Draft report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session
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I. INTRODUCTION

1. By its resolution 37/97 of 13 December 1982 the General Assembly, inter alia, requested the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference 1/ to maintain close contact with the representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons in order to remain currently informed of their attitudes, as well as with all other States, and to consider any possible relevant proposals and observations which might be made to the Committee, especially having in mind paragraph 122 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (resolution 5-10/2). The Assembly also requested the Committee to submit a report to the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

2. The elected officers of the Ad Hoc Committee were as follows:

   Chairman: Mr. Ignatius Benedict Fonseka (Sri Lanka)

   Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Celso Pastor de la Torre (Peru) 2/
                 Mr. Ryszard Krystosik (Poland)

   Rapporteur: Mr. Arturo Laclaustra (Spain)

3. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics participated in the work of the Committee by virtue of paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII). Under the same provision, China, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America maintained contact with the Ad Hoc Committee through its Chairman. The German Democratic Republic, the Holy See, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam attended meetings of the Committee as observers.

4. The Working Group established in 1974 continued to function. 3/

II. WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

5. In accordance with its mandate mentioned in paragraph 1 above, the Ad Hoc Committee held two sessions in 1983.

6. During the first session, the Committee held three meetings from 4 to 7 April. At the first meeting of the session (67th meeting), the Ad Hoc Committee was informed that Mr. Juan José Calle y Calle (Peru) had completed his mission in New York and thus was unable to continue in his function as Vice-Chairman of the Committee. The Committee, therefore, elected by acclamation Mr. Celso Pastor de la Torre (Peru) the new Vice-Chairman. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the contribution made to the work of the Committee by Mr. Juan José Calle y Calle. The other post of Vice-Chairman remained vacant, pending further consultations.

7. During the second session, the Committee held ___ meetings between 5 and 8 July. At the first meeting of the session (70th meeting), the Ad Hoc Committee was informed that Mr. Celso Pastor de la Torre (Peru) was resigning from his post of Vice-Chairman in order to assume other duties. The Committee expressed its
appreciation for the contribution made to the work of the Committee by
Mr. Celso Pastor de la Torre. That post of Vice-Chairman also remained vacant,
pending further consultations.

8. During the two sessions, the Chairman and the representatives of the following
States members of the Ad Hoc Committee and observers made statements: Bulgaria,
Czechoslovakia, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Sri
Lanka and Viet Nam. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also made statements.

9. Members of the Committee were fully aware of the positions previously
expressed by the Governments of other States on the convening of a world
disarmament conference.

10. The Working Group held four meetings on 6 and 7 July, under the chairmanship
of Mr. A. Laclaustre (Spain) and elaborated the draft of the report of the Ad Hoc
Committee.

11. The Ad Hoc Committee, at its meeting on 8 July, considered and adopted
its report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

12. In accordance with paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 37/97, the
Ad Hoc Committee, through its Chairman, maintained close contact with the
representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons in order to remain
currently informed of their attitudes and obtained the following updated
indications of their positions:

China

The basic position of the Chinese Government on the question of the
convocation of a world disarmament conference remains unchanged. The absence
of progress on disarmament thus far is not due to any lack of disarmament
conferences but is due to the fact that the super Powers, clinging to their
hegemonistic policies, have stepped up their arms race and have not shown the
slightest sincerity towards disarmament. Under these circumstances, the time
is obviously not ripe for the convocation of a world disarmament conference.

France

The position of France concerning the conditions which should exist in
order for a world disarmament conference to be convened, has not changed since
last year. France notes that, in the present circumstances, there is no
consensus on such a plan.

That being the case, France would have no objection to the ad hoc group's
studying the possibility of spacing its meetings so as to take into account
the continuing deadlock.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The Soviet Union reaffirms its position of principle on the convening of
a world disarmament conference. In the Soviet Union's view, there is not and
cannot be any more important task in the present highly charged international situation than the adoption of urgent measures to halt mankind's slide toward the nuclear abyss, to end the arms race and to make a transition to genuine measures of arms reduction. In this connection, the convening of a world disarmament conference would be an important step towards combining the efforts of all States to attain that goal.

In the view of the Soviet Union, a world disarmament conference based on a comprehensive discussion of disarmament problems could work out effective ways to curb the arms race and to bring about practical disarmament. The great value and usefulness of such a forum, in the Soviet Union's view, is that the results of the conference would be not merely recommendations but specific decisions which States would undertake to carry out.

The idea of holding a world conference on disarmament would win widespread international support, inter alia, in the United Nations. There is no basis for the attempts of some nuclear-weapon States to justify their unconstructive position on the question by references to the worsening of the international situation. It is precisely when the international situation is highly charged, when the world is being drawn at an ever accelerating pace into yet another dangerous turn of the nuclear-arms-race spiral that the process of armaments growth must be halted before it is too late. In this connection, it is essential to take advantage of every possible opportunity, including those that would be afforded by a world disarmament conference.

In its decisions, the General Assembly has repeatedly referred to the possibility of holding a world disarmament conference after its second special session devoted to disarmament. It is entirely logical that the Assembly should now be able to express its view concerning the timing of that meeting.

The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that the adoption of a decision concerning specific preparatory measures for a world disarmament conference would be welcomed by the entire world community as a demonstration of the determination of Member States to devote special attention to the study and solution of disarmament problems, which are of such vital importance to all mankind.

Guided by its principled policy of strengthening peace and curbing the arms race, the Soviet Union is prepared to contribute as actively as possible to the adoption of such a decision.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The Government of the United Kingdom continues to hold the view, which it has expressed in previous years, that given the present international climate it is not useful to consider holding a world disarmament conference. The United Kingdom therefore continues to doubt the usefulness of further meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and, in any event, thinks that it would be inappropriate for the Committee to undertake any substantive work at this stage.
The United States believes that to be successful, a world disarmament conference must take place in a propitious international environment. An unsuccessful or inconclusive conference would serve no useful purpose but could create impediments to future efforts towards concrete and verifiable measures. As noted in the views of the United States contained in the April 1982 report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference to the General Assembly, the United States believes that at the present time there is insufficient political agreement on the fundamental disarmament issues which would be central to such a conference. Therefore, the United States continues to believe that it is premature to contemplate the convening of a world disarmament conference.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

13. The Ad Hoc Committee reiterated that the idea of a world disarmament conference has received wide support by the membership of the United Nations, however, with varying degrees of emphasis and differences on conditions and certain aspects related to the question of its convening, including aspects related to the deteriorating international situation. It was also evident from the updated indications of positions of the nuclear-weapon States, as reflected in paragraph 12 of the present report, some of which confirm certain elements requiring careful consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee, that no consensus with respect to the convening of a world disarmament conference under the present conditions has yet been reached among the nuclear-weapon States, whose participation in such a conference has been deemed essential by most States Members of the Organization.

14. Having regard for the important requirements of a world disarmament conference to be convened at the earliest appropriate time, with universal participation and with adequate preparation, the General Assembly should take up the question at its thirty-eighth regular session for its further consideration, bearing in mind the relevant provisions of resolution 36/91, adopted by consensus, in particular, paragraph 1 of the said resolution, and resolution 37/97, also adopted by consensus.

15. The General Assembly may wish to renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee and to request it to continue to maintain close contact with the representatives of the nuclear-weapon States in order to remain currently informed of their attitudes, as well as with all other States, and to consider any relevant comments and observations which might be made to the Committee.
Notes

1/ By its resolution 3183 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973, the General Assembly decided that the Ad Hoc Committee should consist of the following 40 non-nuclear-weapon States Members of the United Nations appointed by the President of the Assembly after consultations with all regional groups: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

2/ See para. 7.

3/ The composition of the Working Group is as follows: Burundi, Egypt, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Spain (Chairman) and Sri Lanka. Colombia, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Japan and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics participated in the Working Group as observers.