



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/41/421/Add.1
26 September 1986
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/RUSSIAN

Forty-first session
Agenda item 62

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

Addendum

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS	
Egypt	2
India	2
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	4

EGYPT

[Original: English]

[5 September 1986]

1. Consistent with its strict adherence to the Charter of the United Nations, Egypt has always played a leading role in the international disarmament efforts and has also been a strong supporter of the role of the United Nations in this regard. Consequently, Egypt fully associates itself with paragraph 96 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (resolution S-10/2) concerning disarmament studies carried out by the Secretary-General with appropriate assistance from governmental or consultant experts.

2. The Government of Egypt has considered with interest the studies which have already been completed. It firmly believes that the disarmament studies that have been undertaken within the United Nations have greatly contributed to a clearer realization of the different aspects of disarmament and will enhance the negotiating process. It is confident that the Secretary-General will always be guided by the principle of equitable representation in the appointment of governmental or consultative groups of experts.

3. The programme of studies undertaken will no doubt be enhanced by the prompt agreement on a comprehensive programme for disarmament now being negotiated at the Conference of Disarmament at Geneva. Pending such an agreement, the General Assembly deliberations should be the basis upon which the topics for study are chosen.

4. The studies should entail an objective appraisal of each situation, a thorough and exhaustive examination of the subject of any study with the aim of presenting forward-looking recommendations and suggestions to enhance the disarmament process. The adoption of the studies by consensus should no doubt be attempted; however, it should not be a condition sine qua non for their conclusion.

5. The recommendations of the specific studies could also form a part of the report of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and subsequently be endorsed by the Secretary-General. The Advisory Board's ability to provide advice on the substance as well as the implementation of the studies should be fully utilized.

INDIA

[Original: English]

[13 August 1986]

1. The Government of India considers that the United Nations has made important contributions towards the promotion of disarmament studies. These studies have played a very constructive role in the field of disarmament. The three purposes of these studies, identified in 1979 by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, namely: (a) To assist in ongoing negotiations; (b) To identify possible new areas of negotiations; and (c) To promote public awareness of the problems involved in

/...

the arms race and disarmament, continue to be valid. The 22 studies carried out since then under a mandate from the General Assembly have dealt with a variety of topics and examined several disarmament and arms limitations problems, identified areas of potential agreement and clarified areas of disagreement. This process has been extremely instructive for educating large numbers of people all over the world about the continued arms build-up and the various implications of the arms race. It aids and facilitates the creation of an informed public opinion and of a reservoir of information on the opinions and approaches to the controversies that bedevil issues in the field of disarmament. It provides support and inspiration for academic institutions all over the world for undertaking research in difficult areas, which is sorely needed to devise practical solutions to the problems that obstruct disarmament efforts. As such, these studies are extremely valuable. The importance of the role played by studies sponsored by the United Nations was recognized in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (resolution S-10/2), the first special session devoted to disarmament, which had been adopted by consensus.

2. It is noteworthy that all except two of the above-mentioned 22 studies were concluded with the adoption of an agreed report. In most cases, this was done by reaching consensus on the final report. It would, however, be most unreasonable to expect all such studies to result in a consensus between the participants. A clear distinction needs to be made between negotiations as such and the work of United Nations study groups. The latter are not negotiating bodies and any expectation from them to produce agreed conclusions would be fatal to such studies. There would always be subjects on which consensus would not be possible but which, because of their importance for human survival, would need to be examined in depth and demystified so that they could be placed before world public opinion for final judgement. In such cases, ways of carrying out the studies other than through consensus should be employed, as for example, by giving full expression to all points of view and presenting the conclusions stemming from them in their entirety when some of these conflict with each other. In the present international situation, these studies represent the only available means for striving at objectivity in the field of disarmament, and objectivity demands a presentation of differing views as they are and not truncating of opinion just for the sake of obtaining an artificial consensus. The reader should be trusted to make his own assessment in such a situation when the experts are divided. What must be clear from the outset is that there should in all cases be a report. The absence of consensus cannot be a reason for styming a study.

3. The problems that have arisen in the course of the preparation of the studies should be looked into and ways to resolve them should be found, without impinging in any way upon the freedom of each group of experts to decide how best to tackle the task entrusted to them. Various suggested procedural avenues could, for instance, be drawn up on the understanding that, while each group would make all efforts to adopt these procedures for arriving at an agreed conclusion, it would also be free to consider other ways.

4. While there need be no objection to a summing up of the experience gained in the United Nations over the years with a view to improving further and enhancing the value of the studies, the aim of any such exercise should be forward-looking and positive and should not place any constraints on the conducting of these

studies in the United Nations in the future. We reject any recommendation that would prejudice the functioning of such study groups by raising artificial demands on the views and facts presented in these studies or their manner of presentation. Every effort must be made to avoid duplication and to cut costs, but narrow budgetary concerns alone must not be allowed to constrain the excellent work that the United Nations has been doing in the field of disarmament studies. The financial implications of this endeavour, never too severe, ought to be seen in proper perspective. Much less can political concerns be allowed to come in the way.

5. In this context, it is also essential to stress that an adequate political and geographical balance must be maintained in the composition of expert groups assigned to undertake studies. The importance of this for forging a common understanding on the crucial issues of disarmament acceptable to all cannot be over-emphasized.

6. Furthermore, while the studies undertaken in the past have been useful in promoting awareness of the dangers and the complexity of the problems involved, they have so far been undertaken more or less on an ad hoc basis and have not been integrated in the context of disarmament negotiations. This should be borne in mind in the future. The choice of subjects chosen for study should focus on the major stumbling blocks to progress in the field of disarmament, so that the studies can effectively "assist in ongoing negotiations", as already affirmed by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies.

UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

[Original: Russian]

[13 August 1986]

1. The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that the preparation of disarmament studies, as an important aspect of the work of the United Nations should contribute to the adoption of specific disarmament measures, as well as to the strengthening of confidence and the adoption of other steps to promote international peace and security, but should not be an end in itself or a substitute for real disarmament, nor should it divert attention from solving the vital problems of limiting and reducing armaments. The basic purpose of United Nations disarmament studies must be to provide practical back-up to negotiations in progress and meet their real needs.

2. Unfortunately, not all United Nations studies are in keeping with these goals. For example, the work of the group of experts to construct price indices and purchasing-power parities for the military expenditures of States is delaying and complicating the solution of the problem and is substituting artificial calculations and statistics for specific measures. It is hard to imagine how such work can lead to a reduction of military expenditures.

3. An excessive increase in the number of United Nations studies is counter-productive. Their number must be determined by the real need for them in disarmament negotiations.

/...

4. The role of the Advisory Board on Disarmament should be enhanced: this body would be able to draw conclusions concerning the usefulness, urgency, general thrust and scope of a particular study before a decision was taken by the General Assembly on whether to carry it out.

5. The groups of experts established to conduct a particular study should be constituted on the basis of equal political and geographical representation. Their members must be competent experts possessing a deep knowledge of the given problem. In most cases, it would be preferable for them to be government experts with authority in their own countries.

6. The studies should be conducted within short periods, make economical use of United Nations resources and have practical value for the adoption of specific disarmament measures.

7. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have put forward many genuine proposals aimed at strengthening general security through disarmament. United Nations studies on various aspects of disarmament should also play a specific role in saving mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, achieving measures of real disarmament and strengthening international peace and security, and machinery for carrying them out should constantly be improved.
