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The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

STATEMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PEACE AND DISARMAMENT RESEARCH INSTITUTES

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the recommendation contained in paragraph 43 of the report of the Preparatory Committee, adopted at its twentieth meeting, on 5 February 1988, and as endorsed at the first plenary meeting of the fifteenth special session on 31 May 1988, four meetings of the Committee of the Whole have been set aside to hear statements from representatives of non-governmental organizations and peace and disarmament research institutes.

At the same meeting the Preparatory Committee decided that non-governmental organizations' disarmament committees at Geneva and at United Nations Headquarters would draw up an appropriate speaker list of such representatives. I understand that a very large number of organizations and institutes did indeed apply to make oral statements before the Committee of the Whole, and consequently the liaison group for non-governmental organizations had very difficult decisions to make in order to establish an appropriate speakers' list.

We will hear a total of 94 representatives of non-governmental organizations at two meetings today and one meeting tomorrow morning. Their interventions are limited to 5 minutes each, and I trust that each of them will co-operate and not exceed the time-limit. A total of 25 representatives of peace and disarmament research institutes will speak, with similar time constraints.

I would add that organizations will, with very few exceptions, speak in alphabetical order.

I now call on the first speaker, Mr. Murad Ghaleb, of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization.
Mr. GAHALE: What has been accomplished in the field of disarmament at the super-Power level since the Gorbachev-Reagan first summit, in 1985, has given a tremendous impetus to the disarmament process world wide. The main task of this third special session will be to shift meaningful disarmament negotiations from the bilateral to the multilateral level. That is why one should expect this session to produce a document of still greater importance. It is the aim of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AARPSO) to contribute to this world effort by articulating issues of particular pertinence to the peoples of Africa and Asia.

Peoples of the third world, for whom the issue of development has top priority, have a vested interest in the peaceful solution of conflicts. Underdevelopment is no less a cause of insecurity than the arms race. Disarmament and development go hand in hand.

Very few States have implemented the United Nations resolution requiring developed countries to devote 1 per cent of their gross national product to the development process. In the new international climate of constructive disarmament negotiations, it should be possible to meet and then exceed that percentage. We call for the establishment of an international development fund under United Nations auspices. We consider it crucial to relate both disarmament and development issues to the new international economic order and to seek solutions to the staggering third world debt problem.

However, there is no general recipe for the solution of all regional conflicts. We believe that settling conflicts peacefully requires conditions that are not always available. Some degree of parity must exist between the protagonists. Parity is a precondition because any mutually accepted settlement will require concessions from all the protagonists, and concessions are only acceptable in situations in which they are perceived as balanced.
Regional conflicts are not, as they are sometimes described, low intensity conflicts that can hardly affect the global disarmament process. Regional conflicts can threaten world peace and justify stepping up the arms race. That has been the case at each critical turn of the Arab-Israeli conflict. One further indication of how critical such a conflict can become is that at least one of its protagonists has already stockpiled a secret arsenal of nuclear weapons, driving the other protagonists to follow suit.

Actually the secret nuclear capability of States geographically located in the third world is one of the most serious threats to the disarmament process. There has been much talk of progress now under way in banning chemical weapons. It is, however, difficult to expect States threatened by undeclared nuclear arsenals to go along with such a ban. Disarmament in the field of weapons of mass destruction cannot but be indivisible. Nuclear-free zones have become imperative. But how can they be implemented, when certain States deliberately conceal their nuclear capabilities?

Regional conflicts cannot but be resolved at their very core, principally on the basis of recognizing the legitimate rights of all concerned, not only in terms of what can temporarily appear to be the balance of power. Take, for instance, the Palestinian component in the Arab-Israeli conflict: who could have predicted, only a few months ago, the impact of the Palestinian uprising on the Middle East equation?

The peaceful solution of regional conflicts should be reached on an international level, within the framework of the United Nations. Such a solution would contribute to disarmament and development, as well as security in the region.

We wish this historic session of the United Nations every success.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Conmany B. Wesseh, of the All Africa Students' Union.
Mr. WESSEH: The All Africa Students' Union, the movement of millions of African students and their organizations, in whose name I am privileged to address you, sends very warm and heartfelt greetings to the third session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The privilege of Africa's future being heard in these great walls at this time manifests a clear appreciation of how close disarmament is to the life and general well-being of humankind in general and the oppressed, downtrodden and wretched of the earth in particular.

Africa and its people are still the most wretched of the earth, the most deprived and underdeveloped. The black race is the most segregated, the most abused and the most dehumanized in the world. Africa feels the most gruesome effects of the economic crises in the world. It is such that today, when the majority of the countries of Africa are celebrating more than 25 years of national independence, the vast majority of its people are gearing up for the battle against recolonization, a drive apparent in the policies of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, other international financial institutions and transnational corporations. This recolonization process appears to operate on a simple logic.
(Mr. Wesseh)

There must first be conditions for increasing illiteracy by reduced access to education; a very sick society for lack of health facilities; a very immobile society for lack of transport and communication, and the promotion of anti-democratic and anti-people régimes to assist the plan's implementation.

Against that base logic stands the logic of truth, of freedom and of hope held by the African people, especially the struggling young men and women, today's students and working and unemployed youth who are the future of the continent.

This new and enterprising future Africa stands by the ideals of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". In pursuit of these ideals we see a triad of peace - disarmament, development and security. This can be expanded to what we like to call the four pillars of life - disarmament, national independence and sovereignty, development and global security.

What moral right does anyone or any group of people anywhere have to waste $900 billion of the world's scarce resources on means for self-destruction? The production and stockpiling and modernization of nuclear and chemical weapons and other means of mass destruction is an abuse of the collective scientific achievement of human civilization. Such abuse, we make bold to say, is criminal. Nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction must be totally banned and completely eliminated from the face of the earth and from the logic of any defence doctrine.

In this connection, we hail the United Nations in its World Disarmament Campaign, the Governments and ordinary people that have protected the world through peace actions and the Soviet Union and the United States for responding to the voice of reason.

Nuclear weapons kill everything, even if released by accident. The development of this self-destruction is putting the world, especially Africa,
through a gruesome devastation that makes it hard for our people to imagine anything worse. Millions of our people, including babies, die each year from curable diseases such as malaria and diarrhoea, from malnutrition and dehydration, from drought and famine — to say the least, from simple causes. In fact, Africa is in a deadly war. When we demand disarmament we do so not only to avert a threatening nuclear conflagration but to end the current nightmare created by preparation for that conflagration. In general, we demand development, which appears to be centuries away from our people.

Then there is the pillar of national independence and sovereignty. May we ask what right an illegal régime like that of South Africa has to impose a system of white superiority over the people of South Africa? What right does the apartheid régime have over Namibia, contrary to numerous United Nations resolutions for that country's full independence? Or is there justification for the racist régime continuously to disrupt the peace of the countries of the region through unprovoked aggression and support of bandits? Could South Africa have continued its brazenness without the support of Britain, the United States and some other Western States and business interests?

All men of peace must support the people of South Africa and their organizations, led by the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), and of Namibia, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). They must support the people of Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and the other front-line States in crushing apartheid and bringing about a non-racial, democratic South Africa and an independent Namibia. At the same time, the world must stand by the people of other parts of Africa struggling for genuine independence, such as the people of the Saharoui Arab Democratic Republic as well as those under neo-colonial régimes that accumulate arms only to repress their own people, as in Zaire, Liberia, Malawi and the rest.
(Mr. Wesseh)

Disarmament is linked to global security in so far as confidence-building measures are strengthened among States and peoples. There can be no security when powerful nations use their might to declare spheres of interest and to dictate their will to others. What security can there be when, in gross violation of international and civilized behaviour, United States warplanes raids an African country in an attempt to kill that country's leader; or when the United States supports Israel in its murders of schoolchildren and political leaders in and beyond Palestine; or when it organizes gangs and creates conditions for the forced removal of a legitimate Government in power in Latin America?

Should not the process of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan signal another new beginning by the big and powerful nations to work together with the rest of us to end regional conflicts and build new bridges of trust? Why does not, for example, the United States end its backing of the UNITA bandits in Angola and the Contras in Nicaragua? Would not the world be a safer and happier place were the rights of the vast black majority of South Africa and Namibia restored and those of the Palestinians restored, and if neighbours like the United States and Cuba, the Soviet Union and China, Sudan and Ethiopia started on a renewed footing of mutually beneficial relationships?

Mr. Chairman, please allow me to reaffirm that the students of Africa see our world as one simple world with finite resources - human and material. Those of us who are lucky to be alive today can only do for the future the only sensible thing left - to bequeath a world free of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction and a world where mankind remains the centre for development. The continuing relevance of the United Nations in this regard has never been so pressing.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the Secretary-General of the Asian Buddhist Conference for Peace (ABCP), Mr. Lubsantseren, to make a statement.
Mr. LUBSANTSEREN (interpretation from Russian): Allow me to express to you, Sir, our sincere gratitude for the opportunity given to us to speak to the international community from this rostrum.

It is in the nature of things that Governments and States - in particular, countries that are nuclear Powers - have a special role to play in preventing a nuclear holocaust. That calls for new thinking in international relations and greater importance being attached to world opinion, specially with regard to disarmament. Everybody knows that our opinions and ideas about disarmament were expressed in the Message recently adopted by the forum of Non-Governmental Organizations, held in Geneva.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is still valid. But we must give thought to the fact that the ideas it contains have failed to be translated into reality. New developments encourage us, however, that that will happen.

First and foremost, we, the Asian Buddhist Conference for Peace, whole-heartedly welcome and strongly support the first encouraging steps towards banning nuclear weapons.

In present conditions we must expand the anti-war movement and have more people involved in peace and disarmament.

Buddhist ideals inspire our actions throughout the Buddhist community working against nuclear war and for peace and security. The ABCP strongly favours discussions and meetings worldwide on the problems of peace and security in Asia and the Pacific. The ABCP has initiated the holding of an all-Asia forum of different religionists on the same problems and issues. It has already been supported by many religious dignitaries. I take the liberty of requesting this house to give its valuable support for this idea and encourage our proposed venture.
We fully support the proposed United Nations conference on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. In fact, we are now making arrangements for a meeting of Buddhists on peace in the Indian Ocean, to be held this year in Sri Lanka. It is our hope that this Buddhist forum in Asia will help in its small way in the preparations for the United Nations conference on the Indian Ocean.
Today the role of the mass information media in regard to disarmament matters is very great. In fact, the world community at large is not well informed about the arms race or about the progressive developments in disarmament issues; indeed, sometimes it receives distorted information. In such conditions, the information system of the Non-Governmental Organizations is of paramount importance, and it behooves us to expand in every possible way the work and activities of the recently created World Information Clearing Centre in Geneva.

The peace-loving Buddhists of Asia will do everything to promote the implementation of the recommendations to be adopted by this special session of the General Assembly.

May this special session on disarmament be crowned with complete success in making important contributions to the progressive process towards peace.

In conclusion, I wish to quote a passage from the initiation of Zanabazar, a seventeenth century great Mongolian Buddhist thinker:

"May the fire of all the negative deeds and afflictions be extinguished and may all beings be compassionate in harmony, without revenge. May the wholesomeness of peace and tranquillity prevail forever."

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the Australian Coalition for Disarmament and Peace, Ms. Edna Ross.

Ms. ROSS: This is the first time that Australian disarmament organizations have addressed the United Nations.

We believe that on the basis of the Final Document of the first special session and the renewed momentum for disarmament provided by the signing of the Treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), this third special session can and should develop a concrete programme of disarmament - nuclear and conventional - for the rest of this century.
While we appreciate a new quality in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union and welcome their first-ever agreement to reduce their nuclear armaments, we want to make two points: First, nuclear disarmament, while being the responsibility primarily of the nuclear-weapon States, cannot be left to them. All the potential victims of nuclear war have a right to participate in ending this threat. Thus we give support to multilateral initiatives as well as bilateral ones, and we oppose any attempt to downgrade the role of the United Nations in disarmament negotiations. Secondly, the INF agreement between the super-Powers will at best rid the world of 3 per cent of their nuclear arsenals. Thus we can be optimistic but not euphoric. And there is a very real danger that weapons may be recycled, that they will leave a land-based system in Europe and turn up on a submarine-based system in our region: the Pacific.

As a people of the Pacific, we see the South Pacific nuclear-free-zone Treaty as a useful initiative. All the nations in that region, parties to the Treaty, refuse to acquire or store nuclear weapons in the region. But it has not yet become possible to insist that nuclear weapons should not be transported through the region. Some Governments, including our own, accept that nuclear-armed ships will enter our harbours from time to time. We see such visits as an unacceptable risk and believe that conditions must be created to end all nuclear-ship visits to civilian ports.

We fully support the initiatives of our Government in giving priority to achieving a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

In a survey currently being conducted by our movement under the title of "Australian Disarmament Dialogue", more than 70 per cent of the respondents want Australia to end uranium sales to France. Economists, politicians and trade experts have explained and do explain that Australia's uranium is only ever used
for peaceful purposes or, more practically, that if we do not sell it to France someone else will. But beyond all the practical issues are the moral issues. A moral stance is vital not only against those who test nuclear weapons in a region far from their own country but against all weapons of mass destruction. So long as the nuclear-weapon States base their defence and security on such weapons, so long as others seek to acquire them, there will be fear in the world, cynicism among the young and poverty in most of the developing world.

All our surveys show that people in the community value peace education and training in conflict-resolution - for politicians, for diplomats and especially for the young. When we asked Australians to express their messages to this special session their overwhelming response was for more education. This role of the United Nations ought to be enhanced.

We also want to see more efforts for confidence-building and regional security, which in time would enable all foreign military facilities associated with nuclear-war fighting to be removed from every host country. The only non-Australian facilities acceptable to us would be those which confined themselves to monitoring arms-control agreements for the international community. We differ from our Government on this, as many peace movements differ from their Governments, but we do appreciate the funding of community peace projects by government, as in the International Year of Peace and by the Peace Trust of New South Wales.

We are conscious of the need to make advances in controlling and reducing other weapons systems. We are appreciative of all those, including our Government, who are working for an effective agreement on chemical weapons. At this special session we ask the United Nations to be more active in establishing a timetable for Member States to disengage from the international arms trade. Such trading is
truly a trade in death. It not only distorts economies but holds hostage those who should be free.

It is not too much to say that 200 years ago, at the outset of British settlement in what is now Australia, aboriginal people lost their land because of superior weaponry. It is clear that Indonesia maintains its rule of East Timor, against the wishes of the East Timorese, because of superior weaponry. It is also obvious that the superior weaponry of France allows that nation to deny independence to the Kanak people of New Caledonia.

We seek the rule of justice, not the rule of weaponry.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite Bishop Karoly Toth, President of the Christian Peace Conference, to address the Committee.

Bishop TOTH: Speaking on behalf of the Christian Peace Conference I want to emphasize very strongly that our movement attaches great importance to the United Nations as the only forum where all the nations and peoples of the world can, without any discrimination, peacefully discuss vital issues of the whole inhabited earth. The most urgent challenge humanity has to face today is undoubtedly the Biblical picture of a world free of weapons and wars. This prophetic vision, inspiring the whole of Christianity, visualizes a world where "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more". (The Holy Bible, Isaiah 2, v. 4)

No doubt disarmament, nuclear and conventional, is the imperative of our time. Our movement therefore supports the disarmament resolutions of the United Nations and stresses the urgent need to strengthen the Organization in promoting and accelerating the disarmament process.

Since the Christian Peace Conference is a religious, Christian organization, it addresses itself not only to the military, political and diplomatic aspects
of disarmament but also and primarily to the moral, spiritual and psychological conditions which can and must promote genuine disarmament. The attention of the Christian Peace Conference is concentrated on those moral and spiritual trends which have become prominent in the present stage of the very complex disarmament debate.

The recent breakthrough in genuine disarmament convincingly proves that this is not just a military question but depends on political will, on moral decisions, on confidence and on the readiness to co-operate. The new emerging political principles unequivocally demonstrate the inadmissibility of wars, nuclear or any other.
Differences, political and ideological, between nations and peoples should not necessarily lead to confrontation but rather to the recognition of their common responsibility. To support disarmament means to support this new mentality.

There are three new trends to be encouraged in the interest of disarmament. The first is the new concept of security. According to this the guarantee of security for national States is no longer to be seen as superiority over the potential enemy; rather the guarantee of national security has to be seen in the security of partners. This is what in essence is generally called common or comprehensive security which can only be envisaged through United Nations efforts because the nuclear Powers other than the United States of America and the Soviet Union - that is, China, the United Kingdom and France - also have to be involved in the disarmament process.

Secondly, a new philosophy of conflict resolution will have to replace the old one. Until now the last resort for the resolution of conflicts has been the military one. The role of war in international relations has been strongly questioned and the delegitimization of war has been started. The recognition of the need to resolve international problems by political means is the sine qua non of today's politics. The idea of winning or losing a war, nuclear or conventional, has become obsolete. According to this new philosophy of disarmament, still to be developed, international conflicts should be transformed into shared problems which must be faced and solved jointly by the opposing sides. This philosophy of disarmament is the only way to give new orientation and new impulses to the disarmament process in the nuclear age. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF) recently concluded and ratified, the ongoing negotiations on strategic missiles, and other issues, point in that direction.
Thirdly, one essential element of this philosophy should be the clearer understanding of the interrelationship of disarmament and justice and development. I refer again to the Holy Scriptures, which state: "And the work of righteousness shall be peace" (The Holy Bible, Isaiah 32:17).

Certain temptations hindering disarmament need to be exposed and opposed. I mention only three: first, trying to compensate with new weapon systems for the arms to be destroyed by virtue of the treaties; secondly, the attraction of the financial profit of the armaments trade and transfer; and, thirdly, the persistent belief in the balance of terror instead of the balance based on trust and co-operation.

Christian churches and Christian peace movements represent universal structures which transcend political, social and ideological barriers. The potential for confidence-building, mobilization for disarmament and peace with justice by these structures calling for a universal peace council of Christian churches - the message of which would not be ignored by the world - is not yet fully realized. This could be an important Christian contribution to disarmament out of which an appeal would go forth for a transformation of the very basis of peace in the nuclear age, namely that mutual threat, deep-rooted fear and staunch power mentality have to be replaced by confidence and mutual respect which, in Christian terminology, are called "hope" and "love". The fear and hatred which poison international relationships should be transformed into mutual understanding and openness to co-operate.

Humankind now stands at a crossroads of crucial decisions. Either lethal weapons, nuclear and conventional, will destroy life and God's beautiful creation or a united humanity with God's help will destroy these weapons and life will triumph. The road to this victory is called disarmament.
The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Dr. Gibble from the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches.

Dr. GIBBLE: We value this opportunity to present the concerns for disarmament of the World Council of Churches through its Commission of the Churches on International Affairs to this third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Council is a fellowship of over 310 Orthodox and Protestant member churches comprising over 450 million believers from all over the world whose lives are seriously impacted in many negative ways by the effects of the arms race and the militarization of our global society. Born 40 years ago in the wake of a devastating world war the Council has been an advocate for disarmament and conditions that nurture a just and peaceful global community. While the Council affirms unilateral initiatives and the current bilateral efforts of the two great Powers, which have taken some significant steps towards nuclear disarmament, it believes that comprehensive multilateral efforts, preferably within the context of the United Nations, must be undertaken if a significant impact is to be made on the arms race.

In the limited time given for this testimony, among many concerns we choose the following for emphasis. First, even in the aura of an historic agreement to reduce intermediate-range nuclear weapons the awful risk of nuclear war remains. We are painfully aware that this agreement can reduce the nuclear arsenal by only 3 per cent or slightly more. We would therefore urge the pursuit of every possible effort further to reduce and ultimately to eliminate these weapons of mass destruction. We reiterate the declaration of our most recent Assembly that "the production and deployment of nuclear weapons as well as their use constitute a crime against humanity, and therefore there should be a complete halt in the production of nuclear weapons and in weapons research and development in all nations, to be expeditiously enforced through a treaty."
Only if such a comprehensive approach is taken to nuclear disarmament and complemented and reinforced by mutually accepted verification procedures and by the new technology available for verification, can the possibility of nuclear holocaust be significantly reduced. We would encourage this special session to establish a multilateral mechanism under the auspices of the United Nations to perform such verification functions for our global community.

Secondly, while we recognize the possibility of significant steps in the reduction of nuclear weapons, we cannot overlook the significant new dynamics in the arms race. We view with alarm the development of "star wars" technology, chemical weapons, and the ever more deadly capacity of conventional weapons which blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear, and defensive and offensive weapons. Only through multilateral agreements banning the research, development and testing of these new weapons, can we effectively end this process.

Thirdly, we commend the gains made at the United Nations International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development to fashion an interrelated perspective on disarmament, development and security. Recognition of the multidimensional relationship between disarmament and development might give greater realism to our understanding of the real threats to national security. Furthermore, this special session might want to call for a programme of conversion from military technology and production, to technology and production linked to human need and the enhancement of the human community.

Fourthly, the blatant misuses of the concept of national security to justify repression, foreign intervention and spiralling arms budgets is of profound concern to us. Security cannot be separated from justice. True security for people demands respect for human rights, socio-economic justice, effective machinery for
peaceful resolution of conflicts, and broad international co-operation in science, technology, economy and culture. Significant progress on these fronts can ensure common security for all peoples and nations.
Finally, as Christians of the Council, we believe that war and the preparation for war is contrary to the will of God, that it violates humanity and the created universe, and that the current threat posed by the conventional and nuclear arms race knows no parallel in history. Out of our religious heritage we struggle for justice, peace and the integrity of creation. We look toward a time when peacemakers might not only be called blessed, as in Mathew's Gospel, but also might be greatly revered and honoured, and when all might live in peace, "everyone under their vine and fig tree with none to make them afraid". (Michah 4:4)

I extend every good wish for significant progress in this special session.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Ms. Kristiina Hallman of the Finnish Committee of 100.

Ms. HALLMAN: Today we are facing a long-desired and deeply gratifying disarmament process. The super-Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, have agreed on diminishing the numbers of and demolishing nuclear weapons, the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF Treaty) and a possible START agreement. For the first time in the history of mankind, nuclear weapons will be removed permanently. The focus of disarmament talks seems to be moving from multilateral to bilateral efforts.

Relying only on bilateral disarmament processes and negotiations between the super-Powers is insufficient for real global disarmament. Bilateral disarmament processes include several risks and weaknesses because: first, disarmament and arms control processes would become too vulnerable and insecure if they were dependent on changes in relationships between the super-Powers; secondly, bilateral disarmament cannot overcome global threats such as environmental problems that require international co-operation; and, thirdly, the super-Powers' interests are different from the needs of the international community. The super-Powers are led by complicated, mostly internal mechanisms which support the arms race.
Multinational co-operation on pursuing disarmament is necessary for creating new arms control, verification and information structures. In spite of the beginning of nuclear disarmament, the world is facing a conventional arms race which may escalate to a new threatening level.

The international community needs sufficient means for verifying and controlling the disarmament processes. For complete and efficient verification of disarmament, it is inevitable that we rely on and develop a viable United Nations organization. Non-governmental organizations have their own interests in disarmament and demilitarization, which require international organization for co-operation between nations. For example, the International Peace Bureau (IPB) proposed a year ago that the United Nations could create an open data base to include current information on arms trade and arms production. This initiative can be carried out only through international co-operation.

Besides multilateral disarmament processes we must support unilateral disarmament initiatives around the world. Unilateral actions are most important in removing military structures and replacing them with new structures of peace within societies.

The non-governmental organizations are in a key position to create new peace-promoting structures in the cultural, political and economic life of our societies. We have to encourage peace movements and improve their ability to work in all United Nations Member countries. We have to demand the right to conscientious objection, and the right to peace activities in every United Nations country. We need the non-governmental organizations and multilateral co-operation both for disarmament processes and for demilitarization of our societies.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Hemachandra Bassapa of the Documentation and Dissemination Centre for Disarmament Information.
Mr. BASSAPPA: Please give me an answer that I can take back to the 800 million plus people of my country, 70 per cent of them illiterate, and 40 per cent of them living on a monthly family income of between $20 and $30, on what this session has achieved towards alleviating their poverty and misery and that of all those other millions in the developing countries. You are the representatives and the trustees of those voiceless people. You have a moral responsibility as concerned citizens of the world to show that you care for them and that you are serious. They do not ask for much, for they know not the necessities that we have been used to.

Why are equally poor neighbouring countries pushed into an arms race? Why are the super-Powers encouraging this?

In south Asia there is a major arms race which the peoples of the region can ill afford, especially a people who share a common heritage, culture and background. Please leave us alone. We believe that the time has come to draw a line - that enough is enough. We believe that there are enough scientists and engineers in the arms-exporting countries who are prepared to work on conversion plans. Give them a chance. We believe that if they can design and manufacture sophisticated weapons of mass destruction, they are equally capable of designing and manufacturing goods and services for the benefit of mankind.

In this connection, we call on friendly Sweden seriously to implement the Thorsson report and lead the way for the weapons exporting countries.

We believe that, as steps towards nuclear weapons disarmament have begun, serious efforts should also begin towards reducing conventional weapons. More than one third of the external debt of the developing countries results from weapons purchases. These countries are populated by poor people, most of them unaware of why they are poor or why they need to suffer endlessly.
We recommend that the 1990s be declared as the decade for conversion and development.

We seem to be caught up in scoring debating points. We call on the intellectuals of the weapons-exporting countries, to overcome their state of insensitivity and to speak out against their countries' policies of weapons export and the death, destruction and misery that they cause. We believe that they have a responsibility as fellow citizens of this planet to the millions of illiterate peoples of the world.

We call on the countries on the threshold of acquiring nuclear weapons boldly to renounce their nuclear weapons options. I especially appeal to my own government, India, and that of Pakistan on this. By the end of this special session let us boldly resolve that we will ensure that the next century will have a new beginning of peace and prosperity.

We call on India and Pakistan to agree on a single common resolution on the Indian Ocean, giving up their present positions and jointly insisting that the much delayed United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean be held immediately.

I represent a small Centre, conceived to create an awareness of the need for disarmament for development and related issues, and to make information accessible for study and research.

The poor peoples of the world survive on hope, hope for a better future. Do not destroy those hopes. That is the least we can offer them.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite Ms. Joanne Landy, European Nuclear Disarmament, to make a statement.

Ms. LANDY: I speak for European Nuclear Disarmament, Great Britain, but I am from the United States and represent The Campaign for Peace and Democracy, East and West. However, the statement I am about to read is from END, Great Britain.
Europe has been the epicentre of two devastating World Wars. Europe was the birthplace of colonialism and fascism. Today, Europe is a stage for the global East-West confrontation; it is the most heavily militarized area in the world.
(Ms. Landry)

The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - ratified by the United States Senate and the Supreme Soviet this month, is a victory for millions of European citizens who are anxious to redress in some small way their responsibility for the past and who campaigned against the stationing of Soviet and United States missiles in Europe. The INF Treaty offers the first break in the arms race since the Second World War, and the possibility of beginning to end the cold war in Europe and throughout the world.

European Nuclear Disarmament asks the special session on disarmament to support us in building upon the achievements of the INF Treaty. First, we urge the Assembly at this special session to oppose explicitly any attempt to undermine the INF Treaty by the "modernization" of short-range nuclear weapons in Europe, by so-called compensatory adjustments in the form of air-launched or sea-launched cruise missiles based in Europe or by the strengthening of British and French nuclear forces.

Secondly, we ask the special session to call for the withdrawal of foreign troops on European soil. The existence of two militarily-integrated bloc systems in Europe exacerbates the danger of war and limits the sovereignty and self-determination of individual European nations. The cold war can be ended only if the occupation of Europe by United States and Soviet as well as British, Canadian and other forces in Germany and Central Europe is ended.

Thirdly, we ask the special session to support the creation of an alternative European security system based on the principles of the 1975 Helsinki agreement. It would include respect for the territorial status quo, international co-operation and respect for political, economic and social rights. New processes of democratization in the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries are making an important contribution to peace in Europe. We would particularly stress the role of newly emerging peace, ecology and human rights groups in the socialist
countries, and we would ask the special session to support the demand of many European peace groups for the right to conscientious objection.

We Europeans have to come to terms with our history and learn to live together if we are to contribute to peace, disarmament and development in the world as a whole. We ask the nations of the world to help us to fulfil this goal.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Ms. Solange Fernex of the International Women's League for Peace and Liberty.

Ms. FERNEUX (interpretation from French): I convey to the Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament the best wishes of all the men and women in France who in increasing numbers are calling for an immediate halt to nuclear testing in Moruroa, the prohibition of chemical weapons, reductions in military budgets, a halt to arms sales, increased development assistance, education for peace, training in the negotiated settlement of conflicts and non-violent resistance.

France spends 11 million francs a day on defence, money diverted from the real needs of its citizens, diverted from development. Our borders, defended at such cost, are invisible in the springtime landscape and invisible in satellite pictures. In fact, the borders that separate human beings exist only in the mind. It is urgent that they be eradicated and that we work to save our fragile little blue planet - together, all of us together.

Life is threatened not only by the arms race and weapons of mass destruction, but also by the pollution of our air, water and soil, by the death of our forests and oceans. Chernobyl showed that our borders are ignored by nuclear technology, a dangerous technology which we have not mastered, whose wastes - which remain radioactive for milleniums - we do not know how to dispose of. The majority of the world population lives in extreme poverty; millions of children still die of hunger. Modern society is producing a vicious circle of death: weapons,
pollution, famine, the exploitation of resources, marginalization. Let us put an end to this disaster.

Each and every one of us is responsible for this state of affairs, whether we be citizens, members of non-governmental organizations or political leaders. Future generations will hold us accountable for our disastrous management of the earth.

Let me return to atomic, chemical and biological weapons. Following Hiroshima and on the eve of Nagasaki, on 8 August 1945, the Allied Powers established in London the Nuremberg Tribunal to try and sentence Nazi crimes. Its conclusions, approved by the General Assembly in 1946, apply to all crimes against peace: war crimes, everywhere and for all time.

International law affirms that atomic weapons - the Auschwitz of our day, gigantic crematoriums on a global scale, final solutions to life itself - are criminal. The Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal and the Judgment of the Tribunal hold personally responsible in international law citizens who finance these weapons by their taxes and leaders who opt for them, even if they are carrying out orders and acting in accordance with their national law. You and I are personally responsible. We are adjudged accomplices in crimes against humanity. The development, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction of civilian populations violate such instruments as the Geneva Conventions. They are crimes against humanity, for which we shall be held accountable.

More and more of us are refusing to be accomplices. Activists are carrying out "Nuremberg actions": strikes, sit-ins, the destruction of weapons. That respect for international law is casting them into the prisons of their countries, including the country in which this meeting is taking place. They no longer wish - we no longer wish - to be accomplices.
That is why, on behalf of a number of French women's movements for disarmament and French non-violent anti-nuclear movements, I call upon the delegations of France and other nuclear Powers to stop their tests, to sign a comprehensive test-ban treaty, to work out a rapid disarmament timetable, to sign a treaty prohibiting chemical weapons, and to begin here in New York during the third special session on disarmament.

I call also upon the delegations of all countries the world over no longer to accept the diktat of the nuclear Powers, and to make them cleanse the earth of these instruments of death. Those delegations represent the overwhelming majority of the world's peoples. We want to commit ourselves together to the service of life, and we want to do it now.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon Ms. Cay Sevon of the Finnish Peace Committee.

Ms. SEVON: Unanimous and conscious support of official foreign policies can be attained, but on one condition only: that a State's foreign policy is actively peace-pursuing. Finland's disarmament and détente policies are supported by more than 90 per cent of the population. Our country is neutral, but not on the question of war and peace: we are for peace and against war. We have no enemies, and equally important we have no enemy images.

Finland's position is, of course, unique. We are a highly industrialized market-economy country with a treaty of friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance with the Soviet Union. The treaty contributes to the stability of Northern Europe.

There is broad and active public support in Finland for a comprehensive nuclear-weapons-test-ban treaty. Since the mid-1980s all our parliamentary groups have supported that demand. So have trade unions, churches and housewives and military organizations. "No tests" means no development of new and even more
destructive nuclear weapons. "No tests" means no fading of the stars in a Star War. "No tests" means less strain on the natural environment.

We appeal to the Assembly has we have done before through The New York Times: Find the way to a test-ban treaty now that the main nuclear Powers are advancing on questions of verification and now that outstanding experts consider it possible, which is even now being demonstrated.

Our people celebrated the INF Treaty. There are high hopes in Finland that the Treaty will have a positive influence on the intergovernmental work being done by the Ministries for Foreign Affairs of the five Nordic countries to study the prerequisites for creating a Nordic nuclear-weapon-free zone.
However, we do have concerns. There is talk about compensation in areas not included in the Treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces. At this stage of the disarmament negotiations arguments are being voiced against denuclearized zones. We regard the Nordic zone initiative, first presented by Finland's President Urho Kekkonen 25 years ago, as a confidence-building measure that will contribute to a wider European disarmament process. Even discussion about the zone project keeps the nuclear threshold higher.

The peace movements of all Nordic countries have acted together for the zone throughout this decade. A vast majority in each and every one of the countries supports it. We have the right to create such a zone. From the third special session we expect an advancement in United Nations work towards nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In mid-July, at an all-Nordic peace camp in the Aaland Islands, a demilitarized area, we are going to draw up our plans for common action. There, we will also evaluate the results of this session.

Ours is a country with one third of its geographical area north of the Polar Circle. We have a natural and legitimate interest in the military, ecological and cultural developments in the Arctic area. The military build-up in the northern seas worries us greatly. The Law of the Seas was progressive in the seventeenth century, but we do not live in those days anymore. The right to move unrestricted under the eternal ice with nuclear-missile-equipped and nuclear-fuelled submarines bears the seeds of a catastrophe. There cannot be effective disarmament without restrictions on sea-based armaments.

We support initiatives - like the one made by our President Mauno Koivisto - calling for confidence-building measures on the northern seas. We want the disarmament negotiations to include long-distance sea-based cruise missiles.
Nature is so vulnerable in the North. When it is damaged, little repair can be made. On the other hand, the natural resources there are immense. We plead for ecological, economic and other co-operation. It is in the interests of all humanity that the Arctic be protected against military hazards.

There is no progress for nuclear-weapon-free zones and a non-violent world without public movements. We are proud of the United Nations and of being an initial recipient of its Peace Messenger Award. We propose a third global peace wave on 24 October 1988. Movements, States and the United Nations together, and all can be gained.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Jan van der Putten of Food and Disarmament International.

Mr. VAN DER PUTTEN: Following the Second World War the concept of security has been purposely limited to the East-West confrontation and has acquired a predominantly military character based on the supposition that the most important threat comes from the opposing military bloc. The corollary to that limited view is that only an arms balance can prevent war. That limited security concept, which is incapable of tackling all those threats that are not included in the limited East-West framework, has also been manipulated at various times when it coincided with national security. In fact, to believe that national sovereignty, in particularly that of small countries, can be defended by preparing militarily to repress any and all military aggression, instead of preparing to address the variety of more serious economic, monetary, commercial, social and political pressures, is simply grotesque. It is our opinion that will be difficult to render those phenomena obsolete in the near future without major political changes.

Hunger, misery, social injustice and nationalism are, in fact, an explosive mixture and a real and specific threat to security. This threat is too-little
studied and analysed, even though its danger and seriousness are comparable to any conceivable military threat.

With particular reference to the third world, the threats that imperil their well-being and survival do not come from direct military threats from other countries, but from approaching the point beyond which it will be impossible for them to meet the elementary needs of their peoples and to service their debts.

Enormous resources are required in both the northern and southern hemispheres in order to confront such new threats as demolition of the ecosystem, impoverishment of the third world and the magnitude of third-world debt, to name only a few. In order to tackle those new challenges, new instruments and new forces are required, new rules and new plans of battle. Those new instruments and forces can come into being only through the courageous and decisive conversion of military expenditures and structures into civilian institutions capable of coping with the economic and ecological crisis of our world. The economic demilitarization and the better use of resources must now become a necessity for all, so that the hegemonic dreams of small regional Powers and super-Powers, which hinder progress in that direction, may be rendered bankrupt.

In order for those forces to come into being there must be a new conviction and resolve to counter all the new and old nationalisms. An invader might be stopped at the border, but not pollution, the desert, international economic instability and the multitude of famines and oppressed peoples.

Subsequently, a new unity and a new political integration must be developed among countries on a regional and continental level. That political unity should not be founded upon old ideologies but upon our common interest in defending ourselves against new threats to our global security.

It will be even harder to define new rules and battle plans for action. In fact, to affirm and recognize the obvious economic interdependence between
countries and at the same time neglect political interdependence is nonsense. But political interdependence is ignored today, whether covertly, as so often happens, through hypocritical formulas of international diplomacy, or rejected openly by means of the brutal use of arms or direct economic pressures. New contracts and new treaties must be conceived between countries and guaranteed by an effective supranational authority. The dramatic choice between debt and democracy can only be tackled if new rules ensure the mutual interests of both debtor and creditor countries, promoting the development of the economic and democratic growth of all and a real and proportional reallocation of defence expenditures in order to face old and new threats.

In other words, new plans of action must be developed in order to face effectively the challenge of old problems such as barbarism, genocide and totalitarianism, which are still with us, and new problems such as the degradation of the global commons. We must neither be accomplices nor spectators.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Ms. Patricia Mische of Global Education Associates.

Ms. MISCHE: I am here today representing Global Education Associates (GEA), an international organization of men and women in some 70 countries who conduct research and educational programmes aimed at advancing world peace and security, economic development and co-operation, human rights and ecological sustainability. We were pleased last year to be one of the recipients of the United Nations Peace Messenger Awards.

We wish to express our special appreciation for the Final Document and Programme of Action advanced at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978 and for the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development in 1987. Those are landmark documents. However, there is a long way to go towards their effective
implementation. Nations are not likely to disarm without at least some basic level of confidence regarding their security. Therefore, at the third special session we urge that extra attention be given to advancing effective international structures and mechanisms for dealing with problems of verification, compliance, safeguards against aggression and crisis monitoring.

We identify with the concerns of our colleagues in other non-governmental organizations can call for an end to the costly and deadly arms race. We would put our emphasis in this meeting on creating security arrangements and alternatives that can make disarmament possible.
In my remaining time I should like to focus on one specific step that could be taken towards enhancing international security. It is the development of an international satellite monitoring agency, which would have the following purposes: first, international verification of arms control agreements, confidence-building and international crisis monitoring; secondly, preventing an arms race in outer space; thirdly, advancing multilateral approaches to the peaceful and co-operative uses of outer space.

In the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, States parties agreed that outer space should not be subject to national appropriation but should be preserved for peaceful purposes and developed for the benefit of all peoples. Plans to put weapons in outer space threaten the spirit, and in the case of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction also the letter, of that agreement. Moreover, an arms race in outer space would be extremely destabilizing, undermine arms control and disarmament agreements and increase the risk of nuclear war - all concerns of this special session. It would also consume enormous amounts of money and physical and human resources that should be better applied to meeting human needs.

Yet the development of certain space technologies could also enhance international peace and security if, and possibly only if, that technology is employed by and for the benefit of all the world's peoples and for the earth itself, rather than to increase the power or dominance of one or a few nations. Thus it is important now, before a new arms race is started in outer space, to develop multilateral systems which can harness new space technologies in the cause of international peace and security and for the benefit of all peoples.

One practical step the United Nations could take in that direction would be to develop an international satellite monitoring agency. Such an agency is relevant to the permanent agenda of the Disarmament Conference established in 1979, which
calls for confidence-building measures and effective verification of arms control and disarmament measures.

As to feasibility, studies have shown the technical and legal feasibility of such an international agency. In 1978 the General Assembly approved the French proposal for a feasibility study on the development of an all-nation satellite monitoring agency to help monitor and provide verification for peacekeeping and common security agreements between nations. The resulting 1982 report by a group of experts from 12 nations found no legal or technical obstacles to the development and use of international satellites for that purpose. In 1984 the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute convened a meeting of experts to consider technical, political and other aspects of international and regional use of satellites for arms control and crisis monitoring. Again no technical or legal impediments were found, only the lack of political will at the international level. In 1985 the Soviet Union proposed the establishment of a world space organization that would, among other goals, monitor agreements related to preventing an arms race in outer space and to advance co-operation in the peaceful uses of space. That appeared to signal a new-found political readiness on the part of one of the military Powers to reopen discussions in the area of multilateral approaches to the development of outer space.

Such studies and proposals have been paralleled by the work of many scientists and non-governmental organizations on behalf of the peaceful uses of outer space. For example, thousands of scientists in the United States and elsewhere around the world have pledged not to engage in research related to space weapons. Many of those same scientists would happily support and commit their expertise to the development of space technologies that they believed could make the world more secure and peaceful. Thus the time is becoming riper every day for the United Nations to act on those studies, proposals and new openings.
While costs are a question, the French ISMA study proposed a three-phased development that would keep initial costs low. The first phase, the sharing of data and information gathered by existing national and regional satellite monitoring systems, need not be a drain on a limited United Nations budget. Some of the costs might be covered through contributed services of participating regional and national space agencies, or by other sources outside the United Nations.

This is an axial moment in history. The decisions we make or fail to make now - or by default leave to others - will determine the fate of outer space. Research on space weapons, quietly under way for several decades, has now been accelerated. We have only a few more years to prevent an arms race in outer space and to save the high frontier as a global peace commons. Once weapons are placed in space it will be too late. We urge you to go beyond mere words of support for the peaceful uses of outer space and to advance practical programmes and structures which can make that goal a reality.

An international satellite monitoring agency could aid not only in the international monitoring and verification of existing and future arms control and disarmament agreements, enhanced confidence and public support for disarmament processes; it could also be an important step in harnessing space technologies for multilateral approaches to the peaceful uses of outer space and for the advancement of peace on earth.


Ms. TALBOT: Gray Panthers, with its 80,000 members in 80 local networks in the United States and in many other countries, enthusiastically welcomes the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.
The Final Document of the first special session stated that mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation. Today those words hold more profound meaning than ever before. Scientists have warned that if even a small number of nuclear weapons is ever used humankind and all life on our planet will probably be destroyed, if not by the initial blasts, fire-storms and radiation, then by a nuclear winter that would engulf the entire globe.

Everywhere, in the farthest corners of the world, people are breathing a sigh of relief and rekindling their hopes for lasting world peace as a result of the signing of the Treaty on Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev.

Concluding the INF Treaty was above all a victory brought about by public opinion and peace movements everywhere. However, it could not have come about without the perseverance and leadership provided by the great majority of Governments voting time after time in the United Nations General Assembly for disarmament measures. It could not have come about without the remarkable blueprint for disarmament, the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, adopted unanimously by the votes of all the nations of the world. It could not have come about without the world disarmament campaign at the United Nations, which helped focus and give ever greater expression to the efforts of non-governmental organizations and public opinion. It could not have come about without the activities of the United Nations International Year of Peace, the United Nations Conference on Disarmament and Development, held in 1987, and the persistent efforts of the Geneva based multilateral negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament.
The advent of the INF Treaty can and must stimulate further crucial steps for the prevention of nuclear war. These include bringing about a successful conclusion to the START negotiations between the United States and the USSR for a 50 per cent reduction in strategic armaments so that a treaty might be signed rapidly.

Critical to these efforts is the need to prevent an escalation of the arms race into space. First of all this requires strict adherence to the ABM Treaty. The United Nations General Assembly has underscored the urgency of preventing an arms race in space in numerous resolutions usually adopted with the opposition or abstention of only one or two nations.

Gray Panthers, along with the majority of non-governmental organizations and individuals around the world, is adamantly opposed to the development, production and deployment of space weapons, and we take action accordingly.
Further, as emphasized in the Final Document of SSOD I and in resolution after resolution of the General Assembly, prevention of nuclear war is dependent upon a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. Since all perceived verification difficulties, even for tests under one kiloton, have now been proved surmountable by recent technology, a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is more possible than ever before.

Gray Panthers fervently believes that world peace, disarmament and mutual security are dependent upon these priority steps. But they must be deepened and strengthened by moving persistently towards abolishing all nuclear weapons from the face of the earth by the turn of the century.

We are deeply concerned that various existing and potential hotspots of regional conflict, fuelled by intervention and aggression, be peacefully resolved. That is necessary not only to bring about peace and justice in those regions, but to prevent a global nuclear conflagration.

Gray Panthers is involved in advocacy and action to bring about economic and social justice - such things as universal health care, decent, affordable housing for all, income maintenance and dignified productive lives for older people, and alleviation of joblessness, poverty and hunger, particularly for the sake of children who are the most victimized by these societal ills.

The greatest cause of deprivation, hunger, starvation, social and economic injustice and the constantly deteriorating quality of life in most parts of the world is the more than $1 trillion spent annually on the military and on instruments of destruction.

The vast financial and human resources being flushed down the drain of military spending must be transferred to human needs - to maintain and enhance life. We are outraged that every minute millions are spent on armaments while thousands of children die from starvation.
Each significant step towards disarmament makes it more possible to release resources for human needs - for economic development. Conversely, every real step for development, every step towards achieving a new international economic order, called for by the United Nations, contributes in a major way towards disarmament. Disarmament and development are truly inseparable.

Gray Panthers feels that it is most important to continue and strengthen the World Disarmament Campaign, which we hope SSOD III will decide to do. Above all, while the disarmament priorities of this historical period are being updated and delineated, we strongly urge that there be a reaffirmation and implementation of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Gray Panthers takes seriously the opening words of the United Nations Charter:

"We the peoples of the United Nations".

We will continue to champion and defend the United Nations as the main hope for ensuring world peace for "succeeding generations". We pledge to continue and to intensify our efforts to help mobilize public opinion for United Nations disarmament efforts.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite Ms. Kerstin Blomberg, of the Great Peace Journey, to make a statement.

Ms. BLOMBERG: I have the honour of speaking to the Committee on behalf of the Great Peace Journey, a project which originated in Sweden, but which has grown into a worldwide undertaking, with thousands of people involved.

The Great Peace Journey wants to strengthen the United Nations by reminding Governments of the commitment to world peace and development they made by freely signing the United Nations Charter.

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".
Those opening words of the Charter reflect the fact that when Governments of Member States act here at the United Nations they act on behalf of their peoples.

The Great Peace Journey's five questions to Governments are closely related to the Charter. They deal with strict self-defence, weapons of mass destruction, exports of armaments, basic human needs and conflict-solving.

The peoples have the right to demand answers to the questions. The Governments have a duty to give the answers. They are accountable to the peoples and the whole of humanity. Therefore, the peoples have the right to ask their Governments "What have you done to implement genuine disarmament measures, to convert resources from military production to civil use, to guarantee basic human rights for all people, especially in the developing countries, and to solve conflicts between States by peaceful means, in accordance with Article 33 of the United Nations Charter?"

We want with our five questions to open a dialogue with Governments and to ask them whether they are willing to work for peace and justice in the world.

We want to protest against the increasing expenditure on armaments while the children of the world are starving.

It has not been possible to organize personal visits to all the Member States, but 105 Governments were visited during 1985 and 1986. The five questions have been sent in writing to the Governments of all Member States of the United Nations, with a request for answers. So far 90 Governments have answered "Yes" to all the questions. Our report has been accepted as a United Nations document (A/42/353), where one may find how the different countries answered.

The peoples all over the world that have been involved in and have participated in the Great Peace Journey are not naive enough to believe that the world would change overnight as a result of the answer "Yes" by all Governments to
all five questions. The issues involved are extremely serious, complicated and difficult.

What we want to promote is new thinking and new initiatives to secure human life on Earth. People should intervene in the political process by opening a straightforward dialogue with their Governments.

While we have been working on this project a grass-roots network has been established all over the world. In different ways people in many countries are continuing to work with the five questions. There have been conferences in various regions of the world, where proposals have been discussed on how to follow up the answers.

The five questions are not only questions; they are at the same time proposals. Now we must discuss what the United Nations, the Governments and the peoples can do to bring the five questions into political reality. We shall do that at the Global Popular Summit here in the United Nations Headquarters building in September. The participants in the Summit will be representatives of different regions as well as a panel of internationally known eminent personalities. We shall also invite representatives of the Governments that answered "Yes" to the questions to take part in the discussions.

Today we all depend on each other more than ever before, no matter where we live. Our soil, air and water are being polluted, the deserts are spreading and hunger, poverty and disease are growing. Resources should be used to stop that, instead of developing weapons of destruction. The system of security based on terror has brought only more and more insecurity. The arms race is already consuming the resources necessary for the survival of the poor people.

We live in an overarmed and undernourished world. But it is the only world we have, so let us work together to save this world for future generations.
Let us work for peace and justice, for common survival, instead of common destruction.

We expect that this session will be successful, so that we all come a big step closer to universal disarmament.

We have not only inherited the Earth from our forefathers; we have also borrowed it from our children.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite Ms. Lila Prounis, of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocesan Council, to make a statement.

Ms. PROUNIS: The Greek Orthodox Archdiocesan Council, which represents some 3 million people in 600 parishes throughout North and South America and whose Chairman is His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, lives by the principles and teachings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and by the traditions of the early Church as handed down to us by the first seven Ecumenical Councils.

Though the Orthodox Church has not traditionally held a pacifist position on the question of unprovoked war, it has always seen war as evil.
The threat of massive destruction by nuclear weapons and the loss in human lives, cultural and civilized values, economic resources, the pollution of nature, and its long-lasting residual impact on human life make nuclear war a totally indefensible cause.

International tensions as well as the proliferation of nuclear weapons greatly increase the potential of the deliberate or accidental use of highly destructive nuclear weapons. We believe that it is a spiritual and moral imperative that every effort be exerted with a sense of urgency both to put an end to the increase of nuclear weaponry and to maintain the process of serious negotiations to reduce the already swollen capabilities of the super-Powers and other nations.

In the light of international realities, it is imperative for us to appeal for a reduction and immediate and drastic cut of the nuclear arsenals.

The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese Council commends the recently concluded agreement on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles between the two major Powers and their respective alliances. The prospects for an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear weapons are also a positive sign, which we whole-heartedly endorse.

In order to prevent future wars and gradually safeguard world peace, it is essential for the people of the world to close ranks and wage a resolute struggle against all attempts at hegemonism and expansionism.

Pending the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, all nuclear-weapon States must, as a first step, undertake unconditionally not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones — in any circumstances.

The Greek Orthodox Archdiocesan Council commends the important progress registered within the framework of the recent Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures, held in January 1988.
The Greek Orthodox Archdiocesan Council condemns the use of chemical weapons, which are just as disastrous to the human being as nuclear war, and welcomes the important progress made in the area of chemical weapons in the Conference on Disarmament held in Geneva in 1988. These decisions will have an important impact on the future of disarmament.

Multilateralism as well as the central role of the United Nations in the process of disarmament should be reaffirmed. Peace and security are universal requirements for all States in the attainment of this objective. Not only must the interests of all States be duly taken into account but their concrete contribution to the process must be sought.

We realize that the arms race has dire consequences especially for the poor, whose meager resources it devours at an increasing pace. Yet we do not despair. We continue to believe in the power of prayer and together we trust that God will lead humanity out of this wilderness. It is not too late to replace the threat or use of armed force by peace-directed dialogue. It is not too late to develop a shared notion of common security among the inescapably interdependent nations of the world.

People of religion have a special role to play in these matters by promoting good neighbour policy among peoples, increasing contacts across lines of division, improving the spiritual and devotional life of human communities, helping to erase prejudicial enemy images, and intensifying education for peace through peace corps.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite Professor Kaarle Nordenstreng, President of the International Organization of Journalists, to address the Committee.

Mr. NORDENSTRENG: I have the pleasure of bringing to this forum the greetings of 250,000 mass-media professionals affiliated with the oldest, largest and broadest international organization of journalists in the world.
We share the gratification over the INF Treaty, and we realize that the media played a significant role in bringing about the positive turn in international relations by employing the means of mass communication between peoples

"for the purposes of mutual understanding a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives" -

to use the words of the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), or, to put it in terms of the Final Act of Helsinki, by promoting

"an ever-wider knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of life" in other countries.

By the same token, however, we recognize that it is the people - the general public at large - that have created the ultimate pressure for peace and disarmament, the media playing a catalytic and facilitating role. Moreover, there are among the dominant media in the world those with a tendency to foster militarism rather than disarmament, disinformation rather than fair and accurate information; and thus they continue the cold war even if Governments seem to have closed that chapter in history. This tendency, to be sure, is perpetuated by the owners and managers of the mass media - not, on the whole, by working journalists.

As far as professional journalists are concerned, their position is clear, especially in the light of the Magna Carta of contemporary journalism, the
"International Principles of Professional Ethics in Journalism", issued in 1983 in the name of all major international and regional organizations of journalists, representing altogether 400,000 working journalists in all parts of the world. This is how the document characterizes the role of media workers in relation to global issues:
"A true journalist stands for the universal values of humanism, above all peace, democracy, human rights, social progress and national liberation. Thus the journalist participates actively in the social transformation towards democratic betterment of society and contributes through dialogue to a climate of confidence in international relations conducive to peace and justice everywhere, to détente, disarmament, and national development."

Accordingly, disarmament is recognized as an integral part of what might be called the universal ethic of media professionals - an ethic which begins with the pursuit of truth and ends with support for the same fundamental values as those on which the United Nations was founded. This ethic, it should be noted, is held and elaborated by the profession itself, without any interference from Governments. We stand for a free and responsible press and call for both professional autonomy of journalists and public accountability of the media.

These worthy principles must now be transferred into practical action. We need journalists talking directly to the people, as was done so effectively in the telebridges. We need constructive media criticism, based on scientific evidence, as the late Sean MacBride proposed when he called for a system of monitoring the media coverage of disarmament. And my organization offers its world-wide network of journalists to build a bridge that crosses over the military-industrial complex and brings disarmament diplomacy closer to the world's people."
The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Hinne Wagenaar of the Inter-Church Peace Council.

Mr. WAGENAAR: I am sick. I still have Hollanditis. Many people in the Netherlands have this disease which is called Hollanditis and which causes an unstoppable hunger for nuclear disarmament and subversive behaviour towards injustice.

I speak on behalf of the Inter-Church Peace Council (IKV) from the Netherlands. In 1977 we started our political campaign entitled: "Help rid the world of nuclear weapons: let it begin in the Netherlands", which had an enormous impact on the political and civil discussions in our country and in Europe as a whole.

Disarmament is not a goal in itself but to us the nuclear issue is connected with many other issues. We are a peace movement connected with the churches and we are engaged in the programme of the World Council of Churches called the Conciliar Process for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation (JPIC). In this conciliar process we see expressed the three important threats to humanity and mother Earth - the vigorous violation of justice, the absence of peace and the destruction of our natural environment. These three elements are central to our analysis of the world situation and are indivisible in our vision of a new world society. We say in other words: we are searching for a just peace. In trying to think globally and to act locally, we see that disarmament is not a goal in itself, but the arms race is the first reality we, people living in Europe, have to confront. Because of the East-West conflict in Europe, which lies behind the enormous piles of nuclear weapons, I will say something about the Europe we envisage.

To begin with we want to emphasize the fact that in a nuclear age deterrence is an old-fashioned way of military thinking, which is highly questionable. Security in Europe can only be "common security". That is why we want a
(Mr. Wagenaar)

demilitarization of the ideological conflict and a disengagement of the military confrontation. European security should be a political and not a military matter.

We envisage a Europe undivided; a Europe where the cold war is over, in which there are no blocs and without divisions. We cannot leave the policy of détente to the official Powers. We do not trust détente from above as the only way to end the division of Europe. In Europe a network of ordinary people is being formed to undermine the mechanism and philosophy of deterrence. We call it "détente from below".

At the official level people should strive also towards a new Europe. The best framework for this is the Helsinki Accords. These accords confirm the territorial status quo in Europe and reject the use of force in international relations. Yet, these accords leave the door open to peaceful and gradual change towards a pluralistic Europe which can overcome the bloc structure. For Europe the implementation of the Helsinki agreements in their entirety must be a priority.

We envisage a Europe undivided. We do not want to be a Europe in the hands of the United States of America or the Soviet Union. Even the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF), which is very important, is a decision of the super-Powers about the situation in Europe. But we are Europe, that is, Eastern Europe, Central Europe and Western Europe.

In order to reach this we propose the following: first, to continue to deal with over-armament in Europe through further "zero options". That means initiatives and agreements to eliminate whole classes of weapon-systems in Europe, East and West. There must be "zero options" in battlefield nuclear weapons as well as in the conventional weapons which are most offensive in character.

These further "zero options" would be a good continuation of the INF agreement. We are concerned about and reject the proposals of the Western European
Union to modernize the short-range nuclear weapons which remain in our countries after the INF agreement. That is a bad continuation of the INF agreement.

We also strongly reject the ideas of the Western European Union for a militarily and nuclearily independent Western Europe as a third Power in the northern political arena.

Secondly, we are in favour of starting a process of withdrawing foreign troops and bases from Eastern and Western Europe: a major reduction and finally complete withdrawal of all foreign troops and weapons in Europe. Finally, this should lead to the dissolution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. This is an essential step towards a "common security" system and will contribute to overcoming the division of Europe.

We wish to help rid the world of nuclear weapons. Let the process begin in the Netherlands and Europe. We ask for a Europe without nuclear weapons and an undivided Europe. We ask for a system of common security in order that we can search together for a just peace in our concern for justice, peace and the integrity of creation.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Amar Bentoumi of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers.

Mr. BENTOUMI (interpretation from French): As part of this special session of the United Nations devoted to peace and disarmament I should like, on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers to profit from the opportunity given to me to offer some thoughts about the role of the lawyer in this field.

The lawyer generally is perceived to be at the same time a scholar – he is supposed to know the law; an explainer – he explains rationally the meaning of the law; and an executor – he is supposed to apply the law or to see to it that the
law is applied. In other words, the lawyer takes apart, explains and applies, he does not create. He is supposed to be only a photographer or a guardian of reality, a preserver of relics.

In reality the mission of the lawyer is more complex. While it is true that the lawyer is not in principle either a legislator or a political decision-maker, even though lawyers sometimes hold those positions; and in this regard he does not have the power to make or unmake the laws - none the less within the closed field of the law the lawyer does have space for freedom of action which is just as broad as the law is general.

Faced with a terrain the horizon of which recedes as he explores it, the lawyer, by showing the hidden meaning of a rule and by revealing its possibilities, stops being an accountant in order to become a creator.

A fortiori, it is also true when the lawyer denounces the insufficiency of a rule or criticizes its weaknesses and addresses himself to decision-makers to ask them to fill in the gaps.

The lawyer therefore assumes a political function. It is precisely that which the Association is trying to do by filling in in the matter of peace and disarmament, by showing that in this field positive international law, particularly that in the United Nations, already imposes upon States a number of special obligations.

In the time assigned to us it is impossible for me to review all the actions of our Association for making these rules widely known and also to mention the efforts we are making to contribute to the development of international law. I shall limit myself therefore to three areas that our Association has worked in: the creation of zones of peace; the demilitarization of outer space; and the ban on the use of nuclear weapons.
(Mr. Bentoumi)

The creation of zones of peace. We know that the concept of the zone of peace goes back to the 1970 Non-Aligned Conference in Lusaka. At that time the idea was born of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, an idea that is contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 1971.

The zone of peace contained in that text appears as a zone which is at the same time more and less than a nuclear-free zone. It is more to the extent that within that zone not only are the nuclear weapons of the major Powers to be eliminated but also, inter alia, the process of the escalation and expansion of their military presence is to be halted.

It is less than a nuclear-free zone to the extent that only nuclear weapons of the major Powers are to be eliminated and not those that belong to the States of that zone.

The Indian Ocean as a zone of peace remained for a long time a unique example until, finally, the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 41/11 of 27 October 1986 declared a "zone of peace and co-operation" in the South Atlantic.
Those principles, applicable to the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, are thereby enriched with new principles such as the protection of the environment or the elimination of colonialism and apartheid.

This trend towards assigning to the zone of peace broader goals and perhaps more ambitious goals than those which would apply to the nuclear-free-zones is found in the work done by our Association in this field. The Association has organized three international conferences of lawyers on, successively, The Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace at New Delhi, the Mediterranean as a Zone of Peace at Algiers and the Caribbean Basin as a Zone of Peace in Mexico.

Those conferences highlighted the fact that the notion of a zone of peace contained within itself a package of fundamental rules including, in particular the principles of international law relating to friendly relations laid down by the General Assembly in 1970, including the obligation to negotiate in good faith in regard to disarmament, and, finally, to standards which are more local in nature and which related to situations peculiar to the zone under consideration - for example, the concept of making the Chagos Islands part of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean zone of peace, the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to a state for the Mediterranean zone of peace and further, the cessation of interventions, armed interventions, in Grenada, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua and so on, for the Caribbean zone of peace.

From our Association's point of view, the central identification of a number of elementary rules of international law, found in the zone of peace concept, seems to be an original and positive way of bringing about progress in peace and disarmament. It is this which justifies the fact that our Organization has devoted a substantial part of its activities to this work.
We are aware of the important efforts made by the United Nations to ensure the demilitarization of outer space. There is the Declaration of the General Assembly of 13 December 1963 which, in particular, affirmed that space could be explored and used only in the interest of mankind and it should not be the object of national appropriation.

Then, there is the Treaty of 27 January 1967, which added to the principles laid down in the Declaration of 1963 a ban on placing weapons of mass destruction in outer space and banned the use of the Moon and other celestial bodies for other than peaceful purposes.

Finally, there is the agreement of 18 December 1979 which reaffirms and develops the rule of the peaceful use of the Moon and other celestial bodies of the solar system.

None of these texts explicitly bans the movement through outer space of weapons other than those of mass destruction. Nor do they ban the deployment there of military devices even though resolutions adopted by the General Assembly since 1981 try to fill in those gaps.

Our Association has thought deeply about those things. At its twelfth Congress, held at Athens in 1984, it emphasized that the military use of outer space, even if limited to legitimate defence purposes, which is the American doctrine, was incompatible with the rule of its peaceful use laid down in the aforementioned agreements of 1967 and 1979.

Our Association organized a multidisciplinary colloquium on this subject in Brussels on 29 and 30 June 1986. Legal analyses, presented by the greatest world experts, were made of the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI). However, they did not lead to a unanimous position. Some concluded that SDI was compatible while others concluded that it was incompatible with the letter and spirit of both the treaties
of 1967 and 1979, as well as the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missiles, of 1972.

None the less, that meeting made it possible, first, to recall fundamental principles of international law and of international space law which have an impact on the militarization of outer space; secondly, to register a number of positions which might constitute future law, especially the suggestions to improve existing conventions to explore and propose serious study of projects to curb and ban programmes for the militarization of outer space and, thirdly, to strengthen international co-operation in this field. For that, the political will of States is necessary. It is nothing to prevent lawyers from showing the way to achieve this goal.

We have tried to show this in a publication which contains concrete proposals in this direction.

Finally, a ban on the use of nuclear weapons. Our Association can derive satisfaction from knowing that it did pioneering work on banning nuclear weapons because, since 1950, our Association has affirmed that first use of nuclear weapons was not only a violation of international law, but was also a crime under the Nuremberg rules.

The General Assembly reached the same conclusion in 1961 regarding the illegality of the use of nuclear weapons and, in 1978, regarding making such use a crime.

Quite recently, our Association gave its support, its complete support, to the appeal of lawyers against nuclear war. It was an appeal which was launched in 1987 by the International Peace Bureau on the initiative of the late Sean McBride.

That appeal which, on the one hand, declares the criminal nature of resort to nuclear weapons and, on the other, asks for the elimination of nuclear weapons and for the implementation of United Nations resolutions on general and complete
disarmament, has been submitted for signature to all the lawyers of the world. It constitutes an important opportunity to remind the decision-makers and the strategists, en masse, of the faith which lawyers have in the law and in the superiority of the law over the ultimate weapon.

In conclusion, whether we are talking about strengthening zones of peace, demilitarizing outer space, or banning nuclear weapons or making their use a crime: all of these subjects offer lawyers an opportunity to make a contribution to the struggle for disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Robert De Gendt of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation.

Mr. DE GENDT: The International Committee for European Security and Co-operation (ICESC) grouping together public opinion forces on a broad pluralistic base, has for more than twenty years been pursuing action for détente and disarmament.

In 1975, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) was signed in Helsinki. It was the starting-point of a slow but remarkable process, both in the scope and variety of fields it covered. It was however in 1986 that a more favourable period began when the Conference on Disarmament in Europe ended in Stockholm with an agreement on integrated concrete measures aimed at strengthening confidence and security in Europe. At the moment, the third CSCE follow-up conference in Vienna is drawing up a final document, which we expect to be substantial and balanced. On the other hand, though moderate in the number and type of missiles it plans to eliminate, the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF) signed by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, is, however, the first agreement on nuclear disarmament. It is significant because of the verification procedures if
includes and it meets the expectation often expressed by public opinion of reducing the threat of a nuclear conflict.

Convinced that these problems of war and peace are a matter of concern, not only for Governments but for all of us, forces of public opinion keep advocating the negotiated settlement of disputes and more international solidarity. They are aware that our generation could experience the end of the arms race, could ban nuclear as well as chemical and biological weapons, could drastically reduce conventional armaments, and could, as a consequence, restrict military budgets and allow for universal co-operation in favour of development.

We have always endeavoured to support the CSCE process and have striven for the application of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and its follow-up in other conferences and forums.

In the present situation, we expect the conference in Vienna to provide new negotiations on reduction of armaments in Europe. Conventional armaments should be more particularly highlighted and a new impetus given to the elimination of the nuclear threat in Europe.

The Stockholm Conference should be further extended. Confidence-building measures will have to be enlarged and should relate, in an adequate way, to ground, sea and air forces.
We also emphasize the need to reach meaningful results in the humanitarian field and in the application of human rights. We request improved co-operation in the economic, scientific, technical and ecological fields.

Today, new prospects exist in Europe for an evolution beneficial to all, since the idea of building a "common house" is now developing. This task, geographically natural, is, however, a huge one, for we have to take into account the history and present situation in Europe. But this European house will have to keep its doors and windows open to the major problems of the world. We should not overlook the fact that the race to more sophisticated and deadly weapons is going on, that armed conflicts are killing thousands of people, not sparing civilian population, and that nuclear weapons are still a heavy, threatening burden on mankind, at a time when millions of people are dying of starvation or living an inhuman life. That is why it is even more important to build today a world "common house" based upon the interdependence of peoples and States.

Disarmament for development: that is the challenge this third special session on disarmament should meet. We express the sincere wish that this session will lead to concrete results. To that end, the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be reactivated and updated. Ten years after that session, things cannot remain at a standstill. The responsibility to meet the expectations reflected in that original document rests with the States attending this session. For our part, we shall spare no effort likely to increase the authority and efficiency of the United Nations, and we shall unfailingly intensify our commitment and our determined action aimed at building the "common house" that Europe and the world should become, and which people need so dramatically.

Ms. von ROEMER: The free trade union movement is a movement for peace. How could it be otherwise? Everything we strive for ultimately leads to the creation of a sound basis for a genuine and lasting peace. The aims of "Bread, peace and freedom", the motto adopted by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) at its founding congress, are indivisible.

To highlight the ICFTU's commitment to the promotion of world peace, and as a contribution to the International Year of Peace, a top-level trade union delegation undertook a series of meetings with world leaders in order to bring before them the free trade union movement's views on peace, security and disarmament and to see how the promotion of those ideals could be further intensified. The delegation held discussions with senior United Nations officials and the leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and was subsequently received by General-Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan.

The results of those historic meetings are reflected in a comprehensive resolution on peace, security and disarmament adopted unanimously at the fourteenth World Congress of the ICFTU, convened in Melbourne in March; the text of that resolution has been made available to delegations. The congress welcomed the improved climate of international relations which has led to certain major achievements, notably the INF Treaty, and called for further immediate steps towards effective and verified arms reduction and disarmament, in particular in the following areas: deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons as a first step towards the progressive elimination of all nuclear weapons; a comprehensive nuclear-test ban and, as an initial step, agreement on a reduction in the number of underground tests and the yields of the explosions; the consideration of proposals for the negotiation of regional treaties aimed at reducing and eliminating the deployment of nuclear weapons in specified regions of the world; a world-wide ban on the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and the
destruction of existing stocks of chemical arms; an agreement to reduce substantially conventional armed forces in Europe while maintaining the common security of the nations concerned by removing any disparities in military strength; and similar agreements for the reduction of conventional armed forces in other parts of the world.

The ICFTU has always promoted the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security. Accordingly, it has again called on all States to dedicate themselves to upholding the United Nations Charter and to take a number of measures to enable the United Nations to carry out its primary responsibility. Among these are the establishment of mechanisms for the regulation, monitoring and control of the international trade in armaments and for the suppression of illegal arms exports and the strengthening of the research activities of the United Nations on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and the deadly threat to the survival of mankind in the event of a nuclear war.

The ICFTU congress also insisted on the orderly conversion of military production into civilian industries and the use of resources currently devoted to armaments for employment and development purposes, with the full involvement of the trade union movement in all policies and programmes set up to that end.

Free trade unions are a powerful force for peace. But they can function only where there is freedom: freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of association and freedom of movement. The ICFTU's work towards the creation of a sound foundation for peace therefore encompasses the promotion of basic human rights. Solving military problems alone will not bring lasting peace so long as oppression continues to create tensions within and among nations. When the day comes when everyone can participate fully in the political process and when no one has to fear persecution for his or her convictions, we shall have taken a giant
step towards the peace we all desire. The world's resources will be used for life
and not for death, and we may at last know freedom from want.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Robert L. Beasley of the International
Co-operative Alliance.

Mr. BEASLEY: I suppose my message is addressed as much to my colleagues
in the non-governmental organizations as it is to the participants in the special
session.

A representative of the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) has spoken
at each of the General Assembly's three special sessions on disarmament.
Roger Kerbec, then ICA's President, spoke at both of the first two sessions. In
1982, at the second, he noted sadly that there had been little change since the
first. "The arms race continues," he said, "and war is still seen as an acceptable
way of resolving conflict."

Now at this third special session it is exciting and encouraging to note that
there has been change, there has been improvement. Obviously, there are reasons
for encouragement, but not, as one of the previous speakers said, for euphoria.
There has been progress towards disarmament, but, oh, there is so much more to do.

This third special session on disarmament can play a special role by reminding
the world that even after the arms reductions and limits recently agreed to by the
two super-Powers, they and the other members of the nuclear club are still left
with more than enough of history's most hideous weapons to destroy civilization.

Setting off warning sirens about dangers to world peace is a duty we
non-governmental organizations perform, and must expand. It has been a
self-assigned duty for the International Co-operative Alliance for nearly a
century. This apex organization of the world's co-operatives was begun in 1895,
and among its original objectives was to contribute to the building of lasting
peace and security.
Exactly half a century after the ICA was founded it helped to contribute to lasting peace and security by taking part in San Francisco in the start of the United Nations. Since then, the ICA has come to work with the United Nations and its agencies in many ways. But no joint activity with the United Nations is considered more important to the ICA than work towards peace and for disarmament.

At their annual Central Committee meeting last year, ICA members from countries around the world, from just about every type of political and economic system, combined to pass unanimously a resolution on peace that included an unqualified statement in support of "United Nations efforts in enhancing international security, settling regional conflicts, ensuring human rights and socio-economic advancement of nations".
An objective of the third special session should be to voice a reminder – as if a reminder should be needed – that the world is not at peace, that the ugly sounds of gunfire and exploding bombs echo around the globe from regional conflicts and terrorist attacks. To the man or women it kills, a single bullet or crude bomb is every bit as devastating and final as a nuclear blast.

My first point, then, is to appeal to all non-governmental organizations to join ICA in strengthening our efforts to raise the consciousness, not only of our members but also of anyone else we can reach, to the ongoing need to support the United Nations in its long and difficult task of promoting peace and pursuing disarmament. For most non-governmental organizations, it is the way we can help the most. We need to co-operate to expand an aware constituency for peace.

I should like very briefly to make a second point: much support has been voiced in recent times for a link between disarmament and development, particularly the development of the least developed. It is a subject that arises often in the International Co-operative Alliance. The ICA has some 175 member organizations in 69 countries, and at least 19 of those countries would qualify on just about anyone’s list as the world’s least developed. At the other end of the spectrum the ICA has members from all of the most-developed nations. In its development programmes the ICA helps link those two groups of members. Development is not the only function of the ICA, but it is one of the most important. In terms of resources devoted to it, it is the most important.

Disarmament does not equate automatically or in a neat and direct proportion to development. But disarmament could become a powerful boost to development. A second task, then, that the ICA urges non-governmental organizations to take up is promotion of the idea that at least some resources diverted from armaments, as many as possible, that is, shall be used to develop those parts of the world that need developing the most. In last year’s Peace Resolution, ICA members stated:
"Resources released as a result of curbing and reducing nuclear and other types of armaments must be channeled for development purposes and raising the living standards of people primarily in developing countries, this being, today, part and parcel of the process of ensuring social and economic stability and lasting peace."

A closing note: Well over half a billion people, at least one eighth of the world's population, are members of co-operatives that, in turn, belong to the ICA. This global community has been working together for nearly a century - for longer by twice than the age of the United Nations - across national borders, despite wars and despite threats of war. There seems to be a lesson here. It is that co-operation is the very antithesis of war. It is the very essence of peace.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Murray Thompson of the International Council for Adult Education.

Mr. THOMPSON: In 1978 the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament called for a world-wide mobilization of public opinion, urging all countries to disarm and to create the conditions for lasting peace. Four years later the second special session devoted to disarmament reaffirmed the necessity for such action by launching the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign. It called upon the United Nations, Governments and non-governmental organizations to co-operate in a global campaign to inform, to educate and to generate public understanding and support for the objectives of the United Nations in the field of arms limitation and disarmament.

Many non-governmental organizations responded to that challenge, using their own networks or establishing new ones in carrying out activities supportive of the Campaign and its objectives. In the summer of 1982, for example, the International Council for Adult Education, in co-operation with the Association of Finnish Adult Education Organizations, set up a world-wide Peace Education Network. The Network
adopted a declaration that called upon all adult educators to join in a global effort to help stop the arms race and to urge that substantial resources now spent on weapons be used to meet basic human needs.

Now, six years later, we should ask ourselves how well the three major actors of the World Disarmament Campaign - the United Nations, Governments and non-governmental organizations - have fulfilled the hopes that marked the launching of that Campaign. Of equal importance, we should pledge our continuing commitment to the realization of the Campaign's objectives based on an assessment of its record to date.

We wish to recommend that changes be considered in three major aspects of the Campaign: the setting of objectives, the implementing of programmes and the organization of fund-raising.

Our first recommendation is the establishment of a number of mini or smaller campaigns within the Campaign itself, whose objectives would be designed to further the Programme of Action contained in the 1978 Final Document. Four such campaigns are suggested as examples. First, devise educational programmes towards the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones. Secondly, generate public understanding and support for a United Nations Arms Register. Thirdly, disseminate information and encourage debate on the benefits of the creation of a disarmament fund for development. Fourthly, initiate an education campaign to publicize and dramatize the Final Document itself, especially its guiding principles, its priorities and its Programme of Action.

The second recommendation is to bring the non-governmental organizations, in meaningful ways, into the programming process of the Campaign. Non-governmental organizations involved in education have a great deal of experience in preparing materials, in organizing and conducting workshops and seminars and in the crucial aspects of following up such activities. Do not be afraid of us. We believe in
the Campaign and its objectives. We have access to mass organizations and their leaders, the people for whom the Campaign was created. Let us into the process fully, not as necessary adjuncts but as equal partners.

The third recommendation is to develop a bold and imaginative fund-raising strategy which embraces all three of the Campaign's actors. The strategy to date consists largely of annual Government pledging conferences. What has been the result? According to the United Nations Secretary-General's report of 16 May 1988 on the World Disarmament Campaign, only 44 Member States have pledged funds totalling $3.78 million since 1982. A majority of those funds are in non-convertible currencies, and some are earmarked for important but non-Campaign projects such as the United Nations Yearbook. One hundred and fifteen States, or 72 per cent of the total, have not contributed at all. Taken together, then, since 1982 Governments have contributed less than $4,000 each per year to the Campaign.

In contrast, and during the same period of time, several non-governmental organization funding groups and agencies have raised hundreds of thousands of dollars each per year for disarmament and peace education with purposes identical or similar to those of the Campaign. Those non-governmental organizations, which would be invaluable assets for furthering a fund-raising strategy, should be brought into the Campaign in the months ahead. It is our opinion that Governments - all Governments - must also assume a far greater share of the load than they have to date.

An adult educator, Father Moses Coady of Antigonish, inspired a world-wide co-operative movement with his faith in the power of the people living in the fishing communities of Nova Scotia. He wrote:

The human being, however humble, is brimful of potential energy. If we help to release that energy we will find the answer to the frightening possibilities of destruction that may come from nuclear war."
The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Ms. Shelly Douglas of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Ms. DOUGLAS: I am honoured and humbled to speak to you on behalf of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. The Fellowship was begun in 1914 by a German Lutheran and an English Quaker who vowed that, in spite of the war between their countries, they would remain friends and seek peace. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation now has branches in 30 countries and contacts in many more. We include in our membership most of the major religious traditions of the world. Through our contact with each other we have come to share Gandhi's belief that, at a deep level, all faiths teach non-violence.

Members of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation are involved in the world-wide struggle for justice. We refuse to take up arms or to threaten others in our struggle, and for that reason we ask that you recognize the universal right to conscientious objection. Instead of using arms, we try to devise new methods of struggle and to open ourselves to reconciliation with our enemies.
Thus in the Philippines efforts are made to plan and carry out demonstrations and projects with the people and to meet with the military to try and create change from within. In Sri Lanka the Fellowship aids refugees from communal violence and tries to reduce its causes. In Brazil we work with base communities and educate the wealthy on the effects of the international debt.

Our work is varied. Where possible, we try to solve problems and bring people together. We applaud and support the efforts made by Governments here at the United Nations. We urge you to take courageous steps towards disarmament. We share the hope that as the world disarms money can be diverted from arms spending to providing clean water, nourishing food, good shelter and the means of subsistence and education to all our peoples.

But we bring also a word of warning. Studies show that we currently produce enough food to feed everyone in the world. What we have is a problem of distribution, not of production. The great concentrations of arms in our world are used for defence, but too often they are used to defend an unjust status quo. We applaud your efforts at disarmament, but we are afraid that unless they are coupled with efforts to create justice they will bear little fruit. As long as 5 per cent of the earth's people consume 40 per cent of its resources, as long as one or two per cent of a country's people own 90 per cent of its resources, as long as people are disenfranchised because of race or nationality, we will not disarm. Economic conversion and political justice must come simultaneously with disarmament.

The people of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation are working in our own way to create justice and peace from the grass-roots level. We use non-violence, the power of the powerless, to claim political rights, to speak and be heard and to influence our Governments. We use non-violence to bring people in villages and towns together for economic betterment. We use non-violence to create change for justice. And when we see Governments taking steps towards justice
we will give our full co-operation. We also use non-violence to resist injustice
through non-co-operation, through boycotts, through strikes and civil
disobedience. When we see our Governments perpetuating injustice and building up
armaments, we will with all respect do everything we can to resist. We offer our
lives in these ways, through resistance and through what Gandhi called the
constructive programme.

I am involved in resisting the arms race here in the United States. I live
next door to the home port of the first-strike Trident submarine and missile
system. My community plans demonstrations of resistance, and we are arrested and
we go to gaol. But we also talk to military people to try and create alternatives.

On Monday morning I was handing out leaflets to military people entering the
Trident base. A navy man pulled his car to the side of the road. "I am getting
out of the navy in four weeks," he said. "I am not working on weapons now. I will
never work on weapons again. A lot of us in here agree with what you are doing.
Good luck at the United Nations."

And I should like to leave you with that thought from the peace movement and
also from many of the world's military people. We do not want to build weapons any
more. Good luck at the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Ms. Sheila Oakes of the International Peace
Bureau.

Ms. OAKES: I want to talk about arms transfers.

Over 12 million people have been killed. Tens of millions more have been
maimed, have been made homeless, or have become refugees. Industries and
agriculture in many areas have been destroyed or damaged. This carnage and misery
has been the result of the more than 80 wars which have been fought, or are now
being fought, since 1960. All were possible only because of the transfer of arms.
Sellers usually provide loans, creating long-term financial obligations, or debts. Military aid creates long-term political obligations. In both cases the recipient State is also tied to the producer State by its need for spare parts and for further supplies of ammunition.

Every plane, every tank, every gun, every bullet obtained is paid for a second time, also by ordinary individual people who have not been consulted - in lost clean water supplies, lost food production, lost health care, lost education opportunities and lost communications and industrial development. Similar losses are also suffered, to a lesser extent, by the producer countries.

The International Peace Bureau welcomes the calls made at this session for both conventional weapons disarmament and for more transparency in military matters. As a first step we urge the the third special session on disarmament to agree to recommend that a number of United Nations-commissioned studies be made on the dangers of arms transfers; on other issues relating to arms transfers; on the feasibility of United Nations registers for arms production and for arms transfers; and on the setting up of a United Nations register for end-user statements.

We also urge the early implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, and that SSOD III request the United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs to provide regular information about arms-transfer issues to Member States and to non-governmental organizations.

For any transaction to take place, both provider/producer and recipient/user are involved. We believe that the responsibility for dealing with the problems of arms transfers are therefore the responsibility of both producers and recipients. Arms transfers are not words: they are the deaths and miseries of millions and millions of individual people.
In addition to a number of international non-governmental organizations, the International Peace Bureau has some 50 members from five of the six continents. Each of those members has its own agenda. They have all agreed that the issues of arms transfers are so serious that they must be raised at this special session.

In addition the International Peace Bureau has a project, initiated by the late Sean MacBride, which is an appeal to lawyers to make nuclear weapons illegal. Support for this action is rising, and consideration is being given to asking the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. We would urge States to raise and discuss this issue at SSOD III.

Copies of our recommendations on arms transfers and the appeal have been circulated to all Missions. Further copies are available just outside this room.

Finally I should like to thank those of you who have stayed and listened to us instead of going to hear Mr. Shevardnadze.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I call on Dr. Victor Sidel, of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

**Dr. SIDEL:** My name is Victor Sidel. I am Distinguished Professor of Social Medicine at the Montefiore Medical Center and the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York City. I have the honour to represent International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), which was the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1985. Also representing IPPNW today is Dr. Wennen, who is from the Netherlands and I hope he will stand to also be recognized as our representative.

I wish to tell you that International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War now is a federation of physicians' groups in 61 nations and represents over 200,000 physicians, and we are grateful for this opportunity to speak before you.

The hour is late. I too am grateful since many of you have been here since 10 o'clock. I will not simply read out my statement; you can read it. It is in front of you, and there are copies available. I will do something quite different.
I have set up on a table a metronome, which is beating at a rate of one beat per second. With each of those beats a child either dies or is permanently maimed, physically or mentally, as a result of a preventable illness, somewhere in the world. The deaths amount to 40,000 every 24 hours. That means that there is a Hiroshima or a Nagasaki of deaths every three days as a result of preventable deaths among children in this world.

At the same time, with each beat of that metronome the world spends $30,000 on arms. The calculation is very simple to remember: we start with $1 trillion—that is $1,000 billion—spent on arms each year. Divide that by 365 days, and we have $2.5 billion per day. Divide it further, and we find it is over $100 million per hour, and it comes down to $30,000 with each second, while a child dies or is permanently injured as a result of a preventable illness.

Furthermore, the world now has in its stockpiles 16 billion tons of TNT equivalent in nuclear weapons. If we divide that by the 5 billion people on the earth we find that it is 3 tons of TNT—not three pounds, not three kilograms—for every human being on the planet. If the metronome were counting the tons of TNT on the planet and each beat of the metronome, each second, were a ton of TNT, the metronome would have to beat for 500 years to count up the tons of TNT equivalent in the stockpiles of the world.

Now I wish to read out from the last few paragraphs of the statement we have distributed, in which, in calling for a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, to which International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War is committed, physicians throughout the world protest every nuclear test by any country.

The resolution to the nuclear dilemma lies with every one of us. We must all accept responsibility. All of us are hostages to the nuclear threat. With unequivocal passion we must voice our moral outrage at the nuclear-arms race and decry the madness that passes for sanity in the nuclear age.
Instruments of genocide are sheltered with care, while millions, including children, die for want of basic medical care, suffer from chronic hunger and sleep on the streets. Promoting the health of people everywhere is fundamental to the attainment of world security and lasting peace. Ten years ago at Alma Ata the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) enunciated the goal of health for all by the year 2000. As long as the nuclear-arms race and the arms race in general continue, as long as our thinking about these problems remains militarized, we shall continue to degrade life on Earth, and the goal of health for all by the year 2000 will be a shambles.

As physicians, we have as our goal a world without nuclear weapons and a new manner of thinking about the way in which we live together on this planet - our common home. The healing process must now begin.

We wish all of you well in your deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite Mr. Campbell Christie, President of the International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament, to make a statement.

Mr. CHRISTIE: I wish to begin by thanking all those who have remained throughout the morning to hear my contribution. They will be relieved to know that it is the last one of this morning's meeting.

I also wish to thank the organizers of this meeting for giving our Committee the opportunity to address you all on this important occasion.

My name is Campbell Christie. I am the President of the International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament. I am also the General Secretary of the Scottish Trades Union Congress.

I should like first to pay tribute to the United Nations, whose past initiatives in the form of SSOD I and SSOD II have been of immense value in keeping the issue of peace and disarmament on the world's agenda. Special sessions on disarmament help to direct the attention of world public opinion towards the most
crucial problem, that of saving the human race from nuclear annihilation and making the world a safer place in which to live.

This third special session devoted to disarmament coincides with some very hopeful developments in the disarmament process. Like many who have spoken before me, our Committee sees the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles between the United States and the Soviet Union as a very significant and historic step in the disarmament process. These advances make it essential for the whole of the international trade union and peace movements now to address themselves to the questions of practical disarmament. The International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament, which is also known as the Dublin Committee, has since its foundation in 1982 had as its main objective increasing the awareness of all workers of the grave dangers presented by the arms race. Our Committee also seeks to increase workers' involvement in the struggle for a peaceful world and to promote the unity of trade union action in this cause.

The Dublin Committee supports the concept of a 10-per-cent reduction in military spending, because, as others have said this morning, it is intolerable that 6 per cent of the world's gross national product is poured down the drain annually through the obscenity of lethal arms manufacture and the upkeep of huge armed forces. The obscenity of the situation is further highlighted by the fact that a major part of the world's population is constantly plagued by problems, such as famine, disease and illiteracy, which cause intense suffering and deprivation to millions of people, as was graphically brought out by Dr. Sidel.

In this context, our Committee welcomes the idea that United Nations Member States should base their policies on the principle of disarmament for development. We also support the proposal of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that a disarmament for development fund be set
up in order to make the Third United Nations Development Decade an outstanding success. As trade unionists, we believe that there should be trade union involvement in the administration of that development fund.

We are also highly supportive of the proposal by the Non-Governmental Forum for a Common and Secure Future, held in Geneva from 5 to 8 April this year, to proclaim the 1990s as the decade of a non-nuclear and non-violent world.

Trade unions, for their part, see a very definite interrelationship between disarmament and the improvement of workers' living standards, and therefore the question of practical disarmament should take a very high priority on all trade union agendas.

For our part, the Dublin Committee has anticipated, and endeavoured to come to terms with, the reality of practical disarmament over a number of years. The first fruits of this policy emerged in May 1986, when we published a booklet, "Workers against the Arms Race", which in our view was an unqualified success. The booklet studied the practical problems associated with the conversion of industries from arms production to production for peaceful purposes, in both capitalist and socialist economies.
I am very pleased to inform this gathering that the latest research document produced by our Committee, entitled "Star Wars - Who Stands to Gain", about the militarization of outer space, has been published to coincide with the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I have taken the opportunity to present the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs with the first copy of what we hope will be an informative, objective and constructive document which highlights another element of obstruction to the overall disarmament process, the question of the so-called strategic defence initiative.

I think it would be true to say that the positive developments that have taken place over the last few months give us cause for optimism, and these first tentative steps need to be built upon and developed in order to rid our planet once and for all of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

Our Committee believes that we must continue to advocate other significant measures which will develop and advance the disarmament process. Such measures might be: a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive weapons and strict adherence to the ABM Treaty; the complete abolition of all chemical weapons; the immediate cessation of all nuclear tests; and a significant reduction in armed forces and conventional weapons.

As I stated in my opening remarks, the importance of the United Nations third special session on disarmament cannot be overstated. Recent positive developments in the field of peace and disarmament give us all cause for cautious optimism. The world trade union movement has a very significant role to play in this process, and I am pleased to inform you that our Committee is organizing an international meeting in Cyprus in December this year, when the subject under discussion will be "Practical Disarmament - A Trade Union Response". As was true of past meetings, this meeting is aimed at both supplementing and complementing the work of the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, whose many initiatives have made
a very valuable contribution to the struggle for a long and lasting peace throughout the world. We wish it continued success, both now and in the future.

May I conclude by saying just a few words about the position of my own country, Scotland. We are part of the United Kingdom, but we are also a sovereign nation and an independent people. Every method of measuring opinion in Scotland - the ballot box, opinion polls, petitions, protests - shows that the people of Scotland are opposed to the nuclear-weapons policy of the British Government. The people of Scotland dissent from that policy, and we publicly, at this meeting, call for the removal of all United States and British nuclear weapons from Scottish soil. There is a delegation here today from Scotland to bring to you a declaration made by representatives of the Scottish people only a few days ago at a mass demonstration. Scotland asks for the right to reject nuclear weapons, and we ask you to support us in expressing that right.

The text of our important declaration is available here today for all delegations to read.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.