THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT: A Study of United Nation's Efforts, 1971-1987

۸.

Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

SWARAN SINGH

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, ORGANIZATION AND DISARMAMENT SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY NEW DELHI-110067.

1988



JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY Centre for International Politics, Organisation and Disarmament

> NEW DELHI - 110067 Dated: 21st July, 1988

DECALARATION

Certified that the dissertation entitled "THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT: A Study of the United Nations Efforts, 1971 - 1987" submitted by SWARAN SINGH is in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy of this University. This dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this University or any other University. This is his own work.

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

rum in FULS Supervisor

M.L. Smide

(M. L. SONDHI) Professor M. L. Sondhi Chairman Centre for International Politics Organization and Disa.mament School of International Studies Jawaharlal Nehru University New Delhi-110067

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I take this opportunity to express my regards to Prof. M. Zuberi of the School of International Studies for his extremely patient guidance and encouragement during the preparation of this draft and I feel fortunate to have come under his supervision.

I am equally thankfully to Prof. T.T. Poulose for introducing me to the field of Disarmament.

I record my thanks to Mr. D.K. Bose and Mr. Bishan Singh of the United Nations Liberary for their help in granting me access to United Nations documents. I am also thankful to the staff of the following two liberaries: a) Institute of Defence Studies & Analysis; and, b) Indian Council for World Affairs. Most of my work was done at these three liberaries. I also feel to mention the names of the two of my friends: Ratan Bhaingra and Rakesh Kumar Thakur.

Lastly, my thanks are also due to my typists who have done the job very well.

(SWARAN SINGH)

Dated: 21st July, 1988 JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY NEW DELHI-110067.

CONTENTS

,

CHAPTER I:	Introduction	1.
CHAPTER II	: Alva Mydral Report, 1971-72	17.
CHAPTER II	I: Inga Thorsson Report	29.
CHAPTER IN	V: Other United Nations Efforts	46.
CHAPTER V	: The United Nations Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development	56.
CHAPTER V	I: Conclusion	71.

ANNEXURE I	••••	82.
ANNEXÜRE	••••	87.
ANNEXURE III	••••	92.
ANNEXURE IV	· · · · ·	102.

BIBLIOGRAPHY		111.

	tana Tan	

1

CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

If one were to point to the most important features that characterize the international scene today the issues that would come first to one's mind would be poverty, hunger, disease,unemployment and illiteracy that prevade a large portion of the globe. Depending on one's perspective the scenario may be described in different terminologies. Some may call it 'backwardness' while others would prefer to describe it as 'lack of development' or'under-development', 'mal-development', and there may be others who would explain these probles as being the bye-products of development. Neverthelss, the facts remain what they are.

According to various United Nations estimates¹, close to 1 billion people live below poverty line, 780 million others are mal-nourished, 850 million are illiterate, 1.5 billion have absolutely no access to medical facilities, an equally large numbeer is unemployed are over 1 billion of them are not adequately housed. If it is the developing nation which are primarily prey to the aforesaid problems of 'backwardness', the developed industrialised countries have their own kind of problems of uncontrolled development. For instance, problems of pollution and other environmental hazards, of urban slums and crime, of depleting conventional sources of energy and other raw materials, of excess of manufactured goods, of fast

The United Nations Organisation periodically carries such survey studies. The present data is taken from the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held in New York during August-September, 1987 (A/CONF/130/PC/1-10/Add1.2 dated Ist May, 1987.)

developing new technologies, of industrial recession, of cracking social order and failing welfare systems have made even th developed nations exhausted and frustrated. Today both the developed and developing nations find themselves entangled in a vicious spiral where these problems have become both the cause as well as consequence of present stalemate.

The single most important reasons for our failure to deal with the crises has been lack of an internationalist approach in all our efforts in this regard. Despite 40 years of United Nations' existance, the National interest continues to be most important determinant of all nations' policies and as a result the national leaders have invariably failed to agree upon long-term measures of international co-o pration. Bullying, wooing and other clandestine activities are fast becoming instruments of foreign policy which should ideally be based on yardsticks of independence and objectvity and should strive for international peace and development. But what we actually have is increasing developmental gap between and within the nations and the consequent strains, social tensions and strife, making it all the more difficult to resolve the crises of development.

While the developing countries are presently under the debt burden of over 1 trillian US dollars, the developed nations cling to their short-term measures of protectionism and are doing everything to keep prices of imports from developing countries

at their lowest minimum. The total outflow from the developing countries in the form of debt-servicing and debt amortization has increased to such an extent that it is now larger than the gross inflow from developed nations - including medium and long-term capital inflow. Over and above this the western nations, of late, have also resorted to withdrawing from various international organisations meant for providing development aid. For example², the World Bank capital flows have declined sharply and at the same time commercial loans have also been shrinking. The credit of International Development Association (IDA) declined from its peak of 3.8 billion US dollars in 1980 to \$ 3.0 billion in 1985. SimIlarly the Special Drawing Rights of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) which stood at SDR 14.1 billion in 1983 fell sharply to SDR 8.1 billion in 1984 and SDR 4.2 billion in 1985. Other commercial loans have been increasingly confined to allied nations of bilateral or multilateral defence arrangements and for other nations these carry extremely high interest rates and other attached strings. The economic assistance from developed nations today include large quantities of military hardware and developmental aid is reducing day by day. It only shows that donor/lending countries do not have any concern for the plight of developing countries. Their economic assistance and other trade agreements are all geared to the profit motive. This has only further worsened the situation and thus nearly 3/4th of the world population continues to live in poverty, illiteracy, squalor, pain, disease and ignorance.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/CONF/130/PC/INF/17 dated 12th May, 1986; Page 6, Para 11. All these data are without adjustment for inflation during this period.

Now it is against this background of distorted world development and uncertain economic future that we will try to understand the other most important feature that characterizes international scene today : the uncontrolled arms buildup and the consequent difficulties of disarmament. It remains an inconclusive question as to which of these two phenomena - Development or Disamament - is more important and should receive foremost attention. It has now been accepted by the international community³ that both of these have an intrinsic relationship wherein each one reinforces the other. Neither of these problems can be understood nor can they be resolved in isolation from one another.

Our world today literally stands on the brink of a nuclear disaster. The lethality and precision of modern weapon systems have reached such fantastic heights that the super powers today can annihilate any place in this globe just within a matter of minutes and they can do so to the exactness of few meters. This is not all. They have gained the capacity to eliminate life from this planet and they can do it several times over. Unlimited money, talent and raw materials are being wasted upon achieving fantasies of 'Starwars' and other nuclear counter-measures There are over 50,000 nuclear warheads today lying in various arsenals while

^{3.} The United Nations Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held during August-September, 1987 was the first occasion where all the member-states, except United States, endorsed the fact that such a relationship does exist and that it has an important bearing on the international system and global economy.

only a small number can destroy our civilization.

From an economic angle this arms race is not only eating away large quantities of our rare and scarce resources which would otherwise be available for developmental needs. It also increases the feeling of insecurity among nations which further heightens the arms race. Also, such a tension-ridden international environment hampers free trade among nations. It is a well-established fact that rivalary between the Eastern and the Western blocs has been the greatest hurdle in achieving the twin goals of Disarmament and Development.

The world today spends an exhorbitant sum of 1 trillion US dollars on producing armaments every year. This is not merely a waste of resources but it creates further difficulties in our lives by creating various big and small security threats. The production and trade of armaments further explains how this has distorted world development.

The five nuclear weapons states - USSR, USA, UK, France and China - happen to be permanent members of the Security Council. But nearly 90 per cent of the nuclear weapons are those owned by just the two super powers who possess the most modern weapon-systems and other advanced technologies. Exactly the same scenario is to be seen in the field of world development. Barring the exception of Japan and West Germany - living under US nuclear umbrella - these

nuclear weapons-producing countries are also economically the most powerful. It is economic strategies of these few countries that decide the fate of over 160 big and small nations. These few nations virtually dictate the terms of economic planning and development in other countries which may be done either through international developmental aid institutions or via bilateral aid and trade agreements. The fact that they stand at the peak of weapons technology has been the most important element in positioning them on the top of economic development which is achieved partly by exploiting the weaker nations. Over 75 per cent of all conventional weapons are produced in these countries and then exported all over the world at exhorbitant prices. They also use their arms exports for planting their advisers and technicians in developing countries thereby controlling the latters' national policies, and moulding them to suit their own interests. The Western countries are particularly known for planting their Multi-National Corporations in other countries on highly favourable terms to themselves and thereby controlling the raw materials of these dependent countries. These rich nations are also known for dumping obsolete weapons and out-dated technologies in these countries thus generating various local chain reactions and sparking conflicts and strife among these developing nations, further delaying their achieving minimum standards of living for their people. Nearly 1/3rd of the countries of the Third World are today governed by military rulers who are often more or less puppets of one of these great powers. Even the United Nations Organisation represents these very distortions

of international life. The five nuclear power have the exceptional veto power in the Security Council.

However, with the increasing awareness among the peoples of developing countries, the emergence of new nation states and the rise of the Non-aligned group, these distortions in the international scene have been challenged. These countries have staked their claims on developmental aid and have put forward various explanations as to how this would eventually benefit the developed nations as well. The realisation has come to stay among developing countries that the arms build-up of the industrialised nations has a direct bearing on their own developmental process; that both these phenomena cannot be isolated from one another and cannot be localised to certain regions.

Π

The whole structure and functioning of the United Nations presents a vivid picture of an edifice raised to achieve the goals of disarmament and development. It may be seen from the speeches of various leaders towards the end of the Second World War that all of them wanted peace desperately. The ghost of that unending war was so frightening that even the use of of two atomic bombs was considered justified.

The United Nations Organisation, therefore, from its

very inception implicitly recognised the inherent linkage between disarmament and development. For example, the Preamble of the United Nations Charter expresses clearly its determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourage of war" and "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". The Preamble further declares its intention "to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples". Similarly Article 26 of the Charter refers to the "establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of world's human and economic resources". Article 55 seeks to achieve "higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development" with a view to creating "the conditions of stability and well-being." Similarly, the Charter had envisaged Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) that was expected to mobilize the like-minded forces, bring them under UN banner and thereby help fasten and facilitate the process of world development.

The Charter has also suggested a number of concrete steps towards achieving the ultimate goals of disarmament and development. For instance, Article 11(1) directs the General Assembly to consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security and authorises it to make recommendations to the member states regarding the general principles governing disarmament and regulation of armaments. Similarly, Article 47(1) provides for the establishment of a Military Staff Committee which among other things is expected to assist the Security Council in the regulation of armaments and possible steps towards disarmament.

Soon after its inception, the member states had, on 26th January 1946, set up the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission which was inter-alia expected to achieve "elimination from national armaments and atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction". In February, 1947 another Commission on Conventional Armaments was established and later on January 11, 1952 both these organisations were merged to form the United Nations' Disarmament Commission. Later on a full-fledged Department on Disarmament Affairs was created under the United Nations. Various committees and commissions have since been set-up and various studies have been conducted on disarmament. The Department of Disarmament preiodically convens regions and international conferences on these issues. Three special sessions of the U.N. General Assembly devoted to disarmament have been held. Similarly, the United Nations have successfully piloted various international agreements banning, controlling and regulating various kinds of armaments and their use in space, on ground, underground or on sea etc.

Unlike disarmament, the United Nations efforts in the field of world development have been much more significant. The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) is the nodal

organisation in this regard. Apart from co-ordinating various functions, it is also responsible for convening conferences and drafting conventions. It also makes recommendations to the General Assembly. Article 55 of the United Nations Charter enjoins upon ECOSOC the responsibility of inter alia finding "solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems and international cultural and educational cooperation..." Today a large number of specialised agencies like UNESCO, IMF, WHO etc., are doing a commendable work under the supervision and guidance of ECOSOC. Some extremely successful undertakings of ECOSOC may include launching of UNICEF, the United Nations Refugee Fund, the Technical Assistance Board, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency and its Special Fund for Economic Development.

The United Nations Organisation has been convening various kinds of Conferences to bring to international public consciousness some of the emerging major issues requiring concerted action by member Governments and the international community as a whole. The issues thus focussed are food, drinking water, human settlements, desertification, role of women, trade and commerce, science and technology, law of the sea, industrialization, population, unemployment, health, environmental and agrarian reforms etc.

All these United Nations Conferences have a direct bearing on various aspects of world development and have been particularly helpful for developing countries. Since the beginning of the 1970s these countries have denounced the existing Bretton Woods system of management of world economy and have staked their claims for equality in all international monetary and financial institutions which presently are under the control of a few rich nations. They have used their numerical strength in piloting through the General Assembly various resolutions seeking establishment of a New International Economic Order.⁴ These aspirations of developing countries have been further strengthened by the support given to them by various intellectuals and statesmen from the Indus-Moreover, the United Nations Organisation trialised World. also been focussing on specific issues by designating has decades of Development or of Disarmament; it has been similarly designating specific years as years of Peace or of Shelter for the Homeless.

The question that might be raised at this juncture is that if the World body's striving towards achieving goals of disarmament and development has been so vigorous why is it that it has to readjust its targets? Why it goes on calling every decade as First...Second...or Third Decade on Disarmament or Development? One might remind us of over 250 major and minor international conflicts that have occured during the UN existence. There are the famines and other natural calamities and diseases which have occured during these decade. In fact unless these questions are confronted the study of success and failures of the United Nations in implementing its programmes on disarmament and development

^{4.} During April-May, 1974 the Sixth Special Session of the General Assembly had passed a Resolution for the establishment of a New International Economic Order. Later in December, 1974 the General Assembly adopted a Charter of Economic Rights and duties of States which spoke vehemently for developing countries. The two commissions headed by Olof Palme and Willy Brandt had also supported the view points of the developing countries.

shall remain incomplete.

III

The most important failure of the United Nations has been the fact that during these four decades of its existance its member-states have been reluctant to recognise and appreciate the vital and intrinsic relationship between the twin phenomena of disarmament and development. They have been directing their efforts on these two issues as two separate goals having no bearing, whatsoever, on each other. Accordingly all their efforts have been suffering from short-sightedness and narrow perspective.

The Charter of the United Nations guarantees the sovereign equality of all its member states. At that level it pus a country like St. Marino on equal footing with the U.S.S.R. With vast disparity of size and economic and military power, it is difficult to obtain a general consensus on issues like disarmament and development which impinge on vital aspects of distribution of global power. The documents emerging from the United Nations are therefore diluted by the action of obtaining the lowest common denominator.

The second basic handicap of the United Nations Organisation is that its functioniong has been dominated by a few rich industrialised countries. These countries have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo and thereby

sustaining their leadership in economic and military spheres. These countries have been reluctant to accept any underlying linkage between disarmament and development because they are beneficiaries from the existing from the distribution of military and economic power. The developing countries which want to alter the existing status are constrained by the responsibilities of nation-building and aspirations of rapid development. Added to this is the widespread poverty and illiterary in these countries. All this facilitates the rich industrialised nations' attempts to perpetuate their dominance in the world. Despite their cause being just and their arguments being more authentic, the developing countries have the disadvantages of being greatly dependent in crucial areas on the assistance of the forces of status quo.

Most of the research work on the relationship between disarmament and development has been done in these rich industrialised countries - particularly in the United States. Also invariably all major research projects on this subject have been financed by various foundations controlled by industrialists and weapon system producers. These countries have patronised large work forces of intellectuals and scientists who have invariably been preaching that process of world development should not be delayed if the process of disarmament is slow. While paying homage to the goals of disarmament and development, these intellectuals treat these two goals as distinct and separate. There has been a tendency to treat the threats to national s ecurity as primarily military and

and to discuss the problems of global economy as something unrelated to security issues. And the influence of these forces was such that it took the United Nations nearly twenty-five tears to conduct its first study on the relationship between disarmament and development.

Although the United Nations Organisation has been periodically updating its reports concerning the economic and social consequences of the arms race, these reports are confined to enumerating the resources that are being wasted to0wards production of armaments and which could otherwise have been utilised for productive purposes. But, as the following Chapters will explain, the relationship between disarmament and development is not all that simple. Even the first study conducted under the title Disarmament and Development was sub-titled "Disarmament and Development : Report of the Group of Experts on the Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament."⁵. However, its most important contribution was a detailed study of how resources devoted to arms production could be employed for civilian products (Please see Annexure I). The net result was that although this report repeated the old arguments about disarmament and development being separate, yet it took a great lead in initiating study of other aspects of this intricate relationship.

The most important study on this relationship was the report by a Group of Experts which was chaired by the then Swedish Ambassador to the United Nations, Ms Inga

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174, Sales No.E:73.IX.1 dated 11th August, 1972.

Thorsson.⁶ This was the first and the last report to be so comprehensive and so sraightforward in its survey. All the studies that followed this report show appreciation of . this relationship even if this issue may not be central to their subject of investigation. In fact Ms Inga Thorsson has been the person responsible for the crusade to establish this relationship between disarmament and development. In general the issue has received the backing of all the Third World Countries and their sympathisers in the developed nations. India has played a leading role in all these efforts and Indian experts have made their contribution in the field of disarmament and development.

The United Nations that had considered the issue of disarmament and development as 'fundamentally separate', now agrees that both these issues have an intrinsic relationship and both have to be carried together. This has been achieved by the untiring efforts of many years. If the year 1971 saw the formation of the first group to investigate the relationship between disarmament and development, the year 1987 saw the United Nations convening a Conference on the relationship between these two goals as was recommended by these Experts. It was at this conference that over 155 nations states, except the United States, agreed, for the first-time at their highest political level, that there does exist an intrinsic and a multi-dimensional relationship between disarmament and development. It is a matter of great pride that this Conference was presided over by India and that

6. The United Nations' General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981.

it succeeded in achieving concensus on its Final Document. This marks completion of an era.

In the following chapters we will make an attempt to study various United Nations' efforts since 1971 that made it possible to agree on the Document of 1987.

CHAPTER II

ALVA MYRDAL REPORT, 1971-72

Resolution No.2685 (XXV) of the United Nations General Assembly had requested the Secretary General to appoint a panel of Experts in consultation with advisers as he may deem necessary. This Group of Experts was expected to "formulate suggestions for the guidance of member states, the specialised Agencies of United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency as well as other organisations of the United Nations system, with a view to establishing a link between the Disarmament Decade and the second UN Development Decade." The Group was also expected to "propose measures for the mobilisation of World public opinion in support of the link between Disarmament and Development and thus encourage intensifying negotiations aimed at progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective International Control."

As authorised, the Secretary General selected a Group of Experts from amongst 9 countries and this committee was headed by the well-known Swedish Ambassador Ms. Alva Myrdal. This Group held two sessions at Geneva, one from 13th to 17th March and the other from 31st July to 11th August in 1972. Its report popularly known as ALVA MYRDAL REPORT was submitted to the Secretary-General on 11th August, 1972. This was later adopted by the General Assembly without vote.

While examining the linkage between disarmament and

development, this group of Experts had before it the just concluded and updated United Nations report entitled "ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARMS RACE AND OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES" which had already explicitly concluded that "International suspicions and fears...damage the economic and social well being of the world by impeding exchanges between peoples whether these be of trade and flow of capital or of knowledge and technical know-how" and that therefore "If there were no arms race, trade and other exchanges would almost be certainly be easier."¹ It had further underlined that a "halt in the arms race and significant reduction in military expenditures would help the social and economic development of all countries and would increase the possibilities of providing additional aid to developing countries"². Going a step further than the previous UN studies, this Group of Experts declared that "Disarmament would contribute to economic and social development through the promotion of peace and relaxation of International tensions as well as through the release of resources for the peaceful uses" 3 . Thus it made the argument further explicit.

While the Group of Experts endorsed the conventional views held by preceding reports - that disarmament and development were of the greatest importance to the world community; that fundamentally they stand separately from one another; that the UN should seek each one in its own right regardless of pace of

^{1.} The United Nations' General Assembly Document No.E.72.IX.6 Dated December, 1971, Para 95.

^{2.} Ibid.Para 120.

^{3.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174; Sales No.E.73.IX.1 dated 11th August, 1972; Chapter III; Para 22.

progress in approaching the other - it also made a few general statements which were called "points of departure"⁴. These points are: -

- "a) The main motive for pursuing disarmament is to avoid war and all its fearful consequences, to strengthen peace and security throughout the world and to foster a climate of understanding and cooperation. The achievement of these aims would create a very favourable condition for development.
- "b) In the post-world-war period, and particuarly in recent years, as a result of the negotiations within the framework of the United Nations, in the committees of disarmament as also between Governments, certain treaties and agreements for limiting the arms race, for reducing international tension and for improving the potential climate have been concluded and brought into effect. However, Disarmament agreements have not yet led to any reduction in military expenditures.
- "c) In striving by the adoption of measures for disarmament, to avoid war and to strengthen peace throughout the world, countries unquestionably also take into account great economic possibilities implicit in disarmament through the re-direction of resources to goals of peaceful development. This is a matter of great importance to all countries, developed and developing alike.
- "d) The problem of achieving disarmament and making rapid progress with economic and social development, as well as the problems of generating more and more aid for developing countries are essentially political. Disarmament will come only if people change the direction of politics which have led to arms race. For example if they reject external policies of intervention; if they reject international competition for power and prestige expressed More aid, and other measures through military might. aimed at helping the developing countries will come only if people to a greater degree adopt and act upon inter-nationalist values - the equality of man; the creed to eliminate poverty; mass unemployment, disease, hunger and illiteracy; the desirability of bringing the benefits of science and technology to everyone.

^{4.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174; Sales No.E.73.IX.1 dated 11th August, 1974; Page 1, Para 3.

- "e) There are two separate political objectives disarmament and development - and two sets of political motives linked to each other because the enormous amount of resources wasted in the arms race might be utilised to facilitate development and progress.
- "f) The blatant contrast between this waste of resources and the unfilled needs of development can be used to help rouse the public opinion in favour of effective disarmament and in favour of achievement of further progress in development, particularly of developing countries.
- "g) The employment of resources released by disarmament, especially for development purpose is not likely to take place spontaneously; it will require concerted action on the part of Governments of the countries concerned, both developed and developing. Such a shift will be one of the major means through which the change in political ends would be expressed."

As regards the issues of conversion of assets from Military to the Group agreed with the conclusions reached Civilian Sector various preceding investigations. It believed that "there in would be no insuperable technical difficulties in ensuring the redeployment of released resources for peaceful uses."⁵ The transfer to the peaceful uses of resources used in each country for production of destructive weapons will obviously bring about greater satisfaction of civilian needs. Therefore, the resources which were to be released in the process of disarmament, which the Group called 'disarmament dividend", were expected to be "redirected to raise the standards of living and to promote faster growth, in particular through higher expenditures in fixed investment and in education and training of manpower..⁶

20,.

^{5.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174 Sales No.E.73.IX.1 Dated 11th August, 1974, Chapter 1, Page 3, Para 3.

^{6.} Ibid Chapter 3, Page 11, Para 26.

Dealing with the problems of conversion of existing military installations and manpower to civilian purposes, the Group referred to the often quoted experience of the Second World War. It may be recalled that in the process of demobilisations a great number of military installations were converted for civilian use and manpower re-employed without creating any social unheavles. In the United States alone during 1945-48 some ten million persons were released from armed forces and the defence budget declined nearly by 40 billion dollars. Similarly defence-related employment in industry fell from 12 million persons in 1945 to less than 1 million in 1946. In the United Kingdom 7 million persons were demobilised within 16 months of the end of the war. In neither country, however, did unemployment in the immediate post-war period exceed 4 per cent. The experience of the Soviet Union was similarly positive. Citing this example, when many civilian industries were successfully converted to produce war necessities and later disbanded on the close of the war equally successfully without causing any social unrest or economic decline, the report emphasized that "most of the resources released by disarmament. total or partial, would be readily transferable for other uses for example manpower, food, clothings, transport, fuel and various other products of metal and engineering industries". However, it also underlined that in case "some other resources for example nuclear weapons plants and military aircrafts and

missiles' plants which may not be readily transferable - some

1

DISS 327.174 Si646 Re TH2698

TH-2698

alternative civil uses may be found for them"⁷. In fact the ingenuity and resourcefulness displayed during and after the Second World War in converting facilities to serve military purposes and vice versa was extremely impressive and one can at least hope that conversion from military to civilian purposes would not be an impossible task.

The Group of Experts had also studied the cases of transfer of specific resources that may be released in the process of disarmament. (Please see Annexure I). In this regard they had put forward four hypothesis which are briefly given below:-

a) Comprehensive Test Ban:

Even if two thousand tonnes of fossil materials could be released through a comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, it would be enough for the initial replacement of fuel over their useful life for the installed capacity of about ten thousand electrical megawatts of thermal reactors or an installed capacity of 500,000 electrical megawatts of Fast Breeder Reactors.

b) Chemical Weapons Disarmament:

Chemical disarmament could release many vital chemicals which may be useful for ecologically acceptable pestcontrol and texcological resarch.

c) **Demilitarisation of the Sea:**

Apart from improving the environment for sea trade it would be more economic and efficient utilisation and management of world's common heritage and wealth available in the oceans. In case all exploration and research was done under some international authority it would be of tremendous help to the developing countries.

The United Nations General Asssembly Document No.ST/ECA/174;Sales No.E.73.IX.1 dated 11th August, 1974; Chapter III, Page 14 Para 37,38.

d) Elimination of Foreign Bases:

Apart from releasing the economic burden of the countries maintaining military troops and installations abroad and in reducing tensions in areas where such basis were in existence, their removal would improve the balance of payments amongst the concerned countries. In the short run there might be, of course, some reduction in the foreign exchange earnings of countries hosting foreign troops; but this would soon outweigh the change in the political conditions.

The Group also noted that "many developing countries import their arms from abroad. Although many of these arms are provided as aid or on easy terms, disarmament would still release significant foreign exchange resources which could be used for the import of investment goods very necessary for growth.⁸

One measure suggested by the Group for the transition from partial masures to general and complete disarmament was an 'agreement to limit and reduce the military budgets." According to the Group, "without comprehensive overall economic limitations of this kind, arms limitations agreements expressed in terms of numbers of specific types of weapons cannot prevent an arms race in the form of expenditure or the development and production of entirely new kinds of weapons not covered by existing agreements."⁹ Deriving from this argument the Group categorically denounced th existing disarmament treaties thus: "So far, in the field of disarmament several important international agreements on certain types of arms have been reached. They may have forstalled increases in the military spending but they have not reduced it."10

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174,Sales No.E.73.IX.1 Dated 11th August, 1974; Page 12; Para 31.

^{9.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174; Sales No.E.73.IX.1 dated 11th August, 1974, Chapter I; Page 6 Para 10.

^{10.} Ibid Page 4, Para 6.

Thus we find that the Alva Myrdal Report, which was the first United Nations' official study on the relationship between disarmament and development, was not able to explore all the aspect of this intricate linkage. Though the Group had done excellent studies on the issues of conversion, their final Report tip-toed only traditional approach of showing arms race as an unbearable economic burden. The central focus of this Group remained on showing how disarmament would release additional resources which would be utilised for bridging the developmental gap within and between various countries. This explains how the Group gave top priority to reductions in military budgets.

It was, however, left for later studies to prove that in the conditions of continuous technological progress, mere inspection and regulation of military expenditures gives only wrong impression of reality. In view of the weapon improvements even a policy of zero-net investment will lead to constant increase in the destructive power of their military products.

The group discussed in detail the problems of developing countries. It deplored the fact that economic aid from the developed industrialised nations was being increasingly overshadowed by transfers of military hardware which in turn give r ise to poverty and militarism among developing countries.

The reduction and limitations on military spending was the first step to be taken so that the basic requirements for increasing the rate of economic growth are met. The Group noted

that ".....with few special exception, the developing countries cannot be realistically expected to be able to provide from its domestic savings alone sufficient investment to attain the necessary rate of economic growth" and therefore "some of them will need foreign technical and financial assistance."¹¹ Accordingly it was suggested that as the "disarmament is accomplished the amount of military aid granted by the developed countries should, instead of being merely suppressed, be used for the expansion of economic aid to developing countries."¹²

Chapters IV and V of the Report were devoted to the Group's second most important function - the responsibility "to propose measures for mobilisation of world public opinion in support of the link between disarmament and development".

It was proposed that a United Nations Conference to deal with various aspects of this 'linkage' be convened in which all the countries should participate on an equal footing. The Report underlined that "If an agreement is reached on holding a World Disarmament Conference, and if the Conference is held, this would facilitate the mobilisation of public opinion; and the Group hopes that such a Conference would enable all countries, on the equal footing, to compare ideas concerning every aspect of disarmament".¹³

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174; Sales No.E.73.IX.1 dated 11th August, 1974; Chapter II, Page 8; Para.17.

^{12.} Ibid Chapter III; Page 2, Para 32.

^{13.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.ST/ECA/174; Sales No.E.73.IX.1 Dated 11th August, 1974; Chapter IV;Page 18; Para 46.

The blatant contrast between the waste of resources on armaments and the great unfilled needs of social and economic development had to be constantly brought to the attention of the international community. Regular publication of the glaring discrepancies between world's expenditures for armaments and those for aid to poorer nations as also between other military and civilian expenditures was suggested. The Group proposed that "In particular the Secretary-General should endeavour to include, in his periodic reports to the Economic and Social Council and General Assembly on the economic and social consequences of disarmament and of arms race, statistics for each country, as far as they can be available, showing in addition to military expenditures and their impact on social and economic development, developmental aid given and received".¹⁴ The Group also requested the media-men and the intellectuals of the world to "draw attention to the tremendous inherent potentialities of redirecting military research and development towards developmental objectives..."15

Though it took the United Nations nearly 17 years to convene the kind of International Conference proposed by this Group of Experts, their Study's primary importance lies in being a foundation-stone that for the first time had challenged the traditional theories e.g. Morganthau's National Interest or his Power-Struggle theory. It for the first time had emphasised that Security was not an individual problem. It is an inter-

The United Nations General Assembly Documents No.ST/ECA/174; Sales No.E.73.IX.
 Chapter IV; Page 20, Para 50.

^{15.} Ibid Page 21 Para 56 (g)

national problem and therefore must have only international solutic No nation can find security by sealing its borders. The influence of this Study is vivid in the various conferences and studies that followed it.

In 1974, for example, another Group of Experts had submitted their Report entitled "Reduction in Military Budgets of States Permanent Members of the Security Council by Ten Per cent and Utilization of the Part of Funds Thus Saved to Provide Assistance to Developing Countries". These efforts were given further impetus when in 1977 the Groups of Experts appointed to update the UN Report on the Economic and Social Consequence of Arms Race and Military Expenditures specifically concluded that the "development at an acceptable rate would be hard if not impossible to reconcile with a continuation of arms race" and proposed that the disarmament efforts should be so designed that the "close connection between disarmament and development gets full recognition."¹⁶

In the year 1978 the United Nations convened a Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament. The Final Document of this Session once again underlined the emerging truth of the "close relationship between disarmament and development".

^{16.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/32/88; Sales No.E.78.IX.1.pp73,74.
16. Document of the Tarth facility field of the Occupation Assembly Para 1 and 17.

It said: "The progress in the former would help greatly in the realization of later." It further said, "The hundreds of billions of dollars spent annually on the manufacture and improvement of weapons are in sombre and drastic contrast to the want and poverty in which the 2/3rd of the world live."¹⁷

Thus we find that by the end of 1970s the ground-work had already been accomplished and it was appropriate time for the United Nations to appoint another Group of Experts whose Study was to prove a historic milestone in the efforts of world community for establishing the linkage between disarmament and development. This Group was headed by famous Swedish ambassador Ms. Inga Thorsson and its Report is now popularly known as Inga Thorsson Reort.

^{17.} The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly Para 16 and 17.

CHAPTER III

INGA THORSSON REPORT

On 5th October, 1981, the Secretary-General of the United Nations submitted a report entitled "STUDY ON THE RELATION-SHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT" to the General Assembly at its 36th Session. The study had been done by a group of Governmental Experts from 27 Member-States chaired by The Group had been set up by the Secretary General Ms. Thorsson. in accordance with a request from the General Assembly.¹ At its next session the General Assembly adopted Resolution 37/84 in which it inter alia urged the Member-States to consider the appropriate measures in accordance with the relevant recommendations of Inga Thorsson Report. This Resolution also determined that the question of re-allocation and conversion of resources releathrough disarmament measures from military to civilian pursed should be included in the provisional agenda of the General poses Assembly at intervals to be decided upon, starting with the 40th regular session.

This report is the most comprehensive work covering almost every aspect of the relationship between disarmament and development. It was the first attempt "to investigate systematically and in depth the range of relationships between the prospects for balanced and sustainable global economic and social development on the one hand and disarmament on the other...."² It was an

^{1.} The Final Document of the General Assembly's Tenth Special Session, Para 94.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981,. Page 12, Para 21.

"investigation into the contribution that disarmament could make towards facilitating the changes and adjustments needed to put the global economy on path of sustainable growth and development." The Group was also confident that their work shall "enhance the climate and political will for disarmament efforts by clarifying their economic and social costs and benefits."³

The Group, to begin with, rejected the conventional views on this relationship which believed in issuing moral appeals that "it is wrong to squander resources on armaments while the basic needs of so many people remain unmet" and in putting forward "the dramatic contrast between armament expenditures and unmet needs," or in showing that "for whatever reasons a state of over armament existed so that some reallocation of resources could be accomplished without raising concerns about security".

The Group felt that that desirable and necessary reordering of global priorities in resource allocations had not taken place. According to this Group therefore "one could conclude that regrettably, this broadly moral and logical argument for encouraging disarmament for the sake of development has not in itself been sufficiently compelling to outweigh the concerns with military security."⁴ During the last 30 years of the existence of the United Nations, there had been no lack of attempts to establish this linkage between disarmament and development. There had been in fact many General Assembly resolutions, reports and various conferences and special sessions concerning these issues. However,

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 14, Para 30.

^{4.} Ibid Page 17, Para 40.

the Inga Thorson Group found that all these exhortions called upon morality only which could not outweigh the national security concerns. Such moral appeals in view of the Group had no hope of being heard in future where human-kind "confronted with new technological, economic and social challenges that were being made further difficult by unabated arms race."⁵

However, the Group noted that "more recently there have been changes from these (conventional) views". It discussed various emerging arguments about the relationship. It cited examples of United Nations ;document No.ST/ECA/174 (Alva Myrdal report) which had shown a 'perceptible' distinction by trying to establish that there "exists a deep incompatibility between the arms race and the economic and social needs and aspirations of the peoples of the world." The Group also saw the emerging trends where "systematic attention (was being) paid to the proposals for agreements on the reduction of military budgets. Various UN studies referred to in the last Chapter had lent support to these arguments. The Alva Myrdal Report itelf had rejected all existing disarmment agreements as having at best only "forestalled" "military expenditures without effecting any actual reductions of military budgets." Similarly some more recent investigations had been cited as having done detailed and specific studies on various issues of conversion and possibilities of re-employment of resources released by disarmament. From these Inga Thorsson Group thus concluded that

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 14; Para 31.

"since the process of arms accumulation and of development both require large scale human and material resources and since resources are limited, the pursuit for either tends to deprive the other."⁶ That is to say that both are in a competitive relationship and the world does not have the option of choosing both of them.

The Concept of Security:

Discussing various aspects of National Security that had been compelling nations to neglect the moral appeals of the conventional approach, the Group underlined that military security was in itself a narrow and out-dated view of national security. Security according to the Group was a concept "wider than that of military security alone. Economic as well as social aspects of this problem are of great importance. Moreover the spectrum of factors which may aggrevate the threats to security and their relative urgency is not static but subject to continual evolitionary change. This being the case the central political functions at both national and international levels is to continuously assess whether the available human and material resources are being disposed in a rational manner given the known and foreseable threats and challenges to security."

At this juncture the Group examined the emerging, primary and inter-related challenges to international security. In the coming decades according to this Group "international peace and security are no longer threatened exclusively by the competition

7. Ibid Page 19, Para 43.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 15; Para 31.

between East and West although their competition in armaments can be considered the greatest threat to peace and security. Rather the Group thought "it has become apparent that the future security for all the nations will be challenged by factors as declining prospects of economic growth, by varieties of physical limitations and by tensions arising from the increasingly inequitable distribution of world wealth.

Similarly the Group felt that it may be that at individual level "security from external attack and internal disorder is (regarded as) an essential pre-requisite for sustained development" but from the "global standpoint the attempts by the States individually to provide for their military security can result in widespread frustration and is now widely acknowledged to have done so."⁸ With the increasing interactions and interdependence among nations the security of one lies in the security of all. Armed defence is only an expression of deeper political differences among States and instead of solving any issues it only further complicates them.

Emerging intense specialisation and secrecy in the area of national defence are other two major challenges to international peace. The long lead-time and gestation period of weapon systems compel a nation to "focus its attention not so much on the capabilities of the weapons the opponent already has but on the capabilities of those he might be able to deploy 5 or 10 years

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 20, Para 45.

in future.⁹ All this only intensifies commitments to military investments to attain more destructive and yet fail-safe defence.

Equally threatening is the increasing capability and sophistication of conventional weapons, particularly because they are often over-looked as less imminent danger to international peace. Economically also these weapons consume as much as 80 percent of the total world expenditure on armaments. According to the Group the multitudes of arms races and regional and local conflicts which have been made feasible by those conventional weapons have caused great destruction of men and material. Besides, these races and conflicts "amount to a continuous fluctuations with the supreme danger - the risk of escalation to the nuclear level."¹⁰

Non-Military Aspects of Security:

According to this Group, military threats were however only one aspect of national security. There were also various other major non-military threats to international peace and security. The non-military threats as explained in the report included "the pronounced and almost universal drop in average rates of economic growth, looking scarcities of many vital raw-materials and commodities, mounting concern over the long term effects of an environmental degradation and pursuasive demands for a more just and equitable distribution of world's wealth and opportunity".¹¹

The juxta-position of prevailing economic habits and rates of population growth, with supplies of energy, raw-materials

^{9.} The United Nation General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 21, Para 47.

^{10.} Ibid Page 25 Para 57.

^{11.} Ibid Page 26, Para 60.

food and the capacity of the environment to withstand abuse had already revealed a host of internal inconsistancies. The Group felt that the "world is on a course that cannot be sustained," and that "the changes that these physical constraints dictate are so far reaching and will take so long to effect (that) even under optimum conditions, we must consider taking the first steps to be an immediate priority.¹²

The Group had done detailed and comprehensive studies on the role of land industrial capacity, raw-materials and the research and development activity in the existing military buildup and the possibilities of their conversion to civilian sector. However, their data had its limitations e.g.; non-availability of data, distortions in the available data, difficulties of applying common definitions and classifications to the data from different countries etc. The Group itself expressed the view that data on the "Utilization of air, water and space for military purposes is not adequately documented."¹³

Labour:

The Military consumes only able bodied, educated and skilled labour who may be serving as airmen, sailors, soldiers, beaucrats, scientists, engineers or general workers. Most of these men, except highly specialised scientists could easily be employed in the civilian sector. Besides, governments can also regulate military consumption of civilian goods as after all these consumers

13. Ibid Page 46, Para 108.

^{12.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981, Page 26, Para 61.

even after their transfer to civilian sector continue to be part of society.

Industrial Production

Apart from few industries which may be producing artillary shells or those manufacturing tanks most of other industries supply to both military and civilian customers though in case of former the varient might often reflect more stringent requirments as regards quality, precision and reliability. However, with increasing specialisation the military industries are becoming less and less relevant to civilian needs.

Oil and Minerals:

Military demands for oil and minerals has been increasing faster than demands from the non-military sector. When the research in altrnative resources of energy is extremely slow military consumption of petroleum has reached 75 per cent of its total fuel consumption. Such a dependence has to be treated in face of the fact that most of these oils and minerals are geographically concentrated in certain areas and that man-made problems like political rifts can cause discontinuities in supply lines which may have very dangerous consequences.

Land:

Owing to the increase in the size of standing armies and particularly due to the rapid p ace of technological improvements in the range and speed of weapon-systems as also due

to the increase in the number of countries owning these weapons, the military demand for land has been increasing constantly. However, the supply of land remains the same. Apart from few landscapes, particularly nuclear test sites, which have been seriously degraded, most of land will be equally useful for civilian pursuits.

Research and Development:

With the extraordinary pace of change in weapons technology, which has often raced ahead of strategy and tactics, the bifurcation of civilian and military technologies has widened further. Though military R and D might have few civilian spin-offs, but that serves no justification. These sources should be directly employed to civilian research.

Pointing to these inherent handicaps of international systems where military demand for resources is rising uncontrolled as more armaments create more insecurity and more insecurity necessitates more armaments, the report said that "the fact remains, however, that at the international level, there exists, no automatic market mechanism whereby the existence of unmet economic and social needs is transformed into a claim on resources devoted to armaments."¹⁴ Thus the growing mismatch amongst ever inceasing human needs, man's capacity to exploit earth's resources – both renewable and non-renewable – and earth's capacity to bear with such an abuse are only further intensifying the crises. "The common sense demands", said the Report "that nations coordinate

^{14.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 19, Para 41.

their efforts on both sides of scale to achieve a sustainable balance, that is, to both increase the efficiency of economic activity and to adjust economic and social habits and consumption pattern to conform with resource scarcities and ecological limitations."¹⁵

However, the Group disclosed that "describing the negative effects of the global military efforts as socially harmful, economically unjustifiable, politically counter-productive, ecologically hazarduous and morally intolerable has by now become a familiar theme...." And the fact that despite "these repeated warnings a seemingly endless arms race continues to consume massive volumes of human, material and financial resources.....cannot be attributed to the lack of political volition."¹⁶ "The political volition itself" the Group felt, "is both a factor and a consequence of its economic environment which is beginning to show unmistakable signs of unprecedented strain accumulated under the past patterns of source of utilisation."¹⁷

The uncontrolled and unprecedented arms build-up obviously have a great bearing on our uncertain economic prospects and such an uncertainity reinforces only needed for more armaments. These crises of an unprecedented waste have to be seen in the background of a simple known fact that most of our vital energy sources and other important minerals are scarce and exhaustible. And even in this kind of cases where no such immediate physical limits are in sight it does not preclude man-made conditions of scarcity. For example, most of mineral resources are geographically

17. Ibid Page 73, Para 170.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A.36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 29, Para 70.

^{16.} Ibid Page 73, Para 173.

concentrated in few parts of the globe and often these areas particularly in case of industrial raw-materials - are not the centres of productions from those minerals. Often centres of consumptions may still be different. Thus these "economic and physical scarcities in the world full of declared and undeclared conflicts can easily result in military and other confrontations leading to pressures for incurring new forms of additional allocations for military activities."¹⁸ Resources of the Persian Gulf can be cited as an example as to why the Indian ocean is so heavily militarized todav. According to Global 2000 Report, the potential conflict over fresh water alone is underscored by the fact that out of the two hundred major river basins of the world, 148 are shared by two countries and 52 are shared by three to ten countries. Disarmament therefore is an absolute imperative for human survival.

э

The Report underlined that most of the future projections of the developmental process "admit the urgency of meeting the twin challenge of alleviating absolute poverty and providing gainful employment to the growing labour force.....Poverty and unemployment are universally known invitations for social unrest and political instability."¹⁹ The Report suggested that since all the "military expenditures are Government expenditure any reduction in these expenditures may, on the one hand, promote Government consumption and investment for overall economic and social development, on the other hand, as a result of tax reductions private consumption and investment may also be promoted."²⁰

 The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981, Page 74, Para 177.
 Ibid, Page 78 Para 185.
 Ibid Page 76, Para 181.

Group's Report The Inga Thorsson had specifically examined in detail the prospects of disarmament in the developing countries. It explained that "for many developing countries in the early stages of their national independence the concern for survival constitues a major consideration to their national military But the "purely economic costs of their weapon imports outlays." are made heavier by the political burdens of absorbing a large number of technical personnel...with the explicit political inhibitions that the importing country could not use these weapons unless its military and political objectives were at least endorsed, if not shared, by the supplier country.²¹ Similarly a higher degree of vulnerability to such political and cultural peneterations by weapon supplying nations is characterized by the emergence of export enclaves, patterns of uneven development, creating social tension and political unrest.

For these developing countries, the report felt "the short term consequences of reduction in their military outlays may be less clear-cut" as countries providing military aid may not spontaneously convert it into economic aid. Also for some of them, especially those with unutilized and under utilized resources", the resources constraint may not be felt so soon. But all these efforts will have great "catalytic effects which may eventually produce a global politico-strategic climate more conducive to military restraints."²² Conversion of released military installations and manpower in case of developing countries will also

22. Ibid Page 100; Para 232.

40,

^{21.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 92 Para 219.

be easier as these are not highly specialised or uniquelly meant for weapon echnology alone. Also the report felt that "conversion and redeployment is not phenomena associated uniquelly with disarmament.... actors of production (even otherwise) must respond continuously to the development of new production techniques phasing out the old ones...."²³

Disarmament Fund Development:

As early as 1955, the establishment of an International Fund for Development and Mutual Assistance was proposed by French Prime Minister Edgar Faure. The proposed Fund was to be part of a comprehensive 'draft agreement on the financial supervision of disarmament and allocation for peaceful purposes of the funds made available by the Disarmament Commission in Geneva'.

In March, 1956, the Soviet Union proposed that a special fund for assistance to developing countries be established to be financed through military budget reductions. In 1969 Brazil submitted a working paper to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva entitled "Application of Savings on Military Expenditures" which called for the establishment of an International Conversion and Economic Development Fund. In 1973 the General Assembly adopted at the initiative of the Soviet Union a resolution calling for a 10 per cent reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council and the allocation of 10 per cent of funds thus saved for the social and economic development in the developing countries.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981, Page 109; Para 245.

A number of similar proposals were made at the 10th Special Session of the General Assembly. For instance, President Seneghor of Senegal proposed that a tax on armaments should be instituted based on the military budgets of States. Similarly President Giscard D'Estaing of France proposed the establishment of an International Disarmament Fund for Development. His proposal envisioned the Fund as a new United Nations Specialised Agency which would constitute a practical manifestation of disarmamentdevelopment relationship. Contributors to the Fund were to be those States which were both most heavily armed and most developed, beneficiaries were to be those who were least heavily armed and least developed.

From its studies of all these proposals the Group observed that broadly there have been three major approaches in all these attempts at building a Disarmament Fund for Development. First, the Disarmament Dividend Approach believed that the process of disamament would release resources which could be brought under the United Nations and utilised for Development purposes. However, the Group felt that this approach was not quite practicable because "most of agreements on Disarmament which have so far been reached in the life time of the United Nations have released few, if any, actual resources." Second, the Armament Levy Approachwanted to tax military budgets of member states. This approach was also not quite feasible as apart from lacking an authority that could impose such taxes there were other practical problems of providing uniform definitions of military expenditures

etc. Third was the Voluntary Contributions Approach. The Group concluded that at least initially only such an approach can be successful though when the Fund comes into being it might attempt taxing the military spendings thereby helping in generating a disarmament dividend.

Conclusions:

In its conclusion the Report said, "World can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed towards a more stable and balanced economic development, within a more sustainable economic and political order. It cannot do both."²⁴

The Report further acknowledged that "the true foundation of a national security is a strong and healthy economy but evidence is well nigh over-whelming that the contemporary military establishment significantly distorts and undermines the bases for a sustained economic and social development.²⁵ The Group further stated that "the arms race not only claims resources but also influences the scope and content of international economic cooperation. To the extent that achievements in new international economic order are effected by the dynamics of the arms race, the relationship between disarmament and development involves more than a contrast between the resources claimed by military activities and the basic unmet needs...."²⁶ Therefore all these attempts at seeking reallocation of resources from military to civilian sector should first

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981, Page 161, Para 391.
 Ibid Page 171, Para 426

^{26.} Ibid Page 162, Para 395.

demonstrate that that all these needs for reallocation are equally in the interest of all the social-systems irrespective of their current levels of development. Accordingly, the Group recommended that all the Governments should "urgently undertake studies to identify and to publicise that benefits that would be derived from the reallocation of military resources....."²⁷

The Report suggested that reports on short-term and long-term costs of armaments should be periodically updated and publicised to keep the public well informed and vigilant. The developing countries, the Report felt, were still in the urgent greater allocations to meet the expanding demands of their need growing populations. Similarly the developed world had begun to confront the cumulative results of its past patterns of consumption. It stressed for political commitment which it thought would come easily if the disarmament efforts could be explained in terms of the National Interest.

The Group also recommended the establishment of a Disarmament Fund for Development and wanted the United Nations to further explore its administrative and technical modalities. Finally, it recommended that the Secretary General should "take appropriate action through the existing inter-agency mechanisms of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, to foster and coordinate the incorporation of disarmament and development as a perspective in the programmes and activities of the United Nations Systems."²⁸

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/36/356 dated 5th October, 1981; Page 172; Para 426.
 Ibid Page 175, Para 426 (7)

The publication of this Report had tremendous impact on the future studies of United Nations. In the following Chapter we will discuss how the UN studies, following the Inga Thorsson Report, continued to endorse and appreciate its arguments and conclusions. Even when some of these studies were only remotely related to disarmament-development issues they did incorporate the impressive assertions which the Inga Thorsson Report had first discovered for them. It also strengthened the confidence of developing nations and emphasised the interdependence of countries which could not find any national solutions to the problems, which confront the international community as a whole.

North States

CHAPTER IV

OTHER UNITED NATIONS EFFORTS

The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 37/84 had, alongwith adopting and commending the Inga Thorsson Report, given a Call for Action under which the Secretary General's Office issued detailed questionnaire to member states. However, at the political level of individual nations the response could not be very enthusiastic. Accordingly, very few countries responded to the UN questionnaire. In fact it was only one country - Sweden - which actually initiated a study by experts.

Notwithstanding this unimpressive political response, the Report was to have a great impact on the world of academicians and journalists, as well as on future United Nations Studies and other international forums. For instance, the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs had, in cooperation with the Organisation of African Unity, organised a Conference at Lome (Togo) on "Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa" held during 13th to 15th August, 1985. The declaration adopted at this Conference laid particular stress on the concept of security that it thought "must go beyond military security and the prevention of armed conflicts" and should encompass a sustained commitment by the States to national bilateral and multilateral programmes of socioeconomic development, justice, equity and human dignity". Similarly on 3rd February, 1986 a "South American Commission for Peace, Regional Security and Democracy" was organised with its aim to achieve "a balanced reduction of armaments expenditures, diverting parts of arms spending into foreign debt and development." Also there was great change over the years in the frequency and tenure of General Assembly resolutions seeking to explain and emphasize the relationship between Disarmament and Development. A list of General Assembly Resolution since 1971 is contained in Annexure II.

In the present Chapter we will study the four major United Nations Reports which have had a direct bearing on the issues of disarmament - development. These are:

- a) Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and Military Expenditures; Report of Secretary General, 1982;
- b) Study on Conventional Disarmament: Report of Secretary General, 1984;
- c) Study on the Concepts of Security: Report of Secretary General, 1985; and
- d) Report on the World Social Situation by Commission on Social Development, 1985.

Though the later three reports were not directly dealing with the issues of disarmament and development they have

been included in the present chapter because they contain some significant points which confirm the disarmament-development relationship.

1. Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and Military Expenditures:

Beginning with 1962 the United Nations has periodically been updating its reports on Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and Military Expenditures. The one preceding the report of 1982 was submitted by the Secretary General to the General Assembly in 1978.¹ According to this report "more than 2/3rds of the 82 importers of weapons among the developing countries are known to have arrangements with the exporters which go beyond the purely physical service associated with an act of arms transfer, for example, military assistance programme, direct and indirect transfer of hardware, training courses for the military personnel provisions for military bases, naval facilities and listing posts and tacit or explicit understanding for political and military support in situations of internal unrest in or external threat to recipient country"². In such a scenario depending on the terms of transfer, the supportive equipment and services entailed with these arms imports "have demonstrably made most of their receipients extremely vulnerable to their external environment. Political threats perceptions external to the recipient country's social structures, dependency patterns militating against the nationalistic urge for self reliance and

^{1.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/32/88/Rev.1 dated December, 1978

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/37/88/386 dated December, 1982; para 47.

Report felt, "have been incomparably larger than civilian spinoffs from military research."⁷

At the international level the report concluded that trade in armaments has an opposite effect on the economies of importing and exporting countries. What is involved is "a highly unequal exchange, detrimental in particular to the efforts to bridge the gap between poor and rich countries. For the importer of arms it is, in pure economic terms, a waste of surplus which could have been used productively. Even when weapons are provided as gifts, there are maintenance, operation and infrastructure costs to be included on the debit side. In contrast to the import of civilian goods these outlays raise neither consumption nor production and generate to future output from which to pay for them. Not so far the exporting countries...its production of weapons for export...may in fact be more advantageous than other kind of exports because of advanced technology components... These exports therefore", the Report discovered, "tend to stimulate important sectors of economy of exporting countries - in this way the importing countries are subsidizing the military R&D in arms exporting countries - importing countries are thus helping to perpetuate the lead in military technology of the main arms exporting countries.....".8 Thus the Report proved that unless there is some miraculous change in existing trends of the qualitative and quantitative escalations of arms research and production, the increasing allocation of men and material to this destructive process

^{7.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/32/88 dated December, 1978;Para 99

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/37/386 dated December, 1982; Para 76.

technological choices marginally relevant to the predominantly agricultural economies constitute some of the costs of arms imports which can not be documented or reduced to statistics."³

The report emphasised the fact that in scenario where bulk of nation States are coping with the population explosion, the food crisis and the devastations of natural disasters and wars, "the problems of eradicating poverty and of improving standards of health, nutrition, education and housing have reached a stage of crisis... No less important are the problems as those of industrialisation and growth of developing countries of combating the degradation of environment, of developing new sources of enery and raw-materials while preserving presently available resources, of halting the degradation of cities and many others."⁴ In a world of over-straining needs and scarce resources the wasteful expenditure on armaments stands in direct competition with investment and research in civil expenditure.

In their conclusion the Group stated that "of all the human and material consumption by the military activities none could match the enormity and the distorted orientation of the world wide expenditues on R and D.⁵ The Global military R and D expenditures in 1980 were equal to the combined R and D investments for basic research, energy, health, transportation, information-processing, pollution-control, agricultural and other similar civilian areas. For space research alone,

5. Note 3 para 60.

^{3.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.4/37/386 dated December, 1982, Para 101

^{4.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/32/88 dated December, 1978, Para 57

which accounted for 8 per cent of world wide R and D expenditures, over 90 per cent was geared to military purpose. These destortions were not limited to uneven distribution only. The Report discovered that this "Concentration on unproductive armaments production is, however, often accompanied by heavy subsidization of civilian projects in such fields as aerospace, even though their social utility may be limited and their marketing prospects be poor".⁶ Therefore these distortions in the economy and the squandering and misallocating of resources to which the military efforts and perceived compulsions give rise, is in such cases of civilian budget, much larger than military budgets might lead one to expect."

"The basic fact of an enormous diversion of resources", the report said, "have been disguised by excessive claims about the importance of civilian spin-offs from military R&D. A limited number of examples, always the same, are cited to prove the case; nuclear power, air transportation, radar, space technology and a few more. Yet a sober assessment indicates that the claims are grossly exaggerated and even the standard examples are not all that convincing. In fact it is remarkable how may inventions of civilian production techniques, in materials, in power generation, engines and appliances, in all fields of surface transportation and in communication owe absolutely nothing of their origin, and very little, if anything, of their subsequent development to military even if they were often adopted to military requirements R&D at a later stage. Military Spin-offs from civilian research", the

6. The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/32/88 dated December, 1978; Para:

was bound to continue. The increasing competition between military and civilian demands seems to be getting out of hand. The Report said that this "Escalation in the arms race would not only add to the gravity of existing resource constraints but also highten the dangers of resource related tensions erupting into open conflicts. Apprehensions in this regard the Report cautioned, "cannot be easily dismissed because the post Second World War period has already witnessed several military conflicts involving resources whether they be minerals, ore, water or fish..."⁹

2. Study on Conventional Disarmament:

This study had been carried out by a Group of Experts so appointed by the Secretary-General pursuant of General Assembly's Resolution 36/97 dated 9th December, 1981. The Report was placed before General Assembly in December, 1984.

The Report made it abundantly clear that because of the nuclear threats to human race, as a whole, measures of nuclear disarmament deserved to receive the highest priority. Yet it noted that since the end of the Second World War over 20 million (in 1981) people have lost their lives in some 150 armed conflicts and that the existing trends did not give any reason to believe that there would be any decrease in the incidence and severity of such engagemnts. Therefore, conventional disarmament also deserved equally high priority. The Report also underlined the fact that over four-fifth of the world's total expenditure for military purposes is spent on conventional arms and armed

^{9.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/37/386 dated December, 1982; Para 76.

forces.

The Report noted that "Poor social-economic conditions of the world, especially over large parts of it, are a source of injustice and can be viewed as a matter of strategic concern from the point of view of international peace and security."¹⁰ It added: "The argument that increased military expenditure generates employment and that it spurs scientific and technological development are essentially misleading. Whatever the short-term effects of military expenditure may be, they cannot be regarded legitimate justification for continuing the arms build-up or for maintaining high levels of military investment".¹¹

These Experts believed that the "global expenditure on arms and armed forces represents a massive consumption oF resources for potentially destructive purpose in stark contrast to the urgent needs for social and economic development, for which many of these resources might otherwise had been used."¹²

Study on the Concepts of Security:

Persuant to the General Assembly Resolution 31/188H, the Secretary General had appointed a Group of Governmental Experts to undertake "a comprehensive study of the concepts of security.....aimed at preventing the arms race, building confidence in relations between states enhancing the possibility of reaching agreements on arms limitations and disarmament and promoting

3.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/39/348 dated December, 1984, Para 93.

^{11.} Ibid Para 95.

^{12.} Ibid Para 185.

political and economic security."

The Report submitted by this Group noted that the present world was suffering from a widespread "lack of protection against the consequences of environmental degradation and natural calamities such as floods and drought" and that the developing countries in particular are facing the dilema where "without a measure of economic and political stability development is difficult to achieve, while without development it is difficult to establish and maintain order."¹³

It was pointed out that "Given the growing economic and political links of interdependence between the developed and developing regions, security concerns of developing countries increasingly influence the entire international system."¹⁴ Accordingly, the Group felt that "Security policies can no longer be defined merely as absence of war but mus deal effectively with the broader and more complex questions of inter-relationships between military and non-military elements of Security."¹⁵

4. Report on World Social Situation:

On the occasion of the 40th Commemorative session of the United Nation General Assembly in 1985 the Commission on Social Development was entrusted with the responsibility of presenting its updated report on the World Social Situation. Though it is a hurriedly compiled Report, as often happens in such circumstances, there is no dearth of material and analysis in it. The

15. Ibid Para 214 (3)

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/40/553 dated December, 1985; Para 86 and 63.

^{14.} Ibid Para 85.

following observations contained in the report pertain to the link between disarmament and development:

"When military spending rises and its adverse effect on the budget or current account positions are felt by the developed nations, their willingness and ability to provide aid for the economic and social development of the developing countries declines. Furthermore, if increases in the military spending is accompanied by increase in global tensions, aid can be expected to be given more in the form of military than economic assistance and to be concentrated on countries that are thought to be strategically important." That is why the Report felt that "the choice between social and economic development and armaments is perhaps most clearly made in allocating foreign exchange to military against other import."

CHAPTER - V

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

The genesis of this Conference goes as far back as 1983 when the Indian Prime Minister and Chairperson of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Shrimati Indira Gandhi had given a call to all the heads of state or government to assemble at New York on the eve of the UN General Assembly's 38th Annual Session and to affirm their solidarity and commitment to strengthening the United Nation Organisation. More than 40 heads of states or government had responded to her call. PresidentFrancois Mitterand of France was one of the distinguished persons responding to her request. It was here, during his speech that President Mitterand had, for the first time, proposed that a Conference on Disarmament and Development be held under the aegis of the JN and had as well offered to host this Conference in Paris. This suggestion was promptly followed by the General Assembly which in its very next session adopted on 17th December, 1984, its Resolution 39/160 which inter alia gave a call to convene such an international conference. The Resolution read "The General Assembly...Decides to convene an international Conference on the Relationship between Disarmanent and Development, which should be preceed by thorough preparation ind should take decision by consensus."

The issues that this Conference was expected to deliberate upon according to the aforesaid Resolution included:

- "a) To review the relationship between Disarmament and Development in all its aspects and dimensions with a view to reaching appropriate conclusions;
- "b) To undertake an examination of the implications of the level of magnitude of the continuing military expenditures, in particular those of nuclear'weapon states and other militarily important states, for the world economy and international economic and social situation, particularly for the developing countries, and make recommendations for remedial measures;
- "c) To consider ways and means of releasing additional resources, through disarmament measures, for development purposes, in particular in favour of developing countries....."

The Secretary General as directed by the General Assembly Resolution 39/160 had set up a Preparatory Committee for the Internation Conference consisting of members from 44 member states which was expected to formulate and submit to the General Assembly at its 40th Session, recommendations as to the "provisional agenda, procedure, place, date and duration of the conference." The Preparatory Committee later elected Mr. Muchkund Dubey of India as its Chairman.

Later the General Assembly at its 40th Session, accepted the recommendations made by Preparatory Committee and adopted Resolution 40/155 on 16th December, 1985 providing tht "International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development should be held in Paris from 15th July to 2nd August, 1986." It is also appointed Mr. Jan Martenson, Under Secretary General, Department of Disarmament Affairs, as the Secretary General of the Conference.

The Preparatory Committee of the Conference had held its two sittings in 1985 and was preparing for its final sitting in April 1986 when there was a change of Government in France. The rightist government of Jacqus Chirac sent a note¹, to the UN Secretary General suggesting for a postponement of the Conference on the plea that as adequate preparations could not be made, its success was not certain.

The actual reasons, however, were quite different. Right from the inception of this idea to hold a Conference on Disarmament and Development, the Reagan admiinistration had declared its intentions of not participating in the prepartion work of the Conference. Moreover it had been putting pressures on its friends and allies to follow this line. Rightist organisations like the Heritage Foundation had launched a campaign which depicted the proposed Conference as a platform for Soviet propaganda. The new government in France lost all interest in holding the Conference.

Anyway it was not possible in such a situation to hold this conference at another venue on the scheduled dates. Inspite of this set-back, the Preparatory Committee held its third sitting as was scheduled. It recommended the General Assembly to decide at its resumed 40th Session to postpone the Conference to 1987 and at its 41st Session to fix the specific dates in 1987 as also the venue of the conference.² Accordingly at its 40th Session the General Assembly accepted this recommendation to postpone the conference until 1987.³

1. 1. 1.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/CONF/130/PC/3 dated December, 1986.
 The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/40/131 dated Dc., 1986.

^{3.} The United Nations General Assembly Document No.40/473 dated Dec., 1986.

Similarly at its 41st Session the General Assembly decided "to hold the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 24th August to 11th September ¹⁹⁸⁷, "⁴ It also decided to extend the tenure ;of the Preparatory Committee of the Conference allowing it to have one more (fourth) session.

fin see

The Preparatory Committee held its fourth session during April - May, 1987. Here, the Preparatory Committee had before it background papers with a variety of views on the relationship between disarmament and development. Moreover, according to the General Assembly Resolution 40/155 its sessions were to be opened to all States and Non-governmental Organisations. Obviously the task of the Preparatory Committee to prepare a final draft of recommendations for this Confereence was quite stupendous. However, it succeeded in drafting the final declaration quite in time which was adopted without a vote at its 6th plenary meeting of its 4th session held on Ist May, 1987.

Finally, the Conference was held as scheduled. India was conferred th-e honour of chairing this Conference. Mr. K. Natwar Singh, India's Minister of State for External Affairs, was elected President of the Conference. It was the first such occasion since Dr. Homi Bhabha was elected in 1955 as Chairman of the UN Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. It also placed on the Indian delegation

4.

The United Nations General Assembly Document No.41/422 dated Dec., 1986.

the responsibility of making the Conference a success. The Conference Some 30 to 40 countries was attended by more than 155 countries. were represented at ministerial level and all others, except Britain, were represented by their ambassadors. Around 500 NGOs participated and a large number of them were from the United in the Conference The Reagan Administration, however, boycotted the Conference States. and expressed "serious doubts about the existence of any link between disarmament and development in the context of the agenda of the Conference." This resentful attitude of the Reagan administration did not surprise many. It only further confirmed the Reagan administration policies towards the United Nations : its withdrawl from UNESCO, its criticisms of the functioning of the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agricultural Organisation or International Atomic Energy Agency.

In the absence of the United States, Great Britain and West Germany took a leading part in presenting Western perspectives. They were emphatic about the importance of disarmament and development as two distinct processes but rejected any attempts at establishing any inter-relationship between them. These powers also tried their best to distort and dilute the thrust of the draft document that was presented by the Preparatory Committee of the Conference. For example during the deliberations of the working groups they tabled over 150 amendments to the draft.

These powers were of the view that disarmament, at least in the initial stages, would cause only additional burden of dismantling, supervision and varifications etc. According to Prof. M. Zuberi who was himself a participant at this Conference, "The main points raised in these presentations were on emphasis on the crucial importance of security in the context of disarmanent and development, reminders of the large amount of aid for development purposes, which these countries had disbursed, the greater importance of conventional disarmament, as they contended, nuclear weapons have consumed only 20 percent of military expenditures, a plaintive admonition of how the poor countries were squandering away their precious resources on arms imports and a repeated reiteration of the benefits of the longest period of peace in their recent history for which they seemed to be grateful to the existence of the nuclear weapons."⁵

15 48 354

Here Prof. Zuberi raises a very basic question: "If nuclear deterrence had such a beneficial effect on the industrialised world, why should these benefits be denied to the comparatively impoverished segments of humanity (the developing countries."⁶

The US protogonists who have been over-emphasing the national security concerns have at the same time conveniently overlooked non-military threats to their security. The British delegate

Prof.M.Zuberi's "Swords and Plough Shares" in V.D.Chopra Ed.Disarmament and Development (Delhi 1988) pp.20.
 Ibid pp.20.

#]

Mr. John Birch in his speech said: "Security is a prerequisite both for real progress in disarmament and for a rapid pace of economic development". And he noted that "As long as we perceive a military threat to our security we shall spend as much as we consider necessary to ensure against that threat. Such defence expenditure will always have first claim...." But nowhere in his speech did he mention the non-military consequences of the research and development, production and deployment of weapons to ensure their military security. This only proves that the very understanding of the Western Powers about national security and therefore about disarmament and development, is partial and distorted.

According to V.D. Chopra this distorted understanding, which does not ensure security of even their protogonists is very much a deliberate manipulation. He gives two reasons why even in face of any conflict being sucidal these powers continue to support the policy of national security with arms build-up. "The first and the most evident reason," according to him, "is the appetite of the American military-industrial complex unwilling under any circumstances to lose fabulous profits it reaps from arms deals." And the "second reason" according to him, "is the attempt to wear out USSR's economy through arms race and thus weaken it."⁷

7.

V.D.Chopra's "The New York Conference' in h/is Edited Book "DIARMAMENT AND DEVELOP-MENT (Delhi 1988) pp.51.

However, notwithstanding the fact th these protogonists of national-security-in-arms-build-up did not have many sympathisers in their own countries and perhaps none amongst Socialist or Third World countries they still succeeded in making the deliberations difficult and finally in distorting the very thrust of the Final Document. mese distortions were aptly described in the Mexican delegate's remark: "What Ambassador Dubey had presented to us was a peacock with manycoloured feathers, but what we have ot now is a plucked chicken."⁸ Compared to the Draft Document presented by the Preparatory Committee, the Final Document contained too many references to security. It virtually looks like a Document on 'Security, Disarmament and Development' thereby giving expression to the western attempts at giving security precedence over disarmament and development. The Final Document also deleted figures on arms expenditures as it does not mention that the annual world military expenditure as well as foreign debt of developing countries both today stand at the astronomical figures of one There is no mention of a Disarmament Fund for trillion US dollars. development. Similarly the Final Document does not have any mention of the conversion problems and potential. It's Action Programme which was supposed to be followed step-by-step has lost its thrust.

It is not that there was no one to fight back. The Socialist Countries who were though not very loud in criticising the arms-buildup were broadly sympathetic to the purpose of this Conference. They

8. Prof.M.Zuberi's "Swords and Ploughshares" in V.D.Chopra's Ed. "DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT" (Delhi 1988) pp.22.

formally proposed a Summit level meeting of Security Council to discuss the relationship between disarmament and development. The Non-aligned Group led by Zimbabwe was highly critical of all the attempts at distorting the established relationship between disarmament and development and did in the end record its reservations about the Final Document. According to Prof. Zuberi, "For the continuation of the struggle for disarmament and development, it was crucial to have a concensus document at the end of this Conference. Failure of the Conference would have been a set-back to the campaign which had been carried on at various levels in the past."⁹

Let us now examine what was achieved at this historic conference.

The Preamble of the Final Document of the Conference declared that "Disarmament and development are two of the most urgent challenges facing the world today. They constitute priority concerns of the international community in which all the nations – developed and developing, big and small, nuclear and non-nuclear – have a common and equal stake. Disarmament and development are two pillars on which enduring international peace and security can be built."⁻¹⁰ It also underlined that "the United Nations has thus a central role to play for the promotion of both disarmament and development."¹¹

Speaking on the relationship between disarmament and development while it did endorse the conventional arguments that both

- ment and Development held at New York during August-September, 1987, hereinaftr called only Final Document; Para 2.
- 11. Ibid Para 1.

Prof.M.Zuberi's "Swords and Ploughshares" in V.D.Chopra Ed. "DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOP-MENT" (Delhi 1988) pp.22.
 Final Document of the Internatioal Conference on the Relationship between Disarma-

are "distinct processes" aiming at strengthening international peace and security and promoting prosperity and that "Each should be persued vigorously regardless of the progress in the other" and that "one should not be made hostage to the other", it also emphasises that both ha a "close and multi-dimensional relationship" and that "Each of them can have an impact at the national, regional and international level in such a way as to create an environment conducive to the promotion of the other."¹²

At its elementary level, said the Final Document, disarmament and development have a clean and direct relationship where the arms race and development both "compete for the same finite resources at both the national and international level" and where the "allocation of the massive resources for armaments impedes the pursuits of development to its optimal level." ¹³ But the Final Document also explained that this relationship exists even beyond this elementary level. "Disarmament can assist the process of development not only by releasing additional resources but also by positively effecting the global economy. It can create conditions conducive to providing equitable economic and technological cooperation and to pursuing the objectives of a new international economic order.14 The Final Document also underlined the view that development is the real panacea for providing a sense of security especially when the non-military threats are becoming more and more dangerous. It said that "Real economic growth as well as just and equitable development, and particularly the elimination of po-

Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held at New York during August-September, 1987, hereunder called only FINAL DOCUMENT; Para 8 and 9.
 Bid Para 10.

^{14.} Ibid Para 11.

verty, are necessary for a secure and stable environment at the national, regional and international levels. They can reduce tensions and conflicts and the need for armaments."¹⁵

Discussing various aspects of security and its role in disarmament highlighting the relationship between and development the Final Document observed: "Security consists of not only military but also political, economic, social, humanitarian and human rights and ecological aspects." It emphasized the fact that "Enhanced security can on the one hand, create conditions conducive to disarmament and on the other hand provide the environment for successful pursuit It further stated that "The development process of development." by overcoming the non-military threats to security and contributing to a more stable and sustainable international system, can enhance security and thereby promote arms reduction and disarmament." Also in the same way the Final Document explained "disarmament would enhance security both directly or indirectly." It said that "A process of disarmament that provides for undiminished security at progressively lower levels of armaments could allow additional resources..."¹⁶ Thus both these phenomena are inter-related and are inter-dependent. A way The Final Document is particularly emphatic about the non-military threats to our security e.g. under-development, mismanagement and waste of resources, degradation of environment, gross and systematic

15. Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held at New York during August-September, 1987, hereunder called only FINAL DOCUMENT; Para 12.
 16. Ibid Para 14.

violations of human rights, mass poverty, illiteracy, disease, squalor and mal-nutrition effecting the large parts of globe which it feels are the real cause of increasing social strain, tension and strife. Thus the Final Document said, "Growing interdependence among nations, inter-relationship among global issues, mutuality of interests, collective approach responding to the need of humanity as a whole and multi-laterialism provide the international framework within which the relationship between disarmament and development and security should be shaped."¹⁷

Discussing the implications of military expenditures the Final Document expressed its opinion saying that approximately six per cent of the present global gross domestic product is being used for the production of armaments and in maintaining armed personnel which is 20 times the whole of official developmental assistance. In contrast to the current levels and trends in the world economy which is suffering from a slow-down in growth of demand and output compared to the preceding two decades, military expenditures have grown and that too on an average which is faster compared to that in the second half of the 1970s. It also noted that "bulk of global military spending remains concentrated among some developed countries that also carry out almost all the world's military research and development." pointed out that "during It recent years have bécome more sophisticated, weapons as the rate increase in spending on military research

17. Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held at New York during August-September, 1987, hereunder called only FINAL DOCUMENT; Para 19..

and development has been higher than the general increase in the military expenditures."¹⁸ As was submitted in the Joint Declaration by a Panel of Eminent Personalities in the Field of Disarmament and Development on 12th May, 1986,"Real expenditure of military R & D is estimated to have increased by less than 1 percent a year from 1974 to 1980 from five to eight per cents from 1980 to 1983 and by more than 10 per cent in 1983 to 1984."¹⁹ According to the Final Document the military sector consumes significant resources and apart from being an economic burden it also increases threats to human survival as well as poses significant threats to the environment. "The adverse development implications of such transfers", according to the Final Document "outweigh the immediate trade benefits to the suppliers and the security gains to the recipient."²⁰

The Final Document also analysed the situation as it exists among the developing countries. It underlined the fact that "the developing countries are doubly affected: a) in proportion to the expenditures they incur themselves; and b) because of the disturbing effects of military expenditure on the world economy."²¹ It noted that when military expenditures of developed countries increased the cuts are made first on developmental aid which worsens already weak economies of developing countries. Besides that, the Final Document felt that "militry related production tends to be capital intensive, usually creating fewer jobs than would result if an equivalent amount

 Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held at New York during August-September, 1987, hereunder called only FINAL DOCUMENT; Para 21...
 §The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/CONF/130/PC/INF/7.
 Final Document Para 23.

21. Ibid Para 26.

of public fund had been spent on civil projects. (Also) inefficiency associated with the non-competitive conditions of the military marketplace has negative effect throughout the economy..."²² The Final Document therefore felt it as an absolute imperative to reduce armaments to the minimum levels of national security and to seek "peaceful resolution of conflicts and disputes."

N. Oak

Resources released in the process of control and reduction of military expenditures should be used for "trade expansion, technological transfers, the more efficient utilisation of global resources, the more effective and dynamic international division of labour, the reduction of public debt and budgetary deficits and increased flow of resources through development assistance, commercial and other private flows or transfers of resources to the developing countries."²³

The Final Document of the Conference also adopted an Action Programme which inter alia recommended that the General Assembly should ensure a "periodic review of the relationship between disarmament and development" and maintain an"improved and comprehensive data based on global and national military expenditures." It also wanted the Secretary General of the United Nations "to intensify his efforts to foster and coordinate the incorporation of disarmamentdevelopment perspective in the activities of the United Nations System" and to have regular deliberations and "analysis of the impact of global military expenditures on the world economy" and to facilitate inter-

Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held at New York during August-September, 1987, hereunder called only FINAL DOCUMENT; Para 28.
 Final Document Para 33.

A way.

national exchange of views and experience in the field of conversion.

The countries participating in this conference also undertook to give thorough considerations to the possibilities of "the adoption of measures to reduce the levels and magnitude of military expenditures", the utilization of existing regional and international institutions for the reallocation of resources released through disarmament measures for socio-economic development, particularly in developing countries...." and the importance of greater openness, transparency and confidence among nations with a view to facilitating progress in both disarmament and development.

CHAPTER - VI

CONCLUSION

In its Fact Sheet 45 on the "International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development" the Department for Disarmament Affairs, United Nations Headquarters New York recently updated its standard definitions of the concepts of Disarmament and Development.

> "Disarmament is broadly understood as the process of reducing the size and expenditure on armed forces, destroying and dismentling weapons, whether deployed or stockpiled, progressively eliminating the capacity to produce new weapons and releasing and integrating military personnel into civilian life. This process must be implemented through balanced and equitable reductions and provide for mutually acceptable methods of verifications and compliance to ensure undeminished security for all States at all stages."

It defined Development as a process of

"...social and economic changes in society leading to improvement in the quality of life for all. At the most basic level it means providing every person the material requirements for the dignified and productive existence. More specifically if the global developmental efforts is to be sustainable in the long-term, it should endeavour to provide for a pattern of economic growth that would significantly reduce, within a reasonable time-frame, the prevailing desparities between nations in the quality of life. Development takes place in different economic systems. The inter-action of these systems is significant in projecting global development requirements."

This Fact Sheet further spelled out uptodate United Nations conclusions that Disarmament and Development "remain parallel and distinct processes, although there are many ways in which they can reinforce each other". It felt that the "continuing arms build-ups are pertinent not only in the context of disarmament, but also of development. Beyond the single opportunity-cost effect, the arms accumulation process could make development more difficult in several respects. It is generally felt that unless the world proceeds more resolutely towards the ultimate aim of disarmament, it will not in the long-run, be able to achieve or sustain development fully and world wide."

The year 1987 witnessed these definitions and conclusions being for the first time endorsed by the political leaders of the international community. This is the beginning of a new epoch in the United Nations' efforts at achieving its twin goals of Disarmament and Development. Beginning with the 1971 Report of the UN Group of Experts on Disarmament and Development, the United Nations had been trying to establish this relationship between the two most important goals of the world community. Today the whole world recognises that the twin processes of Disarmament and Development are inter-related in an intricate and multi-dimensional network of which extends far beyond the simple release of resources from military to civil portfolios. The Final Document adopted at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development which was adopted by concensus among over 155 nation states clearly noted that the "world

can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed towards a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order; it can not do both."¹

In the face of the fact that the International Conference had achieved a general concensus on the imperative need of inter-relating the twin goals of disarmament and development, one feels at a loss to understand as to why the Final Documnt could not include any concrete programme of action as also why no follow-up action has been taken so far; and why the Action Programme of the Final Document resorted to the old, stale meaningless beautiful words...'we reaffirm' or 'we will consider' etc. etc.

II

 $b_{2,0} \ll c_{2,0}$

In the first place the Arms Trade is highly skewed in favour of highly industrialised countries. As mentioned earlier only five nations produce nearly 90 per cent of global armaments. All these weapons-exporting economies and especially their industrial military lobby have their economic, political and strategic compulsions for not recognising the relationship between disarmament and development. On the other hand, there are large number of countries which depend on these weapons-exporting countries for their well being

1. Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, August-September, 1987 New York; para 4.

and therefore do not care to highlight views that might displease their masters. A substatial number among these are military dictatorship which often have to arm themselves against their own people, against neighbouring states or against the enemies of their external masters and therefore cannot risk to enlighten their masses to endorse any such vital truths as the relationship between lack of development and over-armed defence of these countires. Most of other developing countries are obessessed with achieving rapid development and building domestic defence-industrial-capacity which, in the context of under-utilisation of sources by them does not compete with civilian needs but only ensures reducing dependence on weapons imports, encourages these half-hearted idealists to go on for their short term national interests instead of fighting for world peace. Obviously very few remain to bother about what heppens to the efforts at highlighting the relationship between disarmament and development.

The developed countries have both the assets of widespread higher education as well as availability of spare funds to finance research on all kinds of issues. Accordingly most of Research Institutions have been controlled by Industrial Trusts and Foundations of these countries. This is particularly true in case of Peace Research as most of these institutions of world fame are situated only in Western Europe and North America: The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI); the Peace Research Institute,Oslo (PRIO);

The Polemological Institute, Netherlands; The Tampere Peace Research Institute (TAPRI); The Institute of Peace Research and Security Policy, Hamburg (IFSH); The Peace Research Institute, Frankfurt (PRIF) etc. Despite these institutes having quite a number of committed researchers, research on the issues of inter-relationship between disarmament and development has remained at its lowest ebb, always repeating the typical arguments of disarmament releasing resources for development and the conversion problems.

Very little of the research that is normally submitted under the disarmament-development title deals with the complex and multi-dimensional relationship between these two phenomena. In the United States a few projects have been financed by the Centre for Economic Conversions and by the Council on Economic Priorities. In the Federal Republic of Germany the Trade Unions have done some significacnt work. For instance, at the University of Hamburg a West German Trade Union, IG Metal, had funded a research project under the guidance of Dr. Hurbert Wulf which explored into the possibilities of producing alternative goods for West German defence industries. Similarly the United Kingdom also had its Trade Unionists trying to investigate conversion possibilities. In 1984 Inga Thorsson had carried out a similar study for Sweden. But while these activists and experts have done a great deal in bringing these issues to the forefront, they have failed to achieve anything much because the management of weaponsrelated industries does not share their views. Also the Development Research community has not shown any interest in these issues. All this has had influenced the functioning of United Nations. For instance, it took the United Nations complete 25 years to recognise the need to just appoint a Group of Experts to go into the details of disarmament-development relationship. Also the General Assembly has failed to achieve concensus on most of its resolutions on this subject.

Most of the United Nations reports concerning disarmament-development relationship are of the opinion that disarmament is more immediately an imperative for the developing countries than it is for the developed ones. These reports maintain that an increase in developmental aid to developing countries is the most important reason why the developed countries should reduce their military expenditures. According to Mr. Ghare Khan, India's permanent representative at the United Nations "In the current literature on the subject there is a tendency to over-emphasize the adverse economic effects of military expenditures of developing countries."² The fact is that the total military expenditure of all the developing country put together is, by any estimate, not more than 15-20 per cent of the global military expenditures. If the oilexporting developing countries are excluded, then these countries together do not amount for even more than 10 per cent of the whole world's military spending. Even this much military expenditure of these countries can be explained. The 2. Speech by Mr.Khan at the Conference, Strategic Digest, November, 1987, pp.2091.

decolonization process has/in the emergence of newly indepen-/ resulted dent countries. It is quite natural that when independent states go in for a separate defence establishments of their own the total military expenditure of these countries is bound to rise. Secondly, the military expenditure of these countries has also to be seen as a reaction to the perceived security threats which emerge from colonial legacies and from interventions in their regions. Regrettably some countries have chosen to ignore security threats to their regions and have succumbled to foreign pressures. These nations have not only distorted their own development prospects but by granting bases and other facilities to outside powers have hightened security threats to their neighbouring countries compelling them to increase their military budgets. In fact, the competition for resources between defence and development does not appear, prima facie, to be direct, as far as these developing countries are concerned. Actually these countries suffer from underutilisation of their resources and therefore it appears that they always have some resources available which can be exhausted by unproductive military industries. Similarly lack of development among the third world nations generates various new disputes that makes disarmament rather difficult as compared to the situation among developed countries.

It has been proved that within a Group of countries with optimum or near-optimum resources utilisations the countries which devote larger proportion of their GNP to defence

grow at a slower rate as compared to the economies which devote lesser percentages of their GNP to military expenditures. The typical examples are of the United States and Japan. Some of the United Nations studies have also endorsed the argument that military research and development does not have any significant spin-offs for the civilian technology. Moreover, recent trends in military research and doctrines are likely to widen the differences between military and non-military scientific and technological requirements and products. The emerging nonmilitary threats to human survival have added a new dimension to the complex problems of security in the contempory world.

In the words of the Brandt Commission, "we are (today) more concerned with what is called military security than with hunger and mal-nutrition which in the end may pose a greater threat".³ Our perceptions of security are dangerously narrow. But the Report continued "If we neglect the task of the present and fail to invest in the future we may arm ourselves to death without actually waging a major war, and bring our economies to the point of collapse. The North itself can survive only if the South is allowed independence and a decent life."⁴

\mathbf{III}

From our study of the various aspects of the relationship between Disarmament and Development, it appears that any attempt at understanding this relationship and any efforts

3. Willy Brandt: World Armaments & World Hunger : A call for Action, (London, 1986)pp.10.

4. Ibid. pp.24.

at utilising this understanding in facilitating the achievement of world disarmament and development must not be devoid of two fundamental things: First, both these goals are interrelated within the wider framework of international security. Therefore, proper understanding of 'SECURITY' is a pre-requisite for understanding the relationship between disarmament and development. Security today can no longer be analysed in terms of great defence build-up with large standing armies and huge stockpiles of other military installations. Security political, economic, cultural, geographical, ecological has dimensions as well. Of all these aspects of security the fast emering threats of physical and material scarcities and incrasing failure of our earth to overcome the human misuse of its resources pose the greatest security threats to the humankind. As was rightly pointed out, "where mass hunger reigns we cannot speak of peace. If we want to get rid of war, we must ban mass misery too. Morally it makes no difference whether human beings are killed in war or condemned to death by starvation. The international community ... has no more important task, besides controlling the build-up of arms, than overcoming mass hunger and other resources of misery which would be avoided."⁵

The second most important thing that needs to be kept in mind is that both the developed and developing countries are linked in an intricate framework of interaction and inter-dependence and therefore it is not possible to pursue separate and different solutions for any group of countries. As stated

5. Willy Brand: World Armament & World Hunger : A Call for Action (London, 1986) pp.17.

No al No

by the Panel of Eminent Personalities, "Global interdependence has increased the need of dealing with international relationships through international cooperation through international law, rule based systems and international organisations - that can, and must reduce the sources of friction and potential conflict that interdependence has multiplied."⁶ History is witness to the fact that non-military issues have often been the cause of military conflicts. "In the past", opined the Panel, "failure to contain and resolve problems of market access and production, commodity price instability, and problems of payments, currency and indebtedness have helped trigger international conflicts on most disastrous scale. The two great rounds of building international institutions in this century", the Panel felt, "came only in the wake of devastating world wars which forced all the humanity to recognise this need. The world obviously cannot afford another such catalyst for the round of rebuilding and reinvigoration that is so badly needed after 40 years."

The members of the United Nations do agree that security today has wider implications than building large armies but there is lack of concensus on the issue of 'interdependence'. Powerful countries do not endorse the view that their well-being in any way is dependent on the well-being of less powerful and less deveoped nations and that they cannot solve their problems without cooperation of these nations. These countries continue to pursue their national interest by all means even if these harm some other country's interests. These nations

6. The United Nations General Assembly Document No.A/CONF/130/INF/17 dated 12th May, 1986; page 8; para 22(c)

7. Ibid; Page 9, Para 22(d)

do not find any need to modify their patterns of consumption and exploitation of exhaustible resources in a way that should be more bearable for our earth and its ecology. This explains why these developed countries continue to pursue the arms buildup and economic development simultaneously. The explanation also lies in the fact of neo-colonialism. Actual sufferers are those who, for whatever reasons, have fallen behind in the race for development.

Right from the days in 1950 when India had first proposed at the United Nations the establishment of a Peace Fund for Development of Underdeveloped Areas, there have been various proposals seeking reduction in all kinds of wasteful expenditures and coordination of all international efforts towards world development. The Secretary-General in 1978 had suggested that "We devote to national and and international disarmament effort dollar one million for every dollar one thousand million currently spent on arms." The issue was also discussed at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development but it could not achieve concensus on any concrete Action Programme. Thus the task is not yet over. As the struggle for disarmament and development impinges on the hiearchy of states in the international system as well as in the global economy, there is natural resistance to any substantial progress in these sensitive areas. A sustained and protracted struggle over long years only can bring about structural changes in the international politics conducive to disarmament and development.

ANNEXURE - 1

ANNEXURE III OF 1972 REPORT

PEACEFUL USES OF MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

S. No.	Military R+D	Peaceful R+D
1.	CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WARFARE	High yielding varieties of staple food;
		Edible protein;
		Pest & Vector Control;
		Communicable diseases control.
2.	NUCLEAR MILITARY PROGRAMME	Nuclear energy R&D
•		Nuclear explosion for stimulation of gas and oil reservoirs and for fracturing of ore bodies;
		Nuclear explosions for large civil engineering projects:
		RESEARCH ON:
		i. Small and medium Nuclear Power reactors for developing countries.
	. A we have	ii. Agro-Industrial complexes.
		iii. Desalination
3.	CIVIL ENGINEERING INSTITUTES FOR	Urban renewal in general:
	DEFENCE WORK	Research on indigenous building and construction materials for developing countries;
		Housing construction method for quicker, lower cost production of houses for developing countries

Urban waste disposal, sanitary equipment and pollution.

Highways, railroads, airports for both developed and developing countries.

Appropriate aircraft and airport facilities for developing countries;

Artificial organs and limbs;

Recording of human organs' functions for diagnostic and monitoring purposes.

Models of vital organs (teaching purpose);

Observation of various health parameters by means of telemetric technology;

Environmental health monitoring;

Improvement of various laboratory control methods through automated instrumentations;

Improvement of pharmaceutical control;

Natural resources surveys by remote sensing from aircraft or satellites;

Fuel cells;

 $\tilde{D}_{1}(0) \to 0$

EARLY DETECTION

OF ICBMs BY SATELLITE

NETWORK

Solar energy;

Geothermal energy;

Natural disasters warning and meteorological research on tropical cyclines.

Natural disasters warning systems;

Broadcasting, television

4. MILITARY AEROSPACE RESEARCH, ENGINEE-RING, ELECTRONICS & TELECOMMUNI-CATIONS

5.

MILITARY SPACE TECHNOLOGY

6. SYSTEM ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES AND COMPUTER TECHNO-LOGY USED FOR MILITARY, AERO-SPACE AND NUCLEAR OPERA-TIONS, MILITARY COMPUTERISED DATA BANKS

7. NAVAL RE-SEARCH INSTITUTES Communication Satellites for education and training.

Telephones

System analysis techniques and computer technology applied to development problems including health planning and operations;

Computer aided instructions;

Training programmes on computers, data processing and programming in developing countries;

Science and Technology information system for developing countries;

Transfer of Technology.

Ocean shipping and ports of developing countries;

Off-shore oil exploration;

Mineral resources and the sea;

Tidal Power;

Fish Research Assessment;

Aquaculture Research and Develop-ment.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT:

- i. Non-pollutive sources of energy.
- ii. Recycling of waste
- iii. Research on Non-pollutive resources of energy.

8. MILITARY ENGINEERING PROGRAMMES 9. ARMAMENT INDUSTRIES UNDER CONTRACTS BY THE MILITARY Industrial Research and Design applied to local materials of developing countries - glass and ceramics:

Metallurgical processing:

Industrial Chemicals:

Household chemicals for personal hygienic use;

Processing of natural fibres;

Plant and equipment design;

Appropriate technology;

Industrial Research.

Storage and preservation of agricultural products.

- 10. MILITARY INSTI-TUTES FOR RESEARCH ON FOOD SUPPLIES
- 11. MILITARY INSTITUTES FOR PETROLEUM
- 12. MILITARY VEHICLES RESEARCH
- 13. RELEASE OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION
- 14. ARMED FORCES TRAINING PROGRAMME

A Way

Research, exploration and development of petroleum and gas.

Design of automobiles adopted to the needs of developing countries;

Efforts on man of noise and vibration.

Advances in peaceful research in any number of areas;

Transfer of technology;

Science and Technology Education;

Improvement and strengthening of Science Teaching on Secondary Schools in developing countries;

Building up scientific and technological capacity.

15. MILITARY RESEARCH IN PHYSIOLOGY, PATHOLOGY, AND HYGIENE

÷

Nutritional Programmes;

Health hazards of climate;

Occupational hazards and personal protection;

Re-adoption process;

Re-animation;

Mental health Research;

Health hazards of ultrasonic waves;

Plastic Surgery and Burns;

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS SINCE 1971

 $D = a \xi_{1}^{2} + c \xi_{2}^{2}$

Res.3075(XXVIII) the 6th December, 1973

Adopted without vote at the 2192nd plenary meeting

Economic and Social Consequences of Armaments Race and its Extremely Harmful Effects on World Peace and Security.

(Endorses the conclusion of the Report of Secretary-General (A/8469/REv.1) that a substantial reduction in military expenditures of all countries, particularly of those whose military expenditures are the highest, should be brought about as soon as possible.

Res.3462(XXX)the 11th December, 1975 Adopted without vote at the 2437 plenary meeting.

Economic and Social Consequences of Armaments Race and its Extremely Harmful Effects on World Peace and Security.

(Requests on undating of the 1972 Report of the Secretary-General A/8469/Res.1)

Res.31/68 the 10th December, 1976 Adopted without vote at the 96th plenary meeting.

Effective measures to Implementing the Purposes and Objectives of the Disarmament Decade.

(Refer to the need for intensifying efforts in support of the link between Disarmament and Development, so as to ensure that the human and material resources freed by disarmament, are used to promote the economic and social development, particularly in developing countries.

Res.32/75 the 12th December, 1977 Adopted without vote at the 100th plenary meeting

Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and Military Expenditures.

(Welcomes with satisfaction the Report of the Secretary General on the Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and Military Expenditures A/32/88 Rev.1) Res.32/88 A the 12th December, 1977

Adopted without vote at the 100th plenary meeting

Special Session of General Assembly devoted to Disarmament.

(Refers to a curtailment of Expenditures on Armaments in facilitating the availability of greater resources for economic and social development, particularly to the developing countries and endorses the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee for the Special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament to initiate an in-depth study of the relationship between disarmament and development.)

Res.5-10/2 the 30th June, 1978

Adopted without vote at the 27th plenary meeting.

Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

(Refers to the relationship between disarmament and development and the decision to carry out a study on the subject.)

Res.33/62 the 14th December, 1978 Adopted without vote at the 84th plenary meeting.

Effective Measures to Implement the Purposes and Objectives of the Disarmament Decade.

(Refers to the need to continue to promote the link between the strategy for disarmament and the strategy for development in view of the close relationship between disarmament and development.)

Res.33/71 I the 14th December, 1978

Adopted without vote at the 84th plenary meeting

Disarmament and Development

(Transmits Proposal for an International Disarmament Fund for Development to the Experts Group nominated by the Secretary-General for preparing a study on the Relationship between disarmament and Development.)

Res.33/71 N the 14th December, 1978 Adopted without vote at the 84th plenary meeting

New Philosophy on Disarmament

(Notes the changing concepts of Disarmament in the light of its effects on global dimensions of development.)

Res.33/91 I the 16th December, 1978 Adopted without vote at the 86th plenary meeting

Disarmament and International Security

(Refers in the close relationship between Disarmament, International Security and Development).

Res.34/83 F theAdopted without vote at the11th December, 197997th plenary meeting

Freezing and Reduction of Military Budgets

(Refers to creating increased possibilities for a re-allocation of resources currently being used for military purposes for economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries).

Res.34/84 K the llth December, 1979 Adopted without vote at the 97th plenary meeting

Study on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development).

(Takes note of the Interim Report of the Experts Group appointed by the Secretary-General for preparing thje Study.)

Res.35/141 the 12th December, 1980 Adopted without vote at the 94th plenary meeting

Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and its Extremely Harmful Effects on the World Peace and Security).

(Requests an update of the 1977 Report of the Secretary-General on the Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and Military Expenditures (A/32/88 Rev.1) and refers to the arms race, particularly in nuclear arms, and military expenditures absorbing enormous material and human resources, which represents a heavy burden for the people of all countries).

Res.35/142 A the 12th December, 1980 Adopted without vote at the 94th plenary meeting

Reduction in Military budgets

(Re-interates its appeal to all states, to exercise selfrestraint in their military expenditures with a view to re-allocating the funds thus saved to economic social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries.)

Res.36/82 A the 9th December, 1981 Adopted without vote at the 91st plenary meeting

Reduction in Military Budgets

(Refers to reduction in military expenditures and re-allocation of funds thus saved to the economic and social developments.)

Res.36/92 G the 9th December, 1981 Adopted without vote at the 91st plenary meeting

Study on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development: Report of the Secretary-General.

(Study received and commended by the General Assembly.)

Res.30/70 the 9th December, 1982 Adopted without vote at the lolst plenary meeting

Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and its Extremely Harmful Effects on World Peace & Security.

Res.37/95 A the 9th December, 1982 Adopted without vote at the 101st plenary meeting

Reductio in Military Budgets

(Preamble mentions the link between Disarmament and Development.)

Res.38/71 B the 15th December, 1983 Adopted without vote at the

97th plenary meeting

Relationship between Disarmament and Development

(Invites Governments to communicate views and proposals concerning the relationship between Disarmament and Development; takes note of the investigation undertaken by the UN Institute for Disarmament Research on modalities of an International Disarmament Fund for Development; requests the Disarmament Commission to take appropriate recommendations.) Res.38/184 A the 15th December, 1983 Adopted without vote at the 103rd plenary meeting

Reduction of Military Budgets

Sec. 65. 1

(Refers to re-allocation of resources released through the reduction of military expenditures to economic and social development.)

Res.39/151 C the 17th December, 1984 Adopted without vote at the 102nd plenary meeting

Study on the Conventional Disarmament

(Study received and noted with satisfaction by the General Assembly.)

Res.39/160 the 17th December, 1984

Adopted wihout vote at the 102nd plenary meeting

Relationship bet ween Disarmament and Development

(Takes note of the Report of Disarmament Commission in pursuance of the Resolution 38/71 B and decides to convene an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and sets-up a Preparatory Committee.)

Res.49/94 E the 12th December, 1985 Adopted without vote at the 113th plenary meeting

Study on the Concepts of Security

(Commends the study and its conclusions to the attention of all Member States.)

Res.40/55 the 16th December, 1985 Adopted without vote at the 1117th plenary meeting

Relationship between Disarmament and Development

(Approves the Report of the Preparatory Committee and extends its mandate to make substantive preparations for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.)

DRAFT FOR A FINAL DOCUMENT OF THE CONFERENCE

Preamble

1. Disarmanent and development are two of the most urgent challenges facing the word today. They constitute priority concerns of the international community in which all nations- developed and developing, big and small, nuclear and non nulcear- have a common and equal stake. Disarmanent and development are two pillars on which enduring international peace and security can be built. The reasons for seeking disarmanent have become even more compelling than ever before as the continuing global military expenditure stand in sombre contrast to the state of the world economy. The rate of growth in developed countries remains modest. Developing countries find themselves trapped in development and debt crises. International economic relations are severely strained and many facets of multilateral economic co-operation have weakened. The international monetary, financial and trading systems stand threatened.

2. The continuing arms race is absorbing far too great a proportion of the world's human, financial, natural and technological resources, placing a heavy burden on the economies of all countries, and affecting international flow of trade, finance and technology in addition to hindering the process of confidence-building among States. Coming close to the staggering figure of \$1 trillion a year, the global military expenditure is in dramatic contrast to economic and social underdevelopment, to the misery and poverty afflicting more than two thirds of mankind and to the continuing crisis of the world economic system. Thus, there is a commonality of interests in finding ways of reducing these expenditures.

3. The United Nations has played a central role for the promotion of both disarmanent and development. The States Members of the United Nations have assumed solemn obligations to combat underdevelopment and achieve security at lower levels of armaments. The United Nations has also had a long history of xamining the relationship between disarmanent and development. The convening, under the aegis of the United Nations, of the first ever International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmanent and Development is a landmark in this process.

4. The Governments participating in this Conference, desirous of:

(a) Enhancing and strengthening the commitment of the international community to disarmanent and development and giving impetus to renewed effort in both these fields;

(b) Raising world consciousness that true and lasting security in this interdependent world demands rapid progress in both disarmament and development; (c) Directing global spotlight at a high political level on the implications of world-wide military spending close to \$1 trillion a year against the sombre background of the present world economic situation;

(d) Looking at disarmament, development and security in their relationship in the context of the interdependence of nations, interrelationship among issues and mutuality of interests;

(e) Taking greater account of this relationship in political decision-making;

(f) Furthering the international community's collective knowledge of the military and non-military threats to security;

have adopted this final document.

Role of the United Nations

5. One of the objectives enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations is "to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversions for armaments of the world's human and economic resources". The States Members of the United Nations have also expressed their determination.*to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples". At the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmanent, the Member States declared. *The time has therefore come...to seek security in disarmament". At the beginning of this decade, Governments-Members of the United Nations-launched the international Development Strategyfor the 1980s, as "a vast undertaking, involving the entire international community, for the promotion of international development and co-operation." In doing so, they reaffirmed "solemnly their determination to establish a new international economic order".

6. A variety of proplosals by a politically and geographically broad spectrum of Member States have demonstrated their interest in the relationship between disarmament and development since the early days of the United Nations. In recent years, there has been an increased understanding of this relationship, in no small measure due to the expert studies and reports prepared by the United Nations. In particular, the 1981 Secretary-General's report on disarmament and development, the periodic reports on the economic and social consequencies of the arms race and of military expenditure and those on the reduction of military budget have all contributed to a growing awareness of the urgent issues at stake in their entirety and interdependence. In the past the contrast between the global military expenditure and the unmet socio-economic needs had provided a strong moral appeal for relating disarmament to development. Today exists a growing recognition that there is a strong politicoeconomic case for it since both overarmanent and underdevelopment constitute threats to international peace and security.

Review of the relationship between disarmament and development in all its aspects and dimensions with a view to reaching appropriate conclusions.

7. Disarmament and development are distinct processes. Each should be pursued vigorously regardless of the pace of progress in the other; one should not be made a hostage to the other. Problems of development cannot wait for the release of resources from the disarmament process. Similarly, disarmament has its own imperative separate from the purpose of releasing resources for development.

8. Disarmament and development are also closely interrelated. There is a multidimensional relationship of a politico-economics nature between disarmament and development. Each of them can have an impact on the regional and global situations in such a way as to create an environment conducive to the promotion of the other. The relationship between disarmament and development in large part derives from the fact that continuing arms race and development compete for the same finite resources both at the national and international levels.

9. In a world of finite resources, it is difficult to pursue development to the optimal level without disarmament. Considering the present resource constraints of both developed and developing countries, world military spending is an area that can afford resources in a range and volume sufficient to meet the developmental challenges of the modern world. Disarmament can assist the process of development not only by making additional resources available but also by its positive impact on the global economy and the international economic system, particularly by facilitating the changes and adjustments needed to put the global economy on a path of sustained growth and development. It can create conditions conducive to promoting economic and technological co-operation and pursuing the objectives of a new international economic order.

10. On the other hand, just and equitable growth and development, and particularly the alleviation of poverty, can contribute significantly to a secure and stable environment at the national, regional, and international levels and facilities the task of nation-building which, turn, can reduce the need for armament.

11. In the relationship between disarmament and development, security plays a crucial role. Progress in any of these areas would have a positive effect on the others, whereas lack of progress in any of these would have a negative effect on the other two.

12. Security is an overriding priority for all nations. It is a fundamental prerequisite for both disarmament and development which also contribute in different ways to the strengthening of security. Enhanced security can, on the one hand, create conditions conducive

to disarmament and, on the other hand, provide the environment and confidence for the successful pursuit of development. The develpment process, by overcoming non-military threats to security and contributing to a more stable and sustainable international system, can enhance security and thereby promote arms reduction and disarmament.

13. Member States seek security by exercising their inherent right to individual and collective self-defence. The judgement as to the level of arms essential for its security rests with each nation individually. However, the purusit of national security regardless of its impact on the security of others can create general insecurity, thereby, thereby endangering the very security it aims at promoting. This is even more so in the context of apprehensions expressed over the likely climatic consequences of a nuclear conflict.

14. There is a widespread belief that the world is overarmed and security is possible at a substantially reduced level of arms buildup. Moreover, continued arms race means a growing threat to international peace and security and even to the very survival of mankind. The nuclear and conventional arms buildup threatens to stall the efforts aimed at reaching the goals of development and to become an obstacle on the road of achieving the new international economic order.

15. A peaceful and secure international environment is indispensable for pursuing development. The use or threat of use of force in international relations, external intervention armed aggression and foreign occupation, violation of territorial integrity and national sovereignty, and encroachment of the right of all nations to pursue their economic and social development free from outside interference constitute some of the military threats to international peace and security today.

16. Recently, non-military threats to security have moved to the forefront of global concern. Underdevelopment, maldevelopment and declining prospects for development constitute standing threats to security. The world can hardly be regarded as secure so long as there is polarization of wealth and poverty. Mass poverty, illiteracy, disease, squalor and malnutrition afflicting a majority of the world's population often become the cause of social strain, tension and strife. The degradation of the environment endangers life on our planet. The existence, at the same time, of the pressing need and physical scarcity of raw materials has the potentiality of leading to confrontations. The problems besetting the world economy and the international economic system also constitute a threat to global security.

17. Growing interdependence among nations, interrelationship among global issues, mutuality of interests, collective approach responding to the needs of humanity as a whole and multilateralism provide the international frame-work within which the relationship between disarmament, development and security should be shaped.

Implications of the level and magnitude of the continuing military expenditures, in particular those of the nuclear-weapon States and other military important States, for the world economy and the international economic and social situation, particul rly for developing countries, and elaboration of appropriate recommendations for remedial measures.

18. The current level of global military spending, incurred worldwide in pursuit of real and perceived security interests, represents a real increase of between four and five times since the end of the Second World War. It also reflects 6 per cent of world output and is over 25 times as large as all official development assistance to developing countries.

19. The bulk of the global military spending remains concentrated among industrialized countries which are also mostly accountable for the latest increases. The developing countries account for a major share of the arms imports, although the rate of increase in imports by them has declined since 1982. The trade is dominated by a handful of developed countries. The adverse development implications of such transfers outweight gains to the immediate trade benefits to the suppliers and security gains to the recipients.

20. By 1985, global expenditure on military research and development was approximately one quarter of that incurred on all research and development. In its latest phase, the rate of increase in spending in military research and development has been higher than that of military expenditure as awhole. A few developed countries carry out almost all the world military research and development.

21. Since the beginning of the 1980s, global military expenditure has been growing on an average at a much faster rate than during the second half of the 1970s. During this period the growth in military spending has also been faster than that of world output.

22. The current level and trends in global military expenditure stand in sombre contrast to the state of the world economy which is characterized by violent exchange rate fluctuations, persistent higher rates of interest, currency misalignments, a decline in flows of resources in real terms to developing countries from official sources and lack of response from private sources of financing, increasing discrimination and lack of transparency of the world trading, system, rising protectionism and the virtual collapse of the commodity prices. Recently, developing countries have been making a net transfer of financial resources to the developed countries. The aggregate debts of developing countries had reached \$1 trillion in 1986.

23. Diversion of resources for military purpose always amounts to a commensurate reduction of resources for the civilian sector. In the context of current resource] constraints and the higher rates of such diversion, this opportunity cost is becoming increasingly larger. It is estimated that \$US 14 trillion at 1983 prices have been spent for military purposs since 1960. During this period the increase in the world output was \$8.6 trillion. Thus, since 1960, military expenditure has absorbed all the economic growth and more.

24. The opportunity cost of military expenditures is borne both by developed and developing countries, as there is a pressing need for additional resources for development in both groups of countries. In developing countries, close to 1 billion people are below the poverty line, 780 million people are under-nourished, 850 million are illiterate, 1.5 billion have no access to medical facilities, an equally large number are unemployed, and 1 billion people are inadequately housed. In developed countries, resources are required for meeting the priority needs of urban renewal, development of non-conventional sources of energy, protection of the environment, restoration of some of the infrastructures and the protection of the welfare system. The developing countries are doubly affected; first in proportion to the expenditure they incur themselves, and again due to the disturbing effect of military expenditure of the industrial countries as their economic interaction with these countries is crucial.

25. Opportunity cost of military expenditures should be seen not only in financial terms but also in terms of real resources. The military sector consumes a significant proportion of world energy resource and non-energy minerals and diverts skilled manpower and industrial production.

26. Military expenditure also involves sizeable diversion of scientific and technical resources. As innovation and research are principal stimulants to growth, these resources are needed for development; for augmenting agricultural production and providing other basic needs in developing countries; for opening new energy potentials; for preventing the depletion of supply of raw materials and protecting the environment.

27. The problem with military spending is that it provides little basis for future production. Military goods are generally destroyed or soon used up. True, there may be some civilian by-products of military research and training but that is a poor route to follow in order to enhance the stock of human capital. There are better direct non-military routes.

Military-related production tends to be capital-intensive, 28. creating fewer jobs than would result if an equivalent amount of public funds had been spent in the civilian sector. Inefficiency associated with the non-competitive conditions of the military market place has a negative effect throughout the economy, including productivity and cost, and on its competitive position in the international market. Allocation of 6 per cent of the gross national product (GNP) for military purposes does not tell the full story. It also contributes to the inefficient allocation of the remaining 94 per cent of the world's resources. Experience has shown that for most of the period since the Second World War, the economic performance of those economies which have been spending less on defence relative to GNP has been better as measured in terms of real rate of growth, investment in productive capacity and growth in manufacturing productivity.

29. Global military expenditure has an impact in the world economy through the interrelationship between the global micro-economic variables. It is very difficult to understand the present unstable and serious world economic situation without taking into account the current levels of military expenditure. Similarly, the current imbalance between military expenditure and resources to meet civilian needs is bound to figure prominently in any strategy for the management of the world economy with a view to imparting it growth and stability.

Ways and means of releasing additional resources through disarmament measures, for development purposes, in particular in favour of developing countries.

30. Apart from promoting international peace and security, disarmament measures can improve the environment for pursuing development. They can do so:

(a) At the national level, by means of releasing resources from the military to the civilian sector;

(b) At the regional and international levels, by creating favourable conditions for international economic, scientific and technical cooperation and by providing a part of the resources released for the development of developing countries, both on a bilateral and multilteral basis.

31. Resources released as a result of disarmament measures should be devoted to the economic and social development of all nations and contribute to the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries. These resources should be additional to those otherwise available for assistance to developing countries.

32. Release of additional resources through disarmament measures, particularly for the benefit of developing countries, would involve transfer among economies at different levels of development. Several economic and statistical projections of the global economy have demonstrated such a transfer of even a part of the released resources to be in the interest of both industrialized and developing countries. However, a number of other policy measures, at the national, subregional, regional and international levels, have to be taken for these resources to have an optimal impact on the development process and for this mutuality of interest to be fully realized. Working towards disarmament which could redirect substantial financial and human resources towards development is not enough; greater emphasis needs to be put on the adoption of an appropriate international development strategy as a vital stabilizing element in international relations.

33. Benefits of releasing resources through disarmament measures need not be confined to mobilizing additional resources for the developing countries. Among the developed countries too, there is considerable interest in economic adjustments at higher levels of output and in supply expansion. The goals of social welfare also remain in some industrial countries. Nevertheless, increased incomes for individuals and enterprises in developed countries due to reductions in arms-spending would benefit developing countries by increasing their export earnings.

34. Resources released by disarmament should not be seen merely in terms of enhanced prospects for financial transfers to developing countries. The disarmament dividend comes in a variety of other equally, if not more, important forms. These include trade expansion, technological transfers, more efficient utilization of global resources, more effective and dynamic international division of labour, reduction of public debt and budgetary deficits, and increased flow of resources through commercial and other private sources. However, the importance of an increase in the magnitude and predictability of the flows of resources to developing countries cannot be underestimated.

35. Past experience has shown that adjustment problems arising in the process of conversion from military to civilian production are generally not long lasting. Conversion of the modern technologyintensive military industry may present some problems and involve initial expenditure. However, these problems should not prove insurmountable if conversion is well planned.

Action Programme

36. The Governments participating in this Conference reaffirm their commitments in the fields of disarmament and development and reiterate their determination to adopt both individually and collectively, appropriate measures to implement these commitments. These will include bilateral and regional initiatives for resolving conflicts and conflict situations.

37. They recognise the need to ensure an effective and mutually reinforcing relationship between disarmament and development and to give practical expression to it through specific measures at the national, regional and global levels, in these and related fields, with a view to strengthening international peace and security.

38. They also reaffirm their commitment, in principle, to allocate for purposes of socio-economic development, particularly of the developing countries, a portion of resources released through measures of arms limitation and disarmament.

39. In this connection, they will give further consideration to:

(a) The adoption of measures to reduce the level and magnitude of military expenditure as an approach to disarmament and as a means of releasing additional resources for social and economic development, particularly of the developing countries;

(b) The establishment of international financial mechanism to facilitate the transfer of resources released through disarmament-related measures for socio-economic development, specially of the

developing countries, taking due account of the existing capabilities of the United Nations agencies and insitutions currently engaged in the international transfer of resources;

(c) The possibility of using the human and technical resources and the expertise of the armed forced of individual countries, in emergency humanitarian relief operations.

40. They will consider :

(a) Making advance preparations for conversion and undertaking studies and planning for this purpose;

(b) Undertaking studies to identify and publicize the benefits that could be derived from the re-allocation of military resources;

(c) Making the results of experience in, and preparations for, solving the problems of conversion in their respective countries available to other countries.

41. They agreed to :

(a) Make assessments of the political and security requirements and of the level of their military spending so as to keep the public informed on the subject and on the problem of reducing these expenditures;

(b) Assess the nature and volume of resources which may be released through arms limitation and disarmament measures;

(c) Carry out analysises of the economic and social consequences of their military spending and to inform their public opinion about them.

42. They recognized that informed public opinion has an invaluable role to play in helping to promote the objective of disarmament and development and creating an awarenes of the relationship between disarmament, development and security. They, therefore, agreed to take appropriate measures to keep the public informed in this regard.

43. They emphasized the need to strengthen the central role of the United Nations is disarmament and development and in promoting an interrelated perspective of these issues within the overall objective of promoting international peace and security.

44. They requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to intensify his efforts to foster and co-ordinate the incorporation of disarmament-development perspective in the activities of the United Nations system.

45. The United Nations should undertake, on a regular basis, global analysis of the impact of military expenditure on the world economy and the international economic system.

46. The United nations should make greater efforts to promote collective knowledge of the non-military threats to international security.

47. Improved data base is necessary for facilitating studies and analysis by the United Nations, as well as at the national level. To this end, all Member States should provide full and objective information on their military bnudgets to the United Nations according to agreed and comparable definitions of the specific components of these budgets. In this connection, the work under way in the United Nations for a systematic examination of various problems of defining, reporting comparing and verifying military budget data should be intensified.

48. Consideration should be given to the idea of creating an "observatory" to follow the growth of military budgets.

49. The United Nations should facilitate an international exchange of views and experience in the field of conversion. The organisations within the United Nations system should prepare studies on how they can support conversion activities in their respective fields.

50. The United Nations and the specialized agencies should give increased emphasis, in their disarmament-related public information and education activities, to the disarmament-development perspective, and in particular to the implications of the global military expenditure for national economies, for the world economy and international economic relations.

51. The General Assembly of the United Nations is requested to make arrangements for undertaking a periodic review of the implementation of this Action Programme.

FINAL DOCUMENT ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE PLENARY ON 11.9.87

Preamble

The State participating in the International Conference on the Relationship between Desarmament and Development, desirous of:

(a) Enhancing and strengthening the commitment of the international community to disarmament and development and giving impetus to renewed efforts in both these fields:

(b) Raisin world consciousness that true and lasting peace and security in this interdependent world rapid progress in both disarmament and development;

(c) Directing global attention at a high political level on the implications of worldwide military spending against the sombre background of the present world economic situation:

(d) Looking at disarmament, development and security in their relationship in the context of the interdependent of nations, interrelationship among issues and mutuality of interests;

(e) Taking greater account of the relatonship between disarmament and development in political decision-making;

(f) Furthering the international community's collective knowledge of the military and non-military threats to security;

adopt the following Final Document:

1. In the Charter of the United Nations, Member States have undertaken to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. The Members States also express in the Charter their determination to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. The United Nations has thus a central role to play for the promotion of both disarmament and development.

2. Disarmament and development are two of the most urgent challenges facing the world today. They constitute priority concerns of the international community in which all nations-developed and developing, big and small nuclear and non-nuclear-have a common and equal stake. Disarmament and development are two pillars on which enduring international peace and security can be built.

3. The continuing arms race is absorbing far too great a proportion of the world's human, financial, natural and technological resources,

placing a heavy burden on the economies of all countries and affecting the international flow of trade, finance and technology, in addition to hindering the process of confidence-building among States. The global military expenditure are in dramatic contrast to economic and social underdevelopment and to the misery and proverty afflicting more than two thirds of mankind. Thus, there is commonality of interests in seeking security at lower levels of armaments and findings ways of reducing these expenditures.

4. The world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristc vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed towards a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order; it cannot do both.

5. Global interest in the relationship between disarmament and development is reflected in proposals by a politically and geographically broad spectrum of States since the early days of the United Nations. There is an increasing understanding of this relationship, in part due to the expert studies and reports prepared by the United Nations.

6. The contrast between the global military expenditures and the unmet socio-economic needs provides a compelling moral appeal for relating disarmament to development. There is also a growing recognition that both over-armament and underdevelopment constitute threats to international peace and security.

7. The convening under the aegis of the United Nations of this International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development is a landmark in the process of undertaking, at a political level, the multilateral consideration of the relationship between disarmament and development.

Relationship between disarmament and development in all its aspects and dimensions.

8. While disarmament and development both strengthen international kpeace and security and promote prosperity, they are distinct processes. Each should be pursued vigorously regardless of the progress in the other; one should not be made a hostage to the other. Pursuit of development cannot wait for the release or resources from disarmament. Similarly, disarmament has its own imperative separate from the purpose of releasing resources for development.

9. However, disarmament and development have a close and multidimensional relationship. Each of them can have an impact at the national, regional and global level in such a way as to create an environment conducive to the promotion of the other.

10. The relationship between disarmament and development in part derives from the fact that the continuing global arms race and development compete for the same finite resources at both the national and inter-national levels. The allocation of massive rersources for armamental impedes the pursuit of development to its optimal level. 11. Considering the present resource constraints of both developed and developing countries, reduced world military spending could contribute significantly to development. Disarmament can assist the process of development not only by releasing additional resources but also by positively affecting the global economy. It can create conditions conducive to promoting equitable economic and technological co-operation and to pursuing the objectives of a new international economic order.

12. Real economic growth as well as sjust and equitable development, and particuarly the elimination of poverty, are necessary for a secure and stable environment at the national, regional and international levels. They can reduce tensions and conflicts and the need for armament.

13. In the relationship between disarmament and development, security plays a crucial role. Progress in any of these areas would have a positive effect on the others.

14. Security is an overriding priority for all nations. It is also fundamental for both disarmament and development. But Security consists does not only of military, but also political economic, social, humanitarian and human rights and ecological aspects. Enhanced security can, on the one hand create conditions conducive to disarmament and on the other provide the environment and confidence for the successful pursuit of development. The development process, by overcoming non-military threats to security and contributing to a more stable and sustainable international system, can enhance security and thereby promote arms reduction and disarmament. Disarmament would enhance security both directly and indirectly. A process of disarmament that provides for undiminished security at progressively lower levels of armaments could allow additional resources to be devoted to addressing non-military challenges to security, and thus result in enhanced overall security.

15. An effective implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations would enhance international peace and security and thus, reduce the need of Member States to seek security by exercising their inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, also recognized by the Charter. The judgement as to the level of arms and military expenditures essential for its security rests with each nation. However, the pursuit of national security regadless of its impact on the security of others can create overall international insecurity, thereby undermining the very security it aims at promoting. This is even more so in the context of the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war.

16. It is widely accepted that the world is overarmed and that security should be sought at substantially lower levels of armaments. The continued arms race in all its dimensions, and its spreading into new areas, pose a growing threat to international peace and security and even to the very survial of mankind. Moreover, global military spending on nuclear and conventional arms threatens to stall the efforts aimed at reaching the goals of development so necessary to overcome non-military threats to peace and security. 17. The use of threat of use of force in international relations, external intervention, armed aggression foreign occupation, colonial domination, policies of Apartheid and all forms of racial discrimination, violation of territorial integrity, of national soverignty, of the right to self-determination, and the encroachment of the right of all nations to pursue their economic and social development free from outside interference constitute threats to international peace and security International security will be guaranteed in turn to the extent that peaceful and negotiated solutions to regional conflicts are promoted.

18. Recently, non-military threats to security have moved to the forefront of global concern. Underdevelopment and declining prospects for development, as well as mismanagement and waste of resources, constitute challenges to security. The degradation of the environment presents a threat to sustainable development. The world can hardly be regarded as secure so long as there is polarization of wealth and poverty at the national and international levels. Gros and systematic violations of human rights retard genine socio-economic development and create tensions which contribute to instability. Mass poverty, illiteracy, disease, squalor and malnutrition afflicting a large proportion of the word's population often become the cause of social strain, tension and strife.

19. Growing interdependence among nations, interrelationship among global issues, mutuality of interests, collective approach responding to the needs of humanity as a whole and multilateralism provide the international framework within which the relationship between disarmament, development and security should be shaped.

Implications of the level and magnitude of the continuing military expenditure, in particular those of the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily important States, for the world economy and the international economic and social situation, particuarly for developing countries.

20. The current level of global military spending in pursuit of security interests represents a real increase of between four and five times since the end of the Second World War. It also reflects approximately 6 per cent of the world gross domestic product and has been estimated to be more than 20 times as large as all official development assistance to developing countries. During the 1980s, global military expenditure has grown on an average at a faster rate thand uring the second half of the 1970s.

21. The bulk of global military spending remains concentrated among some developed countries that also carry out almost all the world's military research and development. It has been estimated that global expenditure on military research and development represents approximately one quarter of the world's expenditure on all research and development. During recent years, as weapons have become more sophisticated, the rate of increase in spending on military research and development has been higher than the general increase in military expenditures. 22. The military sector also consumes a significant proportion of world energy resources and non-energy minerals and diverts skilled human resources and industrial production which could be utilized in other sectors. Moreover the production and stockpiling of armaments, particularly of nuclear and chemical weapons] poses a significant threat to the environment.

23. While arms exports are dominated by a number of developed countries, the developing countries account for a major share of arms imports. The adverse development implications of such transfers outweigh immediate trade benefits to the suppliers and security gains to the recipients.

24. In contrast to the current level and trends in global military expenditure, the state of the world economy in the 1980s has been characterized by a slow-down in growth of demand and output compared with the preceding two decades, generally lower rates of inflation, difficulties in many countries in adapting to structural changes, a mounting stock of debt, high real interest rates, inadequate net flows of financial resources, shifts in exchange rates, high and increasing levels of protection, commodity prices depressed to their lowest level in 50 years, terms-of-trade losses sustained by commodity exporting countries, and a generally insecure economic environment in which millions of people still lack the basic conditions for a decent life.

25. The use of resources for military purposes amounts to a reduction of resources for the civilian sector. Military spending provides little basis for future industrial civilian production. Military goods are gnerally destroyed or soon used up. While there are some civilian by-products of military research and training there are better direct, non military routes to follow.

26. The opportunity cost of military expenditures over the past 40 years has been and continues to be borne by both developed and developing countries, as there is a pressing need for additional development in both groups of countries. In developreources for ping countries, it has been estimated that close to 1 billion people are below the poverty line, 780 billion people are under-nourished, 850 million are illiterate, 1.5 billion have no access to medical facilities, an equally large number are unemployed, and 1 billion people are inadequately housed. In developed countries, resources are required, inter alia for meeting the priority needs of urban renewal, the restoration of some of the infrastructures, the reduction of unemployment, the protection of the environment, the further development of welfare systems and the development of non-conventional sources of energy. The developing countries are doubly affected: (a) in proportion to the expenditure they incur themselves; and (b) because of the disturbing effect of military expenditure on the world economy.

27. The present world economic situation should also be seen in the context of the arms race. For certain countries the high deficits caused by military expenditures as well as the cumulative effect of subsequent rise in the interest rates have the effect of diverting substantial flows of capital away from development activities. In this sense, the world is affected by the arms race.

28. Moreover, military-related production tends to be capitalintensive, usually creating fewer jobs than would result if an equivalent amount of public funds had been spent on civil projects. Inefficiency associated with the non-competitive conditions of the military market-place has a negative effect throughout the economy, including productivity and cost, and on its competitive position in the international market.

29. Global military expenditure has an impact on the world economy through interdependence among nations and the interrelationship between the global macro-economic variables. Attempts at understanding the present world economic situation and attaining stable and sustainable growth need to take account of the current levels of military expenditures.

Ways and means of releasing additional resources through disarmament measures for development purposes, in particular in favour of developing countries.

30. Apart from promoting international peace, security and cooperation, disarmament can improve the environment for the pursuit of development by:

(a) Releasing resources from the military to the civilian sector at the national level;

(b) Removing the distortions in the national and international economy induced by military expenditure;

(c) Creating favourable conditions for international economic, scientific and technological co-operation and for releasing resources for development at the regional and international levels, on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis.

31. Resources released as a result of disarmament measures should be devoted to the promotion of the well-being of all peoples, the improvement of the economic conditions of the developing countries and the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries. These resources available for assistance to developing countries.

32. The release of additional resources for the civilian sector is in the interest of both industrialized and developing countries, as it would mean the stimulation of economic growth, trade and investment. Among developing countries, this could also mean additional resources to meet pressing socio-economic needs, while in the developed countries it could contribute to the achievement of the goals of social welfare. However, working towards the release of resources through disarmament is not enough; an international development strategy is a vital stabilizing element in international relations. 33. The disarmament divided may be obtained in a variety of forms. These could include trade expansion, technological transfers, the more efficient utilization of global resources, the more effective and dynamic international division of labour, the reduction of public debt and budgetary deficits, and increased flows of resources through development assistance, commercial and other private flows or transfers of resources to the developing countries.

34. Past experience has shown that conversion from military to civilian production need not present insurmountable problems.

Action programme

35. With a view:

(a) To fostering an intrrelated perspective on disarmament, development and security;

(b) To promoting multilateralism as providing the international framework for shaping the relationship between disarmament, development and security based on interdependence among nations and mutuality of interests;

(c) To strengthening the central role of the United Nations in the interrelated fields of disarmanent and development:

(i) The States participating in the International Conference reaffirm their commitments in the fields of disarmament and development and reiterate their determination to adopt, both individually and collectively, appropriate measures to implement these commitments. These will include bilateral, regional and global initiatives for peaceful resolution of conflicts and disputes;

(ii) They also stress the importance of respect of the international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts. Respect of this law makes it easier to pave the way for a solution to conflicts, and hence, ultimately to release resources for development.

(iii) They recognize the need to ensure an effective and mutually reinforcing relationship between disarmament and development and to give practical expression to it through specific measures at the national, regional and global levels;

(iv) They reaffirm the international commitment to allocate a portion of the resources released through disarmament, for purpose of socio-economic development, with a view to bridging the economic gap between developed and developing countries.

(v) In this connection, they will give further consideration:

a. To the adoption of measures to reduce the level and magnitude of military expenditures which, in addition to being an approach to disarmament, would be a means of reallocating additional resources for social and economic development particularly for the developing countries.

- b. To the utilization of existing regional and international institutions for the reallocation of resources released through disarmament measures for socio-economic development, particularly in developing countries, taking due account of existing capabilities of the United Nations system;
- c. To according priority to the allocation, within the framework of the United Nations, of part of the resources, including human and technical resources presently devoted to military purposes for emergency humanitarian relief operations and critical development problems, pending the achievement of genuine disarmament under effective international control;
- d. To the importance of greater openness, transparency and confidence among nations with a view to facilitating progress in both disarmament and development;

(vi) They will consider:

- d. Keeping under review issues related to a conversion of military industry to civilian production and undertaking studies and planning for this purpose;
- b. Undertaking studies to identify and publicize the benefits that could be derived from the reallocation of military resources;
- c. Making the results of experience in, and preparations for, solving the problems of conversion in their respective countries, available to other countries;

and the second second

(vii) They agree:

- a. To continue to assess their political and security requirements and the level of their military spending, taking into account the need to keep these expenditures at the lowest possible level, and to keep the public informed on the subject;
- b. To assess the nature and volume of resources that may be released through arms limitation and disarmament measures and to consider including in future disarmament negotiations provisions to facilitate the release of such resources;
- c. To carry out regularly analyses of the economy and social consequences of their military spending and to inform their public and the United Nations aboutthem;
- d. To appeal to appropriate regional organizations and institutions to carry out, within their mandates as appropriate, analyses of the political, military and economic factors in their regions, with a view to encouraging regional measures of disarmament and development;

(viii) They recognize that an informed public, including non-governmental organisations, has an invaluable role to play in helping to promote the objectives of disarmament and development and creating an awareness of the relationship between disarmament, development and security. They therefore agree to take appropriate measures to keep the public informed in this regard;

(ix) They emphasize the need to strengthen the central role of the United Nations and its appropriate organs in the field of disarmament and development, in promoting an interrelated perspective of these issues within the overall objective of promoting international peace and security;

- a. The United Nations and the specialized agencies should give increased emphasis in their disarmament-related public information and education activities, to the disarmament-development perspective;
- b. They request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to intensify his efforts to foster and co-ordinate the incorporation of disarmament-development perspective in the activities of the United Nations system;
- c. The Unitedd Nations should make greater efforts to promote collective knowledge of the non-military threats to international security;
- d. An improved and comprehensive data base on global and national military expenditures would greatly facilitate the study and analysis of the impact of military expenditures on the world economy and the international economic system. To this end, the broadcast possible number of states should provide objective information on their military budgets to the United Nations according to agreed and comparable definitions of the specific components of these budgets. In this connection, the work under way in the United Nations for a systematic examination of various problems of defining, reporting and comparing military budget data should be intensified;
- e. The United Nations should continue to undertake, on a regular basis, analysis of the impact of global military expenditures on the world economy and the international economic system. Consideration should be given to the idea of establishing a mechanism whithin the existing framework of the United Nations to monitor the trends in military spending;
- f. The United Nations should facilities an international exchange of views and experience in the field of conversion;
- g. The General Assembly, in receiving the report of this Conference, in receiving the report of this Conference, is requested to keep under periodic review the relationship between disarmament and development in the light of this action programme, including its consideration at the forthcoming third special session devoted to disarmament.

F

PRIMARY SOURCES

A)	The United Nations General Assembly Documents Nos.*		Brief Subject
	(1)	E.72.IX.16	Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures, 1971.
	(2)	ST/ECA/174	Disarmament and Development: Report of the Group of Experts on the Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament, 1972.
		A/32/88/ Rev.1	Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and Military Expenditures, 1978.
	(4)	A/36/356	Study on the Relationship between Disarma- ment and Development, 1981.
	(5)	A/37/386	Economic and Social Consequences of Arms Race and Military Expenditures, 1982.
	(6)	A/39/348	Study on Conventional Disarmament Report of the Secretary-General, 1984.
	(7)	A/40/553	Study on Concepts of Security: Report of the Secretary-General, 1985.
	(8)	A/CONF/PC/ INF/9	Overview of Events in the Disarmament- Development Relationship Field since 1981: Contribution by Inga Thorsson, 1986.
	(9)	A/CONF/PC/ 9/Addl.1	Overview of Events in the Disarmament- Development Relationship Field since, 1985: Contribution by Inga Thorsson, 1987.
	(10)	A/CONF/130/ PC/INF/3	Relationship between Disarmament and Deve- lopment: A Compilation of Agreed Formula- tions, 1986.

* Only important ones have been included in this list.

 $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}^{t_{1}}$

- (11) A/CONF.130/ PC/INF/17 The Relationship between Disarmament and Development: Joint Declaration by the Panel of Eminent Personalities in the Field of Disarmament and Development, 1986.
- (12) A/CONF.130/ Report of Preparatory Committee for the 1 and Corr.1 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, 1987.
- (13) A.CONF.130/ Report of the Committee of the Whole to 21 the Conference containing a draft Final Document, 1987.
- (14) A/CONF.130/ Draft Report of the Conference to the General 22 Assembly, 1987.
- (15) A/CONF.130/ Note by France on the Final Document. 23
- (16) A/CONF.130/ List of Written and Oral Statements submi-INF/4 tted by non-governmental organisations, 1987.
- (17) A/CONF.130/
PC/INF/4Preparatory
ConferenceCommitteefortheInternationalAddl.1DisarmamentandDevelopment, 1987.
- (18) A/CONF.130/ Draft Report of the Preparatory Committee PC/L.10/ of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, 1987.

(B) Other Documents

- Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, New York, 24th August - 11 September, 1987.
- (2) Final Document of the 10th Special Session of General Assembly (on Disarmament), 1978.
- (3) Concluding Document of the 12th Special Session of General Assembly (on Disarmament), 1982.

- (4) North-South: A Programme for Survival A Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, chaired by West German Chancellor Willy Brandt and published by Pan World Affairs, London, 1980.
- (5) <u>Common Security: A programme for Disarmament</u> The Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, chaired by Olof Palme, Pan World Affairs, London, 1982.
- (6) In Pursuit of Diarmament: Conversion from Military to to Civil Production in Sweden Report by Inga Thorsson, Vol. I and II, (Stockholm 1984).
- (7) The United Nations and Disarmament Compiled by the United Nations, New York, 1985.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- A) Books
 - (1) Alva Myrdal "The Game of Disarmament: How the US and Russia Run the Race", Pantheon Books, New York, 1976.
 - (2) Bhansali, Prof. S.R. "Peace and Disarmament", Faculty of Law, University of Jodhpur, 1987.
 - (3) Brandt, Willy "World Disarmament and World Hunger: <u>A Call for Action</u>, Translated by Anthea Bell, Victor Gollancz Ltd., London, 1986.
 - (4) Chopra, V.D. "Disarmament and Development: Their Relationship", United India Press, New Delhi, 1988.
 - (5) Dumas, Lloyd J. "The Political Economy of Arms Reduction: <u>Reversing Economic Decay</u>, Westview Press Inc. Boulder, Colorado, USA, 1982.
 - (6) Falk and Mendlovitz "Disarmament and Economic Development", as Volume IV of 'The Strategy of World Order', World Law Fund, New York, 1966.

- (7) Fidel, Kenneth Ed. "<u>Militerism in Developing Countries</u>", Transaction Books, New Brunswick, 1975.
- (8) Ganguli, B.N. "Economic Consequences of Disarmament", Asia Publishing House, New York, 1963.
- (9) Gasteyger, Curt "Searching for World Security: Understanding Global Armaments and Disarmament, Frances Pinter (Publication), London, 1985.
- (10) Ghosh, Pradip K. "Disarmament and Development: A Global Persepctive", Greenwood Press, London, 1984.
- (11) Katz, James Everett Ed. "Arms Production in Developing Countries", Lexington Books, Toronto, 1984.
- (12) Tuomi and Vayrynen Ed. "Militerism and Arms Production", Croom Helm, London, 1983.
- (B) Journals
 - (1) World Focus, October, 1987 "Disarmament and Development: A Positive Relationship."
 - (2) Strategic Digest, November, 1987. "Documents on the International Conference with Relationship between Disarmament and Development"
 - (3) Disarmament Fact Sheets of United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs, New York.
