

*Committee on arms
has substantial list
of agreements
to its credit*

curity Commission was put forward in a study published in 1969 by the United Nations Association of the United States. Henry Kissinger, currently a key foreign policy adviser to President Nixon, was a member of the policy panel that studied this subject.

How such a body might operate is an open question, but a possible parallel might be the group that has been meeting in Geneva to consider disarmament questions. In its present form, this group dates back to 1961, when 18 nations were invited to participate. It became known as the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, although, in fact, France has never taken part in its work. In 1969, eight more nations were added to the group and its name changed to the Committee of the Conference on Disarmament (CCD).

In the past decade, this committee has considered almost every proposal for disarmament and arms control and it has a substantial list of agreements to its credit. The committee has been in almost continuous session and the exchange of views and concerns has resulted in areas of disagreement being identified and, in many cases, narrowed. The ability of all participants to introduce subjects of their choosing has meant that nothing could be swept under the rug.

Forum for fears

This provides an interesting example for a body dealing with European security. It might be too much to expect the Soviet Union to have brought before such a body its concern about the Prague uprising of 1968. But other nations could have voiced their fears about possible Soviet reaction to it. In theory at least, there would have

The disintegration of global bipolarity and the rise of non-security issues open new opportunities and provide greater incentives for countries to cultivate a wider and more diverse range of international friends than was possible previously. In the heyday of the cold-war coalitions, each super-power, while competing for allies around the globe, made firm distinctions between its coalition partners and members of the enemy camp. Rarely would lesser members of either alliance deal bilaterally with members of the opposing alliance unless the exchanges were stage-managed by the alliance leader. Even for transactions within the camp, when important political or economic issues were being negotiated, the super-power was usually heavily involved and bilateral or multilateral dealings

been no need for armed intervention no need for the subsequent formulation of the Brezhnev Doctrine.

There would have to be several changes in makeup for a European security body, as compared to the Geneva disarmament committees. The original nation committee worked on the basis of co-chairmanship by the United States and the Soviet Union. That would probably be impossible for a European body. Similarly, the disarmament committee reports once a year to the UN General Assembly. It is not clear to whom any European commission would report — if, indeed, it would report to anyone other than the governments represented on it.

Although the official subjects of the CSCE as given in the title are security and co-operation, its purpose has also been described as to create an atmosphere of co-operation in security. In other words, one of the aims is to break down the barriers that have divided Europe since the end of the Second World War. No one, even the countries of Eastern Europe, realistically expects NATO and the Warsaw Pact to disappear overnight. The alliances are recognized as stabilizing influences today and in present circumstances they provide a feeling of security that should lead to co-operation.

In the long run, however, it may be possible to visualize a European security system without alliances. This presupposes that the European countries will not be in a danger to one another within the continent. A security system of any kind is designed to meet a potential threat. At present, NATO members are threatened by Warsaw Pact countries and vice versa.

among a subset of members were discouraged.

... More and more, divergences in world view or differences in social systems are insufficient causes to bar cordial relations among countries. Economic intercourse, technological co-operation and scientific and cultural exchanges are considered legitimate among virtually all possible combinations of countries; and, increasingly, organizations and forums for these purposes are using functional or geographic rather than ideological criteria for participation. ...

(Excerpt from "The Changing Presence of Power" by Seyom Brown, Senior Fellow at Brookings Institution, Washington, in *Foreign Affairs*, January 1973)