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The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Mieczyslaw Maneli, representative of the Israeli Institute for the Study of International Affairs.

Mr. MANELI (Israeli Institute for the Study of International Affairs): Scholars from many countries participate in the work of the Israeli Institute. Every member of this organization represents his own philosophy, although we each acknowledge certain common principles.

I am an American, a Professor of Law and Political Science and Chairman of the Center for the Study of Ethics and Public Policy at Queens College of the City University of New York. The thoughts I wish to share with you are my own, and I alone am responsible for them.

In 1979 an international group held a conference in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. European, American and Arab intellectuals discussed various aspects of the peace process in the Middle East. The messages sent to the conference on behalf of the President of Israel, the President of the United States and the President of Egypt, the late Anwar Sadat, were a great inspiration to us.

The main methodological conclusion that we reached during that conference is as follows. No complicated or international problem can be resolved by one stroke of the pen. A lasting solution, acceptable to all, may be reached through an evolutionary chain of solutions to seemingly minor questions. Such partial solutions may cause a whole chain of events to move towards peace.

The problem of disarmament should be considered from that point of view. Disarmament cannot constitute a single act that is accepted and executed once and for all. Disarmament should be viewed as a political, philosophical and ideological process in which all nations participate. The basic form of this process must be a continuous dialogue covering multilateral and bilateral issues. Age-old suspicions and superstitions must be analysed, discussed freely and, lastly, laid to rest. The pre-condition of any such dialogue must be that all interested Governments recognize one another and listen to one another. Pretending that a given Government or State does not exist cannot in any way help to move forward the process of peace-making and disarmament.
I do not intend to discuss recognition of a State or Government in accordance with international law. Rather, I wish to pose this question from a simple, pragmatic point of view, from the point of view of the realistic objectives of this international gathering. A conference on disarmament can be productive only in circumstances in which every institution and State that exists and has a bearing on the international arena shares its thoughts and has those thoughts respected. We cannot achieve understanding, reliance on one another and, ultimately, peace without entering into a dialogue, because any denial of reality is a denial of peace. Those who refuse to listen and exchange ideas lack understanding, and that is the essence of the peace process.

Our ideal - total disarmament - is for the time being unrealizable, albeit realistic. It should never be forgotten, however. At this stage of the evolution of mankind and of the international community we can achieve only a series of short-term, partial and intermediate goals: specifically, the freezing of the nuclear armaments race, the gradual diminishing of armaments stockpiles and the control and successive limitation of arms exports to third-world countries, especially in the Middle East. We also feel that it is feasible to introduce a ban on the production of inhumane biological weapons.

A series of proper treaties concerning the Middle East in particular should be signed, and an effective apparatus for the supervision and control of those treaties should be instituted. The curbing of the arms race and the progressive limitation of arms exports should be accomplished through concrete arrangements on a national and international level, and the moneys which are saved in the process should be expended on economic development and the improvement of standards of living. In this way the peace process would pay for further peace efforts.

We are also of the opinion that setbacks in plans for disarmament and the reduction of tension should not be interpreted as proof of the a priori lack of success of such plans. We have an example in history, the so-called Rapacki Plan. That plan, drawn up by the then Foreign Minister of Poland, was not accepted, in either its original or its modified version. Its rejection, however, should by no means be interpreted as meaning that any such plan, be it regional or global, must end in failure. On the contrary, we could speculate that if that plan had been given more serious and careful consideration the world situation might be more promising than it is today. The West rejected the plan not only on its merits but also because it contained implications concerning new frontiers between Germany and Poland.
It did not take too long for the new status quo in Europe to be recognized, although in a manner less favourable for many of the parties involved. Students of political history could draw a meaningful conclusion from this example, namely, that when it comes to disarmament, be it partial or total, the attempt to solve all pending political problems and controversies at once is ill advised because such action might obviate the accomplishment of even a partial solution. We believe these lessons of history should be carefully studied, especially with regard to the Middle East. We cannot solve all the problems of that region in a short time, but we can and should start a dialogue and negotiations regarding them in order to solve those problems that are essential for the preservation of the existence of nations and for the creation of a climate in which irresponsible threats, such as threats to push each other into the sea, are no longer made.\footnote{Mr. Okawa (Japan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.}

Our debates should be guided by the principles expressed in the Declaration of Human Rights and the realization that the real threat to world peace is not the arms race alone, but also the disrespect for human rights expressed in many basic national and international legal documents. During our Conference on Peace in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, to which I have already referred, we were reminded of eminent thinkers of the Enlightenment, men like Emmanuel Kant, Stanislas Staszic, and others, who argued that despotism in one country constitutes a threat to peace and freedom all over the world. Tyrants and despots, they wrote, do not fight themselves. They do not die in wars, but conduct business as usual while the simple people die.

Today, as in previous centuries, freedom and democracy are the best guarantors of peace. We cannot however wait until the last bastion of despotism, totalitarianism and feudalism has fallen. We must secure peace and disarmament now. We have entered a period in which war benefits no one, including the despotic and militaristic ruler. The process of disarmament, therefore, can start and should continue apart from the internal situation of a country. Peace will contribute to the evolution of freedom and democracy all over the world.
We deem our discussion on disarmament a good opportunity for a constructive contribution to mutual understanding, mutual self-esteem and self-respect and to the furthering of the process of peace, justice and freedom. Let us not waste this opportunity on irresponsible gestures, meaningless politicking and cheap demagoguery. The cause of freedom, disarmament and peace should be treated with dignity.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mrs. Margaret Aderinsola Vogt of the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.

Mrs. ADERINSOLA VOGT (Nigerian Institute of International Affairs): The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs has developed a keen interest in disarmament and has focused its research efforts much more centrally on that subject for the following three basic reasons. First, the global arms race, especially the escalation of the qualitative and quantitative competition between the two super-Powers, poses very severe threats to international peace and security. This competition has special significance for Africa because even though the major theatre of confrontation between the two super-Powers centres on Europe, Africa will not be spared from a nuclear conflagration in the European theatre. The geographical proximity of the two continents and the economic and political relationship between certain European and African countries make it inevitable that Africa will suffer the consequences of any European war. In addition, the competition between the two military blocs is extended to Africa, so that events in Africa are perceived and analysed within the context of their cold-war relationships.

Secondly, the very high rate at which the military expenditure of Africa has risen over the past 20 years has attracted our attention. When placed in the context of the worsening social and economic conditions in most African countries, and especially when many countries are producing lower levels of the food and
agricultural products on which they used to depend for the major part of their national income, the escalating rate of African military expenditure is disturbing. While we realize that the black African share of the global military expenditure is one of the lowest, we are nevertheless concerned about the tendency of that expenditure to rise at a very high rate, and we are particularly alarmed about its effect on conflicts in Africa.

Thirdly, our Institute's interest in disarmament stems from concern for developments in southern Africa. The existence and practices of the apartheid regime in South Africa, especially that regime's dependence on the massive build-up of military power, affects the perception of threat of most African countries and is a major stimulus to the arms race in Africa. In other words, the apartheid war machine undermines the campaign for disarmament in Africa.

I shall now elaborate on those points. The competition for supremacy between the two Power blocs increases the possibility that nuclear weapons will be utilized soon. Particularly disconcerting is the preoccupation of those Powers with the development of the capability to fight a limited and even a protracted nuclear war. We believe that the deployment of the newer categories of theatre nuclear weapons in Europe will increase the attractiveness of the prosecution of a nuclear war and, as I mentioned earlier, nuclear war in Europe will have devastating effects on several African countries and on the economic development of those African countries that depend on Europe for most of their trade. The increased tension between the two military blocs, leading to the decision by the United States Government not to ratify the SALT II agreement and the decision to develop a rapid-deployment force, has a direct bearing on African security. Africa has become much more closely drawn into the competition between the two Power blocs, so that the role of Africa in international relations is seen first and foremost within the context of the existing military competition and strategies of the two Power blocs.
Our Institute believes that this new development carries untold danger to African security. African events should be analysed strictly on their own merit. Super-Power rivalry for base rights and facilities will only act to undermine African security and encourage African countries to spend even more of their meagre resources on the military. We view the increased presence of the super-Powers in the Indian Ocean and North Africa with concern, and we believe that efforts should be intensified to implement and negotiate the declaration of both the Indian Ocean and the South Atlantic as zones of peace. In global terms, disarmament should begin at the centre, since that sector accounts for the greatest proportion of world military expenditure and arms production. Furthermore, disarmament at the centre will result in a reduction of conflicts in various parts of the world and will increase the amount of resources available for States to meet their commitments to overseas development assistance. Disarmament at the centre will surely encourage countries on the periphery to disarm.
Since many African countries became independent in the 1960s their military expenditures have escalated very remarkably. Some of the countries with the highest rate of increase are Kenya, Somalia, Zambia, Tanzania and, more recently, Ethiopia. Admittedly, these increases have been from very low bases as all African countries have had very small military budgets. Nevertheless, military expenditure represents a drain on the economic resources of African countries. Fortunately, however, there is an indication that the total military expenditure of black Africa is levelling off, primarily because of a decline in the military expenditure of Nigeria and Ghana in real terms since the mid-1970s.

There are certain basic factors that have influenced greater expenditure on the military by some African countries. The unresolved nature of many African boundaries has encouraged the dependence of some countries on the use of force for boundary adjustments. In spite of the stipulation of the charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to the contrary, boundary conflicts have occurred between some neighbouring countries. Secondly, some African countries have had to deal with insurrections—many of them have had to lay a great deal of emphasis on the size and capability of their armed forces so as to be better able to counter insurgent moves. Thirdly, one of the most important factors that has influenced the level and nature of the arms race in Africa is the persistent tendency of foreign Powers to intervene in local African conflicts. Such interventions tend to heighten the level of conflicts and reduce the chances of the peaceful resolution of such conflicts. Thus, foreign military intervention must be considered as a major force in the determination of the trends of military expenditure in Africa. It not only has an escalatory effect on conflicts but also encourages further intervention by opposing parties to the conflict. The OAU must be strengthened and provided with adequate machinery for the peaceful resolution of conflicts in Africa. Collective security strategies have to be developed under the aegis of the OAU as a foundation for the peacekeeping and peace-making efforts of the regional body.
Last, but most important, is the threat which the existence of a white minority régime in South Africa poses to African security. In southern Africa, the South African military budget is dominant. Countries like Zambia and Tanzania have to maintain extraordinarily large military expenditures largely because of the threats posed to their security by South Africa. The Republic of South Africa is the only country in sub-Saharan Africa possessing a military industrial complex and, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) study, the largest arms producer in the southern hemisphere. Perhaps the most important hindrance to the attempt to keep nuclear weapons out of the African continent is South African activity in the nuclear field. South Africa has acquired the capability to develop nuclear weapons within a very short time, and there are indications that it has developed delivery systems. Since Africa has identified apartheid as a threat to the peace and security of the continent and since South Africa has displayed its aggressive intention of protecting, at all costs, its white minority Government, we believe that there is a direct relationship between the reduction of tension in southern Africa and the displacement of the white minority régime. The announcement of South Africa’s achievements in the nuclear field has led to the eruption of a very lively and ominous debate in Nigeria as to whether or not Nigeria should go nuclear. We consider this debate ominous because the options on either side are dangerous. We believe that no African country has at present the financial resources or technological capability to devote to nuclear development. This is not only all the various other costs of nuclear technology. Yet, if South Africa were to use or even threaten to use nuclear weapons, what protection is available to Africa against this decision? What are the chances of the successful conclusion of the OAU draft convention on the de-nuclearization of Africa?

These questions may appear provocative, but their solution, in our opinion, is vital to any serious disarmament effort in Africa.
The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the Peace Research Institute-Dundas, Mrs. Ruth Klassen.

Mrs. KLASSEN (Peace Research Institute Dundas): Peace Research Institute in Dundas welcomes the opportunity to bring to this Assembly a statement of recommendations that have emerged from our peace research. I speak to you as a member of that organization and also as a mother.

"There is no such thing as an inevitable war", said Bonar Law in a speech delivered in 1914. "If war comes", he said, "it will be from the failure of human wisdom." It is no longer reasonable to assume that we will escape from the shadow of this fearsome challenge without a great deal of anguish and foresight. We need to believe that there is a way to get a purchase on the wheels of human destiny, which now appear to be directionless. However, this special session on disarmament must be assured that human wisdom can prevail.

Twenty years of research have convinced us that many assumptions we have held in the past concerning war and peace are false. For example, arms do not guarantee security, and nations that prepare for war are not likely to be those that find peace. Newcombe's tensiometer studies show that the over-armed nations are most likely to be involved in international war. These studies would further lead us to believe that arms do not serve as a deterrent, nor do they guarantee security. Neither of the super-Powers has achieved any sense of security from its redundant stockpiles of weaponry. And as more nations acquire nuclear capability, increasing the possibility of a catalytic nuclear war, security in fact decreases, thus inducing fears and suspicions that take us deeper into the vicious cycle of the arms race.

A large number of studies on the economic consequences of armaments have taught us that high military expenditures cause inflation and are generated at the expense of the poor. The American Council on Economic Priorities has stated that "The Administration's military build-up will
severely damage the economy for decades." Nations with a high military expenditure have a poor economic performance. The United States allots eight times more per person for military expenditure than Japan, and the consequences are evident in the comparative economic stability and civilian technology performance of these two countries.

Research into the economic consequences of disarmament further indicates, for example, that if disarmament over a period of seven years were accompanied by appropriate government planning, there would be no recession or depression. The present world military expenditure amounts to about $120 per person per year and, were this money to be re-routed to the poor, to development for needy countries, to medical research, to the recovery of domestic technology and to adequate social services, not only would living conditions be improved but the level of global hostilities would be reduced.

There are many ways to reduce the tensions in the world. Should we choose to do so. Common to all our moral and religious roots is what is known as a GRIT move, which means graduated reciprocation in tension reduction. This is a process by which one nation makes an unconditional friendly move that is intended to reduce tensions with another nation. This technique was used by President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis and could be implemented now to serve disarmament. But some one nation needs to be strong and courageous enough to take the first step, to announce to the world its intention to reduce its arms supply, and to carry out that intention.

A second method for reducing tensions is the use of superordinate goals. A superordinate goal is one which is desired by two opposing groups, but which can be achieved only through the cooperation of these two groups. One such target that would be most beneficial to the super-Powers -- indeed to all the nations of the world -- would be nuclear disarmament. As more nations acquire nuclear capabilities the threat even to the super-Powers will increase, mainly because, as we have learned from history, today's allies can quickly become tomorrow's enemies.
"Know your adversary" is a piece of sound military advice. Yet, in today's world, as tensions increase between nations, diplomatic relations and communications decrease, old hostilities and fears kindle new ones, and in isolation we breed an uncontrolled enmity, for we no longer see our adversaries as fellow human beings. An exchange of ideas, of personnel, in Government, medicine, sports, the arts and sciences could help to break down this isolation, allowing respect to replace fear. What exists between hostile groups can best be described as a mirror image, where we see the enemy as the opposite of ourselves. If we put this concept as described by Bronfenbrenner together with the insights of psychologist Eric Fromm we can begin to understand the dynamics of self-righteousness on the one hand and animosity on the other. It is this animosity which invades the spirit of humanity and erodes it, and prepares the groundwork for dehumanization, degradation and distortion of the intentions of people and leaders to such a degree that nations are prepared to risk annihilation. This attitude demonstrates despair, not wisdom, in a great nation. It indicates that we have surrendered to a disposition to kill and to sell our souls to the military, the arms industries and their allies.

We cling to the old systems of security, in spite of the fact that they are suicidal, because we are less and less able to resolve conflict without killing the adversary. True security should include disarmament, non-lethal conflict resolution, peace-keeping and peace-making. A gradual introduction of these elements might consist in commitment to non-first-use of nuclear weapons, reduction of nuclear weapons to below the overkill threshold, a non-aggressive world, nuclear disarmament as a final stage and, finally, general and complete disarmament. Peace-keeping and verification would have to accompany these disarmament stages, and some form of world law would be needed to stabilize further and maintain the development. This would fall into two categories: first, a minimal form which would concern itself with war prevention functions only and, secondly, a maximal form which would also consider world-wide human needs and environmental and resource management.
The Peace Research Institute Hamburg recommends that we should not rely on arms for security and that we should work to convert arms industries to more beneficial civilian production, decrease tensions through unilateral initiatives and their reciprocation and through cooperating for superordinate goals, increase trust through diplomatic, cultural and scientific exchanges, re-educate ourselves to a new sense of values, proceed to general and complete disarmament through carefully planned stages; make disarmament possible through reliable verification; improve peace-keeping and the peaceful settlement of conflicts, and work towards at least minimal institutions of world government.

In the past 35 years we have travelled a long distance in the nuclear race. The sequence of technologies has led us from the atomic bomb to the hydrogen bomb, to intercontinental ballistic missiles, to MIRV weapons, to an increase to tens of thousands of warheads, to cruise missiles and on to laser and particle beams. Those weapons of destruction are weapons of despair. The international climate is inflamed by fear, strident passions and the fatal courage that is bred of malice.

We, the inhabitants of this earth, are meant for more than this. The strength of a nation does not lie in its power to coerce. True strength lies in wisdom, the capacity to judge rightly in matters relating to life and conduct, and soundness of judgement in the choice of means and ends. May we be granted the wisdom to be strong and the strength to be wise.
The CHAIRMAN: I call now on the representative of the Romanian National Committee of Scientists for Peace, Mr. Gheorghe Ciucu.

Mr. CIUCU (Romanian National Committee of Scientists for Peace) (translated from French): It is for me a signal honour to convey to the United Nations General Assembly the greetings and message of peace of the Romanian scientists, to express from this high rostrum their concern over the frenzied escalation of the arms race and the increase in world tension, and the alarming danger that it represents, and to convey their appeal for peace to all the Governments represented at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to all scientists, and to all the peoples of the world so that they may strive indefatigably for the urgent adoption of practical disarmament measures and, above all, for nuclear disarmament, in pursuit of a lasting world peace.

During this period in which the special session devoted to disarmament is being held, extensive activities are being carried out in Romania, and elsewhere throughout the world, in support of disarmament, and in support of the efforts made by you, the members of the most representative world forum, to achieve practical results in halting the arms race and in disarmament, above all in nuclear disarmament. You have thus been given the "appeal addressed by the Romanian people to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament for a nuclear-free Europe and for a peaceful world", an appeal signed by millions of people, including scientists.

Our country's scientists support Romania's foreign policy and its initiatives to promote peace, co-operation and understanding among peoples. They attach great importance to the strengthening of security, to the initiation of disarmament measures in Europe, to halting the deployment and development of new medium-range missiles on the continent, and to a denuclearized Europe. Romanian scientists endorse and support the views of the grand National Assembly and those of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, on the problems under consideration at the current special session of the United Nations General
Assembly, submitted to the session a few days ago by the Minister for
Foreign Affairs of Romania.

In his message to the "Scientists for peace" Symposium held in
Bucharest on 4 and 5 September 1981 and attended by many scientists
from all continents, heads of international organizations in the United
Nations system and representatives of non-governmental organizations,
the President of Romania, Nicolae Ceauşescu, faithfully expressed the
thoughts and aspirations of our people. We may confidently state that
our historical experience, spanning more than two millennia, has taught
the Romanian people to appreciate the inestimable value of peace, and to
consider carefully what it means for development and the full participation
of all nations, great and small, in world progress and in the development
of universal civilization.

Romanian scientists consider it their duty to adopt an unequivocal
and militant stance, so that reason and knowledge may help peacefully to
resolve all the problems confronting mankind so as to eliminate war for
all time and to build a better and more just world. That, for Romanian
scientists, is a fundamental duty. At a time when tens of thousands of
nuclear weapons stockpiled in the world threaten the continued existence
of civilization, and even of the human species, such a position on the part of
Romanian scientists is the only one which is morally and professionally
tenable. More than 400,000 specialists are engaged in the quantitative and
qualitative escalation of the arms race. To us that is an absurd waste,
which we refuse to accept.

In the statement she delivered on the occasion of the establishment
of the Romanian National Committee of Scientists for Peace, the President
of the Committee, academician Dr. Elena Ceauşescu, said:

"I feel that, in the present circumstances, now that we are
witnessing a deterioration in the international situation and a
growing threat to peace and the independence of peoples, following
the escalation in the arms race and the increase in the number of
trouble spots and hotbeds of war - all scientists, whatever their
field of activity, have the duty and the responsibility to take firm action to promote peace and international détente."

Today, more than ever before, we consider that all scientists, faced with the various threats to peace, must form a united front and stand in the vanguard of the defenders of peace. They must utter a resounding "no" to the absurd arms race, and ensure that the wonderful achievements of science and knowledge are used not to promote destruction and death but to serve mankind and to serve the peoples and promote their welfare and freedom. To this end, the Romanian National Committee of Scientists for Peace is taking resolute action in response to the appeal of the Bucharest Symposium, which called for the organization of a world congress of scientists and the election of an international committee to co-ordinate their actions in the struggle for peace, a committee which would be represented both in the United Nations and in other major world forums in which the problems of international peace and security are discussed.

The Romanian National Committee has taken the initiative in collaborating with scientific organizations and leaders working in other countries for peace and disarmament, so as to unite the efforts of scientists throughout the world. Within Romania, the National Committee has organized conferences, symposia and other activities which reflect the determination of Romanian scientists to contribute to peace, disarmament and international co-operation.

Every effort must be made. The talent and professional capacity of scientists must be fully mobilized to provide the peoples with real, viable solutions to remedy the shortages of energy, food and water, the deterioration of land and forests and to combat disease and do away with underdevelopment and the disparity between countries.

Equality, equity and co-operation demand that the immense sums currently spent on armaments should be used to resolve the serious problems facing the contemporary world. To mention only one example, the $40 billion cost of a new intercontinental missile system could provide sustenance for 50 million
unwindowed children in developing countries or finance the construction of 65,000 medical centres.

As Nicolae Ceaușescu, the President of Romania, stressed, "The world has no need for new nuclear weapons, neutron bombs or other means of mass destruction. The hundreds of billions of dollars spent each year by the armaments industry could bring about more rapid economic and social progress, the end of unemployment, a decent and free life for all the peoples of the world and a more just and better order on our planet."

In response to the President's appeal, the Romanian people have stated their strong preference for peace and development. In the context of impressive demonstrations, which have struck a responsive chord throughout the world, the workers, peasants, intellectuals, women and young people of Romania have uttered a resounding "no" to the spiralling arms race.

Given the responsibility and special role devolving upon scientists in the struggle for peace and disarmament, the Romanian National Committee of Scientists for Peace considers that they should be given the opportunity to express their views both in the United Nations and in other international agencies, and be allowed to participate regularly in the discussion of all problems relating to disarmament and peace.

History will judge us severely if we do not act in time to halt the escalation in the arms race and if we stand aloof from the efforts of the peoples to prevent war, to bring about disarmament and to safeguard peace.

We would emphasize that the scientists of Romania feel directly affected by the discussions which the United Nations is devoting to disarmament and which are of the utmost importance and involve particular responsibilities.

May I express the hope that the work of this session will be completely successful.
The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. C. Maxwell Stanley, representative of the Stanley Foundation.

Mr. STANLEY (Stanley Foundation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for permitting me, on behalf of the Stanley Foundation, to address this second special session on disarmament. You are to be congratulated for arranging presentations from non-governmental and research organizations.

Clearly, current world situations emphasize the urgency of controlling, limiting and reducing conventional and nuclear weapons. Hostilities in various parts of the world demonstrate the ease with which national States resort to armed force to settle controversies or to achieve their perceived interests.

For 35 years I have watched the world's futile efforts to control, limit and reduce national armaments. The first special session on disarmament was the subject of three, and the second special session on disarmament has been the subject of four, Stanley Foundation international conferences. Participants included diplomats, scholars and governmental officials from 30 nations. Presiding over those conferences has strongly influenced the opinions that I present to you.

The second special session on disarmament is not an isolated event; it is a chapter, albeit an important one, in the multilateral approach to disarmament. The multilateral approach is not new, although for two decades it has been eclipsed by the drama of Soviet-United States bilateral arms negotiations.

Accelerated multilateral disarmament progress is not just important, it is critical, for five reasons. First, only the multilateral approach can effectively reduce conventional weapons and forces. Secondly, even nuclear weapons reduction measures must ultimately be multilateral. Thirdly, the multilateral approach draws more nations into disarmament efforts. Fourthly, the visibility of the multilateral approach, in contrast to the secrecy of bilateral negotiations, stimulates public interest. And, fifthly, vigorous multilateral activities prod the two major nuclear powers to get on with bilateral negotiations.

No matter what the second special session on disarmament accomplishes — and may it be much — it will be a failure unless it contributes to the continuity and vigour of multilateral disarmament efforts.
The success of the second special session on disarmament will depend on how well it responds to four immediate needs: first, to take prompt and definite steps to reduce the danger of nuclear war; secondly, to agree on a short list of specific arms control and reduction measures that can be negotiated in the near future; thirdly, to increase the number, intensity and effectiveness of negotiations on specific arms control and disarmament agreements; and, fourthly, to build stronger support for disarmament and enlarge the active disarmament constituency.

The agenda of the second special session on disarmament calls for consideration and adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. A soundly structured comprehensive programme of disarmament would develop relationships among the required disarmament measures and facilitate the selection of priority items for early multilateral effort. I believe, however, that a realistic comprehensive programme of disarmament requires parallel progress in strengthening international mechanisms for peaceful settlement of disputes and strengthening United Nations and regional mechanisms for conflict management, peace-keeping and peace-making.

The second special session on disarmament should select a few urgent arms control and disarmament measures that are ripe for achievement in the next few years. This list must include measures to prevent nuclear war. I believe it is false, however, to assume that once the nuclear genie is shackled reduction of conventional weapons will be easily accomplished. Therefore, I urge the second special session on disarmament to come to grips with the conventional as well as the nuclear threat and to select and emphasize measures for furthering the reduction of conventional armaments and forces.
Although the second special session on disarmament cannot dictate disarmament actions to nation States, it should urge and encourage the United States and the Soviet Union to moderate their polemics and accelerate their bilateral negotiations concerning nuclear weapons. They should also be urged promptly to resume negotiations to prevent the weaponization of outer space. Nothing, but nothing, would provide a greater stimulus to disarmament than agreement by these two nuclear giants to halt their arms race and initiate nuclear arms reduction.

The second special session on disarmament should also encourage regional multilateral disarmament efforts and the improvement of Member States' disarmament organizations. The second special session on disarmament made a major contribution by re-emphasizing and to a degree recasting the duties and responsibilities of the United Nations bodies that deal with disarmament. Our conference participants considered the advantages of continuing the process of fine-tuning and improving the United States disarmament mechanisms. I urge the second special session on disarmament to examine, perhaps in the context of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the creation of appropriate machinery to administer and verify scheduled reductions of arms and armed forces. One approach is the international disarmament organization proposed by the 1961 McCloy-Zorin Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations.

Formal negotiations are so slow and laborious that technology and weapons deployment outpace them by a wide margin. Because early breakthroughs and successes would improve the climate for disarmament, I urge consideration of alternatives to the traditional patterns of disarmament progress - for example, the use of non-binding norms or codes, informal restraints, agreed short-term moratoriums and independent initiatives.

The second special session on disarmament can strengthen the will of nations and improve the climate for disarmament by: first, emphasizing the linkages between disarmament, security and development, secondly, stimulating research, including the relationships between disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and conflict resolution; thirdly, encouraging confidence-building measures, particularly verification procedures, fourthly,
stimulating the development of a broad, active, well-informed disarmament constituency with greater involvement of non-governmental organizations and research organizations.

Could the second special session on disarmament be the catalyst that moves disarmament off dead centre and provides stimuli and guidance to substitute arms reduction for promises and action for rhetoric? The time is ripe. The first special session on disarmament stated the principles, proposed programmes and strengthened the United Nations disarmament machinery. More and more nations are straining under the economic burdens of escalating military budgets. Hostilities in the Falklands, the Middle East and elsewhere demonstrate again the futility of solving political problems with armed force. People are awakening to the insanity and insecurity of arms races. They are marching and protesting.

Yes, this could be the time for real disarmament progress. You all know what needs to be done. But do you have the will and the determination to do it? Can you convince doubting national leaders that arms reductions are in their countries' economic and security interests? You know that our present course leads to ultimate destruction. You can change the direction and steer us towards a world without war.

Will you do it? The whole world is watching and waiting.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The next speaker is the representative of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Mr. Frank Blackaby. I call upon him.

**Mr. BLACKABY** *(Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)):* The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute is now in its fourteenth year of work on questions of armaments and disarmament. It is an international institute with researchers from countries with different political and social systems.

In making suggestions for what might be done in the field of disarmament there is always a dilemma. Ambitious proposals are open to the objection that they are politically unrealistic. Proposals which are judged to be in the range of the politically possible are open to the objection that their effects may be very small.
We have some ideas to put into the current debate. They do not form a comprehensive programme; they should be taken rather as suggestions for possible directions of movement. In these suggestions we concentrate primarily on areas of real and present danger, where the arms race is on the brink. If it is allowed to continue unchecked it will cross a point from which it may be very difficult to return. We have suggestions about chemical weapons, about outer space, about nuclear weapons, about negotiations in Europe, and about the production and transfer of conventional weapons.

First, regarding chemical weapons, for the past 12 years, since 1969, there has been no production of filled poison-gas munitions in the United States and there is no hard evidence of Soviet production either during those years. Now the constraints are breaking down. Binary chemical weapons are more attractive to the military than the older types; they are safer to produce, to store and to handle, and easier to use in combat. Production of these weapons may indeed be imminent, but real negotiations between the major Powers for a ban on chemical weapons have not yet begun.

What can be done, pending a comprehensive ban, by nations other than the chemical Powers themselves? To be militarily useful chemical weapons have to be deployed outside the territory of the chemical Powers themselves. Some countries have already said that they will not allow chemical weapons on their soil. If enough countries did this, the world might advance towards the idea of chemical weapon-free zones. In such a world there would be much better prospects for doing away with these weapons altogether.

Secondly, regarding space, three quarters of all satellites launched since SPUTNIK, in 1957, have been launched for military purposes. Because of their increased dependence on such spacecraft, the military are now turning their attention to sophisticated weapons for disabling the satellites of the other side and so gaining military advantage. Here again is a development still in its early stages. Every year without some arms control constraints will make the possibility of control more difficult. As a first modest step towards reducing the military use of outer space, the two major Powers should at least agree to a treaty banning anti-satellite operations.

On nuclear weapons, of course, the negotiations between the major Powers are central to any disarmament process. For all its deficiencies, the SALT II
treaty was a move in the right direction, and pending further negotiations the major Powers should continue to observe its main provisions. The SALT II negotiations took seven years. The world cannot afford another seven years of wrangling on this matter while all kinds of destabilizing developments take place. We would point to two such developments.
First, there are many plans for increasing the number and variety of weapon platforms which can carry long-range and highly accurate missiles with nuclear warheads, a development which is bound to complicate the problem of verification. There are also suggestions to renegotiate or, indeed, abandon the anti-ballistic missile treaty, without any adequate regard to the damage so obvious a backward step would do to the cause of arms control.

A more comprehensive test ban is obviously important here. It would help to inhibit the development of ever more sophisticated nuclear warheads, and it might also help the cause of non-proliferation. If there were a treaty banning nuclear tests signed by all the nuclear-weapon States and many other nations, there would be great pressure on the near-nuclear States also to sign, and they might be deterred from crossing the nuclear threshold.

There is another barrier which is being threatened by present developments - the barrier between civil nuclear power and nuclear-weapon production. The demand for weapon grade plutonium for new nuclear warheads is such that there are proposals for taking the plutonium contained in spent fuel from civil nuclear reactors and enriching it for use in weapons. This should not be done. The barrier between the civil and the military use of nuclear power should at all costs be preserved.

In Europe, obviously, the negotiations at Geneva on long-range or intermediate theatre nuclear forces should be settled by a compromise which reduces and does not increase the total number of such weapons. As the next move, we suggest the exploration of an area of disengagement of, say, an agreed number of kilometres either side of the dividing line in central Europe. All nuclear weapons and major conventional weapons particularly suited for offensive operations should be removed from this area to provide a buffer security zone down the middle of Europe. In time, the idea could be extended to become a nuclear-weapon-free zone in central Europe. This idea of a buffer zone between the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and those of the Warsaw Pact is also inherent in the proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in northern Europe and in the Balkans.
In the past decade arms transfers of major weapons to third-world countries have risen in volume three times faster than world trade in general. The concern about the proliferation of nuclear weapons has not been accompanied by any such concern about the proliferation of advanced conventional weapons around the world. Yet it is these weapons which have been and are being used to kill people. It is generally agreed that any constraint on arms transfers has to be accompanied by a constraint on production as well. The United Nations could begin to explore the possibilities of such a joint constraint, perhaps beginning with advanced weapons of an obviously offensive nature.

Finally, there are two points we wish to make about the conduct of negotiations. The offer to negotiate about arms control or disarmament should not be treated as a favour done to another State or as a reward for good international behaviour. Arms limitation and disarmament agreements serve the interests of all parties. If, every time there is tension between the major Powers, arms-control negotiations are suspended or postponed, there is little hope of progress.

The second point on negotiations is one which was made in SIPRI's presentation to the 1978 special session. There is a case for negotiations about packages of measures rather than separate negotiations about small individual steps. Any individual proposal, however carefully constructed, may often be seen to benefit some participants in the negotiations more than others. Negotiations about a package of measures could make more trade-offs possible.

To sum up, in the four years since the first special session on disarmament no progress has been made towards a more peaceful and less dangerous world. In this statement we suggest some directions of movement which should be in the range of the politically possible and some areas where the arms race is on the brink of developments which would be very difficult to reverse, if they occurred. We can but hope that in the next four years Governments will contribute to the cause of arms control and disarmament something more than words.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of the Tampere Peace Research Institute, Mr. Tapio Varis.
Mr. VARIS (Tampere Peace Research Institute): On behalf of the Tampere Peace Research Institute, I wish to express my deep appreciation of this opportunity to present our views on some aspects of disarmament. I welcome this opportunity as a recognition of the value of scientific research in the field of disarmament.

In our view, disarmament is in essence the antithesis of the idea that security can be obtained through armament. Disarmament not only implies reduction in military capability but is also a vital element of common security based on co-operation, conciliation and accommodation of interests for the solution of the global problems of mankind.

In our statement we have chosen to concentrate on some specific and essential disarmament issues which we feel merit further research. Such research would benefit the international community by clarifying the problems and facilitating their solution.

The first such issue is that of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Their value in the field of nuclear disarmament, identified as the first priority area, was recognized in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. In spite of that unequivocal and unanimously adopted view, and in spite of the multitude of different proposals, only one proposal, that concerning Latin America, has led to the adoption of an effective legal instrument for an inhabited region. The other proposals have achieved, at most, the level of declarations, joint statements and General Assembly resolutions.

Obviously, this is an indication of some political factors, but there are also legal and technical obstacles which prevent the establishment of new zones. It is my conviction that further research could be of some help in mapping and, later on, in overcoming such obstacles.

In 1975 a comprehensive study on the various aspects of nuclear-weapon-free zones was carried out under the auspices of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The General Assembly found that study very useful. However, that study did not provide answers to many important problems. Furthermore, the new interest in nuclear-weapon-free zones, particularly in Europe, would justify a new effort. Considering the regional nature of the nuclear-weapon-free zone approach, it would seem appropriate to take this regional aspect also into account in the organization of new studies.
We therefore propose that the United Nations, through its Centre for Disarmament or otherwise, should encourage and assist in the co-operation of researchers and research institutes aiming at the analysis and thereby the promotion of nuclear-weapon-free zones. I should perhaps add that my own Institute has positive experience of such co-operation and dialogue with other research institutes, concerning in particular the proposal for a Nordic nuclear-weapon-free zone and its relationship to wider arrangements in Europe.

The second issue I wish to comment upon deals with arms production. One of the main pre-conditions of successful disarmament is that the various phases of the arms acquisition process - the development and production of and trade in arms - are under full political control. On the basis of research there is reason to believe, however, that there are in the armament process features which are beyond political control. They are likely to increase unless special efforts are taken to curb them.

Research and development concerning new weapons systems has concentrated large companies and academic as well as other types of research institutions into specialized design bureaus. Very few people outside these research institutions have enough expertise to exercise technical control and the use of funds eludes political control, for reasons of both military secrecy and technological complexity. We should like to draw attention to the role of military research and development in the arms race and to the necessity of taking it into account in all future disarmament efforts.

On the basis of recent studies, including one of our own for the United Nations Group of Experts on Disarmament and Development, we should like to point out two problems which in our view deserve more research and consideration. One is the transnational character of arms production and transfers - an outcome of international co-production, licence agreements, sub-contracting and transfer of know-how related to the development, production and service of arms as well as training in their use. The compounded effects of these activities can hamper disarmament efforts for the reason that the authority of national Governments does not reach all decision-making centres responsible for the armament efforts. As researchers, we regret that there are serious obstacles to obtaining information on this subject. We welcome all initiatives aiming at disclosing more information for further research and political consideration. The other problem is the
economic burden of the armament programmes, particularly financing. It is necessary to know what is the role of the armament process in the mounting foreign debt of various countries, how the funding of armament programmes takes place and what is the role of public and private international financial transfers.

On the basis of this, we should like to propose that the relevant United Nations organs either study or encourage the study of international financing of the armament programmes, both production and transfers.

Finally, the third issue concerns disarmament and communication. Although the role of information and world public opinion was recognized in the Final Document of the first special session, a thorough examination of the issue has not been carried out.

In view of the increasing role of public opinion there is a need to develop a more elaborate communications strategy for disarmament in order to make more effective the information activities of the United Nations and other relevant bodies and organizations engaged in the dissemination of information. Encouraging work has already been done by the information network of the United Nations and by specialized agencies like the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. These efforts should be strengthened by the assistance of a professionally qualified group of internationally representative experts and by co-operation between relevant United Nations bodies, competent international research organizations and national research institutes specializing in communications studies and peace research.

We thus propose that an international research project be launched or a study group be established for the purpose of defining the dimensions and categories on which to base a continuous monitoring of information on disarmament and the arms race.

Such a study would help to define a general communications strategy on disarmament. It would also contribute, inter alia, to the development of journalist training on disarmament issues.

I should like to reiterate the appreciation of the Tampere Peace Research Institute of this opportunity to address the second special session devoted to disarmament. As a research institute, we are prepared to co-operate in efforts to implement the decisions to be taken at this special session.
The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the last speaker for this evening, Mr. Iiroslav Stepan, President of the International Union of Students.

Mr. STEPAN (International Union of Students (IUS)): The International Union of Students and its millions of members, as well as the International Student Research Centre, welcomed the decision to convene the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament and has extended full support to this initiative from its very beginning, when it was decided at the thirty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly, in 1978. As we are convinced that the preservation of peace and the averting of a nuclear holocaust is the most urgent task before the whole of humanity. The developments in the international situation since this initiative was launched have further proved the necessity of putting an end to the arms race, proceeding towards genuine disarmament and reducing areas of tension.

The international situation today is characterized by the increased action of imperialism, particularly United States imperialism, in fomenting hotbeds of tension in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The long-term armaments programme of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the United States-imposed NATO decision to deploy medium range nuclear missiles in a number of Western European countries, the production of the neutron bomb and the concept of a limited nuclear war, together with the world-wide military build-up, as in the creation of a rapid deployment force and the striving to expand imperialist military bases and pacts, constitute a serious threat to world peace. The massive United States-abetted Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the Israeli policy of genocide against the Palestinians is the latest offensive further complicating the already explosive situation in the Middle East and threatening peace not only in the region but world-wide. We believe that the second special session will constitute a significant step in accomplishing the task of ending the arms race, securing world peace and opening up new prospects for détente and effective disarmament negotiations.

A review of the implementation of the decisions of the first special session on disarmament would convincingly prove that the threat of a nuclear war has not yet been eliminated, nor has any significant progress been made in its prevention. Nuclear weapons have been spreading both qualitatively and quantitatively. No significant progress has been achieved in solving the problem
of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, there is an increasing danger of nuclear weapons being possessed by Israel and South Africa. Not a single nuclear-free zone has been established, the SALT II treaty has not been ratified by the United States Administration, more new types of weapons of mass destruction are in preparation and the production of chemical weapons has received the green light from the United States Administration.
(Mr. Stepan, IUS)

In contrast to their aggressive policies, there is a mass movement for peace surging throughout the world, of which the international student movement is an inseparable part. Many constructive proposals have been put forward from different sides, in particular by the socialist countries and President Brezhnev of the Soviet Union, in order effectively to preserve peace and achieve disarmament. Millions of students all over the world welcomed President Brezhnev's message to the second special session on disarmament. While paving the way for constructive negotiations, these numerous and concrete proposals provide possibilities of strengthening the peace movement and demand an appropriate response from other administrations.

Against this background of the review of the first special session on disarmament, the holding of the present second special session assumes further significance.

The IUS, having been founded at a time of joy over the victory over fascism and having inherited the experience of the struggle against fascism and war, has constantly upheld the ideals of peace, disarmament, democracy, national independence and social progress. These ideals have brought within the fold of our organization 109 national affiliates from 106 countries, which are steadfastly holding aloft the ideals of peace and mobilizing the student masses in their countries around the IUS world-wide campaign "Students for Disarmament". In this undertaking special emphasis has been laid during the recent period on providing support to this special session.

The IUS fully supports the peace movement of the masses of people raising their voices in various parts of the world. The mass actions recently organized in a large number of countries have taken place with the decisive participation of youth and students; national students unions have frequently been among the main organizers of these actions. The IUS has supported the stances taken in this connexion by the national unions and participated, through international student delegations, in the mass demonstrations held in Bonn, Vienna and various cities in the German Democratic Republic, as well as in the peace days in Greece, Sofia, New York and elsewhere.
Simultaneously, we have organized a number of specific actions supporting the demand for implementation of the programme adopted at the first special session on disarmament and the successful holding of the second special session.

Also, in this context, the IUS has organized or joined in organizing a number of seminars and conferences, including an international student round table in Cyprus in April 1982 and an international conference in India on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Together with Latin American students organizations, the IUS recently organized international student days for peace and disarmament in Guadalajara, Mexico, where representatives of students organizations from all continents discussed the progress of the campaign "Students for Disarmament" and their preparation for the second special session on disarmament. Those days were climaxed by a mass demonstration involving more than 100,000 students.

On the occasion of Mr. Reagan's visit, on 9 June, a student tribunal took place in Bonn, with the participation of thousands and thousands of students from more than a dozen countries protesting against the anti-peace policy of the United States, as well as its policy of intervention, particularly in Central America. An international student peace tour was organized around eight European countries on that occasion.

The present situation, and above all the current stage of the arms race, make imperative radical actions leading to the adoption and implementation of concrete measures conducive to the reduction and eventual elimination of the danger of war. This presupposes the effectiveness of disarmament negotiations and the implementation of the realistic solutions already suggested. The prevention of the production of new weapons of mass destruction and the halting of the nuclear arms race are vital demands in the interest of peace. Indeed, it is much easier to prevent the emergence of new weapons than to ban those that already exist.
(Mr. Stepan, IUS)

Representing the interests of millions of students the world over who are concerned over the danger of the arms race, which is swallowing up enormous resources needed for education, health, culture and other services vital to the advancement of mankind, we pin our hopes on the second special session on disarmament to come out with concrete and bold decisions, assimilating the experience gained since 1978, designed to lead to general and complete disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee of the whole, however sparsely represented this evening, I wish to thank the representatives of the non-governmental organizations, national and international, and the peace and disarmament research institutions for their presence here in New York and for their participation in our discussions. They have travelled long distances to be here. I wish to pay a tribute to them for the dedication and devotion with which they are working in their respective walks of life for the cause of peace and disarmament. We are grateful for the contributions they have made to our deliberations at this special session and we offer them our cordial thanks.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.