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Thank you, first of all, professor Jun, for the very kind introduction.

I would be remiss if I don't recognize Chancellor Yun, of Korea National Diplomatic Academy. I would also like to thank Ambassador of Gabon for being here with us. It is great to see so many of our old friends, not only our friends sitting here [in the panel] but also on the floor, and also many young faces of the future generation.

I must also thank three organizations: the Korea National Diplomatic Academy, the Korea Nuclear Policy Society, and the World Federation of United Nations Associations for co-hosting today's conference. Before I make my case, I have to do little bit of PR. In the corridor you will see 12 posters. These posters were selected from a world-wide competition, which our office has organized, because this year marks the 70th anniversary of the first-ever General Assembly resolution adopted by the United Nations, which is on abolishing nuclear weapons, atomic weapons at that time, and weapons adaptable to mass destruction. So this year we organized this poster competition around the world, and it attracted more than 5,000 entries and all those winners have done very professional work. I'm very proud of their creativity and also commitment to disarmament. So please look at those posters. Unfortunately those twelve winners do not include Korean compatriots. That was my only regret. But it shows that the Competition was conducted very fairly.

Today, I want to first talk briefly about the sustainable development agenda, which was adopted last year. I'm sure many of you must know what the MDGs, millennium development goals, mean, which was adopted in 2000. It was implemented until last year, for 15 years. Sustainable Development [Goals] was adopted as the successor to the MDGs which will then go on for fifteen years, until 2030, so we call it the 2030 sustainable development agenda. This Sustainable Development Agenda was a successor, but a very different successor, because the MDGs were focused on narrower goals: Poverty eradication, health and education. But Sustainable Development Agenda covers whole gamut of human rights: social, economic, environmental, and even political and peace and security for the first time. Unlike the MDGs, SDGs, the Sustainable Development Agenda, applies not only to developing countries but also developed countries. So the whole member states of the United Nations, 193 Member States, must implement the Sustainable Development Agenda. That includes Korea too.
And the Sustainable Development Agenda, for the first time, recognizes the crucial link between peace and development. So we often say, peace is not sustainable without development, but development is not attainable without peace. So peace and development must go hand-in-hand. Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Agenda, again for the first time, recognizes the crucial link between peace and development on the one hand, and disarmament on the other. Because without disarmament peace is very hard to achieve, and without disarmament development is also very hard to achieve. Disarmament is the link to both peace and development. So that is my starting point of today's theme: enhancing peace through disarmament.

Coming to the disarmament agenda, my job covers the biggest and most powerful and most inhumane weapons, which are nuclear weapons. So from very big and powerful and very inhumane [weapons] to a pistol. So all kinds of weapons in-between are the focus of disarmament work. And disarmament also applies not only to the physical space we are living in, but it also covers cyberspace and outer-space. All the celestial bodies, including the Moon, and also even on Earth, the Artic and the Antarctic. It means any space which can be misused or militarized are the focus areas of disarmament. So disarmament covers all kinds of weapons and also all kinds of spaces which affect human lives.

So I want to start first with nuclear weapons, because ever since it was first and lastly used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nuclear weapons, thank God, have never been used. Still, we have 15,000 nuclear warheads, and even one can cause unbearable suffering and consequences: human, environmental, and in all aspects affecting our lives. So we must move towards zero. The world has agreed 45 years ago through the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty that both nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear weapon states must work together to reach the destination of a world without nuclear weapons. So every country agrees on this, but we still have deep division about how to get there. One group argues that it must be done step by step, realistically, and pragmatically. The other group, most of the non-nuclear weapons States argue that we must move fast. So this group now argues that we need a nuclear weapons prohibition treaty, before we eliminate all nuclear weapons. But those who have nuclear weapons do not like to join the prohibition treaty. So the Secretary General is calling to both groups that “you have to work together to narrow down the differences, to move together because no matter how lofty the objective, and legal norms set, if none of the nuclear states join in, real movement towards elimination will not happen”. But also, nuclear weapon
states must hear the united call from non-nuclear state that the movement toward zero nuclear weapons must continue. But frustration is rising, because strategic arms control negotiations between the two largest possessors have seemingly stalled. There's no new negotiations going on, no new START treaty going beyond 2018, so now it is incumbent on both two biggest nuclear possessors to show the world that they are serious about strategic arms control. So we do not know how long it will take, but we cannot seize those efforts to push those who have nuclear weapons to continue toward a world free of nuclear weapons.

My second point is on the other weapons of mass destruction: Chemical, Biological and Radiological. We call it CBRN. Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear. In this century, the taboo against chemical weapons use has been broken. It is being used in the Middle East, and the UN, together with the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons are actively investigating who used those weapons, so that those perpetrators be held accountable, and the taboo be restored. But still, unfortunately even today, we have seen allegations of chemical weapons and toxic chemicals being used, such as Chlorine. Chlorine is not a prohibited chemical material, but it is prohibited if it is used in massive amount against human body as weapons. So Chlorine is also prohibited, and allegations of such use still continue. So we remain seriously concerned. And the fact that the taboo against chemical weapons has been broken is a reminder to us that while nobody wants to see it happen the taboo against biological weapons may also be broken. If this taboo is broken, the consequences will be about five to ten times higher than chemical weapons. We have seen Ebola and MERS crisis, even in this country, and it was not man-made, but if we think if biological agent or pathogen can be misused for malicious purposes, then the consequences will be very serious. On the biological side, we have the Biological Weapons Convention, and its Review Conference is going on, but still we have serious institutional gap in how to respond to biological attack. The UN has been doing our best to enhance our prevention and preparedness in case such an eventuality was to happen, so that the international community can at least be prepared before it is too late. But again, the challenge, or the sad reality is that until the world sees a real attack happening, investments are not forthcoming. But we in the disarmament community, with civil society like Tarek, have been doing our best to remind Member States that there is a job to be done.

Third point I want to bring is emerging technologies. I say cyber, space technology is bringing lots of benefits to human rights, but also it increases the likelihood of being misused
by terrorists or other malicious non-state actors. And if it is misused, for example to cause manmade accidents at the nuclear power plant by cyber-hacking, and even satellites can be hacked, then it will cause consequences which may be comparable to the use of WMD. So we say that it could be called a weapon of mass destruction, another WMD. New technologies like drones: aerial or ground, 3-d printing and artificial intelligence also can be misused. If drones are used for chemical or biological attack in urban settings, then the consequences will be beyond imagination. One exercise shows that if Caesium, which is radiological material, is used by terrorists using drones in urban setting, the radius of 2-3 kms would be seriously affected. But if it is Sarine, which is chemical, then it will be more than twice larger area. If it is anthrax, biological agent, then it would be five to ten times wider. And the casualties will be close to 80%. So we must do a better job to stay ahead of the technological curve. Because even technology like artificial intelligence, we are discussing how we can ensure minimum human control before artificial intelligence is used to produce killer robots, like terminators. If human beings lose control over those killer robots, what will happen? Also you may intend to create killer robots to kill your enemy, but if your enemy hacks the artificial intelligence of my killer robot, then my killer robot will kill me. So all these supposedly positive technologies can be misused for malicious purposes and unless we guard against it now, before it becomes massively commercialized, then it may be too late. So we are trying to identify what kind of international law, normative standards, control mechanisms, regulations, export controls, should be applied. So it is not an easy issue, because we still do not know how fast technology will evolve. So we are working with scientific communities and industry as well.

My fourth point, I feel like I'm giving too much of a depressing picture, but is conventional weapons, such as small arms and light weapons, which are the number one killer in countries. One study shows that the world has so many weapons, small arms, guns, light weapons, heavy weapons circulating and also it is used in conflicts and also in violence. The current homicide, murder ratio out of a hundred thousand is around seven. But if we can reduce it by half, the benefit is about two-trillion dollars. By the way, two trillion dollars will be the amount we need to finance the whole sustainable development. So we must do better to stem the flow of small arms and light weapons. So these are the challenges we have in dealing with addressing disarmament challenges, and as I said, this year marks the 70th anniversary of the first-ever general assembly resolution and also this year, marks the 30th year of the Reykjavik summit between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan, for the
intermediate range nuclear forces agreement. At the time, it was still at the height of the cold war, and we often heard the arguments that unless we have the right global security environment we cannot have disarmament or arms control. But what happened in Reykjavik proved that this argument is wrong. What happened was that arms control agreement was first achieved, and those agreements and its implementation led to confidence building between the two superpowers, and led ultimately to the beginning of the end of the cold war. So we always argue that if you wait until the right security environment to be in place for arms control or disarmament, it will never happen. We are reminding world leaders that you have to be bold in pursuing arms control and disarmament, as a way to improve the security environment. And as the generation of the future, I would like to ask all of you to raise your voices, to remind world leaders now to do more about disarmament and arms control. The Secretary General always believed that disarmament and arms control is not achievable without the participation of every single global citizen. And this world, my generation has limited years to live, but your generation has so many years to live. So you have every right to raise your voices. And I count on all of you, on your very active engagement for this cause.

Thank you so much.