the great Powers. In the past, we have regretted the increasing irrelevance of multilateralism. We do so again, knowing that, without it, humankind will suffer grievously, as our greatest hopes are crushed by multiple interlocking crises.

As you know, Mr. President, we have an agreement that, if embraced in deed as much as in word, offers us a hopeful basis for collective security. That agreement is the Charter of the United Nations, which we must not allow to go the way of the failed Covenant of the League of Nations. However, present trends holding, it may well meet this unfortunate end due to the paralysis caused by the increasing conflict between defensive and offensive alliances of major Powers.

The effects are already devastating when it comes to the ongoing war in Europe and its worldwide consequences. Unless dialogue is started to halt the war in Ukraine, the continuation of the logic that led to it will lead to ruin for all of us.

We are at a fork in the road. Will the world's Powers choose to embrace the guiding vision of the United Nations, or will they turn it into one more arena of their conflict and sap its will and means to protect international peace and security?

The rest of the world, and Africa specifically, must not wait passively to be swept into the centre of the storms that are being generated by this historic confrontation. It must not lead to us suffering the agony of proxy wars or out-of-control climate change and pandemics.

The 1982 Palme Commission held out the hope that citizens and civil society would take a more active role in advocating disarmament and security. Our argument today is that regions, and specifically Africa, have an important role to play. The future map of survival, as *The New York Times* dubbed the Palme Commission, will need to have Africa as both its subject and as a critical actor for its success.

The world needs a prosperous, secure and united Africa to successfully navigate today's major challenges, such as global insecurity and climate change. Africa's Agenda 2063 can therefore be a cornerstone for the emergence of a balancing pillar for international peace

and security. We propose to our friends and partners today that aiding this ambition or, at a minimum, not impeding it, is in their fundamental interest.

Without stronger contributions to our common security by all regions and our multilateral instruments, destructive cold and hot wars and other major harms lie in our immediate future. Many efforts are required, but I will mention only a few that I urge Council members to prioritize in their analysis.

First, we need to renew our ambition to undertake overdue reforms of the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council. African seats, in line with the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration, offer the greatest hope for a balanced Council. The African Union and other regional organizations also need to undertake every effort to strengthen their peace and security architecture so as to reinforce the impact of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

Secondly, the United Nations needs to assume greater responsibility for all peace operations against threats to international peace and security. In particular, adequate and predictable financing, including through assessed contributions for Security Council-mandated African Union-led peace operations, needs to be provided. There must also be adequate predictable and sustained financing for peacebuilding. In this regard, we urge members to agree on an ambitious draft resolution on financing for peacebuilding by the end of the seventy-sixth session.

Thirdly, it is an unfortunate legacy that the regions leading in the development of nuclear weapons are also the most advanced in the development of militarized artificial intelligence. The United Nations and regional organizations must have a stronger voice in ensuring that this technology is developed ethically and in line with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Fourthly, common security is not attainable without development. In particular, there must be renewed energy shown by industrialized countries to meet and exceed commitments for climate-change adaptation and mitigation. The twenty-seventh Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, to be held in Egypt, will be a key test in that regard.

Finally, militant non-State actors and, in particular, terrorists, can fatally undermine our common security. We call for stronger efforts by the Council to predictably

and consistently use its full range of tools against all terrorist entities and their collaborators.

Kenya will continue playing its part in promoting dialogue and cooperation for the sake of common security. We have played an essential part in the forging of political solutions to multiple conflicts, and even to head off State collapse in our region. At the moment we are undertaking every diplomatic and political effort to facilitate and assist the Democratic Republic of the Congo to solve the crisis in its eastern region through the Nairobi Conclave and the inter-Congolese dialogue. We make those efforts alongside our neighbours and partners in the firm belief that dialogue and cooperation, not confrontation and conflict, are key to ensuring that our citizens and all people live in peace, security and shared prosperity.

Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America): I thank the Secretary-General and Ambassador Zlaulinen for their briefings and their steadfast commitment to furthering multilateral diplomacy.

We live in a world where our greatest challenges are shared, and global challenges require global solutions. That is what makes multilateral institutions such as the United Nations so valuable. The United Nations, unlike any other institution, can galvanize the world towards better ends. We can promote human rights, protect innocent civilians, provide humanitarian relief and save lives. We can strengthen sovereign equality, promote human development, deter threats to peace and security and work towards a more equal and just world.

But success requires good faith. It means not just quoting the Charter of the United Nations, but actually abiding by its principles in practice. And it requires us to hold Member States accountable — vigorously and consistently — when they violate the Charter and the principles it stands for.

Unfortunately, one of the greatest threats to our success in maintaining peace and security is from within. At the top of the list is the full-scale invasion by Russia, a permanent member of the Council, of its sovereign neighbour and fellow United Nations Member State, Ukraine.

Before Russia's unprovoked invasion, the United States, Ukraine and its neighbours, as well as other Member States, undertook intensive diplomatic efforts to dissuade Russia from choosing a path of force and violence. We convened dialogues at high levels across a

range of international venues, including in the Council, in order to voice concerns about the security situation and to discuss potential measures to revitalize Europe's security architecture.

Russia, however, rejected dialogue, discarded established views of sovereign equality, discarded the concept of the indivisibility of security and launched a horrific war. Russia has justified its actions by attempting to redefine basic concepts like sovereignty, territorial integrity and the indivisibility of security. It has done so by asserting that it is Moscow's prerogative to dictate the political and security choices of its neighbours.

Russia is fond of saying that the security of one State cannot come at the expense of others. But Russia's tortured full-throated messaging on the supposed threats it faces from its neighbours omits the fact that all nations have the right to choose their security alliances. Russia's interpretation of indivisible security does not justify one country's attempted annexation of another. That goes against not only the principles, but the explicit words of the United Nations Charter and its allowances for mutual self-defence arrangements.

Russia's selfish desire to invade its neighbour and steal its land has had implications for us all. It has exacerbated global food insecurity, has launched a new refugee crisis, has led to the deaths of tens of thousands of Ukrainians and Russians and has degraded the bedrock principles that have prevented new world wars.

The greatest mistakes of the twentieth century came from the age of empires, when countries and people were not free to make their own sovereign determinations about their societies, economies, partnerships and alliances. We cannot make those mistakes again. That is why we enshrine those lessons in documents like the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. By protecting and promoting human rights, we protect what bonds us together — our shared humanity.

That is why States cannot excuse their human rights violations under the guise of domestic internal affairs. Universal rights are and must be just that — universal. The language in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could not be clearer.

And finally, we came away from the twentieth century in agreement that existential threats like nuclear

proliferation needed to be monitored together, that we should use institutions and mechanisms established by the United Nations Charter, like the Security Council and General Assembly, to address those shared challenges to peace and security.

That is the message that President Biden and Secretary Blinken delivered just a few weeks ago at the onset of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The United States will continue to support the NPT, which remains the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime. At the Review Conference, we are seeking a consensus final document that preserves the integrity of that essential treaty and strengthens its implementation across all three of the treaty pillars in order to accomplish concrete and practical ways to move forward.

It is also important that the Review Conference acknowledge the manner in which Russia's war and irresponsible actions in Ukraine seriously undermine the NPT's main purposes. That is why we believe that resuming mutually beneficial inspections under the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty is a key part of our cooperation that must continue.

We are ready to negotiate expeditiously a framework to replace New Start in pursuit of further bilateral strategic nuclear arms reductions with Russia. We are prepared to work with all countries on risk reduction and strategic stability efforts. We will continue to support the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. And we are eager to begin working with partners to restart negotiations this year on the long-delayed fissile material cut-off treaty.

Those global challenges require global solutions. They require good faith and adherence to established norms and international law. They require commitment and perseverance, which too often are in short supply. But we have to persist because our collective security hangs in the balance.

Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom): I would like to thank the Secretary-General and Ambassador Zlaouine for their important briefings today.

Dialogue and cooperation are essential components in settling disputes and building peace and security, and we have seen some significant positive examples of that in the Security Council in recent months. In Yemen, sustained efforts, including by Council members and

regional actors, have brought us to a fragile truce. In Somalia, cooperation within the Council and with the African Union led to the establishment of a new mission, the African Union Transition Mission in Somalia. However, dialogue can ensure our collective security only if it is matched and underpinned by States upholding the international system that keeps us all safe. That must start with the Charter of the United Nations, as the guarantor of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

Today there is no contest as to the gravest threat to the system of common security enshrined in the United Nations. Russia, a permanent member of the Council, has torn up the Charter and trampled on the rules that underpin international peace and security, undermining the entire system that we are all here to uphold. In order to ensure everyone's security and uphold the system we rely on, we must hold to account States that transgress the universally accepted norms of sovereignty and territorial integrity. If we accepted that a big country can simply invade a smaller neighbour, we would be returning to dark days of human suffering, as well as wider international instability and conflict. That is why we call again for the Russian Federation to stop its illegal invasion of Ukraine and withdraw its forces.

With the global system challenged, we must do everything we can to prevent nuclear escalation. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) remains the cornerstone of the global security architecture in that area and the only route to our shared goal of complete nuclear disarmament. The joint statement on that subject in January from leaders of the permanent five members of the Council was an important signal of a willingness to work together to reduce risks and build confidence. In that context, we thank Mr. Zlaouine for his tireless work as President of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The United Kingdom remains unwaveringly committed to its aims and to working with other States to ensure the implementation of the NPT and other treaties. We therefore echo the Secretary-General's concern about the Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant in southern Ukraine. He has our support in his efforts to de-escalate the situation. We also underline the importance of sending a mission of International Atomic Energy Agency experts to address nuclear safety and security, as well as safeguarding concerns, in a manner that

respects Ukraine's full sovereignty over its territory and infrastructure.

The Charter and the international security architecture that we have collectively built are crucial for all of our countries. Let us defend them together so that our world can enable all sovereign States to ensure the safety of their people and the integrity of their territory.

Ms. Heimerback (Norway): I would like to thank the Secretary-General and Ambassador Zlauvinen for their informative briefings. I also thank China for convening this very timely meeting.

The world is currently facing a multitude of immediate challenges that are unfolding in new and mutually reinforcing ways, from pandemics to climate-related conflicts, cybercrime, food insecurity and growing numbers of refugees. Conflicts have become increasingly protracted, with devastating effects on civilians and civilian infrastructure. A lack of protection fuels conflicts and is a threat to international peace and security. No State, no matter how powerful, can resolve all of those challenges alone. Multilateralism must be at the heart of how we seek to deal with our global challenges.

We need to take a more active role in preventing crises. We therefore very much appreciate that the Secretary-General made prevention a priority in his report *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982), emphasizing the need to ensure that financing is adequate, predictable and sustained. In searching for ways to facilitate early responses, we also need to improve the Security Council's situational awareness. In that regard, there is a key role for the Secretariat and United Nations briefers to play in using their interactions with the Council to bring emerging issues to its attention and sound the alarm. Working together with regional organizations such as the African Union is essential to enabling the Council to understand and tackle emerging security threats, including the rise of non-State actors in conflict. If we are to achieve sustainable peace, Norway also strongly believes that we need to talk to all actors involved in any conflict, and the full and meaningful inclusion of women is crucial in that regard.

Great Power rivalry is putting pressure on the multilateral disarmament architecture. New weapon systems are being developed and deployed. Proliferation challenges are increasing. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has

helped to safeguard global security for more than half a century. It is the cornerstone of our efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons. It is essential that we seize the opportunity during the ongoing tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to reaffirm our commitment to the Treaty. We also strongly advocate ensuring the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. We must persist in our efforts to prepare the ground for future binding arms-control and disarmament agreements. We stress the importance of using the gender lens in that work as well. Women and women's organizations are central actors in policy and advocacy on non-proliferation and disarmament.

The Charter of the United Nations clearly prohibits aggression and the acquisition of territory by force. Russia must immediately withdraw its forces from Ukraine's internationally recognized borders and cease all threats and military action. The recent shelling of the Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant is especially worrying.

Let me conclude by bringing up a concern that we share with many others around this table. The world is currently facing unprecedented levels of acute food insecurity. Rising food prices are driving hunger in South Sudan, Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan and other places. That is affecting livelihoods and multiplying the risks of further conflicts and instability. Russia's war on Ukraine has worsened the situation further, with serious global impact. Norway commends the Secretary-General for his contribution to the initiative on the safe transportation of grain from Ukrainian ports through the Black Sea. It is an important step and could help to ease global food insecurity.

The challenges we are facing require a holistic and inclusive response. They affect all of us. Our efforts for collective security must be coordinated across all three pillars of the work of the United Nations — peace and security, human rights and development.

Mr. Agyeman (Ghana): At the outset, I would like to thank the Chinese delegation for organizing today's important meeting to promote common security through dialogue and cooperation.

We also thank the Secretary-General for the depth and clarity of his statement, as well as Ambassador Gustavo Zlauvinen, President of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty

on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, for his insightful briefing.

Seven decades after the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations, the world is witnessing increasing strains on the structures of the global order — not only because there are new and emerging global threats that require effective national action to resolve, but also because, distanced in time from the brutal images of the wars of the past, countries are beginning to consider, ever more readily, the threat and use of force as an instrument for pursuing policies in the international arena.

For many smaller countries, while there is an awareness that the rules-based order has not always been fair, the affirmation of the order is nonetheless firm, as it remains a key necessity in upholding the stability of the modern international system. Most of us are only too well aware of the acute risks of Hobbesian imagery if the international system of governance we have built in the post-war era were to be fragily maintained.

Therefore, as we reflect on the prevailing risks to the global system from threats such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear conflict and its use by terrorist groups, terrorism itself, violent conflict, pandemics, climate change, cyberattacks, disinformation, migration crises and food and energy insecurity, we must resolve to walk our respective commitments to the Charter, as well as to the other commitments that we have made. Those commitments include, more recently, the Declaration for the Commemoration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations.

When considering how we can promote common security through dialogue and cooperation, Ghana seeks to share five main points.

First, as an overarching requirement, we must collectively work towards the strengthening of multilateralism in ways that ensure it serves the needs of all, and not the wishes of a powerful or influential few. The dialogue required for sustaining multilateralism must therefore change, and the outcomes of decisions must reflect the common aspirations of all Member States and be based, *inter alia*, on principles such as solidarity. In our view, a strong multilateral system that upholds fairness and justice remains necessary in pursuing the common goal of maintaining global peace and security.

Secondly, there have been far too many derogations in the obligations of some Member States in relation to their own declarations when they joined the United Nations and agreed to uphold the purposes and principles of its Charter. When that has happened with more powerful States, the Organization has been constrained from acting.

We therefore believe that, in the present circumstances, it may be necessary to initiate a consensual process for Member States to formally recommit to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, especially its key purpose, namely, to ensure international peace and security based on the peaceful settlement of disputes; the non-use of force in international relations, except under very limited and defined conditions; the development of friendly relations; and the pursuit of international cooperation in resolving international problems.

Thirdly, while the development of friendly relations among Member States was envisaged as one of the key tools in advancing a peaceful world order, we are only too aware of past actions that have been carried out by some States that undermine the territorial integrity and political independence of other States. Such actions create mistrust and weaken the common security we all seek.

It is important to recognize that, while more powerful States may have extensive security concerns, those concerns cannot, by any stretch, be subordinated to the domestic interests of other States, no matter how small they may be. That is the requirement of the principle of the sovereign equality of States — a principle that must be safeguarded in practice if we seek a more stable world. We therefore encourage deliberate diplomatic actions, consistent with the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, to build mutual trust, including by emphasizing dialogue in order to objectively assess the strategic intentions of countries and obtain a clearer understanding of national policy objectives and strategies. That is critical when it comes to dealing with misjudgments and avoiding unhealthy competition, especially among major Powers.

Fourthly, amid prevailing geopolitical rivalries, elevated risks related to the deliberate or accidental use of nuclear weapons are a strong concern that the nuclear-weapon States should cooperate to resolve. While nuclear non-proliferation is an important agenda that we must continue to work on — whether

on the Korean peninsula, in the Middle East or elsewhere — the fundamental concern is that the idea of nuclear weapons itself is objectionable to humankind, and we should therefore work assiduously towards achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world. That demand requires us to strengthen dialogue and cooperation so that the successes achieved so far can be built upon. I refer to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which has helped to manage non-proliferation for 53 years — although challenges remain — and the 25-year moratorium on nuclear testing.

Finally, there are many conflict situations, especially in parts of the African continent, where small arms and light weapons in the hands of terrorist and violent extremist groups have, in effect, been wielded as weapons of mass destruction. Such security threats of our time cannot be left to regional and national actors to manage alone. The burden must be shared equitably, and renewed efforts and investments should be made in interventions that would accelerate progress towards the realization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Sustainable Development Goals.

In conclusion, Ghana believes that the common security we all yearn for is possible and can be achieved. We therefore look forward to the further engagement of Member States on the *Our Common Agenda* report (A/75/982), in particular as it relates to the New Agenda for Peace.

While recognizing the importance of regional arrangements in advancing collective security, we also underscore the crucial role of the United Nations in promoting dialogue and cooperation for our common security and believe that the equal platform provided by the United Nations enables States to develop common understandings on the application of international law and norms, rules and principles for responsible State behaviour. We must guard that multilateral platform jealously.

Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We thank the Secretary-General, Mr. António Guterres, and the President of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Mr. Gustavo Zlauvinen, for their briefings. We are grateful to our Chinese colleagues for convening today's Security Council meeting and for choosing a highly relevant topic devoted to issues of collective security.

Hardly anyone can be satisfied with the international situation in which we find ourselves today. The international security system is experiencing a profound crisis whereby almost all of the institutions it was based on have deteriorated and the level of trust between key international players has dropped to a critically low level. Today, more than ever before, it is important to understand why that has happened. However, for at least the past 200 years, Western countries have blamed Russia as their sole explanation and universal solution when it comes to such problems.

But let us look at the facts. In the late 1980s, the international community had reason to hope that the Cold War, with its arms race and the threat of a major confrontation between the super-Powers, was over. Back in May, many experts seriously argued that bloc confrontation was also a thing of the past. That happened, first and foremost, because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and then Russia, radically changed course, reacting to the promises and assurances of the countries of the West. Back then, we were assured that NATO would not seek to gain any unilateral advantage from the changed situation in Europe or create new dividing lines throughout it. We were promised an equal partnership based on trust, transparency and the mutual consideration of security concerns, which also included a promise not to expand NATO to the East.

From records of conversations and the memoirs of Western politicians, it became clear that we simply were shamelessly deceived — and are still being deceived — and that neither the United States nor its allies have intended to fulfil any of those promises. No form of equal partnership was even considered. Moreover, the countries of the West, taking advantage of the economic and political challenges we faced during the transition period, declared Russia the loser in the Cold War. In their understanding, the loser cannot lay claim to anything. The members of NATO almost instantly forgot their promises not to build up their military presence in Europe and not to move their military infrastructure closer to Russia's borders.

For 30 years, we have been patiently trying to reach an agreement with NATO on the principles of equal and indivisible security in the Euro-Atlantic region. However, our proposals have been consistently met either with cynical lies or attempts at pressure and blackmail. At the same time, NATO has continued to expand relentlessly, bringing its military infrastructure

closer to our borders, including by deploying missile defence systems and offensive weapons, all of which has created a genuine threat to our country's national security. Our President warned about it in 2007 at the Munich Security Conference, when he urged NATO to abandon its dangerous path of confrontation. Regrettably, those warnings went unheard and unheeded by the West. On the contrary, in 2008 the United States and its NATO allies pressured the authorities in power in Georgia at the time into a crude military venture against South Ossetia and Russia's peacekeepers that had disastrous results for Georgia.

At the same time, the United States deliberately dismantled key elements of the global arms-control system that had maintained the strategic balance and prevented armed confrontation for decades. As long ago as 2001, Washington announced its unilateral withdrawal from the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, on the invented pretext that it was outdated and did not correspond to contemporary reality. In 2019, the United States also unilaterally withdrew from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which the Secretary-General had once described as an invaluable tool that could prevent nuclear war. In order to avoid another spiral into confrontation, we proposed a mutual moratorium on the deployment of such missiles to the United States and NATO. We even undertook a unilateral obligation not to be the first to deploy systems banned by the INF Treaty in regions where similar American-made products would not be deployed. But our moratorium proposal was rejected by the United States and its NATO allies. In that context, it is telling that the United States is still refusing to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

Concerning the Euro-Atlantic space itself, for years we have been doing everything in our power to maintain the viability of the conventional arms-control regime. Russia was an initiator of the negotiations on adapting the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), and we ratified the agreement on the adaptation of the treaty that would have enabled it to take the new strategic realities in Europe into account. But the United States and its allies in NATO, which by the mid-2000s was expanding at full speed, refused to ratify the agreement, while the NATO newbies of the 2000s — Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovenia, Albania and Croatia — refused to accede to the CFE

on principle, all of which stripped the Treaty of any political or military meaning. In 2020, the United States essentially signed the death warrant of yet another cornerstone confidence-building agreement in the Euro-Atlantic region by withdrawing unilaterally from the Open Skies Treaty. I want to stress that the dismantling each of those arms-control instruments was the result of deliberate actions by the United States, which has essentially brought down the existing architecture in this area, brick by brick.

In December of last year we made a last attempt to save the European security system from its death agonies under the Western countries' blows. Russia submitted a set of proposals to the United States and NATO on confidence-building and security measures in the Euro-Atlantic region. We made a proposal to the United States to conclude an agreement on legally binding mutual security assurances that would take into account the concerns of both sides in this area and restore Russia-NATO relations to their 1997 state, when the Russian-NATO Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security was signed. A similar proposal was made to NATO. They are public documents that anyone can access.

Our proposals were based on the principle of common and indivisible security, which assumes that States should not strengthen their own security at the expense of others. That is a fundamental principle of civilized international relations. It is reflected in several foundational documents of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), including the Istanbul Charter for European Security of 1999, it was reaffirmed in the Astana Commemorative Declaration of the 2010 OSCE Summit and it underlies the agreements between Russia and NATO. But our American colleagues did not want to reaffirm the principle, insisting on the sanctity of the NATO open-door policy. As a result, all of our proposals for security assurances were rejected by the United States and NATO. They simply refused to discuss them on their merits, and for the umpteenth time in history chose escalation over a diplomatic settlement. The result is that a crisis has broken out in the European region — one with a global reach and that we can say without exaggeration will have historic consequences.

In our view, the reason why the West has been collectively and purposely destroying the system of European security for all these years is that the proven system of checks and balances — the balance

of interests — has ceased to respond to the West's aspirations to hegemony. What has emerged is the temptation to bend the whole world to its dictates and force it to live and work according to Western countries' models. But collective security is incompatible with coercion and hegemony and the desire to undermine any alternative sovereign paths of development and to keep countries and peoples in the grip of a colonial order. That involves any means available — crude interference in States' internal affairs, coups d'état, threats, blackmail, economic coercion and incitement to conflict. In the past few years we have also seen dirty information campaigns, based on lies and a presumption of one's own innocence. In this context, truth and facts have no part to play, since leading Western media and public relations agencies are working to tarnish their opponents.

As with Georgia in its time, Ukraine has been sacrificed to the confrontation with Russia, in which the West has set up an anti-popular, anti-constitutional and Russophobic regime in the country. Today the United States and its allies are pumping heavy weapons into Kyiv and doing everything they can to prolong the conflict in Ukraine — a conflict that began in 2014 when the Maidan regime bombed and shelled the inhabitants of the south-eastern regions of the country, ensuring that the Ukrainian people were destined to be mere cannon fodder.

And yet in the face of their own declared values, the Western countries have cynically turned a blind eye to the spread of neo-Nazi ideology, the mass murder of Donbas residents and violations of international humanitarian law by the Ukrainian armed forces and nationalist battalions. In recent weeks Ukraine's Western patrons have essentially been assisting Kyiv in its attempts at nuclear blackmail, while ignoring the fact that it is the Ukrainian forces that have been firing on the Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant. At the Security Council meeting convened by the Russian Federation last week on the topic (see S/PV.9109), not a single Western delegation found the resolve to call a spade a spade and urge Kyiv to stop the dangerous actions that could lead to a nuclear catastrophe on the European continent. We have requested another emergency meeting on the Ukrainian armed forces' continuing provocations regarding the Zaporizhzhya plant.

The United States and its allies have been acting in exactly the same reckless and provocative manner in Asia and Africa. They have noticeably intensified

their destructive policy in the Asia-Pacific region recently with attempts to impose a bloc mindset on its States, form aggressive military-political alliances such as AUKUS, the trilateral security pact between Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States, drive a wedge between countries that have their own effective mechanisms for resolving contentious issues and problems and force them to abandon the concept of Asian neutrality that helped them to protect their own interests during the Cold War. The reckless American scheme regarding Taiwan is part of the same deal. In our view, this carefully planned provocation is an open demonstration of disrespect for the sovereignty of other countries and the United States' own international obligations. We have been forced to conclude that the Asia-Pacific region has become part of a purposeful, conscious United States strategy aimed at destabilizing the situation in regions of the world where there are States pursuing their own independent policies.

The tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is currently being held in New York. It is meant to bring the international community together to implement the Treaty's provisions. But here too the Western countries are politicizing the work on the final document by putting their geopolitical interests in punishing Russia above the collective demand that we strengthen global security. Within the context of the collective West's de facto sabotage of the global security architecture, Russia continues to do everything possible to keep afloat at least its critical, vital elements.

In February 2021, at our initiative, the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between Russia and the United States was extended for five years. And we took the initiative to reaffirm the principle that there can be no winners in a nuclear war — and that such a war must never be unleashed — in the joint statement of the leaders of the five nuclear-weapon States adopted on 3 January. It also emphasized the need to prevent not only a nuclear confrontation but any military confrontation between nuclear-weapon States. It is imperative that all the signatories to the statement demonstrate their commitment to its provisions through their actions.

In principle, we remain open to cooperating to reduce tensions, stop the arms race and minimize strategic risks. However, that also requires our Western colleagues' commitment. So far we have seen no such interest on their part. Reducing tensions in the world and overcoming threats and risks in the political and

military arena will be possible only by strengthening the multipolar system, based on international law, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the sovereign equality of States. That is the only real and effective alternative to hegemony and might-is-right. We are ready to participate actively in collaborating with like-minded partners to build a truly democratic world, in which the rights of all nations and their security interests and cultural and civilizational diversity will be guaranteed. That is important, despite the fierce opposition of the United States and its allies.

The outlines of a new world order are taking shape before our eyes today. A growing number of countries are choosing a path of sovereign political, economic and civilizational development while rejecting the formulas and templates imposed by Western countries. The West, however, is ready to do anything to preserve its hegemony. For the sake of that desire, Ukraine was sacrificed and turned into a firing range for a proxy war with Russia until the last Ukrainian falls. We hope that the West's actions in Ukraine have opened the eyes of many around the world to the true underlying cause of the crises gripping our planet. What is happening to Ukraine now, and indeed what NATO has been doing on the European continent for the past 30 years, is a lesson for the whole world. Does anyone think that the United States and its allies will behave differently in other regions? History tells us otherwise. Therefore ask not for whom the bell tolls today. It tolls for you.

Ms. Moran (Ireland): I thank the Chinese presidency for organizing this very timely debate. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General and Ambassador Zlaugienis for their thought-provoking statements.

The United Nations was born from the trauma of the Second World War and a desire to ensure that we would never again go down the path of isolation, nationalism, global division and conflict. Multilateralism has long been central to Ireland's foreign policy. We believe that the rules-based international order, with the United Nations at its core, remains essential if we are to achieve the promise of the Charter of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security and respect the sovereignty of States. Unfortunately, we are seeing an increase in global and regional instability, exacerbated this year by Russia's unjustified and illegal military aggression against Ukraine.

No country can tackle the root causes of conflict and complex global challenges alone. Addressing

climate change, inequality, poverty, cybercrime and terrorism requires effective collective effort if we are ever to achieve sustainable peace. But the basic global consensus, embodied in key regional and international institutions, is being eroded. We must push back against such attempts, while undertaking the institutional reforms that are necessary to maximize the continued legitimacy, relevance and effectiveness of multilateral bodies. In order to collectively address those complex and interconnected challenges we must have a holistic and inclusive response, coordinated across all three pillars of the work of the United Nations — peace and security, human rights and development. I would like to highlight three areas where we see opportunities for cooperation in order to support peace.

First, we must move away from a default position of responding after a crisis has happened and be more proactive with regard to prevention. Ireland joins the call outlined in *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982), to which the Secretary-General referred earlier, to enhance our support for the Peacebuilding Commission and ensure that peacebuilding is adequately and sustainably financed. The Peacebuilding Commission continues to advance its civil-society engagement, increasing its advice to the Security Council, and as part of the wider United Nations peacebuilding architecture has contributed to discussions on peacebuilding financing. Ireland calls on others to support the entirety of the Commission's work and engage constructively in the upcoming negotiations in the General Assembly.

Secondly, we must recognize that disarmament and effective arms control are more vital than ever. During the Cold War era, the world too frequently stood on the brink of nuclear catastrophe. But today we are faced with an elevated nuclear risk. As we heard from the Secretary-General, by adopting the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the international community took a decisive step back from that abyss. As the cornerstone of the international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation architecture, the NPT reminds us that even in the most dangerous times, progress is achievable. As we meet today, the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is under way, under the leadership of Ambassador Zlaugienis. It is our collective responsibility to bring urgency and action to nuclear disarmament, address proliferation challenges and agree on how we can move forward together in order to honour and implement our existing

commitments. Our shared objective of a world without nuclear weapons demands that we act with courage and vision.

Lastly, we must ensure that our approach to peace and security takes a human rights-based approach that is inclusive, particularly of the most vulnerable. It is vital that we pay heed to women, young people, human rights defenders and civil society in this Chamber. It is essential that they can speak freely about the stark realities of conflict without fear of reprisals or intimidation. Support for local peacebuilders, particularly women and youth, is key to finding local sustainable solutions to conflict. By implementing the international frameworks that we have collectively agreed to — be they the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the NPT, the peace and security agenda, the Paris Climate Change Agreement or the Sustainable Development Goals — we can shape and build the world that was imagined when the United Nations was born.

Mrs. Kamboj (India): I thank the Secretary-General for his briefing and his valuable remarks. I would also like to thank Ambassador Gustavo Zlauvinen for his statement.

The United Nations was established in 1945 with the noble objective of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. As our most universal and representative international organization, the United Nations has been credited with keeping the peace over the past 77 years. At the same time, as we enter the third decade of this millennium, we need to ask ourselves whether the United Nations has lived up to its expectations. The requirements and challenges of our present and future are vastly different from those of the past. The world today is very different from the world of 1945. Is the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, which is the foremost organ tasked with the responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, able to remain relevant?

We are all agreed that the world today is beset with multiple challenges — terrorism, radicalism, threats and challenges from new and emerging technologies, climate change, pandemics, intensifying geopolitical competition and many others. Each one directly affects the lives of all of us. An armed conflict in one part of the world has cascading effects on the people of another. We have seen the effects of the Ukraine conflict on other developing countries, particularly through the

supply of food grains, fertilizer and fuel. At the same time, the impact of the crisis in Afghanistan is being felt throughout the region. We can indeed appreciate that the United Nations has been at the forefront of dealing with those and many other such challenges. Such efforts, however, have been partial or intermittent at best, as we have invariably stopped short of providing effective and durable solutions. It is clear that the challenges the world is confronted with today cannot be dealt with through outdated systems and governing structures.

One of the guiding questions posed by the Council presidency for today's meeting is what constitutes common security. We are firm in our commitment to upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The underlying principles of common security include upholding the rules-based international order — underpinned by international law and premised on respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all Member States — resolving international disputes through peaceful negotiations and ensuring free and open access to the global commons for all. Any coercive or unilateral action that seeks to change the status quo by force is an affront to common security. Furthermore, common security is possible only when countries respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity in the same way they would expect their own sovereignty to be respected. It is feasible only when all countries stand together against common threats such as terrorism, refrain from applying double standards while preaching otherwise and respect agreements signed with others, bilaterally or multilaterally, without taking unilateral measures to nullify the very arrangements to which they are party.

Today's meeting is therefore an opportune moment to engage in a serious discussion about India's call for reformed multilateralism, at the core of which lies reform of the Security Council — a body founded in the aftermath of the Second World War that continues to reflect in its decision-making, 77 years later, the fundamentally flawed premise of “to the victors go the spoils” — and that continues to be confronted with a crisis of confidence and credibility. As my Prime Minister said in the General Assembly's general debate in 2020,

“[r]eform in the responses, in the processes, and in the very character of the United Nations is the need of the hour.” (*A/75/PV.12, annex I*)

How can we aspire to common security when the common good of the global South continues to be denied representation in the Council's decision-making? In that regard, the most urgent thing for us to do is make the Security Council more representative of developing countries so as to reflect current geopolitical realities. How can we explain away the fact that the African continent does not have permanent representation on the Council even though the majority of the issues the Council deals with concern that region? How can we aspire to common security in Africa when the Council denies it representation on a permanent basis? A truly representative Security Council is the most pressing need of the hour. Without that, there is a real danger that the United Nations could be superseded by other plurilateral and multilateral groupings that are more representative, transparent and democratic and therefore more effective.

As a founding member of the United Nations, India has consistently demonstrated its commitment to upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter. My country has been a leading advocate in addressing the concerns and aspirations of developing countries and for the creation of a more equitable international economic and political order. As one of the largest contributors of troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions, we have contributed immensely to maintaining international peace and security and have done so proudly, while the number of lives we have sacrificed in that noble endeavour is the highest of all troop-contributing countries. We have also worked to foster global socioeconomic development through transparent, viable, sustainable and demand-driven partnership programmes. The Council will recall that when the coronavirus disease pandemic hit the world, we extended our hand of friendship to others by delivering vaccines, pharmaceuticals and other medical equipment to more than 150 countries around the world.

India has been playing its part by being a trusted and reliable partner for all, based on our ancient Indian ethos that sees the world as one great family. However, the question remains: are multilateral organizations, especially the Security Council, ready to deal with the new world order and new challenges? In my country, which now represents more than one sixth of humankind, we believe that until we reform, perform and transform multilateral governance structures, we will continue to be found wanting.

Mr. Hoxha (Albania): I would like to thank the Chinese presidency for organizing this meeting, a timely opportunity to consider the ways in which dialogue and cooperation — our daily bread and butter — can contribute to maintaining world peace and security, especially when the world is in turmoil. We are grateful for and welcome the remarks made by Secretary-General Guterres and by Mr. Zlauvinen, President of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We and many others here today share their concern that peace and security are under threat and that we will face a bleak future if those threats are not properly recognized and addressed.

Dialogue and cooperation represent a common and strong aspiration for people around the world. We believe that such a noble aspiration is not built in a void but rather, first and foremost, on the basis of the norms and laws that we have agreed on together since the establishment of our Organization. Today the world faces many serious challenges and a multitude of threats in a shifting geopolitical environment. In many countries, peace and security, stability and progress and rights and freedoms are not part of citizens' realities. Seizures of power through force, terrorism, cyber attacks, climate change, transborder crime and poverty continue to fuel violent and deadly conflicts in many parts of the world. But it is the erosion of the fundamental norms established with the creation of the United Nations that constitutes a fundamental threat to world peace and security today.

Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations speaks for itself. It prohibits the use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Yet there are those who still defy it openly, blatantly, repeatedly and unforgivingly. Russia's invasion of Ukraine is in flagrant violation of that obligation and everything we have invested over decades. Its indefensible assault on a peaceful neighbour has undermined the international order, which is rooted in rules and respect. This war of choice therefore poses some urgent questions for us all. Do rules matter? Does sovereignty have any meaning? Do we want a rules-based international order, or do we want chaos and turmoil? What remains of dialogue and cooperation in the face of an unprovoked invasion?

Our answers to those questions will define our future and the future of multilateralism with the United Nations at its core. Our common response will

determine whether we stand by international law or yield to big Powers and their imperial appetites vis-à-vis their neighbours, whether we stand by and contemplate as might dictates right and whether we accept the arrogance of my-way-or-the-highway. Mistakes made in the past give no one, no State, licence to do the same, now or in the future. Let us therefore not forget that what is happening in Ukraine today does not concern that country and its citizens alone. It concerns the entire European continent and all of us.

We also recognize and support an expanded notion of security. That entails an evolved, continued and irreversible shift from mere classic State security to human security, where the individual — the human person — takes centre stage. But despite the undeniable progress achieved over more than seven decades, respect for human rights around the world is in retrograde. Acts of violence and discrimination occur on a daily basis, and we are witnessing more and more human rights violations and abuses in all corners of the world. When human rights are violated, dialogue and cooperation suffer, development and progress stall and peace and security come under threat. But when human rights are respected, societies become stronger and more resilient and stable, and countries develop faster, which benefits dialogue and cooperation at the regional and global levels.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) remains the bedrock of the nuclear disarmament regime, as was rightly recalled by the President of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The core objectives of the NPT in its three important pillars — to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, achieve universal nuclear disarmament and uphold the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy — are key to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. Russia's actions, including its decision to place its nuclear deterrent forces on high alert in February and the continued sabre-rattling of a nuclear threat from various voices and actors close to the regime, go against cooperation, undermine trust and threaten peace. In that regard, the occupation and the militarization of the Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant, which is being used by Russian forces as a springboard to launch attacks, constitutes an imminent threat, defying all International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and safety protocols. We reiterate our call on Russia to withdraw its military forces and for the

immediate establishment of a secure perimeter around the power plant.

With a multilateral global order that is shaken to the core, it is high time that we stopped sleepwalking and brought dialogue and cooperation to the heart of our collective action. We must come together and take wise decisions for the benefit of us all. The pandemic has tested our resilience, climate change threatens our very survival and inaction will only put all of us right up against the wall. As the Secretary-General reminded us here today, the proposals in *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982) represent a road map for reaffirming multilateralism and restoring respect for rules and joint efforts for development, with a United Nations fit for future challenges and crises at the heart of our common action. We strongly support the New Agenda for Peace, with its heightened focus on reinforcing human rights and freedoms and international law through a comprehensive and integrated approach to peace and security, including by addressing challenges related to climate change. We will be able to do better and achieve more by investing in prevention rather than always addressing symptoms, and dialogue and cooperation are crucial to that.

Challenges, crises and disputes between States, whether at the regional or international level, will not disappear. They have been and will be a part of international life. But what can and should change is the way we deal with them. If we opt for open, frank and genuine dialogue while upholding the core norms agreed by all, we can invest in fair solutions and contribute to a peaceful, secure, and prosperous world. Through dialogue, States build trust, and through cooperation, they share mutually beneficial experiences. We always stand stronger together than alone. It is only through dialogue, cooperation and joint efforts that we can recognize and act on the common aspiration of all human beings to live a dignified life that is free from fear, want and repression.

Let me conclude by stating what we have learned from our very own past. Peace and security do not come from an imposed vision, but rather from what is achieved freely and jointly by acting together, as friends, good neighbours and fair partners. Only then do dialogue and cooperation acquire their true meaning with shared benefits.

Mr. Gómez Robledo Verduzco (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico thanks China for taking the initiative

to convene this meeting. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General and the President of the tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons for enriching this debate with their briefings and reflections.

In a context where emerging challenges such as climate change, pandemics and the food crisis are exacerbating traditional security issues, it is clear that unilateral approaches are not conducive to solving problems, unlike multilateral cooperation. As a country committed to effective multilateralism, Mexico has always promoted dialogue and the peaceful settlement of disputes in order to address conflicts early and prevent their escalation. As a member of the Security Council and in particular during our presidency in November 2021, my country has taken on the task of highlighting the important role of preventive diplomacy. We cannot simply manage conflicts; preventive diplomacy and recourse to means for the peaceful settlement of disputes are key to maintaining peace. In order to conduct genuine and effective diplomacy, the United Nations must strengthen coordination between its main organs. Collaboration among all United Nations organs, agencies, programmes and funds, including, of course, the International Court of Justice and the Peacebuilding Commission, is essential. However, the wide range of resources and tools at the disposal of the United Nations system has not been reflected in the results we have seen in recent years.

Nuclear weapons continue to represent the worst threat to the very survival of humankind. The so-called deterrence doctrine is in itself a threat of the potential use of nuclear weapons. The threat of the use of force is prohibited by the Charter of the United Nations, so we cannot normalize any threat, express or veiled, of the use of nuclear weapons concealed by the doctrine of deterrence.

The tenth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is currently taking place, could be an opportunity to make progress towards the goal of achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. However, we are deeply concerned about the slow progress and above all the lack of political will — particularly on the part of the nuclear-weapon States — to reach agreements to achieve that goal. Nevertheless, there is still time to reverse that trend, and in that context we would like to point to the 1996 advisory opinion of the

International Court of Justice with regard to article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which states that

“[t]here exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.”
(A/51/218, *annex, para. 105*)

Mexico agrees with the Secretary-General's view that a more secure and peaceful world must be based on international law, cooperation and solidarity, not the incessant accumulation and modernization of arsenals. That was precisely what led the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean to establish the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in a densely populated area through the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which led more recently to the conclusion and entry into force of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. We would like to see that same spirit of cooperation reflected in the talks to return to full compliance with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and thereby resolve the outstanding issues on Iran's nuclear programme.

Similarly, security on the Korean peninsula remains a source of considerable concern. In recent months, the Council has addressed the threat posed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's launch of ballistic missiles. In the light of the paralysis in the Council caused by a double veto, the General Assembly debated the issue (see A/76/PV.77). It is clear that we must resume a dialogue if we are to achieve the complete denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. We call on the States with considerable responsibility for the issue to spare no effort in returning to a path of dialogue and cooperation.

Mexico has also been unequivocal in its call for an end to the war in Ukraine. The population has paid a huge price as a result of the military intervention. We again call for a cessation of hostilities and echo the call of the Secretary-General for an immediate end to military activities around the Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant and for parties not to target the plant or its surroundings, which is a violation of international humanitarian law. We encourage an agreement that will enable the demilitarization of the zone so that International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors can conduct the necessary technical inspections and prevent an accident with incalculable consequences.

The deadlock that we are experiencing on certain issues is undermining the legitimacy of the collective

security mechanisms we have built. It also leads to greater mistrust regarding the validity and effectiveness of multilateralism. That perception will not change unless we can demonstrate through action by the international community, in particular the Council, that we can find solutions to our common problems. It is clear that the Council has frequently failed to fulfil its mandate and has been thwarted by the will of some of its permanent members. Together with France, Mexico has promoted an initiative to refrain from using the veto in cases of mass atrocities. Endorsing that initiative would be a clear-cut action in favour of common security. We encourage States that have not yet done so, particularly the permanent members of the Council, to join that initiative, which already has the support of 106 States.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of China.

I too thank Secretary-General Guterres and Ambassador Zlauvinen for their briefings, which convey fully their alertness to potential crises. They also shared with us many considerations and suggestions that will provide the Council with much valuable inspiration for the next stage of its work. The members of the Council discussed their respective views on the theme of today's meeting in depth. While our positions may not be identical, we still have a broad consensus on fundamental issues. We should translate that consensus into common action, leverage the role that the Council should play and do a better job of performing our duties.

The Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations sets out the goal of the Organization — saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which has brought untold sorrow to mankind. Some 76 years on, we still have a long way to go before we attain the goal of common security. The baton of time has been passed to us. We should show our historical responsibility and make our contributions to common security. In that regard, I would like to share a few points.

First, we should firmly establish a security concept that meets the needs of the times. That is a prerequisite for realizing common security. It must be recognized that in the era of globalization, all of us in the world face the same security issues and threats. No one lives in a vacuum and no country enjoys absolute security. In realizing its own security, no country can ignore the legitimate security concerns of other countries, build its own security at the expense of another's or

put up a security fence on another's doorstep. Security is indivisible. That is the common-sense concept of our time and the starting point for achieving shared security. If anyone acts contrary to that, any security effort, however mighty, will ultimately send things in the opposite direction and become trapped in a vicious circle.

Clearly, thanks to their various historical and cultural backgrounds and stages of development, countries are bound to have different views on security issues and conflicts of interests. In dealing with such differences and conflicting interests, what we should do is find the highest common denominator through dialogue and cooperation and settle disputes by peaceful means. That is the only way to achieve common security. While at times that path may take longer to reach the goal, it is the right direction. Practices such as clinging to a Cold War mentality and practicing the zero-sum games of unilateralism, bloc confrontation and power politics will not only make it difficult to guarantee one's own long-term security but will ultimately result in escalating crises, to the detriment of common security. In that regard, the problems triggered by several rounds of NATO's expansion to the East and the resultant lessons are indeed profound.

China has consistently adhered to the concept of common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security. President Xi Jinping has put forward the Global Security Initiative, which is precisely the direction we should take, along with China's plan to promote common security in view of the current challenges in international security. The Initiative is open to all. We are willing to work with the international community and to use sincere, pragmatic dialogue and cooperation to implement the Initiative with practical actions in order to build together a balanced, effective and sustainable international security architecture as part of our contribution to saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

Secondly, we should earnestly respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, which are the foundations of common security. The important principle of respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, as set out in the Charter of the United Nations, is a bedrock of contemporary international law and international relations. If that principle is ignored and abandoned, the whole system of international law will be shaken to its core. The

world will return to the law of the jungle and common security will be out of the question.

For that reason, we must take a stand. That means consistently respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, the development path and social systems chosen by their peoples and their efforts to safeguard the unity of their States and their national solidarity. That is the golden rule of State-to-State interactions. It is also the foundation for achieving common security. Since it is a golden rule, it should be universally applied and double standards should not be adopted, let alone saying one thing while doing another or reneging on one's promises out of self-interest. We already have many lessons in that regard. The experiences in Afghanistan, Syria, Iraq and other places serve as a permanent warning to us that interfering in other countries' internal affairs under the banner of counter-terrorism, democracy and human rights not only results in huge losses, harm and suffering for the countries concerned, but it also desecrates the shared values of humankind, such as democracy, human rights and freedom, and undermines efforts to achieve common security, instead of helping them. China always respects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other countries, upholds international fairness and justice and supports the efforts of the international community to achieve common security. At the same time, we will take every measure necessary to firmly safeguard our own sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Thirdly, we should strive to create a stable strategic security environment, which is the cornerstone for maintaining common security. Driven by the mentality of so-called strategic competition among the great Powers, the global strategic security environment has continued to deteriorate. The international non-proliferation regime, embodied by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, is facing the most severe challenge since the end of the Cold War. We echo the Secretary-General's repeated calls that the only way to deal with the nuclear threat is through the elimination of nuclear weapons. The countries with the largest nuclear arsenals should fulfil their special and primary responsibilities by making further substantial and substantive cuts to their nuclear arsenals in a verifiable, irreversible and legally binding manner. That will create the conditions necessary for other nuclear-weapon States to join the nuclear disarmament process.

In January, the leaders of the five nuclear-weapon States issued a joint statement, which stresses that a

nuclear war cannot be won and should not be fought and reiterates that they will not aim their nuclear weapons at one another or any other country. That solemn commitment is of profound importance in the current situation. It will help strengthen mutual trust among the major Powers, prevent a nuclear war and avoid an arms race that would plunge the world into darker catastrophes.

Since the very first day that it became a nuclear-weapon State, China has advocated for the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons, while always strictly adhering to the policy of not being the first to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances. We have also unconditionally committed to the non-use of or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones. China is the only country among the five nuclear-weapons States that has made such a commitment. We urge other nuclear-weapons States to adopt the same policy in order to jointly safeguard global strategic stability and effectively reduce the risk of nuclear war.

Fourthly, the United Nations is the most important platform for maintaining common security. We should support the United Nations in continuing its central role. An effective global security governance system is the sole norm for achieving common security. The Security Council is at the core of the international collective security mechanism and the most authoritative and legitimate body of the multilateral security system. It plays an irreplaceable role in safeguarding common security.

We should uphold true multilateralism and support an effective role for the United Nations and the Security Council in proactively responding to the needs of the times and the expectations of all parties. Council members should promote mutual trust, reduce confrontation, strengthen unity and cooperation and safeguard the authority and effectiveness of the Security Council. We should make greater efforts at promoting the political settlement of disputes and create synergies with the mediation efforts of the Secretary-General to better meet the current challenges and safeguard our common security.

We must increase our contribution in the area of development, build a global partnership for development, promote security with development, ensure development with security and seek shared

development and security. We must remain firmly committed to equity and justice by enabling developing countries, which make up the overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership, in particular the African countries, to enjoy equal rights and play a greater role.

Secretary-General Guterres is formulating his New Agenda for Peace. His considerations about that work, on which he briefed us earlier, are well targeted and provide important and extremely meaningful guidance for the international community to effectively control security risks and improve security governance. China expects the New Agenda for Peace to inject new impetus into efforts to achieve common security by capturing the most important concerns of Member

States, reflecting our common aspirations and focusing on shaping our common future.

China stands ready to work with all other countries in using the United Nations as the core platform to coordinate security in traditional and non-traditional areas, jointly respond to regional disputes and global issues, such as terrorism, climate change, cybersecurity and biosecurity and, by joining hands in cooperation, build our planet into a safer, better and more peaceful world.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.