

ANNEX

United States submission to the Secretary-General of
the United Nations on the use of chemical and toxin
weapons in Afghanistan and South-East Asia

The United States of America has long been concerned about the use of chemical and toxin weapons in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia, in violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, related rules of customary international law, and the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. The United States has thus carefully monitored the situation in these regions to obtain information about chemical and toxin weapon attacks and has shared the information and evidence with the United Nations and its Member States. The United States has also cooperated fully with the Secretary-General and his Group of Experts in the United Nations' investigation of this problem and in other international efforts to bring a halt to the use of these terrifying weapons.

The United States of America, over the past three years has submitted a series of reports presenting the evidence of toxic weapons use and relevant technical information in detail entitled "Chemical Warfare in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan", dated 22 March 1982 (A/37/157), and "Chemical Warfare in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan: An Update," dated 29 November 1982 (A/C.1/37/10). Most recently, on 4 August 1983, the United States submitted a report (A/38/326) on evidence obtained from victims of toxic warfare attacks which had occurred earlier in Laos and Kampuchea.

Since the submission of the last report, the United States has continued to analyze and review the information and evidence available to it on the use of chemical and toxin weapons in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia. As with the previous submissions, the United States has considered reports of toxic attacks as valid only if they were confirmed from two or more types of sources. These kinds of sources include national technical means, intelligence means, medical and sample data, and direct evidence from a person, other than a victim or refugee, known to have access to a particular attack site. Therefore, while we never discount per se any report or second hand information, our evidence must satisfy those tests of consistency and multiple sources to be considered valid before it is included in our final body of data.