



## **SECURITY WITHOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS OR WAR: WORLD MANIFESTO FOR THE XXI CENTURY**

**Deputy Mrs.  
DENISE PASCAL ALLENDE (CHILE)  
President of the Committee on Middle East of the Inter  
Parliamentary Union (IPU)**

Dear friends,

It is undoubtedly we are living difficult times, it may be derived from great economic crisis, the relative inefficiency of our models of political representation or the mere exhaustion of ways to understand the world.

Sectarian violence and terrorism, which are today using the religion as a tool to get their anti democratic aims, have had a disruptive effect on international peace and security by generating answers that challenge the global standards on human rights and international humanitarian law and become a part of the problem instead of becoming a real solution.

The world has been whipped by a series of internal conflicts since the end of the Cold War and today we have to add the reborn of distrust and stress amongst the super powers and the regional great powers. Matters that are encouraging a weapon race similar to the one we lived more than a century ago before the First World War.

In such scenario, nuclear weapons reappear as a threat to global security not only as a revalidation of the infamous "Nuclear Deterrence" but also as a hypothesis of being used with terrorist purposes; a possibility so serious and real that has caused the celebration of four Nuclear Security Summits where my country Chile and Kazakhstan have actively participated.



The most worrying subject to the vast majority of the United Nations State Members is the prevailing position nuclear weapons continue having inside the great powers security doctrines.

Under the leadership of Austria and Mexico, a constantly growing group of States who have a clear peaceful call have undertaken a process that highlights the dramatic humanitarian consequences of the potential use of nuclear weapons, even by accident. The “humanitarian approach” to the nuclear disarmament also stresses the fact that atomic weapons are completely incompatible with the core principles of the Humanitarian International Law, specially with the principle of distinction (between civilian population and combatants) and proportionality.

The political and multilateral momentum created by the humanitarian approach has resulted into the launching of an open negotiating process residing in the General Assembly and ruled by its procedure regulations which as of the beginning of the next year will be devoted to discuss a legally binding tool to ideally outlaw all nuclear weapons in a way similar to the one previously accomplished in regard to chemical and biological weapons.

The hope that we, the ones that love peace, have, is to transmit these processes to the global public opinion – hyper connected and more and more empowered – so from the base of our society they can put pressure on their governments to set a course of action that finally results in a world free of nuclear weapons.

This objective which was embraced in a moment by leaders as Mikhail Gorbachev and Barak Obama will need the solid support of Parliaments that have to energetically take the ideal to represent the most noble and highest objectives to our peoples.



It is clear that nuclear weapons – despite of what some people say that nuclear deterrence (or better said, the balance of terror) maintained peace during the Cold War, generate no security but threaten it. Nuclear Weapons continuously discriminate between Nuclear Weapons States and Non Nuclear Weapons States – as acknowledged by the Treaty of Non Proliferation – which today is something absolutely unacceptable. That is why the Member States of the Community of Latin America and the Caribbean States (CELAC) have committed with the open negotiations that soon will be held by the General Assembly.

It is obvious that any restrictions to the development of nuclear energy by the Non Nuclear Weapons States would be arbitrary if nuclear weapons were a legitimate option. The only way to restore balance y above all the legitimacy of a security world order is to decisively move towards the eradication of nuclear arsenals. Our humanitarian consciousness only allows the peaceful use of nuclear energy as it is directly acknowledged in Article IV of the Treaty on Non Proliferation.

Given the complexity of the growing interactions observed in the Asia Pacific which overlaps with old conflicts known by everybody, the fact that four countries, who are not signatories of the Treaty on Non Proliferation, are in possession of nuclear weapons constitutes an additional reason for severe concern. As well as the attempt to justify certain policies related to nuclear matters and punish others. There are no “good” or “bad” proliferation agents. All nuclear proliferation is negative and the sole way of preventing it is to create as soon as possible a legal by-law that definitively banishes all atomic weapons.

I am convinced that the role of the Parliaments of the World in regard to this matter must be that of becoming agents for the global nuclear disarmament, whether such arms have been produced by States or by actors not related to the States.



From this point of view, I would like to stand out the active role played by the countries of the De-Alerting Group, amongst them Chile, when proposing concrete measures towards the nuclear disarmament, like the Resolution 70/48 of the United Nations General Assembly which sets forth that all the States “having nuclear weapons” to take concrete provisional measures, while awaiting all their arsenals of nuclear weapons are completely eliminated, to reduce the risk of having nuclear detonations, including the operational status of the nuclear weapons and the storing of the deployed nuclear weapons to reduce the function these weapons have when it comes to military doctrines, and rapidly reduce all types of nuclear weapons.

Reducing the operational status means the withdrawal of such condition to around 1,900 nuclear weapons that are nowadays in a state of maximum alert – that is, in condition to be launched in few minutes – such circumstance would drastically reduce the possibility of any launching due to a mistake or to a malicious or technological error.

Lastly, as President of the Committee on the Middle East, I want to recall that when the indefinite extension of the Treaty on Non Proliferation was passed in 1995, the NPT Depositary States: The United States, the United Kingdom and the current Russian Federation introduced during the Conference of the States Parties a Resolution that calls for the establishment of a Free Zone of Nuclear and Mass Destruction Weapons in the Middle East. This Resolution is without any doubts the political condition that declares this Treaty as permanent. Treaty that is traditionally described as the “*cornerstone of International Security*”.

Twenty-five years later, in 2010, the VIII Review Conference to the Treaty of Non Proliferation passed an Action Plan with detailed provisions to celebrate – under the United Nations endorsement – a Conference aimed at stablishing such zone.



Several circumstances not only prevented that Conference from being held but they also led the IX Review Conference, which was celebrated in New York last year, to a complete failure and putting the TNP political legitimacy in question. It is in this area as well as in other scenarios of International Security that the Middle East is still a critical region whose peace and prosperity is not only of interest to its own inhabitants but to the whole world.

Parliaments have the critical and serious responsibility of contributing from the most diverse angles to reach peace in the Middle East making sure that the most violent manifestations of the Arab – Israeli conflict do not find a material answer in our own countries.

Any progress is welcomed and that is why I adhere to those who have congratulated the agreement between Iran and the so called “E3 + 3”<sup>i</sup>. Such agreement has allowed not only the return of the International Atomic Energy Agency to Iran but also the full reestablishment of the international status of this great regional power greatly contributing to the global stability. I sincerely hope this progress is followed by other achievements, specially concerning the materialization of the Free Zone of Nuclear and Mass Destruction Weapons.

Nuclear weapons are a problem by themselves. Our Parliaments have to promote an ethic proposal during their discussions and dialogues inside their own States and also in the very same parliamentary diplomacy instances, a proposal able to call the States to decisively commit in reaching a world free of nuclear weapons. It is our commitment and at the same time it is a challenge all democrats can not elude.

Thank you

[1] That year the United Nations General Assembly created the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which acted as the cooperation agency for nuclear energy matters aimed at providing all those countries that wish to undertake peaceful nuclear projects with fissile materials in the United Nations.

[2] Resolution 1.540 of the United Nations Security Council. URL: [http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=S/RES/1540%20\(2004\)](http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=S/RES/1540%20(2004)).

[3] Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea. The latter renounced the Treaty in 2003.



[4] Resolution 70/48 of the United Nations General Assembly. URL:  
<https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N15/411/44/PDF/N1541144.pdf?OpenElement>

---

North Korea, Iran

<sup>i</sup> Three European: Germany, France and the United Kingdom, plus China, the United States and the Russian Federation.