

pend on it. Thus, to work towards disarmament, it is not sufficient to fight for the establishment of a better international order. The conditions on which the present prosperity of certain countries, both capitalist and socialist, is based will have to be called into question. This means a further reduction in the forecasts of the amount of money that might be transferred as a result of savings from disarmament. Countries that found themselves obliged to convert a particularly profitable part of their industrial activities would undoubtedly be little disposed to increase, at the same time, their contribution to development.

There is as much confusion between causes and effects as there is difficulty in finding the means to attain the desired end. The scourge of arms is not a sort of

skin complaint that can be cleared up by a small surgical operation. It is more like a kind of leukemia affecting the whole international system. Only a transfusion could cure the patient. But, in the absence of a donor of new blood, we must rely on men's wisdom alone to secrete the antibodies vital to the survival of the species. They will not be found in the remedies of charlatans, anxious to sell magical recipes, but rather in a concerted effort to make a thorough examination of the organism to diagnose the disease. That is why the French proposal to create a world disarmament research institute should be taken seriously. Even if it had served only to clear the way for such research, the United Nations special session would not have been in vain.

*Of things military*

## Development and security and the UN special session

By King Gordon

It is tempting to say: "Just another pious United Nations declaration." More words on paper — 10,000 of them. But do they spell "Disarmament"? Do they halt the arms race? Do they make nuclear war less likely?

But that is not what the commentators and editors who reported on the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament and the Declaration and Program of Action it adopted were saying. They did not speak of a major breakthrough. How could they, with the SALT II nego-

tiations stalled and a bloc of delegates breaking away from the UN meeting in New York so that they could decide in Washington that the NATO armaments had to be increased? But in general they spoke, as the *Ottawa Citizen* did, of "modest progress" and "an earnest beginning" of efforts to slow down, and eventually end, the arms race.

It is interesting to meditate on why commentators and critics did not write off this special session. My first thought is that when you bring yourself to shut out everything else and look hard at the arms race — now computed at \$400 billion a year — and study the continuing buildup of the nuclear arsenal, you catch the tolling of a distant bell. It is no longer enough to rely on the wisdom and *détente* of the two super-powers who bear responsibility for maintaining this uneasily-balanced system of deterrence within which all of us are imprisoned as hostages. We begin to feel that, since the fate of all mankind is threatened, the problem of disarmament, the avoidance of nuclear war and the establishment of a basis for security other than the threat of mas-

---

*Mr Gordon is Senior Adviser for University Relations at the International Development Research Centre. For 12 years, he served with the UN Secretariat and was connected with peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo. He is a past president of the United Nations Association of Canada and a current member of the North American Council of the International Peace Academy. The views expressed in this article are those of Mr Gordon.*