

(Transcription)

Mohamed Ezzeldine Abdel-Moneim

Former Minister of Foreign Affairs/ Professor, Port-Said University

Egypt

I don't have a fully written paper, but some reflections on the issues to share with you, which we can later develop in the discussion.

I'll start with something. Please remember it. A woman died in her apartment in Quartier Latin in Paris on the 27th of January 2017. What is the importance of the death of this woman to what we are talking about? I will tell you later.

I will tell you two main things here. One is nuclear weapon free, and the world peace and just. I will start with how this world should be peaceful and just. As long as this world is not peaceful and just, the question of nuclear weapon free world could not be tackled properly. I think for this world to be tackled to be peaceful and just, we have to address the real causes, not the symptoms, the causes, not the symptoms if we really want to do something efficient.

This should start with the grassroots. As long as you start from the grassroots, then you can influence politicians, governments, parliamentarians, syndicates, everybody. I think that the essential thing is that we have to break the vicious circle of the sense of insecurity.

That's important. The vicious circle of the sense of insecurity. Because when you are insecure, you feel vulnerable. And when you feel vulnerable, you may be too aggressive. You may be even irrational. The essence is that you feel insecure. As long as people, communities, minorities, countries, regions feel insecure, then the problem of our moments will be there. But why people feel insecure? It's because some others think that they have a message to liberate humanity, messianic mission to make the world better, to act as the good and the others as the evil. And you can use to whatever, you can resort to whatever you want because you are good and the others are bad and use maximum violence.

What is the essence of war? I remember Clausewitz in his definition, his famous book "On War", the Greek. He defines war as an act of violence through which we want to impose our will on the adversary. Look at the very voice, act of violence. When you say act of violence, what do you use as a tool of this violence? Down from a piece of stone with which you break somebody's head up to a hydrogen bomb. It's all violence. But you do that because of the vicious circle of insecurity.

So we have to address this first. We have to go deep, deep into analyzing what makes people insecure because on the one hand there are those, because they are insecure, they justify themselves to the maximum of defense using whatever violence. And on the other hand, you have those who think they have a message. They are the good of the world and they are fighting the evil of the world and they allow themselves to whatever they can do. I think this is the thing which we have to address. It will take time, deep analysis, but maybe we can elaborate what tools we can resort to in addressing this exact problem.

Second thing, please draw my attention if I go beyond the time limit, but do that secretly, not openly. Okay. Why did I speak about the woman who died in Paris on the 27th of January? Because this woman's name, for those of you who can remember, Emmanuel Rivas. She's the French actress of the great movie of 1959, Hiroshima Mon Amour. She died alone in her apartment in Paris. But every time, and even before coming to Hiroshima, I remember Emmanuel Rivas.

The movie was an excellent documentary of the tragedy of Hiroshima. She was performing the role of Elle, and Japanese actor Eiji Okada was Lui in the movie. Same year, a few months after she died, after Emmanuel Rivas died, the document was adopted in New York, now from Paris to New York. This document was the famous Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Well, the actors who performed, even the actor with her, who performed this excellent movie, "Hiroshima Mon Amour," they didn't have, they didn't live enough to see an important achievement which happened in the same year, which is this great, great treaty. And why I'm saying great treaty? Because it's the first document, thoroughly negotiated, well written, very well written.

If I judge from the standpoint of diplomatic drafting how you produce a good text, this applies to this treaty. This does not apply to the NPT. The NPT is not well written at all. It has many loopholes. Of course, it's imbalanced, it's so and so and so. The question now is, I think one important point to discuss, is how these two treaties are going to exist, live side by side. Very important, why? Though the ideal treaty from the standpoint of a peace movement is the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, because it goes with the concept of abolishment of this movement, which we have here. But unfortunately, the states who ratified it until this day are even less than one quarter of those who ratified the NPT.

I tend to look at the NPT as a transitional treaty, because in the NPT there is a provision on nuclear disarmament. True, it did not come in the watertight formulation, which I hoped to see. True, it did not come in a very strong wording, but at least the objective is there. So the NPT is not an end in itself. The concept of non-proliferation, look at the word. It's a word in the negative, non-proliferation, you see. This concept is not an end in itself. It can never be an

end in itself. It's a means to an end, and the end is what? What is mentioned in the treaty prohibiting the nuclear weapons? So the ultimate is the abolition of all nuclear weapons. What is good in the treaty, the nuclear weapons treaty is that it is providing for a compact mechanism for getting rid of all the nuclear weapons existing in the surface of this planet.

There is a definite and clear mechanism. So the two treaties may be seen from one perspective as complementary, complementing each other from a different perspective, even contradicting. But we have to re-conciliate to the extent that we can between the two texts. We have to work to implement the idea that the NPT is transitional, that it has to work, it has to apply, it has to be applied, it has to be there, in order to lead us to the full implementation, the worldwide application, the universality, actually the treaty among the two, the treaty which deserves to be fully universal is the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. I think we have to contemplate together and think together what to do with it. Or how to achieve this purpose.

(Am I within 10 minutes or finish? Okay, I'll continue a few things.) Now one of the important things we discuss always here is the concept of nuclear weapons free zones. It's an important concept. But also I tend to look at nuclear weapon free zones as steps towards a world, global -- the whole globe should be nuclear free. We cannot live forever with this region being nuclear free and we have all of the other parts of the world that are full of nuclear weapons. These regions to be declared nuclear weapons free zones, these are steps towards a world free of nuclear weapons. That should be the idea.

Unfortunately, active diplomacy to create nuclear weapons free zones came after the NPT. The NPT was 1968. If you look at the Middle East, we started in 73 or 74, about 35 years ago. But the concept of nuclear weapons free zone inherited the weaknesses in the NPT.

It's not fully nuclear weapons free zones. Look at that. And these were taken from the NPT. Nuclear bases are there, even within nuclear weapons free zone. It's a fallacy. If you have an area which is declared as a nuclear weapon free zone, and then two or three countries have nuclear bases, it's not really a nuclear weapons free zone. Here there is a sort of double standard in the application. Also they tell you, take care, for example, if you look at a nuclear warship -- you say, nuclear aircraft carrier, take care. There are two things actually which are nuclear here. The propulsion of the carrier, the engine of the carrier, is in fact a nuclear reactor. Even outer space. You have some missiles with small nuclear reactors in the orbit. Imagine what things should go catastrophe this could mean. Also they tell you, for example, maybe you have limitations on a nuclear warship, that's a nuclear propulsion warship coming to a port, you may say, OK, that's dangerous, but they tell you, please don't talk about the nuclear warheads carried on the planes of an aircraft carrier -- this is total nonsense. Because

in this case actually neither the port nor the maritime passage, nor the land where you have nuclear warheads is really nuclear free zone? And this came actually from the very concept in Articles 1 and 2 of the NPT, because the NPT is drafted in such a manner that the nuclear powers, the nuclear weapon states can have their nuclear weapons anywhere without considering that it is a proliferation but in fact in terms of space and area, this is proliferation.

So I come back to the central idea here – that the NPT is important, that the NPT is one of the pillars of the international system, that's right, but to the extent that it is transiting us, taking us into the full implementation, to the full universality of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Thank you for your attention.