

anything but defensive and in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter. Given this reality, the 'restraint' referred to in the resolution is only likely to occur as a result of this prior determination. Restraint for restraint sake is not a component of the Register process. Rather it is related to a security context that can only be addressed multilaterally.

*Early Warning.* Although this phrase does not appear in the original resolution, Secretary General Boutros-Ghali made it clear in his 'New Dimensions' speech in the fall of 1992 that the Register could be a useful early-warning instrument in the process of preventive diplomacy.<sup>25</sup> The Under-Secretary General for Political Affairs Marrack Goulding, not an ardent supporter of the Register in its early stages, stressed the importance of this function in a statement to the 1993 First Committee session in New York.

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms may also prove to be a very important instrument of preventive diplomacy. While not a substitute for arms reductions, the Register has introduced a new transparency and could be an important step towards a more comprehensive system of cooperative security.<sup>26</sup>

As with several other objectives covered in this section of the analysis, its fulfilment awaits the development of some multilateral mechanism or forum in which the data can be addressed. In addition excessive attention on this objective runs the risk of overemphasizing the Register as an intelligence and verification instrument.

### Current Status of the UN Register

Some momentum and inertia has been established through a continuing series of UN actions, all taken by consensus. The resolution establishing the Register, 46/36L, was adopted in December 1991 by a vote of 150-0. Of the four states not voting for this resolution, China and Cuba have reported and both are on the 1994 Group of experts charged with further developing the Register. The 1992 Panel developed operating procedures which were adopted by consensus in the fall of 1992. As reviewed above participation in the first year of reporting was more than enough to insure that states would continue reporting the second year. In the fall of 1993 in the First Committee, many states responded favourably to the first year of reporting and urged the further development of the Register. A consensus resolution was passed urging continuation and development of the Register by a new group of national experts.

---

<sup>25</sup> *New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold War Era*, UN Document A/C.1/47/7, 23 October 1993.

<sup>26</sup> Marrack Goulding, Statement to First Committee, 29 October 1993.