

preempted for long periods ahead.

And then, perceptively, in a statement that is almost a paraphrase of Clausewitz, he says:

In such a situation, there is a risk that foreign policy can become a servant of defence policy, which is not the natural order of policy-making.

This serious tendency is acknowledged in the final document of the special session on no fewer than three occasions. Under the Program of Action, in Paragraph 77, it is stated:

In order to help prevent a qualitative arms race, and so that scientific and technological achievements may ultimately be used solely for peaceful purposes, effective measures should be taken to avoid the danger and prevent the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles and achievements.

I suppose it is natural that the Declaration and Program of Action should contain inconsistencies and apparent contradictions. It is one thing to take an overview of the contemporary situation and say that the acquisition of more and more sophisticated weapons in the arms race buys less and not more security. It is quite another thing, if you are a negotiator, to establish a mutually-acceptable formula for arms reduction in an international situation in which the atmosphere is deteriorating and the prospects for *détente* darkening.

What is needed as a complement to the disarmament program and process is the strengthening of an alternative set of procedures and institutions on which security may rest. Here is another more or less convincing argument that runs through the United Nations document. It shows up in a variety of forms.

As one might expect, the most conventional is the assertion that, as an alternative to the use of arms in the settlement of disputes, all member states reaffirm their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and "their obligation strictly to observe its principles as well as other relevant and generally accepted principles of international law relating to the maintenance of international peace and security". In at least one case, reference is made to the principles of collective security and collective action that can "effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations".

In a nuclear age, the military connotation of collective action against an aggressor or would-be aggressor is generally considered as inappropriate and is now

superseded by the advocacy of what Dag Hammarskjöld described as "preventive diplomacy".

This latter emphasis is repeatedly made in the Declaration and Program of Action. Paragraph 34 in the Declaration has one of the most comprehensive statements:

Disarmament, relaxation of international tension, respect for self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security are directly related to each other. Progress in any one of these spheres has a beneficial effect on all of them; in turn, failure in one sphere has a negative effect on others.

And again, in Paragraph 58:

All states should actively participate in efforts to bring about conditions in international relations among states in which a code of peaceful conduct of nations in international affairs could be agreed and which would preclude the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The Secretary-General is asked to bring together a group of experts to continue the study of the interrelations between disarmament and international security, taking into account proposals submitted to the special session by individual countries, and to report to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly in 1979. One such proposal, submitted by a group of mainly Western countries, including Canada, deals with the "strengthening of the security role of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of disputes and peacekeeping," and another, submitted by the United States, concerns "the establishment of a United Nations Peacekeeping Reserve made up of national contingents trained in United Nations peacekeeping methods and earmarked by their governments for United Nations duty".

It is, perhaps, appropriate to interject that the International Peace Academy, a non-governmental organization, composed of former officers of UN peacekeeping forces, academics with special familiarity with international affairs, and government officials acting in a private capacity, is devoting conferences and seminars to study and training in peacemaking and peacekeeping methods. A high-level conference on peacekeeping on a permanent basis is being planned for Ottawa in the summer of 1979.

Peace and security, however, rest on more than strengthened institutions for peaceful settlement of disputes and peace-

*Secretary-General
to report
to Assembly
in 1979*