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The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

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

The CHAIRMAN: The first organization on my list is the International Union of Students and I call on Mr. Josef Skala.

Mr. SKALA: The International Union of Students is honoured to share the high expectation and hope for this third special session. Our constituency - national organizations of academic youth from 110 countries - wishes to express its firm support for your endeavours to meet the peoples' call for disarmament.

This special session is debating at "the beginning of a nuclear disarmament era" as was proclaimed during the recent summit meeting. For decades the world has been taking risks on the arms race; why finally can it not start taking risks on disarmament?

Today genuine machinery for crushing the destructive stockpiles must be possible, not only because of the suicidal race but also because of the growing intricacy of all other dilemmas which cannot be solved without disarmament. Such an approach has become a uniting view among students in the world, irrespective of their vastly diversified backgrounds. In student alternative scenarios of the future, derived from the mutuality of different interests, disarmament, a crucial military pillar of security, is regarded as a necessary reinforcement of its other pillars - those pertaining to the alarming North-South gap, the foreign debt bomb, environmental hazards, hunger and misery, injustice and ignorance.

Here the role of international institutions is recalled, for there is a growing need to respond with new insights to the crisis of governability in our "global village" in which science and technology have equipped us with the capability both to solve the prodigious problems and to reduce everything to nothingness.
Academic communities sense a growing co-responsibility for mapping out a programme of new humanism based on the heritage of common values evolved in a historical dialogue between civilizations, but also on the profound reassessment of patterns which have guided the world so far.

We believe in the intellectual and moral potential accumulated. Science could be freed from the shackles of militarism, could serve sustainable development for all and not destruction or fear.

The student movement tries to contribute — for example, our expert groups on the conversion of military production into civilian production, the International Students Coalition in Support of the Delhi Six, signature action for the Hiroshima and Nagasaki appeal and student initiatives for the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign, as well as a number of initiatives for the peaceful solution of regional conflicts.

It could be the idea of an academic peace pledge, a nuclear-age Hippocratic oath to be taken voluntarily by graduates vowing to use their knowledge solely for purposes of peace.

If a new ethos is to prevail in science and technology, radical changes in education are also required, and it is necessary to adopt new unfragmented approaches that enable us to cope with the yet unknown and even more complex tomorrow.

The United Nations could foster such internationalized future-oriented curricula helping the younger generation to work for a disarmed, humanized world bridging political practice with ethical standards.

The longing for peace has been a lofty educational ideal for centuries; today it is imperative. With this message, the University for Peace movement has expanded, seeking to eliminate distrust and the "enemy image", to promote
disarmament research, to oppose military penetration into science, to fight the
cuts in education versus the increase in military budgets.

It is our hope that the United Nations, encouraged by the Treaty on the
Elimination of Intermediate Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF) and a more
favourable climate, will pave the way towards crucial disarmament gains such as the
earliest possible halving of strategic armaments, leading eventually to the total
elimination of the immoral nuclear deterrence, the prohibition of the weaponization
of outer space, the complete banning and liquidation of chemical and other weapons
of mass destruction and a deep reduction in conventional armaments too.

We support all related measures - the Nuclear Weapons Test Ban, nuclear-free
and chemical-weapon-free zones, the reorientation of military into strictly
defensive doctrines, and many others.

We wish you every success in making our world free of armaments and violence,
in ironing out the threats to our common future.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mrs. Sakae Ito, of the Japan Congress
against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs.

Mrs. ITO: It is indeed my great pleasure and honour to have this
opportunity to speak to you on behalf of 360,000 atomic bomb survivors in Hiroshima
and Nagasaki.

In August 1945, a primitive atomic bomb exploded over Hiroshima. The blast,
faster than sound, released enough heat to melt steel, along with a vast amount of
radiation, and literally eliminated the city of Hiroshima in an instant. At the
moment of the explosion I was 1.5 kilometres from the epicentre. The sudden blue
flash seared my back, and within moments I was caught under a collapsed building.
As I struggled to get free I found the outer world consumed in flames. And when
the air cleared, little of Hiroshima remained.

"Hiroshima is gone", I cried.
As the fires raged in the streets, and every escape was cut off, people began jumping into the rivers. Among them were 9,000 boys and girls, mobilized for military work. Those children were burned so badly that their skin was simply peeling off and hanging down from their arms and legs. "Mummy, help me - Daddy, help me," they cried in vain; nobody was capable of responding. Eventually, the children were carried towards the sea holding on to each other's skinless shoulders. Their bodies were never recovered. Only queer shadows of people were left near the epicentre, as the blast evaporated most of their bodies, including their bones. And on that day the seven rivers flowing through Hiroshima were dark with the dead floating on the surface.

The victims were mostly women, children and the elderly. Of the survivors, or hibakusha as they are known, many have taken their own lives, cursing the bomb. Many more have had their lives ruined by fear for themselves and for the next generation. Unable to live a full human life, and dying prematurely and unnaturally, it is in the hibakusha that the legacy of violent atomic energy lives on.

Allow me to reiterate that, first and foremost, world public attention should be focused on the terrifying effects of radiation. Many of those who searched through the ruins for their families and friends and moved corpses after the destruction have died from the residual radiation. They might have appeared healthy for many years, but suddenly they developed serious problems: mouth- and nose-bleeding, hair falling out and bloody stools are some of their symptoms. They suffered from the so-called bura-bura disease, which ends in a slow death.

Even today, 43 years after Hiroshima, many hibakusha are dying prematurely, and there is a rapidly growing cancer rate. Nuclear arms are totally incompatible with life.
I appeal to you all on the following three points.

First, a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be concluded immediately. In Hiroshima, Nagasaki and other Japanese cities, protests are held whenever a test is conducted.

Secondly, there is the problem of sea-based intermediate nuclear forces. The INF Treaty agreed upon by the United States and the Soviet Union is important, but it is not enough. Now uncontrolled, sea-based INF missiles continue to threaten world peace, especially in the Pacific. Tomahawk-armed vessels are scheduled to be home-ported in Yokosuka, Japan, and they are also visiting ports in the very prefectures of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
We *hibakusha* cannot accept these now-peaceful cities being turned into nuclear launching-pads.

Finally, I request the General Assembly at this special session to declare the illegality of nuclear weapons. We can no longer tolerate the threat posed by nuclear arms, the most destructive and inhumane of weapons. I propose that the United Nations quickly convene a world disarmament conference at Hiroshima to move towards the achievement of complete nuclear disarmament.

We reject both military and peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Let us not forget Bikini, Nevada, Three-Mile Island and Chernobyl. Let us eliminate nuclear arms from our planet by the twenty-first century.

As a living witness of the nuclear holocaust in Hiroshima, I appeal to the Assembly: May there never be another *hibakusha*.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon Mr. Martin Popper of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy.

Mr. POPPER: I am an attorney, and Co-Chairman of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, a United States association of lawyers and law scholars concerned with the legal aspects of the nuclear-arms race. It is a great honour to be addressing the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

For law to play a role in preventing nuclear war, the world must rise to the challenge of ensuring that the pen be mightier than the sword.

The sword of our time, more terrible than any weapon of the past, is the nuclear weapon. The pen has been the tool responsible for the following documents: the Geneva Conventions, the Hague Convention, the genocide Convention, the environmental-modification Convention, the Geneva gas Protocol and the United Nations Charter. Those are some of the documents that articulate legal constraints
on the initiation and waging of armed conflict. It is illegal, for example, to use weapons or tactics in war that cause harm without discriminating between civilians and combatants, to use poisonous gases or analogous materials, to cause harm to nations neutral in a conflict, and to commit genocide.

The use of nuclear weapons would violate nearly every one of the principles I have just mentioned. In some cases such use would violate the letter of international law, in others the spirit. This has been affirmed by the General Assembly on several occasions, for instance on 12 December 1980, when it adopted a resolution declaring that the use of nuclear weapons would be a "violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity" (resolution 35/152 D, para. 1 (a)).

There is also a human rights dimension. Nuclear war would violate the most fundamental of rights: the right to life. The arms race itself compromises other rights, including the rights to peace and to development and the right of nations to self-determination.

Clearly, the general legal principles recognized by the global community over the past 100 years, which are themselves based on enduring humanitarian and religious values, call out for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, several arms-control treaties, including the non-proliferation Treaty, legally bind nuclear and non-nuclear States to a programme of nuclear disarmament and general disarmament. The time to begin that process is now.

Certain first important steps towards that goal should be taken. We recommend that the final document of this special session include an extensive examination of the international legal status of nuclear weapons. We also encourage the United Nations to seek an international agreement banning the use of nuclear weapons, through its Conference on Disarmament. That ban would forge into law a widely-shared intent never to use nuclear weapons.
However, in the current global system such a ban alone cannot prevent nuclear war. There also must be effective non-violent mechanisms for resolving disputes between nations, a viable system of multilateral negotiation, verification and enforcement of arms-control treaties, and deep reductions in global nuclear arsenals to be followed by their total elimination.

Our recommendations are made within a growing movement of lawyers united against nuclear war. The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, this April, helped launch the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA), to which I have the privilege to be counsel. IALANA is based on joint United States, Soviet and Swedish leadership, along with lawyers from Britain, Australia, the Netherlands, Japan, Yugoslavia, both Germanies and many other nations.

IALANA is distributing the International Peace Bureau's "Appeal of Lawyers Against Nuclear War", which states that the use of a nuclear weapon would constitute a violation of international law, a violation of human rights, and a crime against humanity. The appeal has been signed by thousands of lawyers world-wide and will be presented to the United Nations early next year. Organizers of this effort will encourage the General Assembly to request an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the legal status of the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. IALANA will contact United Nations Member States for their opinion and advice on this initiative.

Human society, in the international arena, faces a challenge: Either we learn to live under the rule of law or we perish. The world has begun to create laws of war reflecting an understanding, shared by the vast majority of people, that constraints on military behaviour in the global arena serve the interests of all. Our emphasis must be on the development of an international legal system as a means of preventing nuclear war, maintaining peace and ridding the world of nuclear weapons. Intermediate legal measures - arms-control agreements, international
conventions, nuclear-weapon-free zones, and evolving norms of customary law - help accelerate the process. The United Nations can encourage this effort further by heightening public awareness about existing laws of war that are relevant to the nuclear dilemma.

We commend the United Nations for its unique role in promoting peaceful and law-based relations. Let us agree to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. Let us prove together that the pen can indeed be mightier than the sword.
The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Paul Tabary of the Trade Unions of Chemical, Oil and Allied Workers.

Mr. TABARY (interpretation from French): The Trade Unions International of Chemical, Oil and Allied Workers represents some 14 million workers in chemical and allied industries in some 60 countries on all five continents. We salute the many other delegations here and wish them all every success in their work for peace. Many non-governmental organizations are represented here, and we would reiterate the importance of rallying everyone in order to achieve everywhere the economic and political choices that will best serve the cause of peace.

We should like to express our solidarity with all peace-loving forces who are denouncing in many countries the suicidal over-armaments race in which so much money is so shockingly wasted when throughout the world people lack the basic requirements for life and development in harmony.

Given the threat of nuclear holocaust, which is a threat to all mankind, we must halt all production of weapons of mass destruction and eliminate the existing stockpiles of such weapons throughout the world. Our determination is shared by all non-governmental organizations, who turn to the United Nations to find out what success has been achieved in negotiations under way and to demand that new agreements be produced.

As trade-union militants we intend to act in a manner that reflects our responsibilities to our workers. Our struggle for peace is a basic part of our programme of demands, and we know that our purchasing power, our jobs, our living and working conditions are closely linked to a policy of peace, disarmament and development, leading to a new international economic order.

Within the world trade-union movement we are struggling to gain the support of as many workers as possible, rising above the differences that sometimes divide us. Peace is something in which we can all share. Chemical workers have a
specific responsibility in this connection. We must specifically eliminate chemical weapons. We know how toxic they are and we appreciate, better than anyone else, the threat they represent. We also know that the manufacture of such weapons requires installations whose cost and level of technology make them available to countries that want them. We are fighting a diplomatic battle because 20 countries already possess stockpiles of chemical weapons. It is therefore important to halt their proliferation as soon as possible. The recent massacre of the Kurds has convinced us of this, if we had had any doubts.

For the past 10 years we have adopted a position against chemical weapons, and public opinion has for too long underestimated their danger. In 1980 our motto was "Chemistry for Life, not for Death". In 1983 a conference of the trade-union movement against bacteriological weapons was held at Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam. Since then our initiatives have multiplied. Among other things, we have held press conferences and have issued brochures calling for the banning of chemical weapons. We asked the Ad Hoc Committee and the ambassadors meeting in Geneva to receive us. This trade-union initiative was the first of its kind, and it was greatly appreciated. We knew that political determination was the only thing that would enable us to resolve the last technical details of a convention to ensure the effectiveness of monitoring the elimination of chemical weapons. We reiterate here our demand that workers be allowed their proper place in monitoring the production of such weapons, their end use and the security required to eliminate existing stockpiles. The conversions that should ensue should not present problems. A convention to ensure the effectiveness of a ban on chemical weapons must have the support of our workers and their organizations and should be spelt out in the provisions of the treaty.

We venture to hope that chemistry can serve man better and contribute to the well-being of all mankind by improving agriculture, by relieving hostile
environments, by eradicating endemic diseases — indeed, through a whole programme designed to serve life, not death.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Albert Castiel, Chairman of the Brazilian Movement for Disarmament and Peace.

Mr. CASTIEL (interpretation from French): The recent message of the Forum of Non-Governmental Organizations to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, "For a Common and Secure Future", points out that the concept of security has become an issue of global concern. Hence, in the nuclear era, which is also the era that is seeing the beginning of nuclear disarmament, the interdependence of nations and urgent global problems, the idea of security should encompass military, political, economic, ecological and humanitarian aspects.

The Brazilian Movement for Disarmament and Peace, which we represent, intends to take part in the dialogue on this new concept, which implies a mutual responsibility, presenting the standpoint of a developing country like Brazil.

With regard to the military sphere, it is our belief that by reason of their very characteristics none of the treaties now in force, particularly the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, ensures effective denuclearization of Latin America or of any other region. We believe that the United Nations should evaluate the differing points of view of both nuclear and non-nuclear countries. We therefore call upon the United Nations forum engaged in the current process for nuclear disarmament to transcend the objections to already existing treaties. Without overlooking the results already achieved in that process, we should seek new ways of preventing an eventual proliferation of nuclear weapons in Latin America and other countries so that the non-proliferation régime, based on the equality of nations, can gain universal recognition and respect. Thus, in the
political area, an integrated and nuclear-weapon-free Latin America could actually be consolidated as a region of peace and co-operation.

As for international economic security, the need for co-operation among creditor and debtor countries has become an obvious imperative in the search for a solution to the severe foreign-debt problem, which could ensure the future development of third-world countries.
The uneven levels of development among nations calls for a new international division of labour to ensure a new role for the poorer countries. The developing countries should, by means of greater participation in contemporary technology and science, be allowed to provide their peoples with the opportunity to use their full intellectual potential and attain a high standard of living.

In the ecological field, we see alarming insecurity. We suggest that the United Nations establish norms for the preservation of the environment that would bring about a redefinition of man's impact upon nature, and see to it that those norms are implemented in all countries, with shared responsibilities both nationally and internationally.

In the humanitarian and human rights area, it is clear that democracy favours the exercise of sovereignty, the expression of the hopes of peoples, and a vision of global security, for in a democracy there is a clear understanding of the links between a policy that favours peace, the abandonment of military means as a way of resolving conflicts, resorting to negotiations as the only possible solution, and a policy of well-being, freedom and independence in which human life and happiness are the supreme values.

In countries like Brazil it is obviously necessary to use new methods to make people aware of the present threats to our situation and the meaning of global security. We firmly support the new system of world-wide information, the global video project and satellite transmissions on peace, disarmament and other global issues. We call upon the United Nations to assist them while at the same time strengthening the world disarmament campaign.

We firmly believe that the work of the General Assembly will fully contribute to disarmament, to the establishment of a world free of nuclear weapons and violence, a world in which the human community can improve its conditions of existence and live in security and peace.
The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Ms. Katie Boanas of the National New Zealand Consultative Committee on Disarmament.

Ms. BOANAS: We bring greetings to you all from our beautiful land of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Our land is set in the great ocean Te Moana nui a Kiwa, known as the Pacific, the peaceful.

We rejoice in our special place on earth, the privileges we enjoy, the beauty of our land. But most of all we hold up before you the determination of our various peoples that New Zealand should be nuclear free. We have followed the inspiring examples of our Pacific neighbours, Belau and Vanuatu. We moved our Government to legislate, and the Act has been passed. New Zealand is nuclear-free.

At the same time we acknowledge the distance we have yet to go in other aspects of peace. Our achievement is not an end, it is a beginning. We must disarm ourselves, not others. We must continue our campaign to have more peace studies and conflict-resolution taught in schools and to have war toys banned and violent television replaced. We will strive for disarmament at all levels. A few small adjustments to the status quo will not suffice. Disarmament must be deep and radical to be real.

We look back for the reasons why the islands and the sea have been used for war and still carry such a load of arms. We see the reasons in the minds of those who practise colonialism, who are racist, who think people are inferior to them because of their sex, colour, religion, language or technology. Those unpeaceful attitudes still exist in our Pacific and in New Zealand. The white people of our peace movement are struggling to redefine and acknowledge our colonial history and its results. This means honouring the treaty of Waitangi in our own country; in the Pacific, it means opposing uranium mining on our aboriginal land, upholding the supremacy of the nuclear-free Constitution of Belau.
(Mr. Boanas)

As Pacific peoples we say to the nuclear Powers "Do not shift your abominations onto the place where we stand. Let us get on with our own lives. Stop treating us as your toys. We are people, not strategic counters, and the ocean is not a board for playing games on. To those still clinging to colonies or trusteeships in the Pacific: go home!"

The South Pacific nuclear-free zone created by the Treaty of Rarotonga is a wonderful step for all people of the South Pacific, but again it is only a beginning. We will endeavour to strengthen and enlarge it. At present the zone does not cover the huge seas between the tiny islands. It allows nuclear armed ships to visit some countries' ports; it does not ban communications, command and control facilities for nuclear war fighting.

We strongly urge all nations and peace groups to support a move by jurists in New Zealand and in other countries to have the International Court of Justice give an advisory opinion on whether or not nuclear arms are illegal. The symbolic power of such a ruling would be immense, perhaps even more so than the spreading of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

New Zealand does not have a single, mass, one-purpose peace movement. Many different viewpoints are found in our more than 300 separate groups. Their strands are woven into a rainbow web of great strength and beauty, each group adding to the pattern and process begun by our many ancestors. We are proud to acknowledge them all.

Kia ora kotou; kia ora tatou katoa: let there be life for you, let there be life for us all.

The CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Mr. Sidney Peck of the National Mobilization for Survival, New York.
Mr. PECK: I am here on behalf of the National Mobilization for Survival, which is a grassroots-based peace activist organization in the United States. Its programme is concerned with the abolition of nuclear weapons, the banning of nuclear power, the demand to reverse the arms race and stop military intervention and to transfer funds from the military sector to the sector of social and economic development. The Mobilization for Survival was founded exactly 10 years ago as a United States coalition in support of the United Nations first special session on disarmament.

By all accounts, the Final Document agreed upon unanimously by the General Assembly at the conclusion of the United Nations first special session devoted to disarmament is one of the great world documents for peace. I have re-read that document more than a dozen times, and on each reading I am still awed by the breadth and depth of understanding expressed in that final statement. The Final Document was certainly more than any of us hoped for some 10 years ago.
The adoption of the Final Document in 1978 was without doubt one of the precious moments for the United Nations and for peace- and justice-minded people the world over.

The Final Document contained an unyielding logic, to wit: the greatest danger to humanity is the threat of nuclear war; the most important task of humanity is to prevent nuclear war; the most effective means to prevent nuclear war is to eliminate nuclear weapons; the task of eliminating nuclear weapons is urgent and immediate; and the urgent and immediate task of eliminating nuclear weapons, as well as genocidal biological and chemical weapons of war, is part and parcel of a comprehensive disarmament programme, including substantial overall reductions in conventional weaponry.

Today the delivery systems of 3 per cent of all nuclear-weapons have been eliminated with the signing of the INF Treaty. So 10 years after the adoption of the Final Document we have at least a small cause for hope in the world.

But we need more than hope; we need the will to decide that the global arms race must end by the turn of the century. If not, the turn of the century will mark the end and decline of our industrial civilization as we know it. It is decision time for our one and only global parliament.

The General Assembly must stand together as a parliamentary force to express the will of citizens everywhere to do the following: first, reaffirm the SSOD I Final Document, with special focus on zero nuclear weapons and general agreement on a comprehensive disarmament programme by the year 2000; secondly, move ahead on multilateral disarmament talks; thirdly, call for an immediate global disarmament and development initiative, based on the United Nations-sponsored conference on this matter last year; fourthly, urge the withdrawal of military forces and the dismantling of all foreign military bases - East and West; North and South; and,
fifthly, expand and strengthen the role of the United Nations to mediate disputes, provide peace-keeping forces and assist in the multilateral verification process.

The late Rev. A. J. Muste once responded to a question by saying "There is no way to peace - peace is the way", to which I add that there must be will, a determination, a desire, so overwhelming and so compelling that it stirs the General Assembly into action for global programmes of peace and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Ms. Margaret Glover, of the National Peace Council, London, United Kingdom.

Ms. GLOVER: I am making the statement of the National Peace Council, although I am here as a delegate of Labour Action for Peace.

The National Peace Council, which has over 150 member organizations, and itself is a member of the International Peace Bureau, wishes to comment on three items, beginning with reaffirming the Final Document of SSOD I.

The National Peace Council is very concerned that, as at SSOD II, the Final Document of SSOD I should be reaffirmed. We recognize that a few paragraphs have been overtaken by events. We urge that each of these be specifically noted, together with information as to why it is no longer relevant, in the final document of this special session.

We would not wish to see any attempt to amend the 1978 Final Document itself.

We do not regard the 1978 Final Document as a charter for disarmament; it is not complete enough for that. But we do believe that it is still far and away the best long-term statement of disarmament intentions - and the only one agreed by all the Member States of the United Nations. The least that the General Assembly at this session can do is, by reaffirmation, to assure "We the peoples of the United Nations" that the commitments made in 1978, and reaffirmed in 1982, have in no way been diminished.
The second item is military budgets. There have been calls for glasnost, for openness, for transparency in military matters, during this special session. One element in creating this glasnost/openness/transparency would be the provision of more information on the military budget of each Member State.

Over the years a number of proposals to cut military budgets have been made to the United Nations. In principle agreement that this ought to be done was made prior to SSOD I. To define what should be included, and how to equate fairly the military budgets of different States with different military systems, the United Nations established the Ad Hoc Panel on Military Budgeting, which after several attempts produced the Instrument for Standardized International Reporting of Military Expenditures.

We welcome the fact that a number of States are now reporting annually. However, we note with dismay that while some States provide all the information requested others fill in only a minimum number of the totals. The information requested is so minimal that to omit answering in full those questions which are asked invalidates the whole purpose of the exercise. We urge the General Assembly at SSOD III to agree to urge all States to report annually to the Secretary-General, and to provide all the information that is requested. We understand that most North Atlantic Treaty Organization States now provide the information. We urge that additional States, including those belonging to the Warsaw Treaty Organization, as well as the major military Powers in the Non-Aligned Movement, undertake during SSOD III to do this.

Certainty about military budgets would be a major confidence-building measure. In addition, if fully international, it would provide pre-warning of major military build-ups.

The third item is arms transfers. Our members are all extremely concerned about arms transfers and their effects on people and on economies. We urge the
General Assembly at SSOD III to take up and agree the proposals made by the International Peace Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Professor Takeshi Ito, Co-Chairperson of the Japan Confederation of Atomic-and-Hydrogen-Bomb Sufferers Organizations.
Mr. ITO (spoke in Japanese; English text furnished): It is an honour for me to address this United Nations special session on disarmament on behalf of the Japan Confederation of Atomic- and Hydrogen-Bomb Sufferers Organizations (HIDANKYO) and all its members, victims of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

On 6 August 1945 Hiroshima suffered a United States atomic bomb attack; Nagasaki did so on 9 August of the same year. I was then a 15-year-old boy living in Hiroshima. At the moment of the atomic bombing, a flash of light spread all over the sky, houses were blown away, the city was covered by darkness, and fires broke out everywhere. After the dust cloud had cleared, what had been Hiroshima could be seen completely flattened. People in a train were found carbonized, standing just as they had been. Women doing housework, children playing in the street died just as they were. Those who barely survived looked like ghosts, their skin peeling off from burns; they were falling down like rags as they tried to escape from the centre. I still have clearly in my memory the sight of thousands of middle- and high-school students burned to brick colour; their eyeballs had fallen out of their faces; all of them were dying near the blast centre.

The atomic bombs instantly killed human beings and other living creatures. They caused the death of some 140,000 people in Hiroshima and 70,000 in Nagasaki, creating over half a million Hibakusha - or atomic bomb sufferers. The result of the survey conducted by HIDANKYO in 1985 showed that 64 per cent of those who had died by the end of 1945 were children, women and the elderly and that the death rate of children had been especially high. Nuclear weapons are indiscriminatory, genocidal weapons which, if used, could annihilate the whole of humanity. Eighty-eight per cent of the survivors have had to go to hospitals repeatedly during these 43 years, and most survivors have suffered anxiety and difficulties in regard to getting jobs, marriage, child care and many other aspects of their lives. One out of every four of them has experienced a loss of the will
to live, and a number of people have committed suicide. Even now the atomic bomb destroys their health, their way of living and their spirit.

The damage to Hiroshima and Nagasaki caused by the first nuclear war that the human race has experienced forecasts the future of humanity. There are enough nuclear arsenals stockpiled in the world now to kill all human beings many times over. From the time we suffered the atomic bombing, the survivors have never been able to accept their existence. The desire of the Hibakusha for the elimination of nuclear weapons has now become the opinion world wide. It was against that background that the treaty on the abolition of intermediate-range nuclear forces was reached. If nuclear arms are not totally abolished and if the root cause of nuclear war is not eliminated, there can be no future for the human race. We stand now at a juncture where we should start a new page of history.

On behalf of the Hibakusha, I call on the United Nations and its Member States to declare that the prevention of nuclear war and the elimination of nuclear weapons are the top-priority issue, to be swiftly solved; that nuclear weapons are anti-humanity weapons that could annihilate the whole human race; and that an international convention for a total ban on and elimination of nuclear weapons should be urgently concluded.

I also want to appeal to you, to the Governments you represent, to help us make known to the people of your countries the damage and after-effects of the atomic bombing of Hiroshims and Nagasaki, by inviting Hibakusha delegates to your countries. To that end, we ask you to ensure that the "Atomic Bomb Victims' Appeal (1988)" - a basic document of our organization, on the basis of which I am addressing you - be put to the best use by both governmental and non-governmental organizations. Let us work together to eliminate all nuclear weapons from the earth and firmly ensure the survival of humankind and our future.

No more Hiroshimas! No more Nagasakis! No more Hibakusha!
The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Louis Kotra Uregei, who will speak on behalf of the Nuclear-Free and Independent Pacific Movement.

Mr. KOTRA UREGEI (interpretation from French): I bring warm greetings from the indigenous peoples of the Pacific, whose ancestors discovered the James Cooks, the Abel Tasmans, and so forth, floating aimlessly in the Pacific Ocean 200 to 300 years ago.

I bring angry greetings from some of the same indigenous peoples, who are now second-class citizens and landless pariahs in the countries of their ancestors.

I bring sad and uncertain greetings from the survivors of two world wars, who still cannot understand why their little islands have become the theatre of some of history's most violent battles.

I bring silent and tearful greetings from the Hibakusha of the Pacific, whose families are doomed forever to count the number of fingers and toes of every newborn child.

I bring also the grief of the widows, the mothers and the children of my 19 brothers who were massacred on 5 May this year on the island of Ouwea by French military forces - this contemporary illustration of the three centuries of martyred lives, usurped sovereignty, stolen land, human rights trampled on, that the indigenous peoples of the Pacific have endured and continue to endure.

The colonial history of the region, apart from its chapters of tragedy, now serves as the foundation for the global nuclear-weapons policy pursued by such States as France and the United States, particularly in Tahiti, in Belau and in the Philippines. To try to deny that would be to turn a blind eye to the very principles of peace with justice on which the United Nations is founded.

The Nuclear-Free and Independent Pacific Movement welcomes the Treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) recently signed between the United States and the Soviet Union. We do so despite the fact that the Treaty has two
loopholes. First, although the two parties have committed themselves to dismantling the land-based INF arsenals in Europe and Asia, the Treaty is totally, even deliberately, silent about sea-based INFs. The practical implication of that flaw in the Treaty is clear: the reduction of the number of land-based INFs would be compensated for by an increase in sea-based INFs. The second loophole in the Treaty that we wish to stress is that it does not provide for any control over nuclear renegades like France, which, despite the protests of the Governments and peoples of the Pacific for the past 22 years, continues to carry out nuclear tests on Mururoa. And, apart from not having signed either the partial test-ban Treaty or the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, France intends to increase its arsenal to 1,160 missiles by about 1995.

I draw the Committee's attention to those loopholes because the Movement to which I belong calls for a comprehensive nuclear disarmament treaty covering all nuclear arsenals, wherever they are and whatever their scope or power.

There can be neither delays nor reservations when the safeguarding of mankind is involved, and each of us must contribute to that effort. In that regard, we in our region are working for the removal of all foreign military bases and all installations designed for nuclear weapons; for the prohibition of all nuclear tests, including so-called peaceful tests; for the prohibition of all systems designed for the testing of nuclear weapons; for the prohibition of the stockpiling, transit, deployment or any other form of presence of nuclear weapons on land, aboard ships, on submarines or on aircraft; for the removal of all bases carrying out command, control, communication, surveillance, navigation and any other functions that can contribute to the perfecting of any nuclear-weapon system.
I have already pointed out how naive and unscrupulous it would be to analyse the nuclear-weapons policies of the major Powers in isolation from their historical colonialist character. For our Movement, this warrants our solidarity with and active support of the struggles of the peoples of the Pacific. The task we face is very difficult. For it is not easy to locate, let alone demolish, the bastions of racism and discrimination that are the foundations of the nuclear-weapons policy in the Pacific.

At the outset I brought you the sad and tearful greetings of the tangata whenua of the Pacific. Sadly, I must bid you goodbye with the same sentiments. But let these sentiments be a reminder that so long as the United Nations turns its back on the pleas for help from the colonized and oppressed peoples of the world, there can be little hope for the collective survival of the human race.
The CHAIRMAN: I call on the next speaker, Mrs. Helene Zographos of the Panhellenic Families Association.

Mrs. ZOGRAPHOS (interpretation from French): Peace is the greatest hope of mankind. Peace, and not only the absence of war, is the precondition for the survival and prosperity of families in Greece as well as throughout the world.

We pay tribute to the United Nations which makes possible active and constant dialogue among States - if not among peoples - throughout the world and remains one of the only chances we have to safeguard peace and to reactivate development.

The Panhellenic Families Association, a member of the International Union of Family Organizations, ever since its inception has had among its key goals the maintenance of peace, focusing its efforts on active participation in the World Disarmament Campaign and on participation in the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation.

A quick look at the world situation shows persistent evidence of wars and confrontations. Nevertheless one must recognize and acknowledge that the current atmosphere has been very favourably influenced by the ratification of the historic Treaty signed by the United States and the Soviet Union on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.

Already in 1959 the United Nations proclaimed general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Thirty years later we are still calling for the establishment of an international authority which would enable us to reach that goal. A long list of measures has been proposed, debated and sometimes even been accepted but then has been forgotten.

Here in New York among the non-governmental organizations representing a very wide-ranging spectrum of world public opinion, the Panhellenic Families Association wishes to emphasize a number of the different goals it wishes to see find their way
into measures adopted at this third special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament.

First, we would want to be sure that all United Nations resolutions and international treaties already signed – particularly the Final Document of the first special session – are effectively implemented. The third special session must take the measures necessary to take the decisive step towards replacing confrontational positions taken by Governments with negotiations aimed at common security and co-operation for development. Common security implies the ability for all peoples to decide freely how to live as well as economic and social well being for all. The concept of security based on military force – be that nuclear or chemical, conventional or any other – must be eliminated and military activities reduced to participation in United Nations peace-keeping forces.

We insist that this third special session should adopt a very clear-cut disarmament agenda with priority being given to the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. We demand that the savings derived from the cut-back on military expenditure, the prohibition of the arms race in outer space, and the prohibition of nuclear testing be used to increase the resources made available for the social and economic development of countries and regions undergoing development. We demand that international co-operation be strengthened to make possible the transfer and use of new technologies and of nuclear technology for social and economic development. We demand that confidence-building measures be devised and implemented as part of the disarmament process together with the verification of the implementation of agreements and treaties. We demand active support for all regional disarmament initiatives such as the Six-Nation Initiative to establish an integrated multilateral verification system. We also
support declarations of nuclear-weapon-free or chemical-weapon-free zones, particularly in the Balkans or the Mediterranean, until such time as the United Nations can declare the entire universe to be a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Contacts among people in cultural, educational and professional terms, together with social and economic co-operation are the best way to establish confidence among nations. Such contacts must be bolstered by Governments.

Above and beyond wars and confrontations families want to co-operate, to make their contribution towards supporting the attainment of United Nations goals, consisting of the uniting of peoples and Governments in order to resolve common problems and build our future together. The universe is our common home.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mrs. Leoni Pynappel of the Pan-Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association International.

Mrs. PYNAPPEL: On behalf of the Pan-Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association, a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Category II, I wish to say how deeply I appreciate and welcome this opportunity to address the members of the Committee of the Whole on the subject of the cessation of all nuclear testing in the Pacific.

The Pan-Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association, known also by the acronym PPSEAWA, comprises national affiliates in both developing and developed countries. One of our aims is to create peace and understanding among the women of Asia and the Pacific.

The women at PPSEAWA's Seventeenth International Conference held in Canberra, Australia in January 1988 and at PPSEAWA's Fifteenth International Conference held in Saratoga Springs, United States of America, in 1981 resolved in their concern for the lives of all people in the Pacific area to protest against, deplore and
condemn the continuing testing of nuclear weapons and the dumping of radioactive waste in the Pacific. We have been and are apprehensive about our health and the health of those yet unborn; about the poisoning of our soil and the vast but fragile seas which surround us and from which we derive our nourishment and sustenance.

The women of the Pan-Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association, therefore, strongly and emphatically call upon the United Nations and Member States to ensure that positive action be taken to ban all testing of nuclear weapons and dumping of radioactive waste in the Pacific to save succeeding generations, and all other living things, from nuclear pollution.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Relus ter Beek of Parliamentarians Global Action.

Mr. ter BEEK: Parliamentarians Global Action is an organization of elected national and supranational legislators which is dedicated to disarmament, development and the reform of international institutions. We have members in more than 40 countries and in the European Parliament as well.

Representatives to this special session are perhaps aware of our work in pioneering an approach by which States can trigger negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. Our approach is to invoke the amendment procedure of the partial test-ban Treaty, to compel the convening of a conference to negotiate the amending of that Treaty into a comprehensive test ban.

We continue to believe that the cessation of all nuclear testing is the essential step to end the nuclear arms race. We hope that at this special session, and in their capacities as parties to the partial test-ban Treaty, States will address the urgent priority of a comprehensive test ban and the need for the commencement of multilateral negotiations.
Representatives may also be aware of our organization's work in convening the Six-Nation Peace Initiative, for which we were honoured last year in New Delhi with the Indira Gandhi Peace Prize.

We are encouraged by the degree of positive interest generated by the proposal of the Six for a multilateral verification system. We believe this proposal can rightly be taken as a litmus test of the extent of any State's real motivation for disarmament.

We say that because it is logical that there can be no multilateral, comprehensive disarmament without a multilateral, comprehensive verification system. To argue, therefore, that a multilateral verification system is not needed at this time, as some are doing, is to admit that one sees the future of multilateral disarmament itself in an unduly long time-frame.
(Mr. Beek)

We fully understand the concerns expressed by some governments that verification régimes must be specific to particular treaties. But if our goal is a process of comprehensive disarmament and security, it will require, for instance, satellite monitoring in support of the verification of treaties, or in support of crisis management by the Secretary-General. We must recognize that we cannot create new international satellite systems for every new treaty or operation of that kind. There will clearly be a need to bring some elements for international data collection and interpretation together in one institution, which can then devise specific measures for specific treaties.

The main question is when to begin. To this we say let us be on the early side. It will take many years to build the monitoring capability of a future verification system. If the international community could begin to put such a system in place, it would be ready to facilitate the verification provisions of future treaties, perhaps bilateral as well as multilateral. In this way, it could actually help produce the disarmament treaties the world so urgently seeks.

If we foresee a comprehensive, multilateral disarmament process under way at any time in this century, we cannot fail to support the preparations for the infrastructure for multilateral verification which the international community has, on many occasions, said is needed.

We therefore call upon this special session to fully support the proposal introduced by the Prime Minister of Sweden on behalf of the Six Nation Initiative.

The CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Mr. Susumu Nikaido of the Parliamentary League for the Promotion of United Nations Activities.

Mr. NIKAIKO: Japan is the only country which has experienced the horrors of atomic weapons, and there is an especially strong desire among the Japanese people for world disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.
Sharing that national sentiment, the Japanese Parliament has repeatedly adopted resolutions urging the promotion of disarmament. The Japanese Government supports, as an unchanging element of national policy, the three non-nuclear principles of not possessing nuclear weapons, not producing them, and not permitting their introduction into Japan.

In the world today, we see a truly staggering volume of nuclear weapons possessed by the two super-Powers and, in countries which desperately need resources to relieve the hunger of their peoples, we often see vast sums of money spent on the procurement of arms. This is a very sad situation for all mankind.

At the summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Moscow last week, the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (the INF Treaty) on a global basis came into effect and the determination of the two super-Powers to make substantial reductions in their strategic nuclear weapons was reaffirmed. I whole-heartedly welcome those developments. However, much remains to be done.

One of the reasons why concrete disarmament goals are not easily achieved, despite the desire of the world's people, is that a number of States fear that disarmament measures will threaten their security. They should consider the fact that the excessive armaments which are the consequences of their fears may well gravely endanger their security.

In order to attain disarmament, it is necessary to create an international environment in which States may feel confident that they can disarm safely. In regions where there is actual armed conflict, the settlement of those conflicts should be pursued before anything else.

The recent realization of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, attained through the mediation of the United Nations, has brought hope to the people of the world. The success of the United Nations effort has again
demonstrated to the world the effectiveness and the importance of the United Nations peace-keeping functions. As has been true in the case of Afghanistan, I think that tasks that only the United Nations can undertake are becoming more and more numerous.

There is strong criticism of the United Nations in some quarters. Well, I have to admit that the United Nations, as it is today, is not functioning ideally. However, if we merely criticize the United Nations and do nothing more, we may in the end make the United Nations even less able to act effectively. Let us move on with the task of revitalizing the Organization, putting forward constructive proposals, not paralysing it with merely destructive criticism.

As one of the main pillars of its foreign policy, Japan has always attached very great importance to United Nations diplomacy. Prime Minister Takeshita has stated that he believes that Japan's esteem and support for the United Nations should be one of the clearest proofs of its determination to build a Japan that will truly contribute to the world. The Parliamentary League for the Promotion of United Nations Activities is in complete agreement with that statement. In his remarks at this special session last week, Mr. Takeshita elaborated upon his concept of co-operation to achieve peace, and stated that Japan would intensify its co-operation in the sphere of United Nations peace-keeping and other activities, including assistance to the Afghan refugees and the economic rehabilitation of Afghanistan. Our Parliamentary League welcomes, and will energetically support, that policy.

Our Parliamentary League was established with the purpose of promoting the activities of the United Nations, the most important organization for world peace and prosperity, by expanding and deepening the understanding of the Japanese people regarding the United Nations, and by making more and more numerous and
diverse the Japanese people's contacts with the United Nations. Although the United Nations is an intergovernmental organization, I am convinced that parliamentarians should be more active, given the unique and universal character of the United Nations, helping to support and guide the Organization so that it may make the contribution that it alone can make to world peace.
Therefore, I would urge that parliamentarians of all Member States establish national leagues of supporters of the United Nations and that eventually an international league of parliamentarians be formed for that purpose. I hope most sincerely that as many parliamentarians as possible will agree with that proposal. We, the members of the Japanese Parliamentary League for the Promotion of United Nations Activities, are already engaged in consultations with interested parliamentarians from various countries and hope that an international body will be inaugurated during this year's regular session of the General Assembly, with the support of Governments.

The Constitution of Japan stipulates that:

"aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes".

The spirit of settling international disputes peacefully, expressed in those words, is in every way in accord with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, the mediator, guardian and sanctuary of world peace. I should like to conclude by reaffirming here our determination to strive in co-operation with all in the world who share those ideals to build a world in which all the peoples of the world can practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Pieter van Rossem of Pax Christi International.

Mr. van ROSSEM: Pax Christi is an international peace movement with 27 national sections all over the world. These sections all have close relations with the Catholic Church and advise bishops on peace-related issues. At the same time, Pax Christi sections are active peace movements that work for a world with fewer
arms and more security. For over 40 years Pax Christi has been working on disarmament, human rights and development issues.

In this very short statement we want to concentrate on item 15 on the agenda of the General Assembly at this special session: the relationship between disarmament and development. First of all, we are encouraged that the relationship between disarmament and development will be discussed, in Working Group II. Only nine months ago the United Nations International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development concluded in its Final Document that disarmament and development were two of the most urgent challenges facing the world today. In its Action Programme, several important measures were agreed upon. The Conference agreed

"to assess the nature and volume of resources that may be released through arms limitation and disarmament measures and to consider including in future disarmament negotiations provisions to facilitate the release of such resources" (A/CONF.130/39, para. 35 (vi)(b))

and reaffirmed

"the international commitment to allocate a portion of the resources released through disarmament for purposes of socio-economic development, with a view to bridging the economic gap between developed and developing countries". (para. 35 (iv))

The just-concluded INF Treaty, the forthcoming chemical-weapons ban and massive reduction of strategic arsenals add weight to the demands for research and public debate by Governments to identify where the resources regained can be redistributed.

In the seven days that have passed in this special session, arms transfers have been called one of the most urgent issues by the Secretary-General and by the representatives of a number of Governments. Proposals have been put forward
concerning restraint of the arms trade. Some earlier proposals show the importance of regional initiatives. For instance, on the recipient side, initiatives by Latin American countries led to an effective arms-restraint policy in that region. On the supplier side, it has become clear that national legislation is no longer able to restrain arms exports. Pax Christi has been very active in Western Europe doing research on arms transfers to developed and developing countries. The ongoing transfer of conventional arms to the countries at war in the Persian Gulf has led members of the European Parliament to introduce a draft resolution on arms transfers which is an attempt to undertake a regional initiative on the supplier side to limit those transfers.

In addition to regional policies of restraint, transparency has also been emphasized. Many Government representatives have suggested at this special session that the United Nations should monitor and control arms production and transfers. Such monitoring could be acceptable to both producing and recipient countries, and would certainly help create confidence and diminish threats. The creation of such an arms-transfer and production register seems now to be well within reach of the Assembly at this special session.

I should like to draw attention to the relationship among debt, military expenditures and arms exports. Data from the United Nations and from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) confirm that in general 20 to 25 per cent of the debt of developing countries is attributable to military expenditures. Case studies show that the influence of military expenditures on some countries' economies is even higher, especially when the multiplier effect and other variables are also taken into account.

Along with economic factors, moral awareness is also rising. In a recent conference of Catholic and Protestant churches and ecumenical organizations of
Western Europe, Africa and the Caribbean on the debt crisis and the ACP countries, the moral context was highlighted in the following way:

"We should be aware that 'forgiveness' of the debt of southern countries is a dubious term. Careful historical analysis would rather suggest that it should be the creditor countries that should receive forgiveness with regard to their policies that led to the impoverishment and indebtedness of and within debtor nations. Tring to solve the problem of indebtedness is a question of justice rather than a question of mercy."

Debt and military interests seem to have joined in a vicious circle. Some States seem to be considering military intervention when another State is unable to repay its debts. However it should be noted that as early as 1902 the well-known Drago doctrine was formulated to prevent such a thing happening, and that in 1907 the Porter Convention was internationally accepted at the second Hague Peace Conference.

Now, 80 years later, there is increasing interest by international lawyers in addressing the legitimacy of certain military-related debts. Some of the subjects that have been identified and are currently under research include the case of a country that received loans which were used by an overthrown Government in the struggle against its own population or more generally against the public interest. Some standards for measurement have been developed by multilateral institutions. Certainly, high flight of capital and great spending on luxury items by the overthrown Government do not fit the idea of public interest. It could be argued that such loans should not be repaid by the succeeding Government but should be seen as a régime debt for which the former Government officials are still responsible.
In the case of a country that fulfilled an important role in favour of the foreign policy of the creditor it is questionable whether the creditor really intended and expected to be repaid. One can argue that the debtor in reality performed a certain service, although not paid at that moment. State practice in several cases shows that military loans were not repaid.
Research has also been initiated on possible alleged excess profits. There are several examples of States that have leased large portions of their country's territory for military facilities without receiving proper payment. Assessing compensation retroactively for profits or rent seems to offer interesting perspectives.

The cases I have brought to your attention are still under research. However, whether or not in the past certain measures have been illegal or illegitimate, we should not fail to judge their morality.

Research by well-known economists has shown that had countries abided by their promise to make .7 per cent of their gross national product available for development a larger sum would then have been available for development than the present third-world debt figure of $1,200 billion. Perhaps it would not, as such, have prevented underdevelopment. But that promise, if kept, would certainly have contributed to more sustained development.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now call upon Miss Christa Grossmann of the Peace Council of the German Democratic Republic.

Miss GROSSMANN (interpretation from French): The peace movement in the German Democratic Republic supports all efforts made on the bilateral and multilateral levels to reduce the level of armaments, always provided that those efforts are governed by reciprocity and respect the principle of equality and equal security. That is why we are striving to see to it that the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament discuss and devise effective, action-oriented measures to achieve it.

We welcome the start of nuclear disarmament and we expect that the treaty will be strictly implemented without further delay. The German Democratic Republic, which is directly concerned, is in a position to announce that Soviet OTR-22 missiles had been withdrawn from our territory even before ratification of the
text. The former missile base in our country near Waren has just been transformed into a vacation resort. We are awaiting the conclusion of an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in the strategic nuclear weapons of the United States and the Soviet Union. That would be an intermediate phase on the way towards the total elimination of those weapons world wide, it being understood that the measures to be determined in that connection must be accompanied by strict compliance with the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and with the non-militarization of outer space. At the same time we are in favour of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban so as to give tangible expression to the great and realistic goal of ridding the world of all nuclear weapons and all other means of mass destruction.

As a peace movement within the German Democratic Republic, a country located on the sensitive line that separates the countries of the Warsaw Pact and those of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), we strongly support the efforts being made by our State, according to its ability, to establish a nuclear-weapon-free corridor and a chemical-weapons-free zone in Central Europe and to promote an atmosphere of dialogue, co-operation and confidence in international relations. The Olaf Palme March for a nuclear-weapons-free corridor in Central Europe, organized last year by peace movements in the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Austria and Sweden, was one particular way of contributing towards that end.

Another high point of our activity on behalf of peace will be the International Gathering for Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones. It will get under way at Berlin on 20 June and will bring together participants from all continents.

We believe it is high time for us to put behind us once and for all the entire strategy of deterrence, which leads to an increase in the arms race, and, thanks to disarmament and a policy of good political will and determination, for us to arrive
instead at mutual non-aggression and common security. The Peace Council of the German Democratic Republic supports all peace and disarmament initiatives being undertaken in various parts of the world and on the continents of our planet.

No one can close his eyes to the fact that excessive arms build-ups and militarization are dangerously at variance with what is needed in order to cope successfully with such crucial tasks as the elimination of the most serious problems of underdevelopment, education, environmental protection, health, hunger and so on. By struggling to achieve disarmament and co-operation, we are at the same time striving to release our joint energies for the benefit of a better life for all peoples, for whom it is important to guarantee the kind of development due all human beings.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Hieronim Kubiak, President of the Polish Peace Committee, and I now call upon him.

Mr. KUBIAK: I should like to draw attention for a moment to the interrelationship between the technical and socio-political aspects of disarmament. The disarmament negotiations and polemics concerning the nature of the arms race inevitably lead to the conclusion that true and permanent disarmament has two dimensions: the technical dimension and the socio-political dimension. Although the two dimensions are linked, each of them requires separate consideration.

Disarmament in its technical dimension concerns such crucial problems as the means of mass destruction, the transfer of arms, the size of armies and their territorial distribution and so forth. Those are the factors that most attract the attention of international organizations, politicians and public opinion, and that seems quite understandable, since the contemporary world continues to spend almost 50 times more on armaments than on the educational system. At the same time, the continually increasing expenditures can only buy less and less national and
international security. This is unavoidable because the technical complexity of contemporary means of mass destruction leaves less and less time and space for political negotiations and ethical arguments – particularly if the real god of War who irrevocably decides the fortunes of mankind is now pure Coincidence.

However, it is not machines that make decisions about armaments and the allocation of intellectual potential and natural resources, but parliaments and Governments. That is why, while supporting disarmament in the technical sphere by every means possible, we ought to ask more and more forcefully about the means of building international confidence, both military and non-military. It therefore becomes necessary to ask about the socio-political and psychological dimension of armaments, about the causes of armaments and about the realistic chances of abolishing the conditions that have led to them.
To do so, we must also learn how to demilitarize human thought, human feelings, human dreams. In the 1920s the League of Nations already possessed an awareness of that necessity; it was due to that awareness that there originated the idea of moral disarmament, regional intellectual co-operation, the elimination of the syndrome of hatred from school textbooks, national and international mass media, works of symbolic culture.

As was confirmed by the Stockholm Conference, the building up of mutual confidence in the military sphere signifies an exchange of information and effective means of control of the implementation of Treaties already approved, as well as the evolution of military doctrines in a strictly defensive direction, which constitutes an important element of the Jaruselski Plan submitted in the spring of 1987.

In the non-military sphere, a significant step in the process of building international trust will surely be the full implementation of the Final Act of CESC, but other solutions are possible and indeed necessary. Above all, we ought to participate in the process of creating a new peace culture within individual nation States and in international relations. Such a culture would signify an exposition of the general needs and values of mankind over particular class-stratum interests and State egoism; recognition of the principle of *pax dissidendum* - agreeing to multidimensionalism and different ways of satisfying human needs, which teaches one how to coexist with real differences, to care for the sensitivity and dignity of every human being; readiness to accept arguments which after critical analysis turn out to be true regardless of the source of origin, country, ideology or religion; the ability to combine the right to live in peace with the right to social justice, economic development, State sovereignty and full observance of human rights; rejection of ethnocentrism, racism, ethnic prejudices, stereotypes of the enemy of one's own State borders, and demanding analogous actions from other
partners in international relations; declaring that the role of individual States, ideologies and cultures consists not in what they themselves proclaim but what they have to offer others, what they do; considering the principle of coexistence as a value in itself, as a vision of a foreseeable, secure future for all; and, finally, strengthening the effective system of international institutions acting in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

Creating the thus understood foundations of non-military international confidence and a new culture of peace is an opportunity and a special noble duty of social movements and of non-governmental organizations, including the broad Polish peace movement coalition, which I have the honour to represent at this session.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Sadao Nakabayashi, of the Preparatory Committee towards the Achievement of SSOD III, of Tokyo, Japan.

Mr. NAKABAYASHI (interpretation from Japanese; text provided by speaker): My name is Sado Nakabayashi. I am a representative of the Preparatory Committee towards the Achievement of SSOD III, which is promoting grass-roots campaigns for a total ban on nuclear weapons and the conclusion of the international agreement. At the same time I am the Honorary President of the Japanese Consumers' Co-operative Union. I express my gratitude for the great honour of being given the opportunity to make a statement at the meaningful third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

I should like to remind you of the frightful report published by the specialists' group of the United Nations on 23 May 1988, showing that nuclear war may have grave effects on the weather that will lead to the death of several billion people. We Japanese experienced the disaster caused by the atomic bombs dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki 43 years ago. Their victims still live with the suffering those bombs caused. We think that such harsh experience should be central to the movements against nuclear weapons.
(Mr. Nakabayashi)

I took part in the events centred on the second special session devoted to disarmament, in 1982, and at that time I swore to make further efforts to bring about the elimination of nuclear weapons. I was impressed by a speech by Lord Philip Noel-Baker, the great pacifist leader, who insisted that the key factor in bringing success to SSOD II was the force of non-governmental organizations throughout the world.

It was good news that the United States-Soviet summit meeting concerning the elimination of nuclear weapons was initiated thereafter and the INF Treaty was concluded and ratified. But we should not get complacent and tone down the peace campaign. I see many obstacles before the summit meeting, and I am convinced that the decisive factor to make the summit meeting successful is the strong support of international public opinion through the non-governmental organizations.

We grass-roots organizations are striving for the advancement of the peace campaign through a variety of activities including exhibitions of photographs of atomic bombs, peace rallies and fund raising for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). On the occasion of the third special session devoted to disarmament, more than 300 Japanese, mainly women, have come to New York. My experience of so many years leads me to believe that women are strongly opposed to war and aspire to peace for humanistic reasons since it is they who bear children and bring them up.

However, when we consider the present international situation, we find that local armed conflicts are continuing in many places, that the arms race to develop nuclear weapons for space and the oceans and chemical weapons, is being intensified, as are underground tests. That is why the defence spending of many countries increases year by year, putting financial pressure on Governments and bringing national economies to the brink of grand catastrophe. On this occasion
(Mr. Nakabayashi)

I feel it is an urgent necessity to move away from the arms race to disarmament and to reorient economies to peace. In this respect I should like to stress that it is of great importance that SSOD III bears fruit and succeeds. Most importantly, I should like to propose that the United Nations establish a research and information centre on nuclear disarmament in Hiroshima, the first city in the world to fall victim to an atomic bomb.
Finally, I wish to apologize for Japan's role in the events of the Second World War, bringing disaster to many peoples. I swear that we shall preserve the peace-loving Constitution and use our surplus for the welfare of mankind, including giving assistance to the developing countries. I promise that we shall make united efforts to ensure that Japan never becomes a military super-Power, to eliminate nuclear weapons as soon as possible and to achieve our goal - the establishment of lasting peace and mankind's happiness.

(spoke in English)

No more bloodshed! No more war!

The CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Mr. Ernie Regehr, of Project Ploughshares of Waterloo, Canada.

Mr. REGEHR: As the representative of a coalition of Canadian churches and development agencies, I should like to focus on just three issues. In each case the challenge to the Assembly is twofold. The first is to create a climate of urgency, to broaden an international political will demanding action. The second is to prescribe action, to propose practical policies to make disarmament real.

The first issue is that of controlling nuclear-weapon technology. The major Powers have made tantalizing moves towards reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. But reductions accompanied by unimpeded technological innovations could actually add destabilizing first-strike and war-fighting capabilities.

I remind the Committee that the Canadian Government has at previous special sessions proposed measures to prevent that deadly modernization, and I urge the Assembly at this special session to propose similar actions in its final document, as follows: first, call for a permanent ban on all nuclear warhead testing and encourage an immediate major-Power testing moratorium in support of accelerated negotiations towards a comprehensive test ban; secondly, urge a ban on all flight tests of strategic ballistic and cruise missiles; and, thirdly, urge a ban on tests
of anti-ballistic missile systems, on all tests of anti-satellite systems and on tests of any weapon systems designed to be deployed in space.

The second urgent issue is that of controlling the international arms trade. The arms trade delivers insecurity. It sustains wars, promotes repression and squanders resources - and it is out of control. Analysts and politicians have despaired of finding ways to bring it under control, but two constructive measures are available to the Assembly.

One measure is to use the final document to help generate the political will for control by pointing out again the devastating consequences of the international arms trade and by challenging the Conference on Disarmament to address the issue. The other is to authorize the Secretary-General to pursue, as recommended by the report on disarmament and development, measures for a fuller and more systematic completion and dissemination by Governments of data on military transfers. An international arms transfer register remains an available, practical means of creating a common international base of arms-transfer data on which to build future control mechanisms.

Finally, I remind the Committee of the promise of common security. Studies by the United Nations and others of the social and economic consequences of militarization clearly link the pursuit of militarized security to the insecurities of economic deprivation, disrespect for human rights and the overarching threat of nuclear omnicide. In contrast to this destructive militarization, there is now emerging into broader political consciousness the compelling idea of common security. The key insight of common security is that security cannot be wrenched violently and unilaterally from an insecure world. Security is ultimately mutual; by pursuing the security of others we are ourselves made more secure.

The Assembly can, in its final document, give these ideas vigour and legitimacy. By using the language of common security, representatives can do much
to advance the public discourse on disarmament and security. As the words they
write into the final document are repeated in community gatherings and union halls,
by political leaders and the mass media, and as they are promoted by citizens' groups around the world, they will go beyond descriptions of the desirable to become descriptions of the possible and of the actual.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Professor Bernard Feld, of the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs.

Mr. FELD: At the opening of each special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament Pugwash - the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs - is pleased to present our views on critical issues facing the Assembly. We highlight the current status of negotiations for the control and reduction of armaments of all kinds, the prospects for the peaceful resolution of conflicts between nations and the release of funds now used in the pursuit of arms for the peaceful development of all nations.

Established in 1957, Pugwash is a confederation of scientists, predominantly, but not exclusively, natural scientists, from North and South as well as East and West. We meet to discuss issues of peace and security and try as individuals to devise and promote feasible, equitable solutions to international problems that might lead to military confrontation and war. To date over 7,000 attendees have met in over 150 meetings - either in specialized symposiums and workshops or annual general conferences.

In recent years Pugwash has concentrated its attention on two areas: first, problems of verification of arms control and disarmament arrangements; and, secondly, special issues in the control and elimination of nuclear, chemical and conventional forces.

Thus, for example, we are convinced that there are now no serious verification obstacles to a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. It is not only a step that is
technically feasible and politically desirable; it is also long overdue. We strongly support the Treaty eliminating intermediate-range missiles in Europe, and we endorse the progress it promises in verification techniques. We urge its rapid implementation as well as its extension to other systems capable of delivering nuclear weapons across international borders. Such measures, together with the comprehensive test ban, would support and strengthen the present nuclear non-proliferation régime.

On chemical weapons control, Pugwash has achieved significant success in bringing together experts from Governments and the chemical industries. The result has been agreement on most important aspects of a verification régime which is likely to be acceptable to all sides. We are convinced that there are no serious obstacles to a complete chemical weapons ban.
On nuclear forces, our aim is a large initial reduction - perhaps on the order of 50 per cent by all parties - followed by a steady pace of further reductions. We also support the elimination of the potential for conflict in space, the exploration and exploitation of which are now being pursued by an increasing number of nations. It is essential that we reach agreements that will effectively prevent the weaponization of space and eliminate such systems as, for example, the strategic defence initiative, and ensure the continuation of an open-skies régime.

In the case of conventional forces, our goal is the progressive elimination of offensive military capabilities. Initially, longer-range forces that could be used for pre-emptive attack should be removed. We support their replacement by forces that are unambiguously defence-oriented - a concept that we like to refer to as "defensive defence".

We believe that progress in nuclear disarmament coupled with the elimination of destabilizing weaponry may ultimately pave the way towards transforming the military pacts of the West and the East into mutual security systems.

In the long term, Pugwash recognizes that a world in which there are great economic and social inequities is an unstable world, prone to conflict.

New developments suggest that the time is now ripe for a more determined pursuit of the long-range goal of establishing a global security system. Examples of recent progress towards the essential component of such a system include, first, the new recognition of the principle of no military interference by major Powers in the internal affairs of developing countries - or indeed by any country in the internal affairs of any other country. Here the recent commitment of the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan is to be welcomed, and rapid implementation is urged. Such international actions reflect one of the priority requirements: to restrain military interference everywhere in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East.
A second component of a global security system is the commitment by the major
powers to a more positive and reasonable series of steps to strengthen the
effectiveness of the United Nations in the resolution of conflicts. A salutary
beginning is the recent unanimous resolution of the Security Council on the need to
end the Iran-Iraq war and opposing the use of chemical weapons there - backed up by
enforcing action through sanctions on arms supply.

A third element is the emerging international consensus that recognizes an
international approach to the resolution of intransigent regional conflicts, in
contrast to past unilateral attempts to impose solutions. This trend must be
matched by respect and support for the efforts of regional States and organizations
to resolve conflicts that undermine regional security, and ultimately global
security. We applaud the endeavours of the Latin American States to find solutions
for their debilitating conflicts away from outside interference. All these
developments contribute to the evolution of a truly global security system.

Clearly, the goals of this special session, as of Pugwash, are long term and
will require vast new areas of co-operation and concern. We call on the special
session to recognize these goals, to lay out feasible paths towards their
achievement and to begin to take these paths. We pledge the active co-operation of
Pugwash in mustering the efforts of the world scientific and academic communities
to these ends.

As scientists, we recognize that today mankind is passing through decisive
years. We are at a threshold - to pursue the arms race and seek
military-technological solutions to the grave social disparities splitting the
world or, rather, to seek political solutions based on the high principles of the
United Nations Charter. We think that we know the right path.
The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Reverend Nikkyo Niwano, representing Rissho Kosei-Kai of Tokyo, Japan.

Reverend NIWANO (spoke in Japanese; English text furnished): I should like to extend my heartfelt thanks to the many people who have given me this opportunity to speak.

Fortunately, I had the opportunity of making proposals to both the first special session devoted to disarmament and the second special session devoted to disarmament. On those occasions I made this plea to the heads of the United States and the Soviet Union: "Instead of taking risks with arms, please take major risks for peace and disarmament". At the same time, I emphasized that world security should be based not on the precarious balance of power but on a new sense of values. The conclusion of the INF Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union should be highly valued as the raising of a curtain on a new age of disarmament.

To meet the need for further initiatives, I sincerely hope that the following proposals will be adopted unanimously before this special session closes on 25 June: First, the two super-Powers will eliminate at least half of their existing strategic intercontinental nuclear missiles. Secondly, all nations will conclude a long-overdue comprehensive nuclear test-ban agreement. Thirdly, nations having nuclear weapons will freeze their existing stockpiles. Fourthly, all nations will adopt a declaration that all nuclear weapons will be abolished by the year 2000. Fifthly, the world community will again affirm that outer space will be used only for peaceful purposes; development of the strategic defence initiative ignores that affirmation.

In 1970 the first assembly of the World Conference on Religion and Peace, in Kyoto, Japan, adopted the following resolution:
"We commend to all mankind the Peace Constitution of Japan, which in article 9 has legislated against waging war and against the Japanese people arming themselves as a nation. We, as religionists, express our appreciation of the Japanese nation, which seeks to preserve this aspect of its Constitution, and strongly appeal to the religionists of the whole world to co-operate with the Japanese people in this objective, so that they may realize this sincere desire."

Today, however, some people are demanding that Japan should greatly increase its expenditure for defence. Such demands only arouse a feeling of unrest in other Asian countries. I think that increased defence spending by Japan would hinder mutual trust, which is most necessary for the promotion of disarmament. Now peace is a matter of human survival, and security is established through our awareness of the need to live in harmony with others. In that sense, I wish to conclude my speech by stating that we should pay as much attention to inner peace as to outer peace.
The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Commissioner Andrew Miller of the Salvation Army.

Commissioner MILLER: This is the statement of Commissioner Andrew S. Miller, National Commander of the Salvation Army in the United States, on behalf of General Eva Burrows, International Leader of the Salvation Army, to the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In 1983, General Jarl Wahlstrom, then the International Leader of the Salvation Army, issued a statement on world disarmament and peace which was sent to the United Nations and was graciously acknowledged and welcomed by the Secretary-General. The position of the Salvation Army under General Eva Burrows remains constant and is committed to the basic concepts of that historic document. While men and women of goodwill everywhere are grateful for the current signs of hope as the super-Powers continue fruitful negotiations, we feel it remains important to reiterate what the Salvation Army said five years ago.

The Salvation Army therefore: first, renews its plea to the United Nations strenuously to maintain its efforts for world peace, and to Member States to fulfil their obligations to abide by the provisions of the United Nations Charter to seek the resolution of disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations; secondly, calls on all Governments to reduce their total weapon-capability to the minimum level necessary for present security; thirdly, continues to urge world leaders to take positive action to remove the causes of mistrust, fear, tension and hostility, to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and to show a determination to move towards elimination of the spectre of nuclear conflict which still imperils all civilization; and, fourthly, recommends again that in a world of finite resources, benefits to be derived from reallocation of excessive military expenditure be identified, and the sharing of these resources for development
programmes at home and abroad be planned in good faith, with special regard to alleviating world hunger and poverty and removing the deep scars of human suffering.

The Salvation Army reaffirms its belief in the love of God for all peoples, and in the standards of righteousness and justice set forth in the Bible and revealed to mankind in the person of Jesus Christ as the basis for harmonious interpersonal and international relationships.

Salvationists everywhere pledge themselves to continue to pray for peace, and gladly join all Christians in seeking to revitalize the Church's unique witness to the source of true peace, God Himself. They will strive to exemplify convincingly the Christlike spirit of brotherly love, mutual concern and honesty in all their relationships with all peoples. This we feel is a positive and distinctive contribution to the peace of the world.

Today General Eva Burrows pledges the moral resources of more than 2.5 million Salvationists throughout the world to the cause of world disarmament, peace on earth and goodwill to all men.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the next speaker, Mr. Jack O'Dell of SANE/FREEZE, Washington, D.C.

Mr. O'DELL: On behalf of SANE/FREEZE, the largest membership organization of the peace movement in the United States, we extend warmest greetings and felicitations to all representatives from around the world. The work of the United Nations continues to be a beacon light of hope that the popular desire for peace among the world's peoples will continue to grow and bear fruit. In our country the merger of SANE/FREEZE this past year lends itself to the strengthening of peace and justice activity, increasing the possibility for this organized activity to be transformed into Government policy.

This meeting and the general work of the United Nations reflect the profound reality that a new way of thinking, new principles of world behaviour—principles
that reject racism, sexism, national chauvinism and military solutions to the world's problems - are increasingly embraced as the norm, becoming a material force favourable to deep changes in human development. Humane priorities at home in a world at peace is the vision that inspires millions of United States Americans to find ways to make their personal commitment to the movement of resistance against the arms race and the many injustices that the arms race serves to perpetuate.

Our work in the United States is greatly enhanced and supported by those outstanding initiatives in the international community which contribute to an easing of war tension. These include successful efforts by the Nicaraguan Government and people to establish a climate of negotiation and a political settlement affecting the whole region of Central America, and the crystallization of public opinion throughout Latin America in opposition to any interventionist plans by the present Government of the United States. The signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF) by the United States and the Soviet Union and ratification of its provisions by their respective Governments, as a small but significant step, has contributed greatly to the relaxation of tension between our countries. One of the by-products of this more relaxed political climate is the growing discussion among many sections of our movement that is re-examining the history of the cold war in its 40-year development and its daily consequences in our national life. Several organizations have undertaken such discussion within our membership throughout the past year in the holding of public meetings. These forums are gaining momentum as they reach out to a variety of activists in peace and justice work. This is deepening our understanding of the foreign policy of our country that has been pursued over the past 40 years and the economic, political and ethical motivations that have propelled this policy.
We in the United States celebrate this year the twentieth anniversary of the poor people's campaign which Dr. Martin Luther King was leading at the time of his assassination. The convergence of a peace and justice agenda that can mobilize millions of people to move our nation in a new progressive direction is the central task our movement has undertaken. Our SANE/FREEZE Organization is in the front ranks of the movement dedicated to the accomplishment of this historic goal. We are confident of success as we open up a "peace decade" of struggle to transform our nation into a land whose governmental policy is in harmony with the finest traditions of its people.

The millions of votes received for the peace candidacy of Reverend Jesse Jackson in this 1988 election season have made an indelible imprint on the public's mind. Jesse Jackson won over 6 million votes, 2.5 million votes in the South, on what we called "Super Tuesday"; carried the industrial state of Michigan, with its strong trade union base; won the city of New York; and won very substantial votes in Maine, Vermont, Oregon, Minnesota and elsewhere. All this is clearly a recognition that his is a peace candidacy. The peace and justice agenda has been moved to centre stage in the political arena. The outstanding political/education work of this candidacy has made it the main form in which the assault upon the ideology of racism and national chauvinism is crystallized in this period. Through Reverend Jackson's candidacy and the building of the Rainbow Coalition, new forces are coming to maturity in our country and the connections between the wasteful, dangerous arms race and the widespread social ruin in our country are being made ever clearer to millions of working people, small business people, farmers, the unemployed, the homeless, veterans, radiation victims and others. It is influencing the work of our artists and writers and galvanizing the determination of the African-American, Hispanic and other ethnic communities to free themselves from the imprisonment imposed by the "cold war". So
(Mr. O'Dell)

this meeting of our NGO colleagues from around the world on the occasion of this United Nations special session on disarmament is assembled at a landmark time in the political life of the United States.
We salute you and the many whom you represent for the vital work you are doing in daily affirming our common humanity. We welcome the opportunity that this third special session on disarmament offers to strengthen the active bonds of co-operation, understanding and common action among the peoples from every corner of the planet.

We share a common understanding that public opinion when mobilized and informed is a powerful force that can change the course of human history.

Venceremos: we shall overcome.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Professor Derek Paul of Science for Peace.

Mr. PAUL: My colleague, Mr. Dorn and I represent a Canadian organization of over 600 physical and social scientists. We have confined our brief to three broad areas.

The first is on verification of arms control, disarmament and peace treaties. One of the most promising areas in which science can serve the cause of international peace and security is the area of international monitoring and verification.

In spite of much progress, the international community still lacks a means of assessing overall compliance with arms control agreements. Violations of treaties are matters of concern to us all, but there is no institutional mechanism for detecting violations and assessing compliance. For this reason, we strongly urge the formation of an arms control and disarmament monitoring agency under the auspices of the United Nations.

The Six-Nation Initiative for such a system, as described by Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, represents an opportunity that the international community cannot afford to miss.
As a first step, we recommend that plans should be made for the creation of a special verification unit within the United Nations Secretariat, perhaps as part of the Department of Disarmament Affairs, whose mandate it would be to develop United Nations expertise in monitoring of arms control and disarmament agreements. One of the tasks of the unit would be to develop and manage a verification data base as has been put forward in a Finnish proposal (A/CN.10/91). The new verification unit would also assist negotiators in the development of effective verification provisions for treaties under negotiation and under review.

At the same time, the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to make a study of the potential development of a United Nations role in verification of arms control and disarmament agreements. In particular, the study should consider how to create and operate a United Nations arms control and monitoring agency, and the role of non-governmental organizations should also be considered.

Our second broad area refers to bilateral and multilateral agreements. First, regarding fissile materials, noting that no arms control or disarmament treaty to date requires the elimination, by safe disposal, of bomb-grade fissile materials, we urge this third special session to try to come to agreement on a resolution proposing the following steps: (a) that the next nuclear disarmament treaty should be accompanied by a significant measure of the disposal of bomb-grade fissile material; (b) that the preparations for this safe disposal be planned without delay following at once upon the conclusion of the third special session; and that (c) all five of the present nuclear Powers and all of the nuclear-capable Powers make such plans in preparation for the eventuality of nuclear disarmament.
Secondly, with regard to nuclear weapons testing, and for the sake of brevity I say merely that in this section of our brief we make recommendations intended to render a threshold test ban treaty the equivalent of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

I come now to our third and last broad area in which we combine the prohibition of the development of new weapons and open science.

We ask the third special session to give attention to the problems of banning new weapons, in particular, three categories, all of which have special potential as offensive weapons: (1) x-ray lasers; (2) ground-based lasers for anti-missile defence and (3) virtually all types of new missiles.

We reiterate the need for a ban on flight tests.

One approach to preventing the development of new and secret weapons is through openness in science. We suggest that a beginning be sought in those areas involving devices of very high power.

We recognize the political barriers to implementing a principle of open science, even one limited to specific categories, but it is necessary to enunciate such a principle in the spirit of the McCloy-Zorin agreement, namely, something essential towards which we must work.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Pentti Vaananen of the Socialist International.

Mr. VAANENEN: It is a great honour for me to bring to the United Nations third special session devoted to disarmament the best wishes of the Socialist International (SI) and its President, Mr. Willy Brandt. The SI has developed fruitful contacts in the field of peace and disarmament with the United Nations Organization since 1979 when, for the first time, the Secretary-General received our delegation headed by Mr. Kalevi Sorsa, now Foreign Minister of Finland.
Since the INF agreement and the successful summit meetings between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, there seem to be real chances of further disarmament and the strengthening of peace. The final value of the INF agreement and these summits, however, will depend on their follow-up.

It is encouraging that the two major Powers have confirmed that they have agreed, in principle, to 50 per cent reduction in strategic delivery systems. The SI urges them to conclude this agreement without delay.

In Europe, where the two over-armed military alliances are facing each other, reductions on conventional arms should be agreed upon rapidly. The framework of such negotiations should be the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) process. In the first phase, a special responsibility lies with those CSCE countries which are members of military alliances. The reductions could, for instance, be down to a level of 50 per cent of what the weaker side in each of the categories has today. The military forces should also be structured in a way that makes it impossible for a potential aggressor to attack to put the defender into a stronger position. Such reductions would make it possible to remove all nuclear weapons from those countries which do not themselves own them.

The fact that the negotiations on eliminating chemical weapons have not, so far, been successful has increased the risk that those weapons will become more and more common and that they will actually be used. That risk is particularly serious in the third world. For these reasons, an early agreement to ban chemical weapons is essential.
It is important to work for regional arrangements to safeguard peace. The Socialist International supports the concept of nuclear-free zones as one possible way forward. There are already positive experiences with such zones in Latin America and the South Pacific. In Europe, such zones could be established in northern Europe, the Balkans and central Europe, as suggested by the Independent Commission chaired by the late Olof Palme.

It is necessary to safeguard the results of disarmament agreements, the INF agreement in particular, by preventing any kind of so-called compensation. The nice-sounding word "modernization" must not be used as a pretext for a qualitative arms race.

During 1987 the world used more than $1 trillion for various forms of military build-up. That is a tremendous waste of resources. Through disarmament and through the strengthening of peace these resources must be released for the good of mankind.

The Socialist International, through its 69 member parties, 23 of them currently represented in national Governments, is working towards those goals based on the principles of common security and partnership.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I call on Mr. Anatoly Ananyev of the Soviet Peace Committee.

**Mr. ANANYEV** (interpretation from Russian): Let me first express the gratitude of Soviet supporters of peace for this opportunity to address the special session. We think it significant that it is our movement, the most massive in the Soviet Union, that has been given the chance to speak from this rostrum.

The new democratic philosophy of international relations and world politics and the new thinking, with its humane, universal criteria and values, are penetrating ever deeper into various strata of public opinion. Peoples are now more visibly and openly at the forefront of history. Government policy must now
take account of the will of peoples and public opinion. Thanks to the restructuring - perestroika - under way in our country and to greater openness, public opinion is taking an even more active part in defining our country's international-affairs policy.

The Soviet peace movement supports Soviet Government initiatives to reduce armed forces and arsenals to a level of reasonable sufficiency, to free mankind from nuclear weapons by the end of the century, and to prohibit and destroy chemical weapons. We favour creating a comprehensive system of international security encompassing the military, political, economic and humanitarian spheres.

Soviet supporters of peace wholeheartedly supported our Government's efforts to reach agreements on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The INF Treaty signed at Washington marked the beginning of genuine disarmament.

We followed attentively the recent meetings held at Moscow between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, and the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan. We think it was important that the world public engaged in parallel activities before and after the summit. We at the Soviet Peace Committee established an international public monitoring centre for the Moscow USSR-United States summit. Among the events held at the centre were press conferences and discussion groups on such questions as spirituality and peace; the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - expectations and prospects; perestroika and the Soviet peace movement; perestroika and the new political thinking; concepts of a comprehensive system of international security; and a nuclear-free, non-violent world - reality or utopia.

Soviet public opinion advocates improved relations with all countries of the world, a joint search for solutions to problems of joint and international
security, and the solution of the contemporary world's main problem: the survival of mankind.

Broad international contacts by Soviet supporters of peace are aimed also at destroying the stereotypes of anti-Sovietism, enemy images, and suspicion of our peace initiatives. To that end we advocate co-operation in the humanitarian sphere, the dissemination of the ideals of peace, disarmament and international security, a higher overall level of objective information, opportunities for our peoples to learn about each other's way of life, consolidating the spirit of mutual understanding, and greater agreement in our relations.

For many years, the Soviet Peace Committee has had direct contacts with various departments of the United Nations Secretariat. We think it important that in recent years the United Nations has begun to change its attitude towards national and international non-governmental organizations and has started to view them not only as sources of information about activities, but as active and dynamic partners in discussing and resolving many specific problems before the world community.

The United Nations provides a unique machinery and a forum for the representatives of Governments and non-governmental organizations. The Soviet Peace Committee has been actively involved in implementing the World Disarmament Campaign, since the time of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We regularly inform the Secretary-General about the Campaign's status in the Soviet Union.

In collaboration with the Department for Disarmament Affairs, the Soviet Peace Committee has held in the USSR two regional conferences for non-governmental organizations: one in 1984 at Leningrad, and one in 1986 at Tbilisi. We also sponsored two meetings of experts, at Dagomys, the most recent held from 11 to 15 April 1988, on the subject of problems of verification.
We have agreed with the Department for Disarmament Affairs to hold, next year at Alma-Ata, a United Nations regional conference for non-governmental organizations from Asia and the Pacific.

I should note that all the costs of these meetings will be borne by a special fund supported by the Soviet Government.

In conclusion, I affirm that the Soviet Peace Committee is prepared to play a most active role in implementing the proposals and decisions in the interest of universal peace and security that will be adopted at this important session.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Vladimir Aksyonov of the Soviet Peace Fund.

Mr. Aksyonov (interpretation from Russian): The very fact that the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has been convened with the active and interested participation of representatives of members of the world community is testimony to our joint determination to avert the ongoing threat to the existence of human civilization and to life itself.

The ratification of the USSR-United States Treaty on the elimination of their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles has put the problem of reallocation onto a practical level. The transition to genuine disarmament demands first and foremost that we resolve the political and military aspects of the problem. So far as my country is concerned, the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will enable us to reorient our scientific and manufacturing capacity from the defence industry to the design and production of consumer goods. We estimate that by converting the industrial capacity now used to produce missiles, we shall be able to save tens of billions of rubles.

When the INF Treaty was being discussed in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Soviet Peace Fund stated its readiness to participate actively in promoting this conversion, inter alia by financing research and development and other programmes in this sphere.
We cannot agree with the military-industrial complex when it says it is too expensive to disarm and that, far from releasing funds for development, disarmament will involve additional expenditures. Serious scientific research has refuted that argument, which obviously reflects the fears of the military contractors that they will lose billions in profit.

World public opinion is searching with growing persistence for concrete ways to achieve conversion, including the methods endorsed by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. As you know, there will be an international exchange of views and experience in the sphere of conversion. Accordingly, the Soviet Peace Fund expresses its readiness, together with trade unions and scientific organizations in our country, to act as host in the Soviet Union in 1990, within the framework of the United Nations Disarmament Campaign, an international conference on the impact of arms reductions and disarmament on employment. That conference - and we would hope that the United Nations specialized agencies, the International Labour Organisation in particular, would take part in it - could make a positive contribution to finding ways of converting military production in order to achieve the imperative need of our time, namely, disarmament for development.

Conversion is the economic basis for resolving the problem of disarmament and reflects political agreements to halt the arms race. The expected agreement on a 50-per-cent cut in strategic offensive weapons, while complying with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, will provide for large-scale measures in the field of conversion and will make it possible to use the funds saved for peaceful creative purposes.

As someone professionally involved in the exploration of outer space I cannot fail to emphasize the exceptional importance of preventing the spread of the arms race to outer space. Outer space should be kept peaceful. Otherwise the military
threat will gain a new and extremely dangerous dimension, and the improvement of armaments will get out of control. The world community cannot allow that from happening.

The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is being held at a time when there are real trends to lower the levels of confrontation throughout the world. Credit should go not only to politicians and diplomats, but to world public opinion as well. Our combined challenge is to support in every way we can the efforts of the United Nations to implement the conclusions of the third special session devoted to disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Miss Manijeh Ali of the International Youth for Peace and Justice Tour.

Ms. ALI: We wish to thank you for this opportunity to address the Committee of the Whole of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. My statement has been written and agreed to by Michael Standup, a native of Kanawaki, Canada, Antonio Romero of El Salvador, Lyna Ateyeh of Lebanon, and myself, from Afghanistan.

The International Youth for Peace and Justice Tour is an international development education programme for youth in Canada and abroad. Our programme creates a forum for dialogue on peace and justice issues through tours of Canadian high schools and communities. Each year 50 native, refugee Canadian and international young people from 35 countries come together to share with Canadian high-school students their experience of living amidst war, injustice and human-rights violations. We speak to Canadians to inform and sensitize them to the plight of the majority of the world’s people.

As young people coming together from different countries, cultures, beliefs and languages, we have worked to achieve one common goal. By learning about our friends from other cultures, we understand how to respect them. That respect led us
to trust one another in the hope that we could begin to work together for a future of world-wide peace, justice and development. If we are together, we are strong. We are the youth of the world, and, together, we can make a big change.

The Tour is organized by young people who have experienced suffering, repression and human-rights violations. My three friends and I are living examples of youths who are victims of armed conflict and social injustice. If the conflict in my country, Afghanistan, had been a nuclear exchange, I would not be here today to speak to you. My experiences, as inhumane as they were, have strengthened me in the belief that our future is still our own to create, and that that future must be one free from fear and filled with hope. We are the messengers of hope for all youth.

The way we create the world today is the way the world will be tomorrow. As young people working for peace we encourage all young people and all those willing to listen and to change to join us and to commit themselves to work together with us for a future of peace. Because I know that young people are our leaders of tomorrow we must never again repeat the mistakes that have been made by adults, mistakes often covered up by shallow and hollow gestures of peace. We are presenting ourselves here today at the United Nations third special session devoted to disarmament to learn about world-wide peace movements and the proposals and promises being made to us as young people.

What about the future and hope for peace and disarmament? We are wondering when and how it will come? The promises - are they true? Are they false? Will we destroy ourselves in the process of waiting?

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the last speaker for this meeting, Dr. Ramal Parikh, from the Peace Research Centre of Gujurat, Ahmedabad, India.

Mr. PARIKH: I greet you from India. I deem it a great honour to address the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Despite
almost three decades of marathon discussions in the United Nations system and outside it, the world is yet no nearer to disarmament. The arms race and competition in arms supply by the big Powers continue unabated. While there are intermittent signs of hope, on the whole the situation continues to assume grim proportions.

The United Nations has no doubt made tremendous strides in focusing world attention on the devastating consequences of the continued arms race on all aspects of human life and on the entire environment. The assiduous efforts of three decades have had only marginal impact. The United Nations has no doubt prevented further catastrophe, but it has not succeeded in eliminating the fear of war and of the extinction of our planet. The future of global peace depends on the good sense of two super-Powers alone. The third special session should therefore consider this issue in the wider dimensions of disarmament for a peaceful world community and not in limited terms of détente.

The United Nations, which was born in the name of the peoples, should now seriously consider how the role of the people rather than the role of Governments can be brought to centre stage. The disarmament of nuclear or lethal arms alone will not bring lasting peace unless and until the foundations of violence on which modern society rests are altered and the indivisibility of peace and non-violence are accepted as a way of life for all.
While disarmament is envisaged as a step towards that ultimate but imminent goal, the debates in the United Nations system of the last three decades hardly reflect the immediacy of the ultimate goal of a non-violent global society, in both macro- and micro-dimensions. This requires drastic changes in the perspectives of the United Nations. The United Nations system and its entire thought process has been so overpowered by the Governments that its concern for the people of the world does not yet get reflected in the articulation of its ideas on a society free of armaments. The views of the people have a very peripheral and marginal role through the non-governmental organizations.

As a humble peace researcher, I would therefore submit that SSOD III should devote specific attention to building a global society free of armaments, as also its endeavours to secure arms limitation. While the struggle for the survival of mankind has to be foremost, it should not be forgotten that even the solution of contingent issues requires the support of visible progress of movement towards the ultimate goal of a peaceful and non-violent world community.

Even if some success is achieved in disarmament, that will not ensure peace as long as the culture of violence persists. It will not become meaningful so long as hunger and starvation persist. It will not end the exploitation of one group of human beings by another group of human beings. It will not secure equity in human life. It will not benefit the more than 900 million illiterate people of the world, who will continue to drag behind in the fast knowledge-based world.

Even after the Hiroshima tragedy, Mahatma Gandhiji, who founded my institution, Gujarat Vidyapith, in 1920, had the courage to reaffirm the efficacy of non-violence - Ahimsa. In Harijan on 16 November 1947, he wrote:

"In this age of the atom bomb I make bold to say that unadulterated non-violence is the only force that can confound all the tricks put together of violence."
Shri Jawaharlal Nehru also pursued this question in a wider dimension on 17 October 1949 in his address to Columbia University, New York. He stated:

"Political subjection, racial inequality, economic inequality and misery - these are the evils that we have to remove if we would ensure peace."

These perceptions of Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru remind us of the need to alter the foundations of society not in limited terms of containing the arms race but in wider terms of achieving a new non-violent and non-exploitative society.

There is enough diagnosis of the gravity of the arms race, but what is urgently needed is to begin the work of constructing a peaceful society - without losing much time. I therefore humbly plead with SSOD III to consider following four concrete proposals.

First, the United Nations must launch an ongoing massive programme of peace education to raise the consciousness of the people on the imperatives and efficacy of peace and non-violence in an indivisible process.

Secondly, it must support a manifold and much larger programme of peace research in all its manifold dimensions and ramifications, particularly with reference to the practice of non-violence in personal and community life, both national and international, in all spheres of life, animate and inanimate.

Thirdly, it must generously support programmes to end the persistence of hunger and starvation, so that the dignity of all human beings can be ensured by giving them an opportunity to liberate themselves from illiteracy, undernourishment and lack of gainful work; the programmes of the global movement of the Hunger Project are very pertinent in this respect. The Hunger Project has now entered into a partnership in my country to liberate 161 villages with a population of 100,000 from persistent starvation and hunger and to make the ending of hunger a reality within the coming three years.
Fourthly, there has been an over-macronization of all our problems. The focus must shift to the endeavours of micro-level communities through a world-wide movement like community education programmes that prepare people through practice in community life and at the same time keep our mental horizon at a cosmic level. Their catchword "Think globally, act locally" is now extremely pertinent and relevant.

In my humble view, those constitute the effective ingredients of any process of disarmament. Recognition of those four components will make the disarmament process a positive and creative movement in constructing a new non-nuclear, non-violent communitarian society that is not solely dependent upon governments. It may be recalled that last year the Delhi Declaration signed by the Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, and the Soviet leader, Mr. Gorbachev, echoed those sentiments and categorically affirmed the need to work for a non-nuclear, non-violent world whose parts are not separate but completely complementary.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the United Nations Administration, for giving this splendid opportunity to me and to the Peace Research Centre of Gujarat Vidyapith to present its thinking in this most significant body of the last decade of the twentieth century. I plead with you, Sir, and with the distinguished representatives to consider disarmament as a step towards constructing a new society, and not as a preventive contingent problem.

Om Shanti, Shanti, Shanti: peace, peace, peace.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker for this meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.