



**General Assembly**

Distr.  
GENERAL

**A/41/421**  
**30 June 1986**  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINALS ARABIC/ENGLISH/  
RUSSIAN/SPANISH

Forty-first session  
Item 64 (1) of the preliminary list\*

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

United Nations disarmament studies

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....                        | 3           |
| II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS .....  | 3           |
| <b>Argentina</b> .....                       | <b>3</b>    |
| Australia .....                              | 5           |
| Austria .....                                | 5           |
| Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic ..... | 7           |
| Cuba .....                                   | 9           |
| Czechoslovakia .....                         | 9           |
| Finland .....                                | 10          |

\* A/41/50/Rev.1.

CONTENTS (continued)

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| German <b>Democratic</b> Republic .....  | 11          |
| Mex <b>ico</b> .....   | 13          |
| Netherlands ( <b>on</b> behalf of the States <b>members of the European Community</b> ) .. | 14          |
| Nigeria .....  | 15          |
| Norway .....   | 17          |
| <b>Oman</b> .....  | 10          |
| <b>Sweden</b> .....  | <b>18</b>   |
| <b>Union</b> of Soviet Socialist Republics .....   | 20          |
| United States of <b>America</b> .....  | 22          |

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its fortieth session, the General Assembly, under the item entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", adopted resolution 40/152 K of 16 December 1985, the operative part of which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"...

"1. Reaffirms the value of United Nations studies, prepared with appropriate assistance from governmental or consultant experts, as a useful means by which important issues in the field of arms limitation and disarmament can be addressed in a comprehensive and detailed manner!

"2. Invites Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General, by 1 April 1986, their views and proposals on how the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament studies can be further improved!

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the replies of Member States to the General Assembly at its forty-first session and to the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies;

"4. Also requests the Secretary-General to invite the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies to prepare a comprehensive report on these matters for submission to the General Assembly at its forty-second session;

"5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-first session an item entitled 'United Nations disarmament studies'."

2. The views and proposals received from Member States in response to the request in General Assembly resolution 40/152 K are reproduced in section II below.

## II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

### ARGENTINA

[Original: Spanish]

[1 April 1986]

1. Argentina is particularly interested in the various studies undertaken by the United Nations on the diverse aspects of the disarmament question.

2. That interest has been clearly reflected by the effective contribution that Argentina has made to such initiatives, with the participation of the various experts who have offered their collaboration and knowledge for the respective studies.

/...

3. Argentina believes that it is essential for the General Assembly to continue its policy of proposing disarmament studies, since this will make it possible to identify the items of greatest interest to the majority of Member States.
4. From this standpoint, the expert groups should be properly constituted so as to reflect clearly the different positions and approaches that will inevitably be taken on respective questions.
5. The value of the studies will be twofold. On the one hand, they are the expression of the combined wisdom and experience of the experts of each group and also the product of the interaction arising in the course of the discussions and analysis of arguments put forward during the successive meetings of each group. On the other hand, the fact that the studies are prepared in the United Nations and emanate from a political organization that is broadly representative of the international community gives them an authority and weight that purely academic works do not carry.
6. The disarmament question is delicate and complex given the different interests involved and that is why, when dealing with subjects of this nature, groups composed of experts representing different areas and ideologies, which generally have the necessary combination of doctrinal knowledge and political experience, constitute an optimum way of producing valuable and useful studies.
7. Much of the merit of the studies undoubtedly derives from the fact that they reflect a consensus based on different approaches. Thus every effort must be made to achieve consensus in every case. At the same time, it is necessary to recognize that such consensus is becoming increasingly difficult to achieve.
8. Accordingly, studies are being undertaken that rule out the possibility of consensus from the very beginning; the study on deterrence currently being prepared is a case in point. The purpose of such studies is simply to ensure that the different positions and viewpoints are fully reflected.
9. While recognizing that this type of study may have its uses - although in order properly to appreciate them it will probably be necessary to acquire further experience - there is no doubt that the ideal will continue to be the preparation of studies that are approved by consensus.
10. At the same time, the danger that attempts to pursue consensus at all costs may lead to failure or deadlock make it necessary to seek ways of qualifying the consensus, of achieving agreement on partial aspects when it is not possible to achieve agreement on the totality of the subject of the study, and to combine areas of consensus with a balanced exposition of different opinions when those opinions prove to be irreconcilable.
11. Such a practice would make it possible to preserve in large measure the value of these United Nations studies on disarmament, the special characteristics of which make them irreplaceable.
12. Likewise, Argentina agrees that the studies should be far-reaching and comprehensive. To that end, the broadest possible approach should be taken in the use of the consensus rule so as not to limit its scope or thrust.

AUSTRALIA

(Original: English)

[22 April 1986]

1. Australia sees disarmament studies as making a useful contribution to the sum total of information and views on disarmament and arms control issues, particularly in regard to those disarmament areas where negotiations have not yet begun. Australia is concerned, however, that there have been recent cases where studies have run beyond their allotted time, thereby increasing their cost, and where it has not been possible to conclude studies because agreed texts have not been reached.

2. What is perhaps even more serious, several of the studies produced have been more anodyne documents than the subject matter warranted.

3. The principal cause of all these difficulties has been the tendency of a small number of participants (government appointed experts) to abuse the tradition of consensus by resisting the inclusion in studies of views with which their Governments disagree. The only remedy is to depart from the consensus rule. The problem is to avoid the opposite danger of academic or idiosyncratic studies that fail to take account of the view of all Governments concerned, including those that have nominated experts to participate in the study. The best arrangement might be to make the chairman of each study group individually responsible for the content of the study (and its timely conclusion), but to require him or her to reflect all relevant views. The other participants in the expert group would become advisers to the chairman, but with a right to have their views reflected, in whatever form they may wish, in the study. They would not, however, have the right to prevent the views of others being equally reflected or to block expression of the conclusions of the chairman.

AUSTRIA

(Original: English)

[30 April 1986]

1. Austria has always subscribed to the notion expressed in paragraph 96 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly that "taking further steps in the field of disarmament and other measures aimed at promoting international peace and security would be facilitated by carrying out studies by the Secretary-General in this field with appropriate assistance from governmental or consultant experts" (resolution S-1012).

2. Since the convening of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, 22 studies have been completed, covering a wide range of issues and offering a wealth of data not readily available. The experience gathered so far allows for the following comments:

(a) Austria welcomes the United Nations studies so far undertaken as a valuable contribution to facilitating identification of new areas for disarmament efforts.

(b) Although United Nations studies, due to the lack of success in disarmament negotiations, have so far not been able to promote substantive steps in the field of disarmament, they have nevertheless played a major role in creating a general awareness of various issues in the disarmament sector among nations and in the general public.

(c) As highly complex and political issues are involved touching sensitive areas of national policies, Austria considers United Nations disarmament studies not as purely academic, but as mainly political efforts.

3. Austria agrees with the concept that studies undertaken by the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat with the help of a group of governmental experts should usually operate on a consensus basis. Bearing in mind that the studies are designed to assist disarmament negotiations, agreed formulations would enhance prospects for those negotiations. A study merely outlining opposing points of view would not serve that envisaged purpose.

4. Austria is however aware that reaching a consensus has in the past very often led to difficulties in agreeing on the final text, necessitating on occasion the extension of the expert group's mandate. Regarding the 22 studies so far undertaken, it has to be noted that only two of them did not lead to agreed results. The record of disarmament studies thus has to be viewed as highly successful.

5. In order to avoid unnecessary costs, wherever feasible, experts should at an early date during their work decide whether they will be able to reach a consensus or whether the subject under consideration is not amenable to consensus.

6. As far as the size of the group of governmental experts is concerned, Austria believes that a reasonable compromise between a fair representation of experts from the five regional groups, including the major military alliances, the non-aligned and the neutral States on the one hand and the need for cost effectiveness on the other hand, should be sought. The latter factor should be given serious attention. Although the size of the expert group will to a certain degree depend on importance of the subject to be studied, Austria believes a group of between 10 and 15 experts to be most appropriate and reasonably cost-effective. A larger group of governmental experts would not only increase costs, but inevitably bring about the danger of an unconstructive repetition of debates in the First Committee of the General Assembly or the Disarmament Commission.

Austria welcomed the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), in that it offers an opportunity for in-depth research to be carried out in restricted areas at less cost and with the results being more quickly available. Whereas studies undertaken by the Secretary-General with the assistance of an expert group of governmental or consultant experts are mandated by resolutions of the General Assembly, the tasks of UNIDIR are assigned

to it by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies. Austria recognizes that the capacity of UNIDIR is, of course, closely related to its funding.

8. Before any decision is made by interested delegations on requesting a study on a given subject, it should be carefully considered whether a study should be undertaken by a group of governmental experts or by UNIDIR. The decision will to a certain degree depend on political considerations and on the area to be covered by the study, but should also take into account financial implications. In this regard Austria believes that studies undertaken by UNIDIR with the help of two or three recognized experts will be less costly than those undertaken by a group of governmental experts. At the same time, however, it has to be recognized that a small UNIDIR group will not reflect the broader political and geographical concerns of a United Nations study. UNIDIR can conduct its research in a more independent way than governmental experts, which has the additional advantage that individual Governments are not required to identify themselves with the results of a study.

9. Austria believes that, according to the nature and the subject or the time-frame within which a study should be completed, it could be advantageous to allocate work either to a United Nations expert group or to UNIDIR. This of course should not preclude that on some occasions it would be appropriate for both to co-operate closely on a given subject.

10. It is also for consideration that on occasions it may be appropriate to use more fully the professional knowledge and expertise that exists within the staff of the Department for Disarmament Affairs.

11. While in no way disputing the need to study various aspects of the disarmament field, Austria believes that the General Assembly should adopt a restrictive approach in mandating new studies. In the view of Austria, no more than two new studies should be requested in a given year. In this way it will be possible to make the most effective use of the two different methods of implementing the mandate of paragraph 96 of the Final Document and at the same time using to best advantage the capabilities of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and UNIDIR.

EYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

{Original: Russian}

{23 March 1986}

1. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the activities of the United Nations in the field of disarmament studies must be founded and improved on the basis of the principles defined in the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (resolution S-10/2), the first special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament. In particular, in accordance with paragraph 96 of the Final Document, the execution of such studies by the Secretary-General should facilitate the taking of further steps in the field of disarmament and other measures aimed at promoting international peace and security. The Byelorussian SSR proceeds from the premise that the studies must

have a practical orientation and must lay the foundations for the elaboration and adoption of effective measures leading to the halting and limitation of the arms race and to disarmament. That is the principal purpose of the studies.

2. In a situation where mankind is faced with the danger of general nuclear disaster and where the arms race is threatening to spread into outer space and to go out of control in all its forms, abstract, scholastic research has no place in the activities of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.
3. The necessity and possibility of making a real contribution to the search for practical solutions leading to disarmament must be the basic criterion for determining whether or not any given study should be conducted.
4. The studies must have a clearly defined purpose. They should help bring the different positions closer together rather than to widen the disagreements between the States Members of the United Nations. On no account must they become an instrument or a pretext for providing substitutes for solving, or delaying or confusing the solution of, the pressing problems of limiting the arms race and achieving disarmament. The work of the group of experts to construct price indices and purchasing-power parities for the military expenditures of States is an example of a study being misused in this way.
5. The studies should rely on the available official sources of information.
6. The groups of experts set up to carry out any given study must be established on the basis of equitable political and geographical representation. The services of qualified experts must be enlisted to participate in these groups.
7. In the past, failures to take into account the opinions of some of the experts forming part of some research groups have adversely affected the objectivity and value of these studies. They must not be impaired in this way in the future.
8. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies should play a more substantial role in co-ordinating the efforts relating to the studies. In particular, it could consider the issue of the conduct of the execution of new studies before the General Assembly takes a decision on the matter and submit recommendations on the direction and volume of research, the priority of one or another subject, or the possibility of distributing efforts between the United Nations groups of experts and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.
9. All research should be carried out in the shortest possible time so as to contribute to the speedy adoption of effective and practical measures leading to disarmament.



CUBA

[Original : Spanish]

[2 May 1986]

1. The Government of **Cuba believes that the** preparation of specific studies on the various aspects of **the subject** of international disarmament and security **has** helped and **continues to help** to inform Member States and public opinion more fully about **the** problems studied and **thus** contributes more effectively to the deliberative and **negotiating** process in the search for specific disarmament measures **and** agreements, as well as permitting the identification of possible areas for new negotiations.

2. The diversity of the different spheres to which disarmament relates means that each specific **aspect** of disarmament that is to be studied by **a group** of government experts or consultants has its own inherent characteristics, so that no uniform guide or model **can be** established for all **the** studies **which the General Assembly** decides to carry out.

3. **Similarly, the Government of Cuba believes that,** while it is important that governmental **experts or, where appropriate,** consultants in a particular group should adopt by consensus **the** study that they **carried** out, the fact that such **consensus cannot** be achieved in no way diminishes **the** importance of **the** study or **its value,** which is determined by the contribution it can make to the proposed objectives.

4. In fact, **the** political differences between governmental experts, or **the** different **technical or academic** considerations **on which consultants base their work,** may in some cases **continue to** conflict as they approach and evaluate specific aspects of a given study. **In the view of the Government of Cuba,** this **can even** help **Member States to** gain a fuller **and clearer** understanding of the problems **studied.**

5. The **Government of Cuba** believes that, by **carrying** out disarmament studies, **the United Nations** strengthens **its role in** the field of **disarmament.** In this connection, the other institutional machinery existing within the **United Nations,** **such as the** Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies **and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research,** must be used effectively in order to **enhance the** work of the Organization.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[Original: English]

[1 April 1986]

1. Czechoslovakia consistently advocates a real **enhancement of the role of** the United Nations in the **field of** disarmament **and a most effective utilization of all mechanisms that the Organization has created.** **Studies on disarmament worked out with the United Nations should also be directed towards** that end.

2. Czechoslovakia considers that United Nations studies on disarmament should be target-oriented and compact and that they should include recommendations aimed at substantive solution of the pending issues. They should also play a significant educational, informative and **publicizing** role, especially in **mobilizing** broad world **public** opinion for the achievement of the goals of disarmament.

3. Czechoslovakia **supports** on principle the elaboration of timely and stimulative studies on **the** most pressing aspects of the arms race and disarmament. Czechoslovak experts have taken part in formulating and updating a number of studies of that kind. According to the effectiveness of such studies and within its possibilities, Czechoslovakia intends to make also in the **future** an active contribution in this respect.

FINLAND

[Original: English]

[June 1986]

1. **The** General Assembly has initiated a **sizeable** number of United Nations disarmament studies **during** the past years. Their **purpose, as** stated in the United Nations Disarmament Yearbook 1984, is to provide information which may facilitate better understanding of the **problems** of the arms race and disarmament and to assist **the** negotiating process through **the analysis** of specific matters related to negotiations in progress.

2. There seem to be rather few general guidelines regarding **the** procedures to be followed in **the** preparation of the United **Nations** disarmament studies. It might be useful if **the** Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies could look further **into this** matter and, if **possible**, establish some rules and principles **on the** basis of practice and accumulated experience. The following observations are intended as a contribution to this task. They are largely based on comments made on behalf of Finland **in the First** Committee of the General Assembly during the fortieth session of **the** Assembly.

3. Most of the actual work has been done in the framework of study groups appointed to assist **the** Secretary-General, who carries the final responsibility for presenting **the** completed studies to the General Assembly. The members of **the** study groups **are** normally so-called governmental experts **who do not** necessarily work under **continuous** instructions or **supervision by** their Governments, **but who are** expected to reflect in a general way the views of their Governments **without** formally committing **them to the outcome** of the studies. Above all, the study groups work under **the** principle of decision-making **by consensus**. In principle, the **consensus** method is extremely flexible. It **makes** it possible, if **necessary, to** adopt **not only statements** and evaluations **on which** there is full agreement in the group **concerned**, but also passages reflecting different points of view. Slow progress under **the consensus** rule has often delayed the adoption of disarmament studies. It should, therefore, **be kept** in mind that the efficiency of **the consensus** method depends on its appliers. Great flexibility and a strong spirit of accommodation is needed in order to make the rule of consensus work productively.

4. There **has been a great variation in the** size of the study groups. Experience **has shown that a large group** needs more **time than** a smaller one, and **this** should be **taken into account from the outset** in planning the work. There are probably in most cases good reasons **to be cautious in establishing** large groups with more than, **say, about a dozen members.**
5. Another **thing to consider** at an early stage of the work is the preparation of material to be used as a basis for discussion in the study groups. If the subject-matter is not very new or controversial, **a good solution in many** cases could be to have **preliminary studies** prepared by consultants, by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research or by other institutes, available already at **the beginning** of the work in the study groups, **to be then refined and developed** by the experts.
6. The need for such preliminary work also depends to some extent on the **composition** of the respective study groups. Their **composition** is of course **mostly determined by the Governments concerned, but on the whole it would probably be desirable to secure both competent** diplomats and competent non-diplomats as **members. At the** very least, the methods and practices of diplomatic work should not be allowed to dominate **the** work of the study groups. For example, in strictly political negotiations problems **can sometimes be solved by bargaining, by making** reciprocally balancing concessions in different parts of documents under preparation. The United Nations disarmament studies, on the other hand, are supposed to make comprehensive **analyses** without ignoring important aspects for the sake of political balancing.
7. The United Nations disarmament studies have **at least one principal advantage** over the products of academic research on **disarmament** matters. They carry the authority of the United Nations and implicitly of the Member States whose views have been reflected **in their contents.** There is therefore a temptation to regard **them - and to elaborate them - as** diplomatic documents, negotiated **between** appointed government representatives. This temptation should however be resisted. In particular, the fact that some Governments **may not have taken** specific stands on certain matters should not prevent their discussion in the studies concerned. On the other hand, it is hardly necessary to burden the texts with summaries of all the specific views of all the Governments **that have** designated experts for the study groups.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

[Original : English]

[7 April 1986]

1. The German Democratic Republic, like **many** other States, takes the position that the cardinal task of our time is to eliminate the danger of nuclear war, to prevent an arms race in outer space, to terminate it on earth and to radically reduce armaments, mainly in the nuclear field. The programme put forward by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on 15 January 1986 (see A/41/97) for completely

ridding **the world of nuclear weapons by the end of this century, which is fully supported by the German Democratic Republic, constitutes a unique basis for addressing this task. It shows a practicable way for the implementation of the joint Soviet-American statement (see A/40/1070) issued at Geneva on 21 November 1985 on the inadmissibility of nuclear war and the renunciation of any attempt to achieve military superiority, as well as of the intention reaffirmed by both States "to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability"**.

2. The global **system of international security, which was proposed at the Twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, corresponds with this objective and reflects the new kind of approach which the States of the world community need to make in the present situation to meet the challenges of maintaining peace, achieving disarmament and ensuring international co-operation.**

3. The United Nations **can and must make a substantive contribution to resolving the cardinal task of the present time. As a universal and the most representative intergovernmental organisation it offers unique opportunities for the exchange of views and the harmonisation of positions of States on resolving the problem of disarmament. Of great importance is its general authority in informing world public opinion about the dangerous and destructive consequences of the arms race and in mobilizing peoples to support concrete measures of disarmament.**

4. **Disarmament studies by the United Nations can play a positive, complementary and stimulating role in the attainment of these aims. A prerequisite for this is that such studies have a definite goal and a clear orientation and that they be elaborated in a co-ordinated and effective manner. Studies cannot replace negotiations on the cessation of the arms race and on disarmament) they can, however, facilitate the launching of negotiations and show ways for achieving agreements. Moreover, they can be valuable in informing the public on the basic issues of disarmament and on possibilities of resolving them. Special attention should be paid to the need for United Nations studies to meet the political concerns of the world Organization and to pursue a purpose that is conducive to the resolution of the problem of disarmament.**

5. **Numerous studies so far prepared by United Nations groups of experts in the field of disarmament comply with these requirements. Experts from the German Democratic Republic actively participated in the work of different study groups, inter alia, on the subjects "disarmament and development", "conventional disarmament", "security concepts", "military research and development", as well as "deterrence".**

6. The German Democratic Republic holds **that disarmament studies can also in the future constitute a useful element in the activities of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It shares the assessment that these studies fulfil primarily a political rather than an academic function. They shall reconcile different points of views instead of aggravating differences of opinion. For this reason a balanced political and geographical make-up is a fundamental factor of productive proceedings of groups of experts. Studies should be prepared as effectively as possible, and this includes observance of the principle of a most rational and economical use of funds. Unanimous adoption, which means the principle of consensus, should remain the preferable base of decision-making.**

7. In the perception of the German Democratic Republic, the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies can play a **more important part** in the co-ordination of study activities on disarmament. In this context, the German Democratic Republic supports the principles for disarmament studies that were agreed upon by the Advisory Board. It would be highly satisfactory if the Advisory Board discussed proposals for new studies with due regard for these principles before the General Assembly reached a decision on their elaboration. Furthermore, the Advisory Board could assist in more effective organization of the elaboration process by submitting recommendations for the direction and the scope of the studies, for priorities in their drafting and for the general approach. In its dual function as a advisory body to the Secretary-General and as Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, the Advisory Board is specially suited to make politically and financially responsible allocations of study activities between the United Nations **groups** of experts and the Institute.

8. The German Democratic Republic will continue to take an open and constructive attitude towards disarmament studies of the United Nations. In its own decision-making procedures it will be guided by the extent to which a study serves to make headway towards the solution of substantive disarmament issues and the mobilisation of world public opinion against the danger of nuclear war and in favour of disarmament.

MEXICO

[Original: Spanish]

[3 June 1986]

1. The Government of Mexico believes that the studies carried out by the United Nations on various aspects of disarmament are valuable working tools which help to make known the latest information and research on the question. This promotes greater international public awareness that will lead to active public support for the cause of disarmament. The studies carried out by the United Nations are also particularly useful for facilitating the multilateral negotiations being conducted in the Disarmament Conference.

2. The Government of Mexico none the less considers that certain steps **could be** taken to improve the work done by the United Nations in any future studies:

(a) Mexico believes that in order to give the studies in question greater practical impact, they should propose **specific steps** to be taken in the area with which they deal.

(b) It also recommends that the conclusions in the studies should be amplified, so that all States may have a clear view of the prospects opened up by the research.

(c) As to the composition of the expert groups participating in the preparation of the disarmament studies, it would be desirable for these groups to be more representative of the various political **and regional** groups, in order to **achieve** the broadest consensus among the **experts on the recommendations** to Governments.

(d) Given the necessity to publicize more widely the work being done by the United Nations to achieve disarmament, Mexico suggests that the studies should be transmitted not only to Member States but also to all individuals, academic institutions and non-governmental organizations interested in disarmament.

(e) Consideration could be given to the possibility of publicizing the recommendations and conclusions of these studies more widely by using audio-visual media and preparing versions suitable for use in primary and secondary schools.

NETHERLANDS\*

(Original: English)

(27 June 1986)

1. The twelve members of the European Community have a long and consistent record of supporting the concept and objectives of the United Nations disarmament studies programme. They believe that studies present a useful opportunity for all Member States to participate in the disarmament debate. Studies alone are unlikely to resolve fundamental differences but they can make a valuable contribution to the disarmament process. Due attention should also be paid to the efficient use of the limited resources available, to the way subjects for studies are selected and to the manner in which studies are conducted.
2. The value of United Nations disarmament studies is greatly diminished if the topic and parameters of a study are not discussed thoroughly in advance and if due account is not taken of the views of all interested States.
3. The objectives of studies should be clearly identified at an early stage and agreement reached on the best means of achieving them. A precisely defined mandate in the enabling resolution is necessary to ensure that groups of experts do not draw up over-ambitious work programmes and that the study is carried out within the time and budget originally allotted to it. It goes without saying that the objectives of a study should be realistic. That is not to say that contentious issues have to be avoided, but when divisive subjects are tackled the problem or problems should be presented in a balanced and factual manner.
4. If a study is to be useful it is important that all States should be forthcoming regarding the provision of information. Without balanced data and adequate information on the relevant activities of all States in the field in question, a United Nations experts group cannot perform its task in a worthwhile manner.
5. Using the mandate given to it by the General Assembly, a group of experts should be in a position to agree quickly on the methods and approach to be adopted. The Twelve believe that it is important to maintain the consensus rule.

---

\* On behalf of the States members of the European Community.

The failure of two recent studies, however, has highlighted the fact that it may not always be possible to expect the experts to agree on every sentence in the final report. There may, for example, be occasions on which it is preferable for differing views to receive equal weight and attention in the body of the report without the need to resort to the lowest common denominator of agreement. On every point. This would allow experts sufficient flexibility in drafting to ensure that balance and objectivity were retained.

6. The Twelve believe that small groups of around eight experts, with an equitable geographic and political balance, reflecting all relevant views, appear to be the most efficient. The calibre of experts is also important. In the view of the Twelve, greater direction should be provided by the Secretariat, in consultation with Member States as appropriate, on the type and level of expertise required for a particular study. This would help to ensure that the Secretary-General has the most suitable candidates from which to draw.

7. The twelve members of the European Community believe that the United Nations disarmament studies programme should continue. These studies are still very useful in exploring those disarmament areas on which the available knowledge is insufficient or where the existing conceptual approaches are divergent. The challenge lies in ensuring that the studies address issues on which realistic and cost-effective work can be done. Greater care in the preparation of enabling resolutions, together with better and earlier consultation among Member States on the most practical and useful approach to studies, will greatly enhance their value.

8. In addition to adequate consultations among Member States, greater use should also be made of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies as UNIDIR studies as a channel for new proposals and initiatives.

#### NIGERIA

[Original: English]

[21 April 1986]

1. The Government of Nigeria is profoundly disappointed at the current level and speed of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, which has brought the world closer to nuclear war - the outbreak of which would lead to the ultimate elimination of all lives on earth. As a country traditionally dedicated to the cause of international peace and security, Nigeria attaches utmost importance to the question of disarmament, especially of nuclear disarmament, and would therefore continue to give full support and encouragement to all activities of the United Nations aimed at enhancing better understanding of the complex question of disarmament in the hope that this could contribute to the de-escalation of the arms race and its reversal.

2. The Government of Nigeria, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 40/152 K and in response to the Secretary-General's request for views and proposals of all Member States on how the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament studies can be further improved, wishes to state in the context of the foregoing as follows:

(a) Nigeria fully **associates** itself with paragraph 96 **of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session** of the **General Assembly** (resolution **S-10/2**), in which the Assembly **stated that** "Taking further **steps** in the field of disarmament and **other measures** aimed at promoting international peace and security would be facilitated by carrying out **studies by the Secretary-General in this field** with appropriate assistance from **governmental or consultant experts**". The Government of Nigeria would therefore **wish to place on record its satisfaction with the work so far done by the United Nations in this regard**, with the publication of a number of high-quality, **thought-provoking study series** in the field of disarmament that have **no doubt** contributed significantly to the clarification of several **issues**. Nigeria would **wish to call for a wide dissemination of these study series** in order to enlist greater public opinion in **favour** of disarmament.

(b) The **Government of Nigeria is of the view that, in order** to ensure the quality and purposefulness of the studies, the **Secretary-General** should always be guided by the principle of wide geographical **representation** in his appointment of governmental or consultant group **of experts**.

(c) The **United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research** should be provided with more resources for its proper functioning. In this connection, **Member States should be urged to make more voluntary contributions** to the Institute so that it could have **increased resources as set out in article VII of its statute**.

(d) The approach to the preparation of reports on **studies** should probably be reviewed. Delay of reports on studies because of **lack of consensus** or owing to sharp divergent views could be **avoided if such reports** could reflect **both consensus and divergent views and recommendations**. It is the considered view of Nigeria that the advantages of having **such balanced report**, where **consensus cannot be achieved, outweigh the disadvantages of not having a report or delayed report on studies**. This should be the standard for **studies by both intergovernmental experts or consultant experts** whenever they meet as a group.

(e) **Member States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, are urged to co-operate with UNIDIR to enable it to provide the International community with more diversified and complete data on problems relating to international security and disarmament in all fields, particularly in the nuclear field.**

(f) Considering that **negotiations on disarmament and efforts** to ensure greater **security must be based on objective in-depth technical studies**, Nigeria subscribes to the **view that sustained research and study activity by the United Nations in the field of disarmament would promote informed participation by all States in disarmament efforts**. Nigeria would therefore **wish to call for intensification of research activities by UNIDIR for the purpose of assisting ongoing negotiations in the field of disarmament**.



NORWAY

(Original in English:

[6 May 1986]

1. The **studies on** question of disarmament **undertaken** within the framework of the United Nations are, in the view of the Government of Norway, of considerable importance **as a means** of facilitating the consideration of issues in the field of disarmament. The United Nations disarmament studies **can thus** play a useful role in disarmament **efforts** by **increasing** the understanding of the problems and dangers in the area and **by examining** questions directly related to ongoing disarmament negotiations. **This** general attitude **towards** United Nations disarmament **studies has been underlined by the participation of Norwegian experts in certain United Nations studies and in preparation of others.**

2. Whereas United Nations disarmament studies **have, generally speaking, been** useful contributions, **recent experience** demonstrates that **proposals for new studies** should be carefully considered, **both as regards mandate** and methods of work.

3. In principle, studies **ought to contribute to the** broadening of areas of **agreement within the** United Nations system. In some **cases** this may not be possible. In **such cases other formulae** may be **considered** that would enable all points of view to be presented in **a balanced and factual manner.**

4. Hence, the experience accumulated from the disarmament studies **already produced** should in the view of the Government of Norway, **serve as a basis for** further **efforts to define** general principles and guidelines **for the** framework and conduct of future **studies.** *When* evaluating the future format of United Nations disarmament studies, one should give particular consideration to factors **such as the expenses involved by the** establishment of groups of experts,

5. The Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies **has a** special responsibility in seeking **ways to make more effective** use of available resources and to define guidelines for further studies.

6. At **this** stage it should **be pointed out that** enhanced effectiveness could be attained if draft resolutions **proposing the establishment** of **groups** of experts were subjected to thorough consultations regarding **the scope and** methods of work of **the study in question.** **Such** consultations should be undertaken **among Member States** before draft resolutions are formally introduced in **the** First Committee. Ways should also **be** found to increase the role of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board **in this** respect without infringing **upon the** right of **Member States** to propose new studies. **Attention should** also be drawn to the benefits that **Member States** planning to introduce such draft resolutions **can** derive from **the** expertise available **in the** United Nations Secretariat **in these matters.**

7. Thorough consideration should also be **given to the** role of UNIDIR. UNIDIR **has** already undertaken **many** valuable studies in **the** field of disarmament. As a relatively **new, autonomous** body within **the** United Nations **system,** UNIDIR

undoubtedly still **has** unused potential in the field of disarmament studies. The financial **costs** of **research** reports **produced** by the UNIDIR will in **most cases be considerably** lower than what is **the case with** studies carried **out by** groups of **experts**. Greater **use** should be made, therefore, of UNIDIR in this **respect** as a supplement to, if **not a substitute for**, studies **by groupe** of governmental **experts**.

OMAN

[Original : Arabic]

[12 March 1986]

1. The **question** of disarmament is one of **the** most important questions **facing** mankind, **not only with** respect to **its military** and security implications **but also because** of its substantial effects **on man's** economic and social **existence**. **It is** thus **quite** natural that the question of disarmament should be the subject of widespread attention. Accordingly, the preparation of studies in this field, with appropriate assistance from governmental or consultant experts, **is** an important activity that will assist disarmament efforts.

2. If **such** studies are to be beneficial and useful, they should be broad enough in scope to reach all **segments** and classes of society. They should be kept simple and **free of** complexities and repetition in order that those who read them can understand **them and** ponder their implications. It would be advisable **in all cases that such** studies be tightly drafted and not of a lengthiness that detracts from their content **and** significance. Studies should be practically oriented and the **meaning** clearly intelligible to the reader. They should include information **about the** effects of disarmament on the daily life of the individual. Studies should **also be of** a forward-looking nature and should explain the security, economic and military advantages that **might** accrue to mankind if general and complete disarmament **were** achieved.

SWEDEN

[Original: English]

[1 May 1986]

1. The Government **of** Sweden attaches great importance to United Nations **studies** in the field of disarmament, prepared with **the appropriate** assistance of governmental or consultant experts.

2. It should be recalled that in paragraph 96 of the Programme of Action, section III of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (resolution **S-10/2**), the Assembly affirmed that "taking further steps in the field of disarmament and other measures **aimed** at promoting international peace and security would be facilitated by carrying out studies by the Secretary-General in this field".

3. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies has subsequently identified three purposes for disarmament studies mandated by the General Assembly:

(a) To assist in ongoing negotiations;

(b) To identify possible new areas of negotiations

(c) To promote public awareness of the problems involved in the arms race and disarmament.

4. To date, a total of 23 disarmament studies have been completed by the Secretary-General pursuant to mandates from the General Assembly. The studies have covered a wide variety of topics. With two exceptions, all studies have ended with the adoption of an agreed final report.

5. The effort has been truly multilateral. Experts from more than one third of the States Members of the United Nations have participated, and thus a broad range of factual information and political viewpoints has been reflected. This is of great significance, given the uneven access to, and knowledge about, the relevant sources and data in this field. The studies have endeavoured to identify the facts and perceptions that pertain to various aspects of the subjects under study and, by so doing, have helped to map out possible ways of moving towards the limitation or resolution of the problems. While these studies cannot be expected to resolve issues that have divided States for years, they can serve as pre-negotiating exercises by establishing areas of potential agreement or clarifying aspects of disagreement.

6. Generally, the aim has been to achieve agreed reports by consensus. Although this approach has not always been successful nor received unanimous support, it does have the virtue of requiring the participating experts to endeavour to find common ground rather than allowing them to articulate their individual viewpoints and reinforce their respective disagreements. As compromise and negotiated agreements are the essence of progress in disarmament, the principle of consensus reporting is essential. However, it is recognized that there may be subjects under study from time to time in which the only tenable objective is to exchange and to shed light on strongly held but divergent views.

7. United Nations disarmament studies have often complemented or corroborated each other in describing aspects of the arms race and the problems that have to be resolved. The study reports have therefore come to represent an evolving series of commentary and analysis of disarmament matters reflecting views and perceptions held by many of the States Members of the United Nations.

8. To sum up, the United Nations provides a unique forum for conducting such essential studies.

9. It is against this background that Sweden has sought to play an active role and has taken several initiatives with regard to United Nations disarmament studies,

10. For the very same reason, the Government of Sweden is concerned about the recent non-completion of two United Nations studies in the field of disarmament. A consensus, which is required in the work of most groups of governmental experts, presupposes a minimum of co-operation on the part of all involved. Unless there **is** a spirit of compromise, such studies **cannot** succeed.

11. As long as United Nations studies can be carried out in a spirit of **compromise**, the Government of Sweden considers that they fulfil a very useful role by identifying possible compromises and staking out the limits of consensus on significant matters in the field of disarmament.

12. There may, however, also be a role of United Nations disarmament studies on vital issues where political compromise is not to be expected and where, hence, the consensus requirement is not viable. In such instances, alternative modalities for the conduct of the work should be agreed upon in advance; this would safeguard against the inadvertent non-completion of future United Nations studies **i.** this field.

13. The Government of Sweden is convinced that United Nations disarmament studies will continue to provide a valuable source of information to both Governments and the general public, to promote an international dialogue on disarmament matters and to facilitate future negotiations.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[Original: Russian]

[17 April 1986]

1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers the preparation by the Secretary-General, with assistance from governmental experts, of studies on various aspects of the arms race and disarmament to be an important area of the work of the United Nations. It takes an active part in such work. In doing so, the main criterion that the Soviet **Union** applies in determining its approach to **each** specific study is how far such a study can contribute to the practical solution of issues relating to disarmament. Bearing this consideration in mind, Soviet experts have in recent years **taken** part in the preparation of reports on confidence-building measures, conventional armaments, concepts of security and so forth. Representatives of the USSR, **together** with experts **from other countries**, are now completing work on a **report** on the concept of "deterrence" and will update the report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race.

2. Disarmament studies conducted under the auspices of the United Nations cannot and must not, of course, be a substitute for negotiations on real measures for disarmament. The Soviet Union is strongly opposed to this.

3. Thus, for example, continued work by the group of experts on constructing price indices and **purchasing-power** parities for States' military expenditures can have no practical value. This work does not help to solve the problem of reducing

military budgets; and, what is more, it is aimed essentially at substituting deliberately complex studies on the comparability of military expenditures - in other words, nothing but endless arguments about figures between economists, statisticians and other experts - for a solution to that problem. In fact, it is an attempt by some States to complicate the issue of real disarmament and to give the appearance of efforts for disarmament at a time when the arms race is continuing to escalate. Such an approach is alien to the Soviet Union.

4. An unjustified increase in the number of studies conducted under the auspices of the United Nations would not serve to enhance their effectiveness. Such a practice can only lead to a higher United Nations budget, without yielding practical results.

5. The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that United Nations studies on disarmament, by reflecting the real situation in that field, must assist and support negotiations on the various issues of arms limitation. It is clear, therefore, that the importance of such studies is determined by whether or not practical results are achieved at the negotiations.

6. Broad opportunities for achieving such results at the negotiations are afforded in the extensive proposals submitted by the Soviet Union *recently*, including at the Twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

7. The Congress identified as a central part of Soviet foreign policy the struggle to implement the programme for comprehensive security through disarmament put forward on 15 January 1986 (see *h/41/97*). At its core is a plan for the step-by-step elimination of nuclear arms and the banning of space strike weapons. The USSR proposes the complete elimination of chemical weapons, in addition to nuclear weapons, and also the renunciation of the development of other weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, it is prepared to go as far as other States are willing to proceed in the area of reducing conventional weapons and armed forces. The relevant Soviet proposals at the negotiations on disarmament contain all the essential elements, inter alia, regarding questions of verification, for providing the opportunity to reach mutually acceptable accords without delay.

8. The task of ridding present and future generations of the fear of a nuclear catastrophe and of establishing a comprehensive system of international security requires that the entire existing system of negotiations be set in motion and that maximum efficiency be ensured in the machinery of disarmament. To this end, the fullest use should be made of all existing instruments - including, of course, such a universal organ for multilateral co-operation as the United Nations. Studies on the various issues relating to disarmament should have their place in its work in that area.

9. The Soviet Union, for its part, is ready to participate further in those United Nations studies that would, in practical terms, advance the cause of real disarmament and assist in the struggle against the danger of war.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[Original: English]

[13 May 1986]

1. The United States of America hopes that the adoption without a vote of General Assembly resolution 40/152 K indicates readiness on the part of all Member States to examine the situation carefully with respect to United Nations disarmament studies and to make earnest efforts at improving it.
2. For its part, the United States finds that, regrettably, not many of the United Nations studies conducted thus far represent a truly meaningful contribution to the fund or' knowledge in the field of disarmament. In the view of the United States, a major failing of these studies is that they have all too often been used as a vehicle for advancing objectives inconsistent with the very concept of studies and the fundamental purpose that they should serve. Many initiatives for studies have had very little to do with a real need for expert, in-depth analysis. Some of them have been aimed primarily at promoting and gaining United Nations imprimatur for certain pre-conceived ideas or one-sided proposals, while others have been put forward purely for reasons of perceived political prestige. Terms of reference have been so framed as to prejudge the study, or at least to give it an a priori, specific orientation. In addition, study groups frequently have been diverted from their serious work through injection of polemics, often on extraneous matters. Attempts also have been made to use studies for the purpose of undermining existing arms control arrangements or to engage study groups in quasi-negotiations.
3. Another major factor seriously prejudicing the work of United Nations disarmament studies has been that some Member States remain unwilling to provide the necessary information and data concerning their military capabilities and programmes, while refusing - even at the price of scuttling a study - to accept such material from other sources, including those whose integrity is widely recognized by the international community. Study groups are thus deprived of an element essential for any objective analysis and conclusion.
4. To date, reports resulting from United Nations disarmament studies have been essentially of two types: some represent the lowest common denominator of differing views of the participants; others consist of what is basically a compilation and juxtaposition of those views. In either case, they are of questionable value - the former because they fail to reveal and illuminate the true dimensions and complexities of the issues to be covered, the latter because they largely reiterate, albeit without attribution, the already well-known public positions of the parties concerned. Such results can hardly be regarded as justifying the considerable efforts and expenditures involved. Most important, they fall far short of affording their potential readers any useful insight into the problems investigated.
5. The United States deeply regrets that the foregoing observations have to be so critical. They do, however, reflect serious existing problems that must be addressed squarely and openly if serious, constructive efforts are to be made at improving the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament studies.

6. In offering its contribution to such efforts, the United States proceeds from certain fundamental premises, namely:

(a) That the function of United Nations studies in the field of disarmament should be to assist Member States in developing their thinking on, and realistic approaches to, problems of disarmament and international security, as well as to enhance the understanding of those problems among the general public;

(b) That for a study to serve this purpose effectively it should provide a thorough, factual and objective analysis, in the context of the international security situation, of all factors relevant to the issue under investigation;

(c) That improving the work of United Nations disarmament studies and ensuring their cost-effectiveness is the responsibility of all Member States.

7. The following are the specific suggestions that the United States would like to put forward:

(a) Member States should be strongly encouraged to exercise utmost restraint and self-discipline in contemplating initiatives for United Nations disarmament studies)

(b) The Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies should be requested to review all proposals for such studies from the standpoint of their substantive relevance, timeliness, costs and general consistency with the purpose that United Nations disarmament studies are supposed to serve. Such a review should take place prior to the possible submission of the proposed study for consideration by the First Committee. In particular, the Board should be requested carefully to consider:

- (i) The relative importance of the topic of the proposed study, as well as the appropriateness of the framework in which it is to be dealt with under the proposed terms of reference;
- (ii) The actual necessity for the study in light of pertinent material that may already be available;
- (iii) In the case of a proposal for updating an earlier United Nations study, the degree to which it is warranted by interim developments;
- (iv) Whether the study could not be conducted at less cost by a properly selected, outside consultancy.

In conducting the review, the Board also should take full account of the serious financial situation of the United Nations and the pressing need to avoid any non-essential expenditures.

When a member of the Board is a national of the State sponsoring or co-sponsoring a proposal under review, that member should disqualify himself from reviewing that proposal. The conclusions of the Board should be conveyed to the sponsor or sponsors of the respective proposal. If the proposal is pursued in the First

**Committee, the Board's findings also should be made available to all Member States. While the views of the Board could not, of course, be of a binding character, Member States would, no doubt, wish to give them closest attention.**

**(c) The actual carrying out of studies requested by the General Assembly should be rendered more efficient and productive by the following means:**

- (i) The size of study groups should be the minimum consistent with the principle of equitable geographic and political representation, and most important, with the substantive expertise required;**
- (ii) Participation in studies should be recognized as carrying with it the responsibility of individual experts to provide relevant information and data concerning their own countries;**
- (iii) If some experts are unable to meet this responsibility due to the policy of their Governments, study groups should be free to draw on pertinent material from other sources, especially internationally recognized research establishments;**
- (iv) Study groups should operate strictly within their terms of reference, with members refraining from raising polemics, introducing extraneous matters or attempting to use the study forum for any other purposes inconsistent with its proper function)**

**(d) The elaboration and adoption of study group reports should continue to be governed by the essential principle of consensus among the members of the group. This, however, should not detract from the substantive value of the report. In preparing their reports, study groups and their chairmen should be guided by the fact that, if a report is to be of any practical utility to its potential readership, it should be factual and as comprehensive as possible. Where important differences persist, they should not be ignored or obfuscated by ambiguous formulations. Divergent views should be presented in a balanced and objective, non-polemical manner. In order to provide an insight into the problems involved, reports should not merely juxtapose statements of differing views ("some believe .../others believe ..."), but also include the respective experts' substantive rationale for them. As the extent of possible coincidence of views can usually be assessed in the initial stages, and often even before the beginning of a study, the format of any draft report should correspond to that assessment so as to facilitate and expedite the work of the group.**