



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/40/744
15 October 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fortieth session
Agenda items 61 (a), 65 (d) and 65 (j)

REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUDING DOCUMENT OF THE
TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY: WORLD
DISARMAMENT CAMPAIGN

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

Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies

United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1 - 2	3
II. ACTIVITIES OF THE ADVISORY BOARD ON DISARMAMENT STUDIES ...	3 - 25	3
A. United Nations studies on disarmament	3 - 6	3
B. Implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign	7 - 16	4
C. Situation in the area of disarmament	17 - 25	6
III. ACTIVITIES OF THE ADVISORY BOARD IN ITS CAPACITY AS BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR DISARMAMENT RESEARCH	26 - 37	8
A. Report of the Director on the work of the Institute ...	26 - 27	8

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
B. Proposed annual budget for 1986	28 - 34	8
C. Work programme for 1986	35 - 37	10
IV. OTHER BUSINESS	38	11
<u>Annex.</u> Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies		12

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to section III of General Assembly resolution 37/99 K of 13 December 1982, the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies has the following functions:

(a) To advise the Secretary-General on various aspects of studies and research in the area of arms limitation and disarmament carried out under the auspices of the United Nations or institutions within the United Nations system, in particular on the integration of a programme of such studies with a comprehensive programme of disarmament, once this had been established;

(b) To serve as the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR);

(c) To advise the Secretary-General on the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign;

(d) At the specific invitation of the Secretary-General, to provide him with advice on other matters within the area of disarmament and arms limitation.

In its resolution 38/183 O of 20 December 1983, the General Assembly, inter alia, requested the Secretary-General to report annually to the General Assembly on the work of the Advisory Board.

2. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies held its twelfth and thirteenth sessions from 6 to 10 May 1985 in New York and from 23 to 27 September 1985 at Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. Rolf Björnerstedt of Sweden. The annex lists the members of the Advisory Board.

II. ACTIVITIES OF THE ADVISORY BOARD ON DISARMAMENT STUDIES

A. United Nations studies on disarmament

3. At both its twelfth and thirteenth sessions, the Board considered the matter of United Nations studies on disarmament. At its May session, the conclusion of two studies (on nuclear-weapon-free zones and the military use of research and development) without agreement on their final reports had led to questions about the nature of the problems encountered and, separately, about the need for consensus in study reports. In the discussion, there was general agreement that sometimes there would be subjects on which consensus would not be possible and, on such occasions, different ways of carrying out the studies should be employed: the study on deterrence, mandated by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Board, was an example in this respect.

4. The Board decided at its twelfth session to hold a more extensive discussion of the subject, for which the Secretariat was asked to prepare a working paper summarizing briefly the experience gathered to date and setting out some of the

procedural possibilities that might be considered for the future. At its thirteenth session, in September, the Board's discussion was held on the basis of the Secretariat paper, which was regarded by the Board as an informative, balanced and useful description of experience gained from the completion of 22 disarmament studies since 1979. In the exchange of views, several members endorsed the point that disarmament studies were primarily political in nature rather than purely academic and that consensus played an important part in achieving study reports. Where a study was difficult and consensus not possible, full expression should be given to the presentation of all sides of the argument, bearing in mind the need for balance and moderation and that the language used should be appropriate for the Secretary-General to present to the General Assembly. What must be clear from the outset was that there should be a report. In this regard, the Board regretted the absence of any agreed substantive reports from the groups of experts that carried out the studies on nuclear-weapon-free zones and the military use of research and development.

5. The Board was of the opinion that the purposes of studies, namely, to assist in ongoing negotiations, to identify possible new areas of negotiation, and to promote public awareness of the problems involved in the arms race and disarmament, remained valid within the overall objective of enhancing the role of the United Nations in disarmament. While there would continue to be subjects and occasions when studies should be carried out in the established manner by the Secretary-General with the assistance of groups of governmental experts, the advent of UNIDIR provided new possibilities that should be used to advantage. With either method, an effort should be made to achieve a more careful selection of subjects for study and the matter of costs should be given close attention, although it must be understood that expert groups should reflect political and geographical balance.

6. The Board reaffirmed the view expressed in the Secretary-General's report in 1984 (A/39/549) that, while it could not presume to censor proposals by delegations of sovereign States, the Board should be in a position to examine proposals for study before they were submitted to the Assembly and to advise on possible directions or scope, priorities, approaches, etc., at least if the initiators of proposals so requested.

B. Implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign

7. At both its twelfth and thirteenth sessions, the Board discussed the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign. At both sessions Mr. Jan Martenson, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, presented to the Board an account of the activities being carried out. At its thirteenth session the Board took note of the Secretary-General's report to the General Assembly on the implementation of the programme of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign in 1985 and the programme of activities proposed for 1986 (A/40/443).

8. Generally the Board expressed its appreciation at the manner in which the Campaign was being conducted. Favourable comments were made, inter alia, on the organization and realization of regional conferences and seminars. Members of the

Board emphasized the value of such activities, and suggested that the practicability of conducting such conferences for special audiences or concentrating on specific themes should be investigated. Members of the Board also expressed significant interest in the proposal, discussed at the Regional Conference on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa held in Lomé, Togo, from 11 to 15 August 1985, to establish an African regional centre to undertake research and promote the objectives of security, disarmament and development in Africa. This would add a new dimension to the work of the World Disarmament Campaign.

9. From the standpoint of presentation, the increased quality and number of information publications were noted as positive steps. The Board encouraged the production of such materials in easily understandable form and underlined the importance of using radio, television and other means of visual presentation. The value of wider use of the media was also emphasized. Noting the efforts being made to produce materials in several languages, members of the Board felt that still greater emphasis should be placed on the distribution of publications, using United Nations information centres, United Nations associations and other avenues as appropriate. Responding to this point, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs stated that this aspect was already given great attention but that it might be useful to send a questionnaire to United Nations information centres asking them what materials were sent out and to whom; the results of that investigation could then be reported to the Board.

10. Regarding the content of the publications, some members of the Board recommended that a more important place should be given to global aspects of the problem of disarmament and to its link with development - a theme that was precisely the purpose of the International Disarmament Fund for Development project, the principle of which had been discussed by the General Assembly. It was noted that UNIDIR was already carrying out a study on this subject and had prepared a first report that should be complemented by another report on the civil uses of military resources.

11. The Under-Secretary-General emphasized that a special issue of the Newsletter on the proceedings of the third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was already being prepared and the Board welcomed that action in the light of the successful conclusion of that Conference. The Board stated that the importance of 1986 as the International Year of Peace should also be highlighted in the Campaign's forthcoming programme.

12. Noting all the Board's suggestions, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs recalled that, in practice, the Campaign was tripartite in action, requiring efforts by the United Nations, by Member States and by non-governmental organizations. Regarding the 1986 programme, efforts would continue to be made to develop the Campaign's activities to reach out to as wide a public as possible, but the extent to which the proposed programme could be implemented depended on the active and material support of Member States and other sources, especially contributions to the Trust Fund.

13. Following established practice, at its thirteenth session the Board also met with representatives of the co-ordinating bodies of non-governmental

organizations. Representatives of the Special Non-governmental Organization Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and the World Federation of United Nations Associations attended the meeting. The representative of the Non-governmental Organization Committee on Disarmament at United Nations Headquarters was unable to attend in person but submitted a written statement for distribution to members of the Board.

14. In their comments, the representatives expressed satisfaction with the successful conduct of the World Disarmament Campaign. In their view, as the Campaign was past its initial stage, ways to improve the methods and content of the Campaign should now be addressed.

15. The representatives of non-governmental organizations indicated that the Campaign materials had received favourable comments, especially the question-and-answer booklets and the wall-chart, and requested that consideration be given to the use of lighter paper to facilitate copying and handling. Among other points, the representatives of non-governmental organizations suggested that fact sheets should be issued on more specific issues and also on the outcome of each General Assembly, showing the resolutions adopted and voting results. The representatives felt that the possibilities of improving the role of the non-governmental organizations in planning the Campaign should be investigated and that there should be more organic links with the Board itself to permit a better exchange with the community of non-governmental organizations.

16. Further to the points raised by the representatives of non-governmental organizations, the Board decided to invite the Secretariat to prepare a working paper on the nature and extent of involvement of non-governmental organizations with the World Disarmament Campaign. The paper should also address the policy to be adopted by the Board concerning representation of non-governmental organizations at Board meetings when so invited. This working paper, the preparation of which would entail consultations with the non-governmental organizations co-ordinating bodies concerned, should provide the Board with recommendations for consideration at its session in spring 1986. Representatives of non-governmental organizations should therefore be invited to attend the Board at its session in September 1986.

C. Situation in the area of disarmament

17. Arising from its decision in 1984, the Board held a discussion on the subject of nuclear winter at its spring session in 1985. The discussion was preceded by a showing of the relevant part of a BBC documentary film "On the Eighth Day". At the Board's invitation, two eminent scientists presented their views on the subject, Dr. Carl Sagan and Dr. George Rathjens, both from the United States of America.

18. Mr. Sagan felt that although the likelihood of a nuclear winter was not certain, nevertheless its probability was sufficiently high to be taken into account by those making political decisions. All scientific work so far had generally supported the theory. There were therefore powerful incentives for very significant reductions in nuclear weapons to achieve levels at which, even though the dangers of extensive damage would remain, at least there would be little prospect of a general nuclear winter phenomenon.

19. Mr. Rathjens believed that there were too many uncertainties to permit reliable judgement. Estimates of targeting, the amounts of fire and smoke, the elevation of particles, the amount of radiation, the likely temperature range, the possible air movements and other factors all combined to make accurate prediction of circumstances impossible. In his view nuclear weapons were a menace and reduction to lower levels was urgently needed, but that opinion was not based on the prospect of a nuclear winter.

20. These differences of view were reflected in the comments of members of the Board, although the sense of the Board was that, whatever the reliability of the assessment, the risk of such a disaster was sufficiently large to constitute yet another compelling reason to avoid nuclear war and proceed with significant reductions in nuclear weapons.

21. The Board was informed of the work being carried out by the Secretary-General in response to General Assembly resolution 39/148 F of 17 December 1984, which called for a presentation of relevant extracts from various reports on the subject of nuclear winter.

22. At both its sessions the Board had an exchange of views on the present international situation and its implications for disarmament. Several major concerns were highlighted in frank and wide-ranging discussions.

23. The Board underlined the significance of the bilateral agreement of 8 January 1985 between Mr. George P. Shultz, the United States Secretary of State, and Mr. Andrei A. Gromyko, at that time the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, concerning negotiations on "a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms - both strategic and intermediate-range - with all these questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship". The objective of the negotiations is to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on Earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms and at strengthening strategic stability, ultimately leading to the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere. The Board expressed the hope that those negotiations would lead to a successful conclusion.

24. Other members drew attention to the repeated demands of the international community for progress in disarmament, which remained as yet unmet. Despite major and consistent efforts, and appeals at the highest level from a number of countries such as that contained in the New Delhi Declaration of 28 January 1985, multilateral negotiations continued largely to be in a situation of stalemate. Several members considered that the role of multilateral negotiations was increasingly important and such conferences and forums should be seriously encouraged. It was noted that a successful example of multilateral negotiation was the recent Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty of which the final declaration, although not precisely what non-aligned States would have preferred, was nevertheless a constructive outcome.

25. In view of the concerns expressed in multilateral bodies for positive progress in disarmament, a specific request was made that multilateral forums should be kept appropriately informed of the outcome of the forthcoming talks between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States on 19 and 20 November at Geneva.

III. ACTIVITIES OF THE ADVISORY BOARD IN ITS CAPACITY AS BOARD
OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR
DISARMAMENT RESEARCH

A. Report of the Director on the work of the Institute

26. In accordance with the provisions of article IV, paragraph 2 (i), of the Institute's statute, the Director reported to the Board on the Institute's activities and the execution of its work programme. The Board complimented the Director and the Institute on achieving much on so slender a budget and noted that the Institute had continued to make good progress in furtherance of its aims. However, in the existing financial circumstances, members were of the view that the Institute's efforts should be more concentrated on certain priority projects in order to ensure the maximum effective use of the resources available.

27. At its thirteenth session, the Board approved the report of the Director on the work of the Institute for submission to the General Assembly (A/40/725).

B. Proposed annual budget for 1986

28. In its review of the financial situation of the Institute and consideration of the proposed annual budget for 1986, the Board had before it documents prepared by the Director as well as the comments and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The Board expressed its appreciation to the Advisory Committee for its guidance and counsel and decided that its recommendations should be fully implemented. In this regard, the Board approved a timetable for the presentation of the 1987 budget that should provide adequate opportunity for consultations with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Office of Financial Services, as required in article VIII, paragraph 1, of the UNIDIR statute, as well as the time necessary for the Board's own consideration of the matter. The Board also directed that in future the presentation of the proposed draft work programme should be improved by the addition of further information as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

29. Concerning the proposed budget for 1986, the Board noted the Advisory Committee's comments on the matter of basing the Institute's activities only on the basis of the firmest possible estimates of income. The Director reported that, as at 27 September 1985, the assured income from voluntary sources for 1986 was as follows:

<u>Donor</u>	<u>\$</u>
Balance of contributions brought forward from previous year	21 600
France	180 000 <u>a/</u>
Norway	50 000
Switzerland	20 000
Barrow and Cadbury Trust Fund	44 400
Inerg Industrie Corporation	24 000
	<hr/>
Total	340 000
	<hr/> <hr/>

a/ \$60,000 of this amount is at present subject to formal confirmation.

30. The Board considered that a subvention from the regular budget of the United Nations would be necessary for 1986 and, in accordance with the provisions of the Institute's statute, recommended that it should be at the level of one half of the assured income of the Institute from voluntary sources, namely \$170,000.

31. It was decided that any income that might be pledged in addition to that shown above should be held in account to be used in connection with the 1987 programme of work and budget.

32. Together, the assured voluntary income and the subvention recommended would amount to a cash income to UNIDIR of \$510,000 for the year 1986. The estimated expenditure is summarized as follows:

	<u>\$</u>
Salaries and related costs of the regular staff of the Institute (Director, Deputy Director, two General Service)	231 400
Travel of staff	30 000
<u>Ad hoc</u> expert groups	19 000
Honoraria for contributors to the research programme	15 000
Contractual services	155 600
Fellowship programme	35 000
Reimbursement of programme support costs	17 000
Contribution towards liquidation of the deficit	7 000
	<hr/>
Total	510 000
	<hr/> <hr/>

33. Noting that the outstanding deficit had been halved by 30 June 1985, the Board considered that it should be possible to liquidate the remainder over a reasonable number of years.

34. Regarding new pledges, the Board took careful note of the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions that potential donors to UNIDIR should be advised of the procedures related to finance and budget contained in the Institute's statute, and that donors should be requested to consider providing written confirmation of their pledges by 1 July of the year prior to the year for which the pledge was being made. The Director was instructed to take action accordingly, but the Board observed that the budgetary timetables of potential donors might make this difficult to comply with in practice.

C. Work programme for 1986

35. At its twelfth session in May, the Board accepted the outline programme of work proposed by the Director with a view to a more detailed presentation being made to the Board, together with the proposed budget for 1986, at its September session.

36. At its thirteenth session, the Board adopted the proposed work programme, which will cover the following subjects:

- (a) Prevention of an arms race in outer space;
- (b) Military equilibrium;
- (c) Disarmament and development: use of military resources for civilian purposes;
- (d) International nuclear commerce and the non-proliferation treaty régime;
- (e) Verification;
- (f) Confidence-building and disarmament measures in Europe;
- (g) Subjective factors in disarmament;
- (h) Update of the UNIDIR Repertory of Disarmament Research;
- (i) Establishment of an automated data base on disarmament;
- (j) UNIDIR fellowships.

37. The Board decided that priority should be given to subjects as listed in the order above. The Board directed that it was particularly important to avoid duplication of work being done by the Department for Disarmament Affairs.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

38. The Board noted that, according to the draft calendar of conferences, the fourteenth and fifteenth sessions of the Board were scheduled to take place in 1986 as follows:

5-9 May (New York)
8-12 September (New York)

However, the institution of a timetable to permit proper attention to UNIDIR's proposed annual budget in order to meet the requirements of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions would not allow the fifteenth session to take place as scheduled. It had been indicated to the Board that the Advisory Committee would not be able to consider UNIDIR's proposed budget until the first week of September, and that two full weeks would then be required by it before its report would be available to the Board. In the circumstances, the Board asked that a formal request be made to the General Assembly for authority to meet in New York from 22 to 26 September 1986, and for similar arrangements to be made in future years.

ANNEX

Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies

Mr. Oluyemi Adeniji
Ambassador
Ministry of External Affairs
Lagos, Nigeria

Mr. Hadj Benabdelkader Azzout
Ambassador
President of the Court of Auditors
Algiers, Algeria

Dr. Rolf Björnerstedt
Chairman
Governing Board of the Stockholm International Peace
Research Institute (SIPRI)
Stockholm, Sweden

Professor Oleg N. Bykov
Deputy Director
Institute for World Economy and International Relations
USSR Academy of Science
Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Professor James E. Dougherty
Department of Politics
Saint Joseph's University
Philadelphia, United States of America

Mr. Omran El-Shafei
Ambassador, Assistant Foreign Minister
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Cairo, Egypt

Mr. Constantin Ene
Ambassador
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Bucharest, Romania

Mr. Edgar Faure
Member of the French Academy
Member of the Senate
Paris, France

Mr. Alfonso Garcia Robles
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Mexico to the Conference
on Disarmament
Geneva

Mr. Ignac Golob
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations

Mr. A. C. S. Hameed
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka

Mr. Bjorn Inge Kristvik
Director General
Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Oslo, Norway

Mr. Carlos Lechuga Hevia
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations
Geneva

Mr. Liang Yufan
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Deputy Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of
China to the United Nations
New York

Sir Ronald Mason
School of Molecular Science
University of Sussex
Brighton, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr. Akira Matsui
Advisor
Japan Atomic Energy Forum
Tokyo, Japan

Mr. William Eteki Mboumoua
Minister for Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Yaoundé, Cameroon

Professor Dr. Manfred Mueller
Institute for International Relations
Academy for Political Science and Legal Studies
Potsdam, German Democratic Republic

Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas
Ambassador of Argentina to France
Argentine Embassy
Paris, France

Mr. Maharajakrishna Rasgotra
Formerly Foreign Secretary to the Government of India
New Delhi, India

Mr. Friedrich Ruth
Ambassador
Federal Commissioner for Arms Control and Disarmament
Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

Ms. Amada Segarra
Visiting Professor
Institute of Diplomacy and International Relations
Guayaquil, Ecuador

Mr. Agha Shahi
Professor Emeritus of International Relations
to Universities in Pakistan
Pakistan

Mr. Tadeusz Strulak
Ambassador, Deputy Director
Department of International Organizations
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Warsaw, Poland

Mr. Liviu Bota, Director of UNIDIR, is an ex officio member of the Advisory Board when acting in its capacity as the Board of Trustees of UNIDIR.
