

**Address by the Executive Secretary
of the Preparatory Commission for the
Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO)**

Mr. Tibor Tóth

**at the Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS)
conference: *Have the United Nations agencies adapted to the 21st century?***

Vienna, 9 January 2013

[The text that follows is transcribed from an audio recording of the event.]

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Good morning. Thank you so much. It's nice to be back. This is a pilgrimage for me. I don't necessarily have an abundance of time, but I really do believe, first of all, in what ACUNS is doing, and congratulations for the series of high-level events here. And I very much believe in what ACUNS, together with the participants here, are trying to pursue. But let me try to give a talk based on the three reasons why I am here.

These three reasons are not necessarily the usual reasons, which would be: I explain to you how the nuclear Test-Ban Treaty organization managed to push the genie of nuclear tests back in the bottle. The trivial way would be to explain to you that from 2000 explosions in the first fifty years following

World War II, we managed, together with the international community, to eliminate this threat of nuclear testing. But I have three other reasons why I am here today.

Reason number one is that I truly believe that we have to rethink. We must rethink how we approach the issues confronting us. Reason number two is I think we have to reset: not reset the button - this is a phrase which is often used - but reset the stage. Reason number three is that we have to release new energies, another “re-“.

ACUNS brings together those who have been dealing with these issues for a long time, but I’m very happy there are many young faces. Yesterday I had a talk to a regional academy audience, and especially for the new generation, the “rethink” is extremely defining. Today and tomorrow, you will hear presentations about three issues: progress, prosperity and protection. Progress of technologies such as nuclear and outer-space technologies. Prosperity - I’m sure that our colleagues from UNIDO will describe this to you - and protection from drugs and crime, the attempt to eliminate the uncivil faces which society is creating, and protection as it is being provided by the IAEA, its nuclear safety security safeguards, and the CTBT.

But while you will be listening to all these statements, I would like to ask you: not just to listen to us, but to challenge us. This is part of rethinking the issues; challenge us in the following ways. Let me try to explain the dilemma from my perspective. I am speaking more in a personal capacity now.

We have been doing a lot, and we have achieved a lot, on nuclear testing. Yes, we have managed to do what I was referring to in the introduction. At the same time, 50 years after the Cuban missile crisis - in that crisis two presidents, the President of the United States and the General Secretary of the former Soviet Union, pledged a test ban. 50 years after that, we are still working on delivering on that promise.

And 50 years after the early 1960s, still we are working on files, which are the same files there were in the early 1960s, the files of the nuclear test ban, of what used to be called nuclear non-dissemination which is now called nuclear non-proliferation, and the file of fissile material production for military purposes. I can continue because if we go on to other letters in the soup alphabet from nuclear issues, we move to biological and chemical issues, we move to other technologies like electronics, and cyber, and delivery and delivery missiles. We could move to fissile materials and robotics and all the other technologies, where there are similar challenges.

The reason why we have to think about where we are is that I think the gap is widening. There is a widening gap on our delivery, and what is required to retain those three components: progress, prosperity and protection. And, on one hand, 50 years for a diplomat might be like a flicker of time because of the length of multilateral efforts. But time might not be in as much abundance as it used to be, for two reasons:

Number one: the crises. Crises in plural, the crises which are around us. This is not about one crisis - mortgage, financial crisis, banking crisis, sovereign crisis or a crisis of economies or a crisis of integration. This is a set of crises coming together that if we do not manage it the right way, will be the configuration for a perfect storm. So this is number one, why all these challenges will have to be rethought, in terms of the progress we are making, or lack thereof.

The second reason is the transformation. There is a transformation taking place right now which is totally unparalleled compared to the experience of previous generations. This is a transformation with some countries in ascendance, and certain other regions potentially not in ascendance, which will change the way the world works.

These two reasons: the crisis and this transformation - a crisis which has not been seen in three generations, and a transformation which is probably unfolding in a way unimagined in three or four generations - is forcing us to rethink the way we do business. We should acknowledge there is a governance problem. "Houston, we have a problem!" and we have to spell it out.

The second issue, and the second reason I am here, is that we have to reset the stage: I don't think it's enough just to acknowledge that "Houston, we have a problem." We cannot land this spaceship, so we have to manage it. We have to govern this global spaceship of progress, prosperity and protection.

Let me say a few words about multilateralism. The organizations we are representing and the organization I represent are all-inclusive, global organizations. We have nearly 190 member states in this organization. There is a lot of talk about multilateralism, and there are different perceptions of multilateralism. There is a perception of multilateralism between two, of multilateralism between five players, or eight players, or fifteen, or twenty, or fifty plus players. But I would like to bring back the multilateralism which is the defining clause of multilateralism, which is not a zero sum game compared to other settings. This is a complementarity. And this multilateralism is at the level of 190, or 190-plus, is a must to rethink the issues I have alluded to, and to find a way forward. And

whatever you hear about all-inclusive multilateralism, that it may be passé - I don't think so. If we as an organization could build a norm of no testing – if, at the level of close to 190 countries we are managing a \$ 1 billion monitoring system with 500 facilities around the world and it's running, and we could build and manage it, and we can recapitalize it if needed, then multilateralism at this level of 190 is alive. Multilateralism at the level of 190 should be part of the solution.

There is another notion of all-inclusive multilateralism. I would call it 'all-inclusive globalism. It goes much beyond what I described at the level of 190 plus. It goes beyond IGO (Intergovernmental) level. This is all-inclusiveness in a sense where the revolutions unfolding outside this building – mass education, mass collaboration – are finally embraced.

These are the issues we are charged with, and which matter again for progress, prosperity and protection. And those are revolutions in the real sense: mass collaboration, where certain institutions enroll 160,000 students in a course of education. These are highly respected universities, like Stanford, MIT and UC Berkeley, in the United States alone. This mass collaboration can produce miracles like Wikipedia, which is one example with 22 million entries produced in 10 years, compared to the Encyclopedia Britannica in 275 years. Or, Linux as an example of open source cooperation, by now representing six of the top supercomputers worldwide.

So, these are the type of things which are going on, and I don't think we can close our eyes. For me, this belongs to all-inclusive globalism. We need these players for resolving issues, we need those players and those new approaches to close the gap which is widening between where we are, and where we should be.

The last point I would like to make – the last reason why I am here – is to release new energies. I think the previous point has led me there. We need to release the new energies of a new generation. The new generation is the generation of the younger people sitting in this room. It's not just us belonging to the previous generation who should be listening and challenging. I think you should be listening and challenging *us* on this gap issue. You should tell us whether you believe that this gap is closing, or not. And you, the new generation, have to remind us that you are not a lost generation. For many, as a result of the last five years of crisis, your generation has been written off. In the media, the reference is to the lost generation. And this crisis might go on for another five years. For many, efforts to come out of the crisis have already been described as decade-long.

So I would like to ask this generation to challenge the things you hear from us. Challenge us on how good you think progress and prosperity and protection is. But even more importantly, join forces with us. Again, if I may use a splendid example of open source competition, X Prize. I was referring to some of these examples yesterday in a talk with the regional academy. X Prize, as a private entrepreneurial initiative, set a goal of spacing private spacecraft outside the 100 km barrier. And they achieved this in less than a decade. It's called SpaceShipOne, and it was delivered in nine years. It was delivered such that they managed to do it twice in two weeks. Now, they are nurturing the private space industry, and they are moving towards putting a lunar device on the moon. And they will do it. And they will do it independently of government - with cooperation - but independently of government, as a new initiative. And some of these achievements are delivered by groups of young people from Stanford, for example on the one hundred miles per gallon type-initiative per year that cost \$10 million, compared to the \$200 million invested by NASA and 20-30 years of non-delivery.

This is where we need the new generation to release new energies, and this is where this new generation will have to lead us to resolve the issues that are facing us. These are the reasons I am here. I wish you all the luck and I wish to all of us all the luck we will need in the years and decades to come.

Thank you so much.