



# Statements and Speeches

---

No. 80/27

## THE LINK BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

An Address by the Honourable Mark MacGuigan, Secretary of State for External Affairs, to a Symposium on Disarmament, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, October 31, 1980

...For the two military alliances in the developed world, security rests chiefly on a system of deterrence, the essential component of which is a stable balance of forces. Thus, mutual deterrence has been the main element throughout the past 35 years in preventing a war in which the most powerful weapons ever available would be used. This form of security is clearly not ideal, since it carries with it the risk of mutual annihilation. Real security will be achieved only when there is a disarmament which has international agreement and is verifiable. In the meantime, our immediate disarmament objective must be the pursuit of undiminished security at lower levels of armaments, both in terms of destructive capability and cost.

But would there then be real security in the broadest sense of the word? The Brandt Commission Report, on international development issues, calls for a new concept of security, in the following words:

"An important task of constructive international policy will have to consist in providing a new, more comprehensive understanding of 'security' which would be less restricted to the purely military aspects."

Putting it more bluntly, the Report also says:

"History has taught us that wars produce hunger, but we are less aware that mass poverty can lead to war or end in chaos. While hunger rules peace cannot prevail. He who wants to ban war must also ban mass poverty. Morally it makes no difference whether a human being is killed in war or is condemned to starve to death because of the indifference of others."

As you have gathered, as well as speaking about disarmament, which is a vital element of security, I would like to speak about development, and the relationship between disarmament and development. By linking the two, we are pointing to a more positive motivation for disarmament than simple survival. If even a small fraction of the more than \$500 billion spent annually on military purposes were to be added to the \$20 billion now spent on aid, there would be a real possibility of making concrete, and even dramatic progress on solving existing development problems.

Annual global military expenditures are now estimated to be \$500 billion. This is equal to more than \$1 billion a day or, if you wish, almost \$1 million a minute. Since the Second World War, the direct costs of the arms race have exceeded \$6 trillion, almost as much as the gross national product of the entire world in 1975. Six countries — the Soviet Union, the United States, China, France, the United Kingdom and

---