SUMMARY OF NEGOTIATIONS LEADING TO THE CONCLUSION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF MILITARY OR ANY OTHER HOSTILE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MODIFICATION TECHNIQUES AND OF SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO THE CONVENTION

(Background paper prepared by the Secretariat)
INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 16 of its Final Report, the Preparatory Committee for the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to submit an information paper containing a summary of the negotiations leading to the conclusion of the Convention and of subsequent developments related to the Convention. This paper has been prepared pursuant to that request.

DELIBERATIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS LEADING TO THE CONCLUSION OF THE CONVENTION

2. The problem of artificial modification of the environment for military or other hostile purposes began to attract increasing international attention in the early 1970's, especially after the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which was held at Stockholm in 1972. The Declaration adopted by that Conference stated, inter alia, that nations had the responsibility to ensure that their own activities did not damage the environment of other nations.

3. The importance of the problem arises from the fact that scientific and technical progress not only opens the possibility of influencing the natural environment in beneficial ways - for instance, by artificially induced rainfall, prevention of hailstorms, fog dispersion, neutralization of the destructive force of hurricanes and typhoons - but would also make it possible to use environmental modification techniques for military or other hostile purposes. This potential led to efforts to achieve an international agreement prohibiting the artificial modification of the environment for military and other hostile uses before the techniques involved had become fully developed by States.

4. In the course of the spring part of the 1974 session of the multilateral disarmament negotiating body, known then as the Conference of the Committee on
Disarmament (CCD), Sweden considered that the meteorological field required closer attention to see what measures could be taken to prevent the development of methods for meteorological warfare. Poland said there was much merit in the Swedish view, but suggested that before the CCD looked into the matter in greater detail, it should perhaps try to obtain expert opinion about the various implications of developments in that and related areas. 3/

5. In the summer of 1974, at the summit meeting between General Secretary Brezhnev of the Soviet Union and President Nixon of the United States held in Moscow from 27 June to 3 July, the question of the military use of environmental modification techniques was examined. A joint statement was issued in which the two countries, among other things, considered that scientific and technical advances in environmental fields, including climate modification, might open possibilities for using environmental modification techniques for military purposes; recognized that such use could have widespread, long-lasting and severe effects harmful to human welfare; and advocated the most effective measures possible to overcome the dangers of the use of environmental modification techniques for military purposes. 4/

6. During the summer part of the CCD sessio., the Soviet Union and the United States referred to the joint statement and noted that they would meet to study the problem and discuss what steps might be taken to remove the threat of the military or other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. 5/

7. At the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, an item entitled "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health", was inscribed in the Assembly's agenda
at the request of the Soviet Union. In its request, the Soviet Union noted that many States were carrying out scientific research and practical work in an attempt to influence natural elements in a positive way and to mitigate the deleterious effects of natural disasters. It considered that activities in this field, pursuing peaceful and constructive ends, should be encouraged and welcomed in every way. It pointed out, however, that the results of this research could also be used for destructive purposes, and thus present an extreme danger to world peace and to human well-being and health. In its view, it was necessary to draw up and conclude an international convention to outlaw action to influence the environment for military purposes, without in any way restricting scientific research and practical work on the alteration of natural conditions to meet the peaceful needs of States for the benefit of mankind. It believed that the adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution approving the idea of concluding a broad agreement on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health, as well as the preparation of a draft international agreement on the subject, would certainly be in the interests of strengthening peace, make a substantial contribution to the cause of preserving mankind from the danger of the use of new means of waging war and also serve the interests of limiting the arms race and of disarmament.

8. In his address to the Assembly, Foreign Minister Gromyko, explaining the reasons for the Soviet initiative, reiterated that the latest discoveries relating to possibilities of influencing nature and the climate could be used not only for creative purposes but also for military purposes with extremely destructive consequences for mankind. Since this was a threat that was assuming an ever-more realistic shape, it was in the
9. On 24 September, the Soviet Union submitted, in the Assembly's First Committee, a draft resolution on the subject which was subsequently revised and co-sponsored by 22 other States and to which a draft convention, entitled "Convention on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health", was annexed.\(^8\) By that draft resolution the General Assembly would, \textit{inter alia}, take note of the annexed draft convention, as well as other points of view and suggestions put forward during the discussion of the question and would request the CCD to proceed as soon as possible to achieving agreement on the text of such a convention and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session.

10. Under Article I of the draft convention, States Parties would undertake not to develop meteorological, geophysical or any other scientific or technological means of influencing the environment, including the weather and climate, for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health and, furthermore, never under any circumstances to resort to such means of influencing the environment and climate or to carry out preparations for their use. Article II provided that the activities mentioned in Article I consisted of those active influences on the surface of the land, the sea-bed and the ocean floor, the depths of the earth, the marine environment, the atmosphere or any other elements of the environment that might cause damage by the actions listed in Article II. This Article also provided that the list could be supplemented or amended depending upon progress of scientific and technological research. The draft convention also included provisions to the effect that nothing in the convention should impede the economic or scientific and technological development of the Parties or international economic and scientific co-operation in the utilization, preservation and improvement of the
11. In the First Committee, the Soviet Union pointed out that its proposal involved a field of activity and certain processes, meteorological and geophysical, which had never before been the sphere or subject of international negotiations in disarmament. It opened up a new direction in the field of disarmament and the prevention of a new potential threat to mankind. The Soviet Union also underlined that the importance of the proposal was that its implementation would contribute not only to the limitation of the arms race but to the preservation of the environment for the benefit and in the interest of the whole of mankind. 2/

12. The Soviet proposal was favourably received by many Members as an important and timely initiative. 10/ Several States, among them Argentina, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia and the Ukrainian SSR, expressed full support for both the draft resolution and the draft convention annexed to it. Kuwait and the Philippines, while welcoming the proposal, stressed that due and equal importance should be given to the need of harnessing the achievements in science and technology to influence the environment and climate for the benefit of mankind, in particular, the peoples of developing countries. A number of countries, among them, Austria, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Finland, Iran, Italy, Nepal, Peru, Sweden and Thailand, while favourably inclined towards the Soviet initiative, were of the view that the question required further study and a variety of mechanisms were suggested for that purpose, including examination of the matter in the CCD with the participation of experts. The United States believed that environmental modification techniques could have considerable potential for peaceful purposes, but regretted that they might also be used for hostile purposes that could have widespread, long-lasting and severe effects harmful to human welfare.
It reiterated its willingness, as stated in the Joint Statement, to examine with the Soviet Union what measures could be effective to overcome the dangers of the use of environmental modification techniques for military purposes. It was prepared to study the question and to examine the measures that might become the subject of international agreement. It also stated its readiness to support referral of the question to the CCD if that were the general view and if it were accomplished without prejudging how the Committee would deal with the question. In its view, the draft resolution failed to meet the second condition. Furthermore, it was not persuaded that the Soviet draft convention annexed to the draft resolution provided a suitable basis for the discussion of the question.

13. On 9 December 1974, the General Assembly adopted the revised draft resolution by a vote of 126 in favour to none against, with five abstentions (Chile, France, Mali, Paraguay and the United States), as resolution 3264 (XXIX). China did not participate in the vote. The resolution reads as follows:

   The General Assembly,

   Noting the concern of peoples to consolidate peace and pursue efforts designed to save mankind from the danger of using new means of warfare, to limit the arms race and to bring about disarmament.

   Bearing in mind that, under conditions of continuous scientific and technological progress, new possibilities arise for using the results of this progress not only for peaceful but also for military purposes,

   Convinced that the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostiles purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health, would serve the cause of strengthening peace and averting the threat of war,
Taking into account the profound interest of States and peoples in the adoption of measures to preserve and improve the environment and to modify or moderate the climate solely for peaceful purposes for the benefit of present and future generations,

1. Considers it necessary to adopt, through the conclusion of an appropriate international convention, effective measures to prohibit action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health;

2. Takes note of the draft international convention on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health, submitted to the General Assembly by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as other points of view and suggestions put forward during the discussion of this question;

3. Requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to proceed as soon as possible to achieving agreement on the text of such a convention and to submit a report on the results achieved for consideration by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the discussion by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session of the item entitled "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health";
5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirtieth session an item entitled "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human-well-being and health.

14. During the summer part of its 1975 session, the CCD, at the request of Sweden, held four informal meetings on the subject with the participation of experts from a number of countries. At those meetings, the status of scientific research in the field of environmental modification was discussed. Canada submitted a working paper suggesting a preliminary approach to considering the possibility of concluding a convention on the prohibition of environmental modification for military or other hostile purposes. Sweden also tabled a working paper containing a short list of methods to influence the environment for hostile purposes.

15. On 21 August 1975, the Soviet Union and the United States separately submitted to the CCD identical texts of a draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. The Preamble, inter alia, expressed the realization of the States Parties that military use of environmental modification techniques could have widespread, long-lasting or severe effects harmful to human welfare, and their desire to limit the potential danger to mankind from means of warfare involving the use of environmental modification techniques. Article I of the nine-article draft convention prohibited military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects, as the means of destruction, damage or injury to another State Party. Article II contained a definition of the term "environmental modification techniques" for the purposes of the prohibition contained in Article I as well as some examples thereof. According to Article III,
environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes.

By Article IV the States Parties would undertake, in accordance with their constitutional processes, to take any necessary measures to prohibit and prevent any activity in violation of the provisions of the Convention anywhere under its jurisdiction or control. Article V included undertakings for consultation and cooperation in solving any problems which might arise in the application of the Convention and also made provision for the submission of complaints to the United Nations Security Council. Article VI through IX contained provisions covering such matters as amendments, duration, entry into force and deposit.

16. In introducing the draft convention, the USSR and the United States expressed their wish to see it serve as a basis for negotiations in the CCD and stressed their hope that the discussion would lead to early agreement on an international convention.\textsuperscript{14/}

17. A number of delegations made preliminary comments on the draft convention.\textsuperscript{15/} Argentina sought clarification from the sponsors mainly on the draft's preamble, scope of prohibition and the need for a provision concerning the exchange of information on the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes. Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Sweden and the United Kingdom, generally welcomed the submission of the identical texts and expressed the view that the texts constituted a good basis for negotiations. The Federal Republic of Germany, while also welcoming the identical drafts, stressed the need for possible improvements in them.

18. At the thirtieth session of the General Assembly in 1975, Member States in general reacted positively to the submission by the Soviet Union and the United States of identical texts of a draft convention to the CCD. Views
various fora dealing with related problems. In connection with the
proposed identical texts, comments were made, in particular, on the
scope of the prohibition and the need for improvements in the complaints
procedure and for the inclusion of a provision on periodic review
conferences.

19. The General Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 3475 (XXX)
by which it, inter alia, noted with satisfaction that the
Soviet Union and the United States had submitted identical
drafts of a convention and that other delegations had offered suggestions
and preliminary observations regarding the drafts, and requested the CCD
to continue negotiations, bearing in mind existing proposals and
suggestions as well as relevant discussions by the Assembly, with a view
to reaching early agreement on the text of a convention and to submit
a special report on the results achieved for consideration by the Assembly
at its thirty-first session.

20. At the beginning of the 1976 session of the CCD, the delegations of
the Soviet Union and the United States, as sponsors of the identical
draft texts, urged that every effort should be made
to reach an agreement on the matter in the course of the session
and to submit a report on the results achieved to the General Assembly
at its thirty-first session.16/

21. The United States held that the submission of identical texts of a
convention had been an important step, that the major issues had been
identified and that discussions had shown that a consensus had clearly
been reached on the desirability of achieving such an agreement. The
current task was to determine how best to achieve the objective. The
United States agreed that some formulations of the draft were not perfect,
but held that it constituted a practical means for dealing with the
problem of preventing environmental warfare and merited the support of
all Committee members. 17/ The Soviet Union emphasized the overall
importance of such an agreement, and the expectation of the General
Assembly to have a widely acceptable draft convention submitted to it
at its next session.18/
22. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia and Poland fully supported the identical draft conventions and urged early agreement on it.

23. Other delegations, while supporting the concept of a ban on environmental warfare, suggested various modifications in the proposed draft convention. Several suggestions were put forward concerning the Preamble. Argentina considered that the third paragraph should make reference to "hostile use" other than "military" and that it should draw a clearer distinction between military and peaceful uses of environmental modification techniques; that the fourth paragraph should express the desire to eliminate the use of such techniques and not merely limit them; and that the Preamble should contain a recognition of general and complete disarmament as the fundamental objective. Canada suggested that the third paragraph should be divided into two paragraphs, in order to make clear the distinction between peaceful and military uses. Romania indicated that the preamble should contain an expression of the will of the parties to halt the arms race and achieve general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.

24. As regards Article 1, Argentina and Mexico were of the view that the convention should provide for a comprehensive prohibition and called for the deletion of the phrase "having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects". In their view, that phrase had the effect of legitimizing the use of techniques under the established threshold. Iran and Yugoslavia also favoured a total ban. Australia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom favoured retaining the phrase, but believed there should be some definition of terms, perhaps in an annex to the convention. The United States held that the phrase was necessary to ensure that the ban could be implemented successfully and would not give rise to trivial issues. The USSR, noting that the restrictive aspect of the identical drafts had been the result of a harmonization of the views of the Soviet Union and the
United States on the subject, held that the text under consideration presented the optimum solution. Egypt, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, Romania and Sweden favoured the inclusion of a ban on the threat of use of the techniques in question. The Netherlands proposed a ban on the preparation for use, which, in its view, would ban research and development for hostile use.\(^{22}\)

26. With respect to the list of examples of environmental modification techniques contained in Article II, some delegations, among them the Netherlands and Sweden, considered the list as unnecessary and superfluous. Pakistan considered that only the definition of the term "environmental modification techniques" should be contained in the Article and held that an illustrative list of examples should form an annex to the convention.\(^{23}\)

27. In relation to Article III dealing with the peaceful uses of such techniques, Argentina and Egypt favoured a provision for the promotion of peaceful uses of those techniques. Romania stressed the importance of a commitment in the convention to encourage the development of peaceful uses in this field, including an information exchange system. Pakistan considered that it was necessary to ensure that uses for ostensibly peaceful purposes were not diverted to hostile ends or would not be such as to have an adverse effect on another State. In the context of this provision, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy and Sweden also expressed concern about the implications the convention might have on the application of environmental modification techniques for peaceful uses. The United States said that Article III sought to make clear that the convention should not be involved with the complex question of peaceful uses, without prejudicing any efforts elsewhere to promote or regulate such uses. The USSR objected to proposals to include definite
provisions governing international cooperation in the peaceful use
of environmental modification techniques and to the laying down of what
amounted to specific obligations on States in connection with such
cooperation. It pointed out that the inclusion of such provisions in
the convention was unjustified, since questions relating to
the peaceful use of those techniques were not germane to the
convention.\(^{24}\)

28. The Netherlands questioned the need for Article IV, dealing with the
measures a State Party would be required to take in accordance with its
constitutional processes. Australia maintained that the text
was unclear and should be redrafted. The USSR stated that the formulation
of the article left no room for doubt that every State was free to determine
independently, in accordance with its own legislation, the procedure for
carrying out the provisions of the convention.\(^{25}\)

29. Sweden expressed concern about the provisions concerning the verification
and complaints procedure as contained in Article V and suggested that provisions
should be made for some kind of international machinery to guarantee that objective
verification procedures were available at the international level, before
a complaint was referred to the Security Council. The Netherlands also
favoured an intermediate body to which parties could complain and which
could investigate the matter on an expert basis before the Security Council
was involved. Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iran, Italy, Japan
and Romania also expressed concern about the adequacy of the
complaints procedure as defined in Article V. The United States said that
the text of Article V satisfied the need for practical effectiveness in
deterring violations and dealing with them as they occurred. It established
the right and obligation of parties to consult and cooperate before recourse
to the Security Council, and such consultations might take place through
The Soviet Union also held that in case of need a sufficiently wide range of courses of action was open to the State concerned, including the conduct of bilateral consultations and cooperation, resort to existing international bodies within the framework of the United Nations for consultation, the convening of the advisory committee of experts, and, lastly, recourse to the Security Council. It stressed that Articles I and V constituted a delicate balance which represented the optimum solution and should not be upset.26/

30. In connection with Article VI concerning amendments, the United Kingdom suggested that any amendment should be sponsored by at least 10 Parties and should require the support of two-thirds of the Parties before entering into force. Canada held that it should be stipulated that an amendment would enter into force for all Parties that had accepted it, upon the deposit of the instrument of acceptance by a majority of the Parties.27/

31. In relation to Article VIII, Australia proposed that, in view of the universal nature of the agreement, the Secretary-General of the United Nations should be given a depositary role.28/

32. A considerable number of delegations, among them Bulgaria, Canada, Egypt, India, Iran, Japan, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Romania, United Kingdom and Yugoslavia, suggested that a provision for review conferences should be included in the proposed convention.29/

33. In addition to the plenary meetings, four informal meetings were held on the subject on 5 and 6 April 1976, with the participation of experts. On 1 July 1976, the CCD established a working group for the purpose of considering any modifications that any delegation might propose to the identical texts of a draft convention and of facilitating the negotiation of the text of an agreement to be submitted to the General Assembly.
The Working Group was able to reach agreement on many of the proposed modifications but not on others. Consequently, its report to the CCD included the text of a draft convention, together with comments, dissenting views and reservations thereon. As a result of the deliberations in the Working Group, various provisions of the identical texts were revised.

35. In the Preamble, a new phrase was included in the first paragraph reaffirming the objective of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. A second paragraph was added, by which parties expressed their determination to continue negotiations in order to achieve effective progress in the field of disarmament. A new fourth paragraph was included, recalling the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. The former third paragraph was divided into two new paragraphs, the fifth and sixth, and the latter was redrafted, the words "widespread, long-lasting or severe effects harmful to human welfare" being replaced by the words "effects extremely harmful to human welfare". Two modifications were made in the new seventh paragraph; the new formulation stressed the desire to prohibit effectively military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques instead of referring to limiting the potential danger from such means of warfare, and a new phrase was added to the paragraph, affirming the willingness of States parties to work towards the achievement of an effective prohibition.

36. The text of Article I was maintained as in the original draft. In connection with this Article, the CCD reached an understanding that, for the purposes of the Convention, the terms "widespread", "long-lasting" and "severe" would be interpreted as follows: (a) "widespread": encompassing an area on the scale of several hundred square kilometres; (b) "long-lasting": lasting for a period of months, or approximately a season; (c) "severe": involving serious or significant disruption or harm
to human life, natural and economic resources or other assets. It was further understood that that interpretation was intended exclusively for the Convention and was not intended to prejudice the interpretation of the same or similar terms if used in connection with any other international agreement.

37. The definition of environmental modification techniques in Article II was retained, but not the examples originally included in the Article. In that connection, the CCD reached an understanding that the following examples were illustrative of phenomena that could be caused by the use of environmental modification techniques as defined in Article II of the Convention: earthquakes; tsunamis; an upset in the ecological balance of a region; changes in weather patterns (clouds, precipitation, cyclones of various types and tornadic storms); changes in climate patterns; changes in ocean currents; changes in the state of the ozone layer; and changes in the state of the ionosphere. It was further understood that all those phenomena, when produced by military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, would result, or could reasonably be expected to result, in widespread, long-lasting or severe destruction, damage or injury. Thus, military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques as defined in Article II, so as to cause those phenomena as a means of destruction, damage or injury to another State Party, would be prohibited. It was recognized, moreover, that the list of examples was not exhaustive. Other phenomena which could result from the use of environmental modification techniques as defined in Article II could also be appropriately included. The absence of such phenomena from the list did not in any way imply that the undertaking contained in Article I would not be applicable to those phenomena, provided the criteria set out in that article were met.
38. Article III was divided into two paragraphs. Paragraph I followed the wording of the previous draft, but added a new phrase to the effect that the provisions of the convention should be without prejudice to generally recognized principles and applicable rules of international law concerning the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes. Paragraph 2 included an undertaking relating to the fullest possible exchange of scientific and technological information on the use of such techniques, as well as a new text on economic and scientific co-operation concerning the environment, in which reference was made to the needs of the developing areas of the world. In connection with this Article, the CCD reached an understanding that the convention did not deal with the question whether or not a given use of techniques for peaceful purposes was in accordance with generally recognized principles and applicable rules of international law.

39. Changes were also introduced in Article IV in order to meet observations to the effect that the original text was unclear.

40. A new sentence was added to paragraph 1 of Article V, stating that the international procedures referred to therein might include the services of appropriate international organizations, as well as of consultative committee of experts, as provided for in a new paragraph 2 of the same article. Provisions relating to the functions and procedures of the Consultative Committee were included in an annex to the Convention. Paragraph 3 was slightly amended to require that a complaint to the Security Council should also include all relevant information.
41. Article VI, as completed, provided that proposed amendments should be submitted to the Depositary and that any amendment would enter into force for all States Parties which accepted it, upon the deposit with the Depositary of instruments of acceptance by a majority of States Parties.

42. The revised draft also included a new Article VIII relating to the convening of conferences to review the operation of the Convention with a view to ensuring that its purposes and provisions were being realized and, in particular, to examine the effectiveness of the provisions of Article I, paragraph 1, in eliminating the dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. In connection with Article VIII, an understanding was reached that a proposal to amend the Convention might also be considered at any conference of Parties held pursuant to this Article. It was further understood that any proposed amendment that was intended for such consideration should, if possible, be submitted to the Depositary no less than 90 days before the commencement of the conference.

43. The Secretary-General of the United Nations was designated as Depositary of the convention. It should be noted that this was the first multilateral agreement in the field of arms limitation and disarmament that entrusted depositary functions to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

44. The Soviet Union and the United States expressed the view that the text of the draft convention resulting from the proceedings of the Working Group represented a considerable accomplishment. They also observed that the draft had been significantly modified from the identical drafts which they had tabled in the CCD in August 1975, reflecting accommodation of the sponsors' positions to views stated by others in the Working Group and the CCD itself. The amended draft text, they held, would accomplish the main objective of effectively eliminating the real dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification
45. Argentina and Mexico continued to object to the draft convention because of the retention in Article I of the qualifying phrase "having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects". They reserved their right to revert to the question in the General Assembly.\(^{31}\)

46. Brazil, Egypt, Pakistan, Romania and Yugoslavia also expressed some reservations regarding Article I.\(^{32}\) Romania, reiterating its strong preference for a comprehensive convention that would prohibit the military use of all environmental modification techniques, considered that, should the scope of the convention remain unchanged, Article VIII should include a definite commitment by all States Parties to keep that question under constant observation and also to take advantage of the first review conference in order to engage in concrete negotiations with a view to banning those environmental modification techniques which remained below the level of magnitude as established by the draft convention.

47. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly in 1976, significant differences of view arose in the First Committee with respect to the text of the draft convention annexed to the CCD's report, which led to the submission of two different draft resolutions on the subject.
48. The first resolution (A/C.1/31/L.4) was submitted on 3 November by Argentina, Mexico, Panama and Peru, and subsequently also sponsored by Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Jamaica, Mauritius, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela. According to the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, inter alia, request the CCD, without prejudice to the priorities established in its programme of work, to continue negotiations on the text of a draft convention, bearing in mind the proposals and suggestions which had been submitted as well as the relevant discussion by the General Assembly, with a view to reaching agreement as early as possible on a text which would be widely acceptable to Members of the United Nations.

49. In introducing the draft resolution on 9 November, Mexico explained that it felt the process of negotiation needed to continue in order to arrive at a text of a draft convention that would be widely acceptable to Members of the United Nations. In its view, that procedure would be in keeping with the practice that had been followed in the past by the General Assembly with regard to the drafts of multilateral agreements prepared by the CCD, which had obtained a general consensus before being referred to the General Assembly as "final drafts". It held that the text of the draft convention annexed to the report of the CCD could not be said to enjoy the general support of the countries participating in that body since the report also contained "dissenting opinions and reservations". Mexico reiterated its view that as drafted the text of Article I would legitimize the use of certain environmental modification techniques for military or other hostile purposes so long as those techniques were not widespread, long-lasting or serious in their effects.32/
50. The other draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.5) was submitted on 4 November by Canada, Denmark, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the United Kingdom and Zaire. According to this draft resolution, the General Assembly would recommend the convention as contained in the report of the CCD, and would request the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as depositary of the convention, to open it for signature and ratification at the earliest possible date.

51. In introducing the resolution on 5 November, Finland maintained that the negotiating process undertaken in the CCD had led to substantial improvements in several of the articles of the draft convention. It believed that the divergence of views regarding Article I should not be a decisive obstacle to reaching broad agreement on the matter as a whole and did not detract from the overall value of the draft convention. It was of the opinion that the definition of the scope of the prohibition in the draft treaty, in practice, would prevent the modification of the environment for hostile purposes which had been the main objective that the General Assembly had instructed the CCD to seek by resolution 3475 (XXX), adopted by consensus. It, therefore, considered that the General Assembly should recommend the draft convention for signature and ratification.\(^{34}\)

52. The debate continued to centre on the question of whether the text of the convention should be further considered, as provided for by draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4, or whether it should be opened for signature and ratification at the earliest possible date, as called for by draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5. In the course of the debate, both draft resolutions were revised. The first draft resolution, as revised (A/C.1/31/L.4/Rev.1), requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to transmit to all States the text of the draft convention contained in
the report of the CCD, as well as all other relevant documents, relating to the question; invited all Member States to communicate their views and suggestions on that question before 30 June 1977; requested the Secretary-General to transmit to all Member States the replies received; and decided to include the item in the provisional agenda of its thirty-second session. The second draft resolution underwent three revisions. In its final form, the draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.3), inter alia, referred the convention, which was annexed to the resolution, to all States for their consideration, signature and ratification; requested the Secretary-General, as Depositary of the Convention, to open it for signature and ratification; and called upon the CCD, without prejudice to the priorities established in its programme of work, to keep the matter under review.

53. On 3 December 1976, on a procedural motion initiated by India and seconded by Nigeria, the First Committee decided by a vote of 50 to 31, with 30 abstentions, to give priority in the voting to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.3. The draft resolution was subsequently adopted by the Committee by 89 votes to 11, with 25 abstentions. The Committee then decided, by a vote of 49 to 42, with 35 abstentions, not to put the other draft resolution to a vote.

54. On 10 December 1976, the General Assembly, by a vote of 96 to 8, with 30 abstentions<sup>25/</sup>, adopted draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev. 3 as Assembly resolution 31/72. The resolution reads as follows:
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3264 (XXIX) of 9 December 1974 and 3475 (XXX) of 11 December 1975,

Recalling its resolution 1722 (XVI) of 20 December 1961, in which it recognized that all States have a deep interest in disarmament and arms control negotiations,

Determined to avert the potential dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques,

Convinced that broad adherence to a convention on the prohibition of such action would contribute to the cause of strengthening peace and averting the threat of war,

Noting with satisfaction that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has completed and transmitted to the General Assembly, in the report of its work in 1976, the text of a draft Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques,

Noting further that the Convention is intended to prohibit effectively military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques in order to eliminate the dangers to mankind from such use,

Bearing in mind that draft agreements on disarmament and arms control measures submitted to the General Assembly by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be the result of a process of effective negotiations, and that such instruments should duly take into account the views and interests of all States so that they can be adhered to by the widest possible number of countries,
Bearing in mind that article VIII of the Convention makes provision for a conference to review the operation of the Convention five years after its entry into force, with a view to ensuring that its purposes and provisions are being realized,

Also bearing in mind all relevant documents and negotiating records of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on the discussion of the draft Convention,

Convinced that the Convention should not affect the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes, which could contribute to the preservation and improvement of the environment for the benefit of present and future generations,

Convinced that the Convention will contribute to the realization of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Anxious that during its 1977 session the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should concentrate on urgent negotiations on disarmament and arms limitation measures,

1. Refers the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, the text of which is annexed to the present resolution to all States for their consideration, signature and ratification;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, as Depositary of the Convention, to open it for signature and ratification at the earliest possible date;

3. Expresses its hope for the widest possible adherence to the Convention;

4. Calls upon the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, without prejudice to the priorities established in its programme of work, to keep under review the problem of effectively averting the dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques;

* The text of the convention is reproduced in Annex II.
5. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the discussion by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session of the question of the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques.

55. Pursuant to operative paragraph 2 of the General Assembly resolution, the Secretary-General, as Depository of the Convention, opened it for signature and ratification on 18 May 1977. On that day, the Convention was signed by the following 34 States: Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States and Yemen.

SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS RELATING TO THE CONVENTION

56. The question of averting the dangers of the military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques was considered at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In paragraph 78 of the Final Document adopted at that session, the General Assembly stated that:

"The Committee on Disarmament should keep under review the need for further prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques in order to eliminate the dangers to mankind of such use."  

57. When the Committee on Disarmament convened in 1979, an understanding was reached in connection with the adoption of the Committee's agenda to the effect that heading IX of the so-called "Decalogue" dealing, inter alia, with
collateral measures, included among other questions to be considered by the Committee at appropriate stages of its work, the question "of effectively averting the dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques.\(^37\)"

58. The question received some attention in the Committee on Disarmament in the context of its consideration of the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament submitted to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1982\(^38\). The relevant text provided for review of the need for a further prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques with a view to the adoption of further measures to eliminate the danger to mankind from such use.\(^39\)

59. The question came again to the fore at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly in 1983. In connection with resolution 37/99 I relating to the preparation and convening of the first review conference of the Convention, Argentina and Mexico reiterated their reservations on the scope of the prohibition contained in Article I of the Convention.\(^40\)

**STATUS OF THE TREATY**

60. The Treaty entered into force on 5 October 1978. As of 31 July 1984, there were 43 States Parties and 20 States Signatories. The list of Parties and Signatories appears in Annex III.
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ANNEX I

TEXT OF THE IDENTICAL DRAFT CONVENTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT ON 21 AUGUST 1975 BY THE UNION OF SOVIET
SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE UNITED STATES

The States Party to this Convention,

Guided by the interest of consolidating peace, and wishing to contribute to
the cause of limiting the arms race, and of bringing about disarmament, and of
saving mankind from the danger of using new means of warfare;

Recognizing that scientific and technical advances may open new possibilities
with respect to modification of the environment,

Realizing that military use of environmental modification techniques could
have widespread, long-lasting or severe effects harmful to human welfare, but
that the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes could
improve the interrelationship of man and nature and contribute to the preservation
and improvement of the environment for the benefit of present and future
generations;

Desiring to limit the potential danger to mankind from means of warfare
involving the use of environmental modification techniques;

Desiring also to contribute to the strengthening of trust among nations and
to the further improvement of the international situation in accordance with the
purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to engage in military
or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having
widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or
injury to another State Party.

2. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to assist, encourage
or induce any State, group of States or international organization to engage in
activities contrary to the provision of paragraph 1 of this article.

ARTICLE II

As used in Article I, the term "environmental modification techniques"
refers to any technique for changing - through the deliberate manipulation of
natural processes - the dynamics, composition or structure of the earth, including
its biota, lithosphere, hydrosphere, and atmosphere, or of outer space, so as to
cause such effects as earthquakes and tsunamis, an upset in the ecological balance
of a region, or changes in weather patterns (clouds, precipitation, cyclones of
various types and tornadic storms), in the state of the ozone layer or
ionosphere, in climate patterns, or in ocean currents.
ARTICLE III

The provisions of this Convention shall not hinder the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes by States Party, or international economic and scientific co-operation in the utilization, preservation and improvement of the environment for peaceful purposes.

ARTICLE IV

Each State Party to this Convention undertakes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, to take any necessary measures to prohibit and prevent any activity in violation of the provisions of the Convention anywhere under its jurisdiction or control.

ARTICLE V

1. The States Party to this Convention undertake to consult one another and to co-operate in solving any problems which may arise in relation to the objectives of, or in the application of the provisions of this Convention. Consultation and co-operation pursuant to this article may also be undertaken through appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter.

2. Any State Party to this Convention which finds that any other State Party is acting in breach of obligations deriving from the provisions of the Convention may lodge a complaint with the Security Council of the United Nations. Such a complaint should include all possible evidence confirming its validity, as well as a request for its consideration by the Security Council.

3. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes to co-operate in carrying out any investigation which the Security Council may initiate, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, on the basis of the complaint received by the Council. The Security Council shall inform the States Party to the Convention of the results of the investigation.

4. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes to provide or support assistance, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, to any Party to the Convention which so requests, if the Security Council decides that such Party has been harmed or is likely to be harmed as a result of violation of the Convention.

ARTICLE VI

1. Any State Party may propose amendments to this Convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to ______________ which shall circulate it to all States Party.

2. An amendment shall enter into force for all States Party which have accepted it, upon the deposit with ______________ of instruments of acceptance by ______________. Thereafter it shall enter into force for any remaining State Party on the date of deposit of its instruments of acceptance.

ARTICLE VII

This Convention shall be of unlimited duration.
ARTICLE VIII

1. This Convention shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign the Convention before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph (3) of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with __________.

3. This Convention shall enter into force after the deposit of instruments of ratification by __________ in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article.

4. For those States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited after the entry into force of this Convention, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The __________ shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification or of accession and the date of the entry into force of this Convention, and of the receipt of other notices.

6. This Convention shall be registered by __________ in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IX

This Convention, the Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited with __________ which shall send certified copies thereof to the governments of the signatory and acceding States.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

Done in _______________ On _______________
ANNEX II

CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF MILITARY OR ANY OTHER HOSTILE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MODIFICATION TECHNIQUES

The States Parties to this Convention,

Guided by the interest of consolidating peace, and wishing to contribute to the cause of halting the arms race, and of bringing about general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, and of saving mankind from the danger of using new means of warfare,

Determined to continue negotiations with a view to achieving effective progress towards further measures in the field of disarmament,

Recognizing that scientific and technical advances may open new possibilities with respect to modification of the environment,

Recalling the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, adopted at Stockholm on 16 June 1972,

Realizing that the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes could improve the interrelationship of man and nature and contribute to the preservation and improvement of the environment for the benefit of present and future generations,

Recognizing, however, that military or any other hostile use of such techniques could have effects extremely harmful to human welfare,

Desiring to prohibit effectively military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques in order to eliminate the dangers to mankind from such use, and affirming their willingness to work towards the achievement of this objective,

Desiring also to contribute to the strengthening of trust among nations and to the further improvement of the international situation in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Have agreed as follows:
Article I

1. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to engage in military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or injury to any other State Party.

2. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to assist, encourage or induce any State, group of States or international organization to engage in activities contrary to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article.

Article II

As used in article I, the term “environmental modification techniques” refers to any technique for changing—through the deliberate manipulation of natural processes—the dynamics, composition or structure of the earth, including its biota, lithosphere, hydrosphere and atmosphere, or of outer space.

Article III

1. The provisions of this Convention shall not hinder the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes and shall be without prejudice to the generally recognized principles and applicable rules of international law concerning such use.

2. The States Parties to this Convention undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of scientific and technological information on the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes. States Parties in a position to do so shall contribute, alone or together with other States or international organizations, to international economic and scientific co-operation in the preservation, improvement and peaceful utilization of the environment, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world.

Article IV

Each State Party to this Convention undertakes to take any measures it considers necessary in accordance with its constitutional processes to prohibit and prevent any activity in violation of the provisions of the Convention anywhere under its jurisdiction or control.

Article V

1. The States Parties to this Convention undertake to consult one another and to co-operate in solving any problems which may arise in relation to the objectives of, or in the application of the provisions of, the Convention. Consultation and co-operation pursuant to this article may also be undertaken through appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. These international procedures may include the
services of appropriate international organizations, as well as of a Consultative Committee of Experts as provided for in paragraph 2 of this article.

2. For the purposes set forth in paragraph 1 of this article, the Depositary shall, within one month of the receipt of a request from any State Party to this Convention, convene a Consultative Committee of Experts. Any State Party may appoint an expert to the Committee whose functions and rules of procedure are set out in the annex, which constitutes an integral part of this Convention. The Committee shall transmit to the Depositary a summary of its findings of fact, incorporating all views and information presented to the Committee during its proceedings. The Depositary shall distribute the summary to all States Parties.

3. Any State Party to this Convention which has reason to believe that any other State Party is acting in breach of obligations deriving from the provisions of the Convention may lodge a complaint with the Security Council of the United Nations. Such a complaint should include all relevant information as well as all possible evidence supporting its validity.

4. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes to co-operate in carrying out any investigation which the Security Council may initiate, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, on the basis of the complaint received by the Council. The Security Council shall inform the States Parties of the results of the investigation.

5. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes to provide or support assistance, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to any State Party which so requests, if the Security Council decides that such Party has been harmed or is likely to be harmed as a result of violation of the Convention.

Article VI

1. Any State Party to this Convention may propose amendments to the Convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary, who shall promptly circulate it to all States Parties.

2. An amendment shall enter into force for all States Parties to this Convention which have accepted it, upon the deposit with the Depositary of instruments of acceptance by a majority of States Parties. Thereafter it shall enter into force for any remaining State Party on the date of deposit of its instrument of acceptance.

Article VII

This Convention shall be of unlimited duration.

Article VIII

1. Five years after the entry into force of this Convention, a conference of the States Parties to the Convention shall be convened
by the Depositary at Geneva, Switzerland. The conference shall review
the operation of the Convention with a view to ensuring that its purposes
and provisions are being realized, and shall in particular examine the
effectiveness of the provisions of paragraph 1 of article I in eliminating
the dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modi-
fication techniques.

2. At intervals of not less than five years thereafter, a majority
of the States Parties to this Convention may obtain, by submitting a
proposal to this effect to the Depositary, the convening of a conference
with the same objectives.

3. If no conference has been convened pursuant to paragraph 2
of this article within ten years following the conclusion of a previous
conference, the Depositary shall solicit the views of all States Parties
to this Convention, concerning the convening of such a conference.
If one third or ten of the States Parties, whichever number is less,
respond affirmatively, the Depositary shall take immediate steps to
convene the conference.

Article IX

1. This Convention shall be open to all States for signature. Any
State which does not sign the Convention before its entry into force
in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any
time.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification by signatory
States. Instruments of ratification or accession shall be deposited with
the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

3. This Convention shall enter into force upon the deposit of
instruments of ratification by twenty Governments in accordance with
paragraph 2 of this article.

4. For those States whose instruments of ratification or accession
are deposited after the entry into force of this Convention, it shall enter
into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification
or accession.

5. The Depositary shall promptly inform all signatory and acced-
ing States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each
instrument of ratification or accession and the date of the entry into
force of this Convention and of any amendments thereto, as well as
of the receipt of other notices.

6. This Convention shall be registered by the Depositary in
accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article X

This Convention, of which the English, Arabic, Chinese, French,
Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with
the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall send duly certified copies thereof to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Convention, opened for signature at Geneva on the eighteenth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven.

Annex to the Convention

Consultative Committee of Experts

1. The Consultative Committee of Experts shall undertake to make appropriate findings of fact and provide expert views relevant to any problem raised pursuant to paragraph 1 of article V of this Convention by the State Party requesting the convening of the Committee.

2. The work of the Consultative Committee of Experts shall be organized in such a way as to permit it to perform the functions set forth in paragraph 1 of this annex. The Committee shall decide procedural questions relative to the organization of its work, where possible by consensus, but otherwise by a majority of those present and voting. There shall be no voting on matters of substance.

3. The Depositary or his representative shall serve as the Chairman of the Committee.

4. Each expert may be assisted at meetings by one or more advisers.

5. Each expert shall have the right, through the Chairman, to request from States, and from international organizations, such information and assistance as the expert considers desirable for the accomplishment of the Committee's work.
ANNEX III

STATUS OF THE CONVENTION

Opened for signature at Geneva: 18 May 1977
Entered into force: 5 October 1978

The Depositary: Secretary-General of the United Nations

States Parties to the Convention

1. Bangladesh
2. Belgium
3. Bulgaria
4. Byelorussian SSR
5. Canada
6. Cape Verde
7. Cuba
8. Cyprus
9. Czechoslovakia
10. Democratic Yemen
11. Denmark
12. Egypt
13. Finland
14. German Democratic Republic
15. Germany, Federal Republic of
16. Ghana
17. Greece
18. Hungary
19. India
20. Ireland
21. Italy
22. Japan
23. Kuwait
24. Lao People's Democratic Republic
25. Malawi
26. Mongolia
27. Netherlands
28. Norway
29. Papua New Guinea
30. Poland
31. Romania
32. Sao Tome and Principe
33. Solomon Islands
34. Spain
35. Sri Lanka
36. Sweden
37. Tunisia
38. Ukrainian SSR
39. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
40. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
41. United States of America
42. Viet Nam
43. Yemen

States Signatories of the Convention

1. Australia
2. Benin
3. Bolivia
4. Brazil
5. Ethiopia
6. Holy See
7. Iceland
8. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
9. Iraq
10. Lebanon
11. Liberia
12. Luxembourg
13. Morocco
14. Nicaragua
15. Portugal
16. Sierra Leone
17. Syrian Arab Republic
18. Turkey
19. Uganda
20. Zaire