



**Thematic Summary of the 12<sup>th</sup> Heads of State Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement,  
Durban, South Africa (1998)**

**Disarmament**

**Nuclear Weapon  
Convention**

**(Final Document, Para 113)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear

weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

**(Final Document, Para 114)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated their call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, as the highest priority, an ad hoc committee to start in 1998 negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. The Conference on Disarmament shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, regarding this issue that have been submitted to it. They also insisted on the need to conclude a universal and legally binding multilateral agreement committing all States to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. In this context they regretted that some Nuclear Weapons States had adopted inflexible postures which prevented the Conference on Disarmament from commencing these negotiations. They underscored the flexibility, which on the other hand has been demonstrated by the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, members of the Conference on Disarmament, in accepting the proposal to establish an ad hoc committee under item 1 of the Conference on Disarmament's agenda to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. They emphasised that this flexibility should be reciprocated by others through their agreement on the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as well as during the course of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (Decision CD/1547).

**(Final Document, Para 119)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated their conviction of the validity of the unanimous conclusion of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice that "There exists 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 recognised that the unanimous conclusion contained in the International Court of Justice's Advisory Opinion has identified existing international law obligations. In this connection, they reiterated their call upon all States to immediately fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of threat of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.

**(Final Document, Para 139)** The Heads of State or Government welcomed the initiative by H E. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, in June 1998, to achieve a world free from all weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons and to convene as soon as possible an international conference to consider this issue.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Disarmament and Development</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 142)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that global and regional approaches to disarmament are complementary and could be pursued simultaneously. They urged States in various regions of the world to negotiate agreements to promote greater balance in conventional armaments and restraint in the production and acquisition of conventional arms and, where necessary, for their progressive and balanced reduction, with a view to enhancing international and regional peace and security. They stressed that the peaceful resolution of regional and inter-State disputes is essential for the creation of conditions which would enable States to divert their resources from armaments to economic growth and development. Regional disarmament initiatives, to be practical, needed to take into account the special characteristics of each region and enhance the security of every State of the region concerned. The question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate requirements of the States for self-defence should also be addressed, taking into account the special characteristics of each region.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Nuclear-Weapon States Obligations</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 113)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena</p>

Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

**(Final Document, Para 114)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated their call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, as the highest priority, an ad hoc committee to start in 1998 negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. The Conference on Disarmament shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, regarding this issue that have been submitted to it. They also insisted on the need to conclude a universal and legally binding multilateral agreement committing all States to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. In this context they regretted that some Nuclear Weapons States had adopted inflexible postures which prevented the Conference on Disarmament from commencing these negotiations. They underscored the flexibility, which on the other hand has been demonstrated by the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, members of the Conference on Disarmament, in accepting the proposal to establish an ad hoc committee under item 1 of the Conference on Disarmament's agenda to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. They emphasised that this flexibility should be reciprocated by others through their agreement on the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as well as during the course of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (Decision CD/1547).

**(Final Document, Para 115)** In this connection, the Heads of State or Government reiterated that a number of Non-Aligned Movement countries had taken collective initiatives at the United Nations General Assembly sessions to underscore the need for urgent action in the field of nuclear disarmament, as mandated by the Cartagena Summit. They recognised all of the constructive and useful proposals put forward by members of the Non-Aligned Movement in the Conference on Disarmament on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament including the useful work done by Non-Aligned Movement members of the Conference on Disarmament and developing a Programme of Action for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons within a time-bound framework. The Heads of State or Government took note of the Declaration issued on 9 June 1998 entitled - "Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons: Time for a New Agenda", supported and responded to by a number of States including by some members of the Non-Aligned Movement. They recognised

	<p>that this Declaration, as well as all other initiatives which have consistently been proposed by the Movement and its members are contributions to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and called upon the Nuclear Weapon States to react positively to these initiatives.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 116)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed concern over the failure of the Nuclear Weapon States to demonstrate a genuine commitment with regard to complete nuclear disarmament, and to provide universal, unconditional, and legally binding negative security assurances to all Non-Nuclear Weapon States, and urged the Nuclear Weapon States to immediately commence and conclude without delay negotiations on these assurances.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 121)</b> Consistent with the decisions taken by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT called upon all States party, particularly the Nuclear Weapon States, to fulfil their commitments, particularly those related to Article VI of the Treaty. They also emphasised the need to ensure and facilitate the exercise of the inalienable right of all states to develop, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination under IAEA safeguards. Undertakings to facilitate participation in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be fully implemented.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 124)</b> The Heads of State or Government of State signatory to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty expressed their satisfaction that 150 States have signed the Treaty and 20 States have ratified it thus far. They further expressed their general satisfaction at the progress of establishing the international verification system thus far. They realised, the continued commitment of all State signatories, especially the Nuclear Weapon States, to nuclear disarmament would be essential.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Arms Races</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 118)</b> The Heads of State or Government commended the establishment in the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc committee, under agenda item 1, entitled “The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament”, to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices and believe that the proposed convention must constitute a nuclear disarmament measure and not only a non-proliferation measure, and must be an integral step leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The treaty should also promote international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and should not hinder access to nuclear technology, equipment and material for peaceful purposes by developing countries.</p>

<p><b>Bilateral Disarmament</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 113)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.</p>
<p><b>Disarmament and Nonproliferation</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 113)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various</p>



international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

**(Final Document, Para 118)** The Heads of State or Government commended the establishment in the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc committee, under agenda item 1, entitled “The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament”, to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices and believe that the proposed convention must constitute a nuclear disarmament measure and not only a non-proliferation measure, and must be an integral step leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The treaty should also promote international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and should not hinder access to nuclear technology, equipment and material for peaceful purposes by developing countries.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>International Humanitarian Law and ICJ</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 119)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated their conviction of the validity of the unanimous conclusion of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice that “There exists 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 recognised that the unanimous conclusion contained in the International Court of Justice’s Advisory Opinion has identified existing international law obligations. In this connection, they reiterated their call upon all States to immediately fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of threat of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NAM Involvement and Contributions</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 113)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination</p>



of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

**(Final Document, Para 114)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated their call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, as the highest priority, an ad hoc committee to start in 1998 negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. The Conference on Disarmament shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, regarding this issue that have been submitted to it. They also insisted on the need to conclude a universal and legally binding multilateral agreement committing all States to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. In this context they regretted that some Nuclear Weapons States had adopted inflexible postures which prevented the Conference on Disarmament from commencing these negotiations. They underscored the flexibility, which on the other hand has been demonstrated by the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, members of the Conference on Disarmament, in accepting the proposal to establish an ad hoc committee under item 1 of the Conference on Disarmament's agenda to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. They emphasised that this flexibility should be reciprocated by others through their agreement on the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as well as during the course of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (Decision CD/1547).

**(Final Document, Para 115)** In this connection, the Heads of State or Government reiterated that a number of Non-Aligned Movement countries had taken collective initiatives at the United Nations General Assembly sessions to underscore the need for urgent action in the field of nuclear disarmament, as mandated by the Cartagena Summit. They recognised all of the constructive and useful proposals put forward by members of the Non-Aligned Movement in the Conference on Disarmament on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament including the useful work done by Non-Aligned Movement members of the Conference on Disarmament and developing a Programme of Action for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons within a time-bound framework. The Heads of State or Government took note of the Declaration issued on 9 June 1998 entitled - "Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons: Time for a New Agenda", supported and responded to by a number of States including by some members of the Non-Aligned Movement. They recognised that this Declaration, as well as all other initiatives which have

	<p>consistently been proposed by the Movement and its members are contributions to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and called upon the Nuclear Weapon States to react positively to these initiatives.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 145)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed once again their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session on the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. They welcomed the adoption by the General Assembly, by consensus, of the resolution on the Convening of the IV Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament. They took note of the deliberations on the matter held by the United Nations Disarmament Commission and directed the Co-ordinating Bureau to entrust the Non-Aligned Movement Working Group on Disarmament with the task of pursuing further the holding of the Fourth Special Session and the related co-ordination during the preparatory process. In this context, they reaffirmed the need to continue to press for further steps leading to its convening with the participation of all Member States of the United Nations as well as the need for SSOD IV to review and assess the implementation of SSOD I.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 147)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed their satisfaction with the work of the Non-Aligned Working Group on Disarmament under the co-ordination of Indonesia and encouraged delegations to continue their active work in this regard.</p>
--	--

**United Nations Fora**

<p><b>UN General Assembly</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 115)</b> In this connection, the Heads of State or Government reiterated that a number of Non-Aligned Movement countries had taken collective initiatives at the United Nations General Assembly sessions to underscore the need for urgent action in the field of nuclear disarmament, as mandated by the Cartagena Summit. They recognised all of the constructive and useful proposals put forward by members of the Non-Aligned Movement in the Conference on Disarmament on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament including the useful work done by Non-Aligned Movement members of the Conference on Disarmament and developing a Programme of Action for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons within a time-bound framework. The Heads of State or Government took note of the Declaration issued on 9 June 1998 entitled - “Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons: Time for a New Agenda”, supported and responded to by a number of States including by some members of the Non-Aligned Movement. They recognised that this Declaration, as well as all other initiatives which have consistently been proposed by the Movement and its members are contributions to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and called upon the Nuclear Weapon States to react positively to these initiatives.</p>
-----------------------------------	---

**(Final Document, Para 129)** The Heads of State or Government expressed particular concern over the illicit transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their accumulation and proliferation in many countries, which constituted a serious threat to the population and to the national and regional security and were a factor contributing to the destabilisation of States. They urged States to take steps to deal effectively, through administrative and legislative means, with the increasing problem of illicit transfer of small arms and light weapons which exacerbate tensions leading to strife, conflict and terrorism, and impact negatively on the socio-economic development of affected countries. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of guidelines in 1996 for international arm transfers in the context of General Assembly resolution 46/36H of 6 September 1991 by the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Moreover, they welcomed the initiative by His Excellency Alpha Oumar Konare, President of the Republic of Mali, on the establishment of a moratorium on the production, transfer and illicit traffic of light arms in West Africa, adopted by member States of ECOWAS within the framework of on-going discussions and referring to the creation of a mechanism to prevent, handle and rule on conflicts in the sub-region. They also welcomed the decision adopted by the 34th Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) regarding the problem of small arms and light weapons in Africa.

**(Final Document, Para 136)** The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.

**(Final Document, Para 138)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolutions 487 (1981) and 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they called on Israel, the only country in the region that has not joined the NPT nor

declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) without delay, and to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA full-scope safeguards. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States and they condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. They are of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons which allow one party to threaten its neighbours and the region. They further welcomed the initiative by H.E. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel.

**(Final Document, Para 143)** The Heads of State or Government took note of the relevant paragraphs of the United Nations General Assembly resolutions 52/12A & B on international peace, security and disarmament, and insisted on the need that its implementation respects fully the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

**(Final Document, Para 144)** The Heads of State or Government continued to stress their hope that the decision to re-establish at the United Nations Secretariat, the Department on Disarmament, headed by an Under Secretary-General from a Non-Aligned Country should contribute to greater disarmament efforts towards achieving general and complete disarmament in conformity with priorities set out in SSOD I and relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 52/220.

**(Final Document, Para 145)** The Heads of State or Government expressed once again their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session on the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. They welcomed the adoption by the General Assembly, by consensus, of the resolution on the Convening of the IV Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament. They took note of the deliberations on the matter held by the United Nations Disarmament Commission and directed the Co-ordinating Bureau to entrust the Non-Aligned Movement Working Group on Disarmament with the task of pursuing further the holding of the Fourth Special Session and the related co-ordination during the preparatory process. In this context, they reaffirmed the need to continue to press for further steps leading to its convening with the participation of all Member States of the United Nations as well as the need for SSOD IV to review and assess the implementation of SSOD I.

	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 146)</b> The Heads of State or Government welcomed the decision adopted by the General Assembly on maintaining and revitalising the three Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament in Nepal, Peru, and Togo.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 148)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the validity of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. They reaffirmed the importance of international co-operation to ensure peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean region. They noted that greater efforts and more time were required to facilitate a focused discussion on practical measures to ensure conditions of peace, security and stability in the region. They also noted that in the light of United Nations General Assembly resolution 52/44, the Chairperson of the Ad-Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean will continue his informal consultations on the future work of the Committee.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SSOD</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 144)</b> The Heads of State or Government continued to stress their hope that the decision to re-establish at the United Nations Secretariat, the Department on Disarmament, headed by an Under Secretary-General from a Non-Aligned Country should contribute to greater disarmament efforts towards achieving general and complete disarmament in conformity with priorities set out in SSOD I and relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 52/220.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 145)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed once again their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session on the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. They welcomed the adoption by the General Assembly, by consensus, of the resolution on the Convening of the IV Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament. They took note of the deliberations on the matter held by the United Nations</p>

	<p>Disarmament Commission and directed the Co-ordinating Bureau to entrust the Non-Aligned Movement Working Group on Disarmament with the task of pursuing further the holding of the Fourth Special Session and the related co-ordination during the preparatory process. In this context, they reaffirmed the need to continue to press for further steps leading to its convening with the participation of all Member States of the United Nations as well as the need for SSOD IV to review and assess the implementation of SSOD I.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>World Disarmament Conference</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 113)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition,</p>



	<p>testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 139)</b> The Heads of State or Government welcomed the initiative by H E. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, in June 1998, to achieve a world free from all weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons and to convene as soon as possible an international conference to consider this issue.</p>
<p><b>Test Ban and CTBT</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 113)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear</p>

	<p>weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 124)</b> The Heads of State or Government of State signatory to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty expressed their satisfaction that 150 States have signed the Treaty and 20 States have ratified it thus far. They further expressed their general satisfaction at the progress of establishing the international verification system thus far. They realised, the continued commitment of all State signatories, especially the Nuclear Weapon States, to nuclear disarmament would be essential.</p>
<p><b>Conference on Disarmament</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 113)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated that with the end of the Cold War, there is no justification for the maintenance of nuclear arsenals, or concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence. They noted and welcomed the various international initiatives, which stress that with the end of the Cold War the opportunity now exists for the international community to pursue nuclear disarmament as a matter of the highest priority. They also noted that the present situation whereby Nuclear Weapon States insist that nuclear weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet monopolise the right to own them, is highly discriminatory, unstable and cannot be sustained. These weapons continued to represent a threat to the survival of the mankind. The Heads of State or Government recalled their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issues of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear tests. They expressed their concern at the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, which constitutes their primary disarmament objective. They noted the complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia, which underlined the need to work even harder to achieve their disarmament objectives, including elimination of nuclear weapons. They considered positively the commitment by the parties concerned in the region to exercise restraint, which contributes to regional security, to discontinue nuclear tests and not to transfer nuclear weapons-related material, equipment and technology. They further stressed the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all Nuclear Weapon States, and commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (decision CD/1547), which, inter-alia, should accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. They also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries. They reiterated the need for bilateral dialogue to secure peaceful solutions on all outstanding issues and the promotion of confidence and security building measures and mutual trust. They recalled that the Cartagena Summit had called for the adoption of an action plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. They once again called upon the international community to join them in negotiating and implementing universal, non-discriminatory disarmament measures and mutually agreed confidence-building measures. They called for an international conference, preferably in 1999, with the</p>

objective of arriving at an agreement, before the end of this millennium on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.

**(Final Document, Para 114)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated their call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, as the highest priority, an ad hoc committee to start in 1998 negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. The Conference on Disarmament shall take into consideration all relevant views and proposals, regarding this issue that have been submitted to it. They also insisted on the need to conclude a universal and legally binding multilateral agreement committing all States to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. In this context they regretted that some Nuclear Weapons States had adopted inflexible postures which prevented the Conference on Disarmament from commencing these negotiations. They underscored the flexibility, which on the other hand has been demonstrated by the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, members of the Conference on Disarmament, in accepting the proposal to establish an ad hoc committee under item 1 of the Conference on Disarmament's agenda to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. They emphasised that this flexibility should be reciprocated by others through their agreement on the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as well as during the course of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on fissile materials (Decision CD/1547).

**(Final Document, Para 115)** In this connection, the Heads of State or Government reiterated that a number of Non-Aligned Movement countries had taken collective initiatives at the United Nations General Assembly sessions to underscore the need for urgent action in the field of nuclear disarmament, as mandated by the Cartagena Summit. They recognised all of the constructive and useful proposals put forward by members of the Non-Aligned Movement in the Conference on Disarmament on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament including the useful work done by Non-Aligned Movement members of the Conference on Disarmament and developing a Programme of Action for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons within a time-bound framework. The Heads of State or Government took note of the Declaration issued on 9 June 1998 entitled - "Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons: Time for a New Agenda", supported and responded to by a number of States including by some members of the Non-Aligned Movement. They recognised that this Declaration, as well as all other initiatives which have consistently been proposed by the Movement and its members are contributions to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and called upon the Nuclear Weapon States to react positively to these initiatives.

	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 117)</b> The Heads of State or Government noted the establishment of an ad hoc committee on effective international arrangements to assure Non-Nuclear Weapon States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate universal, unconditional and legally binding assurances to all Non-Nuclear Weapon States. In this context, they expressed their conviction that efforts for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to Non-Nuclear Weapon States should be pursued as a matter of priority by the members of the Non-Aligned Movement.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 118)</b> The Heads of State or Government commended the establishment in the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc committee, under agenda item 1, entitled “The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament”, to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices and believe that the proposed convention must constitute a nuclear disarmament measure and not only a non-proliferation measure, and must be an integral step leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The treaty should also promote international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and should not hinder access to nuclear technology, equipment and material for peaceful purposes by developing countries.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 141)</b> The Heads of State or Government stated that in order to enhance international security and stability, all States parties to non-proliferation, arms limitations and disarmament treaties should comply with and implement all provisions of such treaties. They emphasised that questions of non-compliance by States Parties should be resolved in a manner consistent with such treaties. They further emphasised that any deviation from the role envisaged for the Security Council under the United Nations Charter or in certain circumstances under relevant provision of multilateral treaties on non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament would undermine the provisions of these treaties and conventions, including the inherent mechanisms for securing redress of violations of their provisions. Such deviations would also call into question the value of painstaking multilateral negotiations on disarmament and arms control treaties in the Conference on Disarmament. They underlined that circumventing or undermining the provisions of existing treaties will seriously prejudice the role of the Conference. In this context, they also underlined that they were opposed to the assumption of a role by the United Nations Security Council inconsistent with the United Nations Charter.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UN Disarmament Commission</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 129)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed particular concern over the illicit transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their accumulation and proliferation in many countries, which constituted a serious threat to the population and to the national and regional security and were a factor contributing to the destabilisation of States. They urged States to take steps to deal effectively, through administrative and legislative means, with the increasing problem of illicit transfer of small arms and light weapons</p>

	<p>which exacerbate tensions leading to strife, conflict and terrorism, and impact negatively on the socio-economic development of affected countries. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of guidelines in 1996 for international arm transfers in the context of General Assembly resolution 46/36H of 6 September 1991 by the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Moreover, they welcomed the initiative by His Excellency Alpha Oumar Konare, President of the Republic of Mali, on the establishment of a moratorium on the production, transfer and illicit traffic of light arms in West Africa, adopted by member States of ECOWAS within the framework of on-going discussions and referring to the creation of a mechanism to prevent, handle and rule on conflicts in the sub-region. They also welcomed the decision adopted by the 34th Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) regarding the problem of small arms and light weapons in Africa.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 145)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed once again their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session on the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. They welcomed the adoption by the General Assembly, by consensus, of the resolution on the Convening of the IV Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament. They took note of the deliberations on the matter held by the United Nations Disarmament Commission and directed the Co-ordinating Bureau to entrust the Non-Aligned Movement Working Group on Disarmament with the task of pursuing further the holding of the Fourth Special Session and the related co-ordination during the preparatory process. In this context, they reaffirmed the need to continue to press for further steps leading to its convening with the participation of all Member States of the United Nations as well as the need for SSOD IV to review and assess the implementation of SSOD I.</p>
<p><b>UN Regional Centers for Peace and Disarmament</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 142)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that global and regional approaches to disarmament are complementary and could be pursued simultaneously. They urged States in various regions of the world to negotiate agreements to promote greater balance in conventional armaments and restraint in the production and acquisition of conventional arms and, where necessary, for their progressive and balanced reduction, with a view to enhancing international and regional peace and security. They stressed that the peaceful resolution of regional and inter-State disputes is essential for the creation of conditions which would enable States to divert their resources from armaments to economic growth and development. Regional disarmament initiatives, to be practical, needed to take into account the special characteristics of each region and enhance the security of every State of the region concerned. The question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate requirements of the States for self-defence should also be addressed, taking into account the special characteristics of each region.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 146)</b> The Heads of State or Government welcomed the decision adopted by the General Assembly on</p>

	<p>maintaining and revitalising the three Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament in Nepal, Peru, and Togo.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>International Atomic Energy Agency</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 120)</b> The Heads of State or Government noted with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They emphasised that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 125)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities - operational or under construction - poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. They recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 138)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolutions 487 (1981) and 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they called on Israel, the only country in the region that has not joined the NPT nor declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) without delay, and to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA full-scope safeguards. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States and they condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. They are of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons which allow one party to threaten its neighbours and the region. They further welcomed the initiative by H.E. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone</p>



	<p>free from weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel.</p>
<p><b>UN Security Council</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 138)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolutions 487 (1981) and 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they called on Israel, the only country in the region that has not joined the NPT nor declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) without delay, and to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA full-scope safeguards. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States and they condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. They are of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons which allow one party to threaten its neighbours and the region. They further welcomed the initiative by H.E. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 141)</b> The Heads of State or Government stated that in order to enhance international security and stability, all States parties to non-proliferation, arms limitations and disarmament treaties should comply with and implement all provisions of such treaties. They emphasised that questions of non-compliance by States Parties should be resolved in a manner consistent with such treaties. They further emphasised that any deviation from the role envisaged for the Security Council under the United Nations Charter or in certain circumstances under relevant provision of multilateral treaties on non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament would undermine the provisions of these treaties and conventions, including the inherent mechanisms for securing redress of violations of their provisions. Such deviations would also call into question the value of painstaking multilateral</p>

	<p>negotiations on disarmament and arms control treaties in the Conference on Disarmament. They underlined that circumventing or undermining the provisions of existing treaties will seriously prejudice the role of the Conference. In this context, they also underlined that they were opposed to the assumption of a role by the United Nations Security Council inconsistent with the United Nations Charter.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Chemical and Biological Weapons</b></p>	
---	--

<p><b>Chemical Weapons</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 126)</b> The Heads of State or Government of the States party to the Chemical Weapons Convention welcomed the increasing number of ratifications of the Convention and invited all States who have still not ratified it to do so as soon as possible with the view to its universality. They also underlined the urgency of satisfactorily resolving the unresolved issues in the framework of the Organisation of the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) with a view to paving the ground for the effective, full and non-discriminatory implementation of the Convention. In this context, they reiterated their call on the developed countries to promote international co-operation through the transfer of technology, material and equipment for peaceful purposes in the chemical field and the removal of all and any discriminatory restrictions that are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Convention.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 127)</b> The Heads of State or Government of the States party to the Chemical Weapons Convention, while stressing the importance of the full implementation of the Convention, and in this context, the provisions of Article X on Assistance, expressed their concern at the small number of responses received from the States parties to the voluntary Fund on Assistance established by the OPCW and called upon all States parties to the Convention that had not yet acted in accordance with Article X, to reply to the OPCW and contribute to redress this situation.</p>
--------------------------------	---

<p><b>Biological Weapons</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 128)</b> While asserting that the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention inherently precludes the use of biological weapons, the Heads of State or Government reiterated the decision by the BWC Review Conference that the use by the States parties, in any way and under any circumstances, of microbial or other biological agents or toxins, that is not consistent with prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes, is effectively a violation of Article I of the Convention. In this connection they noted that the Islamic Republic of Iran has formally presented a proposal to amend Article I of the Convention to include the prohibition of use of biological weapons and urged an early reply from the States parties to the inquiries by the depositaries on this proposal. They noted the progress achieved so far in negotiating a protocol to strengthen the BWC and reaffirmed the decision of the Fourth Review Conference urging the conclusion of the negotiations by the Ad Hoc group as soon as possible before the</p>
----------------------------------	--

	<p>commencement of the Fifth Review Conference and for it to submit its report, which shall be adopted by consensus, to the States parties, to be considered at a Special Conference. Therefore artificial deadlines should be avoided. They also expressed issues related to Article X of the Convention. Ensured access for peaceful purposes to the relevant materials, equipment and technology is essential to safeguard the economic interests of developing countries. Substantive progress in strengthening the application and full operationalisation of Article X is thus crucial for the conclusion of a universally acceptable and legally binding instrument designed to strengthen the Convention.</p>
<p><b>Nonproliferation</b></p>	
<p><b>Nonproliferation and Noncompliance</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 141)</b> The Heads of State or Government stated that in order to enhance international security and stability, all States parties to non-proliferation, arms limitations and disarmament treaties should comply with and implement all provisions of such treaties. They emphasised that questions of non-compliance by States Parties should be resolved in a manner consistent with such treaties. They further emphasised that any deviation from the role envisaged for the Security Council under the United Nations Charter or in certain circumstances under relevant provision of multilateral treaties on non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament would undermine the provisions of these treaties and conventions, including the inherent mechanisms for securing redress of violations of their provisions. Such deviations would also call into question the value of painstaking multilateral negotiations on disarmament and arms control treaties in the Conference on Disarmament. They underlined that circumventing or undermining the provisions of existing treaties will seriously prejudice the role of the Conference. In this context, they also underlined that they were opposed to the assumption of a role by the United Nations Security Council inconsistent with the United Nations Charter.</p>
<p><b>Nonproliferation and Peaceful Uses</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 120)</b> The Heads of State or Government noted with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They emphasised that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p>

	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 121)</b> Consistent with the decisions taken by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT called upon all States party, particularly the Nuclear Weapon States, to fulfil their commitments, particularly those related to Article VI of the Treaty. They also emphasised the need to ensure and facilitate the exercise of the inalienable right of all states to develop, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination under IAEA safeguards. Undertakings to facilitate participation in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be fully implemented.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Peaceful Uses</b></p>	
-----------------------------	--

<p><b>Access to Nuclear Technology</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 118)</b> The Heads of State or Government commended the establishment in the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc committee, under agenda item 1, entitled “The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament”, to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices and believe that the proposed convention must constitute a nuclear disarmament measure and not only a non-proliferation measure, and must be an integral step leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The treaty should also promote international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and should not hinder access to nuclear technology, equipment and material for peaceful purposes by developing countries.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 120)</b> The Heads of State or Government noted with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They emphasised that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 121)</b> Consistent with the decisions taken by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT called upon all States party, particularly the Nuclear Weapon States, to fulfil their commitments, particularly those related to Article VI of the Treaty. They also</p>
--	---

	<p>emphasised the need to ensure and facilitate the exercise of the inalienable right of all states to develop, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination under IAEA safeguards. Undertakings to facilitate participation in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be fully implemented.</p>
<p><b>Attack or Threat of Attack Against Peaceful Nuclear Facilities</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 125)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities - operational or under construction - poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. They recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p>
<p><b>UN and IAEA Authority</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 120)</b> The Heads of State or Government noted with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They emphasised that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 125)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities - operational or under construction - poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. They recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p>
<p><b>Inalienable Right Through NPT</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 121)</b> Consistent with the decisions taken by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT called upon all States party,</p>

	<p>particularly the Nuclear Weapon States, to fulfil their commitments, particularly those related to Article VI of the Treaty. They also emphasised the need to ensure and facilitate the exercise of the inalienable right of all states to develop, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination under IAEA safeguards. Undertakings to facilitate participation in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be fully implemented.</p>
--	--

<p><b>NWFZs</b></p>	
---------------------	--

<p><b>Contributions to Disarmament</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ’s) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Contributions to Nonproliferation</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ’s) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.</p>
---	---



<p><b>Regional Zones of Peace</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 148)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the validity of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. They reaffirmed the importance of international co-operation to ensure peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean region. They noted that greater efforts and more time were required to facilitate a focused discussion on practical measures to ensure conditions of peace, security and stability in the region. They also noted that in the light of United Nations General Assembly resolution 52/44, the Chairperson of the Ad-Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean will continue his informal consultations on the future work of the Committee.</p>
<p><b>Treaty of Tlatelolco</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.</p>
<p><b>Treaty of Pelindaba</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide</p>

	unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.
<b>Treaty of Bangkok</b>	<b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.
<b>Treaty of Rarotonga</b>	<b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.
<b>Mongolia as a NWFZ</b>	<b>(Final Document, Para 137)</b> The Heads of State or Government welcomed and supported Mongolia's policy to institutionalise its single State nuclear weapons-free status.
<b>Middle East WMDfZ</b>	<b>(Final Document, Para 122)</b> The Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT took note with regret at the outcome of deliberations of the Second Preparatory Committee held in Geneva

from 27 April to 8 May, 1998. They further regretted that the Committee could not achieve a substantive result due to the insistence of one delegation to support the nuclear policies of a non-party to the NPT. They called upon the Preparatory Committees up to and including the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT to engage immediately, in good faith, in substantive work for the speedy and meaningful implementation of the obligations under the Treaty and the commitments in the 1995 Principles and Objectives document, and the resolution on the Middle East. In this respect they further called upon the Preparatory Committee to make specific time available at its future sessions to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons and for the 2000 NPT Review Conference to establish a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. The Heads of State or Government parties to the NPT, called for the establishment of a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT.

**(Final Document, Para 138)** The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolutions 487 (1981) and 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they called on Israel, the only country in the region that has not joined the NPT nor declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) without delay, and to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA full-scope safeguards. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States and they condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. They are of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons which allow one party to threaten its neighbours and the region. They further welcomed the initiative by H.E. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel.

**Security Assurances**

<p align="center"><b>Nuclear-Weapon States Role</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 116)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed concern over the failure of the Nuclear Weapon States to demonstrate a genuine commitment with regard to complete nuclear disarmament, and to provide universal, unconditional, and legally binding negative security assurances to all Non-Nuclear Weapon States, and urged the Nuclear Weapon States to immediately commence and conclude without delay negotiations on these assurances.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Legally-Binding International Convention or Instrument</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 117)</b> The Heads of State or Government noted the establishment of an ad hoc committee on effective international arrangements to assure Non-Nuclear Weapon States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate universal, unconditional and legally binding assurances to all Non-Nuclear Weapon States. In this context, they expressed their conviction that efforts for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to Non-Nuclear Weapon States should be pursued as a matter of priority by the members of the Non-Aligned Movement.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 119)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated their conviction of the validity of the unanimous conclusion of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice that "There exists 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 recognised that the unanimous conclusion contained in the International Court of Justice's Advisory Opinion has identified existing international law obligations. In this connection, they reiterated their call upon all States</p>

	<p>to immediately fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of threat of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.</p>
<p><b>NWFZs and Security Assurances</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.</p>
<p><b>Security Assurances and the NPT</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 116)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed concern over the failure of the Nuclear Weapon States to demonstrate a genuine commitment with regard to complete nuclear disarmament, and to provide universal, unconditional, and legally binding negative security assurances to all Non-Nuclear Weapon States, and urged the Nuclear Weapon States to immediately commence and conclude without delay negotiations on these assurances.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 136)</b> The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon free zones (NWFZ's) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. They urged States to conclude agreements with a view to creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I). In this context, they welcomed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones established by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba. The Heads of State or Government considered the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world and agreed that this should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and in conformity with the provision of the Final Document of SSOD-I. They concurred that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States should provide</p>

	unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone.
<b>Country Specific</b>	
<b>United States</b>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 122)</b> The Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT took note with regret at the outcome of deliberations of the Second Preparatory Committee held in Geneva from 27 April to 8 May, 1998. They further regretted that the Committee could not achieve a substantive result due to the insistence of one delegation to support the nuclear policies of a non-party to the NPT. They called upon the Preparatory Committees up to and including the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT to engage immediately, in good faith, in substantive work for the speedy and meaningful implementation of the obligations under the Treaty and the commitments in the 1995 Principles and Objectives document, and the resolution on the Middle East. In this respect they further called upon the Preparatory Committee to make specific time available at its future sessions to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons and for the 2000 NPT Review Conference to establish a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. The Heads of State or Government parties to the NPT, called for the establishment of a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT.</p>
<b>Israel</b>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 122)</b> The Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT took note with regret at the outcome of deliberations of the Second Preparatory Committee held in Geneva from 27 April to 8 May, 1998. They further regretted that the Committee could not achieve a substantive result due to the insistence of one delegation to support the nuclear policies of a non-party to the NPT. They called upon the Preparatory Committees up to and including the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT to engage immediately, in good faith, in substantive work for the speedy and meaningful implementation of the obligations under the Treaty and the commitments in the 1995 Principles and Objectives document, and the resolution on the Middle East. In this respect they further called upon the Preparatory Committee to make specific time available at its future sessions to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons and for the 2000 NPT Review Conference to establish a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. The Heads of State or Government parties to the NPT, called for the establishment of a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to consider and recommend</p>



	<p>proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 138)</b> The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolutions 487 (1981) and 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they called on Israel, the only country in the region that has not joined the NPT nor declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) without delay, and to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA full-scope safeguards. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States and they condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. They are of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons which allow one party to threaten its neighbours and the region. They further welcomed the initiative by H.E. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 140)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed their concern over the Israeli-Turkish military alliance as well as the naval manoeuvres carried out in the eastern part of the Mediterranean and the dangers such manoeuvres pose to the security of the region.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Iran</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 128)</b> While asserting that the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention inherently precludes the use of biological weapons, the Heads of State or Government reiterated the decision by the BWC Review Conference that the use by the States parties, in any way and under any circumstances, of microbial or other biological agents or toxins, that is not consistent with prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes, is effectively a violation of Article I of the Convention. In this connection they noted that the Islamic Republic of Iran has formally presented a proposal to amend Article I of the Convention to include the prohibition of use of biological weapons and urged an early reply from the States parties to the inquiries by the depositories on this proposal. They noted the progress achieved so far</p>

	<p>in negotiating a protocol to strengthen the BWC and reaffirmed the decision of the Fourth Review Conference urging the conclusion of the negotiations by the Ad Hoc group as soon as possible before the commencement of the Fifth Review Conference and for it to submit its report, which shall be adopted by consensus, to the States parties, to be considered at a Special Conference. Therefore artificial deadlines should be avoided. They also expressed issues related to Article X of the Convention. Ensured access for peaceful purposes to the relevant materials, equipment and technology is essential to safeguard the economic interests of developing countries. Substantive progress in strengthening the application and full operationalisation of Article X is thus crucial for the conclusion of a universally acceptable and legally binding instrument designed to strengthen the Convention.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Non-Proliferation Treaty Related</b></p>	
--	--

<p><b>Disarmament Through the NPT</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 121)</b> Consistent with the decisions taken by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT called upon all States party, particularly the Nuclear Weapon States, to fulfil their commitments, particularly those related to Article VI of the Treaty. They also emphasised the need to ensure and facilitate the exercise of the inalienable right of all states to develop, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination under IAEA safeguards. Undertakings to facilitate participation in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be fully implemented.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 122)</b> The Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT took note with regret at the outcome of deliberations of the Second Preparatory Committee held in Geneva from 27 April to 8 May, 1998. They further regretted that the Committee could not achieve a substantive result due to the insistence of one delegation to support the nuclear policies of a non-party to the NPT. They called upon the Preparatory Committees up to and including the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT to engage immediately, in good faith, in substantive work for the speedy and meaningful implementation of the obligations under the Treaty and the commitments in the 1995 Principles and Objectives document, and the resolution on the Middle East. In this respect they further called upon the Preparatory Committee to make specific time available at its future sessions to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons and for the 2000 NPT Review Conference to establish a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. The Heads of State or Government parties to the NPT, called for the establishment of a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to consider and recommend</p>
---	--

	<p>proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT.</p>
<p><b>1995 Review and Extension of the NPT</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 121)</b> Consistent with the decisions taken by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT called upon all States party, particularly the Nuclear Weapon States, to fulfil their commitments, particularly those related to Article VI of the Treaty. They also emphasised the need to ensure and facilitate the exercise of the inalienable right of all states to develop, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination under IAEA safeguards. Undertakings to facilitate participation in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be fully implemented.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 122)</b> The Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT took note with regret at the outcome of deliberations of the Second Preparatory Committee held in Geneva from 27 April to 8 May, 1998. They further regretted that the Committee could not achieve a substantive result due to the insistence of one delegation to support the nuclear policies of a non-party to the NPT. They called upon the Preparatory Committees up to and including the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT to engage immediately, in good faith, in substantive work for the speedy and meaningful implementation of the obligations under the Treaty and the commitments in the 1995 Principles and Objectives document, and the resolution on the Middle East. In this respect they further called upon the Preparatory Committee to make specific time available at its future sessions to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons and for the 2000 NPT Review Conference to establish a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to deliberate on the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. The Heads of State or Government parties to the NPT, called for the establishment of a subsidiary body to its Main Committee I to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT.</p>
<p><b>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 121)</b> Consistent with the decisions taken by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Heads of State or Government of States party to the NPT called upon all States party, particularly the Nuclear Weapon States, to fulfil their commitments, particularly those related to Article VI of the Treaty. They also emphasised the need to ensure and facilitate the exercise of the inalienable right of all states to develop, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination under IAEA safeguards. Undertakings to facilitate participation in the fullest</p>

	possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be fully implemented.
<p align="center"><b>2000 and 2010 Action Plans</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 123)</b> The Heads of State or Government Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons also called for the creation of an open-ended standing committee which would work intersessionally, to follow up recommendations concerning the implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which would be agreed to at the Treaty’s 2000 Review Conference.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Conventional Weapons</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>Licit Access to Conventional Weapons</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 130)</b> The Heads of State or Government recognised that there is also a significant imbalance in the production, possession and trade in conventional weapons between the industrialised and the Non-Aligned Countries and they called for a significant reduction in the production, possession and trade of conventional weapons by the States with the largest arsenals with a view to enhancing international and regional peace and security.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 131)</b> The Heads of State or Government encouraged States, taking into account the legitimate requirement of States for self-defence and the specific characteristics of each region, to consider appropriate initiatives at international, regional and national levels to promote transparency in all types of armaments as an important element for building confidence and security. They also stressed that the concept of transparency should encompass both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, in particular, nuclear weapons.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 142)</b> The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that global and regional approaches to disarmament are complementary and could be pursued simultaneously. They urged States in various regions of the world to negotiate agreements to promote greater balance in conventional armaments and restraint in the production and acquisition of conventional arms and, where necessary, for their progressive and balanced reduction, with a view to enhancing international and regional peace and security. They stressed that the peaceful resolution of regional and inter-State disputes is essential for the creation of conditions which would enable States to divert their resources from armaments to economic growth and development. Regional disarmament initiatives, to be practical, needed to take into account the special characteristics of each region and enhance the security of every State of the region concerned. The question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate requirements of the States for self-defence should also be addressed, taking into account the special characteristics of each region.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Anti-Personnel Mines</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 132)</b> The Heads of State or Government called on States to become parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW) and the Protocols thereto, and expressed their satisfaction on the entry into force of its Protocol IV on Blinding Laser Weapons on 30 July 1998 as well as the announcement by the UN Secretary-General that the Protocol II, as amended, on Mines, Booby-Traps and other Devices of the CCW would enter into force on 3 December 1998.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 133)</b> The Heads of State or Government called upon the international community to provide the necessary assistance to landmine clearance operations as well as to the rehabilitation of the victims and their social and economic reintegration in the landmine affected countries. They further called for international assistance to ensure full access of affected countries to material equipment, technology and financial resources for mine clearance. They also called for continued humanitarian assistance for victims of landmines.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 134)</b> The Heads of State or Government deplored the use, in contravention of international humanitarian law, of anti-personnel mines in conflict situations aimed at terrorising civilians, denying them access to farmland, causing famine and forcing them to flee their homes eventually leading to de-population and preventing the return of civilians to their place of original residence.</p> <p><b>(Final Document, Para 135)</b> The Heads of State or Government expressed concern about the residue of the Second World War, particularly in the form of landmines which cause human and material damage and obstruct development plans in some Non-Aligned Countries. They called on the States responsible for laying mines outside their territories to assume responsibility for the landmines, to cooperate with the affected countries, to provide the necessary information, maps and technical assistance for their clearance, to contribute towards defrayal of the costs of clearance and provide compensation for any ensuing losses.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons</b></p>	<p><b>(Final Document, Para 132)</b> The Heads of State or Government called on States to become parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW) and the Protocols thereto, and expressed their satisfaction on the entry into force of its Protocol IV on Blinding Laser Weapons on 30 July 1998 as well as the announcement by the UN Secretary-General that the Protocol II, as amended, on Mines, Booby-Traps and other Devices of the CCW would enter into force on 3 December 1998.</p>

**Small Arms and Light Weapons**

**(Final Document, Para 129)** The Heads of State or Government expressed particular concern over the illicit transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their accumulation and proliferation in many countries, which constituted a serious threat to the population and to the national and regional security and were a factor contributing to the destabilisation of States. They urged States to take steps to deal effectively, through administrative and legislative means, with the increasing problem of illicit transfer of small arms and light weapons which exacerbate tensions leading to strife, conflict and terrorism, and impact negatively on the socio-economic development of affected countries. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of guidelines in 1996 for international arm transfers in the context of General Assembly resolution 46/36H of 6 September 1991 by the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Moreover, they welcomed the initiative by His Excellency Alpha Oumar Konare, President of the Republic of Mali, on the establishment of a moratorium on the production, transfer and illicit traffic of light arms in West Africa, adopted by member States of ECOWAS within the framework of on-going discussions and referring to the creation of a mechanism to prevent, handle and rule on conflicts in the sub-region. They also welcomed the decision adopted by the 34th Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) regarding the problem of small arms and light weapons in Africa.