

PANEL IX:

NEW CONTEXT FOR THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY: 2005 AND BEYOND

Moderator: Rebecca Johnson, *Executive Director, Acronym Institute, UK*

Vladimir Ostropikov, Leading Expert, Department of International and External Economic Cooperation of Ministry of Atomic Energy of Russian Federation, Russia

Fidel Castro Diaz-Balart, Member, Academy of Sciences, Cuba

Rebecca Johnson began by citing George Perkovich's statement that "the NPT is a tool, not an actor." It is what states make out of it. She argued that the Prep Com meeting was a political failure and didn't come to grips with central challenges.

She outlined four areas where the NPT was "missing the boat"

- The incentives for nuclear technology need to be reduced.
- Energy needs and security concerns that lie outside the strict parameters of the NPT regime need to be dealt with.
- Credibility of arms control & the rule of law need to be restored.
- Verification and enforcement powers need to be increased.

Vladimir Ostropikov, *Leading Expert, Department of International and External Economic Cooperation of Ministry of Atomic Energy of Russian Federation, Russia*

Mr. Ostropikov began by stating that he wanted to go over the results of the 2003 NPT PrepCom and prospects of NPT development. Entering into force in 1970, 188 countries are signatories and it was prolonged indefinitely in 1995. He asserted that this treaty has been tested by time itself. During the 2003 PrepCom meeting in Geneva, they discussed the questions pertaining to the strengthening of the NPT. All delegates confirmed their commitments.

Mr. Ostropikov stated that he saw the polarization of views there. The participants at the 2003 PrepCom saw the strengthening of the IAEA's role as being of principle importance. Strengthening safeguards, preventing illicit trade of nuclear materials and verification measures are all important issues.

He stressed that Article IV of includes the right of development of peaceful nuclear energy. Violating Article IV would undermine the whole treaty. He stated that, with time, Article IV will grow and strengthen the treaty and its universal character. Also, during the 2003 PrepCom meeting, participants discussed the strengthening of physical protection of facilities and fighting nuclear terrorism.

During the meeting, attention was also focused on the obligations within Article VI - on nuclear disarmament. He also stressed the CTBT - a measure of nuclear non-proliferation and arms control. He hoped that others will join, and enhance the universal character of that treaty. He cited that three countries, India, Pakistan and Israel, are not members of the NPT and threaten the possibility of a regional arms race.

He stated that we should continue to try and involve India, Pakistan and Israel in non-proliferation efforts and that the absence of North Korea from the NPT may have negative consequences regionally and globally. He affirmed the belief that non-nuclear status, peace and stability on the peninsula are in consonance with all people. North Korea, he said, should receive sovereignty guarantees and economic aid. He noted that the 2003 PrepCom ended in consensus and that the third NPT PrepCom meeting is scheduled for April 2004.

Mohammed Shaker, *Chairman, Council of Foreign Affairs, Egypt*

Mohammed Shaker began by stating that all the issues today and in 2005 are old issues. Thus, it is important to take stock of the past. The regime, today, is trying to solve old problems. He outlined two major issues for 2005 NPT Review Conference: organizational issues and issues of substance.

He stated that good organization for 2005 Review Conference would have four aspects:

- The choice of president should be made a year in advance, and that person should know well ahead of time. This will guarantee a better result.
- The review process should be enhanced. There should be more dialogue between delegations and this should be guaranteed next April for the third PrepCom.
- It should be known whether a declaration will be made or not. But it is not necessary to aim for a declaration. Usually, when there is a declaration it is interpreted as a successful conference. Yet, it is not essential. It is more essential to follow-up on what is actually decided.
- The Inter-session period. The president of the General Assembly should remain in power between the two conferences.

On issues of substance, he noted the significance of establishing a Nuclear-Weapons Free Zone. He cited that the Middle East countries agreed on a number of steps. He also stated that Iran feels that it has the right to develop peaceful nuclear energy; under Article IV it has that right. He stated that Korea needs to be watched, but that more than six countries should be included in discussions.

Fidel Castro Diaz-Balart, *Member, Academy of Sciences, Cuba*

Fidel Castro Diaz-Balart began by stating that the past context must be clearly understood in order to clearly understand the future. Many analysts, he stated, have asked why Cuba joined the NPT? What did it have to gain? He answered that in order to ensure world peace, Cuba joined the NPT in hopes of eliminating nuclear weapons under strict verification. On September 18, 2003 Cuba decided to sign the additional protocol. He remarked that this has made Cuba the first densely inhabited state to become a Nuclear Free Zone. This demonstrates, he asserted, a clear political will.

He cited two kinds of states: non-nuclear states and nuclear states. Cuba has invested a lot in human capital, in the nuclear sciences and technology and will continue to maintain IAEA ties. In the first Moscow Conference, he said, the need to assure that the public has enough knowledge to make decisions was discussed. Cuba, he concluded, is dedicated to the advancement of human and scientific endeavors.

Alejandro Estivill, *Chief of Cabinet of the Vice-Minister in charge of Multilateral Affairs, Mexico*

Alejandro Estivill began by emphasizing that Mexico will reinforce its multilateral activity. Yet, he stated that the Iraq question showed that the 450 resolutions on Iraq and the Middle East from the United Nations were too many. They were not enforced. He suggested the following ways existing mechanisms may be modernized:

- The creation of security guarantees within the parameters of the New Agenda's initiatives.
- Reforming the multilateral regimes.
- There is a greater need to look at the problems of regional tactical nuclear weapons.

Questions and Answers

Q: Does a 2005 meeting make sense? The context of the NPT is changing and Article VI, the notion of disarmament has lost meaning as have the 13 steps adopted in 2000. CTBT is not a reality, testing may resume. Can the NPT tackle these questions?

Q: What can we do to get a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in Central Asia?

A: Mr. Shaker stated that in regards to Central Asia, the key is to learn from others and to add new aspects relevant to the specific conditions within that region. He noted that in the Middle East, there is a need for strict verification due to Israel.

A: Mr. Estivill stated that a today movement on the NPT is in a backward jump. The 13 steps, he believes, are losing their meaning and they must regain their meaning if it is to jump forward.

Q: The Iranian case is a different kind of case. Lots of cooperation with the IAEA on Iran. Directed to Mr. Shaker, the questioner asked what he believes the obstacles are to a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in the Middle East.

Q: Citing the 400+ resolutions on the Middle East and Iraq, the questioner asked what can be done to avoid making those mechanisms of 2005 not propaganda tools. How can we make the mechanisms realistic?

A: Ostropikov answered that he believed that the next meeting will be effective, and not simply a “venue” for old friends to meet. He said he was more optimistic about the CTBT, and noted that Russia has signed and ratified it. Russia does not believe that the document will be undermined. India and Pakistan are still an issue, and that it is a square that must be circled.