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INTRODUCTION

Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was approved by the General Assembly in resolution 40/155 of 16 December 1985, requested the Secretary-General of the Conference inter alia to update existing materials, to prepare background papers, bibliographies, and compilation of information and analysis relevant to the work of the Conference, including succinct papers on the three substantive items on the agenda. These have already been published as information papers A/CONF.130/PC/INF/3 to 8.

In addition, paragraph 20 stated that "the preparation of a number of other new documents and papers, on a strictly selective basis, might be necessary". In that connection, the report stated that "the Secretary-General of the Conference should make full use of the United Nations system and also be free to consult acknowledged expertise in the field". It should also be noted that a statement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, contained in document A/C.5/40/52, "anticipated that approximately five research papers would be required".

In keeping with that, the Secretary-General of the Conference invited Ambassador Inga Thorsson, Chairperson of the 1981 United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development, to prepare a personal contribution entitled "Overview of events in the disarmament development relationship field since 1981". The paper of Ambassador Thorsson is hereby reproduced and the views expressed in it are solely those of the author.

OVERVIEW OF EVENTS IN THE DISARMAMENT DEVELOPMENT RELATIONSHIP FIELD SINCE 1981

Ambassador Inga Thorsson

"The single most massive ... obstacle to development support is the world-wide expenditure on national defence activity. It has been estimated that in 1975, compared with a total flow of net concessional transfers from all sources to developing countries of less than $20 billion, defence expenditure, world wide, amounted to about $300 billion." (United Nations Committee for Development Planning, 1976)

"In the military sector we have the greatest potential reserve for support to economic and social development."

(Wassily Leontief)

On 5 October 1981, the Secretary-General of the United Nations submitted a report on the study on the relationship between disarmament and development to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. 1/ The study was carried out by a group of governmental experts from 27 States Members of the United Nations, in accordance with the request of the General Assembly in paragraph 94 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

/...
At its thirty-seventh session the Assembly adopted resolution 37/84 in which
the Assembly, inter alia, urged Member States to consider appropriate measures in
accordance with all relevant recommendations of the Group of Governmental Experts
and determined that the question of reallocation and conversion of resources
through disarmament measures, from military to civilian purposes, should be
included in the provisional agenda of the General Assembly at intervals to be
decided upon, starting with its fortieth regular session in 1985.

At its thirty-ninth session the General Assembly adopted resolution 39/160,
the first paragraph of which reads as follows: "Decides to convene an
International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development".

In addition, at its fortieth session, the General Assembly decided, by its
resolution 40/155, that the Conference was to be held in Paris from 15 July to
2 August 1986.

The intention of this paper is to give an overview of what has happened in the
field under consideration since the Secretary-General submitted the report of the
Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and
Development to the General Assembly in 1981, to which the Assembly gave its
approval at its thirty-sixth session. What will be reviewed is:

(a) Actions taken in accordance with resolution 37/84 at international as
well as national levels;

(b) Research undertaken by universities, foreign affairs research institutes,
peace research institutes and others, including trade unions and particular
conversion groups;

(c) Opinion-building activities.

**Action at the international level**

Regarding the activities by and within the United Nations the author can in
the main refer to a separate document submitted by the Secretariat to the
Preparatory Committee at its second session (A/CONF.130/PC/INF/5). A few words
more could be added, however, concerning the way in which the issue under
consideration was discussed in the 1985 Report on the World Social Situation 2/
submitted to the Commission on Social Development at its 1985 session. Quotes of
parts of two paragraphs show the effect on international development co-operation
of the rise in military spending:

"When military spending rises and its adverse effects on the budget or
current account positions are felt by the developed countries, their
willingness and ability to provide aid for the economic and social development
of the developing countries declines. Furthermore, if increases in military
spending are accompanied by increases 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. In the
case of at least one major donor, the share of aid going to security rather

/...
than to economic assistance has increased, whilst a few countries account for a very large percentage of its total aid. The implication of such a trend for the international economy, and especially for the development of those countries which are not considered strategically important would appear to be negative."

(p. 38)

"At the level of the individual developing country, the choice between social and economic development and armaments is perhaps most clearly made in allocating foreign exchange to military as against other imports. As most arms have to be imported, arms buildup are strongly felt on the balance of payments and external debt positions. It has been calculated that among the 20 countries with the largest foreign debt in 1983, arms imports between 1976 and 1980 were equivalent to 20 per cent of the increase in debt. In 4 of those 20 countries, the value of arms imports was equal to 40 per cent or more of the rise in debt in that period." (p. 39)

In contrast to what can be found in terms of comments on the consequences of what is called "conflicts and militarism" in the above quoted United Nations report, the author has not been able to see any reference in a series of United Nations world economic survey reports from the years 1982-1984 to the effects, caused both by external and domestic factors, of the continuing and intensifying arms race on world economy and economic development in developing countries.

Reference should also be made to the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the study on concepts of security (A/40/553). Against the background of what was said on the dynamic relationship between disarmament and development and security, forming the point of departure of the report on the disarmament-development relationship, what is stated in document A/40/553 is of interest, as could be seen from the following quotes:

"Security issues in developing countries have acquired a special degree of urgency. Many developing countries are faced with war and deprivation. Given the growing economic and political links of interdependence between the developed and the developing regions, security concerns of the developing countries increasingly influence the entire international system. The security implications of unrest in developing countries are magnified by the possibility of political, economic or military intervention by the great Powers." (para. 85)

"For many of the four billion inhabitants in the developing countries, security is conceived at the most basic level of the struggle for individual survival. Eight hundred million live in absolute poverty and deprivation. Five hundred million are malnourished. Many millions have no access to safe drinking-water and do not have the income necessary to purchase food. They lack protection against the consequences of environmental degradation and natural calamities, such as floods and drought, which, in Africa in particular, have produced famine and suffering of unprecedented proportions." (para. 86)
"In addition to threats posed by proliferating arms technology, spiralling nuclear and conventional arms race, problems of development, population and environmental resource issues have emerged as major new challenges to global peace and stability. The recent United Nations population conferences in Mexico City and Bucharest have increased the awareness of the enormous impact that current population trends will have on efforts for development for the foreseeable future." (para. 90)

"The close relationship between disarmament and development has been recognized by the General Assembly. The release of resources by the achievement of disarmament measures could do much to promote the economic and social development of all nations and assist in relieving the difficulties arising from the economic gap between developed and developing countries." (para. 120)

"Security policies can no longer be concerned with peace, defined merely as the absence of war, but must deal effectively with the broader and more complex questions of the interrelationship between military and non-military elements of security. It is essential to address underlying political, social and economic problems." (para. 214 (3))

Action taken at the international level could also be initiated regionally. That happened when the Organization of African Unity convened a ministerial regional Conference on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa at Lomé, Togo, from 13 to 15 August 1985. The Conference was organized in co-operation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR). Before its conclusion the Conference adopted:

(a) The Lomé Declaration on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa,

(b) The Programme of Action for Peace, Security and Co-operation in Africa.

In its declaration the Conference recognized the close interrelationship and interdependence between the objectives of security, disarmament and development, not only in Africa but world wide. It also stressed that the concept of security in the region must go beyond military security and the prevention of armed conflicts to: "encompass a sustained commitment by States of the region to African, national, bilateral and multilateral programmes of socio-economic development, justice, equity and human dignity".

Notice should also be taken of a very recent initiative in Latin America: the formation, on 3 February 1986, of a South American Commission for Peace, Regional Security and Democracy. This was preceded by a meeting on 1 and 2 February, attended by personalities from seven South American countries and headed by a former President of Venezuela. Among its objectives, mention should be made of the following: the concepts of security, the elimination of foreign military bases, the peaceful solution of border and territorial tensions and conflicts, the balanced reduction of armaments expenditures, diverting parts of arms spending into foreign debt payments and development.

/...
Action at the national level

Action at the national level consists, inter alia, of Government responses to questionnaires sent out by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in 1982, at the request of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, and submitted in time for the second special session on disarmament in July 1982, and to those sent out at the request of the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session and submitted in time for the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission in May 1984. The answers received from Governments can hardly be said to reflect a widespread, genuine and deep-felt involvement in the disarmament-development issue.

Thirty Governments responded to the 1982 questionnaire, nine of them through the then spokesman for the European Economic Community. Of the answers six came from Governments in developing countries.

In the answers from 14 Governments, a positive attitude to the report by the Group of Governmental Experts was clearly reflected. A common feature is a recommendation to the United Nations to continue its work on the subject. It should be noticed that at this stage, before the second special session on disarmament of the General Assembly, the Governments of Member States had not yet taken political action related to the report through any decision of the General Assembly.

This was, however, the case in spring 1985, as preparations went on for the debate on that issue at the fortieth session of the General Assembly. At its thirty-seventh session, in 1982, the General Assembly adopted resolution 37/84, in which it, in paragraph 2, urged Member States to consider appropriate measures in accordance with all relevant recommendations of the Group of Governmental Experts.

The Secretary-General's questionnaire was this time answered by 12 Governments. In nine of these answers no reference was made to follow up actions at the national level, in accordance with the paragraph mentioned above. One Government referred to cuts made in its military expenditures and to plans to retrain demobilized military personnel for civilian activities. Another Government announced its decision in principle to set up a national commission to examine the question of conversion of defence industries to civilian production. A third Government reported on such an examination having been carried out; this report will be referred to below.

Turning now to substantive action at the national level, as a follow-up of paragraph 2 of resolution 37/84, it is of course almost impossible to evaluate the amount of consideration that Governments of Member States have given to what appropriate measures could and should be taken at the national level, most particularly based on recommendation No. 5, which reads:

"The Group recommends that Governments create the necessary prerequisites, including preparations and, where appropriate, planning, to facilitate the conversion of resources freed by disarmament measures to civilian purposes, especially to meet urgent economic and social needs, in particular in the developing countries."
However, to the best of knowledge acquired, only the Government of one Member State as indicated above, has made the first step towards the implementation of this recommendation. In September 1983 the Government of Sweden initiated a study, to be carried out by me as a special expert, on how, in a situation of international disarmament, Sweden could convert resources from military to civil production. The terms of reference given to the special expert specified her tasks as follows:

(a) Describing the nature and magnitude of Sweden's present defence efforts in economic and social terms;

(b) Giving examples of defence resources which, in the event of varying degrees of disarmament in our part of the world, can be converted for other purposes;

(c) Stating the feasibility of defence-sector conversion and its problems in different peace perspectives;

(d) Stating how a conversion of resources from defence to civilian use might also make a contribution to Sweden's international development co-operation with the developing countries.

The main report was submitted to the Swedish Government by the special expert in August 1984 and was followed by a second report containing a number of more detailed analyses in October 1985. Both reports are available in English under the title "In Pursuit of Disarmament: Conversion from Military to Civil Production in Sweden"; a summary, the appraisals and the recommendations of the main report are also available in French.

The content of the main report can be summarized as follows.

The various components of Sweden's security and defence policy as well as the Swedish arms industry are described in some detail. The report explains why Sweden - due to its policy of neutrality - maintains a comparatively large defence-industrial sector. By describing the Swedish defence forces and the defence industry extensively it aims at focusing interest on, and increasing the knowledge of military resources in Sweden. The report provides examples of how, in the event of international disarmament, resources could be reallocated for other domestic purposes as well as for development co-operation with developing countries and explains why preparations for such a conversion of resources must start well in advance of a disarmament process.

According to the report it would be possible to reduce Sweden's defence expenditures if the military blocs started to reduce their armed forces and weapons in Europe, with particular emphasis on offensive weapons and weapon systems. The report concludes that, since the defence sector absorbs only a few per cent of Sweden's economic resources, the effect for the economy as a whole would be manageable. However, such a reduction would create economic and social difficulties locally, particularly in a number of communities with heavy defence dependency. In order to avert such difficulties, plans would have to be worked out and steps taken to reduce defence dependency by expanding the civil sector.

/...
Although effective international disarmament may still be a somewhat remote possibility, the report concludes that it would be essential to start preparing for defence-industry conversion today. Experience gained from reduction in defence procurement in recent years indicates that, because of the particular characteristics of the defence industries, it takes a long time, often as much as 10 years, to design and develop competitive products for civilian markets. Also, it is of the utmost importance that those working in the defence industry should not have to look upon disarmament as a threat to their future and their means of livelihood.

Another important consideration emphasized in the report is that the Government has a responsibility for defence-industry conversion since the human and technical resources involved have been utilized for national defence purposes. A number of practical measures are suggested in order to facilitate conversion from military to civilian production in Sweden.

According to both the United Nations report on the relationship between disarmament and development and this Swedish report, it would be desirable for a link to be established between disarmament and development by reallocating resources from the military sector to meeting the needs of economic and social development, not least in developing countries. Such resources should be additional to existing allocations made for development purposes. Such a transfer of additional resources would contribute to development efforts in all parts of the world as well as to the attainment of a more just distribution of world resources.

The Swedish report suggests that an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations would be helpful in this respect since it would facilitate a discussion of a global, integrated view of disarmament and development. Such a conference would create a better understanding of the need to devote more resources to development co-operation with developing countries. The report concludes that Sweden should take an active part in the forthcoming International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

Research in the field of disarmament-development relationship

The author of this paper is not convinced that she has been able to get adequate knowledge of activities around the world in the area covered by the subtitle. It has, however, struck her that what she has learned constitutes by far the most extensive efforts to analyse and, thereby, clarify the many aspects of this relationship and, through that process, throw some light on the possibilities for political action in order to promote a more sensible use of Earth's available resources for constructive purposes. On the other hand, this does not mean that the area of investigation has attracted the attention world wide of researchers or funding activities.

What follows are reviews of such activities as carried out:

(a) At universities and foreign affairs research institutes;
(b) At peace research institutes;
(c) At other peace-related surroundings.

/...
First, however, a brief general remark. There are only a few groups which devote their energies to the topic and research in the area is rather unco-ordinated. In particular, few members of the development research community have indicated interest in the subject. This corresponds to the equally small amount of interest in this area of relationships among involved official actors on the international development stage, already discussed briefly in this paper. Also, few foundations and other funding agencies have shown themselves willing to support a significant amount of new research in this field. It is a matter of fact that some but by no means all of the research published in recent years in the area is derived from projects begun under the auspices of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

In spite of these reservations, the following can be said about recent and current research activities.

Most of it has been carried out in Western Europe and North America. As far as defence-industry conversion is concerned, research has been entirely limited to these areas. This is perhaps not surprising since only a few third world countries have defence industries of any magnitude and there is little, if any, interest in the economic consequences of a contraction in the defence-industrial sector. Rather, concern in the third world tends to be concentrated on how best to build up a domestic defence-industrial capacity. Even in Western Europe and North America, research on defence-industry conversion has been limited to just a few countries. Most work has taken place in the United States - especially under the auspices of groups such as the Center for Economic Conversion and the Council on Economic Priorities - and the Federal Republic of Germany, where the trade unions have played a leading role. At the University of Hamburg, for example, the West German trade union IG Metall has funded a research project under the guidance of Dr. Herbert Wulf which is seeking to identify alternative products for German defence companies. In the United Kingdom, trade unionists have been actively involved in finding alternative products for firms currently producing weapons and in contributing to the debate on how conversion might be best carried out.

Both recent research and attempts on the part of conversion activists to implement alternative-use planning at companies that produce weapons strongly demonstrate the importance of co-operation between Governments (national, regional and local), management and workers if the conversion process is to succeed. Equally important, the greater flexibility all parties to the adjustment process are able to exhibit, the more likely it is that conversion will be successful. While conversion activists and trade unionists cannot hope to transform the military-industrial sector in the absence of government support and without the co-operation of management, they have a role to play in terms both of public education and of offering examples of how the conversion process might proceed. They can also carry out much-needed research into the defence dependence of communities, firms and different categories of workers.

In view of the decline of a number of industries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries in recent years (for example shipbuilding and steel), many conversion researchers and activists in the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany have started to
argue that the problem of conversion extends beyond the borders of the defence sector. In the words of Dr. Gordon Adams, Director of the Defence Budget Project at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, who has a long-standing commitment to defence-industry conversion, "the conversion issue is only one, small piece of a much larger dilemma: the problem of economic transition ... the issue we are dealing with is local economic diversification and planning for all communities, not just communities that depend upon defense contracting or bases".

Most research which comes under the disarmament-development rubrique examines the effect that increases or decreases in military expenditure have on economic growth and development in the industrialized and the developing countries. Two groups which have devoted considerable attention to this topic over the years are the Arbeitsgruppe Rüstung und Unterentwicklung at the University of Hamburg and the Birkbeck Group at the University of London. The Arbeitsgruppe, currently headed by Dr. Peter Lock, is now examining the effect that the military sector has on development in seven third world countries. The Birkbeck Group, led by Drs. Ron Smith and Saadet Deger, continues its work on the macro-economic relationship between military spending and economic growth and development in both the industrialized and the developing countries.

Two large conferences funded by the Ford Foundation have brought together researchers in the United States (at Tufts University, 1984) and Europe (at Birkbeck College, University of London, 1986) working on these topics. Only a handful of these researchers, however, have devoted themselves exclusively to these subjects. Three researchers who have written extensively on disarmament and development over the last five years are: Dr. Jacques Fontanel of the Centre d'études défense et sécurité internationale in France, Dr. Robin Luckham of the Institute of Development Studies in the United Kingdom and Nicole Ball of the Swedish Institute of International Affairs. Fontanel has concentrated on the effect of military spending in the industrialized countries and the establishment of a disarmament fund for development; Luckham on militarization in the third world, especially Africa; and Ball on the developmental role of the military sector in third world countries and on defence-industry conversion.

Until recently the major peace research institutes have been located primarily in Western Europe: 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), and the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF). In 1985, the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security was set up in Ottawa and the Peace Research Centre at the Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra. The main activity of the ANU Centre is research while the Canadian Institute will devote much of its resources to public education although it will also carry out research.

Of these, SIPRI has made the largest contribution to the disarmament-development field during the 1980s through its continuing work on military expenditure, arms production and arms transfers. PRIO has published reports on third world militarization and on the likely effects of reductions in military expenditure on the Norwegian economy. One of its researchers, Dr. Marek Thee, also
took part in the UNIDIR exercise on the creation of a disarmament fund for development. PRIF held a conference in March 1985 on possibilities for and limits to an East-West understanding of the North-South conflict, at which one session was devoted to the disarmament-development theme. IFEH has been carrying out the IG Metall-funded project on defence-industry conversion mentioned above.

While much of the relevant research has been carried out in Western Europe and North America, interest in disarmament-development is by no means absent in the third world. Many researchers from Africa, Asia and Latin America have studied the effects of the military sector on development. At least two development agencies have supported research in the third world on this topic. The Swedish Agency for Research Co-operation with Developing Countries (SAREC) funded an international project on the role of the military sector in the development process which involved researchers in the third world as well as in Sweden and in which is now nearing completion. IDRC in Canada has recently commissioned a feasibility study and a state-of-the-art report to determine how a research programme in this field might be designed. IDRC has also reportedly begun to fund a project on Asian security issues to be carried out in Singapore.

It is, however, a fact that has been pointed out several times already in this paper, that disarmament and development still tend to be treated as two separate issues. Very little of the research that is normally subsumed under the disarmament-development heading actually deals with the release of resources from the military sector and their subsequent use for development purposes and, as already mentioned, only a few individuals in the development research community have shown much interest in the topic. Since 1981, several French researchers have examined the modalities for creating a disarmament fund for development while British and Norwegian researchers have extended earlier macro-economic work on the effect of reductions in military spending on national economies. For the most part, however, research has focused on the military use of resources (financial, human and material), on security environment (which, of course, helps to determine resource use), and on the relationship between the use of resources for military purposes and economic growth and development in the industrialized and the developing countries. Rather than examining the effect of decreases in military spending on growth and development, many researchers have focused on the effect of increased military expenditure, since that has more accurately reflected trends.

In the main, the research carried out over the last five years on all aspects of the disarmament-development theme tends to support the conclusions reached in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that "the arms race and development compete for the same resources", that "irrespective of economic systems and levels of economic development, all countries would benefit economically from an effective disarmament process", and that if conversion were "well-planned and prepared ... no serious technical and economic difficulties would result".

This recent research has, however, done more than simply reiterate the findings of the investigations on which the Expert Group's report was based. It has also added depth to our understanding of the relationship between the process of armament, on the one hand, and that of development, on the other, by illuminating more clearly the complexities of this relationship.

/...
In one important respect, however, some researchers have begun to question earlier assumptions. Because the military sector and development are seen to be in competition for scarce resources and it is argued that the world cannot successfully arm and develop simultaneously, disarmament has often been considered a precondition for development. Some researchers now suggest that the opposite may in fact be the case: development may be the precondition for disarmament, at least in the third world.

"The conventional pattern of development ('growth and modernization') actually seems to create internal and external conflicts that breed the arms race but ... there may be other, more 'peace intensive' development option ('another development') with a contrary effect. If this is correct, then the causational chain between disarmament and development must be reversed. Rather than conceiving disarmament as a condition for development, one could argue that development -- development of a certain kind -- is a condition for disarmament." (Bjørn Hëtne, Approaches to the Study of Peace and Development, a state-of-the-art report. August 1984)

Inequalities among and within countries are closely associated with the perpetuation of underdevelopment. Their persistence frequently produces discontent and, in all too many cases, causes "Governments to arm themselves against their own people". In such a situation, limitation on the arms possessed by the major Powers and the transfer of additional resources from abroad -- the traditional disarmament-development formula -- may not make much difference to those who are most in need of assistance and will not help overcome the political constraints on development.

Probably the greatest contribution of the recent research into the use of resources for military purposes and the effects of this pattern of allocation on development is that it demonstrates quite clearly the considerable differences that exist among countries. It remains true that the net impact of military expenditure on growth and development in both industrialized and developing countries is more likely to be negative than positive. It is increasingly recognized, however, that the burden of supporting the military sector is greater for some countries than for others and that reductions in military spending will not automatically be translated into economic growth and development.

Despite the research that has been carried out in the last five years which has refined our understanding of many aspects of the disarmament-development relationship, considerable work remains to be done. In order to evaluate the likely effect of increases or decreases in military expenditures on an economy, it is necessary to know in as much detail as possible how the resources devoted to the military sector interact with the rest of the economy. In many cases, our knowledge of the resources absorbed by the military sector is not sufficiently precise to enable accurate evaluations to be made.

Opinion-building activities

Since the beginning of the 1980s, international security relations have been dominated by the sharp deterioration of relations between the United States and the
Soviet Union, the related increase in military spending by the major Powers and the intensification of the arms race between the two super-Powers, armed conflicts in parts of the third world and intervention by the major Powers in many of these conflicts. International economic relations have been characterized by recession in the industrialized countries which has spilled over into the third world and seriously weakened many developing countries' economies, due to falling demand for third-world exports, declining terms of trade, increased debt-servicing costs and food shortages, to mention some of the serious global problems the burden of which has fallen heavily on the peoples in the third world countries.

In an attempt to alter these negative trends and to capitalize on what was seen as "an extraordinary period of popular and political awakening to the dangers of war" (Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament, report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues (London and Sydney, Pan Books, 1982)) a number of campaigns got under way in the 1980s to influence public opinion on the need for disarmament and the importance of revitalizing the world economy. Chief among these were the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues (the Palme Commission) which issued the above-mentioned report, the Independent Commission on International Development Issues (the Brandt Commission), which published its second report, Common Crisis: North-South - Co-operation for World Recovery, in 1983, the InterAction Council and the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign.

Although the first two of these reports both deal with important aspects of the disarmament-development equation, neither of them devotes much attention to a discussion of the link between the two processes. In his introduction to Common Crisis, Willy Brandt expresses his belief that "only an end to the arms race, which in developing countries also has reached a terrifying pace, will give us the chance of overcoming our common crises - the grim political and economic confusion engulfing our societies everywhere". The main body of the report, however, concentrates on:

"The international recession, which could deepen into depression in 1983; massive unemployment in the north and the threat of economic collapse in parts of the South; the acute dangers to the world financial system and growing disorder in international trade ..." (p. 11)

Common Security, for its part, concentrates on security issues, particularly as they affect the industrialized countries. The discussion of third-world security problems is limited and, of the 32 short- and medium-term objectives for promoting common security identified in the report, 24 directly concern only the members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO. Common Security does, however, devote an entire chapter to the economic and social consequences of military spending in the industrialized and the developing worlds. Its conclusions here support those reached in the United Nations report. In addition, the Palme Commission argues that a continuation of the post-Second World War trend of devoting ever more resources to the military sector is only likely to increase both military and economic insecurity, and that the attainment of military security and economic security are intimately related.

/...
"The principle of common security which underlies this report asserts that countries can only find security in co-operation and not at each other's expense. This principle applies to economic as well as to military security. Countries are joined together by economic interdependence as well as by the threat of destruction. All countries are hurt if military spending reduces the economic well-being of major participants in the world economy. All are hurt if military demands on Governments' finances limit aid or commercial lending to developing countries. Economic recovery requires a common effort to increase trade. Without economic recovery there is not hope for common security - for the common prosperity which is the basis of security itself." (p. 96)

On the link between disarmament and development, Common Security has much less to say. While recognizing that such a link "is close and compelling", the Palme Commission takes the position that:

"Schemes for linking disarmament and development will be different in different countries and regions ... It is up to the imagination of people in each country to find ways to participate in such 'peace competition'." (p. 174)

In January 1984, the Palme and Brandt Commissions held a joint meeting in Rome which, somewhat surprisingly, received scant attention in the world press and the international community. In the statement issued after this meeting, the two Commissions:

"... recognised the close relationship between security and development, and in the process by which economic distress caused instability in Third World countries which in turn could draw in outside powers with the ultimate risk of nuclear war ... they drew attention to the resources which even partial disarmament would release for development and peace-keeping efforts, pointing out that only 0.1 per cent of world-wide military spending would treble the United Nations' peace-keeping resources".

Discouraged by the lack of "political decisions and effective action" that has resulted from the Brandt and Palme reports and from various international meetings such as the second special session on disarmament at the United Nations and the North-South Summit in Cancún, a group of former heads of Government decided in 1983 to set up the InterAction Council "as a result of our deep concern over the world situation as it is today, and as it may develop in the absence of effective international action". With 26 former heads of Government as members and supported by a small secretariat, a Policy Board and a Communications Committee, the InterAction Council is a high-level lobbying group. The Council hopes to influence world affairs through "an informal network of eminent persons in the world political, intellectual and business communities and from non-governmental organizations" and through contacts with the media. (Communiqué Vienna, 7-9 March 1983)

Concerned that "world peace was being threatened on two fronts, the politico-military and the economic", the InterAction Council has given top priority to three issues:

/...
(a) The promotion of peace and disarmament;

(b) The revitalization of the world economy, in particular by way of lower interest rates and dealing with the problems of external debt;

(c) The strengthening of co-operation for development (Final Statement, adopted at Brioni, 24-26 May 1984).

Based on advice from several high-level expert groups - on nuclear disarmament and security, on military expenditure by developing countries, on the problems of the least-developed States and on global financial issues - the Council has formulated a series of action proposals which its members are currently supporting, including by taking part in high-level missions to particular countries to inform Governments of the Council's concerns.

While the Interaction Council has not suggested any formal mechanism by which disarmament and development concerns might be linked, it is clearly cognizant of the relationship which exists between these two processes:

"... military outlays by developing countries, part of which undoubtedly serve legitimate security interests, also have negative effects on development prospects and tend to aggravate domestic and regional tensions and conflicts. The level of arms expenditures is often not only determined by security needs, real or perceived, but also by pressures from arms-producing countries, competition among suppliers and political intervention. Super-Power rivalry and the arms race between them contribute significantly to the level of military expenditures by developing countries. Moreover, the transfer of increasingly sophisticated arms to developing countries generates new insecurity and dependence and diverts funds from development activities." (Final Statement, Paris, 25-27 April 1985)

Under the subtitle dealing with research activities the author made the remark that few members of the development research community have indicated interest in the issue under review in this paper. One of these few is the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, United Kingdom. The issue of October 1985, vol. 16, No. 4 of its IDS Bulletin is devoted completely to the subject of this paper, under the title: "Disarmament and world development: is there a way forward?". The many contributors to this issue review the present situation against the background of earlier reports, referred to in this paper, and present developments in the arms race as well as lack of developments in the development field. The findings constitute the justification of but also the answers to the question contained in the subtitle of this special issue.

Similarly, the 1986 edition of the French yearbook Arès, published by the Centre d'études défense et sécurité Internationale of the Université des Sciences Sociales de Grenoble, will contain a special section entitled "Disarmament for development" as a response to the 1986 International Conference.

The United Nations World Disarmament Campaign, launched pursuant to a decision by the General Assembly at its twelfth special session (the second special session
on disarmament) and focused mainly on five major constituencies: elected representatives, media, non-governmental organizations, educational communities and research institutes, is carried out in all regions of the world. It devotes a quite considerable amount of attention, at regional seminars and otherwise, to the disarmament-development relationship.

Lastly, the observation should be made that the general public debate worldwide has to an increasing extent focused on the disarmament-development relationship. The author believes that an understanding is growing among peoples in the world that the present amount of resource use for military purposes, particularly in the militarily significant countries can never be considered compatible with sensible planning for a better and more secure human future. Instead evidence points clearly and to an increasing extent to many and various negative economic consequences of the continuing and considerable use of available resources for purposes which cannot, in spite of arguments brought forward by political and military leaders, be judged as constructive. Public opinion in all countries may be expected to provide guidance to their leaders in the direction of a more positive resource use than at present.

As has been pointed out in different contexts earlier, the author has noted with some regret that there seems, up to and as of now, to be a lack of sufficient interest, at all levels of the international development community in disarmament-development relationship. As the existence of such a relationship, in the opinion of many, is evidenced by years of studies and research. It is a hope and an expectation that the development community, nationally and internationally, at the governmental and the non-governmental levels, will appreciate the possibilities of benefits to be accrued from an effective international disarmament and conversion process. Hopefully, this will make them join the forces which are now urging constructive political action to this end.

Notes

1/ The Relationship between Disarmament and Development (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1).