



General Assembly

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/36/654  
11 November 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-sixth session  
Agenda item 51 (c)

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

Programme of research and studies on disarmament

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1 - 3	2
II. WORK OF THE ADVISORY BOARD ON DISARMAMENT STUDIES IN 1981 . . . . .	4 - 27	2
A. Proposals for new studies . . . . .	6	2
B. Consideration of the mandate and functions of the Advisory Board . . . . .	7 - 20	3
C. Work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research . . . . .	21 - 23	7
D. New philosophy on disarmament . . . . .	24 - 27	7

ANNEX

Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, which was established pursuant to paragraph 124 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (resolution S-10/2 of 30 June 1978), held two sessions during 1981. A report on the Board's principal activities is submitted herewith for the information of the Assembly.
2. As indicated in the report, the Advisory Board felt that, with the approach of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in the light of the fact that the terms of appointment of the present members of the Board would expire at the end of 1981, it would be appropriate to apprise the Secretary-General of the experience the Board had gained in the three years of its existence and to acquaint him with the Board's views on its possible future activities.
3. The General Assembly, under agenda item 55 (b), has before it the report of the Secretary-General on the study on the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament (A/36/392). This report deals, *inter alia*, with the activities of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies; the Secretary-General therefore feels that the Assembly may wish to take note of the views expressed on that subject by the members of the Board.

## II. WORK OF THE ADVISORY BOARD ON DISARMAMENT STUDIES IN 1981

4. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies held its sixth and seventh sessions at United Nations Headquarters, in New York, from 4 to 15 May and from 28 September to 9 October 1981, respectively. The greater part of the Board's meetings was presided over by its Chairman, Mr. Agha Shahi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan; when Mr. Shahi was absent, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. E. Wyzner, presided. The annex to the present report lists the members of the Advisory Board as of 1 October 1981.
5. The Advisory Board's sessions in 1981 were devoted mainly to the discussion of the following subjects:
  - (a) Proposals for new studies;
  - (b) Mandate and functions of the Board;
  - (c) Work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research;
  - (d) New philosophy on disarmament.

### A. Proposals for new studies

6. At previous meetings the Board had considered nine proposals for studies and in its report to the Secretary-General on its fourth and fifth sessions (A/35/575), it had cited four studies from among those nine, which, in the view of most of the

/...

members, should be undertaken in the near future (i.e., the conduct and financing of a world-wide disarmament campaign; zones of peace and co-operation; the verification problem; and the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and means of delivery and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes). The General Assembly, in its resolution 35/152 I of 12 December 1980, had requested the Secretary-General to carry out one of the proposed studies, on the organization and financing of a World Disarmament Campaign under the auspices of the United Nations. 1/ The Board continues to attach importance to the implementation of the remaining studies and noted that they could be considered in due course in the context of a comprehensive programme of disarmament studies in relation to a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

B. Consideration of the mandate and functions of the Advisory Board

7. There was general agreement in the Advisory Board that, with the approach of the second special session devoted to disarmament, which is expected to deal, inter alia, with the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament, and in the light of the fact that the terms of appointment of the present members of the Board would be expiring at the end of the year, it would be appropriate if the Board apprised the Secretary-General of the experience it had gained in the first three years of its existence and conveyed to him its views on possible future activities. The Board accordingly devoted a substantial part of its sessions during 1981 to the question of its mandate, functions and possible future activities.

Past activities

8. In reviewing the work of the past three years, the Board recalled that this had been based on the following principal decisions of the General Assembly:

(a) Paragraph 124 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which read:

"The Secretary-General is requested to set up an advisory board of eminent persons, selected on the basis of their personal expertise and taking into account the principle of equitable geographical representation, to advise him on various aspects of studies to be made under the auspices of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and arms limitation, including a programme of such studies."

(b) Resolution 33/71 K, in which the Secretary-General was requested to seek the advice of the Advisory Board on possible ways of establishing, operating and financing an international institute for disarmament research, under the auspices of the United Nations;

---

1/ For the study, see A/36/458, annex.

(c) Resolution 33/71 N, in which the Secretary-General was requested, with the assistance of the Advisory Board, to study ways and means whereby "all the new ideas, new proposals, new thinking and new strategies set forth in the broad range of general debates preceding and following the adoption of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session be formulated into a single comprehensive and co-ordinated system, into a new philosophy on disarmament ...".

9. With regard to studies undertaken under the auspices of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and arms limitation, the Board recalled that it had formulated the purposes to be served as assisting in ongoing negotiations, identifying possible new areas of negotiation and promoting public awareness of the problems involved, while studies might serve several of those purposes at once. The Board had also formulated criteria for the selection of studies. They included the consideration that studies should be realistic in the sense that they should deal with areas that lent themselves to research. The Board had recognized as the decisive criterion the extent to which studies could be expected to help promote the cause of disarmament, in particular negotiations.

10. In the light of those criteria, the Board had submitted to the Secretary-General a number of proposals for new studies. Those proposals had been conveyed by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly, which had adopted two proposals for implementation (see decision 34/422 and resolution 35/152 I). The Board discussed the nature and purposes of a comprehensive programme of disarmament studies as well as some possible elements for such a programme. Once a comprehensive programme of disarmament has been elaborated, the Board should be able to prepare a comprehensive programme of disarmament studies.

11. In the course of 1979, the Advisory Board discussed possible ways of establishing, operating and financing an international institute for disarmament research under the auspices of the United Nations, with a view to advising the Secretary-General on this matter pursuant to General Assembly resolution 33/71 K. It submitted a series of recommendations (A/34/589, para. 7), which were welcomed by the Assembly in its resolution 34/83 M. Following that resolution, the Advisory Board, in the course of 1980, had several discussions on the United Nations institute, in particular, on the question of its mandate and the appropriate composition of its Advisory Council. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research was established with effect from 1 October 1980 within the framework of UNITAR as an interim arrangement for the period until the second special session on disarmament. The Advisory Council of the Institute comprises 17 members, of whom 8 are members of the Advisory Board. It is chaired by the Board's ex officio Chairman. The Advisory Board devoted several meetings to the consideration of the work of the Institute, with the purpose of enabling those members participating in the work of the Advisory Council to reflect adequately the views of the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board also on several occasions consulted with the Director of the Institute. Thus, a relationship of close co-operation has been established between the new institute and the Board.

12. After the Advisory Board had rendered its advice to the Secretary-General with regard to a new philosophy on disarmament, as requested in resolution 33/71 N, it had a series of further discussions on this subject, both in 1980 and 1981. In the

course of extensive discussions, a number of proposals were made for means to achieve novel approaches to the hitherto intractable problems of disarmament. The Board is of the view that consideration of the new philosophy on disarmament should continue after the second special session on disarmament in the light of the results thereof.

#### Mandate and functions

13. The Board's exchange of views on the question of its mandate and functions was facilitated by the availability of the text of the study of the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament (A/36/392, annex) - in which attention was paid, inter alia, to the activities of the Advisory Board - and by working papers prepared by Mr. A. Rovira and Mr. M. A. Vellodi.

14. The Board took into consideration the recommendation made in paragraph 93 (d) of the above-mentioned study concerning the advisability of a "more precise definition of the role of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies". In assessing that role, members stressed that the functions of the Board were exclusively advisory and quite different from those performed by other bodies within the disarmament machinery. On the nature of those functions, different views were expressed. However, in the end it was generally agreed that the wording of paragraph 124 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, the first special session devoted to disarmament, left sufficient flexibility to cover additional activities, as had been shown by the Board's activities with regard to the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

15. One important expansion proposed in the functions of the Advisory Board was that it should not only deal with studies but should become the advisory organ for the Secretary-General in the field of disarmament. There was considerable support for this proposal and the question was raised whether, if it assumed that function, the Board should be able to initiate its own advice or should only act if it were so requested. A consensus was reached that, since the Board was in the unique position of discussing and formulating conceptual aspects in the field of disarmament, it could be requested by the Secretary-General and by the General Assembly through the Secretary-General, to give advisory opinions in that field. It was also agreed that the present mandate could be interpreted to accommodate that function.

16. Members generally felt that the name of the Board as it now stood did not adequately reflect its range of activities. Alternatives were proposed, such as "Advisory Board on Disarmament", "Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters" and "Advisory Board on Disarmament Questions". Those proposals received substantial support, but it was agreed at the current stage not to make specific proposals for a change.

17. With respect to its activities with regard to disarmament studies, the Board recognized that it was within its mandate:

(a) To initiate and recommend studies. Members noted that the Board had made a number of recommendations to the Secretary-General, who had transmitted them to the General Assembly, but that only two had been adopted, following formal

/...

proposals by Member States. It was pointed out that the Assembly could, of course, have taken action on proposals by the Advisory Board without such formal proposals but that it was free to refrain from doing so or to adopt proposals for studies initiated from outside the Board. It was suggested that proposals by the Board for new studies should be made at its spring session so as to enable the Secretary-General to bring these to the notice of Member States well before the beginning of the General Assembly session;

(b) To elaborate a comprehensive programme of disarmament studies. It was recognized that, as discussed above, it would be possible to devise such a comprehensive programme only when a comprehensive programme of disarmament studies had been worked out;

(c) To advise the Secretary-General on planning and executing studies proposed and under way as well as to comment on completed studies;

(d) To render advice, if specifically requested through the Secretary-General, to delegations intending to submit proposals for studies;

(e) To co-ordinate the study activities of the United Nations system of organizations in the area of disarmament, to help prevent duplication, to promote the rational use of resources and to determine priorities among those studies, in line with recommendations made in the study on the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament (A/36/392, annex). It was agreed, however, that the Board should not get involved in administrative aspects of studies;

(f) To recommend approaches to studies proposed in or approved by the General Assembly, designed to provide greater efficiency and cost savings, in accordance with suggestions contained in the above-mentioned study. The co-ordinating function was also considered relevant in this regard;

(g) To continue to comment upon and promote the work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, which the Board had been instrumental in creating. Regarding co-ordination of work with the Institute, the Board was of the opinion that, whereas the Centre for Disarmament might prepare for and manage the more politically oriented studies carried out by the Secretary-General with the help of expert groups, the Institute would do more technical and specialized research. The Advisory Board might be in a position to suggest in which framework a given study or item of research belonged.

18. It was agreed that the Board might provide valuable assistance to the Secretary-General in connexion with the World Disarmament Campaign; the Group of Experts, in the study that had originated from a recommendation of the Board, had proposed that the "over-all guidance and co-ordination" of the Campaign be entrusted to him (A/36/458, annex, para. 59 (f) (i)). That did not imply endorsement of the report of the Group of Experts, since the Board had not had an opportunity to discuss it.

19. With regard to the Board's working methods, a number of members noted that the agenda should have more variety and that, to that end, the Board itself should

generate some items, rather than leave it entirely to the Secretariat to make proposals. It was noted that the variety of subjects would increase to the extent the Board was asked to render advice on various items. There was a suggestion that the Board might take up a single subject per session and concentrate on that in greater depth.

20. The mixture among the Board's membership of persons of diplomatic, academic and political backgrounds was generally commended as conducive to a rich, many-faceted and constructive exchange of views. Although there were comments that the number of members of the Board might have been smaller, it was generally felt that the size of the Board had not hampered its deliberations.

#### C. Work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

21. At both of its 1981 sessions, the Board considered the question of the programme of work of the Institute for Disarmament Research, so as to enable those of its members who participate in the Advisory Council of the Institute to reflect adequately the views of the Advisory Board. Subsequently, the Board was advised that the Advisory Council had approved the programme of work of the Institute, consisting of the compilation of a repertory of disarmament research; a general conceptual analysis of the field of disarmament; and projects entitled "Security and disarmament: security of States and lowering of levels of armaments"; "Prevention of war by accident", "Science and technology for disarmament" and "Disarmament data bank".

22. The Board, furthermore, took note of a list of 17 proposals for possible future research projects that had been submitted to the Advisory Council. In the discussions, members pointed out that proposals for new research projects should be submitted well in advance, together with as complete a description as possible of the proposed contents. It was stated that the Board should indicate for the use of those members who form part of the Advisory Council the priority that should be given to the various research projects proposed. After the deliberations of the Advisory Council, the Board was informed that the Council had approved 2 items from among the 17, referred to, namely, "Disarmament and development: continued research on various aspects of the problem in the light of the report of the Group of Experts on Disarmament and Development", and "Negotiations to achieve disarmament: comparative analysis of various multilateral negotiations and improvement of disarmament negotiations". It was hoped that all approved projects would be completed in time for the second special session on disarmament.

23. The Board was also informed that the Advisory Council had reaffirmed its conclusion to adopt a long-term programme of research only after the second special session, so that it would be possible to take the results of that session into account in the programme.

#### D. New philosophy on disarmament

24. After the Advisory Board had rendered the advice requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 33/71 N (see A/34/590), it agreed to leave the topic of

/...

a new philosophy on disarmament on its agenda for further consideration so that proposals under this heading might be formulated before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Advisory Board accordingly had a substantial exchange of views on this subject. The member who had taken the initiative of retaining the topic on the Board's agenda repeated his previous proposal, that a group of "wise men" should be established to formulate a new philosophy on disarmament or that this task should be entrusted to a personage of world-wide prestige.

25. The Board recognized the subject as vast, complicated and at times nebulous, and in the expression of a wide range of views it heard a series of pragmatic and realistic approaches in which emphasis was laid, inter alia, on the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, the first special session devoted to disarmament, in the attempt to construct a single, comprehensive and co-ordinated system. The members who followed that approach stressed, inter alia, that as a United Nations organ, the Advisory Board was held to function within the parameters of the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the various decisions taken by the General Assembly. In that framework, reference was made in particular to the new international economic order, the World Disarmament Campaign, the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace (General Assembly resolution 33/73) and the educational activities of various bodies within the United Nations system. Some members, on the other hand, suggested that a more metaphysical, spiritual and future-oriented approach should be adopted under which, while by no means conflicting with the decisions of the Assembly and specifically with the programme of action contained in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, basically novel concepts could be developed. Several Board members felt that both sets of approaches could be considered as complimentary.

26. In conclusion, the Board recognized that it could not, within the time at its disposal, complete a fruitful discussion on this subject and it agreed to recommend to the Secretary-General that continued consideration should be given to the question of a new philosophy on disarmament.

27. At the end of its meetings the Board unanimously expressed its high appreciation for the services rendered by the Secretariat to its work. The Board also wished to record its appreciation for the able and adequate manner in which the Secretary-General, through the Centre for Disarmament, had contributed to the execution of studies in the field of disarmament made under the auspices of the United Nations.



ANNEX

Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies

- Mr. Erich-Bielka-Karltreu, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria
- Mr. Abdulla Bishara, former Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations b/
- Mr. O. N. Bykov, Deputy Director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Academy of Sciences, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Vice-Chairman, Research Council on Peace and Disarmament
- Mr. Frank Edmund Boaten, Ambassador of Ghana to Denmark
- Mr. James E. Dougherty, Professor of Political Science, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia
- Mr. Constantin Ene, Ambassador, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Romania
- Mr. Alfonso García-Robles, Permanent Representative of Mexico to the Committee on Disarmament
- Mr. John Garnett, Woodrow Wilson Professor of International Politics, University of Wales
- Mr. Enrique Gaviria-Liévano, Deputy Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations Office at Geneva
- Mr. Ignac Golob, Assistant Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia a/
- Mr. A. C. S. Hameed, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka b/
- Mr. John W. Holmes, Counsellor, Canadian Institute of International Affairs
- Mr. Hussein Khallaf, Professor at the University of Cairo, former Minister and Ambassador of Egypt b/
- Mr. Lai Ya-Li, Ambassaodr, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China b/

---

a/ Unable to attend the sixth session.

b/ Unable to attend the seventh session.

- Mr. Carlos Lechuga-Hevia, Director of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Cuba
- Mr. Akira Matsui, Vice-Chairman, Japan Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc.; President, Japan Atomic Relations Organization
- Mr. Kasuka S. Mutukwa, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Lusaka, Zambia
- Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, Ambassador of Argentina to the Court of St. James
- Mr. Radha Krishna Ramphul, Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations c/
- Mr. Klaus Ritter, Director, Foundation of Science and Politics, Ebenhausen, Federal Republic of Germany
- Mr. Alejandro Rovira, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay
- Mr. Agha Shahi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan
- Mr. Pierre-Christian Taittinger, Senator and former Minister of France
- Mr. Oscar Vaernø, Director General for Planning and Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway
- Mr. Milous Vějvoda, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia
- Mr. M. A. Vellodi, Adviser, Department of Atomic Energy, India
- Mr. Perio Vinci, Ambassador of Italy, Rome
- Mr. Euġeniusz Wyzner, Permanent Representative of Poland to the United Nations
- Mr. Alejandro D. Yango, Permanent Representative of the Philippines to the United Nations
- Mr. Alexander Yankov, Professor of International Law, Sofia State University, Bulgaria a/

-----

---

c/ Unable to attend the sixth and seventh sessions.