



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/43/741
25 October 1988

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Forty-third session
Agenda items 14, 31, 51, 53, 54,
55, 57, 59, 60, 64, 67, 68,
73 and 141

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

ZONE OF PEACE AND CO-OPERATION OF THE SOUTH ATLANTIC

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 42/25 CONCERNING
THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE
TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA
(TREATY OF TLAHELCO)

URGENT NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE
IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA

CONCLUSION OF EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS ON THE
STRENGTHENING OF THE SECURITY OF NON-NUCLEAR-WEAPON STATES
AGAINST THE USE OR THREAT OF USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

PREVENTION OF AN ARMS RACE IN OUTER SPACE

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS
ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN
AS A ZONE OF PEACE

COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE THIRD REVIEW CONFERENCE
OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR
WEAPONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE
FOURTH REVIEW CONFERENCE

Letter dated 21 October 1988 from the Permanent Representative of
the German Democratic Republic to the United Nations addressed to
the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith information material on the
International Meeting for Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held at Berlin.

I would be grateful if you arranged for the distribution of the present letter
and the attached material as an official document of the General Assembly under
agenda items 14, 31, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 64, 67, 68, 73 and 141.

(Signed) Siegfried ZACHMANN
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary

ANNEX

International Meeting for Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones
held at Berlin from 20 to 22 June 1988

1. The International Meeting for Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones was convened in Berlin from 20 to 22 June 1988 at the initiative of Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic. Some 1,034 leading representatives and personages of non-governmental and intergovernmental organisations, States, Governments, parliaments, social and religious organisations came from 113 countries to discuss in an open and free exchange of views the pros and cons of regional disarmament steps in efforts to remove the nuclear threat and safeguard peace. Speaking on behalf of his country, Erich Honecker reaffirmed that the German Democratic Republic would continue to display firmness and initiative in serving the common cause of peace. In working for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free corridor and a zone of confidence and security in Central Europe it would contribute its share to this end. With this in mind, he said that "... to further stabilize the situation at the dividing line between the two alliances, the German Democratic Republic would welcome the setting up of machinery for peaceful crisis management and for the prevention of military incidents in Central Europe".

2. At what was the broadest international forum on peace matters ever, an intensive dialogue was carried on within the framework of plenary sessions, nine commissions and nine special meetings, and a panel discussion. Experience from every continent was pooled, both that gained from existing nuclear-weapon-free zones and that relating to current projects of this kind. The strong commitment of the United Nations to this goal was clearly reflected in the discussions held. The views of people were heard who represented the nuclear Powers and the non-nuclear States, came from East and West, from North and South.

3. The discussions held at the Berlin Meeting for Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones prove that common sense and realism are winning new ground in relations between peoples and States. At a time when the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament had commenced its proceedings, the Moscow summit between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan had just ended and the first Soviet and American medium-range missiles were due to be scrapped, representatives from all over the world affirmed the peoples' resolve to contribute an active share of their own to international peace and security by way of disarmament and détente.

4. What crucial role is assigned to nuclear-weapon-free zones and regions as a major means of freeing humanity from atomic weapons was also reflected in the reports drawn up by the nine commissions on the results of their work.

5. The report of Commission 1 on the subject of "Nuclear-weapon-free zones - possible steps towards a nuclear-free world" says, among other things:

On principle, the participants agreed that it was necessary to modify the traditional way, based on military power, of designing security policies. They demanded the demilitarisation of international relations and societies, a peace by non-violence, and that interests common to both systems in the survival of mankind should be sought and extended.

It was emphasized that all States and all peoples have the right and duty to be involved in the decision-making on, and shaping of, the world's destiny since no one would be spared the consequences of a nuclear war.

Many speakers put forward arguments which substantiated that nuclear-weapon-free zones were a major step towards comprehensive disarmament and global security. Analysing well-known arguments of the opponents of such projects, it was pointed out that nuclear-weapon-free zones:

- Are directed against the fundamentals of the concept of nuclear deterrence;
- Remove particularly destabilizing weapons from the immediate line of confrontation;
- Raise the nuclear threshold;
- Prevent the possible striving by non-nuclear-weapon States for the power to possess nuclear weapons;
- Are steps towards consolidating the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons;
- Increase the security and strengthen the sovereignty of non-nuclear-weapon States because they become less dependent on decisions by the nuclear Powers;
- Facilitate first steps in the field of conventional disarmament;
- Make it more difficult to carry out plans for the "modernization" and compensation of nuclear weapons;
- Add to the transparency of military potentials;
- Create more favourable conditions for more confidence.

6. The report of Commission 2 on the subject of "Nuclear-weapon-free zones, zones of confidence and co-operation" states the following:

... a lively exchange of views and experiences took place, concentrating on the link between nuclear-weapon-free zones and regions and the need to develop more confidence between peoples and States. It was agreed that such a link exists, and that it is not merely a link but an interaction. Disarmament presupposes confidence, while at the same time creating more confidence. In

this sense, nuclear-weapon-free zones could be a factor leading to greater confidence, good neighbourliness, mutual understanding and more co-operation. It should be mentioned that many, almost all, speakers spoke out in favour of nuclear-weapon-free zones in as many regions as possible throughout the world, while one speaker considered such a zone in Central Europe to be inexpedient. Our debate, in which representatives from almost all parts of the world participated, has shown that nuclear-weapon-free zones, where they already exist and are binding under international law, in no way led to more insecurity, as is occasionally maintained, but to the peoples feeling less threatened. Obviously, mistrust among peoples has not come about by countries having no nuclear weapons but it has frequently been caused by such weapons being targeted at those countries.

It was stated in the exchange of opinions that more recently there have been signs of improvement in the political climate in the world, although this does not yet apply to all regions. But the traces of the militarization of politics in the past are still noticeable even where such improvements are to be seen, especially now that the first treaty on disarmament has been concluded. There is still a deficit of confidence in many parts of the world. This deficit can be no justification for adhering to nuclear weapons. It would be wrong to say that more confidence must be built before attention is turned to other things such as disarmament, co-operation, etc. The building of confidence is a very complex process composed of many elements: political and military, economic and humanitarian. Even the media, the speakers emphasized, hold a specific responsibility in this process. All these factors must be developed. Yet irrespective of this, the demilitarization of politics, a shift of priorities from armament to co-operation should be in the interests of East and West, South and North. The preservation of peace, it was stated, is a precondition for the shaping of peace.

7. The report of Commission 3 on the subject of "Nuclear-weapon-free zones, regional conflicts and crisis management" says among other things:

Discussing ways of settling regional conflicts, several delegates underscored the interdependence linking problems and events in today's world, the indivisibility of peace and security. In this context, the view was expressed that nowadays a regional conflict may lead to a world conflagration. This makes it vitally necessary to intensify efforts to solve disputes by peaceful political means and to take all legitimate rights and interests of the countries involved into account in settling the crisis ... Many contributions dealt with the connection between the issues relating to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the peoples' struggle for national and social liberation ... In the course of the discussion it was noted that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones represents an obstacle to the aspirations of States involved in regional conflicts to obtain nuclear weapons. Under the conditions of nuclear-weapon-free zones, more favourable conditions will be created for the dialogue aimed at finding just and lasting solutions for regional conflict.

8. The report of Commission 4 on "Nuclear-weapon-free zones and conventional disarmament" emphasizes:

Many addressed the clear link between conventional and nuclear weapons, and the broad support for nuclear-weapon-free zones was followed by the acknowledgement that conventional weaponry must also be addressed.

Today, conventional weapons are highly sophisticated; these highly technical, computerized arms can even survive the troops and keep on fighting. In many respects, the results of conventional war can be as devastating as the effects of nuclear war ... so many thought it imperative that conventional weapons be a part of the negotiations.

9. Commission 5 on "Questions of guarantees, control and verification of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" reports:

1. The subject: It was not the task of this Commission to deal with the pros and cons of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones but rather to discuss questions arising once the decision has been made to establish such a zone. However, whenever the question of whether the establishment of such zones could be useful was discussed, the outcome was affirmative, valuable new thoughts occasionally being contributed ...

2. Verification: The crucial issue of any arms control and arms reduction measures is the verification of the concluded agreements. All the speakers on this issue held the view that the technical means do exist that allow for reliable verification of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The crucial question is what is to be verified, and where and when ...

The part which neutral and non-aligned States could play in finding solutions to the complex verification issue was particularly stressed.

3. The discussion reflected many concerns:

- Nuclear disarmament by the two big Powers alone is not enough in view of the fact that there are five nuclear Powers;

- The interrelationship between military and civilian uses of nuclear energy could make nuclear disarmament more difficult or even stand in its way;

- There is great concern over the future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Not only must it be our concern to keep outer space as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and, consequently, retain the ABM Treaty but to attach equal importance to preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons on the Earth and save the Non-Proliferation Treaty from possible disintegration.

4. Our deliberations reflected the hope that the United Nations will be able to play a significant role in the denuclearisation process and its reliable verification. Speakers also voiced the expectation that discussions about nuclear armament would not divert attention from the non-military aspects of humanity's security or insecurity, that is, the problems of hunger, poverty and disease.

10. Commission 6 on "Nuclear-weapon-free zones and European security" says in its report:

The vast majority of speakers were sympathetic to the idea of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in Europe as a step towards a world without nuclear weapons. As they see it, the creation of such zones should be part of a comprehensive process that would have to be characterised by détente in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as between the European countries, and by the settlement of regional conflicts throughout the world ... Many speakers underlined the important contribution which nuclear-weapon-free zones would make to the security of individual States, in Europe and in the world at large. Possession of nuclear weapons tends to heighten rather than ease tensions because such weapons are a priority target for the other side.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones had to be seen as a confidence-building measure going beyond the recommendations of the Stockholm conference, both in its scope and importance. The advantages of such zones were mentioned: (i) the limitation of the arms race; (ii) the greater advance warning and time for reflection in the case of a conflict triggered by chance or otherwise; (iii) the raising of the nuclear threshold in such a case; and (iv) the provision of more time to find political solutions, in other words greater political predictability, which to a greater or lesser extent contributes to consolidating confidence among States.

It was emphasized likewise that such zones could only contribute effectively to security if they were integrated into a broader process and that they should for this reason be accompanied by a general easing of tensions and a reduction in other types of armaments, especially conventional ones. The majority of speakers were in favour of such zones ...

11. Commission 7 on "Nuclear-weapon-free zones in Latin America and in the South Pacific - practical experiences and international significance" reported:

1. There was a general tendency to support both the elimination of nuclear weapons and conventional disarmament.

2. The importance of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a contribution to the world-wide disarmament process was pointed out. Emphasis was laid on the need to establish a peaceful world order which would be based on a reasonable approach to international security, not only in the military sphere but also in the economic field, and which would also include respect for the right of self-determination and the sovereignty of States and ensure decent social conditions for all mankind.

3. Another point stressed was the valuable experience gained from the Treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga. The spirit and the goal of both Treaties were acknowledged although no consensus of opinion on their effectiveness was apparent. To widen the nuclear-weapon-free zones it will be necessary to perfect the pertinent arrangements and to create favourable conditions for all States of a region to accede to a treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The points raised included the elimination of all vestiges of colonialism in the zone, the dismantling of foreign military bases and an end to the use of that territory by ships and aircraft capable of transporting nuclear weapons.

4. There was agreement that the significance of a nuclear-weapon-free zone must be based on the idea that the nuclear-weapon States respect the objectives and provisions of the treaties establishing such a zone. Effective guarantees by the nuclear Powers are essential for the effectiveness of any nuclear-weapon-free zone.

5. Some delegations underlined the need to halt nuclear tests in the area of nuclear-free zones and to forbid naval manoeuvres involving nuclear-armed ships in these zones.

6. It was stressed that it would be desirable for the States of every region to examine ways of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in their respective area.

7. There was a general consensus that any behaviour directed against peace and mankind represents a violation of international law.

8. Several speakers expressed the view that disarmament is not only the business of Governments but also of all the world's peace-loving peoples. The activities of non-governmental organizations constitute an important contribution to the struggle for peace and security.

12. Commission 8 on "Initiatives for nuclear-weapon-free and peace zones in Asia and Africa" says in its report, inter alia:

The importance of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in Asia and Africa for regional and global security and for peace, co-operation and development was emphasized during the discussions. It was seen as a favourable condition for creating mutual trust and for reducing the risk of nuclear confrontation. The participants heard with interest of the Treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga, which have already brought about the formation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The speakers pointed out the initiatives which have been taken in Africa and Asia since the 1960s which aim to:

1. Transform the whole of the African continent in a nuclear-weapon-free zone;

2. To create nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of Asia and the Pacific, above all in the Middle East, in South and South-East Asia and on the Korean peninsula;

3. To transform the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, including such dangerous nuclear bases as Diego Garcia.

These initiatives brought to the fore in numerous speeches are illustrative of the efforts being made to strengthen regional security and stability.

13. Commission 9 on the subject "Denuclearisation, disarmament and overcoming underdevelopment, material security" stressed in its report:

The following main points were discussed and deliberated upon:

1. Nuclear and general disarmament is necessary and urgent for the survival of mankind. The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all continents is an important step in ending the arms race and forming an international security system. The experiences and conditions for creating the zones in each continent were also discussed. The participants expressed their great concern at the threat to peace posed by South Africa's and Israeli nuclear capabilities in their respective regions.

2. The speakers analysed the relationship between the arms race and underdevelopment in the world. They were unanimous in pointing out that high expenditure on armaments is a major cause for economic and social underdevelopment in the world. They agreed on the need to lower expenditure on armaments and to redirect resources to economic and social development. They pointed out that expenditure on armaments and the resulting arms race is a heavy economic and social burden for the developed countries irrespective of their social systems. In the socialist countries, too, the means which are set free by disarmament are urgently needed for a better and faster development of the economies and societies.

3. All the speakers saw the urgent need for redressing the structural economic irregularities which exist in the global economy. They noted that the pressing economic problems of underdeveloped countries such as the debt burden and the need for a new international economic order could be meaningfully tackled if serious disarmament is embarked upon. The speakers also pointed out that the arms race has contributed to the debt burden of the developing countries.

4. ... It was demanded that the multinational corporations must stop the pollution of environment through their export and dumping of nuclear industrial waste in the world. It was also noted and urged that programmes of arms conversion ought to be advocated and implemented.