

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Exchange of views (continued)

1. **Mr. De Icaza** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, Sweden and Mexico, said that the proponents of the New Agenda Initiative had taken note of the joint statement issued the day before by the nuclear-weapon States, which fell short of their expectations regarding nuclear disarmament. The States concerned appreciated the nuclear-weapon States' forward-looking approach to non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament and their acknowledgement of their special responsibility and a key role in that regard; however, the total elimination of nuclear weapons was an obligation and a priority, not an ultimate goal, and it was still less a goal linked to, subject to or conditioned on general and complete disarmament. The proponents of the New Agenda Initiative reiterated their appeal to the five nuclear-weapon States to make an unequivocal commitment to achieving the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals and, in the course of the forthcoming period 2000-2005, to engage in an accelerated negotiation process and take steps to implement nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). They also reaffirmed the importance of the specific measures they had proposed as provisional steps to be taken by the five nuclear-weapon States.

2. **Mr. Wibisono** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries that were parties to the NPT, took note of the joint statement issued on 1 May 2000 by the five nuclear-weapon States, particularly its paragraph 5. The non-aligned States parties were concerned at the conditionalities established by the five nuclear Powers. In that connection, he referred to the non-aligned States parties' long-standing and principled positions on nuclear disarmament and related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and testing, reaffirmed by the Twelfth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Durban, South Africa, in 1998 and by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries at their recent ministerial meeting, held in Cartagena, Colombia. He also referred to the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there existed an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear

disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control, and to the conclusion of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament that nuclear weapons should be accorded priority in disarmament negotiations. In that context, the total elimination of nuclear weapons was an obligation and a priority and not an ultimate goal, and even less a goal that was linked to, subject to or conditioned on general and complete disarmament.

3. The non-aligned States parties therefore urged the nuclear-weapon States to comply unconditionally with their commitments regarding nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Treaty and to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures to halt the nuclear arms race at an early date and to achieve nuclear disarmament. They called for the early commencement of negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament, and for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified time-frame, including a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.

4. **Mr. Pham Binh Minh** (Viet Nam) said that the lack of progress in the field of nuclear disarmament since the 1995 Review and Extension Conference was alarming. Some 35,000 nuclear warheads still existed; the planned national missile defence and theatre missile defence systems in the United States threatened to undermine the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty); and nuclear weapons were becoming increasingly important in certain military doctrines. Despite the recent ratification of the Treaty on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) by the Russian Federation, the START bilateral process was at an impasse, and the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty was being delayed by the nuclear-weapon States, which were supposed to be setting an example for all the others.

5. A number of steps could be taken to promote nuclear disarmament in the coming five-year period. First, further progress must be made towards universality of the NPT. Second, nuclear-weapon States must be requested to redouble their disarmament efforts and to take interim measures to reduce nuclear risks, such as the de-alerting of nuclear weapons, the removal of nuclear warheads from their delivery systems, the conclusion of joint agreements on the no-