

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

London, Moscow, Washington 11 February 1971

(Entered into force on 18 May, 1972)

States which have signed, ratified and acceded at London

State	Date of Signature	Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification	
United Kingdom*+	11 February, 1971	18 May,	1972 (1) (7)
Russian Federation+ (formerly Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)	11 February, 1971	18 May,	1972
United States of America	11 February, 1971	18 May,	1972
Afghanistan	11 February, 1971	23 April,	1971
Australia+	11 February, 1971	23 January,	1973
Austria	11 February, 1971	10 August,	1972
Belgium	11 February, 1971	20 November,	1972
Bolivia	11 February, 1971		
Bulgaria	11 February, 1971	26 May,	1971
Myanmar (formerly Burma)	11 February, 1971		
Canada*	11 February, 1971	17 May,	1972
Cyprus	11 February, 1971	17 November,	1971
Czechoslovakia ²	11 February, 1971	11 January,	1972
Denmark	11 February, 1971	15 June,	1971
Ethiopia	11 February, 1971	12 July,	1977
Finland	11 February, 1971	8 June,	1971
Ghana	11 February, 1971		
Greece	[see Note no 3]	28 May,	1985
Hungary+	11 February, 1971	13 August,	1971
Iceland	11 February, 1971	30 May,	1972
Iran	11 February, 1971	26 August,	1971
Ireland	11 February, 1971	19 August,	1971
Italy*	11 February, 1971	3 September,	1974
Japan	11 February, 1971	21 June,	1971
Jordan	11 February, 1971	1 November,	1971
Korea*	11 February, 1971	25 June,	1987
Laos	11 February, 1971	19 October,	1971
Lebanon	11 February, 1971		
Luxembourg	11 February, 1971	11 November,	1982
Malta	11 February, 1971		
Mongolia	11 February, 1971	15 November,	1971
Netherlands	11 February, 1971	14 January,	1976 (4)
New Zealand	11 February, 1971	24 February,	1972
Norway	11 February, 1971	28 June,	1971
Poland	11 February, 1971	15 November,	1971

State	Date of Signature	Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification
Romania+	11 February, 1971	10 July, 1972
Sierra Leone	11 February, 1971	
Sudan	11 February, 1971	
Sweden	11 February, 1971	28 April, 1972
Switzerland	11 February, 1971	4 May, 1976
Tunisia	11 February, 1971	28 October, 1971
Morocco	18 February, 1971	26 July, 1971
Nepal	24 February, 1971	6 July, 1971
Turkey	25 February, 1971	25 October, 1972
Yugoslavia* (8)	2 March, 1971	25 October, 1973
Singapore	5 May, 1971	10 September, 1976
Mauritius	[see Note No 5]	3 May, 1971
The Gambia	18 May, 1971	
Malaysia	20 May, 1971	21 June, 1972
Germany, Federal Republic of**	8 June, 1971	18 November, 1975 (6)
Argentine Republic*	3 September, 1971	21 March, 1983
Brazil*	3 September, 1971	10 May, 1988
Jamaica	11 October, 1971	30 July, 1986
South Africa	[see Note No 4]	26 November, 1973
Rwanda	[see Note No 4]	20 May, 1975
Benin	[see Note No 4]	2 July, 1986

ACCESSIONS

State	Date of deposit of Instrument of Accession
Zambia	9 October, 1972
India	20 July, 1973
Qatar	12 November, 1974
Portugal	24 June, 1975
Mexico	23 March, 1984
Seychelles	12 March, 1985
Spain	15 July, 1987
China ⁷	28 February, 1991
Liechtenstein	30 May, 1991
Latvia	24 June, 1992
The Philippines	5 November, 1993

SUCCESSIONS

State	Date of deposit of Instrument of Succession
Antigua and Barbuda	26 January, 1989
Solomon Islands	17 June, 1981
Slovenia	7 April, 1992
Czech Republic*	5 April, 1993
Slovakia*	17 May, 1993
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	13 May, 1999

* See Declarations and Statements.

+ See Objections.

1. Also in respect of the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St.Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St.Lucia and St.Vincent) and Territories under the territorial Sovereignty of the United Kingdom as well as the State of Brunei and the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.
2. See now separate entries for the Czech Republic and Slovakia.
3. Signed at Moscow.
4. In respect of the Kingdom in Europe, Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.
5. Signed at Washington.
6. Including Berlin (West)
7. Ceased to apply to Hong Kong wef 1 July 1997.
Applies to Hong Kong (SAR) wef 1 July 1997.
8. As of 4 February 2003, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia became known as 'Serbia and Montenegro'
As of 3 June 2006, the Republic of Serbia became the continuation State of 'Serbia and Montenegro' : in a Note dated 12 December 2006, the Government of the Republic of Montenegro confirmed that this Agreement continues in force for the Republic of Montenegro with effect from 3 June, 2006.

DECLARATIONS AND STATEMENTS

ARGENTINA

Statement on signature (translation):

"The Government of the Argentine Republic wishes specially to place on record that it strictly abides by the statements made by the Representatives of the Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America and Argentina in regard to the meaning and scope of the Treaty at the 429th Plenary Session of the Conference of the Disarmament Committee when the final draft of the Treaty was submitted for consideration.

When referring to Article IV of the Treaty the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated: 'As we have said before, we attach great importance to this Article of the Draft Treaty, which concerns the problem of the relationship between the obligation assumed under the present Treaty and the position of States with respect to other existing international conventions. We have repeatedly stressed that the provisions of the Seabed Treaty are designed solely to accomplish the purpose that the Treaty is designed to serve, namely, to prevent the extension to the seabed of the race in nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. The Treaty is not intended to solve numerous obligations assumed by States under other international agreements, or to prejudice possible future solutions in that sphere. In our view, Article IV of the draft Treaty fully serves that end.'

The Representative of the United States of America in turn stated: 'A number of changes have been made in Article III in order to take into account the views of certain Delegations concerning means of avoiding any implication of prejudice to differing positions on Law of the Sea issues. In that connexion I want to emphasize again a point which has been fundamental to these negotiations: All the provisions of this Treaty, including those relating to verification through observation as well as other verification activities, are designed to ensure that the Treaty will accomplish its arms limitation purposes, the provisions of the Treaty are not intended to affect any of the various outstanding problems regarding the Law of the Sea. While the United States has taken this position from the very beginning and has felt that previous drafts were responsive to this need, we have continued to work with other Delegations to find formulations which all could accept as being entirely neutral on these issues. We believe that Article III as now drafted, together with the Article IV disclaimer which remains unchanged, should remove any remaining doubt as to the possibility that the Treaty might affect Law of the Sea issues.'

On the same occasion the Representative of the Argentine Republic stated: 'One of the constant anxieties which have guided our action has been to avoid, by all the means available to us, the risk that the draft might, by virtue of its sphere of application, affect the position of various States on questions relating to International Maritime Law and most particularly to

ARGENTINA (continued)

the territorial sea and continental shelf. We have stated, and emphatically repeat, that a document of this nature could not and should not, either directly or indirectly, attempt to solve or even interfere in the complex problems pertaining to the Law of the Sea (CCD/PV.445, paragraph 48 et seq., CCD/PV.454, paragraphs 10 and 11 and CCD/PV.475/Add.1, paragraph 16). For that reason we have taken due note of the statements made by the co-sponsors of the Draft that this is not the aim of the Treaty and that its provisions are in no way designed to, nor do they seek to, undermine, strengthen or affect the position of States, or to prejudice or influence future decisions on those questions, or to support or revoke existing or future obligations assumed under international instruments. On the basis of those assertions, to which we attach the value of a formal commitment or undertaking, and by virtue of the provisions of Article IV - the so-called 'Safeguard Clause' - by whose letter and spirit we abide strictly, we wish expressly to record the view that we interpret the references to the freedoms of the high seas as in no way implying a pronouncement on the different positions relating to questions connected with International Maritime Law. In the same context, we understand that the reference to the rights of exploration and exploitation by coastal States over their continental shelves is included solely because those could be the rights most frequently affected by verification procedures. In other words, we preclude henceforward any possibility of strengthening, through this document, certain positions concerning continental shelves to the detriment of others based on different criteria.'

These statements constitute the authentic interpretation of the Treaty and it is on this understanding that the Argentine Government signs the instrument."

The above declaration by the Argentine representative was confirmed on ratification.

BRAZIL

Declaration:

"Nothing in the present Treaty shall be interpreted as in any way prejudicing the sovereign rights of Brazil in the area of the sea, the sea-bed and its subsoil adjacent to the Brazilian coast, in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It is the understanding of the Brazilian Government that the word 'observation', in Article III, paragraph 1 of the Treaty refers only to observation that is incidental to the normal course of navigation, in accordance with international law."

CANADA

Declarations:

"(i). In the view of the Canadian Government, the provisions of Article I, paragraph 1, cannot be interpreted as indicating that any state has a right to implant or emplace any weapons not prohibited under Article I, paragraph 1, on the seabed and ocean floor, and in the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, or as constituting any limitation on the principle that this area of the seabed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof shall be reserved for exclusively peaceful purposes.

(ii). In the view of the Canadian Government, the provisions of Articles I, II and III cannot be interpreted as indicating that any state but the coastal state has any right to implant or emplace any weapon not prohibited under Article I, paragraph 1, on the continental shelf, or the subsoil thereof, appertaining to that coastal state, beyond the outer limit of the seabed zone referred to in Article I and defined in Article II.

(iii). In the view of the Canadian Government, the provisions of Article III cannot be interpreted as indicating any restrictions or limitation upon the rights of the coastal state, consistent with its exclusive sovereign rights with respect to the continental shelf, to verify, inspect or effect the removal of any weapon, structure, installation, facility or device implanted or emplaced on the continental shelf, or the subsoil thereof, appertaining to that coastal state, beyond the outer limit of the seabed zone referred to in Article I and defined in Article II."

CHINA

The Chinese Government reaffirms that nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as prejudicing in any way the sovereign rights and the other rights of the People's Republic of China over its territorial sea, as well as the sea area, the seabed and subsoil thereof adjacent to its territorial sea.

The signature and ratification of this Treaty by the Taiwan authorities by illegally using the name of China on 11 February 1971 and 22 February 1972 respectively are null and void.

CZECH REPUBLIC

In a Note dated 24 March 1993, received on 5 April 1993 the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Czech Republic notified the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the following:

"Upon the instruction of the Government of the Czech Republic and referring to the Declaration of the Czech National Council to All Parliaments and Nations of the World of 17 December 1992, I have the honour to communicate to Your Excellency the following:

CZECH REPUBLIC (continued)

In conformity with the valid principles of international law and

to the extent defined by it, the Czech Republic, as a successor State to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, considers itself bound, as of 1 January 1993, i.e. the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, by multilateral international treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party on that date, including reservations and declarations to their provisions made earlier by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

From among the treaties deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland this applies also to the following:

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, done at London, Washington and Moscow on 11 February 1971."

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Declaration (translation):

Signature of this Treaty does not imply recognition of the German Democratic Republic under international law; therefore, no relations under international law with the GDR shall arise out of this Treaty for the Federal Republic of Germany.

Declaration on ratification:

With effect from the day on which the Treaty enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany it will also apply to Berlin (West) without affecting the rights and responsibilities of the Allied Authorities and the competences falling upon them with respect to disarmament and demilitarization.

Declaration by a Note dated 12 April, 1976 (translation):

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to state with regard to the Note of the Government of Canada of 17 May 1972, the Note of the Government of the Republic of India of 20 July 1973 and the Note of the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of 25 February 1974 that the declarations contained in the above-mentioned Notes are not of a nature to confer on the Governments of those three countries more far-reaching rights than those to which they are entitled under current international law. Moreover, the Federal Government holds the view that all rights existing under current international law which are not covered by the prohibitions are left intact by the Treaty.

Declaration dated 14 July, 1981 (translation):

With regard to the declaration submitted by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on the occasion of the deposit of its

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

instrument of accession to the Treaty of 11 February 1971 on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil thereof, to the depository in Moscow on 20 June

1980, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to recall its position set out in its Note of 12 April 1976 to the depository in London in connection with the declarations made by the Governments of Canada, India and Yugoslavia on the said Treaty. It continues to hold the view that those declarations are not of a nature to confer on those governments more far-reaching rights than those to which they are entitled under current international law. It also holds this view with regard to the declaration made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Furthermore, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to state once more that all rights existing under current international law which are not covered by the prohibitions are left intact by the Treaty.

INDIA

Statement:

"On the occasion of its accession to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil thereof, the Government of India would like to make the following statement of its position."

2. In accordance with its basic position - which is shared by a vast majority of States - that the exploration and exploitation of the seabed should be reserved for peaceful purposes and that serious efforts should be made to prevent an arms race on the seabed, the Government of India has supported the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. The disclaimer clause contained in Article IV of the Seabed Treaty ensures that the position of any State Party on questions related to the Law of the Sea is not affected in any way. It is important that nothing should be done through a seabed treaty in the field of disarmament which would prejudice or prejudge questions in regard to the Law of the Sea, nor should such a treaty affect adversely in any way the rights of coastal States on their continental shelves. As a coastal State, India has, and always has had, full and exclusive sovereign rights over the continental shelf adjoining its territory and beyond its territorial waters and the subsoil thereof. It is the considered view of India that other countries cannot use its continental shelf for military purposes. There cannot, therefore, be any restriction on, or limitation of, the sovereign right of India as a coastal State to verify, inspect, remove or destroy any weapon, device, structure, installation or facility which might be emplaced or emplaced on or beneath its continental shelf by any other country, or to take such other steps as may be considered necessary to safeguard its security.

INDIA (continued)

3. The accession by the Government of India to the Seabed Treaty is based on this position.

ITALY (translation):

The Italian Government naturally hope that, as foreseen in

Article V of the Treaty, it will be possible to continue in good faith negotiations on further measures in the field of disarmament to prevent an arms race on the seabed and ocean floor and in their subsoil. They believe that, in the case of future agreements on such further measures, the question of the delimitation of the area within which these would find application, shall have to be examined and solved in each instance in relation to the nature of the measures envisaged.

KOREA, REPUBLIC OF

Declaration:

"The signing by the Government of the Republic of Korea of the present Treaty does not in any way mean or imply the recognition of any territory or regime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government."

MEXICO

Declaration (translation):

"1. In the view of the Government of Mexico no provision of the Treaty, including Article 1, may be interpreted as indicating that any State has the right to emplace nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction, or military weapons or devices of any kind on the continental shelf of Mexico.

2. In consequence of the above, the Government of Mexico reserves the right to verify, inspect, remove or destroy any military weapon, structure, installation, facility or equipment emplaced on its continental shelf, including nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction.

3. The well-known position of the Government of Mexico in all the international fora in which negotiations on disarmament have taken place, has been to support a general and complete disarmament, and on all possible territories. In this respect, although the Government of Mexico would prefer to reply on a treaty that clearly prohibits the emplacement of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction on any physical space, it accedes to this Treaty which limits the prohibition to the Seabed, the Ocean Floor and the Subsoil Thereof, in view of the fact that it constitutes a step towards the objective of having a universal prohibition, as indicated, through the establishment of denuclearised zones throughout the world.

MEXICO (continued)

4. Having signed and ratified the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Mexico considers that the provisions contained in it which relate to what is stipulated in the Treaty apply fully to the Treaty."

SLOVAKIA

In a Note dated 17 May 1993, received on 17 May 1993 the Ministry Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic notified the Foreign and

Commonwealth Office of the following:

"In conformity with the valid principles of international law and the extent defined by it, the Slovak Republic as one of the successor States to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, consider itself bound, as of 1st January 1993, i.e. the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, by multilateral international treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party on that date, including reservations and declarations to their provisions made earlier by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

From among the treaties deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland this applies to the following:

Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil thereof, done at London, Moscow and Washington on 11 February 1971."

UNITED KINGDOM

Declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish in this connexion to recall their view that if a regime is not recognised as the Government of a State, neither signature nor the deposit of any instrument by it, nor notification of any of those acts, will bring about the recognition of that regime by any other State."

YUGOSLAVIA

Declaration:

"In the view of the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Article 3, paragraph 1, should be interpreted to the effect that a State exercising the right under this Article shall be obliged to notify in advance the coastal State, in so far as its observations are to be carried out within the stretch of the sea extending above the continental shelf of the said State."

OBJECTIONS

AUSTRALIA

Communication by Note dated 4 March 1987:

"The Australian Government takes the view that the declaration made by Mexico is incompatible with international law to the extent that it lays claims to rights over the continental shelf which a coastal state is not entitled to exercise under the Treaty itself or under international law as reflected in the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea"

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Communication by a Note dated 14 October 1985 referring to the declaration by the Government of Mexico on depositing their instrument of accession in London on 23 March, 1984: "In the view of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the aforementioned declaration relates above all to matters that are not dealt with in the Treaty to which it refers. The declaration is not acceptable to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to the extent that it lays claim to rights to which a coastal State is not entitled under general international law."

HUNGARY

Communication by a Note dated 13 September 1976 concerning the application of the Treaty by the Federal Republic of Germany to West Berlin:

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic as a party to the Treaty is of the opinion that this step by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is at variance with the Four-Party Agreement of 3 September 1971, since the Treaty directly affects the questions of status and security. This view is in conformity with the position represented in the question of extension by the Government of the Soviet Union as a party to the Four-Party Agreement."

ROMANIA

Declaration of 1 June 1971:

"The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the signing of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and the Subsoil thereof, signed in London on the 11th of February 1971 by the 'Republic of Korea' is an illegal act, as the authorities of South Korea cannot in any case act in the name of Korea."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Communication of 2 July, 1971 (translation):

Amongst the signatories in London of the above Treaty was the Representative of the South Korean regime. In connection with this, the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to make clear that the Soviet Union does not recognise the signature to the Treaty of the South Korean authorities as having legal force, as these authorities have no right to speak in the name of Korea.

Communication of 10 May, 1976 (translation): The Federal Republic of Germany's statement on the extension to Berlin (West) of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, is not in accord with law. The said Treaty in its entire content directly affects matters of security and status and therefore is numbered among

those international agreements and arrangements the force of which the FRG, as is clearly stated in the Quadripartite Agreement is not entitled to extend to Berlin (West).

The reservation in the FRG's statement to the effect that the Treaty "shall apply to Berlin (West), without affecting the rights and responsibilities of the Allied authorities and their competence in respect of disarmament and demilitarisation" is unfounded, since all provisions in the Treaty relate to matters of disarmament and demilitarisation and such application is simply impossible. This reservation is designed merely to veil the illegal character of the FRG statement which, obviously, can have no legal force. The said actions on the part of the FRG are nothing but a crude violation of the Quadripartite Agreement.

UNITED KINGDOM

Communication to the Yugoslav Ambassador dated 23 April 1975: "The views of Her Majesty's Government on the statement made by the Yugoslav Government quoted in Your Excellency's Note are as follows: In so far as the Statement may be intended to take effect as an interpretive declaration, Her Majesty's Government regret that they are unable to accept it as a valid interpretation, or as having any effect on the Law of the Sea. In so far as it may be intended to take effect as a reservation, Her Majesty's Government must place on record their formal objection to the Statement on the grounds that it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Treaty. Her Majesty's Government would further draw attention to the fact that it was submitted out of time."

In a Note to the Soviet Union dated 9 August 1976, Her Majesty's Government, following consultations with the Governments of France and the United States of America, stated the following on behalf of all three Governments:

UNITED KINGDOM (continued)

In a communication to the Government of the USSR which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the Three Powers confirmed that, provided matters of security and status are not affected and provided the extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the USSR, in a communication to the Governments of the Three Powers, which is similarly an integral part (Annex IVB) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement, are designed, inter alia, to afford the authorities of the Three Powers the opportunity to ensure that the treaties concluded by the Federal Republic of Germany which are to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that matters of security and status

are not affected. When authorising the extension of the 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 to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers, acting in the exercise of their supreme authority, took the necessary steps to ensure in accordance with the established procedures that this treaty was applied in the Western Sectors of Berlin subject to Allied rights and responsibilities in the field of disarmament and demilitarization. The application of the Treaty to the Western Sectors of Berlin can, therefore, in no way affect matters of security and status. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, for its part, in its declaration on Berlin, also stated that the rights and responsibilities of the Allies in the fields of disarmament and demilitarization were not affected. Consequently it is the opinion of the three Governments that the extension of this Treaty to the Western Sectors of Berlin is entirely consistent with the Quadripartite Agreement".

In a Note of 31 December 1976 to the Hungarian Government, Her Majesty's Government, following consultations with the Governments of France and the United States of America, stated the following on behalf of all three Governments:

"The Note from the Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic refers to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. This Agreement was concluded in Berlin between the Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Governments not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement are not competent to make authoritative comment on its provisions.

UNITED KINGDOM (continued)

The position of the Governments of the United States, France and the United Kingdom concerning the extension of the Seabed Treaty to the Western Sectors of Berlin was set forth in the Note of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 9 August 1976. This position remains unchanged."