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

The CHAIRMAN: The first speaker for this afternoon is Ms. Alba Zizzamia of the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, and I call on her to make her statement.

Ms. ZIZZAMIA: The World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations appreciates this opportunity to express to the General Assembly at its third special session on disarmament the following concerns of its members in 67 countries on all continents.

We share the general sense of welcome and relief at the adoption by the United States and the USSR of the INF Treaty as a first reassuring step in the field of nuclear disarmament. But we are unhappily aware that trade and transfers in increasingly sophisticated conventional weapons are burgeoning. We urge the Assembly at this session to reemphasize the imperative need for both developed and developing countries, buyers and sellers alike, to achieve agreed limits on the arms trade. Its costs in social and economic terms - in terms of human deprivation - are morally indefensible. By their very nature, arms trade and arms transfers are in conflict with the concept of confidence building and undermine any conceivable progress towards that goal. We believe the role of the United Nations in the conduct of the required diplomacy in this regard is crucial. We urge the Assembly at this session to push for the implementation of existing recommendations in this area, particularly that concerning a regular analytical review of the relationship between the arms trade and the global debt crisis.
We feel that the role of the World Disarmament Campaign should be expanded in relation to confidence building. The World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations has long been committed to education for peace, that is, to the formation of a climate of public opinion that will make progress towards disarmament possible. Thus, we welcomed the creation of the World Disarmament Campaign. We now note with regret that references to confidence-building measures are limited to treaties and negotiations, all at the governmental level, while the gap between those measures and the creation of the aware, informed public opinion necessary to promote and buttress them remains as wide as ever. Given the importance accorded public opinion and the role of non-governmental organizations by the Assembly at its first two special sessions on disarmament, we urge an expansion of the World Disarmament Campaign and of its relationship with non-governmental organizations.

The factual publications of the World Disarmament Campaign provide valuable resource material, but like all United Nations materials they must be adapted not only to local languages but also to different cultural realities, age levels and educational systems. We recognize that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has been charged with the development of disarmament education, and in the review and appraisal being undertaken at this session we trust serious notice will be given to the implementation of paragraphs 106 and 107 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which deal with this matter.

Nevertheless, we feel that in addition to whatever UNESCO may or may not do there is a distinct role for the World Disarmament Campaign in working with non-governmental organizations to adapt its materials to the needs of the constituent members of the non-governmental organizations. In a true disarmament
campaign, public opinion must be informed of the impact of a country's military spending on its own economic and social fabric, the purpose of the expenditures and their international repercussions. We believe the World Disarmament Campaign can assist non-governmental organizations in preparing such information for their affiliates. We also believe that the World Disarmament Campaign could be further involved in co-operation with regional centres and United Nations Information Centres in organizing seminars, especially for educators, editors and others, on the development of materials appropriate to their needs.

In short, we urge that the World Disarmament Campaign be strengthened and given the flexibility necessary to develop productive initiatives with non-governmental organizations and other potential allies in an expanded and more far-reaching campaign.

Finally, we feel compelled to call special attention to the devastating effect on this and future generations of the present custom in many areas of arming children for combat. The all-embracing negative impact this has on their development and outlook on life is a gross violation of the right of children to protection of their physical and psychological integrity and the development of their personality and potential. We ask the Assembly at this session, in its final document - or whatever other form its conclusions take - to express the dismay of the international community at this arming of children for war and the fate befalling millions of them in armed conflicts. If we are speaking of disarmament, certainly we can begin by disarming the children.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Serge Wourgaft of the World Veterans Federation.
Mr. WOURGAPT (interpretation from French): I have the honour to address the Committee of the Whole on behalf of 30 million veterans, resisters and war victims from the five continents who are members of the World Veterans Federation, the European Confederation of War Veterans, the International Confederation of Former Prisoners of War and the International Federation of Resistance Movements.

These are men and women who, having experienced the sufferings of war, whether they fought side by side or against one another, have decided to work together for a world in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to spare future generations from the tragedies they have lived through. They have endeavoured to define policies which will allow progress towards disarmament while guaranteeing to all countries great and small the security which constitutes a major concern for those who have fought in their countries' service.

These policies were decided upon most recently at the second World Meeting of War Veterans, Resisters and War Victims, held in December 1986 at Vienna in the framework of the International Year of Peace. They are set forth in annexes to document A/42/254.
(Mr. Wourgaft)

As regards the proceedings of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament more particularly, the four organizations I represent wish to make the following comments.

First, we note that developments in the international situation that have occurred since the convening of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978 have fully confirmed the validity of the principles, analyses and Programme of Action of the Final Document of that session.

We welcome the encouraging developments that have occurred in recent years in the field of bilateral and multilateral negotiations, which have been marked, in particular, by the following:

One, by the signature and ratification of the Treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear weapons, the first treaty eliminating weapons, which has demonstrated that the technological and political difficulties involved in verification can be overcome.

Two, by current negotiations on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons.

Three, by the progress made within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe on the establishment of confidence-building measures and on a new approach in negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons.

Four, by the recognition at the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development of the interaction between underdevelopment, over-armament and insecurity and of the need need to remedy it by a world strategy for development and a global concept of security.

Five, by the prospects for an agreement in the near future on the convention concerning the banning of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons; and
Six, by new approaches likely to encourage the settlement of certain regional conflicts.

But we are also aware that at present too few of the provisions of the Final Document of SSOD-I have been implemented, that the danger of nuclear annihilation remains, that the quantitative and qualitative arms race is continuing, that armed conflicts are still being waged in several parts of the world, that chemical weapons are being used and that indebtedness, poverty and unemployment are increasing in the world.

We therefore urge Governments to take into account both the encouraging developments that have occurred and the obstacles that remain to be overcome and, during the third special session, to enter rapidly into unequivocal commitments to implement the provisions of the Final Document of SSOD I and of the Programme of Action adopted by the Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development and to honour the other international agreements entered into by them.

To ensure peace in the context of mutually guaranteed security and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the following measures in particular should be taken.

One, the reduction of nuclear weapons should be pursued.

Two, the rapid conclusion of the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons should be achieved.

Three, armed forces and conventional weapons should be reduced.

Four, the international satellite monitoring agency should be established.

Five, the implementation of the Programme of Action adopted by the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development should be pursued and extended.

Six, efforts should be intensified to solve regional conflicts, inter alia, by implementing the relevant resolutions of the United Nations Security Council.
The Helsinki process, which, through its new approach to the principles that should govern international relations, may have a direct impact on improving the international situation, should be developed.

We, for our part, intend to assist in mobilizing men and women throughout the world so that we can replace the infrastructure of war by an infrastructure of peace.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Zivan Berisavljevic, President of the Yugoslav League for Peace, Independence and Equality of People.

Mr. BERISAVLJEVIC: The Yugoslav League for Peace, Independence and Equality of Peoples - the unique Yugoslav peace movement with a truly non-aligned orientation - wholeheartedly supports the convening of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In its fundamental objectives the third special session reflects the aspirations and wishes of all the peoples of my multinational country and of its public opinion and youth to live in a civilization characterized by stable peace, free from fear of nuclear catastrophe, a world of security, freedom and equality. That is why particular attention has been given to activities aimed at creating conditions conducive to disarmament and to concrete action against all forms of the arms race. The Yugoslav movement for peace has therefore initiated extensive and numerous activities throughout the country to mark the special session.

It is my pleasure to point out that one of the objectives our movement has striven for at the international level - the reduction of military expenditures by 10 per cent by the end of the decade - has been realized in Yugoslavia by the decision taken this year by the Yugoslav Government to reduce its own military budget by that percentage.

In its philosophy and concrete activities, as well as in its over-all nature, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries provides an integral concept of peace,
stability and development. It therefore comes as no surprise that peace movements and forces in many other countries, including those with military alliances, are increasingly inspired by and embrace its positions.

We sincerely welcome the recently concluded Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - as well as the negotiations on the further reduction of nuclear weapons. Yet those of us who have peace at heart have always maintained that successful negotiations can be realized and durable peace achieved only with the active participation of all segments of the international community. For those very reasons, both the peace movement and the general public in my country are unanimous in their conviction that the United Nations should be the irreplaceable forum which alone can ensure such conditions.

We, along with other non-governmental organizations and forces, the representatives of peace, have come to New York to express the wishes of millions of people who are firm believers in and staunch advocates of peace and disarmament, to extend our support to the efforts made by the United Nations and to make our contribution to the work of the third special session. Our statements should not be understood merely as declaratory pronouncements. Notice should be paid them and they should be widely reflected in the results and decisions of the third special session.

The Yugoslav League for Peace, along with the broad segments of people from all walks of life it encompasses, believes that the third special session, which is being held in a more favourable international environment, will ensure a meaningful follow-up to the positive process sparked by the first special session. We in the League for Peace are striving for a world without weapons; yet we are well aware that the realistic way to achieve that goal is to struggle to bring about maximum security for all with minimum weapons. To achieve that, it would be
necessary, in our opinion, for the two major Powers to reduce their strategic nuclear weapons by 50 per cent and for the international community to focus its efforts on reaching an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, on concluding a comprehensive convention on chemical weapons, on preventing an arms race in outer space, on reducing conventional armaments and on insisting upon the military disengagement of the great Powers and blocs from foreign territories, particularly and primarily from the territories of non-aligned and non-bloc countries.

We are convinced that the third special session will recognize the importance and role of non-governmental organizations and peace movements and other forces that are striving for disarmament, for the promotion of international co-operation and the creation of an atmosphere of confidence and friendship among nations. Those are no doubt important moral preconditions to the struggle for the initiation and realization of the disarmament and peace process in the world. In that context the activities of the World Disarmament Campaign should be fully recognized and encouraged. To give those activities impetus and encouragement throughout the world would, in our opinion, be one of the commendable commitments of the third special session.
The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Bruce Kent, of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, London.

Mr. KENT: We have come a long way since the first United Nations special session on disarmament, in 1978. Many of the conclusions of that session set out in the final report have become general perceptions and even practical politics.

It is becoming common sense now to say, as the United Nations did in 1978, that the increase in weapons, especially nuclear weapons, far from helping to strengthen security, on the contrary weakens it.

It becomes common sense to say, as the United Nations did in 1978, that enduring international peace and security cannot be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence.

It becomes common sense to say that the billions spent on weapons in this world today stands in sombre and dramatic contrast to the want and poverty in which two thirds of the world's population now lives. How does one evaluate human rights in a world where annually one death in three - about 14 million - is of a child under the age of six dying of malnutrition and preventable disease?

It is even common sense now to accept that there is no either/or choice between unilateral and negotiated measures of disarmament. Both are important.

I come from a country of which I am both proud and ashamed. I am proud because of our history, our literature, our language, our scientific achievements and a much better democracy than many enjoy, proud of a long list of great men and women: Wesley, Wilberforce, Nightingale, Pankhurst, Noel Baker and Penner Brockway, who had the vision and courage to leave this world a better place than they found it.

But I am also ashamed of our present British nuclear nationalism and ignorance. We promised at the first United Nations session on disarmament, in 1978, to take steps to develop programmes of education for disarmament and peace
studies at all levels. In fact, the 1978 report remains an unknown factor to most of our citizens and "peace studies" is a term of abuse. The 1982 World Disarmament Campaign was given no publicity. The 1986 Year of Peace was ignored. Our Administration actually boasts of "spectacular achievements" when it comes to selling weapons and is busy trebling its nuclear arsenals just at a time when the super-Powers are beginning to talk some sense. We badly need a new peace-making national spirit. We who founded the Salvation Army, Oxfam and Amnesty International are not without generosity and vision.

We all, especially the British and the French, who bear a special responsibility for proliferation and nuclear nationalism, need a new vision. A Europe free of the blocs is now actually on the agenda. A world of common security is no longer the dream of utopians. Wars cannot be won. Within the nation State we have found more constructive, rational and moral ways of settling our disputes. As a species we face a variety of real threats - disease, pollution, famine, economic disaster, nuclear accident - all of which have no respect for frontiers or for passports. Our loyalties have to shift from our nations to the planet.

"Patriotism," said that great Englishwoman Edith Cavell, "is not enough." How right she was. Our obsessive nationalisms have got to give way to wider notions of our responsibility for the whole planet, for international law and justice, for without justice there will be no peace. For this reason we look to you at the United Nations as a fragile hope and a continuing miracle in the world today.

Long ago the Jewish psalmist of the Old Testament said "The war horse is a vain hope for victory, by its great strength it cannot save". In today's world, General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan are starting to apply that old idea to a new world, a world in which we have to avoid nuclear barbarism.
(Mr. Kent)

At some cost, we in the different peace organizations have helped to change perceptions. There is much more to do. Let us get on with it. Words are easy; actions are much more significant.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Karoli Lauko, of the Hungarian Peace Council.

Mr. LAUKO: I intend to use the opportunity of the honour granted me as the representative of a national non-governmental organization, the Hungarian Peace Council, to address four issues.

First, I should like to remind you that I come from a country in eastern Europe which is building socialism, which is a founding member of the Warsaw Treaty and therefore temporarily has Soviet troops stationed on its territory, which however possesses no nuclear or chemical weapons and has only conventional forces. My country is small and consequently open and subjected to the influence of changes in the world. It is now faced with the task of creating a modern society through far-reaching economic and political reforms.

Secondly, I should like to tell you that the public in Hungary devotes great attention to the United Nations special sessions on disarmament because we Hungarians are convinced that, over and above bilateral meetings and agreements - in the first place great-Power summits and treaties - the ratified INF and the planned agreement on the halving of strategic nuclear weapons - international forums facilitating multilateral disarmament talks and agreements have their own role and significance. The United Nations can do a great deal to help make the work for disarmament more democratic. The numerous positive examples such as the World Disarmament Campaign and the International Year of Peace should inspire more direct and extensive involvement by the public at large in that work. The growing participation of national peace movements and local peace groups in United Nations initiated activities could make an important contribution.
Thirdly, the Hungarian public is convinced that the success of SSOD III would greatly enhance the prestige and influence of the United Nations, which in turn would advance the solution of other global issues within the competence of the whole Organization. We therefore expect the special session to come up with new ideas and initiatives borne of a new way of thinking. The session should mandate the Secretary-General to draw up a draft on how the United Nations could be involved in the verification of disarmament agreements. Work by the world Organization should cover the banning of nuclear weapons tests as well as of chemical and bacteriological weapons; the reduction of military spending; the elimination of all regional conflicts; and verification of the interrelationship between disarmament and development. All this should now at last go beyond the talking stage and and take the form of concrete actions.

Accordingly, fourthly, we are determined to explore the possibilities of the peace movement of our small country in the elaboration of a new concept of peace that is more humane and better appeals to individuals; the promotion of confidence-building also through the elimination of the enemy image; work for the dissolution of the military alliances in Europe and the withdrawal of all foreign troops within their respective national boundaries, which would also necessitate the transformation of military doctrines into defensive ones; the reduction of conventional forces - we would like to see Hungary be among the first countries of Europe that in the framework of a related agreement had cuts in the number of troops stationed on its soil; the prevention of any possible future deployment of nuclear or chemical weapons in the country; the formation of a unique association of interest by countries possessing no nuclear weapons; the solution of the problem of conscientious objection; the promotion of a broad dialogue at home and abroad guided by the spirit of tolerance, openness, constructiveness and non-dogmatic thinking.
Those are the specific major objectives of the Hungarian peace movement. We should all intensify our efforts to make peace everybody's business.
Mr. CARROLL:

"The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can
never forget what they did here."

Many of those present will recognize those words from President Abraham Lincoln's
famous Gettysburg address. Although he spoke at Gettysburg 125 years ago, Lincoln
still speaks to us here today. His message is clear. mere words count for little;
the deeds of brave men count for much. Deeds are lasting; words without deeds
perish.

This truth is evident at the third special session of the General Assembly
devoted to disarmament. At the first special session strong words were spoken in
support of the proposal for suffocation of the nuclear-arms race. But nothing was
done to turn those words into deeds. The second special session went even further
in discussing a nuclear freeze - once again, wise words unsupported by deeds.

As a result, the General Assembly meets in this third special session devoted
to disarmament in a world grown far more dangerous than the world of 1978. At that
time the United States and the Soviet Union were armed with a total of 15,000
strategic nuclear weapons. Today that total is 23,000 nuclear weapons, and they
are more destructive in swifter, more efficient missiles, bombers and submarines.
The new weapons make war more likely, universal annihilation more certain.

Not only have the super-Powers continued their mindless arms race, but the
other nuclear States continue to expand their arsenals. The threshold States move
inexorably to put more fingers on the trigger of nuclear war.

Of course, during these 10 years there has been talk about arms control, talk
about disarmament, but talk is always overtaken by testing and building new nuclear
weapons. Talks move on slowly, but testing and building move swiftly, increasing
the peril of nuclear war for every Member of the United Nations, threatening the
survival of every human being on Earth.
(Mr. Carroll)

The great truth spoken by President Lincoln tells us that talk is not enough. This body must take action to halt all testing of nuclear weapons in order to break the talk-test-build cycle, which leads only to more destructive nuclear forces. A test ban is the first, essential step to avert nuclear war. No amount of talking, no torrent of mere words, will ever halt the arms race as long as nuclear testing continues to create new and more dangerous weapons for use on Earth and in space.

Clearly, it will not be easy for this body to overcome the predictable resistance of the nuclear States to any action calling for an immediate end to nuclear testing. Confronting those who would continue testing with a demand by the General Assembly at this special session for an immediate halt to nuclear testing would be the most powerful action this body could take, but there is another course of action open to it to reinforce its demand. That is for individual nations to support the call for a conference to amend the partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty. Twenty-five years ago the nuclear States pledged themselves to bring about an end to all nuclear tests for all time. An amendment to require them to honour their pledge is long overdue. This assertion of the rights of the non-nuclear States which are parties to the partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty would be a compelling declaration that the people of the world demand an end to the nuclear-arms race.

However the Assembly chooses to act, words alone are not enough. The world must have brave deeds by brave men and women here at the United Nations. It is intolerable, an offence against humankind, that the survival of 159 nations is in the hands of those few nations which insist on testing nuclear weapons in order to prepare for nuclear war. A sense of outrage should impel every member here, every potential victim of this senseless, criminal arms race, to demand an end to nuclear testing while there is still time to avert a nuclear war.
(Mr. Carroll)

The world will little note nor long remember the words of the third special session on disarmament if representatives do not act. But if they can find the wisdom, the will, the courage to act, to demand an end to nuclear testing in 1988, the world today, and our children tomorrow, will remember that they were the ones who turned wise words into brave deeds.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. William Potter, of the Center for International and Strategic Affairs, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA).

Mr. POTTER: It is with great pleasure that I speak at the third special session devoted to disarmament and share some of the research activities undertaken by the UCLA Center for International and Strategic Affairs.

Since it was established in 1975 the Center has sought to promote the multidisciplinary study of international security and arms control. It is currently engaged in three central, multi-year research projects which relate to topics of concern to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: alternative approaches to arms control, the emerging nuclear suppliers and non-proliferation, and international co-operation and international security. The remainder of my remarks will focus on one component of the central research project - international co-operation and international security.

The project on international co-operation and international security seeks to identify specific programmes that will enable the United States and the Soviet Union to move towards a more co-operative international relationship. One proposal to assist this process that is now being studied entails the conversion of ballistic missiles banned under arms control agreements to launch space payloads for peaceful purposes.
The technical feasibility of using retired missiles as boosters for spacecraft has been demonstrated by both the United States and the Soviet Union. Virtually all of the earliest launchers were converted intermediate-range or intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). Today the United States Air Force is converting at least 14 of the 56 decommissioned Titan 2 ICBMs into satellite launchers. On the Soviet side, a version of the SS-6 ICBM is the primary launch vehicle for the Soviet space programme, and other Soviet ICBMs have been used as satellite launchers.

Although ICBMs have previously been converted, this has never been done in the context of a bilateral arms control agreement. Unfortunately, the verification provisions of the Treaty banning intermediate- and shorter-range missiles (INF) make it infeasible to convert the missiles eliminated under that accord. Most INF missiles, in any case, lack the thrust to be very cost-effective boosters.

The larger missiles on the table in the deep-out negotiations, however, can put a variety of payloads into orbit. Although the costs for missile conversion are not inconsequential, the disposal of hundreds of missiles under the terms of a strategic arms reduction talks (START) agreement would also be very expensive.

Space scientists can offer long lists of potential payloads for converted missiles. These include the first probe to the sun, a high-priority scientific mission that is too expensive for any one nation to do alone. Another payload would be one or more spacecraft to look at space weather, both in and out of the ecliptic plane, which could forecast geomagnetic storms that can create communications blackouts, power surges and other disturbances.
In addition to promoting United States-Soviet co-operation in space, converted missiles could also provide launch services for developing countries. The potential impact of satellites on agriculture, industry, education, health and social services in the third world has long been recognized. The problem has been one of cost. Most developing States simply cannot afford to build, launch and operate satellites.

The missile conversion plan could also provide a concrete demonstration to nations often critical of the super-Powers that they, too, derive tangible benefits from progress in East-West arms control. As such, missile conversion might serve as a first step in demonstrating the feasibility of linking disarmament and development. This demonstration may be especially important in gaining the support of developing States for renewal of the nuclear non-proliferation (NPT) Treaty in 1995.

A missile conversion programme would probably require a multilateral effort. Countries such as Japan, Canada and Sweden, which combine a commitment to both arms control and development assistance, could play a major role. Their involvement would important in spreading the costs of a conversion programme. Multilateral involvement would also add an element of stability to a programme that would otherwise be vulnerable to the fluctuations typical of the super-Power relationship.
There is reason to believe that the United States and the Soviet Union would be receptive to a proposal permitting missile conversion. The United States, in particular, has suffered a very restricted launch capability and badly needs expanded launch opportunities. The conversion approach also has the attraction of being easy to verify. In addition, it should be attractive for its symbolism: the super-Powers would be devoting resources once spent on weapons to the causes of peaceful science and economic development.

It is only natural that the super-Powers view arms control primarily in terms of their own security. Without realizing it yet, however, they are now in a position simultaneously to reduce the risk of nuclear war by eliminating large numbers of ballistic missiles and to spur international co-operation in space. If the United States and the Soviet Union seized the opportunity, they could demonstrate a space-age version of beating swords into ploughshares.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Wolfgang Schwegler-Rohmeis, of the Society for Political Ecology, Stuttgart.

Mr. SCHWEGLER-ROHMEIS: The Society for Political Ecology was founded in 1980 by people from the peace and ecology movement, women's-lib organizations and groups in solidarity with the people in the third world. The purpose of our Society is to generate understanding of and support for ecological consciousness, social justice, peace and vibrant democracy, especially in its interdependent aspects. One of our main tasks as a non-governmental organization is to build up a network for grass-root groups and sponsor their activities as far as information, research and education are concerned. In that context, the Society for Political Ecology is a representative of the peace movement in Western Germany.

The attempts on the bilateral and multilateral levels to achieve substantial results on arms limitation or disarmament have so far failed. All the agreements that have been concluded have in fact triggered a new qualitative dimension of the
arms race. Has a new situation now been brought about in the context of the recently concluded agreement on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles?

On the one hand, we can confirm that. With the INF Treaty we have for the first time in history a real disarmament measure and not merely an arms-control agreement. And it is important to stress that this is not only the result of the fact that the two super-Powers are now in a period of so-called new détente; this is at last the outcome of a patient, imaginative and powerful fight over the years; it is a success of the Western European peace movement, especially in the Federal Republic of Germany.

On the other hand, there is considerable doubt about the nature of the INF Treaty. We all know that less than 3 per cent of the whole arsenal of nuclear weapons is involved. Therefore, reducing the intermediate-range nuclear forces means no more than temporarily slowing down the speed of the arms race.

Perhaps the contemporary situation offers a historical chance to stop the armament train. But the politicians in the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have not taken up of this chance. Indeed, they have decided to modernize the short-range nuclear weapons. This is in fact a new armament measure.

Moreover, a new dimension has been introduced into the militarization of Western Europe. In close co-operation between France and the Federal Republic of Germany, a European nuclear super-Power is being established. We are seriously concerned that the true result of the INF Treaty will be more weapons, more threats and, finally, the entrance by the Federal Republic of Germany into the "Nuclear-Powers Club".

To prevent such a development, the peace movement and the anti-nuke groups have started a campaign. The aim of this campaign is to establish in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Grundgesetz, the renunciation
of nuclear weapons. We regard this as a positive signal in regard to the ongoing
endeavours on disarmament. We wonder how our Government and important
representatives of the Liberal and Conservative Party, as well as important
Social-Democratic politicians, can say "no" to that proposal.

On the whole, negotiations among Member States for disarmament have failed. A
lot of proposals and concepts from peace-research institutes have not been
implemented by the political decision-makers. Therefore, we need a change in the
direction of disarmament proposals. The people themselves must be the addressees.
Only by organizing themselves, through public opinion and grass-root pressures,
could citizens and their movements manage to influence the decision-makers.

What we need is a world-wide, computer-based information network for the
Non-Governmental Organizations. That is necessary for communications on the
global, regional, national, federal and local levels. More information, not only
scientifically or statistically speaking, could well be turned into an instrument
for concrete political activities. As a consequence, many of the so-far-separate
national campaigns of resistance to national and world-wide armament could be
co-ordinated and strengthened on an international level.

In order to achieve and support such a global environment and
peace-information network, the United Nations General Assembly should establish a
non-governmental-organization ad hoc committee immediately. In the near future we
shall need a non-governmental international peace and development fund, since the
material and monetary bases for "peace politics from below" has to be secured.

It is understood that we are building on the free participation of
individuals, groups and movements from all Member States, world-wide, that have
signed the Human Rights Covenants. That means free national and transnational
co-operation among the peace groups or research institutes, without any government
controls. A grass-root-oriented approach such as that is not like the repressive
measures we have witnessed in the Warsaw Treaty countries against members of the peace or environment movement. We need domestic changes in all Member States in the direction of strengthening the democratic influence of their citizens in regard to security and military policies.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Burton Pines, of The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Mr. PINES: Thank you for inviting me once again to address a United Nations special session on disarmament. I am grateful for this honour that you are giving The Heritage Foundation. Returning to this podium where, in 1982, I addressed the second special session on disarmament, I am compelled to ask the obvious question: what has happened in the past six years?

Here the news is very bad. Since we last met here, the world has suffered 36 wars. What is worse, these wars have taken as many as 4 million lives and injured many millions more, civilians and soldiers. When we met in 1982, the world was spending $762 billion on arms. This year, in inflation-adjusted terms, arms expenditures will top $842 billion. Except for the treaties negotiated between my country and the Soviet Union, there is no evidence — none at all — that there have been any steps towards disarmament in the past half-dozen years. Clearly, the United Nations second special session on disarmament accomplished very little.

Will we accomplish more here? It is unlikely unless we candidly ask and honestly answer this question: which arms have been and remain the greater threat to world peace and which devour more of the planet's scarce resources — nuclear arms or conventional arms?

The answer, of course, is conventional arms. They have been killing the innocents and they have been consuming more than 95 per cent of the world's weaponry expenditures. And in this century, while some 150,000 people have died from atomic bombs, 1,000 times that number — 150 million people — have died from
conventional arms. If we thus intend to accomplish anything here, we must address
the plague of conventional weapons.

The international trade in such weapons is booming - not so much because they
are being pushed by sellers but because of the enormous demand from third-world
buyers. Those with the most voracious, insatiable appetites for arms are Iraq,
Egypt and India. A serious discussion of disarmament must ask: why do these
nations buy so many arms? Why do impoverished Ethiopia and Mozambique spend more
per capita on arms than the United States? Why has India boosted its arms
expenditures 50 per cent in just the past two years? Why does a country as small
as Viet Nam maintain the third largest military in the world?
At a time when we hear so much touching rhetoric about the tragic hunger, poverty and illness that chronically plague much of the third world's populations, why do these third-world nations spend so much of their scarce resources on instruments of violence? Certainly a serious conference on disarmament must demand answers to these questions. If we at this conference are here for a serious purpose, we must be ready to take steps to deal with the world's most rapidly expanding arsenals.

The Heritage Foundation is ready to do this. As such the Heritage Foundation offers a proposal to ensure that this third special session devoted to disarmament accomplishes more than its two sterile predecessors. The Heritage Foundation plan for disarmament, which I here for the first time publicly announce, calls upon the United Nations General Assembly to establish an **ad hoc** committee on disarmament in the non-aligned world.

This **ad hoc** committee is to be comprised of all 99 States of the non-aligned group. Under a mandate from the General Assembly, this **ad hoc** committee is to be given 12 months to negotiate the means by which non-aligned nations will reduce their arsenals 3 per cent a year throughout the 1990s - a period which the General Assembly is to designate the "decade of non-aligned disarmament". In addition, the **ad hoc** committee is to be instructed to negotiate stringent on-site verification procedures to ensure that no non-aligned nation cheats.

Under this Heritage Foundation plan, by the start of the new century the non-aligned nations will have slashed their arsenals by 30 per cent and cut their arms costs enormously.

To be sure, the General Assembly has passed numerous resolutions calling for conventional arms reductions. Yet these resolutions focus mainly on the so-called weapons of mass destruction - nuclear and chemical arms. The real weapons of mass
destruction, however, as history proves, are conventional arms. I ask the non-aligned nations to follow the example of the United States and the Soviet Union, which have been vigorously negotiating arms reductions. It is time for the non-aligned nations, where almost all of the battlefield deaths have occurred since 1945, to begin reducing their arms. I ask the non-aligned nations to vote for the Heritage Foundation plan and to vote to establish the ad hoc committee on disarmament in the non-aligned world.

I can promise here that the Heritage Foundation will do everything in its power to persuade the United States Government to provide its fair share of funding for this ad hoc committee. The Heritage Foundation will also work to persuade the United States Government to share its technical expertise on ways to verify a non-aligned conventional arms accord.

I have been listening to and reading the statements emanating from this podium and from the other platforms at this special session. I have been visiting the exhibits and closely examining the literature on arms and disarmament being distributed by organizations in and around these buildings. From what I have seen and what I hear, I fear that this third special session devoted to disarmament will be as barren and futile an exercise as the first two special sessions. Success at this gathering can be achieved only if, at long last, the non-aligned nations begin taking steps to reduce their conventional force arsenals.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mrs. Ann Hallan Lakhdhir of the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, Brookline, United States.

Mrs. LAKHDHIR: As many have already said at this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the present time is a most hopeful one, when a new relationship seems possible between East and West and North and South. Considerable progress in nuclear arms reductions of the two major Powers,
the United States and the Soviet Union, now seems possible, progress that will perhaps lead to a diminished arms competition between them, and increased economic, environmental, humanitarian and political co-operation in addressing global problems. There seems to be increasing recognition by many countries of the value of the concept of common security, as developed initially by the Palme Commission. Possibilities are opened up that seemed unthinkable five years ago.

Non-governmental organizations and research institutes, such as the one I represent at the United Nations, could play a key role in shaping the scope and direction of the disarmament negotiating process, as well as in putting forth new ways of more effectively utilizing the United Nations itself.

But existing procedures do not facilitate that. Listening to more than 100 five- and six-minute speeches over a two-day period gives representatives some idea of the range of activity and the interests of many of us, but not much more. And that happens only at a special session. The United Nations needs to establish additional ways of utilizing the thinking and research of non-governmental organizations and research organizations. So I am going to use my time primarily to pose some questions for representatives.

Will representatives consider opening up some of their own procedures, in the name of glasnost, or transparency or whatever? Most recently I found myself considerably frustrated in trying to fathom why discussion in the Disarmament Commission this year in the Working Group on conventional disarmament encountered difficulties.

When, at this special session, many delegations have attached to them non-governmental organizations that can attend working groups, does it make much sense to exclude those that are not attached to delegations? Non-governmental organizations might make more worth-while suggestions about the World Disarmament
Campaign and much more if they had a clearer idea of the discussion that takes place.

How might representatives establish a hearings process by which they can call for the testimony of outside experts speaking on their own behalf rather than in the name of particular Governments? Many national legislatures could hardly function without such a process.

Expert committees are certainly useful, and we hope that one will be established by this special session to explore ways of utilizing the United Nations more effectively in the verification of regional and multilateral agreements. Would representatives consider the appointment to such a committee of some experts who might be proposed by research institutes?

Some possibilities already exist and could be expanded upon. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) can hold conferences and commission research that can be extremely useful, as the Conference that was held in Sochi in March 1988 was. The Department for Disarmament Affairs can hold conferences such as the one on verification that was held in Dagomys, which also seems to have been very useful. The Department should be encouraged to utilize more non-governmental experts at such conferences than they have so far.

The non-governmental organizations' Committee on Disarmament has been holding forums at the United Nations that bring together governmental representatives as well as non-governmental organization experts that we hope contribute to the substantive debate. The schedule of forums at the special session is appended to my statement. In it you will find the forums listed for 14, 16 and 17 June, that is, next week. We welcome suggestions from delegations as to what topics would be most useful for future forums. These forums with your help could possibly evolve into a sort of hearings process on disarmament for the United Nations.
(Mrs. Lakhdhir)

The Committee itself - and now I am speaking of the non-governmental organizations' Committee of which I am the Programme Chair - needs to expand its contacts so that it receives suggestions from other non-governmental organizations and research institutes not just prior to a special session but continuously, and I call upon other research institutes and non-governmental organizations to help us do that.

The Institute I represent, the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, which at the time of the second special session presented a nuclear freeze proposal, has been focusing for several years now on the concept of non-provocative defence, or defensive defence. Defensive defence seems central to developing a stable security system at the lowest safe levels of standing armed forces and military spending and greatly reduced nuclear arsenals. This may ultimately make thinkable the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. So far the research has focused on Europe, but the concept of defensive defence could be applied to other regions as well. More information is appended on the Institute's activities, and the non-governmental forum on 16 June will focus on this. As I have already mentioned, other non-governmental organization forums will focus on ideas as to how the United Nations itself can more effectively intervene in conflicts and facilitate the verification of multilateral treaties.

I will end by expressing the hope that at this special session the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries will play a role not only in pressuring the nuclear Powers but that they will also be in the forefront of advocating ways of more effectively utilizing the United Nations to resolve conflicts and to achieve multilateral agreements. We hope the Western Group will also show more creativity than I feel has been true in the recent past in also utilizing the United Nations more effectively.
The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Air Commodore Jasjit Singh, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, India.

Mr. SINGH: I think it is universally agreed that disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, remains a vital objective. However, we must always bear in mind that disarmament is only the means to an end, and not an end by itself. Weapons are only the symptoms and responses of the underlying malaise. The real challenge to peace and security emanates, not so much from the weapons, but from the ideas concerning the use and usability of weapons.

It is also ideas that create as much distrust amongst peoples and nations, and we find that the force of ideas has always had a profound impact on the course of human history. It is, therefore, necessary that steps towards disarmament be accompanied, if not preceded, by a reshaping of ideas, concepts, doctrines and strategies which govern inter-State relations on the one hand, and the legitimacy, the usability and the use of force and weapons on the other. While peace and disarmament progress at the practical levels, their fundamentals need to be pursued on the ideological and philosophical planes. It is in this context that ideas and measures which provide legitimacy to nuclear weapons, such as the doctrines of nuclear deterrence, the non-Proliferation Treaty, nuclear-weapon-free zones and so on, need to be seen as playing a negative role since they all tend to provide a degree of legitimacy to nuclear weapons when, at the same time, most of them do not meet the legitimate security needs of many of the countries concerned.

On the other hand, positive vectoring can be achieved only through ideological changes such as rejecting nuclear as well as chemical or biological deterrence, and also concluding, at an early date, the convention to outlaw the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity.

At the ideological level of seeking durable peace and security, serious thought needs to be given to the establishment of a moral political order which
would have peace with justice as a prime objective. Advantage must be taken of the current relaxed international climate to work towards a more co-operative global order. This would require fresh approaches to political, economic and military doctrines and strategies.

In this context, the role and utility of force in inter-State relations require some serious consideration, especially since there have been some fundamental changes in this regard in recent times. The trend points towards greater application with greater impact and lesser defensive or counter capability, and therefore leads to a greater propensity on the part of some nations to resort to its use. In recent times, coercive diplomacy and the use of military forces as political instruments have emerged as the greatest probable threat to security.

The pursuit and progress of new and emerging technologies cannot and must not be stopped, but they must be directed solely for the benefit of mankind and not for destructive purposes. Unfortunately, signs of an emergent arms race constructed on a new range of technologies and going beyond mere qualitative changes in the current means and methods of warfare, and also distinct from militarization of outer space, are clearly discernible. While efforts and actions to manage and eliminate the existing arms race must go on, steps need to be taken to manage and, if possible, prevent this new arms race.

Hypervelocity and hypersonic delivery vehicles operating at trans-atmospheric altitude bands which were not exploitable thus far, a complete new range of highly lethal and accurate kinetic and directed-energy weapons and sophisticated command and control systems, all in the process of development or maturity, will dramatically enhance long-range selective strike capabilities.

Historically, enhancement of the range and kill probability of weapons has increased the incentives for surprise and pre-emption. The process encourages
reliance on offensive capability and action. At the same time, a shift in the means and methods of warfare from mass destruction to highly selective discrete destruction would tend to remove many of the political, psychological and moral restraints operating so far. This is likely to erode strategic stability even where it continues to rely on nuclear weapons.

The important point to note is that the time to stop the new arms race is now, as much as the time to stop the nuclear arms race was in the early 1940s. We do not underestimate the difficulties in the process. Problems of accurate appreciation of the dual potential of technologies, their maturity status, the assessment of capabilities, verification of agreements concerning their application, and so on, are serious hurdles in the process. However, given the necessary will, short-term realism coupled with long-term idealism can lead to success in fulfilling the aim, stated in the Charter of the United Nations, of saving "succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The key lies in greater trust and transparency in the activities of nations.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Robert Johansen, Institute for International Peace Studies, Notre Dame, United States.

Mr. JOHANSEN: Studies at our Institute and at other peace research centres around the world demonstrate that political leaders now have within their reach the instruments required to tame the war-making impulses of nations. Such an achievement is essential because the only way, ultimately, to prevent nuclear war is to eliminate all war. To accomplish that, we must skilfully graft the next generation of world security institutions onto established United Nations procedures. The purpose is not merely to reduce arms, but to reduce the role of military power in international relations.
Here are five suggestions on how to accomplish that: first, establish a permanent United Nations peace-keeping force. The United Nations needs a standing transnational police force so that no nation must wait for the deployment of a highly trained integrated force when the need arises. The members of the United Nations force should be individually recruited from among volunteers from nations throughout the world rather than be drawn from individual contingents contributed by the national armed forces of United Nations Members as is now done in the ad hoc forces.

The proposed force could establish such a strong reputation for reliability that countries which are now reluctant to draw upon United Nations peace-keeping would become more willing to rely on United Nations peace-keepers rather than resort to the unilateral use of force of their own national armed forces.
The peace-keeping efforts of the United Nations could be enhanced also by giving the Secretary-General advance authority to send United Nations peacekeepers to a ten boundary at any time. Without advance authorization, United Nations peace-keeping can be delayed by Security Council inability to come to an agreement. Under those conditions no country can really rely upon multilateral enforcement of international rules guaranteeing its security. The Assembly should therefore consider inviting all the permanent members of the Security Council to agree in advance, on a purely informal and experimental basis, not to use their veto power to obstruct border patrols ordered by the Secretary-General within certain carefully prescribed guidelines.

My second point concerns the creation of an international monitoring and research agency. Such an agency could utilize new on-site United Nations inspectors and advanced seismic and surveillance technology, aided by satellites and high-altitude aircraft, to warn of and hence possibly deter surprise attacks. Such an agency could be used to accumulate evidence to confirm or deny alleged border violations, such as between Nicaragua and Honduras; to monitor and implement cease-fires, such as the Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai in 1982; to assist United Nations peacekeepers and observer patrols; to discourage clandestine tests of warheads or missiles; or to hamper covert operations aimed at manipulating political events in smaller nations.

My third suggestion is to create the status of United Nations-protected countries. When United Nations peacekeepers can guarantee a small country's security more effectively than that country's national armed forces acting on their own, United Nations-protected countries will become a realistic possibility. Such countries would not then need to maintain a full-scale national military force with offensive capabilities, because those offensive capabilities obviously lead to
military rivalries and build-ups. Instead, they could rely on United Nations peace-keeping to enhance their security while they would adhere to regional or global plans for strict limitation of military forces to non-offensive defences.

Permanent global agencies for peace-keeping and for monitoring would also set the stage for eliminating military intervention by globally or regionally hegemonic nations.

Fourthly, I propose the demilitarization of the common heritage. To plant the idea that institutions acting on behalf of the world community can begin a demilitarizing process and to enable nations collectively to hold one another accountable for enforcing demilitarization as it occurs, the Assembly should call for the establishment of a modest degree of global governance over those parts of the earth not now claimed under national sovereign control: outer space, Antarctica and the high seas. The purpose of this would be not only to govern these ecologically vital parts of the biosphere for the benefit of the species, but to make them permanently free of all national armed forces.

We propose finally the convening of a conference, procedurally similar to the Conference on the Law of the Sea, focused on building world security institutions. The purpose of this, of course, is to acknowledge that it is hard to get nations to disarm very far until there is a substitute that can provide for their security through multilateral means.

Each of the preceding steps could be taken without jeopardizing any nation's security, but not one will be taken unless the Governments most committed to establishing reliable multilateral mechanisms for peace-keeping take a firm stand. The key is a diplomatic programme designed gradually to replace national armed forces, which are now pitted against one another's interests, with United Nations-authorized peace-keepers who will eventually enforce the global community's interest in world peace.
The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Horst Heininger of the Institute of International Politics and Economics of Berlin, the German Democratic Republic.

Mr. HEININGER: I have come here to address the Committee on behalf of the Institute of International Politics and Economics of the German Democratic Republic, which functions in close co-operation with our country's Scientific Council for Peace Research.

Studies concerning disarmament and détente rank high in our agenda of priorities. That research orientation cannot be separated from the fact that my country is geographically located right along the line that divides the world's two most important military alliances. The destructive potential of Eastern and Western Europe massed in that central region is 20 times higher than that in other parts of the world. For decades, we have lived with the worry of sitting on a powder-keg. We perceive any military concept aimed at the regionalization of nuclear or conventional war as a threat to our very existence. We consider the present system of mutual nuclear deterrence as a danger, entailing the conditions for ever-new stages of the arms race, primarily its qualitative aspect. Nuclear deterrence is also unreasonable. At the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe all States in our region undertook a commitment to respect the political and territorial status quo. There are intensive political, economic, humanitarian and cultural links between East and West. What could be a greater burden on this situation and on its positive development than nuclear threats and counter-threats?

Can the future of our region be built on a foundation of fear and suspicion? In our view, that is impossible, and we are therefore seeking ways by which to replace deterrence with a comprehensive system of international security. The foundation for our common European house should be stable and sound, and should be made up of confidence and co-operation rather than mistrust and mutual fear.
It is our most urgent objective to reduce nuclear confrontation both in our own region and in the rest of the world. A conflict between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Treaty Organization fought with nuclear weapons would not only devastate the European continent and render it uninhabitable, but would trigger global conflict. Our whole planet and our civilization would be doomed to perish. A nuclear-weapon-free zone in central Europe, therefore, is of global importance. We see nuclear-weapon-free zones as steps by which to overcome nuclear deterrence and to establish a world free of nuclear weapons.

We are approaching 20 to 22 June, when more than 800 representatives of Governments, parliaments and public opinion from all over the world will gather in Berlin, the capital of my country, to attend an international meeting on nuclear-weapon-free zones. At that forthcoming gathering we shall discuss possible ways to set up, guarantee and verify nuclear-weapon-free zones with due consideration for the security interests of all.

Withdrawal of nuclear weapons to the territories of States that claim nuclear status should be undertaken in a step-by-step, negotiated and verified manner and if possible should lead to the total elimination of those weapons. In our capacity as researchers, we strongly feel that we have to reject a point made by some politicians in Western Europe, according to which nuclear weapons and their incredible destructive power are indispensable deterrents against war.
(Mr. Heiniger)

We feel that position to be unacceptable, and not only because it insinuates an intention of military attack or threat. It is intolerable because of the consequences even a conventional war could have for a region in which the destruction of over 200 nuclear reactors, numerous chemical industries and highly concentrated power, supply and transport systems would most severely jeopardize the very foundations of life.

At the first National Peace Congress of scholars of the German Democratic Republic to be held in November of this year we shall submit papers producing hard evidence to the effect that any progress in human civilization and the development of modern industries requires respect for peace and the advancement of international co-operation.

We want our own studies to support research being conducted by colleagues in other countries, and, in making our contribution to international co-operation, we wish to set an example that can be followed in other areas where co-operation is just as necessary.

A policy of commonsense and realism, such as we are demanding, must comply with that objective necessity. It is in that spirit that we offer to place our research efforts at the service of peace. Let us take a joint stand against the dangerous squandering of human work and wisdom, as well as of natural and social resources, on preparations for war and confrontation.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Nazir Kamal, Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Mr. KAMAL: The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), in Geneva, recently published the proceedings of the International Conference of Disarmament Research Institutes, which was held in March of this year. The publication includes a report prepared by me that is directly relevant to the work of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to
disarmament. At the outset, therefore, I would invite the attention of representatives to that report, which is entitled "The United Nations Third Special Session on Disarmament: Views of an Outside Observer." In my brief statement I shall limit myself to a few remarks on some important issues discussed in that report.

There is an apparent turn towards greater pragmatism among United Nations Member States as a whole. An active role by the United States could prove very useful in strengthening those encouraging trends and facilitating the Organization's evolution towards a more effective and business-like institution. The United States can recover at least some of its lost influence by playing a more dynamic role.

The importance of reaching an agreement in the strategic arms reduction talks (START) should prevail over any impetuous pursuit of the strategic defence initiative (SDI). One way of preventing an arms race could be to consider Senator Sam Nunn's idea of a very limited defence against accidental missile launch. That would be more than a short-term approach to the problem, and there would be greater assurance of the durability of a START agreement. It could later prove highly destabilizing to strategic arms reduction if current differences over SDI were papered over in a desperate bid for results. In theory, the idea of a co-operative transition offers a way of protecting a START agreement. In practice, however, that could prove illusory.

SDI has unsettled the régime of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM). In addition, SDI's nuclear-pumped laser weapon poses a potential threat to the Partial Test-Ban Treaty of 1963, whose ban on nuclear explosions extends to outer space.

The concluding document of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should categorically oppose both the introduction of SDI
weapons and its early deployment. Alternatively, both of those positions could be reflected in two separate paragraphs in order to avoid reservations on one or the other to the extent possible.

There has been progress in recent months towards fashioning a mandate for conventional arms-control negotiations in Europe. General Secretary Gorbachev's stated acceptance of the idea of asymmetrical reductions and some other concerns of the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are important and promising steps forward.

It is a pity that 15 years of negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions (MBFR) have proved singularly unproductive. It is important not only for Europe's evolution but also for the vitality of the over-all arms-control process that East-West conventional stability talks should begin as soon as possible and be sustained by resolute efforts.

Recent changes in the Soviet posture have greatly strengthened the case for arms control. The current opportunities could prove ephemeral unless they are seized in good faith. The arms-control process should not become a selective, short-term affair. Equally important, it should be supported by multilateral mechanisms for preventing and resolving armed conflicts and for reducing the utility of military power.

The developing countries, especially the major regional States, need to demonstrate a greater interest in arms control. The focus on the big Powers should not overshadow the importance of regional initiatives. There has been no major initiative since the abortive Ayacucho Declaration of 1974. South Asia should be regarded as one of the prime areas for focusing arms-control efforts, duly supported by the big Powers.

The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should also highlight the mutually reinforcing relationship between disarmament
and international security. Progress should be urged particularly towards strengthening the United Nations role in the maintenance of international peace and security. The work of the Special Committee on that subject should attract attention and elicit a supportive response.

Finally, as on previous occasions, there will presumably be an agreement in principle at the third special session to hold a further special session after an appropriate interval. It is only as a regular, ongoing process that special sessions can best assist the task of consensus-building and can become a dynamic mechanism for dialogue and a factor of some practical consequence.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. A.G. Arbatov, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Moscow. I invite him to make his statement.

Mr. ARBATOV (interpretation from Russian): First of all, on behalf of our Institute I wish to express to you our sincere thanks for the opportunity to address you here today.

The Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEI) is a non-governmental organization research centre financed by the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union. The Institute carries out pure and applied research on economic and political trends in world development, including contemporary global problems and disarmament and security issues. Having conducted a comprehensive analysis of current disarmament and international-security problems, we would like to present to delegations the Institute's following recommendations, which are also available in more detail in writing.

We propose, inter alia, to ensure the effectiveness of the Final Document adopted by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and we would appeal to all members or the world community to strive to implement the provisions of that Final Document in respect to the new political situation in the world and in the spirit of a new philosophy of security.
(Mr. Arbatov)

We must contribute to the noble cause of eliminating the nuclear threat facing mankind by supporting the current bilateral process of nuclear-arms reduction and by ensuring that that process moves ahead smoothly and that it is all-embracing and multilateral in nature.

We must take decisions that would give impetus to the Conference on Disarmament and that would make possible the elaboration of the convention on a complete and total ban on chemical weapons in order to initiate disarmament in that very important area.
Support is necessary for the negotiations now beginning on conventional stability in Europe and to encourage the initiation of negotiations on drastic reductions in other regions in conventional arms and armed forces.

We must encourage negotiations to reduce naval armaments and activities.

There should be detailed discussion of how to enhance the United Nations role in verification, including how the existing national, bilateral and regional verification régimes could be complemented by creating a comprehensive verification system within the framework of the United Nations.

Particular attention should be given to qualitative aspects of the arms race and the impact of military technological advances on disarmament and international security and to enhancing the role of the United Nations in controlling emerging military technologies and involving scientific and academic circles in elaborating ways and means of preventing the use of scientific and technological achievements to threaten the security of mankind.

In more general terms we recognize the need to enhance the role of the United Nations in disarmament. The Security Council, which according to the United Nations Charter has practical functions in the sphere of controlling armaments, could join in international efforts to promote disarmament. Among other things, it could use its rarely exercised powers to consider and investigate situations that could lead to international conflicts and disputes. The Council could at periodic meetings deal with situations caused by the non-participation of many countries in multilateral agreements on disarmament, especially when weapons of mass destruction are involved and the States concerned are in conflict. The final goal of such action would be the promotion of an effective system of arms limitation which could serve as a most important factor in ensuring nuclear security for all States.
Today mankind has a historic opportunity: we can step into the age of disarmament. We would express the hope that the third special session devoted to disarmament will take into account the recommendations we have made, which are based on an analysis of historical experience and the needs of the present generation and future generations.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Marek Thee, of the International Institute for Peace, Vienna.

Mr. THEE: In today's world disarmament has become a historical imperative. Three dramatic developments in the domain of armaments underlie this: first, the growing size of military arsenals of increasingly sophisticated nuclear and conventional weapon systems, which are too likely to get out of control at a moment of crisis; secondly, the uninterrupted arms race aimed at improving existing weapons as well as developing more fearful exotic arms using so-called new physical principles including hyper-velocity kinetic energy weapons and nuclear-pumped X-ray directed-energy weapons; and, thirdly, the intense drive to militarize outer space, along with the emergence of new war-fighting military doctrines.

Moreover we now have a unique historic opportunity to move vigorously and determinedly to halt and reverse the accelerating armaments spiral. The policies of glasnost and perestroika in the Soviet Union, together with the keen desire of the West to lessen international tension, have created a propitious climate for genuine disarmament. Decision makers of East and West should seize this momentous opportunity to open a new chapter in the establishment of peace among nations.

A necessary precondition is that we grasp the dynamics of contemporary armaments. Today's arms race is predominantly qualitative in nature, projected into the future by the incessant labour of a million highly qualified scientists and engineers in military laboratories throughout the world. We must restrain and halt that drive, before it is too late. In addition to quantitative
limitations, arms control and disarmament first of all urgently require qualitative curbs. Of overriding importance are such measures as a comprehensive nuclear test ban and a ban on the testing of new strategic weapon systems. These are long overdue. Exotic weapon systems in the military laboratories have to be nipped in the bud if the emergence of new and increasingly ominous arms is to be avoided.

The historic task of humanity today is to abolish nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century. This calls for the revival of the basic principles of general and complete disarmament endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in the early 1960s. To pave the way and stimulate the progress of disarmament, we need comprehensive confidence-building measures on land and sea, aimed at removing mistrust and building greater openness in security affairs. Well developed confidence-building measures should significantly facilitate force reductions in both conventional and nuclear weapons. Confidence and mutual trust are essential prerequisites for creative and constructive efforts towards solving the outstanding problems of peace-making on the basis of common security.

In addition to saving humanity from the danger of a cataclysmic war, disarmament should also pave the way for the general betterment of the human condition. Disarmament and development are irrevocably interlinked. Disarmament would release sizeable material resources that could be used for development. More important, since science and technology today are crucial vehicles for human development, disarmament would liberate considerable human resources now in the service of military research and development, thus freeing them for productive developmental efforts. This should make a major difference to economic performance, productivity and the progress of human civilization.

For such a global transformation of human horizons, we need to change perceptions and attitudes so as to decouple peace and security, as far as possible, from military hardware, associating them instead with co-operative developmental
(Mr. Thee)

efforts to satisfy basic human needs. Lasting peace cannot rest on the power of arms. It must be built on the fulfilment of the vital social, economic, cultural and ecological requirements of humankind.

Genuine disarmament will contribute decisively to such a transformation.

The CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Ms. Nittza Nachmias, of the Israeli Institute for the Study of International Affairs.
Ms. NACHMIAS: On behalf of the Israeli Institute for the Study of International Affairs and its Director, Professor Mushkat, I bring a greeting of peace to this important session devoted to disarmament.

The people and the Government of Israel recognize the most urgent need to contain the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Israel has stated repeatedly that it will not be the first country to introduce nuclear weapons to the Middle East. In the face of the terrible threat that nuclear weapons pose to the world, the Israeli Government offered to negotiate with its neighbours a non-proliferation agreement that would turn the region into a nuclear-free zone for ever. Israel is willing to enter into such negotiations immediately and without any pre-conditions. Israel regrets profoundly, and wishes to reiterate this before the representatives of the world community, the unfortunate fact that its neighbours have consistently rejected its offers of peace and negotiations. Any progress towards non-proliferation and the attainment of a nuclear-free-zone agreement requires the co-operation of all the countries of the region. Neither conventional arms reduction nor non-proliferation of nuclear weapons can be achieved as long as Israel's neighbours refuse to come to the negotiating table.

The Israeli Government affirmed its commitment to honour the rights of the Palestinian people when it accepted Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which established the principle of land for peace. Hence arguments that Israel's refusal to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people is the cause of the fierce hostility and terrible violence in the region are completely invalid. Israel reaffirmed this commitment when it signed the peace treaty with Egypt. The treaty stated clearly that Israel would continue all its endeavours in the search for peace and promised to respect the rights of the
Palestinian people. This commitment is in effect and has never been revoked, although some members of the Israeli Cabinet are reluctant to agree to an a priori promise of the exchange of land for peace.

While there is no consensus yet in Israel as to the exchange of land for peace, there is universal agreement on the need to stop the arms race and ensure that the region remains free of nuclear weapons. The vast military budgets and the money spent on weapons by all the countries of the region could and should be used to promote social and economic development. For example, the military expenditure of Saudi Arabia, which is only a part of its defence budget, was over $22 billion in 1986, only $2 billion less than China's, and as much as that of West Germany and France. Iraq, Iran and Libya were not far behind. Egypt and Israel lag, with military expenditures of about $5 billion each per year. We have just been informed that Syria will soon receive a new arms package from the Soviet Union, which will include Tupolev-22 and MIG-31 jets as well as advanced surface-to-air missiles.

Indeed, there are correlations between the arms race, danger of war, especially nuclear war, economic well-being and peace. No advance towards peace is possible without a major reduction in conventional and nuclear weapons. The military-industrial complex world wide hinders the process of disarmament. Arms manufacturers are indifferent to either human suffering or the threat of war. They are usually motivated by the drive for economic benefits and not by genuine security concerns. Moreover, the free-market economy system impedes efforts to regulate the defence industry and control the arms race.

We hope that at this session the General Assembly will recognize the urgency of the global situation and move from words to action. Let us work together for the elimination of human suffering, animosities and hatred. Let us live in peace and harmony and advance the humanitarian values to which we all subscribe.
The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Lloyd Dumas, of the National Commission for Economic Conversion and Disarmament, Washington.

Mr. DUMAS: The dogged pursuit of the international arms race has undermined the productive competence and economic well-being of even the strongest and most developed economies among its participants. The damage it has done to the prospects of those nations struggling to develop has been correspondingly more severe and more painful.

More important, the international arms race has led to a massive reduction in both national and world security. Now we all live in one world, sharing the ever-present threat of the termination of human society and perhaps the extinction of our species by global nuclear war. Whether such war comes by intention, escalation or accident, it is the logical end that the arms race will impose on us, if we do not find the wisdom to impose an end to the arms race.

If the arms race is so obviously counter-productive, why has it been so difficult to end? In part it is because each step taken by each participating nation appears to be effective in maintaining its security in the face of the last step taken by its opponents. However, the result of all these short-term steps is a reduction in everyone's security. In part, then, we are trapped by our own myopia.

But it is a mistake to assume that all the major factors which contribute to the international arms race lie in the realm of international affairs. There are also powerful internal factors that drive the arms race and stand as obstacles to its termination. In every participating nation - whether capitalist, socialist or communist - there are many people who benefit economically, socially or politically from the continuation of this arms race. They are not cold-hearted warmongers, nor are they necessarily ignorant of the damage the arms race is doing. They have come
to believe that their own economic and social well-being, that of their families and their local communities, depend on a continued flow of military spending. They do not want to be sacrificed on the altar of disarmament. This powerful internal obstacle to disarmament can be overcome by creating alternatives for those who find themselves dependent on the arms race. That is the essence of the process of planning for economic conversion.

Military spending can be as dangerously addictive to an economy as drugs or alcohol can be to an individual. There are many parallels. In the short term, it can appear to be an effective stimulant, creating jobs and increasing income. In the long term, however, continued overuse destroys the health of the economy by diverting critical resources from activities that increase economic well-being. Even after it becomes clear that the addiction is doing great damage, it is very difficult to stop, because stopping is likely to cause a great deal of pain and suffering.

Both our physical security and our economic well-being require that a significant fraction of the productive resources currently being poured into the militaries of the world be shifted to productive, civilian-oriented activity. To do this efficiently and smoothly is the mandate of economic conversion. It is a kind of detoxification programme for addicted economies.

The essence of the conversion problem is similar, regardless of whether a nation's economy is market-oriented or planned. It is more a problem of the enterprise than a problem of how the wider economy is organized. It is not reasonable to expect that people accustomed to serving the military will be able to function effectively in the very different civilian world without substantial retraining, reorientation and restructuring.
There are two compelling reasons why it is vital for all participants in this arms race to begin conversion planning now, rather than waiting for arms reduction agreements to be signed. Planning to convert is a lengthy process. Plans made now can save years of unnecessary delay and disruption once those agreements are achieved. Much more important, advanced planning for conversion will reassure those whose livelihoods depend on the arms race. This will greatly reduce at least one key internal obstacle to disarmament.

Many centuries ago the Roman writer Vegetius proclaimed in the fourth century, "Let him who desires peace, prepare for war". A few decades ago, one of the most brilliant and creative minds of modern times, Albert Einstein, said "You cannot simultaneously prepare for and prevent war". The long stretch of history since the time of Vegetius has been filled with attempts to deter aggression through military strength. It has also been filled with war. The twentieth century alone has seen over 200 wars. They continue even in the face of the overwhelming threat of nuclear holocaust. Perhaps it is time for us to stop listening to Vegetius and give Einstein a chance.
Advanced planning for conversion is an important part of preparing for peace. Any nation that undertakes such planning sends a clear, concrete signal of its commitment to serious arms reduction and its dedication to a more secure world.

Our nations will ultimately have to do just what we tell them to do, for we are their life-blood. We have many differences, we speak in many languages; but in this we must speak with one voice: "We want peace, we shall prepare for peace, and we will accept nothing less".

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Walter Dorn, of the Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Canada.

Mr. DORN: It can be said that disarmament and security are inexorably linked; in the style of mathematicians, that disarmament is necessary, but not sufficient, for security. Disarmament depends on the establishment of a strong system of comprehensive security. Mechanisms to enhance compliance with treaties strengthen security and thus help the cause of peace.

We should therefore like to put forward three specific, bold and realizable proposals relating to arms control verification and compliance.

This is the first proposal. An international verification and monitoring system could be established as a new United Nations agency. Since verification and monitoring are a necessary part of every arms-control and disarmament treaty, it would be advantageous to have a single integrated agency to oversee these tasks for past, present and future treaties. The agency could gain its information from its own international technical means as well as from Governments and other agencies and through civilian reporting. We feel that it is better to establish and build on a general verification and monitoring agency than to construct an agency for each treaty. The International Atomic Energy Agency is currently responsible for supervising the Non-Proliferation Treaty; it might serve as a good model for the more general United Nations agency. At the present time, we wish to add our
support to the proposal put forward by six nations for such a comprehensive verification and monitoring system to act as an umbrella organization for more treaty-specific arrangements. This is an opportunity that we, as national and non-governmental-organization representatives cannot afford to miss.

You may have noticed the satellite dish next to the cafeteria here at United Nations Headquarters. This is to communicate with peace-keeping forces around the world. Why can we not have a second dish, to be used to monitor events around the world and report back directly to the United Nations?

Our second proposal relates to citizen reporting of non-compliance.

While "verification" usually implies the use of highly sophisticated technology, such as satellite surveillance or seismology, or various forms of on-site inspection, there should be a new, supplementary method: reporting by citizens who perhaps work at the production site of illicit weapons or who live in the area and have observed signs of illicit production or deployment. Certainly, for any medium-scale or large-scale treaty violation, a large industrial or military effort by the offending nation would have to be mounted, and a number of citizens of that nation would undoubtedly come to know of it, or at least suspect it. Would they be willing to report it? There might be two reasons why they might not: they might consider it unpatriotic, or they might fear reprisals by their Government.

To counteract the first objection, we suggest the following provisions: As part of new disarmament treaties, participating nations would be required to announce to their people that it would henceforth be the civic duty of all citizens to report to international inspectors any suspicious activity that has come to their attention. With that sanction, even exhortation, by their own Governments, patriotic citizens would feel more at ease about reporting, would indeed consider it their duty, and it could be made illegal under national laws to punish such
persons. With regard to the fear of reprisals, measures could be developed to protect the anonymity of informers. This combination of provisions would make citizen-reporting a feasible supplementary method of verification. It would be particularly valuable, if not absolutely necessary, in cases where other methods of detection and identification are difficult, such as the verification of cruise missiles.

The third proposal relates to measures to promote compliance.

In order to promote compliance with arms-control treaties, we suggest that further studies by the United Nations and by Governments on the legal authority and the administrative structures of treaty-administering agencies be carried out. Such considerations should go in tandem with research on verification. Verification can only determine the occurrence of a violation, not stop it or forbid it. In addition, disputes may arise when a violation is alleged. Who will decide? Something like a court of arbitration may be needed. Another problem is what to do about a violation once it is shown to be genuine. We should find ways to save the treaty while stopping the violation and compensating for any damage done. Again, a treaty-administering agency would be necessary to carry out such a process. Thought must be given to its structure, method of voting, and so forth, to make it both fair and effective. It could perhaps apply a progression of graduated measures, as does the International Labour Organisation: first a gentle nudge made in confidentiality, then a warning by a wider body, followed by a public reprimand, and so on, until compliance is obtained. These and related problems are now being studied by a group called PACT - Protection of Arms Control Treaties - in Hamilton, Ontario.

In making those proposals, we realize that if the United Nations is to establish any new mechanisms or agencies, it must do these tasks well. We have
chosen these specific proposals because we feel that they are suitable and we are confident that the United Nations could perform these tasks excellently.

The twenty-first century belongs to multilateralism and to the United Nations. Let us together prepare for it - as nations in this forum, as non-governmental organizations in our native lands, and as individuals in our hearts.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Nikolai Shaskolsky, of the Scientific Council on Peace and Disarmament Research, Moscow.

Mr. SHASKOLSKY (interpretation from Russian): I have the honour of addressing this important meeting on behalf of the Scientific Council on Peace and Disarmament Research, in Moscow, USSR. The Council consists of prominent Soviet scientists, experts in the social sciences - primarily in international relations - outstanding representatives of the natural sciences and political and public figures.

The Scientific Council, which was founded 10 years ago, has become one of the centres of scientific and social thought and international co-operation by Soviet scholars carrying out research in the field of peace and disarmament. In 1988 the United Nations Secretary-General awarded the Scientific Council the "Peace Champion" diploma.

Soviet scientists take an active part in perestroika, which affects all aspects of life in our society. They have made a valuable contribution to the elaboration of the new political thinking according to which our contradictory world is seen as a single and interconnected whole. At the same time, we realize that science-based elaboration of these problems is in its initial stage and there is still much work to be done.

As the dynamism of international life gains momentum, a qualified and timely assessment of new tendencies and a study of problems not yet clearly understood are
becoming particularly important. Let me draw your attention to only one of such problems: that of curbing the naval arms race. For a number of years this problem has been discussed by the United Nations, but adequate research has not yet been carried out in this field.

The Soviet Union has proposed the convening of a special international conference on naval issues, including naval-force reductions. The strengthening of peace and security on the seas is vitally important to the safeguarding of peace on the planet. A naval arms race does grave damage to the solution of one of the key global problems - the development of the oceans of the world for peaceful purposes. Preparatory research work for such an international conference is the professional duty of scientists.
One of the top priority tasks is to work out criteria for defining the levels of reasonable sufficiency of naval forces for purposes of defence. That is not an easy task. Due to the specificity of performance characteristics of naval armaments they can produce a particularly destabilizing effect. Under conditions of hostilities at sea the tasks of both defence and offence were traditionally solved by the same means: the ships of the enemy were to be destroyed in both cases.

The existing methods of assessment of regional military balances should be revised, taking into account the possibility of the free movement of maritime weapon-carrying platforms on the high seas. Obviously, the solution could be found by limiting areas of navigation for warships of particular types, and the elaboration of a detailed, mutually acceptable concept of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace in the world's oceans, by limiting and banning certain types of naval armaments and by extending confidence-building measures to agreed-upon areas of the oceans. Scientists are needed to help in elaborating the means of verification of the presence of nuclear arms on board ships. The verification would be significantly facilitated if the proposal for the "non-nuclear navy" were to be adopted - that is, a complete ban on the stationing of any nuclear weapons on board ships.

The naval aspect of European security has not been sufficiently developed. There are many other problems also, so we are faced with the task of raising this field of science to a higher level.

Discussion of disarmament issues at this special session and the resolutions to be adopted will give a new impetus to the efforts of the Scientific Council and of Soviet scientists and scholars who are trying to make a contribution to solving the problems of peace and disarmament.
The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Ambassador Dr. Inga Thorsson, of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

MRS. THORSSON: The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) is proud and honoured to have the opportunity to report to the Committee of the Whole on its research for the purpose of benefiting disarmament, security and peace. By necessity I have to make a piecemeal report.

First, SIPRI is of course pursuing its continuing activities in producing the Yearbook and in covering events in the international arms trade.

As far as the latter task is concerned, I shall only make the general remark that experience of competitive market pressures shows the virtual impossibility for Governments to address the arms transfer problems successfully through unilateral action. Thus, collective action through the United Nations and regional organizations remains the most promising path towards arms trade control.

Another, as it were, traditional area of research at SIPRI is the possibility of a chemical weapons convention. As a matter of course we share the concerns of army that, after some years of rather successful negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, new obstacles to a final conclusion of such a convention seem to have appeared.

A particular problem here is the time factor involved. Countries must know, as early as possible, what obligations they will be required to meet under a chemical weapons convention. Present negotiation troubles seem, as is so often the case, to be caused by new elements of distrust and lack of confidence. This makes the difficult verification issues all the more important, particularly in the context of recent proposals for an integrated multilateral verification system within the United Nations. Considerations of this kind are among the issues under study at SIPRI.
Turning to ad hoc ongoing research projects, a general remark of mine would be that research on peace, disarmament and security would have to be ahead of events, that is, to try to look into the future and to anticipate developments to come, be they positive or negative to the cause of peace and security, and to conduct serious research as a contribution to reaching the truth of these matters.

Thus the present SIPRI research programme contains projects related to these aims. Let me describe some of them very briefly.

The first is "Security without Nuclear Weapons?" At the Reykjavik summit meeting in 1986, President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev envisioned the abolition of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. The realization of this objective raises questions about the relevance of nuclear weapons in the current security relationship, not only, but first and foremost, between the United States and the Soviet Union and those countries that either directly or indirectly depend upon the skilful management of American-Soviet nuclear relations. Should nuclear weapons be abolished or at least be dramatically reduced, many assumptions about national and international security will be challenged and will most probably have to change. The project as a whole in no way advocates policy. Rather, it aims to increase our understanding of the complex role nuclear weapons have played and our appreciation of the structural and procedural requirements a non-nuclear security environment would entail. Thus the question-mark at the end of the project title symbolizes the key purpose of the study which is to explore questions, not to advocate answers.

The second is that no one challenges the rights of nations, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, to use individual or collective self-defence against an armed attack. But it has become increasingly important to look for such a structure for the conventional armed forces that would promote confidence- and security-building, what is increasingly called a non-provocative defence. The aim of this SIPRI study is to analyse the contribution that this
concept could make to confidence, security and stability in Europe. This seems to be of particular importance as Europe is approaching the start of new negotiations on what might be called conventional stability.

It is hoped that this SIPRI study might be able to contribute towards illuminating possibilities for a change in military doctrine, aiming at new defensive tasks in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact.

The third is that SIPRI will participate in the continuing studies, as a follow-up to the United Nations International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in the autumn of 1987. The SIPRI study will be conducted on the basis of some generally accepted facts about the relationship issue. To quote just a few of these facts: first, the ever-increasing sophistication of defence technology and rapid cost escalation impose impossible financial burdens on arms procurement. Economic constraints therefore may act as potent new instruments of disarmament. Put simply, the world must have arms reductions, not only because the destructive potential of armaments is a threat to global security but also because it cannot afford financially to do otherwise.

Secondly, the economic dimensions of the non-military threats to security must be emphasized, particularly in the light of the experience of the international system in recent years. The fragility of the financial system, the debt crisis, the rise of protectionism, high unemployment, famines and poverty, as well the failure of growth to provide basic needs, are collectively as important for international security as are the various aspects of the arms race.

Indeed, the two types of phenomena are, as we know, interrelated. These brief words might indicate to representatives the ardent wish of SIPRI to be, through its
research activities, of continued use to the international disarmament community. We do hope for a successful outcome of the special session's deliberations during these weeks of June 1988.
The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Jan Oberg, Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research.

Mr. OBERG: The problem is not disarmament but the abolition of war. The problem is not how to prevent war by preparing it but how to prevent war by preparing for peace. The problem is not how to win a war but how to learn to solve or live with conflicts. The problem is not the weapons but the thinking which leads to violent conflict-resolution. The problem is not how to make quantitative cuts in dangerous arsenals but how to switch to a new security thinking. The problem is not military but existential by nature - in our minds, in our nations and in a world society dominated by Western civilization. The problem is that disarmament policies will not lead to peace, but peace leads to disarmament. If we really want peace, we must prepare for peace. That is the solution.

As individual citizens and movements we have a right to a lawful foreign policy, a legitimate right to decide about our security. Accountability of Governments must be strengthened. Of particular importance is women's perspective on care and co-operation. A few hundred human beings, practically all men, ought not to be allowed to run the world's nuclear policies in the future.

Citizens around the world are painfully aware that day-to-day ecological insecurity and economic insecurity are as manifest as military threats. Peace is possible through intelligent integration of security and development. Security is infinitely richer than armament and military defence. Development is infinitely richer than sheer economic growth. Both however are unthinkable without partnership with nature.

These considerations compel a certain amount of not too typical Western humility, a willingness to let things remain untouched. We must learn to see ourselves as man the partner, and stop attempting arrogantly to instrumentalize and control everything from birth - genetic manipulation, for instance - to death -
nuclear extinction, nuclear winter. The stable, democratic and ecologically sound community does not need arms races just as the healthy human being does not need narcotics.

Common security opens the way to a new thinking. Common security provides a framework in the quest for national and international security. It seeks to eliminate the contradictions between the political and the military dimensions of security. Security must be found through co-operation, that is, making oneself safer in civilian as well as military terms while simultaneously increasing the perceived security of the other.

We must emphasize unequivocally that conventional as well as nuclear deterrence is incompatible with common security. Defensive and protective defence is a qualitatively new idea. It meets legitimate needs for self-defence and it gives priority to civilian resistance, economic and social defence, to detargeting and to reducing social vulnerability. It protects people and retains a military component only for defensive struggle and only during a transition period. Common security and defensive defence leave no one defenceless. They provide a safe ground when we forgo all offensive means.

This new philosophy permit no mass-destructive and other offensive weapons, be they conventional, nuclear, chemical or biological, be they land-, sea- or space-based. We appeal as concerned scholars: scrap them all.

We must now move in the direction of common security also at sea. In a recent statement from the Transnational Foundation, we argue for the abolition of the "neither confirm nor deny" policy of nuclear weapons States, for No First Use of sea-based nuclear weapons, for the establishment of zones of nuclear disengagement,
for restraints on anti-submarine warfare and for negotiations aiming at the total elimination of tactical sea-based nuclear weapons as well as nuclear-tipped, sea-based cruise missiles.

Peace zones can integrate common security, legitimate self-defence, freedom from nuclearization, confidence-building and positive steps to enhance the security of third parties and even peace-time stationing of United Nations peacekeeping forces. The goal is increasingly to supplement national defensive defence with international security arrangements.

We all know that we must change the ways we think and act. The real enemy is our tendency to exaggerate the difficulties and underestimate the benefits from changing our course. Let us realize the truth that experimenting for peace is far safer than continuing to experiment with existence itself. The super Powers have taken the first steps in calling off the meaningless cold war. But their interests are not necessarily identical with those of mankind. It is now imperative for citizens, movements, networks, small and medium-sized countries to de-align from nuclearism and militarism and re-link with each other in an independent peace policy.

We possess enough knowledge about the causes of the arms race. We need knowledge and research, yes – but to shape the solutions. We cannot do without wisdom, empathy and global ethics, leading the way from the present militarizing culture to a culture of peace in which true human and social development is secured and security is developed.

In conclusion, disarmament will not lead to peace, but peace will lead to disarmament. Those who want peace prepare for peace, not for war. That is the truth. Perhaps this truth is so simple that only children can understand it. But they are precisely the ones for whose sake we should, finally, give peace a chance.
The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Dr. Siegrid Poellinger of the University Center for Peace Research, Vienna.

Ms. POELLINGER: It is obvious that enormous problems still confront the world in the field of disarmament. However, without ignoring their magnitude, I think it is permissible to say that this is an auspicious moment as far as efforts to reduce armaments and to strengthen the climate of confidence are concerned. Not long ago the super-Powers signed the INF Treaty and, unlike the unfortunate developments after the signing of SALT II, both the Soviet Union and the United States have already ratified the Treaty.

Last week President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev met in Moscow in what has been described as a most positive atmosphere where useful discussions for further arms control agreements took place.

While there are good grounds for hoping that an agreement on halving strategic arms may yet be reached in the not-too-distant future, conventional arms control now seems to be moving towards the top of the international agenda.

The place where we may look for these achievements is Vienna, more precisely, within the framework of the current follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) in the Austrian capital. As a member of the Austrian delegation to that Conference, I have been following the progress and the tribulations of the meeting for almost two years, sometimes full of hope, sometimes with a measure of frustration. There are hopes now that that Conference, despite remaining difficult negotiations - will conclude successfully by the end of this year.
The delegations of the neutral and non-aligned European States have prepared the draft of a final document offering possible compromise solutions for questions still in dispute. That document has been accepted as a basis for further negotiations on the final concluding document. Moreover, a large measure of agreement, if not a consensus, has already been achieved on the next steps to be taken in the field of disarmament.

First, the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) have agreed that negotiations on reducing the risk of war will take place building on the results already achieved at the Stockholm Conference that was concluded two years ago. Secondly, and in parallel, conventional stability talks will take place within the framework of the CSCE process, but will in fact involve only the 23 States belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. These negotiations are expected to replace the MBFR talks on conventional disarmament in central Europe, which have been going on in Vienna for the past 15 years. The main difference is that this new conference will deal with the whole of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals including the Mediterranean area, whereas the MBFR talks, in which France did not participate, concerned themselves with central Europe only.

Despite these positive developments I feel I must add a word of caution. The MBFR talks were not as unsuccessful as was generally believed. In fact, considerable progress was made, even if no agreement was reached. It is to be hoped that all the positive achievements and lessons learned will be carried over on the agenda, and that the new conference will not start from scratch.

In conclusion, I feel I must turn to another point. Talks on disarmament have concentrated on Europe, certainly the area with the highest concentration of conventional forces in peacetime. However, while that area has been spared the
horrors of war since 1945, regional conflicts have continued practically without interruption. Whereas promising efforts are being made to reduce armaments in Europe, the flow of weapons to the third world has continued unchecked. If nothing is done to correct that imbalance, these weapons will directly or indirectly fall back with a vengeance on the industrialized nations.

The crux of the matter is this: Disarmament alone, however much we all may wish for it, will not lead to confidence among nations. Rather, it is confidence-building measures that will pave the road to disarmament; that is the surest road to security and peace everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN: The final speaker is Mr. Tapio Varis of the University for Peace of San José, Costa Rica.

Mr. VARIS (interpretation from Spanish): Addressing the General Assembly yesterday, His Excellency Mr. Oscar Arias Sanchez, President of the Republic of Costa Rica, expressed his gratitude for the clear-cut and unconditional support of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General for Central American peace efforts. He said:

"I am pleased as well to take this opportunity to call attention to the efforts of the United Nations to show the world that disarmament and development are subjects that should be discussed together. This is a reality we cannot go on ignoring. My own country is the best example of the fact that without weapons there is a true opportunity for development. I would like also to express our thanks for their encouragement of the work of the University for Peace in Costa Rica". (A/S-15/PV.12, p. 29-30)
The General Assembly established the University for Peace in 1980. Recently we have made major contributions in support of the Central American peace process, by organizing courses in conflict resolution and negotiation, by registering information relating to Esquipulas II, and so forth.

Aiming to develop as an academic institution entirely dedicated to peace, the University for Peace is devoting its efforts to the study of peace, to education for peace and to human rights. To attain that goal, the University's activities will focus on: training educators and communicators for peace and the formulation of syllabuses for peace at various levels; making the University a centre for information on peace and related subjects; and providing monitoring, analysis and intellectual support for the world peace process, especially the Central American peace process.

One example of our work is a course in conflict negotiation and settlement, which we are holding in Costa Rica and Nicaragua. It is intended to contribute to the Central American peace process, and is being offered to other Central American Governments and opposition groups.

In the sphere of studies and research, the University for Peace published in January its Second White Paper. The report has been distributed widely in Central America and the rest of Latin America, and made a contribution to the work of the International Verification and Follow-up Commission of the Esquipulas II agreement. We have decided to publish a third report on the peace process, which will be included in a book on the peace plan, containing an introduction to the Central American crisis, the development of Contadora and the complete Esquipulas II process.

Among our projects is research on the security of inter-oceanic sea-lanes through the Central American isthmus, on the protection of children in armed conflicts and on the status of women in Central America.
In a region like Central America, the problem is conventional weapons and low-intensity warfare. We are studying various problems of security, such as regional insurgencies, conflicts between States, threats from outside the region, and so forth.

We are engaged in projects on the effects of militarization on natural resources and the environment. We are participating in the establishment of peace parks in border areas where conflicts are under way.

Finally, one of the most serious problems with respect to continuing the peace process is confidence building. We have drafted a report on "Communication, the exercise of power in the world and peace". A central aspect of this report is the role of communication in the confidence-building process. In our Second White Paper on progress in implementing the Central American peace agreement, we concluded, *inter alia*, that the Esquipulas II machinery, especially its Executive Commission, may be viewed as a means:
first, to promote concerted initiatives of a regional, inter-American or international nature designed to establish confidence-building measures in respect of security and in connection with economic, political, cultural and communication matters; and, secondly, to study regional and national action in the communications field and in the various media, including regionally oriented press, radio and television programmes that can be disseminated in all countries with a view to promoting mutual confidence-building measures.

We believe that it is precisely such mutual confidence that we need today, a common language. We need academic and scientific work to create a climate for international policy-making and to resolve regional conflicts and make progress towards disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker for this afternoon. I now call upon Sister Mary Beth Reissen and Ms. Edith Ballantyne, who have asked to make a joint statement.

Sister MARY BETH REISSEN: We should like to report on the consultation held this afternoon at United Nations Headquarters on the World Disarmament Campaign. More than 100 participants took part in the consultation. The consultation was sponsored by the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs and the NGO Disarmament Committees in Geneva and New York.

The participants expressed their appreciation of the World Disarmament Campaign. They underlined the fact that the World Disarmament Campaign was conceived as bringing together the United Nations system, Governments and non-governmental organizations, which, in turn, reach out to grass-roots movements. This partnership has already borne fruit. It has stimulated activities of non-governmental organizations and has broadened the knowledge of United Nations efforts in the field of disarmament. It was recognized that that partnership offered a much greater potential. We therefore urge Governments, in evaluating the
World Disarmament Campaign, to recognize that potential and provide greater support to the World Disarmament Campaign by increasing their financial contributions to it and their participation in developing its programmes.

Ms. EDITH BALLANTYNE: The participants in the consultation made the following proposals:

1. To promote more imaginative World Disarmament Campaign audio-visual material.

2. To involve non-governmental organizations to a greater extent in planning and preparing materials.

3. To plan speedier receipt of materials, such as the use of electronic delivery, so that non-governmental organizations would receive the material in time to promote disarmament activities.

4. To make the World Disarmament Campaign known in all regions of the world.

5. To expand participation of scientific organizations in the World Disarmament Campaign.

6. To develop World Disarmament Campaign materials to reflect the new concept of the relationship between disarmament and common security.

7. To make greater use of the possibilities non-governmental organizations have to communicate with various professional groups - media, educators, scientists, health workers and so on.

8. To develop programmes to help mobilize women for the World Disarmament Campaign.

9. To be alert to promoting United Nations Decades and International Years in the World Disarmament Campaign, for example the forthcoming International Literacy Year, with special reference to reaching the disenfranchised.
10. To link specific non-governmental organization disarmament activities, such as the promotion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, a nuclear-weapons freeze and nuclear-weapon-free zones, to the World Disarmament Campaign.

11. To include non-governmental organizations in planning, preparing and carrying such World Disarmament Campaign activities as regional conferences and seminars.

12. To increase the effectiveness of the World Disarmament Campaign by greater co-ordination within the United Nations system.

13. To concentrate on specific ways of implementing the final documents of the special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

14. To have celebrities - such as Nobel Peace Prize laureates, for example - as roving ambassadors for the World Disarmament Campaign.

The World Disarmament Campaign needs the full support of Governments, the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations. We urge that the third special session give a new impetus to the strengthening of this partnership.

We would appreciate this statement's being transmitted to the Chairman of Working Group III, where the World Disarmament Campaign will be considered.

The CHAIRMAN: This brings us to the end of our meeting today. I should like to thank all the non-governmental organizations for the statements made by their representatives in the Committee of the Whole. They have addressed a wide range of very important issues, and I have no doubt that their valuable contributions will have a positive impact on the deliberations of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

I should like to thank you once again.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.