



Thematic Summary of the Positions of the Members of the Non-Aligned Movement in Plenary Meeting Records of the 55th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency

United Nations Fora

<p>UN General Assembly</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 17) NAM, which considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step, leading towards the objective of global nuclear disarmament, continued to favour the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 73) NAM, which welcomed the fact that its member States party to the NPT had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency in fulfilment of their obligations under Article III.1 of the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon States, noted that all States in the Middle East except Israel were party to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards; and NAM regarded the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and continued to advocate the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 78) In a letter attached to the Director General's report contained in document GC(54)/14, Israel's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs had stated that Israel valued the nonproliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had over the years demonstrated "a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear domain." Regrettably, official documents of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. For example, in various resolutions regarding South Africa's nuclear capabilities adopted by it prior to 1994, the General Conference had recalled General Assembly resolutions dealing with relations between Israel and South Africa in which the General Assembly had, inter alia, strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>International Atomic Energy Agency</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 16) Mr SHAMAA (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), expressed support for the draft resolution contained in document GC(55)/L.1 and said that NAM was still committed to its principled position regarding the application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East. It strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive</p>

imbalance in military capabilities, due particularly to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 18) NAM, which was convinced that the effective and efficient application of Agency safeguards promoted greater confidence among States, considered that achieving universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East was a necessary step towards the establishment of an NWFZ there.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 19) NAM welcomed the fact that its member States party to the NPT had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency in fulfilment of their obligations under NPT Article III.1 as non-nuclear-weapon States.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 20) All States in the Middle East region except Israel were parties to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards. NAM regretted Israel's continued insistence that the issue of comprehensive Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process; there was no automatic sequence linking the application of comprehensive safeguards at all nuclear facilities in the Middle East to the prior achievement of a peace settlement.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 21) NAM also regretted the fact that the Director General had not been able to make further progress, pursuant to resolution GC(54)/RES/13, as regards the application of comprehensive Agency safeguards covering all nuclear activities in the Middle East. The situation was unacceptable, and all Member States should cooperate in rectifying it. In the promotion of Agency safeguards in the Middle East, top priority should be accorded first to achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards there.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 22) NAM, which welcomed the fact that the Director General had "continued to encourage the development and consideration of relevant new ideas and approaches that could help to move his mandates forward" and the fact that he would "continue with his consultations in accordance with his mandate regarding the early application of comprehensive Agency safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East region", would like him to brief Member States regularly on the results of his future efforts.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 24) NAM had noted with appreciation the Director General's recent efforts to develop "an agenda and modalities which will help to ensure a successful forum on the relevance of the experience of existing NWFZs, including confidence-building and verification measures, for establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East." Also, NAM had noted that, in his report contained in document GC(55)/23, the Director General stated that those efforts had been welcomed by many States and that he had written "to all Member States inviting them to take part in the Forum to be held on 21–22 November 2011 at IAEA headquarters in Vienna." For the Forum to be successful, its agenda should reflect the consensus within

the international community on the importance of establishing an NWFZ in the Middle East. Accordingly, NAM would like the Director General to continue consultations with all Member States on arrangements conducive to the Forum's being a constructive contribution to achievement of the objective of the establishment of an NWFZ in that region.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 25) NAM, which was fully committed to supporting the Director General's efforts in implementing resolution GC(54)/RES/13, expected all Member States of the Agency to support those efforts.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 73) NAM, which welcomed the fact that its member States party to the NPT had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency in fulfilment of their obligations under Article III.1 of the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon States, noted that all States in the Middle East except Israel were party to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards; and NAM regarded the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and continued to advocate the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 74) A selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East was undermining the viability of the Agency's safeguards regime. Also, it had resulted in the continuing dangerous presence of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities, notwithstanding the repeated calls on Israel to subject those facilities and activities to comprehensive Agency safeguards. NAM was gravely concerned about the dire consequences for international security of the acquisition of a nuclear capability by Israel, which posed a serious threat to the security of its neighbours and of other States, and about the continuing provision to Israeli scientists of access to the nuclear facilities of one of the nuclear-weapon States.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 75) All Member States should cooperate in rectifying what was an unacceptable situation and achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East. Implementing resolution GC(53)/RES/17, entitled "Israeli nuclear capabilities", was a first step towards that end.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 76) NAM regretted Israel's continuing insistence that the issue of Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. There was no automatic sequence linking the application of comprehensive safeguards at all nuclear facilities in the Middle East to the prior conclusion of a peace settlement. The former would contribute to the latter.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 78) In a letter attached to the Director General's report contained in document GC(54)/14, Israel's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs had stated that Israel valued the nonproliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had over

	<p>the years demonstrated “a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear domain.” Regrettably, official documents of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. For example, in various resolutions regarding South Africa’s nuclear capabilities adopted by it prior to 1994, the General Conference had recalled General Assembly resolutions dealing with relations between Israel and South Africa in which the General Assembly had, inter alia, strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>UN Security Council</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 17) NAM, which considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step, leading towards the objective of global nuclear disarmament, continued to favour the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 73) NAM, which welcomed the fact that its member States party to the NPT had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency in fulfilment of their obligations under Article III.1 of the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon States, noted that all States in the Middle East except Israel were party to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards; and NAM regarded the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and continued to advocate the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 78) In a letter attached to the Director General’s report contained in document GC(54)/14, Israel’s Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs had stated that Israel valued the nonproliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had over the years demonstrated “a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear domain.” Regrettably, official documents of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. For example, in various resolutions regarding South Africa’s nuclear capabilities adopted by it prior to 1994, the General Conference had recalled General Assembly resolutions dealing with relations between Israel and South Africa in which the General Assembly had, inter alia, strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>Peaceful Uses</p>	
<p>Access to Nuclear Technology</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 77) NAM continued to want a complete ban on the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information,</p>

	material, facilities, devices and other resources and the provision of other assistance in nuclear-related scientific and technological fields.
NWFZs	
Contributions to Disarmament	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 17) NAM, which considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step, leading towards the objective of global nuclear disarmament, continued to favour the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 73) NAM, which welcomed the fact that its member States party to the NPT had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency in fulfilment of their obligations under Article III.1 of the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon States, noted that all States in the Middle East except Israel were party to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards; and NAM regarded the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and continued to advocate the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
Middle East WMDFZ	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 17) NAM, which considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step, leading towards the objective of global nuclear disarmament, continued to favour the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 18) NAM, which was convinced that the effective and efficient application of Agency safeguards promoted greater confidence among States, considered that achieving universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East was a necessary step towards the establishment of an NWFZ there.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 23) The NAM member States party to the NPT, recalling the resolution on the Middle East adopted in 1995 by the NPT Review and Extension Conference, welcomed the fact that the 2010 NPT Review Conference had “endorsed the practical step that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, will convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region, and with the full support and engagement of the nuclear-weapon States.” NAM noted that the 2012 conference would take “as its terms of reference the 1995 Resolution.”</p>

	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 24) NAM had noted with appreciation the Director General’s recent efforts to develop “an agenda and modalities which will help to ensure a successful forum on the relevance of the experience of existing NWFZs, including confidence-building and verification measures, for establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.” Also, NAM had noted that, in his report contained in document GC(55)/23, the Director General stated that those efforts had been welcomed by many States and that he had written “to all Member States inviting them to take part in the Forum to be held on 21–22 November 2011 at IAEA headquarters in Vienna.” For the Forum to be successful, its agenda should reflect the consensus within the international community on the importance of establishing an NWFZ in the Middle East. Accordingly, NAM would like the Director General to continue consultations with all Member States on arrangements conducive to the Forum’s being a constructive contribution to achievement of the objective of the establishment of an NWFZ in that region.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 73) NAM, which welcomed the fact that its member States party to the NPT had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency in fulfilment of their obligations under Article III.1 of the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon States, noted that all States in the Middle East except Israel were party to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards; and NAM regarded the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and continued to advocate the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
--	---

Country Specific	
-------------------------	--

Israel	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 16) Mr SHAMAA (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), expressed support for the draft resolution contained in document GC(55)/L.1 and said that NAM was still committed to its principled position regarding the application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East. It strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, due particularly to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region.</p> <p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 20) All States in the Middle East region except Israel were parties to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards. NAM regretted Israel’s continued insistence that the issue of comprehensive Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process; there was no automatic sequence linking the application of comprehensive safeguards at all nuclear facilities in the Middle East to the prior achievement of a peace settlement.</p>
---------------	--

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 72) Mr SHAMAA (Egypt), speaking on behalf of NAM, reiterated its principled position on Israel's nuclear capabilities: NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a massive imbalance in military capabilities was continuing to exist, particularly due to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowing one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 73) NAM, which welcomed the fact that its member States party to the NPT had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency in fulfilment of their obligations under Article III.1 of the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon States, noted that all States in the Middle East except Israel were party to the NPT and had accepted comprehensive Agency safeguards; and NAM regarded the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and continued to advocate the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 74) A selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East was undermining the viability of the Agency's safeguards regime. Also, it had resulted in the continuing dangerous presence of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities, notwithstanding the repeated calls on Israel to subject those facilities and activities to comprehensive Agency safeguards. NAM was gravely concerned about the dire consequences for international security of the acquisition of a nuclear capability by Israel, which posed a serious threat to the security of its neighbours and of other States, and about the continuing provision to Israeli scientists of access to the nuclear facilities of one of the nuclear-weapon States.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 75) All Member States should cooperate in rectifying what was an unacceptable situation and achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East. Implementing resolution GC(53)/RES/17, entitled "Israeli nuclear capabilities", was a first step towards that end.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 76) NAM regretted Israel's continuing insistence that the issue of Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. There was no automatic sequence linking the application of comprehensive safeguards at all nuclear facilities in the Middle East to the prior conclusion of a peace settlement. The former would contribute to the latter.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 77) NAM continued to want a complete ban on the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information, material, facilities, devices and other resources and the provision of other assistance in nuclear-related scientific and technological fields.

(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 78) In a letter attached to the Director General's report contained in document GC(54)/14, Israel's Deputy Prime

	<p>Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs had stated that Israel valued the nonproliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had over the years demonstrated “a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear domain.” Regrettably, official documents of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. For example, in various resolutions regarding South Africa’s nuclear capabilities adopted by it prior to 1994, the General Conference had recalled General Assembly resolutions dealing with relations between Israel and South Africa in which the General Assembly had, inter alia, strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>South Africa</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 78) In a letter attached to the Director General’s report contained in document GC(54)/14, Israel’s Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs had stated that Israel valued the nonproliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had over the years demonstrated “a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear domain.” Regrettably, official documents of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. For example, in various resolutions regarding South Africa’s nuclear capabilities adopted by it prior to 1994, the General Conference had recalled General Assembly resolutions dealing with relations between Israel and South Africa in which the General Assembly had, inter alia, strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>Non-Proliferation Treaty Related</p>	
<p>Disarmament Through the NPT</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 23) The NAM member States party to the NPT, recalling the resolution on the Middle East adopted in 1995 by the NPT Review and Extension Conference, welcomed the fact that the 2010 NPT Review Conference had “endorsed the practical step that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, will convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region, and with the full support and engagement of the nuclear-weapon States.” NAM noted that the 2012 conference would take “as its terms of reference the 1995 Resolution.”</p>
<p>1995 Review and Extension of the NPT</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 23) The NAM member States party to the NPT, recalling the resolution on the Middle East adopted in 1995 by the NPT Review and Extension Conference, welcomed the fact that the 2010 NPT Review Conference had “endorsed the practical step that the</p>

	<p>Secretary-General of the United Nations and the co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, will convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region, and with the full support and engagement of the nuclear-weapon States.” NAM noted that the 2012 conference would take “as its terms of reference the 1995 Resolution.”</p>
<p>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 77) NAM continued to want a complete ban on the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information, material, facilities, devices and other resources and the provision of other assistance in nuclear-related scientific and technological fields.</p>
<p>2000 and 2010 Action Plans</p>	<p>(GC(55)/OR.9, Para 23) The NAM member States party to the NPT, recalling the resolution on the Middle East adopted in 1995 by the NPT Review and Extension Conference, welcomed the fact that the 2010 NPT Review Conference had “endorsed the practical step that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, will convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region, and with the full support and engagement of the nuclear-weapon States.” NAM noted that the 2012 conference would take “as its terms of reference the 1995 Resolution.”</p>