

arms race among States, also reaffirms the need for all Member States to fulfil their obligations in relation to arms control and disarmament and to prevent the proliferation in all its aspects of weapons of mass destruction, and further reaffirms that the ultimate objective of the efforts of States in the disarmament process is general and complete disarmament;

13. *Reiterates its call upon* all States urging them, as well as the relevant United Nations bodies, to take appropriate measures to fully implement the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects;

14. *Emphasizes* that the United Nations has a central role in promoting and coordinating international cooperation for development, as well as in the follow-up to international economic affairs and the outcome of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic and social fields and in promoting policy coherence on global economic, social and development issues, in consonance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, and expresses its commitment to work for the strengthening of its role as coordinator of the efforts carried out by the international community in this regard, with a view to ensuring the achievement of a fair, democratic, transparent and equitable international economic environment, in which the opportunities offered by globalization are to the advantage of all countries, in particular the developing countries.

RECORDED VOTE ON RESOLUTION 58/317:

*In favour:* Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Israel, United States.

*Abstaining:* Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

The United States, speaking after the vote, declared that the resolution was premature since it attempted to address a matter that was currently being reviewed by the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (see below). Furthermore, it reaffirmed some principles of international law and not others, thus rendering the text incomplete.

### High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change

In a December note [A/59/565 & Corr.1], the Secretary-General transmitted to the General Assembly the report of the High-level Panel on

Threats, Challenges and Change entitled "A more secure world: our shared responsibility". He appointed the Panel in 2003 [YUN 2003, p. 49] to evaluate how existing UN policies and institutions had performed in addressing threats and challenges to international security and to make recommendations for strengthening the Organization in providing collective security in the twenty-first century.

The Panel, chaired by Anand Panyarachun (Thailand), put forward a new vision of collective security, one that addressed all of the major threats to international peace and security. It examined the case for a new security consensus, including elements of a credible collective security system; collective security and the challenge of prevention; collective security and the use of force, including questions of legitimacy, peace enforcement, peacekeeping capability and post-conflict peace-building; and a more effective United Nations for the twenty-first century. The report addressed specific threats and identified new ways of understanding the connections between them and the implications for the policies and institutions that had to be put in place.

The Panel concluded that 60 years after the creation of the United Nations, the biggest security threats went far beyond States waging aggressive war, extending to poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation; war and violence within States; the spread and possible use of nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons; terrorism; and transnational organized crime. Those threats came from both States and non-State actors. The system of collective security created by the UN founders was, in a traditional military sense, a pledge for collective action against aggression. The central challenge for the twenty-first century was to fashion a new and broader understanding, bringing together all the strands of collective security, in order to form a collective security system that would be effective, efficient and equitable.

The case for collective security currently rested on three basic pillars: that threats recognized no national boundaries, were connected, and had to be addressed at the global, regional and national levels; no State alone could make itself invulnerable to those threats; and it could not be assumed that every State would always be able, or willing, to meet its responsibility to protect its own peoples and not to harm its neighbours. Without mutual recognition of threats, there could be no collective security. What was needed was a new consensus between frayed alliances, between wealthy and poor nations, and among peoples mired in mistrust across a widening cultural abyss.