

STATEMENT DISCOURS

SECRETARY
OF STATE
FOR EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS.

SECRÉTAIRE
D'ÉTAT AUX
AFFAIRES
EXTÉRIEURES.



85/39

Notes for a speech by
Douglas Roche, Ambassador
for Disarmament to the
International Institute
for Peace Education
"The Problems and Prospects
for World Peace: A
Canadian View"

EDMONTON

July 8, 1985.

We live in an age of contradictions:

- famine in Africa, surplus food mountains in North America;
- magnificent technology, mass unemployment;
- global air travel, terrorism in the skies;
- mass communication, less understanding;
- more weapons, less security;
- the liberation of humanity through science, the enslavement of the nuclear bomb.

When we understand these great contradictions, which characterize the paradox of our times -- so much danger at a time of so much creativity -- we begin to see why it is so difficult to make progress in disarmament measures.

Nations pledge disarmament and still make weapons. How can this be so?

It is because the technological meaning of the nuclear age has not been incorporated into global security systems. Scientific expertise has outpaced the human development of the global community. Law has been left behind, ethical values side tracked and resources misused in the never-ending -- and impossible -- quest for security via technology.

This is a profound question, and it is at the root of any serious examination of the problems and prospects for world peace.

If we cannot leave the security interests of our society in the hands of philosophers and educators, it is nonetheless necessary for philosophy and education to infuse the politics of survival.

That is the principal reason why it is becoming increasingly necessary to consider better ways of preparing coming generations for the paramount concern of any educated person: the attaining of a just and lasting peace. The University of Alberta is making a signal contribution to enlarging the field of studies with the International Institute for Peace Education.

I have come here not to tell you how to teach peace. That is within your competence not mine. Rather, I am here to reinforce your desire to develop a new generation of global citizens. My message is that there must be a vibrant development of peace studies across the world. It is essential to form minds with a deeper understanding of the integral demands of the human condition today.

In order to bridge the gap between philosophy and action, I propose to spend a few minutes outlining the actual work now going on in the various disarmament forums in the world, focusing on Canada's role in these negotiations.

There are no quick fixes in disarmament -- but there are long term strategies and on-going negotiations which have as their common goal security at lower levels of weapons, both nuclear and conventional. If the going is tough and seems slow, it is because the problems are excruciatingly difficult. In discussing the limitation or indeed dismantling of arms, we are dealing with the most intractable problems in the world.

* * *

When the United States and the Soviet Union resumed bilateral negotiations last March on strategic and intermediate weapons and space weapons, the world momentarily breathed a sigh of relief. However, the difficulties of disarmament negotiations quickly became apparent. The statement by the SSEA, the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark on the resumption of talks has proven accurate. Mr. Clark cautioned:

"We should be under no illusion that the course charted at Geneva will be an easy one. What we are witnessing now is the beginning of a long and sensitive process." The agreement to resume talks, he added, "after a long and dangerous stalemate, offers a new chance, and the world cannot waste that opportunity."

Something more than negotiation is needed today. That "something" is political will. That is why the world has welcomed the announcement that President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev will meet for two days of talks next November in Geneva. President Reagan has said he regards the Summit meeting as "an opportunity to chart a course for the future." This course, leading to practical steps to improve US-Soviet relations, is urgently needed to unlock the disarmament impasse.

Canada has consistently worked to move forward the bilateral talks with their agreed objectives of preventing an arms race in space, terminating the one on earth; limiting and reducing nuclear arms; and strengthening strategic stability leading ultimately to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. These themes reflect Canada's own arms control priorities.

The goals of the superpowers are shared by the world and echoed throughout the multilateral disarmament forums. Concern with the problems of the nuclear arms race and reducing the threat of nuclear war are not the exclusive

preserve of the superpowers, though they do have a special and leading role to play. It is also the responsibility of other countries -- middle and small powers -- to take an active and constructive part in working to ease international tensions and to advance the global arms control agenda in order to support the work going on in the bilateral talks.

* * *

Canada and Canadians have a history of international activism. We were among the founding members of the United Nations, a unique global institution, which is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year. In establishing the U.N. in 1945, Canada and other members of the international community expressed their determination to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and recognised the transcendent need for cooperation between nations in the post war world.

Canada has pursued this tradition of multilateralism in the field of arms control. In fact, Canada has a seat at every multilateral arms control and disarmament forum. This includes: the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction Talks in Vienna and the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. Each of these forums is filled with its own set of difficulties and complications. However, each also offers hope and the long-range prospect for progress.

Canada has long been a vocal proponent of these multilateral negotiations. We recognise the true value of the multilateral processes to the international community as a whole and their particular importance as a forum in which smaller and middle powers can make their voice heard and influence arms control issues that affect each and every nation, regardless of size and stature. We also believe that the potential of these bodies for making real progress and effectively negotiating arms control and disarmament questions is far from being realised.

In his speech to Saint Francis Xavier University last September, Prime Minister Mulroney recognized the utility of the multilateral process when he stressed Canada's commitment to this process and to increasing Canada's "positive and constructive" influence in these forums. He added:

"It is in these forums that Canada can work most effectively to reduce tensions, to alleviate conflict, and to create the conditions for a lasting peace."

The Rt. Hon. Joe Clark spoke in a similar vein when he addressed the U.N. General Assembly on September 25:

"Multilateral efforts, led and encouraged by the medium and smaller-sized countries, can help improve the atmosphere, and can put specific, workable ideas on the agenda."

The multilateral forums are living proof that in the nuclear age global politics is no longer the exclusive purview of the superpowers. The nuclear arms race threatens every nation and individual on this planet -- all nations have the right to speak out in defence of their future.

* * *

As a focal point for international relations, it is not surprising that the major multilateral arms control and disarmament forums have emerged from the U.N. system itself.

The United Nations has stood by the goal, adopted in 1959, of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. A number of limited agreements for arms control have been achieved through U.N. initiatives -- such as the Antarctic Treaty, the Partial Test Ban Treaty, the Outer Space Treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Non-Proliferation Treaty. At the first United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in 1978 (UNSSOD I), the 149 participating nations adopted, by what has been called an "historic consensus" a 129-paragraph Final Document containing a Program of Action which listed measures intended to be implemented "over the next few years."

But no progress has been made in achieving agreements since then. The fault lies not with the U.N. as such but with those governments that use confrontation rather than cooperation. The words at the heart of the Final Document must not be forgotten: "Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation." Multilateral work for disarmament must go on.

U.N. First Committee

The First Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, which deals with political and security matters, has an agenda comprising the entire range of arms control and disarmament questions. The First Committee is a deliberative body and prepares recommendations and draft resolutions which are then submitted to the General Assembly for adoption on the basis of majority vote. Of all the activities of the United Nations, those of the General Assembly attract the most public attention.

At the 39th General Assembly, the First Committee considered 72 resolutions ranging from Radiological Weapons to the Reduction of Military Budgets. Among the most prominent in this plethora of resolutions are those that deal with the questions of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Chemical Weapons, Outer Space and a freeze on nuclear weapons.

Most public attention seems to have been fixed on the three U.N. resolutions which called for a comprehensive freeze on the production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons. Expressing the fear and genuine frustration that the pace of arms control negotiations was too slow compared to continuous upward momentum of the nuclear arms race, it was argued that the superpowers should freeze at existing levels of armaments and then negotiate reductions. While the idea of a comprehensive nuclear freeze has an attractive and almost compelling logic, in the present atmosphere it seems very unlikely that it would be possible to agree to negotiate a verifiable freeze.

There are other ways of stifling the nuclear arms race -- and Canada takes the lead on two major issues. These two steps are "freezes" in their own right.

The first is the call for a Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB). Canada has been one of the "inner core" of co-sponsors of a U.N. resolution on the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. The resolution reaffirms that a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-test explosions in all environments is a matter of the greatest importance. As the resolution itself states, a CTB would:

"...constitute a vital element for the success of efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race and the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, and to prevent the expansion of existing nuclear arsenals and the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries."

The realization of an effective multilateral Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is a fundamental and abiding objective of Canada's arms control and disarmament policy. Since 1945 there have been 1,522 nuclear explosions, and 53 in 1984 alone. Canada has long been an active advocate of a CTB and has been working consistently within the CD to move discussions forward. We believe that a CTB is a concrete and realistic measure that would contribute significantly to halting the nuclear arms race by prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons.

As the Secretary-General of the U.N. has stated:

"It is of direct importance to the future of humanity to end all nuclear explosions. No other means would be as effective in limiting the further development of nuclear weapons."

The second Canadian initiative has been a call for the prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices. This resolution has been consistently gaining support in the international community. The resolution requests the Conference on Disarmament to pursue the question of an adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material.

A ban on the production of fissionable material would prevent the development and production of nuclear weapons. A Comprehensive Test Ban would prevent nuclear testing of any sort. They would thus constitute significant contributions to stopping the nuclear arms race. Canada is pursuing vigorously both of these U.N. agenda items with the long-term goal of halting and reversing the nuclear arms race.

Conference on Disarmament

There are also several other important and significant issues that those interested in disarmament should follow closely. Here I am speaking about the work going on in the Conference on Disarmament on a Comprehensive Test Ban, and on the questions of chemical weapons and outer space.

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva is the sole global multilateral negotiating body dedicated to arms control and disarmament issues. Its membership stands at 40 and includes all five nuclear powers plus representation from all geo-political blocs: The East, the West and the Neutral-Non-Aligned.

Since 1980, the CD has been working on negotiating a convention which would ban the development, production, stockpiling, transfer and use of chemical weapons. The terrible history of chemical weapons use in the First World War -- which resulted in more than 900,000 deaths and one million casualties -- and recent evidence of chemical weapons use in the Iran-Iraq war, and allegations of use in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia have reinforced the immediate need for a CW Convention.

The negotiation of a chemical weapons convention is of four-fold importance:

- it would represent a disarmament treaty and not merely an arms control measure;
- it would be an effective non-proliferation treaty;
- it would be a comprehensive treaty that would ban development, production, stock-piling and the transfer of chemical weapons with the provision for the destruction of stockpiles and production facilities and appropriate verification;
- a chemical weapons convention would be a law-making treaty with far-reaching legal implications.

While all CD participants recognise the urgency of concluding a treaty, there continue to be many outstanding problems and differences of opinion on such fundamental issues as the destruction of existing stockpiles of chemical weapons, the destruction of production facilities and verification provisions which have slowed considerably the negotiation of a CW convention.

Under the Canadian chairmanship of the Ad Hoc Working Group on CW in 1983, significant progress was made toward identifying and isolating those issues that could be agreed upon and that might form the basis for a CW convention. In April 1984 the United States tabled a draft text for a treaty banning chemical weapons. Canada welcomed this step. Since that time work has continued, but progress has been slow and there remain several difficult issues to be resolved.

Canada is also working to overcome the significant political and technical obstacles to a CTB, not least of which involves the verification of an eventual treaty. In this regard, Canada has lent its expertise to the Seismic Experts Group at the CD in an attempt to overcome some of the difficulties of verifying a CTB. Last year, for example, we participated in a 40-nation International Seismic Data Exchange (ISDE) designed to determine the scope and capability for seismic verification of a CTB. Canada provided 15 percent of the data collected during the exercise. This is the sort of steady background work that will form the foundation for the eventual negotiation of a CTB.

It has long been Canadian policy to prevent the weaponization of outer space and Canada has been an active supporter of all initiatives to discuss this issue, both in the multilateral U.N. context and bilaterally between the superpowers. We therefore welcomed the modest but significant progress made this spring in the CD.

After some years of discussion and dispute, the member-nations of the CD were able to agree on a mandate for an Ad Hoc Committee on Outer Space. The work in the CD will complement the ongoing bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. As well, there is the hope that these bilateral negotiations will augment and reinforce the work of the Conference on Disarmament. The establishment of a mandate is indeed an important first step in beginning work on the negotiation of a treaty preventing the weaponization of outer space.

Canada has undertaken some basic research projects to facilitate the discussions which might lead to the negotiation of a treaty. These include a survey of existing treaties and international law relevant to arms control in outer space, funded by External Affairs and undertaken with the assistance of the Institute and Centre of Air and Space Law at McGill University; a compendium of statements made in the CD on Outer Space; and a technical feasibility study on space-to-space surveillance conducted by Spar Aerospace again, under contract from the Department of External Affairs.

Although the issues that form the CD agenda are vitally important and have far-reaching implications, they receive little or no public attention or support. Why is this so? Consider the consequences of the negotiation of a CTB, a CW Convention and a Treaty Preventing the Weaponization of Outer Space:

- Nuclear testing would be prohibited; that would significantly contribute to stifling the development of new nuclear weapons.
- Chemical weapons would be prohibited and existing stockpiles destroyed; the world would be freed of the threat presently posed by these horrible weapons of mass destruction.
- An international convention would guarantee a weapons-free space.

These would indeed be historic and extraordinary accomplishments.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission

The present United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) was established by UNSSOD I in 1978 as a deliberative body composed of all U.N. members. The UNDC, which meets annually in New York for four weeks in May, operates on the basis of consensus and makes recommendations to the General Assembly on selected items in the disarmament field which the General Assembly has referred to the UNDC for examination.

The UNDC has experienced many of the same problems that exist in other U.N. forums and has had difficulty in dealing substantively with its agenda items. At its last session, the UNDC achieved little in substantive terms, except a reaffirmation of the goals of the Second Disarmament Decade. Even perennial agenda items, such as the reduction of military budgets and the nuclear capability of South Africa, remain untouched by progress or movement of any sort. While there was some useful discussion on the role of the United Nations in disarmament, the session was characterized by a lack of urgency.

Nevertheless, the UNDC does have an important role to play in improving and strengthening the manner in which the U.N. deals with disarmament issues. Canada supports the UNDC and believes that if all member-states strive to play a more meaningful role in this process the Commission could make a real contribution to the deliberation of disarmament questions.

The Stockholm Conference

The Stockholm Conference, or as it is formally called, the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, is a creation of the on-going 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and represents a unique approach to negotiating arms control and disarmament.

Proceeding on the basis of a mandate carefully worked out at the CSCE Follow-Up Meeting, which concluded in Madrid in September 1983, the Conference is "to undertake, in stages, new, effective and concrete actions designed to make progress in strengthening confidence and security and in achieving disarmament."

The first stage of the Conference is specifically devoted to the negotiation and adoption of a set of mutually complementary confidence-and security-building measures designed to reduce the risk of military confrontation in Europe. These confidence-and security-building measures (CSBMs for short) represent a novel and largely undefined approach to East-West arms control and disarmament. While the mandate stipulates that the CSBMs are to be militarily significant, politically binding, adequately verifiable and applicable to the whole of Europe, the exact nature of these measures is left up to the Conference to determine.

Here the approaches of East and West are in striking contrast, the West favours a gradual building up of confidence through a series of concrete steps whereas the East prefers an initial declaration that confidence exists and its subsequent reinforcement with subordinate and limited specific measures.

As we approach the Conference's seventh session, Canada hopes that there will be some significant forward movement on the basis of a degree of consensus that does exist on the need to improve on the existing and admittedly modest confidence-building measures contained in the Helsinki Final Act. Canada believes that the Stockholm Conference should produce a substantial result by the time of the November 1986 CSCE Follow-Up Meeting in Vienna which is to review its progress.

The Vienna Talks

The remaining multilateral negotiating forum -- the Vienna-based Mutual Balanced Force Reduction Talks (MBFR) -- has a much more limited mandate and membership than the others previously described.

The Mutual Balanced Force Reduction Talks between NATO and the Warsaw Pact opened in Vienna in 1973. Recognising that the concentration of forces in Central Europe is the largest in the world, the objective of these talks, as its title suggests, has been mutual reduction of conventional forces in Europe to parity at 900,000. Although the talks have been underway for 12 years, progress has been, at best, modest. There has been disagreement between the two sides on the very fundamental and crucial issues of data and verification. The two sides have been unable to agree on the number of Eastern troops in the so-called "reductions area," thereby making it impossible to determine the reductions required to reach parity.

Without agreement on these very basic issues, particularly the question of data, it has been difficult to make any significant forward movement. However, the talks in themselves constitute an important "confidence-building measure" by providing a unique, ongoing forum for dialogue on a fundamental issue in East-West relations.

* * *

As we have seen Canada does have a vital role to play in the work of disarmament. Another prominent forum where this will soon be evident is the Third Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The NPT, which came into force in 1970, will be reviewed at a four-week conference in Geneva opening August 27. With 128 signatories, the NPT enjoys the widest international support of any arms control treaty. Here indeed is something in the disarmament field for which we can be grateful. The NPT provides a legal framework for the political commitment to horizontal and vertical non-proliferation which underpins the international non-proliferation regime.

It is with a solid reputation as a country historically involved and committed to non-proliferation, as well as one on the leading edge in developing the peaceful uses of nuclear technology, that Canada comes to the Third Review Conference. Canada is a country which deeply respects and values the NPT as an invaluable international treaty embodying the objectives of Canada's arms control, non-proliferation and peaceful-uses policies. These are:

-- to encourage negotiations between the super powers leading to a cessation of the nuclear arms race, with the long-term goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control;

-- to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons;

-- to promote and facilitate the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The importance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty as an essential instrument of international security cannot be over-emphasized. It is a vital security lynch pin which benefits all countries by reducing the risk of nuclear proliferation.

The NPT is the legal embodiment of a bargain made between the nuclear and non-nuclear states. The non-nuclear states agreed to forgo the acquisition of nuclear weapons (i.e., horizontal proliferation) in exchange for an undertaking by the nuclear states to halt the arms race in nuclear weapons (i.e., vertical proliferation). This agreement, the outcome of long negotiations, is clearly set out in Article VI of the Treaty:

"Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

At the first review in 1975, many non-nuclear states expressed their frustration that the nuclear powers had not fulfilled their commitments under Article VI. By 1980, these feelings had turned to hostility, preventing the adoption of a final statement, which was interpreted by some as meaning that the Second Review Conference was a failure.

Since there has been little progress in disarmament in the past five years, we can be sure that once again there will be vigorous debate on the perceived failure of the superpowers to implement their obligations to cease the arms race. As in 1980, there is a very real danger that a lack of tangible progress relating to Article VI will hold hostage any agreement on other matters relating to safeguards and international nuclear cooperation.

A new element in the area of arms control is the United States Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI). While it is still too early to render definitive judgement on the technical feasibility or the strategic merits of SDI, Canada is examining closely the SDI programme, particularly in light of the United States' invitation to participate in SDI research. In his January 21 statement, the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark stated that the actual development and deployment of space based ballistic missile defence systems by either the United States or the Soviet Union would transgress the limits of the 1972 ABM Treaty as currently constituted. He added: "That could have serious implications for arms control and would therefore warrant close and careful attention by all concerned."

As a strong supporter of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, the 1972 ABM Treaty, and ongoing efforts in the CD to pursue discussions leading to the negotiation of a treaty preventing the weaponization of space, Canada is evaluating SDI in all its aspects. The Government's desire to be fully aware of all the ramifications of SDI is reflected in the appointment of Dr. Arthur Kroeger to examine the nature and scope of SDI research and, in particular its strategic, scientific and economic implications. In addition, a joint committee of the House and Senate reviewing all aspects of Canada's foreign policy has been established and will report on the issues of SDI (and free trade) by August 23 of this year.

The Government places such importance on the Parliamentary review process and input from the Canadian public, that has reserved making its decision regarding participation in SDI research until after the Parliamentary Committee has tabled its interim report.

* * *

Having reviewed the substance of the disarmament problem, as it is handled in the various forums, it is necessary to plunge more deeply into the fundamental question of the prospects for world peace.

We cannot look to what have been called "nuclear accountants" to produce peace. They are technicians. We must instead look deeply into our value system. The present system of adversarial international relations must be changed. Will nations forever build security by threatening to destroy one another -- and indeed the whole planet -- or will the world, as the Palme Commission recommends:

"...develop procedures to resolve conflicts peacefully and stress those modes of national behaviour which are consistent with the achievement of common security through cooperative efforts."

We must learn to live in true collective security, not on the edge of war. The role of education in moving humanity away from the nuclear abyss is fundamental and indispensable to any future prospects for world peace.

Education can help to develop a sense of shared values as well as a sense of identification with future generations. It is necessary to bring a global perspective into the classroom; education must be internationalized.

The educator Edwin Reischauer, in his book Toward the 21st Century: Education for a Changing World, said we will never operate successfully unless the bulk of people develop a sense of world citizenship.

"This is clearly the biggest educational task of all, for millenniums of history have conditioned men to think in terms of smaller and more exclusive units, while suspicion and hostility toward other groups lie deep in their patterns of thought."

As we move toward the 21st century, it becomes obvious that the next generation will need more knowledge and understanding about the rest of the world than their elders presently possess. We are here talking about much more than the development of a few specialists. There must be millions of contacts between individuals which will help to develop an awareness of other people and a sense of shared interests. The interdependent nature of today's world, and the world of the future, must become as inherently understood by today's youth as the world of the isolationist, independent sovereign state has been by previous generations.

A sense of world citizenship should be developed early in life. The breaking down of barriers and the acceptance of political, societal and cultural differences must be accomplished while minds are yet open and flexible. We must form our young people's attitudes now so that they can become stewards of the planet in the future. A new global ethic must take hold, one based on a vision of social justice, tolerance and hope.

Professional educators are the first to know that elementary and secondary education can work to break down feelings of suspicion and hostility and to provide instead an enhanced understanding of world problems and sense of world citizenship. Education can foster an awareness and, above all, an empathy for peoples of diverse histories, cultural and religious backgrounds, peoples whose political and economic situations might not even permit them the luxury of education. Since peace and world development are fundamentally ethical problems, they must be of concern to those who are entrusted with the education of youth.

Today's 12-year-old will be 27 in the year 2000, just entering his or her prime years. For this student, the 21st century has already arrived. The challenge for today's educators is to meet the demands of students who will be faced with ever-increasing and complex global challenges.

Educators must lead the way, but it is up to all of us to break from the bonds of contradiction and inequity that characterize the world around us. We must recognise that in the nuclear age we have to resolve these questions and restore a global balance of security and justice or risk the destruction of ourselves and our planet for all time. Education today demands the preparation of students for a world of common interests.