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Mr. Chairman,

Pakistan delegation aligns itself with the NAM statement made by Indonesia.

The Final document of SSOD-I contains more than 30 paragraphs that relate to the dangers, and urgency of preventing arms race in its various aspects. Paragraph 80 of this document specifically recommended undertaking appropriate international negotiations on prevention of an arms race in outer space.

It has been three decades since the CD began consideration of this issue. And the General Assembly has recognized, for over two decades, that prevention of an arms race in outer space would avert a grave danger for international peace and security.

Mr. Chairman,

Space is no longer an exclusive preserve of a few developed States. Today developing countries are tapping into space technology in diverse areas ranging from meteorology and disaster management to economy and telecommunications. Their reliance on space technology will only grow further in the years to come.

If history is any guide, monopolies of the few cannot last for too long. It is therefore an urgent imperative for the international community to prevent the possibility of weaponizing outer space, now. Further delay will be counter-productive. Let us avoid the mistakes made in the case of chemical weapons which witnessed decades of production before the CWC was concluded.

The development and deployment of ABM systems and their integration into space assets has added a worrying dimension to the issues relating to outer space. An arms race in and weaponization of outer space would not only endanger the peaceful uses of outer space but also aggravate the intensity of conflicts on earth, with potentially disastrous consequences for international peace and security.

Mr. Chairman,

The rapid growth and change in space technologies has widened gaps in the existing international regime pertaining to Outer Space, including the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 and the Moon Treaty of 1984. These gaps need to be filled by a new legal instrument.

It is against this backdrop that Pakistan has consistently opposed weaponisation of outer space and called for negotiations in the CD on this contemporary issue of interest and concern.

There is a considerable body of existing knowledge on PAROS. Much work has already been done in the CD by the Ad-Hoc Committees on this subject from 1985 to 1992. Moreover, the draft text, tabled jointly by Russian Federation and China in 2008, commonly known as PPWT, also provides a useful basis to commence negotiations. We, therefore, see no impediment in starting negotiations on PAROS in the CD.

Mr. Chairman,

Despite the growing dangers of weaponization in outer space and its attendant repercussions for international peace and security, some states continue to oppose commencement of negotiations
on this issue in the CD. There can be no other explanation for such opposition except that these States seek to protect their monopoly on this technology and maintain their “full spectrum dominance”.

In the past four years, there has been a growing lament expressed over the CD’s deadlock. Some States have found it convenient to attribute this stalemate to one of the four core issues on the CD’s agenda. Facts speak for themselves. And one inconvenient fact is that the CD, despite overwhelming support for negotiating a legal instrument on PAROS, has been prevented by a handful States from doing so.

The international community must therefore ask for a clear expression of the underlying reasons that oblige these States to oppose negotiations on PAROS. We have not heard a convincing case from these States as to how negotiations on PAROS would negatively affect their security interests. In any case, these states should acknowledge their responsibility in perpetuating the CD’s deadlock.

Mr. Chairman,

Pakistan views with interest various initiatives that have been put forward in the recent past regarding transparency and confidence building measures for activities in outer space. While such proposals can be useful interim steps, they cannot and should not obviate the quest for a legally binding treaty on PAROS in the CD.

At the same time, we call for a comprehensive, universal and non-discriminatory agreement that addresses concerns arising from development, deployment and proliferation of ABM systems, which are inheriting destabilizing and of dubious effectiveness.

Similarly, we note that efforts are underway to conclude a Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities. We believe that such initiatives should be pursued in an inclusive, universal and participatory manner, taking into account the security interests of all States.

We take note of the report and recommendations of the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures in Outer Space. We agree that transparency and CBMs should be implemented to the greatest extent practicable and in a manner that is consistent with States’ national interests.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.