

Cluster 6: Final provisions

UN Conference to Negotiate a Legally Binding Instrument to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons, Leading Towards Their Total Elimination

Delivered by Sharon Dolev, 21 June 2017

Madam President,

We support the draft provisions on signature, ratification and entry into force, as well as the provision disallowing reservations.

We believe that any proposals to amend the treaty should be circulated to states parties well in advance of a decision on their adoption. And any amendment must, of course, be fully compatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

We welcome the inclusion in the draft of an obligation on states parties to encourage others to accede to the treaty, with the ultimate goal of universality. In our view, the treaty should also require states parties to promote its norms and provisions, including by disseminating information on its content and purpose to elected representatives, relevant national bodies and public servants, its military, and members of the public.

This treaty will build on, complement and reinforce various existing legal instruments, including those preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and those prohibiting other indiscriminate, inhumane weapons. A number of these instruments are rightly recognized in the draft preamble. We believe that draft Article 19 places undue emphasis on one treaty over the others.

Finally, we see no possible justification for a state party ever to withdraw from this treaty, given the grave threat that nuclear weapons pose to humanity. The treaty should specifically state that no withdrawal is possible.

We note that a number of other important treaties – including, no less, the Charter of the United Nations – do not allow for withdrawal.

Our message must be clear: No “extraordinary events” can ever justify the acquisition or use of nuclear weapons. The so-called “supreme interests” of a state can never be served by weapons of mass destruction.

Thank you.