



UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/35/145 + add-1

3 September 1980

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: ARABIC/ENGLISH/
FRENCH/RUSSIAN/
SPANISH

Thirty-fifth session
Item 48 (h) of the provisional agenda*

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of
States where there are no such weapons at present

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS	4
Bolivia	4
Bulgaria	4
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	6
Chile	8
Cuba	8
Czechoslovakia	10
Egypt	12
Finland	13
German Democratic Republic	14
Haiti	15
Hungary	15
Indonesia	18

* A/35/150.

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Mexico	18
Morocco	19
Netherlands	20
Philippines	21
Poland	21
Romania	24
Sudan	26
Suriname	27
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	29
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	30
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	31
Yugoslavia	33

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its thirty-fourth session, the General Assembly adopted, under the item entitled "General and complete disarmament", resolution 34/87 C, the operative part of which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

...

1. Believes it necessary to examine possibilities for an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to this end to call upon all States to transmit to him their opinions and observations regarding the possibility of concluding the agreement mentioned in paragraph 1 above and to submit a report on this question to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session;

3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-fifth session an item entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present".

2. Pursuant to paragraph 2 of the resolution, the Secretary-General submits herewith the report containing the replies received from States with their opinions and observations regarding the possibility of concluding the agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

/...

II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

BOLIVIA

/Original: Spanish/
/22 June 1980/

The Government of Bolivia believes that the elaboration of an international convention on the subject in question is appropriate and desirable.

BULGARIA

/Original: Russian/
/30 April 1980/

1. The People's Republic of Bulgaria consistently supports all steps aimed at strengthening international security, reducing the danger of nuclear war, halting the arms race, and in the first place the nuclear arms race, and adopting effective disarmament measures. The People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches particular importance to the efforts to place a reliable curb on possible ways of bringing about a further proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. The proposal concerning the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present put forward by the Soviet Union as long ago as the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly represents a concrete contribution in this respect. This proposal is particularly significant in the present complex international situation when certain circles in the West are pushing the world towards a new spiral in the arms race.

2. In the view of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the realization of the idea of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would considerably strengthen the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons without affecting the possibilities of using nuclear power for peaceful purposes. This idea accords with the interests of the large group of non-nuclear-weapon States which in recent years has unequivocally advocated that nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from foreign territories and that the stationing of such weapons in areas where they are not found at present should be prevented. Like the other important proposal by the Soviet Union concerning the conclusion of a convention on refraining from the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, the idea of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present meets the need to make maximum efforts to adopt real measures for strengthening the security of the States which do not possess nuclear weapons.

3. In 1978, bearing in mind the significance of this idea for the cause of peace and disarmament, the People's Republic of Bulgaria sponsored resolution 33/91 F, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, which calls upon all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the

/...

territories of States where there are no such weapons at present and calls upon all non-nuclear-weapon States which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of such weapons on their territories. It was also a sponsor of resolution 34/87 C, in which the General Assembly, at its most recent session, called upon Member States to examine the possibilities of concluding an international agreement on this question.

4. In view of the broad support for the idea of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, which has won support within and outside the United Nations, the People's Republic of Bulgaria believes that the time has come for the international community to direct its efforts towards formulating an appropriate agreement which would represent the international legal embodiment of the political will of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States.

5. The basis of such an agreement could be the clear and simple obligation of the nuclear-weapon States not to station nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. This obligation must be universal in nature, and should therefore apply to any non-nuclear-weapon State on whose territory there are no nuclear weapons, regardless of whether or not that State is allied with any nuclear-weapon State. Naturally, the obligation must apply to all types of nuclear weapons, whether they have been deployed as military systems or are stored in arsenals or depots. At the same time, the treaty must include the obligation of the non-nuclear-weapon States to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territories.

6. The practical realization of the idea of drafting an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would make a further contribution towards reducing the danger of nuclear war and improving the international situation. The taking of such a step could give fresh impetus to the process of implementing further treaty measures on limiting nuclear weapons. This task is particularly urgent at present because of the need to take further measures to strengthen the régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in order to ensure the success of the forthcoming second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

7. With the presence of goodwill, real possibilities exist for concluding an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, for its part, is prepared to make a constructive contribution towards the practical realization of this possibility.

BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

/Original: Russian/

/27 June 1980/

1. As stated in the letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Byelorussian SSR concerning the tasks of the Second Disarmament Decade, the experience of the 1970s has shown that real results in the field of arms limitation and disarmament can be achieved.
2. Bearing in mind that the accelerating nuclear arms race constitutes the main danger to international peace, the Byelorussian SSR believes that the international community should focus its attention first and foremost on eliminating the threat of nuclear war and on nuclear disarmament.
3. One of the questions relating to nuclear disarmament is that of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.
4. In conformity with its position of principle on nuclear disarmament, the Byelorussian SSR supported the Soviet initiative for the conclusion of an international agreement on the subject and at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly it joined with a group of socialist and developing countries in sponsoring a draft resolution drawing attention to the need for a conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.
5. In the view of the Byelorussian SSR, such an agreement must be based on the clear and simple obligation of the nuclear Powers not to station nuclear weapons of any kind on the territories of countries where there are no such weapons at present. That obligation should be universal in nature, that is to say, it should extend to any non-nuclear State on whose territory there are no nuclear weapons, regardless of whether or not that State is allied with a nuclear Power. In this connexion, the Byelorussian SSR attaches great significance to the readiness of the Soviet Union to undertake such an obligation and to its appeal to other nuclear Powers to do likewise.
6. At the same time, the agreement should also clearly lay down the obligation of non-nuclear States to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the appearance of nuclear weapons on their territories. Some non-nuclear States, recognizing the dangers associated with nuclear weapons, have already declared that they will not allow the stationing of such weapons on their territories.
7. The Byelorussian SSR is convinced that the conclusion of such an agreement will in no way impede the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The proposal to conclude such an agreement is in accord with the idea of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones and makes the realization of that idea all the more

/...

possible; it would help to strengthen the régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and would facilitate the complete withdrawal of nuclear weapons stationed on foreign territory.

8. Furthermore, such a measure would in no way affect the existing balance of forces either at the global level or in individual regions.

9. The Byelorussian SSR calls for the speedy elaboration and conclusion of an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present and believes that there are no objective difficulties in the way of concluding such an agreement. All that is required is goodwill and political determination on the part of both the nuclear and the non-nuclear States.

CHILE

/Original: Spanish/

/23 April 1980/

1. Chile supports an international agreement of this type because it would be in line with its traditional policy on these matters and would obviously contribute to properly safeguarding international peace and security.
2. This proposal may be considered as one of the practical means of limiting armaments, and particularly of preventing the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, and as a stage in the total elimination of such weapons.
3. In supporting this agreement, it must be stressed that one prerequisite is that all peoples have the right to share in the benefits of the peaceful use of nuclear energy.
4. It would be advisable for an agreement of this nature to be reached by the concurrence of the political will of States, particularly the great Powers, most notably when their strategic interests in their spheres of influence are affected, as recent events have shown.
5. This circumstance will undoubtedly make the implementation of an agreement on the subject difficult. Although a large number of countries will be in favour of the agreement, the fact is that ultimately it is the few nations which possess the technology that will be best endowed with means to impose their conditions.
6. A further desideratum is that an agreement on this subject should require the application of a strict system of safeguards with regard to each country's nuclear installations, materials and stockpiles in order to ensure the efficacy of the agreement in practice.

CUBA

/Original: Spanish/

/7 April 1980/

1. The Government of the Republic of Cuba believes that nuclear weapons, the constant increase in the number of those weapons and their spread and development constitute the major threat now facing mankind.
2. The arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, consumes a substantial volume of resources which are wasted on the production of nuclear weapons and innovations thereto, with adverse consequences for economic and social development and international peace and security.
3. The non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would be a real contribution to the

arrangements for nuclear non-proliferation and would help to build up the climate of confidence essential to the successful conduct of disarmament talks.

4. The Government of the Republic of Cuba firmly believes that the achievement of an international agreement to that effect would be an effective arms-control measure and would redound to the advantage of international peace and security.

5. At the same time, the Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that such an agreement is not to be interpreted as sanctioning the presence of nuclear weapons on the territories of States already possessing them.

6. Prerequisites for the achievement of such an agreement are to take into account the aforementioned principles and a whole series of safeguards which would facilitate its adoption.

7. The Republic of Cuba takes the view that all States are entitled to have at their disposal such weapons as they deem useful for the defence of their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

8. Renunciation of this right is inconceivable unless the prerogative of every State freely to determine its own destiny and choose the economic, political and social system best suited to the interest of its people, is recognized and respected and unless hostile and aggressive actions against it are brought to an end.

9. If negotiations are to be conducted on achieving an agreement to prohibit the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, a climate of trust and security in which negotiations can proceed satisfactorily must be guaranteed.

10. The Government of the Republic of Cuba believes that one prerequisite for the aforementioned agreement is that the imperialist Powers should end their policy of hostility and aggression against all States, thus allowing an acceptable climate of trust, peace and security to exist.

11. Further prerequisites are the ending of military threats and manifestations of cold-war politics, the dismantling of military bases abroad, and refraining from imposing, and removing, unjust economic sanctions, which are detrimental to international détente and the promotion of co-operation and trust among all States.

12. The demonstration of adequate political will by all States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States, is a key element in the successful conclusion of the negotiations.

13. An international agreement prohibiting the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States must of necessity be accompanied by an international instrument prohibiting the use or threat of force in international relations and an instrument safeguarding the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of nuclear weapons.

14. The Republic of Cuba believes that negotiations on the aforementioned agreement will have the desired result and the conclusion of a real and effective instrument in this area will be possible only if all these requirements are met.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

/Original: English/

/25 July 1980/

1. The prevention of a continued proliferation of nuclear weapons is, in the view of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, one of the most pressing tasks in the current disarmament efforts. Czechoslovakia is therefore giving due attention to the forthcoming Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to be convened at Geneva in August of this year. At this Conference it will give a positive evaluation of the contribution made by the Treaty and will strive for the strengthening of the principle of non-proliferation and for the earliest possible universality of the Treaty.
2. At the same time, Czechoslovakia fully supports all other initiatives designed to contribute to the prevention of a further territorial proliferation of nuclear weapons. This question is at the same time closely connected with the problem of the security of non-nuclear States. The session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty held at Warsaw last May devoted considerable attention to this question. The adopted Declaration stresses the necessity of adopting measures stipulating that nuclear Powers will not use nuclear weapons against States which do not possess such weapons nor have foreign nuclear weapons stationed on their territories.
3. That is why at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly we welcomed the initiative of the Soviet Union proposing the conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear States. The conclusion of such an agreement would represent a significant measure to prevent a further proliferation of nuclear weapons and an important step towards the future complete withdrawal of such weapons from the territories of foreign States.
4. Czechoslovakia believes that such an international agreement should be based on the unequivocal undertaking of nuclear States not to station nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The category of States that do not have nuclear weapons stationed on their territories should include non-nuclear-weapon States regardless of whether they are allied to a nuclear Power or not. It is also of the view that the prohibition should cover all types of nuclear weapons as well as their individual components placed in storehouses.
5. Czechoslovakia welcomes the fact that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has already announced its readiness to assume such a commitment and called upon other nuclear States to do the same. In its view the elaboration of

/...

such an international agreement is fully feasible given the political goodwill of all the nuclear States. Its adoption would represent an important initiative and a contribution of the nuclear Powers to the solution of the problem of nuclear disarmament. It would be, at the same time, a clear example of fruitful international co-operation for the achievement of the goals of disarmament on the basis of principles adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

6. The conclusion and, above all, the implementation of the agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would simultaneously constitute a response to the clearly expressed desire of many non-nuclear States to prevent the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territories. Another important aspect is the fact that the agreement would not disturb the established balance of forces, both on the global scale and in different parts of the world.

7. The adoption of this agreement would contribute to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime and would make possible the creation of nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world. It would simultaneously create suitable conditions for the subsequent withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from foreign territories.

8. An effective solution to the problem of ensuring the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would, in the current complicated international political situation, contribute also to the strengthening of confidence among States and to improving the over-all international climate.

9. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic speaks therefore in favour of initiating substantive talks on the drafting and adoption of an international agreement to this end.

EGYPT

/Original: Arabic/

/20 May 1980/

1. Egypt, which supports the principle of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, stresses that our goal is clear regarding the necessity of prohibiting the use or stockpiling of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, reversing the arms race and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Egypt has stressed on many occasions in all forums its absolute rejection of any effort to consolidate the current nuclear armaments situation. The existing stockpiles of these nuclear weapons and the dreadful prospect of the use of these weapons represent a real and direct threat to the security of those States on whose territories there are no such weapons at present and a tremendous danger to the future of mankind.
2. Egypt believes also that an equal danger threatening the developing States of the third world and those States on whose territories there are no nuclear weapons at present comes from weapons of mass destruction, which likewise constitute a tremendous danger to the security of these States and their territories and to the security and peace of the whole world.
3. Egypt accordingly supports the promulgation of a declaration or declarations by the nuclear States on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The General Assembly should call upon these States to take this step as soon as possible and should at the same time urge the promulgation of a declaration by the non-nuclear States of a collective position refusing to accept the stationing of any nuclear weapons on their territories. The two declarations should be collated in a political document to be issued by the General Assembly at its forthcoming session.
4. Egypt considers that it is not in the interest of the non-nuclear States that they should be involved in the present confrontation between the nuclear States or used for the achievement of the goals and purposes of one of these nuclear Powers vis-à-vis another.
5. Egypt stresses the importance of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, prohibiting the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons and according attention to the initiatives taken so far in this regard, including Egypt's initiative for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.
6. The existence or stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would only increase the perils of a nuclear confrontation, threaten mankind with annihilation and present a threat to international peace and security.

/...

FINLAND

/Original: English/

/10 June 1980/

1. Effective measures for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of the spread and the use of nuclear weapons have been identified as priority tasks in the quest for arms control and disarmament. Without prejudice to other urgent tasks, this priority was reaffirmed by the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament.
2. Efforts to eliminate the dangers posed by nuclear weapons and to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race should include a variety of approaches. The ongoing efforts to this effect should be intensified and further aspects of the nuclear arms build-up, whether global or regional, quantitative or qualitative, strategic or tactical, should be brought within the scope of negotiations. Pending the achievement of effective measures for nuclear arms limitation and nuclear disarmament, the Government of Finland welcomes all measures aimed at reducing the danger of nuclear war.
3. It has been the consistent view of the Finnish Government that in order to curb the nuclear arms race and to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, no new nuclear weapons should be developed, deployed or acquired by anyone. At the same time, nuclear weapons should not be introduced into or deployed in areas where they do not now exist. This can be ensured most effectively through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Arrangements for the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would constitute another measure to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to new areas. The Government of Finland has supported the objective of achieving a world-wide zone of countries that is permanently free from nuclear weapons. That, however, is an objective that requires a carefully considered and balanced arrangement of obligations and responsibilities, including appropriate security assurances.
4. Nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices should not come into the possession of more States. The non-proliferation treaty remains the best instrument to achieve this purpose. Measures to strengthen further the non-proliferation régime are as urgent as ever.
5. In the view of the Finnish Government, it follows from the principle of the sovereign equality of States that only the Government of a country concerned, be it big or small, neutral, non-aligned or aligned, is qualified to determine its own security interests. An examination of the possibility of an international agreement mentioned in resolution 34/87 C should take this into account.
6. Finland, for its part, has foregone the option of nuclear weapons and has consistently worked for the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. Consistent with its national position as a neutral country, Finland will not receive on its territory nuclear weapons on behalf of other countries. The Government of Finland has endeavoured to strengthen the non-proliferation régime and has supported the

/...

concept and practice of nuclear-weapon-free zones as well as other measures aimed at lessening the danger posed by nuclear weapons. Furthermore, it has made proposals that aim at entirely excluding the Nordic countries from any nuclear speculation.

7. The countries which have committed themselves not to acquire or station in their territories nuclear weapons have to receive assurances that such weapons will not be turned against them and that they will not be threatened by them. It is to be hoped that the consideration of security guarantees by the Committee on Disarmament will lead to arrangements for the provision of such guarantees as called for by the General Assembly.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

/Original: English/

/17 June 1980/

1. The German Democratic Republic believes that it is imperative to prevent nuclear weapons from being stationed on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The introduction of such weapons into additional regions would heighten the danger of nuclear war, accelerate the nuclear arms race and further complicate efforts to create prerequisites for nuclear disarmament. The decisions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to manufacture medium-range nuclear missiles and to deploy them in Western Europe illustrate that even in areas where existing nuclear weapons are to be replaced by qualitatively new types of such weapons, the strategic balance of forces would tend to change, which would cause the other side to respond with appropriate action of its own. Similarly, the stationing of nuclear weapons in previously nuclear-weapon-free territories would have a destabilizing effect on the prevailing military equilibrium, both at the regional and global levels. Here again, the other side would be likely to counteract, with additional millions of people being exposed to the risks involved in the nuclear arms race. Such stationing could, furthermore, adversely affect the determination of neighbouring nuclear-weapon-free States to refrain from producing or acquiring nuclear weapons and to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Nuclear weapons in additional States would not only jeopardize the target countries but also involve increased risks for these States in so far as they might attract a nuclear counterblow. Current trends towards an expansion of military bases and the establishment of military facilities and supply depots in foreign lands are only too obvious. Moreover, statements claiming other countries and whole regions to be spheres of allegedly vital importance to one's own interests are causing additional tensions and hazards in international relations, especially since they are being attended by a concentration of military, including nuclear-armed, forces. Such policies, however, cannot but weaken the security of all peoples and lessen the stability of world peace.

2. There is therefore an urgent need for action to reduce the danger of nuclear war and to strengthen guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as for steps to prevent a further proliferation of nuclear weapons. The conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present can be an

/...

important contribution to this effect, as it would stabilize the present situation as regards the territorial spread of nuclear weapons and would hence preserve the conditions for more far-reaching measures being adopted with a view to reducing and finally eliminating such weapons. A non-stationing agreement could be a valuable addition to the existing international instruments designed to bar a further spread of nuclear weapons, especially the non-proliferation treaty. As more and more countries are seeking to keep certain regions free from the nuclear arms race and to enhance their collective security by establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, a binding commitment not to station nuclear weapons in States where there are no such weapons at present would effectively bolster those countries' efforts. At the same time, the conditions would be maintained for a maximum number of nuclear-weapon-free States to obtain effective protection under international law against any threat with, or use of, nuclear weapons by becoming parties to a convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. The participation of the nuclear-weapon States in the non-stationing agreement would help check the nuclear arms race, produce a stabilizing effect and thus contribute to a more favourable climate for nuclear disarmament negotiations.

3. In the view of the German Democratic Republic, an international agreement is the most suitable form in which to guarantee the envisaged non-stationing of nuclear weapons on a reliable and legally-binding basis. An agreement of this kind would provide States with international legal protection against nuclear weapons appearing in areas where there are no such weapons at present. A legally-binding commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to station nuclear weapons in such areas and by the non-nuclear-weapon States not to permit the stationing of such weapons on their territory would enhance confidence among States and have a beneficial effect on the over-all fabric of international relations. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic advocates that work on the proposed agreement should be started as soon as possible.

HAITI

/Original: French/

/6 May 1980/

The Government of Haiti has no objection to the conclusion of an international agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, particularly in view of the fact that it is already a party to a regional agreement, The Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

HUNGARY

/Original: English/

/29 May 1980/

1. The Final Document unanimously adopted at the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, makes it absolutely clear

/...

that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization and that it is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons (resolution S-10/2).

2. A number of proposals and measures have been put forward or adopted to reverse the nuclear arms race or to halt it as a short-term objective. Most important in this context are those called upon to prevent, in one way or another, the spread of nuclear weapons, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones.

3. This goal of preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons is likewise enhanced by General Assembly resolution 33/91 F, which was initiated by the Soviet Union and co-sponsored by the Hungarian People's Republic together with other countries. That resolution calls on the nuclear-weapon States to refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, as well as on the non-nuclear-weapon States which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of such weapons on their territories.

4. It is easy to see that the mutual undertaking of such an obligation would serve to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to promote steps towards fuller implementation of the objectives of the non-proliferation régime as well as towards the objectives sought by the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

5. The advantage of this approach would be that the territories of the non-nuclear-weapon States undertaking such an obligation would be exempt from nuclear weapons and that such an obligation could also be assumed by States which, for various reasons, wished to assert their nuclear-weapon-free status irrespective of whether or not they were parties to the non-proliferation treaty.

6. As regards the comparison of this status to that of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is noted that while the States within such zones should be completely free from nuclear weapons, not all regions of the world are, at least in the short run, suitable for the establishment of such a zone.

7. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the view that the approach taken by resolution 33/91 F would lend itself to eliminating the disadvantage mentioned in the preceding paragraph, and is convinced that undertaking an obligation in pursuance of the resolution would make a significant contribution to increasing confidence and to strengthening peace and security.

8. The said commitment of States would be more effective, and its advantages more tangible, if it were given legal force under international law. This is why the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic has, even by its co-sponsorship, supported resolution 34/87 C, which believes it necessary to examine possibilities for an international agreement on this question.

9. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic considers that the conclusion of such an international agreement is both possible and necessary.

/...

10. It is possible because, in comparison with the present situation, it would involve no additional obligation either by the nuclear-weapon States or by the non-nuclear-weapon States. Far from upsetting the present nuclear parity, it would stabilize it without prejudice to the existing agreements concerning security.
11. The necessity of such an agreement is self-evident. The agreement would contribute effectively to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, thereby increasing confidence among States and strengthening international peace and security.
12. For the reasons stated above, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is firmly in favour of elaborating a pertinent international agreement and deems it necessary that a corresponding resolution be adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.
13. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic holds that the elaboration of the agreement (its form and scope, its provisions for verification, etc.) should be entrusted to the Geneva Committee on Disarmament.
14. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is ready to take appropriate steps to promote the solution of this question, and to co-operate to this effect with other countries both at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly and in the Geneva Committee on Disarmament.

INDONESIA

/Original: English/

/9 May 1980/

1. The Government of Indonesia agrees that the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would constitute a significant element in the efforts of the international community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to strengthen the non-proliferation régime. Indonesia therefore supports, in principle, the conclusion of an agreement which would prohibit the stationing of such weapons in the territories of non-nuclear States.
2. It should be realized, however, that decisions concerning this issue should first and foremost be dependent upon the security perceptions of a State, which is entitled, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to define its security interests.
3. The objective of non-stationing would be greatly facilitated by refraining from policies and actions that would undermine this goal and thereby compromise the decision of the non-nuclear Powers to maintain their territories free of nuclear weapons.
4. Furthermore, one of the essential prerequisites is a legally-binding guarantee against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons in view of the indiscriminate suffering and destruction to mankind and civilization that would inevitably result from a nuclear catastrophe.
5. The question of non-stationing of nuclear weapons should, in addition, focus on measures for the strengthening of effective and credible guarantees for the security of non-nuclear States.
6. Finally, the interrelationship between the obligations of the nuclear Powers and the non-nuclear States should be more fully defined. A consensus should be found covering several related issues including the dangers of any form of proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, non-discriminatory safeguards, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and an unequivocal commitment for progress in nuclear disarmament.

MEXICO

/Original: Spanish/

/18 April 1980/

1. In August 1968 the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, endorsing a Mexican proposal, expressed the conviction that the co-operation of States situated in a nuclear-weapon-free zone should take the form of commitments undertaken in a solemn international instrument having binding legal force, such as a treaty, a convention or a protocol.

/...

2. Existing nuclear arsenals are a threat to the very survival of mankind, and consequently the nuclear arms race must be halted and reversed until all nuclear weapons have been eliminated.
3. The subject is closely linked with the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, which Mexico supports, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, as an important disarmament measure. The process of establishing such zones in various parts of the world should be encouraged with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons, in accordance with paragraphs 60 and 61 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2).
4. The best proof that Mexico is firmly convinced of the intrinsic advantages of an international régime from which nuclear weapons are entirely absent lies in the fact that the Treaty of Tlatelolco, concluded on Mexico's initiative, is based on such a régime.

MOROCCO

/Original: French/

/4 June 1980/

1. First of all, Morocco expresses its satisfaction and its confidence regarding the possibility of concluding an international agreement on the question of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.
2. In Morocco's view, the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and, even more so, of their vertical and horizontal proliferation, deserves to receive the highest priority in disarmament negotiations and, in the current situation, constitutes an important disarmament measure.
3. It should also be recalled that the Non-Aligned Movement, at each of its conferences, has long condemned the nuclear policy of the major Powers, affirming that the survival of mankind and development are bound up with nuclear disarmament and that, consequently, the concerns of the entire international community should be accorded priority.
4. Yet it is regrettable to note that some of the poorer States that are involved in conflicts already considered dangerously explosive are beginning to pursue a nuclear policy by threatening to use atomic weapons against their neighbours.
5. This policy, of which Israel and South Africa are emerging as champions, must be taken into account, particularly since neither Israel nor South Africa is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, although that treaty, in Morocco's view, is the essential instrument on which all efforts to prevent the vertical and horizontal proliferation of strategic weapons must be based.

/...

6. The States which do not yet possess nuclear weapons should solemnly declare that they will refrain from producing, acquiring or possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear devices in any form and from authorizing the stationing of such weapons on their territories by any third party, and should agree to make all their nuclear activities subject to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

7. Furthermore, as indicated in paragraph 36 of the Final Document (resolution S-10/2) of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, non-proliferation measures must not jeopardize the exercise of the inalienable right of all States to implement and develop their programmes for the peaceful use of nuclear energy for the purposes of economic and social development.

8. In this connexion, when the Moroccan Government decided to undertake the necessary studies for the construction of a nuclear power plant, His Majesty King Hassan II proposed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in a letter dated 25 November 1976 that a committee of eminent persons should be appointed to ensure that uranium is not enriched for military purposes. In this connexion, His Majesty the King announced Morocco's willingness to agree to annual or biannual inspection visits.

9. Thus Morocco is not a country with military ambitions, as some see fit to maintain, but a peaceful country which is open to dialogue and concerted action and which advocates the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in all its areas of competence.

10. The United Nations may be assured of Morocco's support in all initiatives aimed at reducing as far as possible the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, at bringing about their total elimination, and at ensuring that they are not stationed on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

11. The statement made at the time by the Moroccan Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation reflects Morocco's opinion on the question and therefore remains valid.

NETHERLANDS

/Original: English/

/5 June 1980/

1. The Netherlands has voted against resolution 34/87 C of 11 December 1979 for the reasons that follow hereafter.

2. The Government of the Netherlands is firmly committed to the furtherance of the objectives of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to which the Kingdom of the Netherlands is a party. The Government continues to believe that the non-proliferation treaty is the major instrument to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to States that do not possess them.

/...

3. Another possible contribution to the objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons exists in the form of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones through the conclusion of regional agreements that provide for adequate verification. Thus, the Netherlands recognizes the Treaty of Tlatelolco, establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, as such a contribution, and is a party to Additional Protocol I to that Treaty.
4. A non-stationing agreement would, in some parts of the world, interfere with the need for States to exercise their right to collective self-defence guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations.
5. Furthermore, a non-stationing agreement could, unfortunately, under the prevailing international circumstances, not be expected sufficiently to provide for measures for adequate verification.
6. Taking into account the above considerations, the Government of the Netherlands concludes that the concept of a non-stationing agreement could at present only undermine universal adherence to the binding and verifiable obligations contained in the non-proliferation treaty.

PHILIPPINES

/Original: English/
/16 July 1980/

1. The Philippines supports the promulgation of an international agreement on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.
2. The above is consistent with our position relative to the formulation of the Association of South-East Asian Nations seeking to make South-East Asia a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, and our support for all efforts which will contribute positively to international peace and security particularly with respect to disarmament, the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.
3. We have consistently disallowed the introduction and storage of nuclear weapons in military bases in the Philippines made available for the use of United States forces.

POLAND

/Original: English/
/6 June 1980/

1. Voting in favour of resolution 34/87 C, Poland was guided by the conviction that such an agreement would contribute to the limitation of the nuclear arms race

/...

and to the progress of détente in international relations, and thus would constitute an important step towards the limitation of armaments.

2. Consistently supporting general and complete disarmament as a basic goal of all disarmament endeavours, the Polish People's Republic has always supported partial solutions promoting quantitative and qualitative limitations of the continuing arms race. It has attached particular significance to the limitation and the halting of the nuclear-weapons race, particularly in the destructive type of mass annihilation weapons.

3. Poland has availed itself of all opportunities to manifest clearly such a stand. It is a signatory of all multilateral agreements designed to limit partially nuclear arms race, such as the 1963 partial nuclear test ban treaty, the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the 1966 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, and the 1970 Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof.

4. Poland has put forward a number of initiatives in this sphere as described below:

(a) Plan to create an atom-free zone in Central Europe, on the territory of Poland, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany (Rapacki Plan - 1957), and to freeze nuclear armaments on that territory (1963);

(b) Draft resolution submitted at the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1960 concerning the creation of conditions favourable for the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament which, among other things, called on all States to refrain from establishing military bases on the territories of other States and from introducing and installing facilities for rockets and nuclear weapons; it also called on all States on the territories of which there were no foreign military bases and no foreign facilities for rockets and nuclear weapons, to refuse their introduction and installation;

(c) Draft resolution submitted at the same session of the United Nations General Assembly concerning the examination by experts of the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons on human life and health as well as on the material and cultural heritage of humanity. As a result of the adoption of that resolution, the United Nations Secretary-General prepared a report on that issue;

(d) Initiative of undertaking by nuclear-weapon States of an obligation not to station nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. This initiative was submitted by Poland and other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty in the communiqué of 15 May 1979.

5. Poland supports all international initiatives with regard to nuclear disarmament aimed at:

(a) The cessation of the nuclear arms race, the reduction and gradual complete elimination of nuclear weapons;

(b) The achievement of a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests;

(c) Poland has consistently supported the strengthening of the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in particular by ensuring that the Treaty concluded in 1968 becomes universally binding, by broadening the scope of application of the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency and its further consolidation, the creation of effective guarantees of security for non-nuclear States and the prevention of the use of nuclear technologies, facilities and materials for military purposes;

(d) The creation of atom-free zones in various parts of the world.

Our position on these matters is based on the conviction that consistent action for the cause of nuclear disarmament is a necessary condition for making détente irreversible and a basic premise of real security in the world and, at the same time, the basic element of general disarmament.

6. Since we see not only the possibility but also the urgent need for concluding an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, we are guided by the following considerations:

(a) As a partial agreement it would contribute to the halting of the nuclear arms race, which is the most dangerous form of arms race;

(b) It would be a factor strengthening the system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, including the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;

(c) The conclusion of the agreement would be conducive to the consolidation and stabilization of the existing balance of forces, both at the global and regional levels;

(d) It would prevent the creation of tensions resulting from the introduction of nuclear weapons on the territories where there are no such weapons at present, and would decrease the risk of a surprise attack;

(e) The agreement would lessen, to a large extent, the danger of a regional nuclear arms race;

(f) It would promote the establishment of atom-free zones in various regions of the world, in accordance with the will of the States concerned;

(g) The agreement would have a positive effect in consolidating confidence among States and would improve the climate of international relations.

7. Taking into consideration the above-mentioned aspects of the issue, the Government of the Polish People's Republic would like to express its approval of the proposal to conclude an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

/...

ROMANIA

/Original: French/

/24 June 1980/

1. Romania has repeatedly expressed its concern about the enormous growth in world military expenditure and the unprecedented intensification of the arms race, especially in Europe, which now has the greatest concentration of troops and weapons, including nuclear weapons, with the accompanying danger of the proliferation of such weapons in the territory of other States.
2. This makes the achievement of general disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, extremely important for the progress and development of mankind and for the very existence of human civilization.
3. Romania has always called for granting absolute priority to nuclear disarmament measures and advocated, pending agreement on such measures, a policy of limiting the nuclear threat and eliminating it from as much of the earth's surface as possible. Romania was therefore one of the sponsors of the proposal on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on any more territories, in the belief that the proposal formed part of broader efforts to freeze and curtail the nuclear-weapons race. This goal can be reached both by halting the development and modernization of nuclear weapons and by preventing any expansion of the area harbouring the nuclear arsenal.
4. To this end Romania favours the conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.
5. Such an agreement, in the opinion of the Romanian Government, has the merit of contributing significantly to confidence-building among States. Furthermore, such an agreement would make an important contribution to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in that the essential goal of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is to halt the spread and stationing of nuclear arsenals.

Any measure to station nuclear weapons on the territory of other States would run counter to the spirit of the Treaty, even if it did not lead automatically to increasing the number of States possessing nuclear weapons.
6. With regard to the conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, as an integral part of the nuclear disarmament process, Romania submits the following considerations:

- (i) During the first phase the focus should be on getting specific negotiations on the subject started promptly. The negotiations should deal with "freezing" the present situation and an undertaking by States to reduce and ultimately withdraw all nuclear weapons stationed on foreign territory. The legitimate concern of each State for its security

/...

can be met not by escalating the nuclear-arms race but by the negotiation in good faith of agreements to halt and reverse it, building on the principle of equal security and without giving any State or group of States unilateral advantages;

- (ii) Not only nuclear-weapon States but every State, whether or not it has nuclear weapons on its territory, should participate in negotiating the agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present;
- (iii) The agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of additional States should constitute a first step towards the attainment of the goal of withdrawing all armed forces and weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, behind national frontiers.

Measures to avert the danger of stationing new weapons should be seen as initiating a process of real nuclear disarmament and, more broadly, of non-stationing of new types of weapons on the territory of other States and, in general, of eliminating the use of force and the threat of force in relations between States;

- (iv) The agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of additional States should be accompanied by a firm undertaking to find a solution quickly to the problem of guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear States and, in the long-term, to conclude an international agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons. In the event that, pending the conclusion of the agreement recommended here, no international instrument on guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear States is agreed upon, it would be advisable to include a provision on the obligation of the nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons against States that have no such weapons on their territories;
- (v) In view of the fact that not only the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are none at present but also the transit or temporary stationing of such weapons may constitute a threat to peace, with devastating consequences for all mankind, the international agreement must also make reference to the prohibition of such activities;
- (vi) With regard to monitoring the implementation of the provisions of the agreement, the verification system envisaged must be based on the equal participation of all States parties in activities aimed at monitoring observance of the obligations assumed.

7. The Socialist Republic of Romania is prepared to participate, together with other States, in negotiations on and in the conclusion in the near future of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, as a first step towards

achieving the objective of stopping the arms race and eliminating nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction.

SUDAN

/Original: Arabic/

/15 May 1980/

1. The Sudan approves the conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, because of the Sudan's deep belief and firm opinion that peace must reign throughout the world, that all disputes must be solved by peaceful means and that a halt must be put to the arms race, on which tremendous sums, representing astronomical figures, are spent which might have been spent on peace, development and the advancement of those States which are relatively backward because of the wide gap between them and the developed States.
2. The Sudan participated in the conferences on disarmament and the conferences on international humanitarian law whose efforts culminated in the adoption of the two Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The Sudan is currently participating in the United Nations conference on conventional weapons, the second session of which will be held next September at the Palais des Nations at Geneva; this emphasizes the Sudan's concern regarding all steps that may alleviate the woes of wars and human suffering in armed conflict.
3. The Sudan supported resolution 34/75 of the United Nations General Assembly, adopted on 11 December 1979, concerning the declaration of the 1980s as a disarmament decade.
4. The Sudan was one of 12 States which submitted a proposal for the prohibition of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, which was adopted as resolution 1653 (XVI) at the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly on 24 November 1961 and which contains a declaration that the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons is contrary to the spirit, letter and aims of the United Nations Charter and contrary to international law, in view of the indiscriminate suffering and destruction which it causes to mankind, and that the use of nuclear weapons is a war directed not against an enemy or enemies alone but also against mankind in general, since the peoples of the world not involved in such a war will be subjected to all the evils generated by the use of such weapons.
5. The resolution referred to in paragraph 4 above was adopted at the time by a majority of 55 votes to 20, with 26 abstentions, and, in spite of the force and clarity of its language, it is only a declaration and is not legally binding. The conclusion of the agreement referred to in resolution 34/87 C of the United Nations General Assembly has therefore become extremely necessary and important.
6. The States of Latin America have concluded the Treaty of Tlatelolco for the prohibition of nuclear weapons on their continent, and this was welcomed by the

/...

General Assembly in resolution 2286 (XXII), of 5 December 1967, in which the General Assembly called upon all States to provide every assistance for the realization of the aims of that Treaty.

7. With regard to Africa, resolution 718 (XXXIII) was promulgated at the thirty-third regular session of the Organization of African Unity at Monrovia, Liberia, in July 1979. The resolution referred to all previous resolutions relating to the declaration of Africa as a non-nuclear zone and expressed extreme concern regarding the supremacy of South Africa, resulting from the tremendous material and technological aid which it receives from its Western allies, and the threat to Africa which this aid represents. The resolution also expressed increasing concern at the co-operation existing between the racist régime in South Africa and the Zionist entity in the nuclear field, called upon the Western States to refrain from providing South Africa with nuclear materials and technology and condemned Israel for its collaboration with South Africa. The resolution also called upon African States to transmit their comments and views on the question of making the African continent a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and this question will be discussed at the forthcoming African summit conference to be held at Freetown, Sierra Leone. In this connexion, the competent authorities in the Sudan have prepared an extensive study containing the Sudan's views and comments on the question.

8. For all of the above-mentioned reasons, the Sudan supports, as a matter of general principle, the conclusion of an international agreement for the prohibition of the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The Sudan will follow closely and with great attention the measures relating to the preparation of such an agreement at all stages and in all forums.

SURINAME

/Original: English/

/10 March 1980/

1. As a signatory of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, better known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, Suriname is against the development, production, stockpiling and proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is, therefore, in support of the objective of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

2. As a preliminary or complimentary step, Suriname would suggest the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones similar to the one established by the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

3. Suriname is, furthermore, of the opinion that a balanced international agreement should entail containment and eventual total elimination of nuclear weapons.

/...

4. In this connexion, and to reassure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the threat from nuclear weapons and intimidation, it holds the view that the treaty should contain specific commitments from the nuclear-weapon States, as well as measures aimed at the discontinuance of the development and production of nuclear weapons, and subsequent destruction of stockpiles of these weapons on hand.

5. In the light of the foregoing, Suriname is therefore of the opinion that accession of the nuclear-weapon States will be indispensable for the realization of a viable international agreement as envisaged.

UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

/Original: Russian/

/24 June 1980/

1. The Ukrainian SSR fully supported the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly concerning the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. Together with other States Members of the United Nations, the Ukrainian SSR sponsored resolution 33/91 of 16 December 1978, in which the General Assembly called upon all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present and upon all non-nuclear-weapon States which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of such weapons on their territories. In that connexion the Ukrainian SSR took the position that the territorial limitation of the stationing of nuclear weapons would be a measure closely related to the maintenance of peace and security in various regions of the world and to the prevention of nuclear war. The non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would also constitute a step towards the larger objective of the eventual complete withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of other States and would thereby help to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and ultimately lead to the elimination of those weapons of mass destruction, which pose the greatest danger to mankind.
2. The Ukrainian SSR was also a sponsor of resolution 34/87 C, adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session on 11 December 1979, which called upon States Members of the United Nations to examine possibilities for an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. In the view of the Ukrainian SSR, it is necessary to concentrate the efforts of States Members of the United Nations as speedily as possible on elaborating, adopting and giving effect to an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. The basic principle of such an agreement would be an obligation on the part of nuclear-weapon States not to station nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. Such an obligation would cover all types of nuclear weapons, both those deployed as weapons systems and those stockpiled in depots and storehouses. At the same time, the agreement should state the intention of non-nuclear-weapon States to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the appearance of nuclear weapons on their territories. In our view, the elaboration of such an agreement would not require complex discussions or protracted negotiations if all States concerned, especially the nuclear-weapon States, showed goodwill.
3. In this connexion the Ukrainian SSR notes with satisfaction the statement of the Soviet Union that it is ready to refrain from stationing nuclear weapons where there are no such weapons at present. By that statement, the Soviet Union has again shown that it has been and continues to be a consistent advocate of the

/...

unswerving pursuit of a policy of détente in international relations and of supplementing political détente with effective measures in the sphere of military détente.

4. On the other hand, the Ukrainian SSR, a European State, cannot fail to be concerned at the efforts of some States to threaten the peace of the European continent. The NATO decision to produce new types of United States medium-range nuclear missiles and station them in Western Europe poses a special threat. If that decision is carried out, the situation on the European continent will become much worse, since an increase in destructive potential here will inevitably affect the political climate and the vital interests of the peoples of Europe and will lead to additional huge military expenditures.

5. The conclusion of an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would be in the interest of all States, including the European States, which are becoming increasingly aware of the danger associated with nuclear weapons and seeking to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. Such an agreement would promote the cause of peace and strengthen the security of the world's peoples.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

/Original: Russian/

/29 May 1980/

1. This question was submitted for consideration by the United Nations in 1978 on the initiative of the Soviet Union. In putting forward this proposal, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics took the position that the conclusion of an appropriate international agreement would prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world and would be an important step towards the complete withdrawal of such weapons from the territories of other States. It is gratifying to note that the United Nations General Assembly, in a resolution adopted at its thirty-third session, called upon all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there were currently no such weapons and called upon all non-nuclear-weapon States which did not have nuclear weapons on their territory to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of such weapons on their territories.

2. On the basis of this fundamental decision, the General Assembly, at its thirty-fourth session, expressed the belief that it was necessary to examine the possibilities for an international agreement on that question and requested all States to transmit their opinions and suggestions on the subject.

3. The Soviet Union feels that, if this question is to be resolved in the most effective manner, it is necessary to elaborate and conclude an international agreement based on the clear and simple obligation of the nuclear Powers not to station nuclear weapons on the territories of countries where there are currently no such weapons. This obligation should be universal in nature, i.e. it should

/...

extend to any non-nuclear State on whose territory there are no nuclear weapons, regardless of whether or not it is allied with one of the nuclear Powers. The obligation must, of course, extend to all types of nuclear weapons - warheads, bombs, missiles, mines, etc. - irrespective of whether they have been deployed as military systems or are in depots and storehouses. At the same time, the agreement should lay down the obligation of non-nuclear countries to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the appearance of nuclear weapons on their territories.

4. The Soviet Union has already declared its willingness to assume the obligation not to station nuclear weapons in countries where there are currently no such weapons and has called upon all other nuclear Powers to do likewise. If this example is followed by all nuclear-weapon States, there will be no great difficulty in arriving at an appropriate international agreement. In this connexion, the clearly expressed intentions of many States to protect their territories from the stationing of nuclear weapons must be taken into account. This measure would in no way affect the power relationship at the global level or in individual regions.

5. The conclusion of an agreement to limit the stationing of nuclear weapons on a territorial basis would be an important measure in curbing the nuclear arms race and would reduce the danger of nuclear war.

Such an agreement would help to strengthen the régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and would contribute to the establishment of non-nuclear zones in various parts of the world and to the complete withdrawal of nuclear weapons stationed in foreign territory. All this would lead to a strengthening of trust among States and a general improvement in the international situation.

6. In the view of the Soviet Union, practical steps must be taken forthwith to achieve the agreement referred to in the resolution adopted at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

/Original: English/

/28 May 1980/

1. The Government of the United Kingdom wish to set out the considerations which led them to vote against this resolution.

2. The Government of the United Kingdom recognize the supreme importance of preventing nuclear war and, as a nuclear-weapon State, acknowledge their responsibility to do everything possible to avoid the risk of the outbreak of such a war. The United Kingdom has already given an undertaking to non-nuclear-weapon States on their security against nuclear attack. Other nuclear-weapon States have given their own form of undertaking. Work is now going on in the

/...

Committee on Disarmament to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The Government of the United Kingdom believe that such arrangements could make an important contribution to international security.

3. However, an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons would contribute nothing to the general objectives of preventing the use or spread of nuclear weapons. In the view of the United Kingdom the cause of non-proliferation is best safeguarded by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. As a party to that treaty the United Kingdom has undertaken not to pass control of nuclear weapons to any other country. All 12 non-nuclear-weapon States members of the Atlantic Alliance are parties to the non-proliferation treaty and have renounced the acquisition, possession or control of nuclear weapons.

4. Secondly, a non-stationing agreement by itself would be unverifiable. Because nuclear-weapon States do not reveal the location of their nuclear weapons, verification of compliance with a non-stationing agreement would be virtually impossible without the institution of a highly intrusive, complex and expensive verification agency. In the absence of rigorous verification, each party would have to rely on the uncorroborated assurances of the Powers or alliances by which it might be attacked. This is not a satisfactory basis for an arms control agreement.

5. Thirdly, a non-stationing agreement would be destabilizing. The members of the Atlantic Alliance have made it clear that they will not contemplate the use of nuclear weapons except where necessary in self-defence against aggression. The integrity of NATO's defence forces as a deterrent lies in the Alliance's ability to defend its collective territory by all the means at its disposal at whatever point it is threatened. This must include the ability to deploy weapons wherever they would be most effective against the threat. Given the geographical asymmetries, a non-stationing agreement such as that proposed, or a withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States, would leave Western Europe exposed and unable to match the Soviet Union's capacity to inflict massive destruction with medium and long-range bombers stationed in the Soviet Union, submarine-launched missiles, ballistic missiles and long-range theatre nuclear force systems. Such an imbalance could only increase international tension and the risk of miscalculation.

6. The non-nuclear-weapon States members of the Atlantic Alliance considered carefully the Soviet Union's original undertaking in 1978 not to use nuclear weapons against States which do not have them on their territories. They regarded this proposal as a deliberate attempt to influence their defensive arrangements, and rejected it. In this connexion, the United Kingdom believes that the purpose of controlling the deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe would be better served if the Soviet Union accepted the United States' offer in December 1979 to negotiate on the limitation of long-range theatre nuclear forces. The unilateral withdrawal of 1,000 United States' nuclear warheads from Western Europe represents an important step towards reducing the level of military confrontation.

7. The non-stationing proposal implies that only nuclear-weapon-States are able to determine, without regard to the wishes of the country concerned, where their nuclear weapons should be deployed. This is not in fact the case so far as Western Europe is concerned. Those non-nuclear-weapon States in Western Europe which have nuclear weapons on their territories have agreed to their deployment because they consider them essential for protection against aggression. The denial of their right to participate in nuclear defence arrangements would infringe their inalienable right to self-defence under the United Nations Charter.

8. Since the non-aligned and neutral countries do not, by definition, wish to be associated militarily with the nuclear-weapon States and to have nuclear weapons stationed on their territories, the proposal would not benefit them in any way and is therefore quite superfluous.

YUGOSLAVIA

/Original: English/

/28 May 1980/

1. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 34/87, the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia wishes to state its views with respect to the possibility of reaching an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

2. The Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia feels that the halting and reversing of the arms race is one of the most urgent tasks facing the international community. This applies, in particular, to nuclear weapons which pose the most dangerous threat to the survival of mankind. Yugoslavia has supported and continues to support all measures aimed at averting the threat of war, of nuclear war in particular; at ensuring that war is no longer an instrument for settling international disputes, as well as those aimed at eliminating the threat or use of force from international life, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. Yugoslavia also attaches particular importance to further efforts by all countries to establish a universal system of international security liable to ensure lasting peace and promote accelerated development throughout the world.

3. Bearing in mind the aforementioned and the great importance that it attaches to the universal efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, the Government of Yugoslavia was among the first to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In its statement of 27 February 1970, made upon ratifying the said treaty, the Yugoslav Government pointed out, inter alia, that it is indispensable to prohibit the development, manufacturing and use of nuclear weapons and to destroy the stockpiles thereof; that it is imperative that the nuclear-weapon States include, besides strategic, also tactical nuclear weapons in their negotiations and, furthermore, that it is indispensable to ban the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories where there are no such weapons at present and to withdraw them from foreign territories.

/...

4. In addition, the Government of Yugoslavia drew attention to the fact that the continuation of nuclear tests is contrary to the spirit and letter of the non-proliferation treaty. It urged the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of reduced armaments, hoping that the nuclear-weapon States would embark upon concluding an international convention on the general refraining from the use or threat to use nuclear weapons.

5. The Government of Yugoslavia believes that the above-mentioned positions are still topical, particularly in view of the current intensification of the nuclear arms race, the deployment of nuclear weapons and plans to deploy such weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States and other areas where there are no such weapons at present. It is obvious that the main responsibility for the present situation lies with the nuclear-weapon States involved in these activities.

6. The signing of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present could, in the view of the Yugoslav Government, serve a useful purpose only if some basic conditions are satisfied, and if it is based on the principles adopted at the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. The Government of Yugoslavia has particularly in mind respect for the principles of universality and equal security for all.

7. Proceeding from the aforementioned, the Yugoslav Government holds that the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is of universal character and that, therefore, an international agreement regulating the question of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present should define the obligations of both the nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States.

8. Furthermore, the Yugoslav Government is of the opinion that this demand cannot be confined merely to the territories of States where such weapons have not been deployed so far, but that it should also include the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where nuclear weapons have already been introduced. One of the obligations of nuclear-weapon States should concern the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States. Otherwise, this could amount to acceptance and maintenance of the existing status quo, i.e. to releasing the nuclear-weapon States from the obligation to withdraw their weapons from the territories of certain States as well as obfuscating the real status of and differences between the nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States.

9. The notion of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons, in the view of the Yugoslav Government, should also encompass other areas where there are no such weapons at present, such as the air and maritime spaces. Otherwise these spaces, which are today the object of the most intensive nuclear arms race, would continue to be an uncontrolled area of rivalry between the nuclear-weapon States. As a result, the Yugoslav Government feels that the future title of the agreement should refer both to the territories of States and to the spaces to be covered by the ban on the stationing of nuclear weapons.

10. Consequently, an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons, conceived as a measure designed to regulate the proliferation of nuclear weapons, should be comprehensive so as to be able to contribute effectively to the realization of basic objectives in the field of prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

11. The Government of Yugoslavia also considers that such an agreement cannot be a substitute for genuine nuclear disarmament measures, but that it should constitute a significant element within the context of nuclear disarmament.
