



Security Council

Seventy-eighth year

9256th meeting

Wednesday, 8 February 2023, 10 a.m.

New York

Provisional

President: Mrs. Frazier (Malta)

Members:

Albania	Mr. Hoxha
Brazil	Mr. Costa Filho
China	Mr. Dai Bing
Ecuador	Mr. Pérez Loose
France	Mr. De Rivière
Gabon	Ms. Koumby Missambo
Ghana	Ms. Oppong-Ntiri
Japan	Mr. Ishikane
Mozambique	Mr. Fernandes
Russian Federation	Mr. Nebenzia/Mr. Polyanskiy
Switzerland	Mrs. Baeriswyl
United Arab Emirates	Ms. Shaheen
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . .	Dame Barbara Woodward
United States of America	Mr. Mills

Agenda

Threats to international peace and security

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

23-03878 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Threats to international peace and security

The President: In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representative of Ukraine to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the following briefers to participate in this meeting: Mrs. Izumi Nakamitsu, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs; and Mr. Roger Waters, civil peace activist.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I give the floor to Mrs. Nakamitsu.

Mrs. Nakamitsu: We are approaching a tragic anniversary. Almost one year has passed since the military offensive in Ukraine by the Russian Federation on 24 February 2022, inflicting untold suffering on the Ukrainian people and creating ripple effects across the globe.

According to information on weapons flows obtained through publicly available media sources, over the past months a number of Governments have announced that they were providing military assistance to Ukraine for its defence needs. That assistance has included the transfer of heavy conventional armaments and munitions, including infantry fighting vehicles, air defence capabilities, large-calibre artillery systems, uncrewed combat aerial vehicles and missile systems, as well as small arms and light weapons. Most recently, States have announced the transfer of progressively heavier modern systems, such as main battle tanks.

There have also been reports of States transferring weapons, such as combat drones, to the Russian armed forces for use in Ukraine. Other reports have indicated the transfer of major conventional arms, including artillery rocket systems, to a private military security company involved in the conflict.

The large-scale influx of weapons into any situation of armed conflict amplifies concerns regarding the escalation of the conflict and risks of diversion. Measures to counter the potential diversion of weapons and ammunition will be key to post-conflict

recovery and regional security and stability, as well as to conflict prevention efforts in other regions. In accordance with international norms, any transfers of arms and ammunition should involve pre-transfer risk assessments and post-shipment controls such as on-site inspection and end-user verifications. Preventing diversion also requires cooperation and information exchange between importing, transit and exporting States and appropriate accounting and safeguarding of arms and ammunition, as well as customs and border-control measures. Transparency in armaments is a crucial confidence-building measure that can serve to reduce tensions and ambiguities between Member States. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and the Arms Trade Treaty remain key instruments in that regard. I call on Member States to participate in those transparency mechanisms, because predictable and transparent State behaviour can build mutual confidence and help prevent conflict.

I also want to reiterate the responsibility of all the parties to the armed conflict to protect civilians and civilian infrastructure. Since the beginning of the current military offensive, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights has recorded 18,657 civilian casualties, a total that includes 7,110 killed and 11,547 injured. The actual figures are likely considerably higher. Most of the civilian deaths and injuries are caused by explosive weapons with wide-area effects, including heavy artillery, multiple-launch rocket systems and missiles.

In addition to the thousands of civilians killed and injured, we are witnessing widespread effects on critical civilian infrastructure and services with direct humanitarian consequences for civilians. Aside from the homes, schools, roads and bridges that have been destroyed, hospitals and health facilities have also been attacked. The disruption of water, gas, heating and electricity created by Russia's attacks on energy infrastructure is causing the humanitarian crisis in Ukraine to reach even more dire dimensions. Those attacks constitute an unacceptable escalation of the war, and civilians are paying the highest price.

Humanitarian principles must be upheld. Any attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure are unacceptable. All feasible measures must be taken to avoid and at the very least minimize civilian casualties and damage to civilian infrastructure. The Secretary-General has unambiguously urged the parties to the conflict to refrain from the use of explosive weapons

in populated areas due to the high likelihood of indiscriminate harm. In November of last year, more than 80 States adopted the Political Declaration on Strengthening the Protection of Civilians from the Humanitarian Consequences Arising from the Use of Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas. It marked a milestone in our efforts to better protect civilians from the consequences of armed conflict. I therefore reiterate my call on Member States to implement it. Attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure must stop.

With the one-year anniversary of the invasion of Ukraine looming ahead, I want to renew the call of the United Nations for peace. The past 12 months have seen immense loss and devastation. The Secretary-General warned on Monday that the prospects for peace keep diminishing (see A/77/PV.58). Regrettably, at the moment the prospects for a negotiated settlement of the conflict would seem to be slim as long as the current military logic continues to prevail. The further escalation and prolongation of the conflict will only bring more intolerable suffering. The transfer of military equipment in support of Ukraine must not derail the aspiration for peace. I reiterate the General Assembly's call to support the de-escalation of the situation and a peaceful resolution of the conflict, with respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders and in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations stands ready to support all genuine efforts to that end.

The President: I thank Mrs. Nakamitsu for her briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Waters.

Mr. Waters: I feel profoundly honoured to be afforded this singular opportunity to brief the Council today. With members' forbearance, I shall endeavour to express what I believe to be the feelings of countless of our brothers and sisters all over the world, both here in New York and across the seas. I shall invite them into this Chamber to have their say.

We are here to consider the possibilities for peace in war-torn Ukraine, especially in the light of the increasing volume of weapons arriving in that unhappy country, as has already been mentioned. Every morning when I sit down at my laptop, I think of our brothers and sisters in Ukraine and elsewhere who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in dire and often deadly circumstances. Over there, in Ukraine, they may be

soldiers facing another deadly day at the front. They may be mothers or fathers, facing the awful question of "How can I feed my child today?" They may be civilians, knowing that today the lights will surely go out, as they always do in war zones; that there is no fresh water, no fuel for the stove, no blankets — just barbed wire and watchtowers and walls and enmity.

Or they might be over here, in a big, rich city like New York. Here, our brothers and sisters can still find themselves in dire straits. Somehow, however hard they may have worked all their lives, they may have lost their footing on the slippery, tilting deck of the neoliberal capitalist ship we call life in the city, falling overboard to end up drowning. Maybe they got sick, maybe they took out a student loan, maybe they missed a payment — the margins are slim. Who knows? But now they live on the street in a pile of cardboard, maybe even within sight of United Nations Headquarters. In any case, wherever they are in the world, war zone or not, together they make up a voiceless majority, and today I shall endeavour to speak for them.

We the peoples wish to live. We wish to live in peace and in conditions of parity that give us a real opportunity to look after ourselves and our loved ones. We are hard workers, and we are ready to work hard. All we need is a fair crack of the whip. Maybe that is an unfortunate choice of idiom, after 500 years of imperialism, colonialism and slavery.

I ask the Council to please help us. In order to help us, members may have to consider our predicament and, in doing so, take their eye off the ball for a moment. They may have to put their own goals momentarily to one side. What are their goals, by the way? Here I would direct my inquiries more to the five permanent members of the Council. What are their goals? What is the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow? Is it bigger profits for war industries, more power globally, a bigger share of the global cake? Is Mother Earth a cake to be gobbled up? Does not a bigger share of the cake mean less for everyone else?

What if today, in this place of safety, we were to look in another direction, to look at our capacity for empathy, for instance, and to put ourselves in others' shoes, such as — right now, for instance — the shoes of that chap on the other side of the Chamber, or even the shoes of the voiceless majority, if they have any shoes, that is? The voiceless majority is concerned that your wars — yes, your wars, for these perpetual wars are not

of our choosing — will destroy the planet that is our home. Along with every other living thing, we would then be sacrificed on the altar of two things — profits from the war to line the pockets of the very, very few and the hegemonic march of some empire or other towards unipolar world domination. Please reassure us that that is not your vision, for there is no good outcome down that road. That road leads only to disaster. Everyone on that road has a red button in their briefcase. And the further we go down that road, the closer the itchy fingers get to that red button, and the closer we all get to Armageddon. Look across the Chamber. At this level, we are all wearing the same shoes.

Let me get back to Ukraine. The invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation was illegal. I condemn it in the strongest possible terms. However, the Russian invasion of Ukraine was not unprovoked, so I also condemn the provocateurs in the strongest possible terms. I now get that out of the way.

When I wrote this speech yesterday, I included an observation that the power of veto in the Council lies only in the hands of its permanent members, and that I was concerned that this was undemocratic and rendered the Council somewhat toothless. This morning, however, I had a revelation upon waking. Maybe toothless, in some ways, is a good thing. If this is a toothless Chamber, I can open my big mouth on behalf of the voiceless without fear of getting my head bitten off. How cool is that?

I read in the paper this morning some anonymous diplomat quoted as saying: “Roger Waters to address the Security Council — what next, Mr. Bean?” For those who do not know, Mr. Bean is an ineffectual character in an English comedy show on television. So it is a penny to a pound — the anonymous diplomat is an Englishman.

I think it is time to introduce my mother — Mary Duncan Waters. She was a big influence on me. She was a schoolteacher. I say was because she has been dead for 15 years. My father, Eric Fletcher Waters, was a big influence on me too. He too is dead. He was killed on 18 February 1944, near Aprilia, near the Anzio bridgehead in Italy. I was only five months old. So I know something about war and loss. Anyway, back to my mum. When I was about 13, I was struggling with some knotty adolescent problem or other, trying to decide what to do. It does not matter what it was. I

cannot remember anyway, but my mum sat me down and said:

“Now listen, you are going to be faced with many knotty problems during your life, Roger, and when you are, here is my advice — read, read, read. Find out everything you can about whatever it is. Look at it from all sides and all angles. Listen to all opinions, especially ones you do not agree with. Research it thoroughly. When you have done that, then you will have done all the heavy lifting and the next bit is easy.”

“Is it? OK, mum, well, what is the easy bit?” I asked. “The easy bit is you just do the right thing,” she responded.

Speaking of doing the right thing brings me to human rights. We the people want universal human rights for all our brothers and sisters all over the world, irrespective of their ethnicity, religion or nationality. To be clear, that would include, but not be limited to the right to life and property under the law. That would apply, for instance, to Ukrainians and Palestinians. Let that sink in. Obviously, that would apply to the rest of us as well.

One of the problems with wars is that in a war zone — or anywhere where people live under military occupation — there is no recourse to the law; there are no human rights. Today our topic is the possibility of peace in the Ukraine, with special reference to the arming of the Kyiv regime by third parties. I am running out of time. So what do the voiceless millions have to say? They thank the Council for hearing us today. We are many who do not share in the profits of the war industry. We do not willingly raise our sons and daughters to provide fodder for your cannons. In our opinion, the only sensible course of action today is to call for an immediate ceasefire in Ukraine — no ifs, ands or buts. Not one more Ukrainian or Russian life is to be spent, not one; they are all precious in our eyes.

The time has come to speak truth to power. I recall the story of the emperor’s new clothes. Well, the leaders of the Council members’ respective empires stand — to one degree or another — naked before us. We have a message for them. It is a message from all the refugees in all the camps, a message from all the slums and favelas, a message from all the homeless on all the cold streets, from all the earthquakes and floods on Earth. It is also a message from all the people not quite starving but wondering how on Earth to make the pittance they

earn meet the cost of a roof over their head and food for their families.

My mother country, England, is — thank God — an empire no more. But in that country there is now a new catch phrase — eat or heat. One cannot do both. It is a cry echoing round the whole of Europe. Apparently, the only thing the Powers that be think we can all afford is perpetual war. How crazy is that?

So, from the 4 billion or so brothers and sisters in this voiceless majority, who, together with the millions in the international anti-war movement, represent a huge constituency, we say: enough is enough. We demand change.

I call out to President Biden, President Putin, President Zelenskyy, the United States of America, NATO, Russia and the European Union, one and all: please change course now and agree to a ceasefire in Ukraine today. That, of course, will be only the starting point, but everything extends from that starting point. Imagine the collective global sigh of relief, the outpouring of joy, the international joining of voices in harmony, singing an anthem to peace, John Lennon pumping the air with his fist from the grave, saying: we have finally been heard in the corridors of power. The bullies in the schoolyard have agreed to stop playing nuclear chicken. We are not all going to die in a nuclear holocaust, after all — at least not today. The Powers that be have been persuaded to drop the arms race and perpetual war as their accepted *modus operandum*. We can stop squandering all our precious resources on war. We can feed our children. We can keep them warm. We may even learn to cooperate with all our brothers and sisters, and even save our beautiful planet home from destruction. Would that not be nice?

The President: I thank Mr. Waters for his briefing.

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements.

Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I think that it would not be an exaggeration to say that, since our most recent meeting on the topic of deliveries of Western weapons to Ukraine in December (see S/PV.9216), the demand for a peaceful solution to the Ukrainian crisis among States Members of the United Nations, and, indeed, the international community in general, has significantly increased, although that is not evident in the Chamber today. For some reason, the countries of the European Union,

which usually do not miss an opportunity to shine on their domestic television screens, did not request to participate in this meeting. Apparently, the explanation for that is that they are not at all interested in the pursuit of peace.

We just heard a poignant analysis of what is happening from Roger Waters, one of the most prominent activists of the modern anti-war movement. Mr. Waters has consistently spoken out against wars and violence for several decades. That theme permeates his world-famous songs. The fact that he wanted to speak to us testifies to the extreme concern of the international creative intelligentsia and people in general about where our world is heading.

In our view, Mr. Waters and his colleagues have every reason to be concerned. It is not even a matter of politicians, such as German Minister for Foreign Affairs Annalena Baerbock, admitting that NATO is waging a proxy war with Russia. Indeed, it is. It is not about the new calls by a number of Russophobic politicians to inflict a strategic defeat on Russia, of which, as we all understand, Ukraine itself is not capable. The problem is that the leverage that could influence the search for a peaceful solution to the conflict concerning Ukraine has ended up in the hands of Western arms companies and corporations. As the Council well understands, they are the last to be interested in peace.

The invitation, which was leaked to the Internet, from the Embassy of Ukraine in the United States of America to a reception in December 2022 marking the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Armed Forces of Ukraine featured the logos of four American defence industry companies sponsoring the reception: Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, Pratt & Whitney and Lockheed Martin.

How does the State of Ukraine owe so much to such private arms companies? The answer is, first, artillery ammunition; secondly, the Stinger man-portable air defence system; and, thirdly, the infamous HIMARS. Thanks to a continuous supply chain and new orders, the shares of those corporations increased by more than 20 per cent in the last three months of 2022 alone.

In addition, American businessmen have a veritable weapons testing ground, where, at the cost of the lives of Russians and Ukrainians, new types of weapons are tested, modified and improved. How can arms manufacturers refuse such opportunities and such profits?

Moreover, the billions of dollars allocated by the United States to Ukraine do not even leave the United States, but are sent directly to contractors from military companies. Lawyer and politician Robert Kennedy — the nephew of the former head of the White House, John F. Kennedy — recently said that. The situation is more or less the same for other major arms suppliers — in other words, Western countries have found a pretext for a significant increase in their defence budgets and the revenues of their own defence companies. As a result, Ukraine generally receives outdated weapons, which the Russian army pulverizes, while the armies of NATO countries are modernized, and Western defence enterprises make huge profits, lulling taxpayers with the need to help Ukraine. Poland and Czechia are becoming its military repair centres, and, according to *The Wall Street Journal*, they are also making huge profits from that.

The former neutral States are not far behind. In that way, 2022 became one of the most profitable years for the Swiss defence industry. In the first half of that year alone, exports reached 517 million Swiss francs. In order not to miss out on such profits, but to boost them, the Parliament of that country is considering an initiative to allow third countries to re-export Swiss-made weapons five years after their purchase.

In that pursuit of profit, the modern Swiss clearly do not lag behind their predecessors of 80 years ago, when Swiss anti-aircraft systems and Oerlikon cannons armed the air defence and air forces of the Third Reich and militaristic Japan, and provided them with a continuous supply of ammunition. Such is pragmatic neutrality.

In short, a business scheme has taken shape, in which Ukraine plays the role of a private military company. The task of our former Western partners is to ensure that that continues in that way for as long as possible, regardless of the losses of the Armed Forces of Ukraine.

I will leave out the moral aspect of that story. Unfortunately, we know that the countries of the collective West have long since lost their morality and conscience. What is there to talk about if the current Kyiv regime is the handiwork of a number of Western countries, implemented since at least 2014, for specific geopolitical purposes to weaken and undermine Russia?

I also do not want anyone to reduce our statement today solely to a call to stop the flow of Western

weapons before it is too late. Although that is important, above all for Ukraine itself, we are well aware that, until the Kyiv regime goes completely bankrupt on the battlefield, that flow will not dry up. While we have already destroyed more than 7,000 tanks, owned by, or supplied to, Ukraine, since the beginning of the special military operation a year ago, 100, 200 or 300 new tanks will not make a difference, as they say.

I would like to once again note that the West is directly involved in the Ukrainian conflict, not only by providing weapons and intelligence, but also by sending mercenaries and military personnel, without whom Kyiv simply cannot operate some Western weapons. In a number of the most Russophobic capitals, which had lost their sense of reality long before our special military operation, they even call for NATO troops to be deployed there to save Ukraine or for the use of NATO border military infrastructure for operations against our country and its allies.

Today I will not go into detail regarding the proliferation of resold Ukrainian weapons around the world. We have already discussed that at length. Now we see attempts to sweep those stories under the carpet so as not to alarm the public in Western States. But that does not mean that the problem has been resolved. On the contrary, it is only growing and becoming increasingly ugly. Suffice it to recall the President of Nigeria's admission that weapons from Ukraine have begun to fall into the hands of terrorist groups in the Sahel on a regular basis.

I will just mention the responsibility of the countries supplying long-range artillery and missile systems for the deaths of the civilians of Donbas, living in places which the gunners of the Armed Forces of Ukraine could not previously reach. All those facts are recorded by us, and all those involved will not escape punishment for those crimes. I would also like to mention the overall responsibility of the Western backers of the Kyiv regime for the inhumane methods of warfare practised by their wards and the flagrant violations of international humanitarian law, ranging from torturing prisoners of war to deploying air defence systems in residential areas.

Just the other day, for example, footage of the use of chemical warfare agents by the Armed Forces of Ukraine was disseminated on the Ukrainian news, complete with blustering commentary. Our relevant authorities are currently reviewing that report. While, as recently

as yesterday (see S/PV.9255) in this Chamber, our former Western partners beat their chests and declared that they would not allow the use of chemical weapons by anyone, we have no doubt that they will ignore that most recent war crime of the Zelenskyy regime. Those are the double standards of today's West.

Our Western colleagues will now begin to argue that, according to them, they have no other choice but to help Ukraine defend itself. They claim that, otherwise, the country will allegedly be threatened with destruction and de-Ukrainization, although we have never set ourselves such goals. I hope that, given the recent admissions by Mrs. Merkel, Mr. Hollande, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Poroshenko saying that Western countries, under the guise of the Minsk agreements, have been arming Ukraine for eight years and preparing it for war with Russia, such assertions will not mislead anyone.

We will make sure that never again in the future will there be a threat from Ukrainian territory to Russia or its allies or to Russian culture or the Russian language. And never again will there be the glorification of Hitler's accomplices, who murdered hundreds of thousands of Jews, Russians, Poles and Ukrainians. That is what should form the basis for any agreement. The so-called "Zelenskyy formulas" are simply a mockery of the concept of a peace plan.

Mrs. Baeriswyl (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Under-Secretary-General, Mrs. Izumi Nakamitsu, for her briefing. We have also taken note of the statement by Mr. Roger Waters.

As the Security Council heard two days ago (see S/PV.9254) and again this morning, Russia's military aggression against Ukraine continues to cost lives and increase the suffering of the civilian population in the middle of winter. Moreover, the humanitarian and economic repercussions of the war are felt beyond Ukraine. It is therefore imperative to put an end to the hostilities and to protect the civilian population.

In order to achieve a just and lasting peace in accordance with international law, allow me to underscore four key points.

First, we call on Russia to cease all combat operations and to withdraw its troops from Ukrainian territory without delay. Switzerland fully supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

Secondly, Switzerland calls on all parties to strictly respect international humanitarian law and human rights. Even in times of war, there are rules to be followed. According to the Geneva Conventions and their Protocols Additional, distinguishing between military targets and civilians, as well as civilian objects, is an obligation.

Thirdly, it is important to move towards peaceful, just and lasting solutions. To that end, we must draw upon international law and diplomatic means. In that regard, and if the parties so wish, Switzerland stands ready to provide good offices and to support de-escalation. Switzerland's neutrality cannot be called into question. There can be no neutrality when international law or the Charter of the United Nations is being violated.

Fourthly, we recall that there can be no lasting peace without accountability. Switzerland strongly condemns any violations of international humanitarian law and human rights committed in Ukraine. If impunity is not addressed, it encourages further violations. In Ukraine and elsewhere, Switzerland supports national and international efforts to document and prosecute war crimes. In particular, Switzerland has referred the situation in Ukraine to the International Criminal Court, together with some 40 other States, thereby enabling the Prosecutor to immediately open an investigation. We encourage all Member States to ratify the Rome Statute and to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Court. We are also closely following the discussions on the creation of a special tribunal to investigate the crime of aggression in Ukraine. Finally, we also welcome the work of other multilateral mechanisms, such as the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine of the Human Rights Council and the fact-finding mechanism on the situation in Ukraine of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

In order to end the war and the suffering of civilians, Russia must immediately stop its military aggression against Ukraine.

Mr. Dai Bing (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I thank High Representative Nakamitsu for her briefing. I also listened very carefully to the statement by Mr. Waters.

Just two days ago, the Security Council held an open meeting on the humanitarian situation in Ukraine during which all parties expressed their apprehension about the humanitarian repercussions of the conflict (see S/PV.9254). It should be seen that the large and incessant flow of weapons and ammunition into the

conflict region will cause greater civilian casualties, more displaced persons and a heavier humanitarian toll on innocent civilians.

More worrisome is the fact that some countries keep sending weapons to the theatre of war and expanding the categories and range of weapons used, thereby engaging in a proxy war, which will further stoke tensions, amplify the risk of triggering strategic miscalculation and cause the fighting to escalate and spread further, diminishing the already bleak prospect for ending the war. One cannot help but worry about the spectre of a protracted and expanded conflict.

High Representative Nakamitsu, in her briefings to the Council, repeatedly indicates that the flow of weapons and ammunition into the conflict region may bring about proliferation risks. Similarly, INTERPOL and some African leaders have also sounded the alarm. Relevant parties should pay great attention thereto, adopt strict control measures, prevent the proliferation of weapons and ammunition and, in particular, stop them from falling in the hands of terrorists and armed groups, and avoid creating new instability in the greater geographic region.

In that regard, the dire consequences of the conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria and Somalia serve as sobering lessons. It is our hope that relevant countries, especially European countries, will take seriously the significant threat posed by weapons and explosive remnants of war to post-war recovery and reconstruction, as well as to regional peace and stability, and revisit with a sense of responsibility and a long-term perspective the complex impact and severe consequences of the large influx of weapons on the Ukrainian crisis and international peace and security.

The crisis in Ukraine is global and multifaceted in nature to which there is no purely military solution. In the past year, piling on sanctions and upgrading weapons did not calm the situation, but instead made the conflict more acute and issues more complicated, pushing the situation to a more dangerous precipice.

As many other peace-aspiring countries, China has repeatedly stressed that dialogue and negotiation are the fundamental way to end the war and restore peace. We call upon the international community to build synergy for facilitating dialogue and peace, encourage the parties to the conflict to return to negotiations at an early date and resolve the crisis through political means.

Mr. Costa Filho (Brazil): I thank Under-Secretary-General Nakamitsu and Mr. Waters for their briefings.

Brazil shares the assessment that the obligation of the parties to guarantee the security of the Ukrainian civilian population must supersede any other consideration. On Monday, at the most recent Security Council meeting dedicated to the humanitarian situation in Ukraine, we expressed our regret that the public debate on the conflict is increasingly focused on transfers of weapons and ammunition and not on what seems most important to us: an immediate ceasefire and the opening of peace negotiations (see S/PV.9254). The emphasis on arms transfers is symptomatic of what we see as a serious escalation in the conflict. On numerous occasions, we have noted the right of States to self-defence, a fundamental principle of international law. Nevertheless, that right must never overshadow the greater duty to restore international peace and security.

There is also a great risk that weapons transferred to any of the parties to the conflict might fall into the hands of unauthorized recipients, including militias and criminal or terrorist groups. Those threats are real and deserve the Council's attention.

We urge the parties to immediately suspend hostilities without preconditions and engage in dialogue. At the same time, we encourage other Member States to act in order to facilitate diplomatic negotiations. Faced with persistent rumours about the launch of a new military offensive, we have to remember once again that our Organization was created with the mission of ridding future generations of the scourge of war. We must not evade that responsibility.

Mr. Ishikane (Japan): I thank Under-Secretary-General Nakamitsu and Mr. Waters for their briefings.

This is the second time this week that the Security Council (see S/PV.9254) is discussing the situation in Ukraine. Japan reiterates its condemnation of Russia's aggression against Ukraine in the strongest terms. Russia's actions are a clear and flagrant violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. We underscore Ukraine's right to defend itself against aggression. The support of the international community in stopping an act of aggression is entirely legitimate in the context of the maintenance of international peace and security. Indeed, no nation should support Russia's aggression, and Russia should not use the Security Council to divert attention from its acts.

Mr. Waters asked about the goals of the Security Council. For us, it is not about profiting from Russia's political appetite or from the military industry. It is, however, about restoring the dignity of a people and of individuals by putting a stop to Russia's aggression and achieving sustainable peace in accordance with international law.

Ms. Oppong-Ntiri (Ghana): I would like to thank Under-Secretary-General and High Representative for Disarmament Affairs Izumi Nakamitsu for her briefing. I also thank civil-society briefer Roger Waters for the views he expressed on the matter at hand.

At the outset, I want to affirm the right of Ukraine to self-defence and in that respect to taking all necessary measures within the limits of international law to protect its people and territory from the aggressive acts of the Russian Federation. After a year of intense fighting marked by suffering, death and destruction, the war in Ukraine now appears to be heading in the direction of an intractable conflict with no end in sight. Secretary-General António Guterres, in his statement to the General Assembly on his priorities for 2023 (see A/77/PV.58), echoed our fears of a wider war with devastating consequences for Ukraine and for the rest of us, who have not been spared the war's effects where the international financial, energy and food systems are concerned. We are deeply worried about the possible threat of accidental or miscalculated actions with catastrophic outcomes as the warring sides mobilize massive military and other strategic resources in anticipation of an escalation of the warfare in the coming days. We find it alarming and unfortunate that projections of a military win seem to be gaining the upper hand over our collectively held values based on the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

It is worth reminding ourselves, however, that many past and present conflicts in various parts of the world have shown that there is little or no chance of establishing peace through military action. Indeed, the United Nations was founded on that very realization and on the importance of ensuring pacific settlements of the disputes that are bound to occur as long as competing interests prevail among States. Based on that wisdom, the Charter of the United Nations expressly prohibits the use of force among States and offers a wide range of diplomatic tools to aid in the peaceful resolution of disputes. We believe that a negotiated settlement would guarantee a comprehensive, durable and just peace between the Russian Federation and its neighbour

Ukraine. We therefore urge the Security Council to intensify its work for peace, along with similar efforts through the good offices of the Secretary-General to help facilitate dialogue among the parties, their allies and other relevant actors.

It is time for a pause by the parties and for the wider international community to critically assess the immediate and long-term implications of the war and what that means for promoting and maintaining international peace and security. For the international community, especially countries with developing economies, the sooner the war ends, the better the chances of recovery for the ailing global economic systems on which we are collectively dependent. We encourage all actors to keep in focus the humanitarian cost of the war and the compelling need to safeguard and preserve innocent lives from harm. We reiterate our call on the warring sides to refrain from further missile attacks on residential facilities, as well as the destruction of critical energy infrastructure, such as we have seen in recent weeks. We call for level-headedness and for a de-escalation of tensions as we approach the one-year mark of this unjustifiable war. While we remain supportive of international peace efforts, we must emphasize the moral and legal obligation of the Russian Federation, as the protagonist of the war, to end all its operations in Ukraine, with the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its forces from the internationally recognized borders of Ukraine. Until then, we fear that the prospects of a peaceful settlement may continue to remain out of reach.

Ms. Koumby Missambo (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): I thank Under-Secretary-General Izumi Nakamitsu for her briefing, and I also thank Mr. Roger Waters, whose account of his own life reminds us all that when we speak of war, it is above all a matter of human lives and deaths.

It will soon be one year to the day since the war in Ukraine began, and there is still no prospect of reaching a solution between the warring parties. The recent announcements of the delivery of new and advanced weaponry lead us to believe that the fighting will not only continue but will likely escalate. We are moving inexorably towards a war of attrition. We can expect more deaths and further destruction of civilian infrastructure. We must find a way to end the war in order to stop the bloodshed and the cycle of fear and trauma that the Ukrainian people have been trapped in for almost a year.

We have not ceased to condemn the use of weapons of mass destruction and the bombing of innocent civilians, homes, hospitals and nuclear power plants. Yet 12 months later, here we are anticipating that more names will be added to the already long list of the victims of the war. Secretary-General António Guterres expressed his concern to the General Assembly two days ago (see A/77/PV.58) when he presented his priorities for 2023, saying, “The prospects for peace keep diminishing, [and] the chances of further escalation and bloodshed keep growing”.

The signing in July 2022 of the grain export agreement, which was renewed on 17 November, has been a source of hope. Taking place at the height of the conflict, it showed that with willpower it is always possible to seek a solution through diplomatic channels. We continue to call on all the parties to seek such mechanisms, as provided for in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to end the war and begin negotiations to achieve lasting peace and peaceful coexistence. We call on the parties to engage in dialogue to silence the weapons in Ukraine. My country will continue to call unceasingly for good-faith negotiations to achieve a ceasefire and find a diplomatic solution to the conflict in Ukraine.

Dame Barbara Woodward (United Kingdom): I thank Mrs. Nakamitsu for her briefing.

Russia has not called this meeting to discuss the prospects for peace. It has called this meeting to try once again to deflect responsibility for its war. Let us look at the facts. This time last year, Russia assembled a military force of more than 100,000 troops and a massive accumulation of weaponry and equipment on three sides of Ukraine. On 24 February 2022, Russia launched its all-out invasion. President Putin claimed he was stopping a genocide in Donbas. The International Court of Justice rejected that reasoning and ordered Russia immediately to end its invasion. Russia revealed its real objectives when it attempted the illegal annexation of further Ukrainian territory, a tactic from the same playbook it used in Crimea in 2014. The United Nations membership rejected that decisively, and repeatedly demanded that Russia end its invasion and withdraw. Yet Russia has continued. It has done so with the assistance of Belarus, in addition to being supplemented by weapons sourced from Iran and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, in violation of United Nations sanctions. Thus armed, Russia shows

no sign of stopping and appears now to be preparing a further offensive.

Russia is the reason that there is no peace in Ukraine. In the face of that onslaught, Ukraine has had no choice but to exercise its right under the Charter of the United Nations to defend itself. It has done so resolutely and successfully, but at massive cost to its people and its resources. It is in that context that the United Kingdom, alongside others, recently pledged further and enduring defensive support to Ukraine. That includes bolstering training for Ukrainian troops, which was announced during President Zelenskyy’s visit to London today. We are proud of that support to help Ukraine defend its country, protect its sovereignty and fight for its territory and freedom.

Russia still has hundreds of thousands of troops within Ukraine’s borders attacking the country every day. Surely none of us can object to Ukraine having the means to protect itself from that aggression. But what Ukraine wants — what we all want — is peace. We welcome and support Ukraine’s proposals to that end. For peace to be just and sustainable, it must be based on the principles of the Charter, which we have all pledged to uphold.

If Russia truly wanted peace, it would not be calling spurious meetings of the Security Council. It would immediately end its illegal invasion, withdraw from Ukraine and return in good faith to the negotiating table it overturned last February.

Mr. Hoxha (Albania): I thank Under-Secretary-General Nakamitsu for her briefing.

We listened carefully to the remarks of Mr. Roger Waters, and there is a lot to take in there. He is lucky to be in New York, in a free country and to speak his mind and say whatever he likes, including about the Russian aggression and how wrong it is. If he had been in Russia, with what he said, he might have been in custody by now.

Exactly one year ago, in this very Chamber, some of us warned of the possibility of an unprovoked military aggression by Russia in Ukraine. Russia repeatedly vehemently denied those warnings, calling them unfounded rumours and assuring the international community that there would be no aggression. Only a few weeks later, aggression there was, in its purest form, with a distorted name, but with the same consequences. And it continues to this hour. Here we are, one year

later, in a meeting to discuss the prospects for a peaceful settlement and arms transfers. That curious mixture compels us to make some key points.

My first point is on peace. It is indeed positive that we talk of peace and that we have repeatedly called for it, but things must be clear, and the call must be sincere. What has been happening for a year in Ukraine is a war of choice that was launched without a shred of justification against a peaceful, sovereign nation that posed no threat to Russia or anyone else. This calamity was Russia's doing — a breach of international law and the Charter of the United Nations — and has since been destroying Ukraine, killing its people, demolishing its infrastructure and dismantling its economy. This dangerous adventure has not only posed a clear and direct danger to the security of Europe but also, as everyone knows now, it has a much wider impact worldwide.

Truth be told, these past 12 months have shown, including to Russia itself, that despite the terrible pain inflicted on Ukraine and its people, Russia has failed to achieve any of its declared strategic, operational and tactical objectives. Everything has gone wrong, as the idea was wicked and its plans were botched. Only Russia may correct it, and there is only one way to do so: stop the war, withdraw its forces from Ukraine and return to talks. But we see no signs — none — that Russia is seriously and genuinely seeking any sort of peaceful settlement, or that it will cease its brutal attack on Ukraine. We are now used to hearing one thing and seeing exactly the contrary materialize. What we are calling for today is no different since what we are seeing is the opposite of what we are asking: an obstinacy to go ahead, persist with the crimes and inflict more pain. And it is difficult for anyone to take missiles that kill for olive branches.

My second point is on arms transfers. A Member of the United Nations was viciously attacked by its neighbour. The world did not choose to look away. It chose to stand up, condemn Russia and to rise up to show solidarity with the victims and in defence of commonly agreed rules. It chose to face the illegal action of Russia through legal means and actions. There is no article in the Charter of the United Nations or anywhere else in international law that gives the right to any country to wage an illegal war against another. That is one of the benefits of the lessons learned from the past, namely, to work in peace, cooperation and friendship for shared benefits. In return, there is a clear

provision agreed by everyone on how to help victims, and Article 51 of the Charter provides the legal basis for individual States to offer whatever assistance to a country exercising its inherent right to self-defence, in defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. Every country would do that. It could not be clearer.

That is what several countries on different continents have been doing. They have been standing for Ukraine and its army — in a country where ordinary people have been obliged to abandon their studies, musical instruments and sportswear to put on military fatigues and rush to the front to defend their children, land and freedom. And with their outstanding courage and military brilliance, they have justified every penny spent. The weapons supplied to Ukraine have helped show Russia and anyone who may attempt to use force instead of peaceful means the limits to such adventures. The community of nations must continue to stand with Ukraine and continue to provide everything that helps Ukraine help itself push back the aggression until the war leaves a place for talks and diplomacy.

Speaking of weapons, what should have our attention is the issue of the illegal transfer of weapons from Iran and North Korea, two countries under Security Council sanctions, which are being used in the war of aggression against Ukraine, in blatant violation of the resolutions of the Council.

In conclusion, we will always support peace efforts, talks, dialogue and peace settlements. But those should not be empty words to be used for putting something on the record. What is needed is concrete action, and that starts in the Kremlin, where the war was decided. Peace is always made by the brave, with clear vision and strong leadership, and with shared benefits for all, not to the detriment of some. Russia started this war. Russia is responsible for its consequences. And Russia can decide to put an end. Because — and I will end with this — as the famous rock band Pink Floyd sung last year in their uplifting iconic song “Hey Hey Rise Up”, “our beautiful Ukraine is in sorrow ... and we will raise it up. And we shall cheer for our glorious Ukraine”. The sooner the war stops and the soon this madness is over, the better off we all will be — the glorious Ukraine, Russia and the world.

Ms. Shaheen (United Arab Emirates): We too thank Under-Secretary-General Nakamitsu for her informative briefing. We listened carefully to

Mr. Waters, and I welcome Ukraine's participation in today's meeting.

The United Arab Emirates reiterates its long-standing position that it is vital to safeguard weapons during their transfer, storage and deployment. That is particularly urgent in a context of ongoing military hostilities. We therefore encourage continued vigilance and transparency regarding the measures in place to mitigate any unintended risks that may be associated with arms transfers in the context under discussion. To that end, we welcome all ongoing efforts and initiatives to strengthen arms control in Ukraine and across the region, especially those aimed at addressing potential diversion. It is crucial that the weapons in question do not fall into the wrong hands.

In the course of the past year we have discussed many of the effects of the war in Ukraine. Most recently, the Council was briefed on the humanitarian situation and the international response aimed at alleviating the suffering of Ukrainian civilians (see S/PV.9254). Similarly, the topic today highlights the importance of addressing the conflict's potential impact on the proliferation of weapons. In that context, the United Arab Emirates firmly maintains its long-standing position that the Council must ensure consistent compliance with all its resolutions.

Mr. Mills (United States of America): I thank the High Representative for an informative and thoughtful briefing for us today. As for our other briefer, Mr. Waters, while I certainly acknowledge his impressive credentials as a recording artist, his qualifications to speak to us as an expert briefer on arms control or European security issues are less evident to me. I will leave it to my Ukrainian colleague to address Mr. Waters' credibility in speaking on behalf of his so-called brothers and sisters in Ukraine. If I may, I will just say that Mr. Waters asked about our vision, and I can say what it is quite quickly.

The vision of the United States is of a world in which Europe is whole, at peace and free. It is a world in which the goal of the Cold War, which we achieved — where every country could choose its own orientation and foreign-policy direction and spheres of influence were a thing of the past — is our goal. Looking at what is happening in Ukraine, I think that members can draw their own conclusions as to what Russia's goal is for the end of it.

We have been brought together today once again to hear another version of why Russia's brutal invasion of Ukraine is actually the fault of Ukraine and Ukraine's partners, or, in the words of Mr. Waters, friends who are provocateurs. Of course, in the past we have even had weaponized bats brought up as a reason for this war. The reality is that the disinformation is intense, but we cannot let it distract our focus. The key fact, which many of my colleagues around the table have pointed out, is that Russia's invasion of Ukraine is illegal. It is a flagrant violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity and of the Charter of the United Nations. As Ambassador Woodward mentioned, that fact has been underscored repeatedly by members of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, the International Court of Justice and across the United Nations system.

Defending the Charter is not just about words written on paper, but about the principles at the heart of the Charter and actions to back them up. For some, that has meant standing up for Ukraine diplomatically during votes in the General Assembly. For others it has meant supporting Ukraine's efforts to defend itself against a brutal, unprovoked war of aggression.

As others have said, the inherent right to individual and collective self-defence is reflected in Article 51 of the Charter. Those are inconvenient realities for Russia, desperate to find a narrative, any narrative, other than the one that it is stuck in. The security assistance, including weapons, that the United States and more than 50 other countries are providing, and will continue to provide, is for Ukraine's self-defence. That distinction could not be more important. Ukraine is using those weapons to repel the invading Russian forces that are committing war crimes on Ukraine's territory. They are designed to stop Russia's relentless shelling of cities and destroy incoming missiles aimed at the electrical grid and other targets of no military value. We unequivocally reject the victim-blaming notion that Ukraine's self-defence is the obstacle to ending the war. No one wants peace in Ukraine more than Ukrainians themselves. It is Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity that have been violated, not Russia's. The Kremlin and its mouthpieces are using the terms "peace settlement" and "peace negotiations". But actions speak louder than words, and Russia has consistently failed to take any action that would give substance to its vaunted talk of peace, such as silencing its guns or withdrawing its forces from Ukraine.

Russia has tried again and again to use the Security Council to distract the international community from the fact of its own armed aggression against a State Member of the United Nations. Today's Security Council meeting is taking place amid reports that we have all seen that Russia is preparing for a further large-scale offensive action against Ukraine.

If Russia wants to talk about dangerous arms transfers in the Council, let it come clean about the hundreds of Iranian drones that Tehran has transferred to Russia, in violation of resolution 2231 (2015). Russia is using those drones to attack Ukraine's critical infrastructure, depriving the people of Ukraine of access to light, heat and water in the dead of winter. If Russia wants to talk about dangerous arms transfers in the Council, what does it have to say about the rockets and missiles that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea delivered to Russia in November for use by the vicious Russia-backed Wagner Group, which has deployed thousands of fighters in Ukraine, including convicts recruited straight from Russia's prisons? Procuring weapons from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as Ambassador Woodward pointed out, also constitutes a violation of Security Council resolutions, and Russia is giving us every reason to expect that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's supply of weapons for the Wagner Group will continue.

As I have said before in the Council, President Putin's playbook is transparent — wreak death and destruction, target civilian infrastructure, freeze and brutalize Ukrainian civilians, force them from their homes and drive up energy and food costs across Europe and around the world. Russia is doing this not only to wear down Ukraine, but to convince the rest of the world that it would be so much easier and more peaceful to turn our backs on Ukraine and ignore the most basic principles of the Charter — respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States. That might be easier for Russia, but caving to Russia's aggression against a sovereign country, enabling Russia's unconscionable killing and injuring of civilians and accepting its brazen attempts to redraw borders by force would tear up the rulebook that has made all of us more secure and lead to dangerous repercussions around the world.

In conclusion, the United States hopes for a just and secure peace in Ukraine. True peace must be durable, and it cannot and will not come at the expense of Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence. It is

preposterous beyond words to try to equate the violence that Russia has inflicted on Ukraine with Ukraine's efforts to defend itself. Anyone serious about peace in Ukraine should call on Russia to abide by the United Nations Charter, stop its relentless bombardments and withdraw its forces from Ukraine's territory.

Mr. De Rivière (France) (*spoke in French*): We meet today at Russia's request. Russia is concerned about the lack of prospects for a peaceful settlement of the war of aggression that it decided to start nearly a year ago in Ukraine. That situation would be almost laughable were the suffering of Ukrainians not so grave and the atrocities committed by the Russian armed forces not continuing to mount.

I would like to recall one simple truth. A peaceful settlement of the war depends on Russia, which is solely and entirely responsible for it. All it has to do is to cease its aggression and withdraw all of its troops from the internationally recognized borders of Ukraine's territory, as ordered by the International Court of Justice in its decision of 16 March 2022.

As has been said in this Chamber on several occasions, if Russia stops fighting, peace will be restored immediately. If Ukraine stops fighting, it will be annihilated. There are Russian troops in Ukraine today, but there are no Ukrainian troops in Russia. Allow me, therefore, to once again recall that there is an aggressor and a victim in this war. Let us not allow Russia to reverse responsibilities.

France is providing, and will continue to provide, the Ukrainian people with all the support they need to exercise their right to self-defence and preserve their sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations. That includes military support, both bilaterally and through the European Union, which is aimed at restoring the balance of power in order to create the conditions for a just and lasting settlement of the conflict. We all know that negotiations will succeed only if Ukraine's sovereignty is respected and its territory is liberated. Helping a sovereign State under attack to resist the invasion of another State is a quest for peace and a defence of the principles of international law.

As Russia's stockpile of weapons dwindles, it seeks to obtain them by any means, including by violating Security Council resolutions. Indeed, it is well documented that Russia has used combat drones

supplied by Iran in its war of aggression. We call on the United Nations to investigate and report to the Council on those transfers, which violate resolution 2231 (2015). It is also documented that, on several occasions, North Korea has delivered missiles and ammunition to Russia in flagrant violation of Security Council resolutions. Those weapons were intended for use by the troops of the private military company Wagner Group, which Russia does not hesitate to mobilize by the tens of thousands, including criminals, to compensate for its many losses on the ground.

Russia continues to use all of those weapons in its strategy of systematically targeting the Ukrainian civilian population and infrastructure, in flagrant violation of the principles of international humanitarian law. The United Nations and all of its Member States cannot — and should not — look the other way.

Ukraine is fighting to defend the principles of the Charter of the United Nations: territorial integrity; the inviolability of borders; the independence and sovereignty of States; the rejection of the conquest of territories by force; and the condemnation of wars of aggression. Defending those principles is a task that concerns all of us States Members of the United Nations. With the 10-point peace plan proposed by President Zelenskyy, Ukraine has shown its willingness to make peace and has mapped out a path towards a just and lasting peace. As since 24 February 2022, we will continue to support Ukraine in achieving that peace.

Mr. Fernandes (Mozambique): We wish to thank the Under-Secretary-General and High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Mrs. Izumi Nakamitsu, for her valuable briefing. We also express our sincere appreciation for the testimony of Mr. Roger Waters — a passionate advocate for peace throughout his illustrious and iconic career.

After one year of the conflict in Ukraine, our wishes for peace are yet to come true. Let me emphatically reiterate Mozambique's strict adherence to, and defence of, the internationally agreed provisions on the use of force in the conduct of nations, as clearly spelled out in Articles 2 and 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Those provisions are central and foundational to rules-based international law and order, as they constitute the best defence of the weak against arbitrary attacks by the strong.

As stated by the briefers and reiterated by our delegation on several occasions, the trajectory of the

conflict between the Russian Federation and Ukraine is pointing towards a prolonged war of attrition and away from any compromise at the negotiating table. We are witnessing, *inter alia*, first, the expansion of directly and indirectly involved actors in the conflict; secondly, the continued erosion of long-held notions of restraint in the conduct of matters related to the maintenance of international peace, including, to a certain extent, in the Council; and thirdly, open disregard for hard and long-negotiated global agreements regulating and controlling the trade and transfer of arms, leading to arms build-ups and the accumulation and proliferation of illicit arms on all sides.

As we have seen in our part of the world, the massive transfer of arms and weapons into an already raging military confrontation is akin to adding fuel to fire. My country is deeply concerned by the increasing prospect of unregulated flows of arms, including weapons of mass destruction. As the war continues and intensifies, the unrestrained supply of arms by numerous countries to both sides is fuelling an already escalating trajectory. We are all losers in this war, except those selling weapons for profit. For the military-industrial complex, intermediaries and arms traders, wars are simply opportunities to increase their profits, irrespective of the global implications of conflict.

Given the fact that vast transfers of armaments to the conflict zone are taking place without the oversight of the agreed United Nations arms control and disarmament structure, it is but a matter of time until some of those weapons end up in our parts of the world, which are already awash with deadly illegal arms. It is estimated that every year more than \$5 billion worth of armaments and ammunition is illegally sold on the black market to terrorists, violent extremists, rebel groups, criminal networks and a whole host of illegal arms clientele.

Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations acknowledges the inherent right of all States to individual or collective self-defence and the right to manufacture, import, export, transfer and retain conventional arms to that end. However, the nature of the present conflict and the staggering amounts of sophisticated weapons systems being considered by both sides and the ever-present spectre of the use of weapons of mass destruction are cause for alarm. We therefore urge those countries providing assistance to the conflicting parties to act in a manner consistent with international arms control agreements and multilateral

pacts in the areas of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation.

In conclusion, the prospects for a peaceful settlement of the conflict on one side and the increasing supply of arms on the other are not compatible. Mozambique reiterates its call on all parties to adhere to Article 2 of the Charter and settle their disputes “by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered”. To paraphrase from Sun Tzu, in *The Art of War*, “there is no instance of a nation benefiting from prolonged war”.

Mr. Pérez Loose (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Mrs. Izumi Nakamitsu, for her briefing, and Mr. Roger Waters for his opinions.

I would like to raise five points that I consider central.

First, I wish to reiterate Ecuador’s historical position of rejecting armed violence, militarization and the arms race. That position has also always been accompanied by our recognition of the right of peoples to self-defence, in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations, including Article 51. Ecuador therefore recognizes the inviolability of territorial integrity and the right of peoples to political independence.

Secondly, we defend the peaceful settlement of disputes. Under that principle, as recalled in the Council’s presidential statement of 6 May 2022 (S/PRST/2022/3), all Member States have assumed the obligation to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, in accordance with the Charter. Therefore, carrying out military aggression against another country is in violation of that principle.

Thirdly, as High Representative Nakamitsu has stated, Ecuador will always be concerned about the challenges to peace and security posed by the large-scale inflow of arms and ammunition in any situation of armed conflict. In all such cases, we are concerned about the risks of diversion, spread and escalation, and we recognize that measures to counter those risks are central to post-conflict recovery, to regional security and stability and even to the prevention of conflicts on other continents. We therefore deplore the fact that the protracted invasion of Ukraine’s territory causes and fuels such risks, and we are furthermore concerned about reports of the involvement of non-State actors in the occupation activities, as they exacerbate those risks.

Fourthly, as Ecuador has always stated, we are concerned about the humanitarian impact of any military aggression and of the use of weapons as a tool of domination of one people over another. We therefore reject the constant escalation of attacks and bombings against critical civilian infrastructure in Ukraine, which further undermines access to basic services and the functioning of hospitals and schools and increases the risks of nuclear disaster.

Finally, how can a peaceful solution be achieved under the continued shelling and military aggression against Ukraine? It is clear that prospects for a peaceful solution depend on the immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the occupying troops.

Ecuador urges this to happen, with a view to re-establishing dialogue for a lasting peace and to preventing the world from being led into a wider war, as warned by Secretary-General António Guterres.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Malta.

I thank Mrs. Izumi Nakamitsu and Mr. Roger Waters for their briefings.

On Monday the Council discussed, once again, the dire humanitarian consequences of Russia’s illegal aggression against Ukraine (see S/PV.9254). We spoke of the severe civilian casualties caused by the use of explosive weapons with wide-area impacts in populated areas, such as towns and cities. We emphasized, once again, that international humanitarian law and human rights law must be always unconditionally respected, and that those responsible for violations must be held accountable.

Just this past week, missile strikes on Ukraine continued unabated, including in the regions of Kharkiv and Chernihiv. Millions of Ukrainians remain without electricity, heating and water as the Russian Federation destroys critical civilian infrastructure. Thousands of children have been killed or injured, millions have had their schooling disrupted or are dealing with the legacy of conflict-induced trauma. The war has not spared women and girls either, and millions of them were forced to flee within or across Ukraine’s borders in search of safety from Russian attacks.

Those dynamics underline the vital importance of access to humanitarian assistance for all those in need across Ukraine and in the areas not currently under Ukrainian control. Equally, we reiterate our calls for

the immediate removal of all obstacles to the safe, rapid and unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance throughout the country.

In addition, we underscore, once again, that the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) must have unconditional, unimpeded and repeated access to all prisoners of war in this international armed conflict. The third Geneva Convention grants prisoners of war the right to receive regular visits from ICRC representatives. It is therefore cardinal that this obligation be respected and facilitated.

In conclusion, we reiterate our insistence that the Russian Federation withdraw its military forces from the entire territory of Ukraine. Any call for a ceasefire must be coupled with such an unconditional withdrawal. This war has to stop. The Charter of the United Nations outlines clearly the duties and responsibilities of each United Nations Member State. It is never too late to uphold the United Nations Charter and its provisions on the peaceful settlement of disputes and return to dialogue and diplomacy. It is never too late to return to the international rules-based order.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

The representative of the Russian Federation has asked for the floor to make a further statement.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Since we spoke first, I would just like to make a few remarks by way of reaction.

I would like to correct my Albanian colleague: Roger Waters has not been threatened in any way in Russia. We respect freedom of speech, unlike the countries of the West, which prohibit alternative points of view and pretend this is what freedom of speech should look like. I would like to recall that we were the ones who invited Roger Waters to speak to the Council today. In a fuss, the Albanian representative probably confused Russia and Ukraine, because in Ukraine, Mr. Waters is on the Myrotvorets, or “Peacemaker”, website, which is infamous and is used as a database of all those whom Ukrainian nationalists perceive as targets.

My American colleague just spoke about victory in the Cold War. I would like to remind him that this was our common victory, both ours and theirs. For some reason, the United States likes to cunningly attribute it to itself. The root of the majority of the problems facing our present-day world probably lies therein.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine.

Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine): As one novelist said: “some cause happiness wherever they go, others whenever they go”. I recognize the representative of Putin’s regime occupying the permanent seat of the Soviet Union. In fact, he has just left.

I am grateful to Under-Secretary-General Nakamitsu for her comprehensive briefing. I would also like to thank our partners, who made it clear that restoring respect for the Charter of the United Nations is the only viable option to deal with the ongoing aggression, and that its principles shall serve as the only basis both for our actions to exercise the inherent right to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter and for the post-war settlement following the military defeat of Russia on the territory of Ukraine.

Military defeat is imminent if the Russian criminal regime does not implement the demands of the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice and does not withdraw its troops from the territory of Ukraine within our internationally recognized borders.

The Charter of the United Nations and international law will also be the framework for our further work to hold Russia accountable for its war crimes and crimes against humanity, as well as the crime of aggression. Meanwhile, let me quote from Article 51:

“Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.”

The Security Council still tolerates the presence of war criminals in the Soviet seat. It is therefore the problem of the Council itself that the second part of Article 51, envisaging the Council’s authority and responsibility “to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security”, cannot be, and has not yet been, implemented.

The resolute contribution of all responsible nations to restoring respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations will be the only way to ensure a comprehensive, just and lasting peace.

It is a war of choice. “Non-violence is infinitely superior to violence”, said Gandhi on many occasions. However, Putin has chosen violence. He has also emasculated his nation and continues to treat his country as an animal farm to produce more and more cannon fodder.

Let me now respond to those who call for a stop to war at any cost, including at the cost of Ukraine’s territory and forgiveness for the lost Ukrainian lives and lands. The guru of non-violence, Mahatma Gandhi, said:

“[A]bstinence is forgiveness only when there is power to punish; it is meaningless when it pretends to proceed from a helpless creature.”

Let me ask those who make such calls, as well as all those present here, if they are ready and fit to show that power to punish the evildoer.

If the Security Council remains immobilized by the evildoer and cannot punish him, let us and all responsible nations do that work for the Council and for our common good, as the first lines of the Charter of the United Nations read, “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”. Let me provide another quote:

“I would rather have [my country] resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should, in a cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour.”

It is not me who was the first one to say that; it was Mahatma Gandhi, who said that about India. When people quote, and cherry-pick from, Gandhi, they should therefore be very careful. Today it is a reply to those who do not mind seeing an unarmed Ukraine torn to pieces, helpless and dishonoured.

We hear again and again that Russia is surrounded by enemies. That could be dismissed as mere paranoia if it was not a clear sign of the narrative of a totalitarian State. Or was it not Mr. Waters himself who said:

“The method for taking over the State and for it becoming a totalitarian police State is always the same, and it is always the identification of the other as the enemy.”

When I hear the Russian representative speaking about yet another newly invented version of the goals of the so-called special military operation to be accomplished, all I can tell him is that pigs might fly. I hope he understands what that means in English. I

am sure that Mr. Waters, an Englishman, does, even if he hated every second of school, apart from games. In Mr. Waters’s own words, his “grammar school was pretty dreadful”. The original version of the phrase was “pigs in the air with their tails forward”. I am surprised that he has not inflated a giant pig-shaped balloon in the Security Council Chamber today, as was the case at many of his shows in the past.

I ask Mr. Waters what it could have been this time: pigs with swastikas and a hammer and sickle, as at some of his performances, decried for their antisemitism? Or probably the faces of Putin and Hitler? After all, was it not Mr. Waters who called Vladimir Putin “the new Hitler” in one of his interviews in September last year? Let me make it clear. On 30 September 2022, in an interview with Chris Hedges, Mr. Waters asked: “How can we stop this war?” He himself replied: “Well, obviously, you have to talk to Vladimir Putin, who is the new Hitler”.

Earlier this month, was it not Mr. Waters who said that he would play in Moscow “given that Moscow does not run an apartheid State based on the genocide of the indigenous inhabitants”? Mr. Waters knows so little, but he seems to know it so fluently.

In 1979, Pink Floyd came up with the song “Another Brick in the Wall”. The same year, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. After the invasion was condemned by Pink Floyd, the band was banned in the Soviet Union. It is ironic, if not hypocritical, that Mr. Waters now attempts to whitewash another invasion. How sad for his former fans to see him accepting the role of just another brick in the wall — the wall of Russian disinformation and propaganda.

This pop star can easily ignore the alleged episodes of war crimes and crimes against humanity. He can totally ignore the crime of aggression; the opinion of 143 members of the General Assembly; numerous reports by United Nations agencies, the International Criminal Court, the International Court of Justice, Governments and citizens; and he can go and entertain the crowd in Moscow because the dictator there, whom Mr. Waters identified as a new Hitler, is not committing the genocide of the indigenous people of Russia. It is no wonder that in a video address in September, a former President of Mongolia, President Elbegdorj, called on Putin to stop the war. “I know that since the start of this bloody war,” he said, “it is ethnic minorities who live in Russia have suffered the most”. He added, “The Buryat

Mongols, Tuvan Mongols and Kalmyk Mongols have suffered a lot. They have been used as nothing more than cannon fodder.” Of course, who gives a monkey’s about tens of thousands of Buryats, Tuvans, Mordvins and other ethnic soldiers sent by Russia’s Hitler to the front as cannon fodder from Putin’s farm? Pigs might fly, Mr. Waters. I am not sure if they can fly with Hitler’s and Putin’s names at the concert in Moscow, even with swastikas and a hammer and sickle, and especially if you once again put on a Nazi-like long leather jacket, as you have done in your previous concerts.

Let me finish with a quote from the last lines of Orwell’s *Animal Farm*. Remember when, standing outside the farmhouse where pigs and men were drinking together, the creatures

“looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which.”

Mr. Waters should keep strumming his guitar. It suits him better than lecturing the Security Council on how to do its job. There should be no flying pigs here, even if Putin, whom Mr. Waters called the new Hitler, were to be put on them.

We had a taste of pop culture today from the Russian delegation, but how about preparing something more classic for the Security Council? How about *Swan Lake*, on 17 February, the full-length four-act, three-hour expanse, which Russians are so accustomed to enduring when their dictator dies? We have seen it with Brezhnev, Andropov and Chernenko, and we know the name of the next one.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.