



General Assembly

UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS
REFERENCE LIBRARY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/57/Add.1
25 April 1984
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Addendum

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS	
France	2
Norway	6
Senegal	7

FRANCE

[Original: French]

[26 April 1984]

1. The General Assembly of the United Nations has already affirmed, on several occasions, the link between the tasks of development and the undertaking of disarmament. France, itself, has put forward proposals on this subject. Various studies on the economic and social consequences of the arms race, the reduction of military expenditures, the relationship between disarmament and development and the modalities of an international disarmament fund for development, have been undertaken within the United Nations. However, these efforts have not yet led to any tangible progress.

2. Without excluding the possibility of undertaking new studies, including some at the national level (in accordance with the conclusions of the study on the relationship between disarmament and development and the recommendations contained in resolutions 36/92 G, 37/84 and 38/71 B), it would now seem to be desirable, as proposed by the President of the French Republic in his address to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session on 28 September 1983 and in accordance with resolution 38/71 B, to begin a substantive debate with regard to the following points in particular:

- (a) The evaluation of the burden of armaments in the world;
- (b) The impact of military expenditures on the world economic situation and development;
- (c) The contribution that a reduction in arms and military expenditures, in particular by nuclear-weapon States and other militarily important States, or a contribution by those States, as appropriate would make to development tasks;
- (d) The ways and means that would enable this contribution to be made in particular in the interests of the economic and social progress of the developing countries;
- (e) The consideration of proposals relating to the convening of a conference.

3. France believes that the experience of the serious and prolonged crisis in international relations should prompt Member States to contemplate a global approach which encompasses all the problems raised by the "disarmament-development" relationship:

- (a) Evaluation of the burden of armaments: this should entail ascertaining the world-wide level of expenditure on armaments and the level of such spending by each of the main military countries. Indeed, since the very magnitude of these expenditures is recognized as being detrimental to the entire international community, the latter needs to know the amount of responsibility of each in that regard.

/...

(b) The impact of military expenditures on unsolved world economic problems: many aspects of the world economic situation can be considered from this perspective. Priority should, of course, be given to the problem of development.

(c) A study of the relationship between security and development: the over-all burden of armaments is greater for developing countries than for others not only because the magnitude of resources spent on arms prevents the rich countries from assisting the least-developed countries as much as they might but also because international tensions have particularly severe consequences for the most disadvantaged countries. Such countries, which have great difficulty in securing the financing they need for their development, are often also those which are most threatened by a deterioration of the international climate, for which in most cases they bear little responsibility. In other words, not only should a reduction in military expenditures bring about an increase in assistance to developing countries, but security is one of the conditions for the economic and social growth of every poor State.

(d) The special responsibility of the greatest Powers: on the basis of previous analyses, the question of the responsibility of the greatest Powers for the deterioration of the international situation - and thus the question of acknowledging the special obligation which they have vis-à-vis those poor countries which suffer the most from inadequate security - must be dealt with.

It is obvious that the debate which France is advocating will be pointless unless it leads to some conclusions. It is equally clear that these conclusions can be precisely identified only at the end of the debate itself.

4. France nevertheless believes that some guidelines for research may be laid down now.

A. In terms of principles, it would be useful:

- To consider a combination of the right to security and the right to development for the most disadvantaged countries and those most susceptible to the consequences of a deterioration of the international climate;

- To establish the ²right to compensation of countries which are "victims of security", that is, countries whose population, territory, economy and social equilibrium have been directly affected by international tensions;

- To determine the responsibility of the greatest Powers in that connection;

- To emphasize the priority which international organizations must give to resolving such situations;

- To stress that development assistance must be provided especially for countries which are victims of international tension, and that it should account for a greater share of the assistance programmes of the developed countries, including the military assistance they provide, whether in the form of technical or financial assistance.

B. One may also ask how additional resources might be secured for development, as well as how those resources would be used.

A decision along these lines is justified by the need for a realistic approach in keeping with the expectations of the disadvantaged countries. To make additional resources available immediately is to acknowledge that it is, unfortunately, impossible to predict when substantial savings might be derived from disarmament agreements, but that it, is not likely to be soon. In this context, any possible decision would be anticipatory and would signify political agreement on the importance and urgency of the problem.

Where are these resources to come from? One could naturally envisage a system of voluntary contributions. It might be desirable, even if a basis for consensus on the problem does not yet exist to consider the possibility of a binding agreement establishing a sort of mandatory tax in proportion to expenditure on armaments. The target could be roughly the equivalent of 1 or 2 per cent of military expenditure.

Following such an approach, the problem of defining criteria would naturally arise. In order to be an incentive to disarmament, contributions must come from the most heavily armed countries and reflect the magnitude of their military outlays.

Criteria linked to the wealth of various countries could also be considered. The contribution could be prorated on the basis of military expenditure, if there was agreement on how to evaluate that expenditure. Such agreement is a very desirable objective in itself, even if there are still difficulties involved. In order to underline the importance of the problem of nuclear weapons reduction, stressing the responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council in that regard, it might be possible to consider the immediate payment by the nuclear Powers of an advance on their future contributions, prorated on the basis of the number of nuclear-weapon delivery vehicles in their arsenals.

The fact that such funds supplement existing official development assistance must be made clear. Certainly, agreement on and the subsequent implementation of effective disarmament measures should make it possible to allocate a portion of the resources released to additional development efforts. These funds could be deducted from the contributions previously requested of the States concerned.

As to how the funds released would be used, they should go to additional development programmes, the majority of which would be agreed on and managed by the international organizations already active in this field. Such an approach seems more effective than that of creating a new body. Rules governing co-operation with other international or regional organizations would be established. A given portion of the contributions would be used for activities to benefit the least-developed countries; another would be reserved for activities to benefit the countries and regions that are most hard-hit by international disturbances, tensions or conflicts, through, inter alia, emergency aid to the affected populations, including refugees, and the rebuilding of destroyed infrastructure. The respective roles of the United Nations and the regional organizations should be

clearly defined. Co-ordination should be established between the international organizations participating in these various activities.

C. The President of the French Republic, addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations, proposed that a debate should be arranged in two successive stages:

- A small meeting which France would be happy to host in Paris.

The choice of participants should be the subject of broad consultation. It would be made on the basis of criteria geared to the situation of the various countries with respect to armaments and level of development in such a way that the major categories would be represented as fairly as possible.

The small meeting should include the nuclear Powers as well as heavily armed States. States chosen from among the developing countries, including some least-developed ones, should also be included.

The special contribution of States to international discussions on disarmament and development could also be taken into consideration.

Finally, it would be essential to ensure an equitable geographical and political balance in the membership of the meeting.

The task of the small meeting would be:

- (a) To reflect on the conditions governing the debate on the relationship between disarmament and development;
- (b) To propose surveys and additional studies;
- (c) To submit suggestions for the second conference;
- (d) To propose a set of objectives to be achieved for the transfer of resources for development and possibility to recommend measures which would have a rapid effect.

- A meeting of all States Members of the United Nations should then be convened, in accordance with the usual procedures.

NORWAY

[Original: English]

[5 April 1984]

Norway attaches great importance to the question of releasing resources from military expenditures for economical and social development through balanced, mutual and verifiable disarmament measures. The resources released in this manner should be utilized in particular for the benefit of developing countries.

A number of relevant questions with regard to the relationship between disarmament and development have been raised in General Assembly resolution 38/71 B of 15 December 1983. Some of these questions have also been discussed by the group of governmental experts which prepared the Secretary-General's report on the relationship between disarmament and development 1/ during the years 1978-1981.

Since the completion of the report, Norway has supported in a number of ways efforts within the United Nations to follow up and to consider further the relationship between disarmament and development. This also includes the efforts undertaken by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 37/84 of 9 December 1982, which, inter alia, recommends UNIDIR to investigate the modalities for an international disarmament fund for development.

Our views on this question and other aspects of the relationship between disarmament and development of relevance to the questions raised in General Assembly resolution 38/71 B are contained in the reply of Norway to the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 36/92 G (A/S-12/13 of 14 May 1982, pp. 22-28).

Norway has noted with interest the specific and new proposal made by the President of France, Mr. François Mitterrand, in his statement on 28 September 1983 to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to convene two successive conferences to discuss the problem of the relationship between disarmament and development.

Although a preparatory conference could be of restricted participation, it would nevertheless seem preferable to convene future conferences in this field under the auspices of the United Nations in view of the global nature of the issues involved and the efforts already undertaken by the United Nations in this area.

The preparatory conference could prepare recommendations on the various aspects of the implementation of future policies concerning the relationship between disarmament and development, in particular on questions relating to the establishment of an international disarmament fund for development. The objective of the conference could be to take action on the recommendations by the preparatory conference, taking into account the views of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

1/ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.

SENEGAL

[Original: French]

[19 April 1984]

Several studies have already been made comparing the trends in military expenditures with the crying economic and social needs of two thirds of the globe.

While 30 children die every minute of hunger or disease, the world continues to spend \$1.5 million every minute in the buildup of increasingly sophisticated arms.

It is obvious from this that a reduction of military expenditures would release immense resources that could be used for the economic and social advancement of the developing countries.

A general indication of how military expenditures could, in practice, be redeployed for development purposes has been given by the Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General to study the relationship between disarmament and development, in whose work Senegal took an active part. The Group's conclusions leave open the choice of the means for reallocating military funds to development.

For the time being, the absence of any genuine disarmament agreements and the obscurity of military budgets stand in the way of both a system for releasing funds through disarmament measures and a system for imposing an arms tax. Consequently, we believe that a provisional yardstick must be found, such as the gross national product or the economic growth rate, to obtain resources for an international disarmament fund for development, which could for the time being be a part of one of the United Nations development bodies or agencies.

As far as the convening of a conference on the relationship between disarmament and development is concerned, the proposal made by France at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly could be adopted. The next step would be to convene a preparatory meeting of representatives of the main military Powers, which would then be expanded to include other countries from the third world, selected on the basis of for instance, appropriate geographical criteria. Such a meeting would, in the process of preparing for a United Nations conference on the question, establish a set of objectives at which to aim in the transfer to development of resources released by disarmament.
