



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIBRARY

JUL 12 1982

PROVISIONAL

A/S-12/AC.1/PV.6
7 July 1982

ENGLISH

UN/SA COLLECTION
Twelfth special session

AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 6TH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 24 June 1982, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh)
(Vice-President)

later: Mr. GUY-HAZOUME (Benin)
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a separate fascicle.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

STATEMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee contained in paragraph 54 of its report, the Ad Hoc Committee has decided that statements should not exceed 10 minutes, in order to ensure that all the non-governmental organizations remaining on our list, as well as the 23 peace and disarmament research institutions, can be accommodated within the time available. As Chairman, I strongly recommend that all speakers comply with that decision.

I now call upon Professor Kaarle Nordenstreng, representing the International Organization of Journalists.

Mr. NORDENSTRENG (International Organization of Journalists): It is a great honour for me to address this assembly of the international community in the name of 200,000 journalists from 120 countries. These are newspaper men and women, radio and television reporters, writers, cameramen - in short, professional workers in the mass media specialized in the task of informing public opinion.

Ever since its foundation in Copenhagen in 1946, the aim of my organization has been - and I quote the first article of our statutes -

"The maintenance of peace and the consolidation of friendship among peoples as well as international understanding through free, accurate and honest informing of public opinion."

It has not always been easy to pursue this aim, especially in those countries where the mass media are under the strong influence of commercial and military interests. We all know that the performance of the mass media has been far from ideal from the point of view of peace and disarmament. Often the media have been a vital link in the socio-economic process which feeds the arms race, by maintaining ignorance, prejudice and fear among the population rather than by satisfying the people's right to acquire an objective picture of reality by means of accurate and comprehensive information.

(Mr. Nordenstreng, International
Organization of Journalists)

Let us recall what was said 35 years ago by an authoritative commission which carried out an independent study of the press in the United States:

"With the means of self-destruction that are now at their disposal, men must live, if they are to live at all, by self-restraint, moderation, and mutual understanding. They get their picture of one another through the press. The press can be inflammatory, sensational, and irresponsible. If it is, it and its freedom will go down in the universal catastrophe. On the other hand, the press can do its duty by the new world that is struggling to be born. It can help create a world community by giving men everywhere knowledge of the world and of one another, by promoting comprehension and appreciation of the goals of a free society that shall embrace all men."

(Mr. Nordenstreng, International
Organization of Journalists)

Those words were written at the time of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Since that time, the capacity for instant destruction which we have acquired has become over a million times greater. Therefore the point made by the commission on a free and responsible press is also a million times more serious today - especially as, parallel to the arms race, we have got hundreds of millions of poor people deprived of the most elementary human rights.

There is indeed a collective duty towards "the new world that is struggling to be born". That is how we see the contemporary movement towards new international relations in general and a new international information order in particular. This new order, understood as an integral part of the new international economic order, is aimed at the decolonization and democratization of the field of information and communication on the basis of peaceful coexistence between peoples.

The majority of journalists in the world support this call by the movement of non-aligned countries and its manifestations, such as the Mass Media Declaration of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. A new order is indispensable, because the status quo in the world does not promote peace, democracy and social progress. Those who are waging an ideological war against the new order - with a false image of freedom as their weapon - are in fact defending those socio-economic structures which produce the arms race and poverty.

The professional journalists today - no matter whether they are working under the sophisticated conditions of the industrialized countries, or with all the hardships of under-development, or even in the middle of a liberation struggle in Palestine, southern Africa, Western Sahara, El Salvador and so on - increasingly realize that we are faced with a struggle towards a new order and that the struggle is one, however great its variety.

But the journalists have gone further than analytically observing the situation. A significant development has taken place in the ethics of the profession, as demonstrated by a declaration issued two years ago in Mexico in the name of the international and regional non-governmental organizations which

(Mr. Nordenstreng, International
Organization of Journalists)

unite as many as 300,000 professional journalists from all continents and various political orientations. This is what they declared, among other things:

"A true journalist stands for the universal values of humanism above all peace, democracy, human rights, social progress and national liberation, while respecting the distinctive character, value and dignity of each culture as well as the right of each people freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems.

"Consequently, a true journalist assumes a responsibility to fight against any justification for or incitement to wars of aggression and the arms race, especially in nuclear weapons, and other forms of violence, hatred or of national, racial or religious discrimination, oppression by tyrannic régimes, as well as all forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism. This fight contributes to a climate of opinion conducive to international détente, disarmament and national development."

This socially committed journalistic ethic has recently manifested itself in the popular peace movement which is sweeping across the world, in particular the Western hemisphere. Journalists have joined other professional groups in mobilizing against nuclear extermination and in defence of peace. Typical of this contemporary movement is what was declared four months ago by the Helsinki chapter of the Union of Journalists in Finland:

"The journalists' instrument is the word. This instrument can be used only under conditions of peace; therefore promotion of peace is the most effective way of defending freedom of speech."

What can be done in practical terms? Unfortunately, professional journalists do not usually have ultimate control of the mass media, and therefore have only a shared responsibility for how the channels of communication are being used. However, journalists for their part want to do their utmost in promoting social consciousness along the lines of the Mexico Declaration.

Among other things we are engaged in the preparation of an international code of journalistic ethics, based on the universal values held in the

(Mr. Nordenstreng, International
Organization of Journalists)

international community and on the common professional principles respected throughout the world, to be endorsed by non-governmental organizations of professional journalists at the national, regional and international levels.

We also offer our co-operation to the United Nations in an effort to raise the standards of journalism in matters of the arms race and disarmament by setting up a representative professional body to review the performance of the press and suggest practical means of improving the coverage.

Finally, we want to remind those engaged in the arms race that even a modest reduction of military expenditures would release financial resources for an extensive development of national and international systems of communication. Given our ethical orientation, we feel that we have the moral right to demand that States, beginning with the permanent members of the Security Council, should curb the arms race and invest the resources thus saved in truthful and honest information.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of the International Peace Bureau, Mr. Sean MacBride.

Mr. MacBRIDE (International Peace Bureau): It is a great honour for me to speak here on behalf of the International Peace Bureau on this important occasion. The International Peace Bureau is a federation of some 40 organizations throughout the world involved in peace and disarmament. It was founded in 1892 and it is probably one of the oldest peace organizations in the world.

I have prepared a fairly long statement, which I have curtailed orally but which will be made available to members. On this occasion I should like to concentrate on just one or two points that I consider important at the present moment.

Any objective examination of the arms race which is now taking place in the world can only lead to one conclusion, namely, that those responsible for it have ceased to think rationally and are devoid of any sense of moral responsibility. If the two super-Powers decided to unleash on the world the 50,000 nuclear warheads which they jointly possess, they would be physically and scientifically unable to do so.

(Mr. MacBride, International Peace
Bureau)

However, it is certain that by unleashing the maximum quantity which they could possibly use, they would destroy this civilization and most living things on this planet. Yet not only do they refuse to freeze those horrendous stockpiles at their present level, but they propose to increase them at the rate of 7,000 to 8,000 additional nuclear warheads per year. They could never, never use the stocks of nuclear weapons which they now hold, yet they still want to increase those stocks.

Professor George Kennan, former United States ambassador, pointed out in Washington recently:

"We have gone on piling weapon upon weapon, missile upon missile ... like the victims of some sort of hypnotism, like men in a dream, like lemmings heading for the sea."

Even a military leader such as the late Lord Mountbatten felt compelled to draw attention to the insanity of this arms build-up. On 11 May 1979, he asked the following question:

"Do the frightening facts about the arms race, which now show that we are rushing headlong towards a precipice, make any of those responsible for this disastrous course pull themselves together, and reach for the brakes? The answer is 'No'."

The great world leaders who founded this world body, the United Nations, had lived through the holocaust of the last world war; they were fully conscious of the threat that faced humanity. After years of anxious and earnest discussion, they unanimously came to the conclusion that the only way of avoiding a third world war, which in turn would inevitably be a nuclear war, was by the achievement of general and complete disarmament under international supervision and control.

After years of discussion, on 20 December 1961 this body - the General Assembly of the United Nations - unanimously endorsed eight principles which had been agreed upon and which were to form the basis for a treaty for general

(Mr. MacBride, International Peace
Bureau)

and complete disarmament. Those eight principles were to be the basis of all future multilateral negotiations on disarmament. In effect, these principles forbade all States to have any nuclear arms and provided that no State should have any conventional arms or military forces in excess of what was strictly necessary to maintain internal order within the boundaries of the State. Those eight principles were comprehensive and detailed; they were the result of years of work and were unanimously adopted by this body on the proposition of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Yet for some reason, the major Powers and their associates never refer to them now. There is a deadly silence maintained in regard to those decisions of this General Assembly. I have appended them as an annex to my statement here, as I think that they should be looked at.

Far from undertaking any measures towards general and complete disarmament, the major Powers have engaged in the greatest arms race in the history of the world. Such negotiations as did take place usually resulted in an increase rather than a reduction in arms. Despite many conferences and what are euphemistically called "partial measures of disarmament", which never resulted in any reduction in arms, no progress whatsoever has been made. There has been no reduction in the existing stocks of arms. Nuclear arsenals are growing day by day.

Conventional and nuclear weapons are being sold or given away by the bigger Powers to the smaller and weaker States. Wars by proxy are being fought all over the world. Not satisfied with the overkill capacity of existing conventional and nuclear weapons, some of the super-Powers are apparently now engaging in the production of additional new and horrifying weapons of mass destruction. Surely, the research on and development of such weapons should be prohibited under international law.

(Mr. MacBride, International Peace
Bureau)

There is probably no field in which the credibility gap between the professions of Governments and their performance is greater than the field of disarmament. Ever since the adoption of the Hague and Geneva Humanitarian Conventions, two types of weapons have been prohibited by international humanitarian law. Those are weapons which are unnecessarily cruel and weapons which are indiscriminate in their effect on combatants and civilians. Their use has been prohibited both by the Hague and Geneva Conventions and by international law. What weapon could be more cruel or more indiscriminate than a nuclear warhead or bomb? Why outlaw dum-dum bullets and not outlaw atomic weapons?

Yet, for some unexplained reason, there has been a refusal on the part of the super-Powers to include nuclear weapons among the weapons to be specifically outlawed in the revised text of the Geneva Convention. If any meaningful credibility is to be given to the rule of law and to humanitarian law, it is essential as a first step to adopt, without any further delay, a short convention outlawing the use of nuclear weapons and making the use of such weapons an offence under international law.

Frankly, the refusal of the nuclear Powers to agree to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons or to agree to any measure of general and complete disarmament is causing grave doubts as to the credibility of their leaders when they proclaim their desire for world peace and disarmament. It is common knowledge that neither the military establishment nor the military-industrial complexes favour world disarmament. To them it would involve loss of prestige, of influence and of inordinate profits in the manufacture and sale of arms. On the basis of the latest estimates, world military expenditure is proceeding at the rate of \$1.2 million per minute. In the light of the millions of human beings who are dying from hunger or from preventable diseases throughout the world, such expenditure is both immoral and obscene. But apart from the moral aspect, it is this expenditure which is feeding the arms race and making a third world war, with its terrible consequences, inevitable.

SK/5

A/S-12/AC.1/PV.6
14-15

(Mr. MacBride, International Peace
Bureau)

In this situation, the only safeguard is whatever influence public opinion may bring to bear on Governments to halt the self-destruction of the human race. In this context, I think it necessary to point out to this General Assembly, composed as it is of representatives of Governments, that the ordinary people of the world are losing patience with Governments for their failure to take meaningful measures for disarmament. We in the peace movement, throughout the world, are in close, direct contact with the ordinary people of the world, and we know that they will no longer tolerate the dangerous complacency which is rapidly leading us to World War III.

(Mr. MacBride, International
Peace Bureau)

General Eisenhower was one of the first to warn that, with the advent of nuclear weapons, there was no alternative to peace, that the only alternative to peace was oblivion. He then added, prophetically, a warning that we should all bear in mind now. He said: "The people want peace so much that one day Governments had better get out of their way and let them have it." That day has now arrived. The people of the world now want general and complete disarmament.

On behalf of the International Peace Bureau, we have submitted for the consideration of this second special session on disarmament a number of concrete proposals, which are appended to copies of my address.

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to the psychological aspects of the nuclear doomsday threat which hangs over humanity. The well-known American educator and Jesuit, Father Richard McSorley, underlined it in these words:

"The tap-root of violence in our society today is our intent to use nuclear weapons. Once we have agreed to that, all other evil is minor in comparison. Until we squarely face the question of our consent to use nuclear weapons, any hope of large-scale improvement of public morality is doomed to failure."

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Dr. ABRAMS (International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War): A few years ago a small group of doctors undertook to establish a dialogue among physicians from many countries on the medical consequences of nuclear war. Each of us had been shocked by the references to nuclear arms as potential instruments for resolving international crises. Almost three years later, in April 1982, the Second International Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War was held in Cambridge, England, with 196 physicians, scientists and observers representing thousands of physicians from 31 countries. Among them were the leaders of many national organizations of

(Dr. Abrams, International Physicians for
the Prevention of Nuclear War)

physicians. Doctors came from the West bloc, the East bloc and the non-aligned nations and from the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Japan, England, Germany, Bulgaria, Sweden, Italy, Egypt, Brazil and numerous other countries.

We met because we knew that nuclear war would be the ultimate human and environmental disaster. We met with the belief that doctors have a special role to play because they are dedicated to the prevention of illness, to the care of the sick and to the protection of human life; because they are uniquely aware of the medical consequences of nuclear war; and because they can work together with their colleagues without regard to national boundaries.

The language of physicians is international; their goals are international. Disease is a transnational enemy; its eradication is best accomplished by crossing many borders. Smallpox has disappeared because nation-states subordinated their egos to their common self-interest and to a humanitarian goal.

Today more people than ever before are conscious of the transient character of our encounter with the planet. We are born, we remain for an instant of millennial time and we depart. There is a compact that accompanies our arrival; its theme is that, somehow or other, we should leave it better than we found it.

There is no greater violation of our compact than to destroy vast areas of the planet's surface and leave many of them uninhabitable. Some say: Man is a rational being; such an act is impossible. Yet, it simply is not so. We are prepared, and we are preparing further, for an insult of such massive proportions that it will not only eradicate life beyond any scale imaginable but also equally poison the land and the atmosphere. Let me present just a few facts about a massive nuclear war that many of you have already heard; they require constant repetition. The best available estimates indicate that, in an all-out nuclear war between the United States and the USSR in the mid-1980s, over 200 million people would be killed immediately and over 60 million injured; 80 per cent of Soviet and United States hospital beds would be destroyed or damaged; 80 per cent of physicians and other health professionals would be either killed or incapacitated; 30 per cent of the immediate survivors would die from infectious diseases in the first year after a nuclear attack; depletion of the ozone layer would increase the ultra-violet

(Dr. Abrams, International Physicians
for the Prevention of Nuclear War)

radiation reaching the earth, with injury to humans, animals and plant life; and leukaemias and solid cancers would be increased by global radiation fall-out and long-term genetic effects would be problems of later generations.

Doctors have never before been involved in an anti-war movement because they have always observed that war, as an extension of national policy, has characterized the behaviour of man over centuries and yet society has been able to emerge intact. But physicians have never before been faced with such a life- and health-threatening possibility, nor with a clear sense that the planet could be so changed. On different sides of the globe, the American Medical Association and the Soviet Academy of Medicine issue the same warnings.

Doctors can tell you how to set a broken bone, but we cannot repair a massive brain injury. We can tell you how to sew up a ruptured liver, but we cannot treat a patient in shock unless we have blood or plasma or substitutes. We can tell you about radiation effects and radiation sickness, but we cannot treat a man exposed to 5,000 rads because we know he will die a brain death in hours to days. We have enormous skills in treating burns, but in this country, with 1,300 burn beds, the millions of burn patients in a nuclear holocaust would have no place to go. We know that there is no credible medical response to a massive nuclear war.

We hear talk that nuclear war is winnable; but we know that there is nothing but mutual suicide in a massive nuclear war. We hear talk that nuclear war is survivable; yet we know that the living may envy the dead. We hear that larger stockpiles will strengthen national security; but we know that they can only increase international insecurity.

(Dr. Abrams, International Physicians
for the Prevention of Nuclear War)

Now, we physicians are not politicians. We are not experts in arms or arms control. We are not diplomats or negotiators or legislators or members of the executive branch of government. We are simply doctors who are concerned about the greatest threat to life and health in this century. We feel a professional and ethical and humane obligation to become involved and to warn you and the whole world that much as we would like to help you in your time of sickness and disease and injury and radiation exposure, we simply will not be here. We will be dead, like the nurses and the other health workers; our hospitals will be destroyed, just like your homes and buildings and this great United Nations General Assembly hall.

This battle is no longer between the great nations; it is between devastation and survival. The enemies are these weapons of annihilation. No crisis between the super-Powers can be won or lost by either; the winner or loser will be the inhabitants of this planet.

Yesterday, in this hall, Prime Minister Thatcher said that the existence of the nuclear-weapon stockpiles is not the fundamental threat to peace. Of course not. She had just finished a war without nuclear weapons. What we are talking about is not the threat to peace but the threat of annihilation. It is myopia to believe that the computers that govern these enormous stockpiles are not subject to error. Doctors see technological failures in pace-makers, in monitors, in electronic devices every day of the week. But we also see human error, and we know that those responsible for the launching of nuclear weapons are subject to psychosis, to paranoia, to alcoholism, to drug-addiction. Wars have been begun by accident in the past. Seventy years ago the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand ignited the First World War. If we gamble on life without accident, we gamble with our collective future.

Though we doctors are not arms-control experts, we have taken a stand on one issue. The International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War supports a verifiable freeze: a freeze for the United States, for the Soviet Union, for England, France, China and every nation that is producing or would produce nuclear weapons. As a first step in stopping the nuclear arms race, we endorse a freeze on testing, on production, on deployment and on development of nuclear weapons. And all of us here today must

(Dr. Abrams, International Physicians
for the Prevention of Nuclear War)

consider together whether we can persuade our Governments that this first step must be taken.

We can stop; we can halt; we can quit; we can freeze. Or we can burn, roast, incinerate or be blown into a thousand bits by the nuclear blast.

So we have these two options: to burn or to freeze. Burn or freeze: which is it? The moment is now, and we must seize it, or it may be lost for ever.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of the Russian Orthodox Church, Patriarch Pimen. I call upon him.

His Holiness Patriarch PIMEN (Russian Orthodox Church) (spoke in Russian; English text furnished by the speaker): Permit me first of all to greet you most cordially on behalf of the millions of believers of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The eyes of the whole world are trained intently on your work at this time. This testifies to the historic significance of the special session and to the cherished hopes, based on the aspiration for peace without arms, which have been reposed in you.

The sons and daughters of the Russian Orthodox Church are watching you in the hope that you will take decisive steps to prevent the possible outbreak of nuclear war, which threatens to put an end to human history. We are clearly aware that true peace can be attained only through the joint efforts of statesmen and peoples, and that it is the duty of churches and religious organizations to educate believers in peace, to humanize international relations, and to seek out and strive to follow the roads to peace. This has always been the aspiration of our Russian Orthodox Church, which is now approaching the first millennium of its existence.

Faithful to its mission of salvation, our Church, from the very beginning, has been concerned to promote peace and unity in the life of our people, as well as peace and fraternal friendship with other nations. Our Church has never wavered in its encouragement and support for its people when, so often in the course of the last millennium, they have had to fight to preserve their life

(His Holiness Patriarch Pimen,
Russian Orthodox Church)

and culture and secure the freedom and independence of their homeland against hostile incursions from outside, and have had to make great sacrifices for peace and justice.

Believing that peacemaking is one of its most sacred tasks, the Russian Orthodox Church is today doing its utmost to promote the strengthening of peace throughout the world. We know that this is a highly complex and crucial task. The world, rent and torn apart by internal contradictions, has now entered a critical stage of its existence. Human reason is increasingly mastering the forces of nature and is ready to use the destructive power of those forces for the senseless destruction of brothers and sisters, other human beings who are bearers of the image of God, instead of using those forces of nature to satisfy the vital needs of the suffering majority of the world's population.

The threat of nuclear war now hangs over the whole of mankind. Will people be able to find in themselves sufficient moral force to overcome what would appear to be a hopeless situation? Will we be able to understand that today the security of one can be guaranteed only by the security of all?

We are convinced that an affirmative answer to those questions depends to a large extent on the positions of the States you represent at this special session on disarmament.

We are also convinced that the obvious danger of universal destruction should encourage all States earnestly to seek ways and means of establishing lasting peace. To this end, we believe it necessary to eliminate mistrust and prejudice, which continue to sow hostility between States belonging to different political and social systems. That would undoubtedly change international relations for the better and facilitate the process of disarmament.

(His Holiness Patriarch Pimen,
Russian Orthodox Church)

The vast majority of members of the Russian Orthodox Church are citizens of the Soviet Union. Therefore, speaking on their behalf, I deem it my duty to bear witness here to the position of the peoples of our State in matters of war and peace. Fully recognizing my spiritual responsibility, I declare that the peoples of the Soviet Union and, undoubtedly, all other nations long for peace; that disarmament is in keeping with the deepest aspirations of our community, the future development of which is possible only in conditions of peace; that our socialist State is striving for peaceful, friendly relations with all countries of the world and welcomes any constructive proposal on arms limitation and on disarmament. But we are also entitled to expect a conscientious approach to the numerous proposals to that end put forward by our side.

Only recently from this rostrum, a message full of love for mankind from our Head of State, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, was read out to you. It set forth a number of extremely important proposals for solving the problem of disarmament which have already won deservedly broad recognition from world public opinion. On behalf of our whole nation, he solemnly declared that the Soviet Union assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The profoundly humane character and broad scope of that decision opens opportunities for peace, and we are convinced that it should make other nuclear Powers equally determined to undertake genuine, positive steps to prevent the irreversible from occurring, and the sacred gift of life from perishing, in the flames of nuclear war. People of goodwill expect this, and we pray for it.

Indeed, our people know the price of a peaceful life, having suffered at first hand the tragedy of the Second World War, which claimed the lives of over 20 million of our brothers and sisters. The scars of that experience have still not healed in the hearts of our citizens.

At the same time, it is necessary for States belonging to the international community with the so-called Western orientation to enjoy the confidence of our society. In our opinion, the most effective way of achieving this would be for those States to come with open minds to disarmament negotiations, which should be underpinned by a policy of détente and all-round co-operation.

(His Holiness Patriarch Pimen,
Russian Orthodox Church)

For over 30 years now, the Russian Orthodox Church has been successfully co-operating with many churches and religious associations all over the world in the noble cause of peace. This co-operation rests upon a common understanding shared by all religions concerning the objectives of peacemaking, because all religions are of one mind about the sacred value of the precious gift of life and about the duty of believers to safeguard this gift from destruction. The most recent striking example of this was the World Conference of religious leaders on saving the sacred gift of life from nuclear catastrophe, which was held in Moscow last May on the initiative and at the invitation of the Russian Orthodox Church. That Conference won widespread support in religious circles throughout the world. It was attended by 590 eminent representatives of Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Shintoism, Sikhism and Zoroastrianism from 90 countries. In the course of a candid brotherly discussion, without in any way compromising their respective religious convictions or political views, the participants in the Conference comprehensively dealt with the problem which is of such profound concern to the world today: the possible outbreak of a nuclear war, with its unimaginably disastrous consequences.

The participants in the Conference were unanimous in their view that religions cannot and must not remain passive in circumstances in which insane sums of money are being wasted on the manufacture of ever more terrifying weapons of mass destruction, at a time when hundreds of millions of people - our brothers and sisters in many countries - are suffering from and dying of hunger, disease and poverty, falling into despair, losing faith in the very value of life and becoming indifferent to death.

Appealing to the leaders and followers of all religions and to all Governments of the world, our Conference expressed the hope that the common sense and goodwill of people would triumph over the madness of the arms race. The participants in the Conference condemned such peace-threatening doctrines as "limited nuclear war" and the admissibility of a nuclear pre-emptive strike, and called for the prohibition and destruction of all types of nuclear weapons.

Our Conference adopted an appeal to the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament - that is, to all of you, beloved brothers and sisters: we call upon you to rid our earth of the blight of nuclear weapons

(His Holiness Patriarch Pimen,
Russian Orthodox Church)

and, as a step towards that goal, to impose an immediate freeze and total ban on those weapons. I hope that you will pay due attention to that document, because it places faith in your wisdom and in your ability to solve the most vital problem now confronting mankind. Placing in you our great hopes and realizing at the same time the complexity and responsibility of your mission, we urge that you do all in your power to rid the world of the burden of nuclear fear, so that nowhere, never and under no circumstances will the all-consuming nuclear storm be unleashed upon our Earth.

I believe that I am expressing the view of all the world's religious leaders in asserting that we shall support all resolutions of this session and shall exercise all of our moral authority so that, by the prayers of believers and through their active involvement, those resolutions may be implemented.

Trusting in the triumph of a just and lasting peace and believing in the providential help of God to all people who long for peace, I whole-heartedly wish this special session every success, and invoke the blessing of the Most-High Almighty Creator upon your work.

The CHAIRMAN: I call next on the representative of the International Union of Students.

Mr. KATSIAOUNIS (International Union of Students (IUS)): First of all, we wish to refer to the fact that the high leadership of our organization was not granted visas to enter the United States by the United States Administration, despite the fact that we applied in accordance with the regulations and in plenty of time for the applications to be processed.

IUS has welcomed the decision to hold the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in June 1982. As in the case of the first special session, we have fully supported this initiative from the very beginning, because of our conviction that there is no task more urgent and pressing before the international community than that of stopping the arms race, proceeding towards genuine disarmament, and eventually liberating mankind from the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

(Mr. Katsiaounis, IUS)

The record of implementation of decisions of the first special session looks very bad indeed. The threat of nuclear war has not been eliminated, and no progress has been made in efforts to prevent it. As far as the halting and reversal of the arms race is concerned, the situation has become even worse. Nuclear weapons have been spreading, both qualitatively and quantitatively. A green light has been switched on for the production of chemical weapons. Strategic arms limitation talks have been postponed without a clear prospect for the future; the issue of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has seen no progress. Rather, there has been increasing danger of their possession by Israel, South Africa and Brazil. Not a single nuclear-weapon-free zone has been established, despite the efforts and commitments of several non-nuclear States and despite such concrete initiatives as the proposal for a Nordic nuclear-free zone. Thus, the general picture is grim. One could almost be pessimistic if such pessimism in this matter of life and death for the whole world were not so costly, involving the very existence of mankind.

The traditions of the progressive student movement's struggle for a lasting peace, security, international co-operation and social progress are rich and glorious.

Throughout its 36 years of existence, IUS has been deeply involved in mankind's efforts to eliminate wars, aggression and exploitation, and to promote the noble goals of the United Nations Charter. Our condemnation of the continuing arms race, the production of weapons of mass destruction - such as the neutron bomb - as well as the introduction of new types of nuclear missiles, has been reflected, inter alia, in the resolutions of our congresses. Since the first special session on disarmament, IUS has launched a world-wide campaign entitled "Students for disarmament" within the framework of various student seminars, conferences, workshops, demonstrations, peace marches and other kinds of events which have been organized on several continents. Every year the culmination of this campaign coincides with the United Nations Disarmament Week, such as last year in Vienna, where the European Student Seminar on Disarmament was held from 27 to 28 October.

Various activities and events have been organized by IUS this year within the context of international co-operation among youth and student organizations,

(Mr. Katsiaounis, IUS)

in support of the successful preparation and holding of the second special session on disarmament. I should like to mention here, by way of example, the round-table discussion entitled "Students for disarmament", organized in April this year in Nicosia, Cyprus. The participants, having discussed a number of topical issues, such as students' involvement in peace movements and students' approach to the second special session on disarmament, adopted a special message to the second special session on disarmament, calling for the elaboration of concrete disarmament measures. They also stressed - mainly during the colloquium "The Cyprus problem - a threat to peace" - the need for immediate implementation of United Nations resolutions on Cyprus, and called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops, the dismantling of British military bases and the complete demilitarization of Cyprus as a step towards securing peace in the region.

The thirteenth congress of IUS, which was held in Berlin, German Democratic Republic, in 1980, pointed out clearly that the aggressive policy of imperialism is seriously threatening peace throughout the world.

The emergence and intensification of local conflicts and the creation of new military bases and alliances are aimed at safeguarding the positions and interests of the United States and its allies in Central America and the Caribbean, in the region of the Indian Ocean and the Gulf, in the Middle East and in southern Africa. The unprecedented arms race and military build-up, the drastic increase in military spending and the production, deployment and proliferation of new nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction - above all, the neutron bomb - as well as the increasing threat to use force as a means of exerting political pressure, are all instruments of that policy.

IUS has also consistently been voicing the support of students for initiatives aimed at the creation of peace and nuclear-free-zones, and for other regional disarmament measures to reduce tensions in the regions of the Indian Ocean, the Gulf, South-East Asia and Central America. The international student movement welcomes the 1981 peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, such as the proposals on the holding of a United States-USSR summit meeting, the reopening of SALT negotiations, a moratorium on the deployment in Europe by the NATO countries and the Soviet Union of new medium-range nuclear missiles, and the expansion of confidence-building measures and the like.

(Mr. Katsiaounis, IUS)

In addition, IUS welcomes the message sent by the leader of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev, to this United Nations special session on disarmament, concerning the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. We express our hope that the peaceful proposals made by the USSR will meet with a positive response from the leaders of the other States Members of the United Nations.

It has been documented through numerous activities that students all over the world are also deeply concerned over the fact that the continuing arms race constitutes an enormous squandering of the material and financial resources needed for economic and social development, especially in the poorest regions of the world. The elimination of famine, hunger, poverty and illiteracy would be achieved much more easily if such huge sums of money were not spent on armaments. In this connexion it should be recalled that, since the Second World War, approximately \$6,000 billion have been spent on the arms race.

A growing share of the funds for education and science is being used for purposes of armaments, and substantial resources are being diverted from socially useful areas such as education or health care. Today, more than 50 million people are involved in one way or another in the military field and 400,000 highly qualified research workers are employed in military research and in the intensification of the arms race.

Students are primarily concerned with problems pertaining to the interrelationship between military spending and the financing of education, as well as the growing penetration of the military-industrial complex into education and scientific research. That is why they often undertake their own research on these issues and make use of the results for national and international campaigns.

Since the problems of disarmament are often not given sufficient priority in university education, IUS is interested in involving students in research and studies on this subject. Student organizations can promote this idea on their own by organizing specialized events and disseminating information on various aspects of disarmament and its interrelationship with various problems of the contemporary world.

The situation arising from the present stage of the arms race makes it imperative to take countermeasures which would in turn lead to concrete action

(Mr. Katsiaounis, IUS)

that would have a decisive effect in reducing and eliminating the threat of war. If this goal is to be achieved, the disarmament negotiations must be made more effective and many of the realistic solutions already suggested must be put into practice. The interests of peace demand above all that the nuclear arms race be halted and that the production of new weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems be banned, because experience proves that it is much easier to prevent the emergence of new weapons than to ban those that already exist.

It is our hope (and our demand) that the second special session on disarmament will be a step towards general and complete disarmament and will be more effective than the first special session. As far as IUS is concerned, we promise that the student movement will continue its active mobilization so as to put pressure on those Governments which are responsible for propagating the arms race to respond to the existing peace initiatives, to eliminate the danger of a nuclear holocaust and to ensure peace, détente and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Mr. Jan Lonn.

Mr. LONN (International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (ISMUN)): The International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, on behalf of which I address this session of the General Assembly, is here to voice the fervent hopes and urgent demands of the younger generation for concrete decisions and measures leading towards disarmament to be taken by this special session. All over the world, men and women, young and old, are demonstrating their fear and anger over the latest round in the increasingly dangerous arms race, the ultimate consequence of which is nuclear war threatening the existence of human civilization on this planet. That universal uproar of millions of people is our greatest asset, and it gives us hope in a world of despair and intensified confrontation between the military blocs.

But while world opinion is increasingly grasping the essence of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament - that "Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation" (resolution S-10/2, para. 18) - Governments have failed to implement the aims of that Final Document. If this special session is to prove successful, its decisions must provide for concerted action by Governments and the general public on the basis of the popular demands that are moving people out into the streets all over the world. The cardinal issue relates to taking the first necessary steps to reverse the present trend, to halt the nuclear arms race now. We request that the special session demand an immediate moratorium on the production, testing and deployment of all new nuclear weapons. We furthermore request that the special session declare that the use of nuclear weapons constitutes a crime against humanity and pave the way for the adoption of an international convention outlawing the use of nuclear weapons. Those steps are the crucial imperatives of the day in the effort to avert an uncontrollable escalation of the arms race that would seriously destabilize and undermine the international situation. They are necessary in order to ensure that strategies for "limited nuclear war" are ruled out from military planning. They should form the starting-point for a programme of substantial reductions of nuclear as well as conventional arsenals, with general and complete disarmament as the final goal. It should be stressed that there can be no consensus with those who refuse to accept these minimal demands, which are essential for the destiny of mankind.

(Mr. Lonn, ISMUN)

As one of the 25 non-governmental organizations that had the privilege of addressing the first special session on disarmament in 1978, ISMUN would like to reaffirm the validity of its pronouncements made at that session. It is very gratifying to note the increasing impact on the majority of Governments and peoples of the ideas and perspectives presented four years ago by our organization and other non-governmental organizations. Since the establishment of ISMUN in 1949, work for disarmament and peace has been at the top of the agenda of its activities. During the period since the previous special session, disarmament issues have been given a particularly high priority in our programme. Each year a number of broadly-attended international seminars and conferences have been organized, both independently by ISMUN and jointly with other international youth and student organizations.

Composed of affiliates from more than 50 countries, on every continent and with all social systems, the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations works throughout the world for the aims and ideals of the United Nations, for peace and international solidarity. With its national affiliates actively involved in disarmament activities in their respective countries, ISMUN considers itself part and parcel of the growing popular movement for international disarmament.

It should be noted that youth and students, and their organizations of various orientations, have for many years been playing a pioneering role in the work for peace, détente and disarmament. Through their numerous joint events and meetings, the broad spectrum of various international youth and student organizations have demonstrated their refusal to submit to a world of confrontation and renewed cold war which offers no future. To young people the world over, there exists no alternative but to pursue constructive co-operation and efforts to safeguard and move forward the process of détente, to the benefit of all peoples and nations irrespective of blocs and social systems.

As we have stated on many occasions, the work for peace and disarmament can never be separated from our determination to create a just and equitable world order from which all forms of unequal relationships and domination have been abolished and in which the peoples' aspirations for national and social freedom and liberation are met. We cannot but express our grave concern, in this context, about the increasing global extension of foreign military bases and the escalated build-up of military intervention forces, accompanied by the revival of the cold

(Mr. Lonn, ISMUN)

war climate with the aim of subjugating newly independent countries, undermining the struggle for national liberation, and thwarting the establishment of a new international economic order. It is our belief that complete disarmament and permanent peace can be achieved only by abolishing the military blocs and by removing occupation troops and bases from foreign lands and territories.

We reject all attempts to inject cold war conflicts into the people's struggle for freedom from colonialism and oppression. For example, no real peace and disarmament can be attained in southern Africa without the elimination of the cancer of apartheid in South Africa, and no real peace and disarmament can be attained in the Middle East until the people of Palestine have regained their inalienable rights in their country of birth. We view with the utmost concern the possession of nuclear capability by the régimes of South Africa and Israel, in view of their ruthless disregard for international law and the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, which adds a new threatening dimension to these regional conflicts. Stringent measures must be undertaken by the international community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to those, as well as to other, régimes.

As recent events have shown, the threat to peace is not limited to the use of nuclear weapons. While nuclear disarmament requires particular priority because of the immense destructive power of nuclear weapons, absence of results in the nuclear field should not be allowed to excuse lack of progress in the field of conventional weapons. Given the enormous waste of resources which are desperately needed for development purposes, and the negative effects of aggravating regional conflicts in every corner of the world, the reduction of conventional forces is equally urgent. No country should disclaim its responsibility in this part of the disarmament process. The current impasse in the state of disarmament negotiations will only be broken by bold initiatives requiring strong political will and public support. With regard to measures that could help to break the deadlock, we should like to draw the Committee's attention to the pronouncement of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which stated that

"Unilateral measures of arms limitation or reduction could also contribute to the attainment of that goal of limiting the arms race".

(resolution S-10/2, para. 41)

(Mr. Lonn, ISJUN)

There are no multilateral agreements concerning the development of arms, so unilateral measures, both nuclear and conventional, should be welcomed as completely valid, and should stimulate reciprocal action by others.

The International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations would like to voice its hope that the role and authority of the United Nations can be strengthened so that it will be able to fulfil its obligations under the Charter. The illusory security which countries try to build up through reliance on arms must give way to security guaranteed through the United Nations system.

In conclusion we should like to welcome the decision by this session to launch the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign. Disarmament is feasible only with the combined efforts of Governments and the general public acting in concert with the United Nations system. We would like this United Nations World Disarmament Campaign to have the strongest input from non-governmental organizations and to join hands effectively with the broad popular movement that is now developing world wide.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of the United States National Campaign for a Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze, Ms. Randall Forsberg. I call on her to make her statement.

Ms. FORSBERG (United States National Campaign for a Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze): I am Randall Forsberg, Director of the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies in Brookline, Massachusetts. I have worked at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). I am responsible for the estimates of United States and Soviet nuclear weapons that are published each year in the SIPRI Yearbook and the estimates of world nuclear arsenals that appear in the Secretary-General's report on nuclear weapons.

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to this Committee on behalf of the United States National Campaign for a Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze. This Campaign is a coalition representing nearly 80 national organizations and hundreds of local organizations in all 50 states.

The goal of the Freeze Campaign is to stop United States and Soviet testing, production and deployment of nuclear warheads and of missiles and aircraft designed to deliver nuclear warheads, as a first step towards a global halt in nuclear weapon production and towards the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

This pragmatic, bilateral first step has mobilized a peace movement of a size unprecedented in peace-time in the United States. In the two years since the call to halt the nuclear arms race brought together the first groups supporting a United States-Soviet nuclear freeze, freeze resolutions have been passed in over 400 town meetings, 34 county councils, 168 city councils and one or both houses of the state legislature in 13 states. In the autumn of 1982, popular referendums on freeze resolutions will be held in 8 to 12 states, representing 20 to 30 per cent of the United States population.

Supported by an overwhelming majority in opinion polls, the goal of stopping United States and Soviet production of nuclear weapons is a non-partisan objective. Just yesterday the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives approved a resolution calling for a bilateral nuclear-weapon freeze, by a vote of 26 to 11, with the support not only of most Democrats but of nearly half the Republican members.

(Ms. Forsberg, United States National Campaign for a Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze)

There are three main reasons why the Freeze Campaign has succeeded in mobilizing unprecedented support in the United States.

First, the next generation of United States and Soviet nuclear weapons will increase the risk of nuclear war. The new United States MX, Trident II, Pershing II and Cruise missiles and Soviet land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles with increased accuracy will provide the super-Powers with improved capabilities to attack each other's nuclear forces. This will put more pressure on both sides to launch a nuclear attack first in time of crisis. Thus the continued production of nuclear weapons will decrease security, not increase it, for all parts of the globe. The freeze goal represents a serious proposal, not a slogan, to prevent the production of a new generation of weapons that will increase the risk of nuclear war.

Secondly, stopping the production of nuclear weapons is a reasonable step, which clearly deserves priority in the process of controlling and reversing the steady global increase in armaments, both nuclear and conventional. Most people, whether acting in their individual capacity or as members of city or county councils or of state or national legislatures, will not work actively for arms-control measures which are either too marginal or too sweeping to put an effective brake on the arms race. What has mobilized an unprecedented mass movement in the United States is the notion of working for a meaningful yet realistic first step, which can make subsequent, more ambitious steps in arms control and disarmament possible.

Thirdly, even in the United States, one of the richest countries in the world, people are distressed by the enormous waste of resources being poured into a futile and dangerous arms race. Clearly, if we are to reduce the \$600 to \$700 billion spent annually on military forces world-wide, the best way to start is with a halt to the production of unusable, dangerous nuclear weapons.

In various United Nations forums, there has been a discussion of disarmament since the Organization was created at the end of the Second World War. For the first 15 years, negotiations focused on plans for general and complete disarmament. Gradually, as it became obvious that this ambitious goal could not be achieved, attention turned to partial arms-control measures, such as the Partial Test-Ban Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the SALT agreements.

(Ms. Forsberg, United States National
Campaign for a Bilateral Nuclear
Weapons Freeze)

However, partial arms-control measures, even when successful, have done nothing to stop the arms race. As a result, during the past decade diplomats have pointed to a lack of political will to control and reduce armaments on the part of the Governments of the major military Powers. Increasingly, diplomats have identified lack of popular support for arms control as the reason for the lack of political will and thus as the ultimate obstacle to disarmament.

Today, enormous popular movements for nuclear disarmament exist in Western Europe and in the United States. These movements are having some effect on politicians. Yet it is still far from obvious that we can reach even the modest goal of stopping the production of further nuclear weapons.

We therefore urge the delegates to the second special session on disarmament to do something they have not done before, just as the 750,000 people who came to New York on 12 June to appeal to the United Nations, along with millions of others in this country, are doing something they have never done before.

This is to try to break the deadlock in the arms race by focusing on a measure that is big enough to signal a true change of direction, yet modest enough to be achieved within a matter of months. Such a measure, the measure that would be least complicated to achieve but would bring the greatest increase in global security, is the stopping of the continued production of nuclear weapons by the United States and the Soviet Union.

This second special session on disarmament, like the first, may adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament approved by consensus. In order for this comprehensive programme to amount to more than a pious expression of hope, more than lip-service to disarmament, it must be accompanied by the singling out of one or more measures as short-term priorities, the achievement of which is expected within the next year or two. If the special session fails to establish a set of priorities and a time-frame for their achievement, this will represent not merely a tactical failure to take advantage of the current popular support for disarmament, but also and more importantly a moral failure and a blow to the United Nations as an institution. The people have done their part. Now they expect firm, meaningful action on the part of the international diplomatic community.

(Ms. Forsberg, United States National
Campaign for a Bilateral Nuclear
Weapons Freeze)

A draft resolution calling for a nuclear freeze in one form or another is being circulated by various delegations from non-aligned countries. Because of the objections of a few countries, it may prove impossible for the Assembly to adopt such a resolution by consensus; there is strong pressure to maintain consensus in this forum. However, while consensus is necessary to conclude disarmament agreements, it is not necessary in deliberating and moving towards such agreements. According to the rules of procedure for sessions of the General Assembly, representatives can take a vote.

Thus we of the popular peace movements urge representatives to show the courage of their convictions by voting for a draft resolution calling for an immediate end to the production of nuclear weapons.. Even with some dissent, such a vote would not be a futile gesture or a sign of weakness. It would represent a significant addition to the widening circles of world opinion that have made a nuclear freeze the first priority in arms-control efforts.

We hope that representatives will add their voice to the growing chorus of voices throughout the world demanding that we should take the first step towards a sane and humane world by stopping the nuclear arms race.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the representative of the Pacific Concerns Resource Center, Mr. Roman Bedor, to make his statement.

Mr. BEDOR (Pacific Concerns Resource Center): It is a great honour for the Pacific Concerns Resource Center to address the Committee of the Whole during the second special session on disarmament, and I am honoured to represent the Center in carrying out that task.

My name is Roman Bedor and I am the Micronesian representative to the Steering Committee of the Pacific Concerns Resource Center. I come from the Republic of Belau. I thank you for the opportunity for the Pacific Concerns Resource Center to present before you the concerns of the Pacific peoples about the increasing military build-up and nuclear developments in their region.

The Pacific region covers nearly one third of the earth. It includes many thousands of islands, a huge ocean and hundreds of diverse cultures. It is an exploited region and remains a region where the heavy hand of foreign domination continues to be felt. To France the Pacific is a nuclear-bomb testing ground; to Japan it is a low-level nuclear-waste dump; to China the Pacific is a missile-testing site; to the Soviet Union it is a military toe-hold. And to the United States the Pacific is a market for nuclear power plants, a testing site for nuclear-weapon delivery systems, a high-level waste dump, a deployment theatre for the mighty nuclear submarine fleet and the lodging for an expanding string of military bases.

But to many people like myself the Pacific is a home, a home where our people have lived for thousands of years. I speak before you not only as a representative of the Pacific Concerns Resource Center, but also as someone who has directly experienced the devastation of world war. If I dwell on Pacific history, it is because I feel that only through our history can the plight of the Pacific peoples and our struggle for self-determination and a nuclear-free Pacific be understood, appreciated and accepted.

Let me begin with the northern Pacific. In this part of the Pacific lie Hawaii and the Micronesian islands. Long after other Trust Territories have been granted independence, Micronesia remains today a United Nations Strategic Trust Territory, administered by the United States. Micronesia consists of the Republic of Belau, the Federated States, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas and Guam.

(Mr. Bedor, Pacific Concerns
Resource Center)

Prior to the Second World War, most of Micronesia was occupied by Japan, while Hawaii, Guam and Tinian were military fortresses of the United States. Micronesians and Hawaiians were told that the military fortification on our islands was necessary for our defence and protection; but during the War we found ourselves defenceless and unprotected as foreign soldiers, and some of our own people with them, fought on our islands. Our homes became a fierce battle-field and many of our people died. The United States even used Tinian to launch its nuclear attack on Hiroshima. For us, military bases on our islands drew us, without our consent, into a bloody war.

When that War ended we were happy and relieved. We thought that the days of living with military bases were over and that we could again enjoy peace and freedom. Unfortunately, we came to understand that the end of the War brought peace only between the countries which had fought with one another. For us, the people of the Pacific, it was the beginning of another era of foreign militarization and the beginning of nuclearization in our region. With the scars of war still fresh in the islands, the United States began testing its new nuclear weapons in the Marshall Islands in the eastern part of Micronesia. From 1946 to 1962, 66 atomic bombs were dropped on the Marshall Islands. The people were relocated and were advised by the military officials from the United States that "the nuclear tests are for the good of mankind and to end all wars". Today these people have not yet returned home as their atolls are still highly contaminated by radioactivity. One of the islands is off-limits for 25,000 years.

The people of the Marshalls are today suffering from cancer, leukaemia, miscarriages and the anxiety which stems from the denial of their own health records and accurate information about the effects of radiation exposure. An independent health and radiological study of the people and their islands and waters has yet to be undertaken.

The lives and the future of 30,000 Marshall Islanders are entrusted to the United Nations until the Trust relationship is superseded by Marshallese self-determination. The United Nations therefore has a special and grave responsibility to ensure that the Marshallese people - these early victims of the arms race - receive the full protection promised them. Besides physical protection, this means their basic right to their own lands and their own future.

But their desire for self-determination pits the Marshallese against the United States military build-up. Last week, on 19 June, 400 landowners of Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands occupied crucial parts of the island to protest against the continued use of Kwajalein's lagoon by the United States as a missile-testing range. Despite a 48-hour advance notice of their peaceful occupation, the United States conducted an intercontinental ballistic missile test, as planned, on 22 June. Sixteen people, including three members of Parliament, were arrested. At least one was beaten, as the United States sought to remove them violently.

In August of this year, the Marshall Islanders will vote on a new political status - free association with the United States. Free association will grant the United States military eminent domain for 100 years. Later, the people of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of Belau will vote on whether or not to accept free association. In my own islands of Belau, the voters have three times ratified a Constitution which protects our own **sovereignty** and forbids all nuclear materials on our lands and in our waters. It is the first nuclear-free constitution in the world.

In a fair and free election it is doubtful that the Belauan people would embrace a 100-year marriage with the United States military. But the islands are far away and we are small. In view of its responsibility to Micronesia - a responsibility which cannot be left only to the nuclear Powers - and its commitment to disarmament, the United Nations must supervise these elections and ensure that sufficient time is allotted for adequate voter education. We seek peace and freedom, and we will not welcome any foreign military bases.

(Mr. Bedor, Pacific Concerns
Resource Center)

The southern region of the Pacific consists of the independent nations of Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Fiji, Tonga, and Western Samoa; and the territories of French Polynesia, Wallis and Futuna, New Caledonia, and Cook Islands. Nearby are Australia and New Zealand, where the indigenous peoples, the Aborigines and the Maoris, today challenge their domination by the most recent immigrants to their lands.

The peoples of the South Pacific face two direct nuclear threats to their survival: the testing of nuclear weapons by the Government of France in its Polynesian colonies, and the mining of uranium in Aboriginal Australia.

In 1962, France lost its Sahara desert nuclear testing site to the Algerian Independence Movement. Forced to relocate its nuclear testing facilities, France chose Tahiti, which has been a French Protectorate since 1842.

Since 1966, France has exploded over 80 bombs at Moruroa and Fangataufa Atolls in Tahiti. The tests in Moruroa have caused the Atoll to sink five feet into the ocean. Besides the Tahiti archipelago, other nations and territories on the eastern rim of the region are affected by radioactive contamination carried by the south-east trade winds and the inflowing ocean currents.

Consequently, Pacific peoples have continued to express their strong opposition to French testing. The Pacific Conference of Churches, the South Pacific Forum, the South Pacific Commission, the Pacific Trade Union Forum and the Pacific Concerns Resource Center are the means through which the people of the Pacific come together across political boundaries in a unified struggle for a nuclear-free Pacific.

The peoples of Tahiti, Wallis and Futuna, and New Caledonia remain colonized peoples -- and they suffer nuclear destruction because they are colonized. Ladies and gentlemen of the United Nations, you enjoy a special opportunity and bear a special responsibility to condemn the Government of France for its callous disregard for the lives, health and homes of

(Mr. Bedor, Pacific Concerns
Resource Center)

Polynesian and Melanesian peoples. If they were politically independent, the Polynesians and Melanesians would not allow such nuclear destruction. Independence for the French colonies would be a step towards global nuclear disarmament and world peace.

On the western part of the Pacific, Australian Aboriginals continue to be threatened by uranium mining on their ancestral land. In addition to the physical dangers of radiation, uranium mining may mean cultural genocide for the oldest known region on this planet.

Small nations and non-governmental organizations in the Pacific understand that we non-aligned peoples may need to continue to lead the way towards global disarmament and world peace.

On behalf of the Pacific Concerns Resource Center, we pledge our continued efforts in the struggle for a nuclear free and independent Pacific as our contribution towards global disarmament. The Pacific Ocean, the water of peace, has paid a staggering price for the waging of war.

We call upon the nations of the world to remember the innocent victims in the Pacific and to work with us in the long struggle for a world of freedom, peace and justice.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of Parliamentarians for World Order, Mr. Douglas Roche.

Mr. ROCHE (Parliamentarians for World Order): As Chairman of Parliamentarians for World Order, I address this special session on disarmament on behalf of our members, who are national legislators in 25 countries.

As members of Parliament from every continent, we speak with one voice to convey an urgent and pressing message to the leaders of every national Government.

The security of the whole planet is threatened by an arms race that knows no parallel in human history. The existence of 50,000 nuclear weapons with the destructive power of 1 million Hiroshima bombs can lead only to global catastrophe. And yet the build-up of nuclear arsenals continues.

(Mr. Roche, Parliamentarians
for World Order)

Vast resources of money and skills are devoted to armaments, while 800 million people live in absolute poverty. This situation is unjust and highly dangerous.

There is a widespread feeling that the world is drifting towards nuclear war, which could begin through miscalculation, accident or terrorism. We are raising our voices together to warn that humanity today is launched on a disaster course. We therefore make this call for global survival.

We call upon the nuclear Powers to seek a temporary freeze by all nations on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, pending a genuine reduction in nuclear arsenals. Such a freeze is a concrete, practical step which can be taken now, without delay. We believe that, with massive overkill, each side has more than enough nuclear weapons for any rational deterrence.

A nuclear freeze must be only a first step. As long as the threat of war itself continues, so will the threat of nuclear holocaust. We declare that the security of our citizens requires nothing less than general disarmament under a reliable global security system.

We therefore call for negotiations on a world treaty for simultaneous, balanced, verifiable and enforceable disarmament, which must eventually include: disarmament by all nations to the level of arms required for internal security; an international inspection organization able to monitor disarmament, using both satellites and on-site inspection; a world peace force able to enforce disarmament and prevent international aggression, the members of which should be individually recruited; an effective system of world courts and arbitration tribunals; a world development fund through which a fixed proportion of the resources made available through disarmament will be devoted to development in the poorest nations.

We commit ourselves to this task.

We recognize that the chief obstacle to disarmament and development is not technical difficulty but a lack of political will. On behalf of the millions we represent, we affirm that political will.

We make this appeal on behalf of our constituents who, whatever their culture, whatever their ideology, whatever their nationality, share one desire: the desire for life.

(Mr. Roche, Parliamentarians
for World Order)

I emphasize that, in making such an appeal, I am not standing here alone. The call for global survival that I have just transmitted has been signed by 610 parliamentarians around the world, who represent more than 50 million people.

In addition, in many parliaments, the members of Parliamentarians for World Order are introducing motions and resolutions incorporating our proposals for a nuclear freeze and general disarmament under world law. In early May, we sent a five-member delegation to Moscow and Washington to present to the leadership of the USSR and the United States an Action Programme for World Security. That delegation, representing every region of the world, was composed of Mr. Luis Echeverria, former President of Mexico; the Rt. Honourable John Silkin, House Leader of the British Labour Party; N. K. P. Salve, Deputy Parliamentary Leader of the Congress (I) Party of India; Idris Ibrahim, Deputy Speaker of the Nigerian House of Representatives; and myself, from Canada. And on the eve of this special session, Parliamentarians for World Order held a three-day forum on disarmament attended by 50 parliamentarians.

These steps that we have taken are a reflection of our resolve to keep pressing Governments in a responsible and vigorous manner. For we are convinced that only concerted pressure by legislators from many countries, backed by growing public pressure for comprehensive arms reductions, will stop the present nuclear madness. And as a signal of the conviction of Parliamentarians for World Order that disarmament efforts must be supported, we are pledging a small contribution from our members to the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign during the first year of its work.

There is nothing idealistic about our goals. Public policies to make the world safe for diversity are the ultimate realism of the nuclear age. Indeed, if anything is idealistic, it is the belief that we can carry on for another 50 or 100 years with a system of nuclear-armed States free to attack one another at any time.

Despite the lofty speeches made from this rostrum, the world is running out of patience and time. On behalf of those we represent, we make this simple statement to the nuclear Powers: If you are serious about wanting to stop the arms race, then stop it.

For our part, we condemn the continued arms race as a crime against God and humanity.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Pax Christi International, Dom Helder Camara.

Archbishop CAMARA (Pax Christi International) (interpretation from French): There are moments so grave in human history that, rather than accusing one another, we all, not only as individuals, but as peoples and institutions, have need of prophets - who, in the name of the Lord, would call us to true conversion, to true change in our lives, to true rebirth.

How great our woe: we have no prophets and we smile at prophecy.

Spirit of God, become our prophet and besides inviting us to collective conversion, compel us to accuse ourselves and to live the truth, which alone is capable of liberating us.

You know better than anyone, spirit of God, that in the course of the centuries of human life, man has always demonstrated that, as far as intelligence is concerned, he shares in God's intelligence but that, as far as selfishness is concerned, he surpasses himself and reaches impossible extremes.

What have we, of the West and of the East, done and what are we still doing?

While, in the West, humanity lived through the First World War, the East lived through a revolution that ran counter to the system prevailing in the West: a system of workers, socialist, without capital, without God.

The West has set itself up as the defender of the faith and Christian civilization. Yet, it created a privileged minority and has oppressed millions of human beings. The confrontation of the century seemed to be between the super-Power of the West, the United States, and the super-Power of the East, the Soviet Union, which has rapidly passed from a feudal State to a rival of the United States.

During the Second World War, the West, in order to defeat the Nazis, pretended to forget that communism is intrinsically evil and sought its co-operation. At the end of that War, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, at Yalta, divided the world into zones of influence between the East and the West.

(Archbishop Camara, Pax Christi
International)

There were already the first and second worlds, more alike than they wished to admit. Profit, the primary value for capitalism, mutely attests to the fact that its system has materialistic roots. The Soviet Union deals with what is most imperialistic in capitalism: namely, the multinationals and the banking system. The two super-Powers have their satellites and each, in its own fashion, oppresses the third world.

The East and the West are rushing headlong into the arms race. As Pope John Paul II told this Assembly, the arms race, whether nuclear, chemical or biological, is the greatest folly imaginable. We all know that the two super-Powers have the capacity to exterminate life on our planet several times over. Even if a nuclear war does not break out, the cost of these arms prevents us from combating extreme poverty throughout the world.

The West should long since have acknowledged the materialistic foundations of capitalism and stopped posing as the defender of Christian civilization. It is time for the East to acknowledge its own imperialism and suppression of liberty, especially religious freedom and the rights of workers.

And we of the North and of the South, what have we done and what are we doing now?

(Archbishop Camara, Pax Christi
International)

Without wishing to pass judgement on anyone, we must admit that the North is holding on to its ever-growing riches, while oppressing the South with the injustices of the international trade policy. The South maintains a small minority of rich people, whose wealth is steadily growing, making the oppression resulting from the North's ambition even more sorrowful and disgraceful. The North created the consumer society, which wastes the South's frequently non-renewable raw materials and causes pollution, which in turn creates desertification and destroys rivers, fish and fishermen. The modern imperialism of the North is wielded especially by the multinational corporations. The North frequently manipulates the Governments of the South, encouraging dictatorships, particularly the military type, which seem stabler than the few weak constitutional Governments. Through advertising, the North imposes its lifestyle, its patterns and even its dietary habits on the South. The North has forced the South to participate in the arms race.

Dear United Nations, teach us the lesson of rebirth and renaissance. Discover the speediest and surest way to liberate yourself from the anti-democratic privilege of the right of veto, which was usurped from the time of your creation by some super-Powers, the victors of the Second World War. This privilege is disgraceful, and the super-Powers are not ashamed to use it to their own benefit. Discover the speediest and surest way to deliver your Members from the idolatry of national security, which, in the Latin American experience, is proving so painful, with the kidnapping, torture and disappearance of thousands of persons.

Those two steps can win you the respect you are sometimes denied, when it seems practically impossible for you to reconcile the selfish national interests of 157 Members.

Dear United Nations, there are immense forces which you can stimulate and co-ordinate by identifying concrete objectives that are of crucial importance for true lasting peace. Encourage military leaders to discover a new mission for armies, since the notion of war has been radically changed in our era by the weapons of mass destruction. Encourage schools, especially universities, to satisfy youth's need for authenticity; they want to learn about the great human

(Archbishop Camara, Pax Christi International)

problems. Encourage the young to become experts in opening eyes and awakening the awareness of persons of goodwill. Encourage women the world over to help dispel the fear of unilateral disarmament. This should occur throughout the entire world, so that there will no longer be a first world, second world or third world, but one single world. Encourage technicians of the world to protect what is human in themselves and to demand that the human dimension in technology and electronics be safeguarded, especially in the economic and political fields. Encourage workers of the world to show that industries of peace employ more workers than industries of war and to refuse to manufacture instruments of death, perhaps even for their own children. Encourage world religions to respect one another and to join forces against violence, hatred, the arms race and war.

In this spirit, Pax Christi International, at its recent council, has addressed concrete proposals to you in its Manifesto on Security and Disarmament.

And never forget the people, the humble, the oppressed, who have a unique mission to build a tomorrow without rich or poor, without oppressors and without oppressed - a tomorrow of true sisters and brothers beneath the loving gaze of the Father of us all.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of Project Ploughshares, on whom I now call.

The Right Reverend Lois WILSON (Project Ploughshares): I speak on behalf of a group of Canadians who wish to convert the tools of death into the tools of life. I speak on behalf of a large number of Canadians who take seriously the teaching to love your neighbour and to honour the Creator of life. In particular, I speak on behalf of Project Ploughshares, a wide coalition of churches, both Protestant and Catholic, and women's and civic organizations and in consultation with the People's Assembly on Canadian Foreign Policy.

My generation is the first in human history to come into adulthood knowing that the human race has the technology to destroy all life on earth and possibly earth itself within a few days.

(The Right Reverend Lois Wilson,
Project Ploughshares)

My generation realized that after 6 August 1945 the world could never be the same. Yet, even with that knowledge, we continued to bear children, to do our work and to plan for the future. We in the Canadian Churches believe God to be the creator of life and not the dealer of death; we also believe that God's will for people in the whole world is that they shall have life and have it more abundantly. Therefore, we, like peoples of other communities, find it shocking and untenable that leaders of any nation today can speak about winning a nuclear war, or a limited nuclear war or even overkill.

Finally, my generation has come into adulthood knowing that the problems of the world know no boundaries and that we face ultimate issues of life and death in a way that our parents did not.

In the light of this urgent situation, permit me a few comments about the struggle for peace and justice in the world.

Disarmament is part of the struggle for a just and healthy society. One of the main deterrents to war which would achieve peace is an adequate and just provision of food, social and economic security and the earth's resources to all the peoples of the world. The monies at present spent on weapons distort national and global economies and increase tensions between nations and peoples by diverting funds and human resources from critically needed development projects.

Movements for disarmament challenge the ideology of national security. The widespread doctrine of national security should be an instrument to achieve social security and internal economic justice for the peoples of the country. But the doctrine has been used to demean human rights, to support repression and to bolster militarism linked with economic exploitation.

(Rt. Rev. Lois Wilson, Project
Ploughshares)

So we affirm as strongly as we are able that the only worthwhile security for individual citizens and for the whole community of nations is the guarantee of full participation of peoples in their nations' development and in the policies established for political, social and economic development. We reject the claim that building up arms will bring security, for a build-up on one side is always answered by a build-up on the other.

We affirm the need to work for mechanisms and structures to secure disarmament and a just peace. We therefore affirm the covenants which have been made through the United Nations and pledge to continue our efforts to support these mechanisms. We have urged our Government to take significant and specific steps to create the climate in which international mechanisms can function and negotiations can be stepped up. Our Government will, we hope, also urge the major nuclear Powers to make deep cuts in their weaponry.

We affirm that disarmament is the concern not only of States but of people. The effort to bring about justice and peace in our world must be in response to the conscience of the people whose lives are endangered by the current growth of weapons of mass destruction. Do we care so little about our children and the Creator of life that we do not speak or act?

We are well aware that disarmament will have some economic repercussions in countries that sell arms, but we affirm the necessity and look forward to the opportunity to create alternative kinds of employment which will support the social and economic needs of people.

We commit ourselves to moving our Government towards specific progress and policies that will serve the ends of peace and disarmament, and to that end we wish to place five concrete suggestions before this Assembly for action.

First, we would urge our Government to support an immediate global freeze on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles as well as all weapons of mass destruction. We would hope that nation after nation will declare its intention to become a nuclear-weapon free zone within a specific time frame and to establish an international monitoring system to ensure compliance.

Secondly, we will continue to press for the adoption of a "strategy of suffocation", as advocated by our Canadian Government in 1978. In particular we

(Rt. Rev. Lois Wilson, Project
Ploughshares)

urge our Government to refrain from testing United States strategic weapons such as the Cruise missile and to declare Canada a nuclear-weapon-free zone in line with the recommendation of the Final Document of the first special session. We also urge our Government to take special steps to bring a halt to the autonomous technological escalation in armaments.

Thirdly, we would urge all the nations, including our own, to declare that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons or to be part of a consortium of nations -- for example, NATO or the Warsaw Pact -- to employ first use of nuclear weapons. We urge the Canadian Government, as part of NATO, to show leadership in seeking that commitment. Such a declaration is critical in those times when nations find themselves in hostilities despite the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The nations of the world must pledge themselves to limiting their military defence to conventional weapons only in such circumstances.

Fourthly, we support and applaud the launching of the World Disarmament Campaign and Fund and urge that Non-Governmental Organizations be formally represented in planning that Campaign. We urge our own Government to make a major financial commitment to such a fund, as have Sweden, India and Czechoslovakia.

Fifthly, we support the formation of a world peace-makers association of nations to begin building alliances between countries committed to working for a just peace based on confidence.

The temptation is to shut our eyes to the horrifying developments in the world because they are so complex and difficult. We cannot give in to that temptation in the face of an arms race that is already threatening the fundamental human right of people to survive. The problems of wars between nations and of nuclear weapons are not just happening on television. They are taking place here on earth.

In the face of the horror of this arms race we reaffirm our faith in the God of hope, who opens up a human future. We pledge ourselves to pray and work for peace and disarmament and for human and caring justice for all the peoples of the world.

(Rt. Rev. Lois Wilson, Project
Ploughshares)

Finally, we recognize the wide variety of motivations of people who support the movement for peace and disarmament. For Christians the motivation lies in the commitment to love both God and the neighbour, who bears God's image. In seeking peace and an end to militarization the people of the world are breaking down the barriers that previously divided us. We believe that to be a sign of hope, one which we beg you to take seriously so that you will take the steps needed to bring peace for our time.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of the Second Special Session National Liaison Committee for Nuclear and General Disarmament, Mr. Senji Yamaguchi.

Mr. YAMAGUCHI (Second Special Session National Liaison Committee for Nuclear and General Disarmament) (spoke in Japanese; English text provided by the speaker): In the name of the Second Special Session National Liaison Committee for Nuclear and General Disarmament, which represents practically all walks of life in Japan, including women, religious workers, peace workers, youth, consumers, trade unions and A-Bomb-victim organizations and other grass-root movements, we should like to express our respect and gratitude to the United Nations for giving us this opportunity to address this historic second special session on disarmament. We believe that the General Assembly is engaged in deliberations that have a crucial bearing on the very survival, or annihilation, of the entire human race.

As Japanese Non-Governmental Organizations we have brought to the United Nations a petition signed by 28,362,935 persons, requesting that the General Assembly take steps for nuclear and general disarmament. Entrusted with its delivery, our delegation transmitted the petition to the United Nations Secretary-General in a public ceremony on 10 June.

With great regret, however, we must say that 223 of our colleagues were absent from our delegation because they had been refused visas by the United States Government and thus were effectively denied their rightful access to the United Nations. We therefore humbly request the Assembly seriously to inquire into this matter, which may well be a violation of the

(Mr. Yamaguchi, Second Special Session
National Liaison Committee for Nuclear
and General Disarmament)

host nation Agreement between the United Nations and the United States. In the future the right of participation in the work of the United Nations of all Non-Governmental Organizations at all levels should be fully recognized by the Host Nation and implemented so that this denial of visas does not establish a precedent.

On 9 August 1945, as the bomb struck the city of Nagasaki, I happened to 1.4 kilometres away from the hypocentre. I sustained serious burns from the waist up and have been left with unhealing scars, as you can clearly see today. On that day I saw people all around me with extruded eyeballs, men and women showered with penetrating splinters of glass and wood, and weeping young mothers frantically holding on to their lifeless all but decapitated babies. Multitudes of others lay dead in the charred ruins of the city. In an instant the atomic bomb had decimated thousands and thousands of people, combatants and civilians alike. It annihilated all life and apparently destroyed human society and its environment.

For about 40 days after the bombing I remained on the brink of death due to a high fever. After leaving the hospital seven months later, keloids covered my entire upper body and I continued to suffer from various illnesses which struck me one after another. I attempted suicide on several occasions in times of deep despair.

(Mr. Yamaguchi, Second Special Session
National Liaison Committee for Nuclear
and General Disarmament)

By the end of 1945, some 210,000 people are believed to have died from the bombing in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Over 90 per cent were civilians. Many of those who managed to survive the nuclear onslaught continue to suffer from, or live under the fear of, delayed effects of radiation, such as leukemia and other cancers. Their predicament is compounded by mental anguish and socio-economic hardships which defy all explanation.

May I, as a hibakusha, as a survivor of the nuclear inferno, ask the Assembly whether this kind of genocide should ever be allowed to happen again. Nuclear arsenals of today are far more destructive than their prototypes of 37 years ago. If a nuclear war should break out, whether it be "limited", a theatre war or an all-out conflagration, it would undoubtedly result in the destruction of countless numbers of people and might very well annihilate civilization and humanity.

Mindful as we are of the aggression and crimes perpetrated by Japanese militarism during the Second World War, we Japanese, the first victims of nuclear war, have committed ourselves to both the letter and spirit of the post-war Japanese Constitution. In so doing, we are dedicated to a world at peace through nuclear and general disarmament. In particular, we call for the outright abolition of nuclear weapons because they constitute an immediate and present danger to humankind.

Our undertakings have enjoyed the broad support of an overwhelming majority of the Japanese people, as evidenced by our successful petition campaign of millions in the past seven months, the massive rally of 200,000 people in Hiroshima in March, and the mass demonstration of over 400,000 in Tokyo in May.

This movement is part of an unprecedented global upsurge of movements and public opinion in Europe, the United States and elsewhere calling for nuclear and general disarmament. It has caused deep concern to surface among all peoples of the immediate danger of nuclear war, a threat that hangs over us all. We can wait no longer.

After meeting and conferring in New York with colleagues from all over the world, we are now even more firmly convinced that our movement is in full accord with world public opinion.

(Mr. Yamaguchi, Second Special
Session National Liaison Committee
for Nuclear and General
Disarmament)

First of all, we would like to propose that the programme of the World Disarmament Campaign should include the dissemination of correct information and knowledge on the damage and after-effects of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, especially among younger generations, which have no experience of the disasters of war. To this end, we Japanese non-governmental organizations are fully prepared to co-operate with such projects by sending teams of hibakusha-A-bomb victims - and scientific experts throughout the world.

Secondly, we urge the General Assembly to adopt immediately an international convention outlawing the use of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity. We would also propose that 6-9 August should be declared as pledging dates for nuclear disarmament and for one-minute of bell-ringing in every city and town throughout the world.

Thirdly, the General Assembly is urged to make every effort to create favourable conditions for establishing regional nuclear-free zones, including a much-needed nuclear-free Pacific, rather than to wait for such conditions to develop.

Fourthly, the United Nations has the primary responsibility for overcoming the present global crisis which is unprecedented in human history. We strongly urge the United Nations to decide on a comprehensive programme of disarmament having a definite time-frame, with the highest priority attached to the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and thus make an all-out effort to eradicate the danger of nuclear war. Let me also remind you of the existence of thousands of nuclear victims who are in need of relief and reparations. They must be aided by legislative action in the nation-States where they reside.

Furthermore, we are convinced that all humanity shares the hope of transferring, through disarmament, the material and human resources now squandered on the arms race to meeting human needs, especially in the developing countries.

(Mr. Yarauchi, Second Special
Session National Liaison Committee
for Nuclear and General
Disarmament)

I ask you: please take a good look at my face and my hands. What happened to me and thousands of other hibakusha - death and suffering in a nuclear war - must never happen again - not to a single person. Please give us your solemn pledge and assurance of peace so that I and my fellow hibakusha shall be the first and the last to suffer the death and agony caused by a nuclear war.

We hibakusha speak out; I shall continue to speak out as long as I live.
(spoke in English)

May there be no more Hiroshimas, no more Nagasakis, no more wars, and no more hibakusha!

The CHAIRMAN: I call next on the representative of the Soviet Liaison Committee of Peace Forces and the Soviet Peace Fund, Mr. Gregory Gretchko.

Mr. GRETCHKO (Soviet Liaison Committee of Peace Forces and Soviet Peace Fund) (interpretation from Russian): Permit me to express my gratitude to the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament for the privilege it has granted me to address this high intergovernmental forum on behalf of the Soviet Liaison Committee of Peace Forces and the Soviet Peace Fund.

The Soviet peace movement, of which those public organizations are an integral part, has always attached primary importance to dialogue - in other words, to the free exchange of opinions on the basis of equality. In our view, the aim of such dialogue consists in getting to know and understand one another better and in working together for achieving the common objective, rather than in imposing one's views on one's partner.

Our objective is to achieve, in favour of peace, the solution of the most vital question of our time - whether or not there is to be nuclear war - war in which only a madman can hope for victory while human civilization, and possibly life on our planet itself, would be destroyed. The Soviet people, more than any other people in the world, knows only too well the true price of security and peace, because it has paid the price for peace - peace not only for itself but for all - with the heavy toll of 20 million lives of its sons and daughters, the destruction of towns, cities and villages, and the tragic plight of widows and orphans.

(Mr. Gretchko, Soviet Liaison
Committee of Peace Forces and
Soviet Peace Fund)

That is why our movement is so wide in scope and why the representatives of various strata of our population -- trade unions and women's, youth and other organizations -- are taking part in it. It is a truly public movement. The Soviet Peace Fund can serve as an example of the independence and voluntary nature of the movement. In their anti-war activities Soviet public organizations rely on the resources of the Fund, which consist of voluntary contributions from the Soviet people. The number of voluntary contributions to the Fund stands today at 30 million.

(Mr. Gretchko, Soviet Liaison Committee
of Peace Forces and Soviet Peace Fund)

The numerous peace initiatives that our Government has repeatedly taken at the international level reflect the will of the Soviet people.

Before my departure for New York, the Soviet peace movement expressed its definitive and total support for and approval of the new Soviet initiative set forth in Mr. Brezhnev's message to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We welcome the obligation assumed by our country not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

We favour a halt to, and reversal of, the nuclear-arms race.

We are for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and destruction of their arsenals.

We are for progress in all areas where there are opportunities for limiting and radically reducing armaments, whether they be nuclear weapons or other kinds of weapons of mass destruction or conventional armaments. There is no weapon that our country would not be ready to limit or to prohibit on a mutual and reciprocal basis.

It is our desire that real success be achieved at the Soviet-United States talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons soon to begin in Geneva.

We support the position of our Government which proceeds from the belief that any agreement on any aspect of the disarmament problem should be honest and equitable and that it should not jeopardize the interests of anyone.

The situation prevailing in the world today makes it imperative that politicians be aware of their unprecedented responsibility for every move they make at the international level. I doubt whether those leaders are really displaying such responsibility when pursuing their selfish, expansionist objectives. They loudly proclaim certain regions of the world to be "a zone of their vital interests" or advocate the theory of "a limited nuclear war" and of "a first nuclear strike"; when they are out to destroy the existing military equilibrium between East and West; when they encourage the Israeli aggression against, and genocide of, the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, and when they brazenly interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples.

(Mr. Gretchko, Soviet Liaison Committee
of Peace Forces and Soviet Peace Fund)

That kind of approach stems, I would say, from the imperialist stereotyped way of thinking according to which the strong can enslave the weak, dictate to them their own conditions or else simply intimidate them and even seize their lands and their wealth. Today such an approach to international affairs is not only obsolete, but also extremely dangerous for the fate of mankind; and it is against that approach, against such a policy, that millions upon millions of people are protesting today, people who have joined hands in a powerful movement against war and the arms race. The peace partisans of our country are in their ranks.

I wish to inform you that in May and June of this year, in connexion with this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a mass campaign for disarmament and peace and against the nuclear threat has been in progress in the Soviet Union. Throughout the country more than 20,000 rallies and meetings, marches and demonstrations have already been held in which more than 60 million people have taken part.

I take this opportunity afforded me in addressing the members of the world community to emphasize the role played by the United Nations over the last few decades in preserving and strengthening peace. But I would be lacking in candour should I fail to say that it has not done all in its power to put into effect those numerous reasonable and equitable decisions that were adopted within these walls. I should like to hope that today, when the situation in the world has become so aggravated, when the threat of a nuclear catastrophe is so real, the present session will adopt a clear-cut and decisive position on the most pressing questions of the day - the problems of halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament. This session must state its positions on these questions before mankind, which is waiting hopefully for the outcome of these proceedings. I hope that the participants in the present session, Members of the United Nations, will strive earnestly to further the implementation of the resolutions and recommendations, relying on the strength of the will of the broad masses of people. These noble tasks might be promoted by the holding of a World Disarmament Campaign. I assure you that, in implementing these objectives, you can rely on the support of the Soviet public, whom I am representing here.

(Mr. Gretchko, Soviet Liaison Committee
of Peace Forces and Soviet Peace Fund)

As one of the as yet rare breed of "space professionals", I have had occasion to work in outer space, and it is highly important that outer space should remain for ever an environment of peace and co-operation, free from any weapons. In the course of these space flights I reflected on the fact that, in essence, our planet is inhabited by a single human family whose members are equally responsible for their future, for the life of generations to come. And a few hours ago, in the Soviet Union a spacecraft with French and Soviet astronauts aboard was launched. In difficult and dangerous circumstances in outer space, this international crew is working as a team for common goals of security and progress in order to preserve life on earth. Indeed, in space flights what is needed is teamwork on the part of all of us constituting the multinational crew on planet Earth. So let us spare no effort in acting together in the name of these common noble goals.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Swedish People's Parliament for Disarmament, Mr. Ulrich Herz.

Mr. HERZ (Swedish People's Parliament for Disarmament): I have the honour to address this General Assembly on behalf of the Swedish People's Parliament for Disarmament, which met in January this year for a three-day session on the items on the provisional agenda of this second special session devoted to disarmament. Three hundred Swedish organizations were represented by a total of 500 delegates. These 300 organizations covered all relevant sectors of the Swedish community - religious, political, humanitarian and professional organizations, trade unions, youth and women's organizations and so forth.

The membership of these 300 organizations had for three years prior to the parliamentary session dealt intensively with the items for a second special session. They started their studies by thoroughly scrutinizing the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. Subsequently they received and examined a great number of documents on disarmament emanating from the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, from the Swedish Foreign Ministry, from peace research institutes and from the international non-governmental organizations family.

(Mr. Herz, Swedish People's Parliament
for Disarmament)

The Swedish People's Parliament formulated a number of resolutions and recommendations, most of which were adopted by consensus. These recommendations have been submitted to our own Government, to the 156 other governmental delegations and to national as well as international non-governmental organizations. I will not repeat here what can easily be studied in print.

We do not claim that these recommendations in themselves offer solutions to the problems at stake at this special session. What we want to report here is the procedure and underlying philosophy by which the Swedish People's Parliament tried to involve the broadest possible segments of conscious, devoted, enlightened and responsible people in careful and serious consideration of how to break the vicious spiral of the arms race and how to change the awkward mechanism of disarmament negotiations which, as a consequence of certain inherent inconsistencies and contradictions, so far have actually resulted in the self-perpetuation of the arms race.

Our conviction is that recent developments in arms technology have made certain elements of the conceptual and institutional framework of the United Nations Charter obsolete. In the first place, we are thinking of the concept of national sovereignty. Our mutual interdependence has increased in a way that makes it impossible for 157 Member States to act as if they were in a position of sovereignty. There must be certain limits to the right of national self-government. The freedom of the Member States to acquire weapons exclusively according to their own decision must be restricted, nor can the Member States be allowed to make their own sovereign judgement regarding how the concept of self-defence should be interpreted and implemented.

(Mr. Herz, Swedish People's
Parliament for Disarmament)

Further, each Member State should be obliged to establish the moral and legal duty of its citizens to resist active participation in any armed contest, either between nations or within nations, before the conflict has been dealt with by an international authority. The ordinary citizens should know - and they should be reminded again and again - that war is forbidden under international law.

The vast majority of politicians, diplomats and military advisers representing their nations in the General Assembly still adhere to the notion that military resources are apt to guarantee their nations' security, peace and freedom. That has been the conventional wisdom of generations, but that wisdom was challenged in this Assembly hall four years ago. The Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament reflects the understanding that the total amount of world armaments, and their persistent increase, are among the most important causes of political, economic and social instability, and thus of insecurity, for all of mankind. Today, that is an established truth.

But those same political leaders act on the hypothesis that, while the totality of armaments is extremely dangerous and threatening, their own part of that totality is indispensable for their national security. That is a great deception. That deception is, unfortunately, strongly reflected in the disarmament negotiations. The concept of balanced reduction is an illusion, since nobody can judge balance in a way acceptable to all parties, and since alleged national interests are always given priority. There seems to be no way out of this dilemma.

Do the governmental representatives, when they act in this way, act on behalf of their peoples? The answer cannot be a simple yes or no. I am under the impression, however, having listened to the general debate in this hall, that the political leaders are more inclined, on average, to think and act in terms of national defence and national security than are, let us say, the majority of the 800,000 individuals from all over the world who rallied for peace on 12 June.

If there are weaknesses in the very machinery of disarmament negotiations, and if there are inconsistencies in the attitudes of the main actors, a certain change can nevertheless be perceived in the disarmament efforts over the last four years. That change is of a somewhat paradoxical character. If we look at the General Assembly, we find that speakers at the four regular sessions held since the first special session on disarmament have, as far as substantive items are concerned,

(Mr. Herz, Swedish People's
Parliament for Disarmament)

mainly echoed the traditional rhetoric on the necessity for international disarmament on the one hand and the importance of the military strength of their own countries on the other.

If we consider what has happened in the reconstructed Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, we find that it has mostly been locked in positions of stalemate.

But in this very same period a new type of thinking has appeared and developed in the field of investigation and analysis, both inside and outside the United Nations. I have in mind such documents as the report of the Brandt Commission, with its attempt to look at disarmament in the broader perspective of North-South relationships, the recently delivered report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, with its recommendations regarding the strengthening of the United Nations security system, and a number of studies carried out by highly qualified groups under the auspices of the Secretary-General, such as the comprehensive study on nuclear weapons, the study of the expert group on the relationship between disarmament and development, and others. In their approaches and in their conclusions, those studies are very near the positions at which devoted non-governmental organizations have arrived and have expressed in books and leaflets. They also coincide fairly well with recent findings of prominent peace researchers.

Those documents prove the necessity of serious joint efforts in the intermediate sphere between governmental negotiations and the people's demands manifested in demonstrations, petitions and rallies. This is where the Swedish People's Parliament comes in, as a pilot project to be followed in an appropriate way in as many member countries as possible. Here we have a chance to develop new concepts and perhaps, in a process of constructive joint thinking among politicians, peace researchers and enlightened non-governmental organization activists, to find new solutions.

In anticipation of proposals which I know are to be introduced at this special session, I should like finally to give support, on behalf of the Swedish People's Parliament, to the following three concrete suggestions: first, that the Assembly should adopt a resolution to endorse and implement the recommendations of the study of the expert group on the relationship between disarmament and development and to promote the widest possible participation by non-governmental organizations in those efforts; secondly, that it should convert the United Nations

(Mr. Herz, Swedish People's
Parliament for Disarmament)

Centre for Disarmament into an independent specialized agency; and thirdly, that it should give to those non-governmental organizations whose activities are focused on peace and disarmament a status in the United Nations machinery corresponding at least to that of organizations having consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

The CHAIRMAN: I next invite the representative of the Union of Arab Jurists, Mr. Mansur Kikhia, to make his statement.

Mr. KIKHIA (Union of Arab Jurists) (interpretation from Arabic):

On behalf of the Union of Arab Jurists, I present my compliments to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee. I should like also to congratulate the President of the General Assembly on his election to preside over this important session. It gratifies us that this session is taking place under the leadership of an individual who is dear to us, and it is an honour that he belongs to the great Arab world, and to Iraq, which acts as host to the Union of Arab Jurists, whose headquarters are in Baghdad. Furthermore, I should like to convey my best wishes to the Secretary-General and to wish him every success in the difficult tasks he faces in this situation, which is critical for the United Nations and the entire world.

The Union of Arab Jurists is an Arab non-governmental organization representing about a quarter of a million jurists in the Arab world. It places particular importance on the need to promote awareness of democracy and human rights in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. The issue of disarmament is therefore of great importance to us. It is one of the most complicated; it is a chronic problem that has existed since the dawn of life on earth. We should look at it realistically and admit that it will be difficult to achieve a decisive solution to it.

The League of Nations failed to deal with this issue, and from the time of its establishment until now, the United Nations has been unable to achieve a proper solution or positive results, even though huge advances have been made in the weapons industry and in the destructive capacity of those weapons. Mankind is threatened with extermination. These facts should provide an impetus for us to put a stop to the arms race.

We all know that disarmament is a difficult and complicated problem because it is linked with the security and the very existence of nations, as well as with mistrust between nations and the lack of any sort of universal deterrent power or any means of verification.

(Mr. Kikhia, Union of Arab Jurists)

Force is considered by some as the only safeguard of the interest of peoples. Hence we shall not achieve any success in disarmament unless we enlighten our leaders and peoples become more aware of the full dimensions of this matter, as the future of mankind in general depends on its solution. We should not deceive ourselves; there will be no hope of controlling the arms race unless we can control the reasons for feuds and disputes and for fear and mistrust in the world.

Disarmament is multi-dimensional and has a long historical background. We have listened to correct ideas and justified demands during the past days and on behalf of the Union of Arab Jurists I should like to focus on two points.

Expenditure on weapons in the world amounts to \$500 billion a year. This is an enormous amount to spend on the manufacture of weapons and it stands in ugly contrast to the poverty in which two thirds of the world's population lives. This is a squandering of our resources and an impediment to development and it is impossible to pursue the arms race and the achievement of economic and social development at the same time. The arms race is an international phenomenon. It has spread through recent wars to the third world and this is a matter for anxiety. The expenditure by developing countries on armaments is about 20 per cent of world expenditure on them and the growth rate of military expenditure in these countries is double the rate of increase in the industrialized countries. It also hampers the comprehensive growth of international trade.

I should also like to emphasize the relationship between disarmament and the human rights crisis in the whole world. The Union of Arab Jurists hopes that this factor will play a role in the matters discussed by the Assembly. Sophisticated arms are used in the service of domination and hegemony at the world level, suppressing striving peoples and impeding the liquidation of colonialism. Brutal military force is an obstacle to achieving the freedom of peoples and enabling them to exercise their legitimate right to self-determination. While the Assembly is discussing such matters, the racist Zionist entity is carrying out an act of aggression against Lebanon, destroying cities, fields and factories with its planes and tanks and the tanks are rolling over men, women and children and the elderly, in pursuit of its policy of extermination of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Kikhia, Union of Arab Jurists)

Sophisticated weapons are a means of suppression used by anti-democratic forces in many parts of the world. By crushing their peoples and suppressing minorities and their own citizens by the most violent methods, the most ferocious dictatorships consisting of fascists, racists, reactionaries, exploiters and military juntas are using the latest military devices to eliminate democracy in their countries and are training their soldiers and mercenaries to kill defenceless citizens and destroy their houses. In this way they use their force against defenceless citizens. All this takes place under the guidance of developed countries, which produce the weapons that help these régimes and supply them with such weapons for torture and suppression. These weapons are eliminating human rights in many countries of the world.

This Assembly has no right to ignore these crimes, which are a source of great sorrow, on the pretext of non-interference in the internal affairs of countries. Faith in the basic rights of man and in the welfare of man and his equality and equity are matters consecrated in the spirit and principles of the United Nations Charter and all Member States should act accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The next speaker is Mr. William P. Thompson, of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. I call on him to make his statement.

Mr. THOMPSON (United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America): My name is William P. Thompson. I am Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, a Christian denomination of 2.4 million active members gathered in almost 9,000 churches situated in all 50 States of the United States, working with Christians in other lands, on all continents, in mission and service. Our Church, organized before our nation became independent, is at present holding its 194th annual General Assembly in Hartford, Connecticut. I bring greetings from our General Assembly to this General Assembly of the United Nations. We pledge our support and offer our prayers for the attainment of a just world peace.

(Mr. Thompson, United Presbyterian
Church in the United States of
America)

Our Church, historically, has wrestled with the implications of the Christian Gospel for issues of war and peace. In 1946 our Assembly first expressed its concern regarding atomic war, stating: "Christians know that war is evil. The use of the atomic bomb means that war reaches a degree of destruction which multiplies this evil beyond human concept." That Assembly called for the "... immediate cessation of the manufacture of atomic bombs." In 1947 our General Assembly sought "... world-wide disarmament through the agency of the United Nations." Supporting the United Nations from the outset, our Church has linked its hope for disarmament with the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument for peace-keeping and peace-making.

(Mr. Thompson, United Presbyterian Church
in the United States of America)

Over the years we have endorsed specific measures such as the comprehensive test ban and a chemical ban. In 1981 our Assembly endorsed the call for a bilateral nuclear freeze, halting the production and deployment of nuclear weapons, an action that has received widespread support among our congregations. We have supported similar actions through our participation in the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America and the World Council of Churches.

I do not come to address the technicalities, the data of the arms race or the merits of particular proposals, nor do I come to focus on our common anxieties about war, nuclear or conventional. While nuclear war looms large on all our horizons, our partnership with Christians around the world makes us particularly aware of dozens of non-nuclear conflicts that have devastated many of your countries. Instead, I come to plead for a vision of an attainable peace.

In 1980 the United Presbyterian Church renewed its commitment to a ministry of peace-making because of our faith - our belief in a God who is sovereign Lord of all creation and of history, Father of all peoples, whose will, expressed in the Prince of Peace, is for the well-being of all humanity in wholeness with all creation. Our Confession of 1967 addresses the implications of this for our Church, as follows:

"The Church, in its own life, is called to practice the forgiveness of enemies and to commend to the nations as practical politics the search for co-operation and peace. This search requires that the nations pursue fresh and responsible relations across every line of conflict, even at risk to national security, to reduce areas of strife and to broaden international understanding."

Our understanding of human nature instructs our peace-making. Our awareness of the sinful and demonic - concepts often disavowed by secular ideologies - helps explain our condition. For us world history reveals those forces that have brought so much tragedy.

We know that power corrupts and that unchecked and unlimited power in the hands of individuals and Governments becomes demonic, even idolatrous,

(Mr. Thompson, United Presbyterian Church
in the United States of America)

because of the wielders of such power forgetting their ultimate accountabilities, playing as they do with the destiny of peoples that should be directed by God alone.

We know that fear destroys and mass paranoia can lead peoples to destroy others as they seek security through the possession of maximum power.

We know that the human mind is capable of rationalizing the grossest of evils in the name of some interest disguised as a good.

Because we also know the human capacity for freedom, for justice, for compassion, we hope and dare to speak of a vision of a just peace. We speak of a world order many have visualized yet which few have dared risk because they have been conditioned to accept only the risks of destruction as normative for the behaviour of nation-States.

A just peace cannot be built on traditional concepts of deterrence. Deterrence is not simply a manner of restraining another's action. The English word means to restrain by creating terror. In practice it means holding other societies hostage by threatening destruction. Such policies are counter-productive because one cannot stimulate terror in others without raising one's own fears.

A just peace cannot be built if the security of one State is gained at the cost of the security or destruction of another State or people. We must realize that there is no absolute security in human affairs. Attempts to absolutize such security result in self-imprisonment and distort other human values.

A just peace cannot be achieved by any policy or practice that devalues human life, dehumanizing victims and victimizers alike. This is true regardless of whether it is the disproportionate allocation of resources for militarism at the cost of human development or whether it is in military strategies that count human life as expendable.

My General Assembly directed me to bring, and I brought, to this General Assembly of the United Nations a thousand paper cranes folded by Japanese-American Christians, honouring the memory of Sadako, a young

(Mr. Thompson, United Presbyterian Church
in the United States of America)

girl, a victim of the bombing of Hiroshima, who sought to fold a thousand paper cranes before her death. She did not succeed, but the folding of paper cranes has become a symbol of the desire of the peoples of Japan in particular, for peace.

A new Japanese film based on recently declassified United States military intelligence footage of Hiroshima and Nagasaki describes those suffering from the physical effects of the atomic blasts as "unrecognizable as human beings". Knowing what we know now, any use of nuclear weapons today would mean that those who committed that deed would be spiritually "unrecognizable as human beings".

What then will a just peace require?

First, a just peace will require a new sense of world community reflected in the strengthening of our global institutions, transcending the divisiveness of national structures. These must be capable of responding to the global problems which challenge our interdependent world.

Second, a just peace will reflect a new understanding of security, based on common interest, co-operation and trust. This means rejecting militarism as a means of providing internal and international order, and eliminating war as an instrument for obtaining national goals.

Third, a just peace requires a new commitment to social and economic equity. The technology and resources exist to provide for all basic human needs. This necessitates patterns of economic production and distribution designed to eliminate poverty and powerlessness, thus removing sources of resentment and conflict. You will recognize this as a call for an obtainable new international economic order.

Finally, a just peace will project our commitment, reflected in our institutions, to respect the dignity, integrity and wholeness of all persons, with accepted standards and adequate safeguards for the human rights of all, regardless of race, creed, sex or custom.

Our common quest for disarmament cannot be achieved unless it occurs as part of an evolving world community. While the growth of world community is nourished, we call upon the United Nations to take all steps

EMH/cam

A/S-12/AC.1/PV.6

94-95

(Mr. Thompson, United Presbyterian Church
in the United States of America)

possible to prevent the outbreak of war, to reduce the levels of armaments, to curtail the proliferation of new weapons and to reduce the costs that bleed our peoples.

Our Scriptures tell us that without a vision the people perish. Without a vision of a just peace and the political will to take affirmative steps our future is dim indeed. Our faith in God compels us towards such a vision. Our confidence that the United Nations can make such a difference in enabling the nations of the world to take concrete steps ensures our support of your efforts. May you be given the wisdom and the courage to risk the creation of a just peace, knowing that the prayers of religious people the world over are with you. Blessed are the peace-makers.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of the War Resisters' International, Ms. Myrtle Solomon.

Ms. SOLOMON (War Resisters' International): A declaration from the War Resisters' International has already been circulated to members and I only want to share with you now some of our background and some of our thoughts that went into the make-up of our understanding of disarmament.

It used to be said that it is better to talk nation to nation and person to person than to attempt to solve any difficult situation through waging war. And this remains true, but we have been talking now for too long even in this great Assembly which generated so much faith and hope in the 1940s. During this period nation after nation has converted its ploughshares into swords and its swords into weapons whose destructive powers surpass our imagination or our ability to control. During that time, many millions of people have been killed in over 130 wars. Millions more have died and are dying from starvation or neglect and oppression. We have reached the time when even the talking must give place to positive action and a totally different approach to the causes of war and the myth of defence. The war game must be put away and we must bring out the jig-saw of real peace-making, each one of us contributing to the complicated pattern that makes life possible for its living. Disarmament is but one facet of this process while we wait for general agreement among Governments and particularly between the super-Powers and those that hold the nuclear weapons - while we watch or read about the thousands of meetings that you too have endured - no single effective weapon has been destroyed. The stockpiles have greatly increased and no nation feels the more secure. On the contrary, most people live in deepening fear and the dangers of a suicidal war are increasingly real. We the people have less and less control over both the invention and the use of such weapons. It is because we live in a world where political leaders so easily resort to military solutions that the very institution of war must be challenged and abolished and the power of being able to use these weapons be taken away from those who rely upon them.

(Ms. Solomon, War Resisters'
International)

Talk of disarmament has become a mythical ritual -- a strange macabre dance of millions of words -- but the weapons are never put down. To justify a totally illusory need, a whole new language has been invented by a sick society dominated by its weaponry. Enemies have to be invented to justify the colossal expenditure in terms of money, skills and labour.

I speak for a body of war resisters scattered throughout the world who have long since personally renounced the method of war as a means of solving conflict. These are men and women who have studied and practised a totally different approach to maintaining security and attaining justice and freedom from oppression. It is a slower and much more difficult way than resorting to war, and sometimes just as in war, it may fail, but never with the unacceptable death toll of today's wars.

It is therefore imperative that we fully understand our motives for promoting disarmament. There are innumerable well-documented programmes from experts on and supporters of disarmament. All have merit and all are possible, but we will achieve this objective only if and when there is the true will and determination to do so. In our view, that can come only if we understand the causes of war and promote disarmament for the purpose of its abolition. When we speak of disarmament we are not speaking of weakness, but of strength and a refusal to resort to the method of war. It is not sufficient to freeze, outlaw or abolish the stockpiles or use of nuclear weapons -- important though that would be -- in order more easily to return to the so-called good old days of the so-called conventional weapon. There is no such thing as a conventional weapon and whenever we speak of armaments we should always remember we are speaking of murder and of death.

Now is the time to look more carefully at the much maligned and misunderstood position of the pacifist and war resister. We who have opposed war for so long can offer a third way out of this hideous dilemma. Members of the War Resisters' International have been training for non-violent resistance and working for non-violent civilian defence since 1921. I have the honour as their Chairperson to represent the non-violent activists and

(Ms. Solomon War Resisters'
International)

scholars from Asia, throughout Europe, the United States of America, in South Africa and Latin and Central America and, to a lesser degree, in the Middle East. Their unrelenting commitment cannot be ignored whether it is expressed by their conscientious objection to military conscription -- which at best invokes discrimination, but all too often results in prison sentences -- or by other acts of non-violent resistance to oppression. The basis of non-violence is no irresponsible dream, as is the nightmare of war. It involves a dedicated commitment which is no longer a prerequisite of those who are called or forced to wage war. Because non-violent resistance rejects war itself, it cannot truly be called an alternative to war. But it is a way of breaking through the shackles of armed force and diverting our skills to a better purpose and to the benefit of all people, especially to those who live and die all too soon in the poorer countries. The war resister is a troublesome person who frequently challenges accepted traditions by unusual methods which range from mass civil disobedience to extensive educational programmes among the young, but most of us are quite sane and have learnt to fight for values without killing for those values. The conscientious objector understands the meaning of unilateral disarmament -- an example to be followed by the States.

It has been said in military terms that "only the greatest of generals know when to turn back". Since we live in a military society, I believe that great moment of conscience has arrived. But I suggest that we change the phrase from "go back" to "go forward". Now is the time for the non-aligned nations and the smaller nations to put words into actions and to show the super-Powers that we have had enough. It is the super-Powers that are holding us back.

Unilateral disarmament and unilateral initiatives will start the process towards total disarmament. We, the people, are clamouring, we are demanding, we are begging our own countries to start and to take risks for peace. We are ready to accept those risks which, when weighed against those of the arms race and the iniquitous sale of arms, we believe to be infinitely less threatening. Nor do we believe that unilateral disarmament will remain literally one-sided. Others will follow. Nor do we believe that the unarmed

(Ms. Solomon, War Resisters'
International)

nation is in immediate danger of being invaded, but, should there come an invasion from outside or an insurrection from within, then we can be trained to meet it. For example, the War Resisters' International members would have known how to deal with the Malvinas-Falkland crisis non-violently, and there would have been no loss of life and no loss of face. Real negotiations could have taken place.

The lack of caution shown over the last decades in relation to rearmament bears no relation to the excessive caution and hesitation expressed by most nations towards disarmament even in this great Assembly. Caution on this particular issue has become the excuse for no action. We are aware of course that disarmament cannot be achieved overnight, but the problems can be solved if we have the will to try. The transitional stages are the most dangerous and difficult, I admit: the removal of troops from foreign soil, the demilitarization of our societies, the training in non-violent defence.

(Ms. Solomon, War Resisters'
International)

But let us go home now and start the great race for disarmament which all sane people are now demanding. I do not know if you know, but the United Nations Organization awarded first prize this year to the symbol of the broken rifle. This symbol has been that of the War Resisters' International since its inception 60 years ago. But we have truly broken our rifles and refused to support their further use or manufacture. Will you, too, friends, turn that symbol into fact and come along with us and scrap the lot.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I now call on the representative of Women for Peace, Ms. Eva Nordland.

Ms. NORDLAND (Women for Peace): I am speaking on behalf of Women for Peace. Through the women's peace movement, a new force in international politics is taking form. A huge wave is breaking against traditional society.

Women throughout history have been trained in their local societies to shield their children and their families against the most imminent threats - starvation and illness. There has always been an idea in the woman's world that when we fight against disasters something will be saved.

With the introduction of nuclear weapons a new truth has dawned upon us: in a nuclear war nothing will be saved.

The genes of living beings have been built up through millions of years, unfolding to wonderful nature. Now stockpiles of weapons have the capacity to end it all. Even without explosions, those stockpiles themselves are poisoning our planet earth and are well on the way to making it uninhabitable.

You, the leaders of the world, know this. The new fact is that now millions know it.

(Ms. Nordland, Women for Peace)

We see with horror that the introduction of these new weapons into traditional warfare causes insanity to break loose. At every step in the post-war years there has been preparation for insanity.

Earlier, soldiers waging war were able to comfort themselves: "God is with us" was the inscription on their badges. Soldiers in our time cannot comfort themselves in that way. The idea of using the ultimate weapon, which is capable of destroying all creation, is incompatible with any religious or humanistic creed. The position of nuclear weapons in our defence system is contradicted by the deepest beliefs of ordinary men and women. We gradually lose confidence in a system relying on these weapons. To women, millions of us, it has come as a revelation, the moment of truth: nuclear weapons have nothing to do with defence. They make those leaders who have the power to press the button terrible and unaccountable.

You, the leaders of States, have conducted negotiations over the past 20 or 30 years. When you told us you were negotiating we thought that the point was to get rid of weapons. But what you really were discussing was how to manage an ongoing arms race. The terrible truth is that all that time we were racing towards the abyss of catastrophe.

Do you think that you can go on with this? Do you think you can fool millions and millions of people? I can tell you that by now we know too much. Our patience has come to an end.

We do not want your START any more. We want and we demand STOP.

This, then, is our programme. On the global level we want an immediate freeze: a total halt in the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons. On the regional level, we want real steps forward: nuclear-free zones in East and West for our countries and our municipalities.

One important step is the creation of nuclear-free zones on a national level, one country at a time. Each country, of the East and of the West mutually, should declare by a United Nations treaty that it is free from nuclear weapons in peace as well as in times of crisis or in war, according to a United Nations zone model.

(Ms. Nordland, Women for Peace)

We propose a United Nations disarmament day - D-day - on 9 July this year, the end of this session, when the United Nations should start a peace contest between nations as to which country will be the first, the second, and so on to declare itself a nuclear-free zone. What has happened in the case of the nuclear-free municipalities in our countries might happen in the case of nations. The more countries that declared themselves to be nuclear free, the more countries would start discussing ways to become both more secure and more free by going nuclear free.

In the countries of Scandinavia, from which I come, almost 3 million people, a significant part of the population, have signified by signing their names in this past month that they demand a nuclear-free zone in Scandinavia.

All over the world women have the conviction that they take better care of our values and our culture by having a defence system that is free of nuclear weapons. Our civilization has up to now had so short a life - only a few thousand years - and so few chances, but it has the possibility of millions or even billions of years ahead. It is an intolerable thought that our civilization might come to an end in its mere childhood. All our troubles, economic and ideological, might be worked on for thousands and thousands of years to come. The main thing now is to save our civilization from extinction, to save ourselves from being defended by nuclear weapons.

It can be done. Man has already done enormous things in stopping disasters before this. We checked the plague, cholera, malaria and leprosy. We even checked slavery, the buying and selling of people all over the world, which was an integral part of not-so-ancient history.

Do you leaders of States think that a world that has made such immense progress, so that most men and women today are able to read, write and think, will sit quietly by and watch Governments do nothing to ward off an imminent threat to our very existence as a species? Mothers and fathers will leap into a burning house to save their children. What are you, the Governments, doing to save our planet?

(Ms. Nordland, Women for Peace)

We, the women of the earth, have stood up. We are marching and campaigning all over the globe, in the hundreds of thousands. When millions become active in campaigns and marches like this, millions are also learning and planning, becoming conscious of the threat and active in finding a way out.

We have stood up to make contacts all over the world, building up confidence between peoples in East and West. We are marching for nuclear-free zones in East and West. We are building up a joint East-West climate of protest against the arms race, thus putting pressure jointly on our leaders in East and West.

Since the Stone Age it has always been the case that men have left their homes to hunt or to wage war. Women have stayed behind at home to defend the children. The men always went further away from the camps.

(Ms. Nordland, Women for Peace)

They developed increasingly more sophisticated technical and abstract means and attitudes towards the values they left behind, towards their own children and towards human values. Women at home are calling you back again. We are pointing to what you are doing; we are pointing to our children and our common future.

Think a second time. As politicians and administrators, you will meet women in the East and in the West, women who are not as rooted in the structures of military power and political society as men are. The movement for peace, the anti-nuclear movement, the anti-war movement among women is growing as one of the strongest forces in the world. Do you think you can fool it? Do you think you can resist it?

You have to join forces with one of the most important movements which has swept over this world since the all-embracing common fight against the plague. What wise women and men and health authorities were able to do at that time, we can together redo. If you do not see that, you will not be in power much longer. There is one choice left for you: to join forces with the women for peace around the globe.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of the Women's International Democratic Federation, Mrs. Valentina Tereshkova, the world's first woman cosmonaut.

Mrs. TERESHKOVA (Women's International Democratic Federation) (interpretation from Russian): On behalf of the Women's International Democratic Federation, which unites millions of women in 116 countries on all continents, I have the honour to address the participants in this august forum.

The Federation has sent a representative to this special session because of its profound anxiety about the fate of our planet and the future of humanity. Women have always, at all times and in every part of the world, felt with particular acuteness the troubles generated by war and by the policy of preparations for war. For them, the arms race is a heavy burden.

(Mrs. Tereshkova, Women's International
Democratic Federation)

But the reckless and dangerous build-up of the most sophisticated arms, primarily weapons of mass destruction, is continuing. In fact, it is accelerating. Aggressive imperialist circles have set out to try to gain military superiority. This is exactly what has impeded the process of détente, whose development in the previous decade enabled nations to look to the future with hope.

Attempts are being made to accustom world public opinion to the horrible thought that there is nothing wrong with the use of weapons of mass destruction. All kinds of doctrines are being put forward about "limited nuclear war" and the so-called demonstration nuclear detonations. Hotbeds of international tension are being stirred up in the Middle East, South West Asia, southern Africa and Central America, as well as in the South Atlantic. Armed conflicts in various parts of the world are bringing destruction and death to totally innocent people, women and children. All of this increases the danger of another world conflict.

Women all over the world are deeply concerned about the fact that, according to the United Nations, in 1980 the world's military expenditures exceeded \$500 billion. This is happening at a time when 570 million people in the world do not have enough to eat, when hunger accounts for 50 per cent of infant mortality in developing countries, when 1.5 billion people have little or no access at all to health care systems, when 800 million are illiterate and 250 million children cannot attend school. According to the World Health Organization, it would take only one quarter of the world's military spending to eliminate slums, wipe out illiteracy and enable all children to attend school.

The women of the world are following with hope the work of the current session, which is called upon to make authoritative recommendations on how to solve the crucial problem of our time. The arms race, as it continues, makes it practically impossible to reach the three interrelated goals of the United Nations Decade for Women: equality, development and peace. Peace and disarmament, as proclaimed in the programme for the second half of the United Nations Decade for Women, are essential for social progress and for improving the position of women.

(Mrs. Tereshkova, Women's International
Democratic Federation)

The World Women's Congress, sponsored by the Women's International Democratic Federation, held in 1981 in Prague with the support of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, was an impressive anti-war demonstration by women. Representatives of 275 national organizations in 133 countries the world over and 96 international organizations of different political persuasions expressed the determination of women on all continents to continue fighting the disastrous arms race. They expressed their fear and concern lest the time would elapse when the arms race could still be controlled and the madness of nuclear catastrophe prevented.

The participants in the World Congress urged the United Nations and its member countries to do their utmost to exercise their primary duty of maintaining and consolidating peace and removing the threat of nuclear annihilation looming large over the peoples. They appealed to women throughout the world for vigorous joint action against the arms race.

Following the appeal of the Prague World Congress, International Women's Day on March 8 this year was observed as a day of greater efforts to eliminate the danger of war. Massive protests of women were held on all continents against the menace of a world-wide nuclear missile war. Women in various countries also showed their desire to contribute to the struggle against nuclear catastrophe by taking part in peace marches and rallies, by setting up camps and schools of peace and by helping to collect signatures for petitions and appeals for peace.

Expressing the will of many millions of women on our planet, the Women's International Democratic Federation therefore urges the nuclear Powers to assume the firm obligation to match the Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear arms. Such an undertaking would in effect rule out the very possibility of a nuclear catastrophe breaking out.

In their struggle for just and lasting peace, the international public has taken many useful and valuable initiatives. A worthy contribution has come from the Women's International Democratic Federation. It has sent an appeal to the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I should like to recall from this rostrum the proposals contained in that appeal. The Federation calls for effective measures

(Mrs. Tereshkova, Women's
International Democratic Federation)

to halt the nuclear arms race, to bring about nuclear disarmament and to carry out the declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe; to limit and reduce strategic arms and to resume the Soviet-United States talks on that problem; to limit nuclear arms in Europe; to improve security guarantees for non-nuclear countries; to establish nuclear-free zones and zones of peace; to ban neutron, chemical, radiological and all other kinds of weapons of mass destruction; to reduce military appropriations; to prevent outer space from being militarized; to reduce conventional arms; and to hold a world conference on disarmament.

(Mrs. Tereshkova, Women's
International Democratic
Federation)

The Women's International Democratic Federation, for its part, intends to continue to contribute to the accomplishment of the lofty and noble mission of protecting life on earth.

I was exceptionally happy when I saw our planet from far away in space. Earth is not only beautiful, it is also a small planet, and the continents are really so very close to one another. I felt that again, back on earth, when I visited many countries of our common and not so large home. The wish of nations to preserve this home is great and indomitable. And that is why we believe in the ability and strength of mankind in upholding peace.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Miss Katherine Camp.

Ms. CAMP (Women's International League for Peace and Freedom): Four years ago, at the first special session on disarmament we non-governmental organizations were asked to mobilize public opinion on "problems created by the armaments race" and "the need for disarmament". That is from paragraph 106 of the Final Document. I think we have done rather well thus far in carrying out that assignment. The upsurge in the world-wide popular demand to rid the world's people of the burden of armament is mounting in a crescendo that will accelerate until you, the Governments, take the concrete steps necessary to meet that demand.

The Governments have not lived up to their solemn commitments. The arms crisis has worsened in a rapidly deteriorating political atmosphere. Neither the United Nations itself nor the nations individually can afford to let the occasion of the second special session on disarmament pass without a clear resolve to halt and reverse the arms race. If the hopes of the world's people are again betrayed the consequences will be disastrous.

No excuses for further inaction are acceptable. Technical problems must not be allowed to delay progress. Problems of verification pale in comparison with those that would be caused by further delay in negotiating agreements or

(Ms. Camp, Women's International
League for Peace and Freedom)

in further military escalation. Building up arms in order to negotiate reductions defies both the logic and the spirit of compromise and co-operation required for successful negotiations, given the rough parity. Arguments over small imbalances must not be permitted to prevent agreements.

The general debate at this second special session on disarmament has revealed that the great majority of nations are ready to begin the disarmament process. You delegates must bring your influence to bear on the recalcitrant.

Again we remind all the representatives of the responsibility to represent the unrepresented in this great and unique world forum. Look about you. Where are the women, the poor, the unlettered, the war casualties and refugees, the children of the world? Numbering billions, they are the majority. Their needs must be your needs; their miseries and their hopes your own. Only you can act to alleviate their suffering, to provide employment, to guarantee their future by shifting arms budgets to meet human needs. The people are mobilizing. It has now been proved in several countries that a higher percentage of women than men are voting as a bloc on the issue of peace.

Although general and complete disarmament must remain the ultimate goal of people and Governments alike, we should like to suggest that an appropriate theme for this special session is "Stop now". A genuine commitment to halt all weapons systems at their current phase of development or deployment as the first step towards achieving subsequent reductions would greatly facilitate such reductions. The "Stop now" theme would apply across the board. It would require agreement on a comprehensive test ban without awaiting the conclusion of working-group deliberations on verification. It would mean stopping the militarization of outer space in both missile-destroying and anti-satellite systems. Regarding the central issue of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the "Stop now" concept would require the setting of schedules for each stage as well as an approximate goal for completion of the process, which in itself would make possible a whole new vision of the future. We strongly advocate general and complete disarmament by the year 2000. To reach that goal we must begin now.

The "Stop now" concept would prevent escalation in military budgets. Planning for the conversion of military industries would proceed at once.

(Ms. Camp, Women's International
League for Peace and Freedom)

For conventional weapons, "Stop now" would mean a halt to modernization and agreements among suppliers to end weapons sales. "Stop now" would also apply to the prevention of additions to armed forces and military bases.

The only change in machinery that we would urge at this time is the development and strengthening of the peace-making capability of the United Nations.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which has been working for disarmament for 67 years, envisions the preceding programme in its "Stop the arms race" (STAR) campaign, which includes the registration of 1 million women, now under way. In this sense we have already begun our world disarmament campaign, and we are glad that the second special session on disarmament has launched the World Disarmament Campaign to distribute the enormous amount of disarmament information available and correct the misinformation and disinformation that are so dangerously prevalent. We are grateful to those Governments and non-governmental organizations that have pledged their financial support, and we urge the vigorous participation of all of them.

We commend those enlightened Governments which have announced unilateral disarmament initiatives, and we urge responses in kind. But we are aware that promises or even actual reductions in one system of armament are of limited value if new types are being developed. We cannot go forwards and backwards at the same time. What we are demanding of the Governments at this session, therefore, is the simple unanimous decision immediately to stop the development of all major weapons systems and to move towards binding bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements on all aspects of disarmament. This is imperative in the best interests of every nation, the United Nations and all the people of the world.

I shall close with a quote from the statement composed by participants in an international women's conference in support of and held on the eve of this United Nations session, representing millions of women the world over, which would have been even more representative had not some visas been denied by the United States in an action which must not be permitted by other delegations to the United Nations. The statement reads, in part:

(Ms. Camp, Women's International
League for Peace and Freedom)

"We women are losing patience with your lack of determination. We call on you Governments deliberating at the second special session to commit yourselves to using the political power you alone have to take immediate steps leading to general and complete disarmament.

"Nothing less is acceptable to the millions of women, men and children the world over who wish to live and to live in peace, to contribute to the development of their societies and to enjoy friendship with all people. You can be assured of our full support in all endeavours that will bring about total disarmament."

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the Reverend G.J. Grant, representative of the World Association of World Federalists.

Reverend GRANT (World Association of World Federalists) I address you on behalf of an organization that has existed since 1947. The World Association of World Federalists brings together people in nearly 60 countries who believe that peace is more than the mere absence of war, that peace demands institutions that can maintain it, enforce it and interpret it. We have therefore seen the organization of other national Governments, besides that of our own in this country: in Switzerland, in Germany, in the Soviet Union and in many others. We have seen that the federation of independent States leads to the establishment of a permanent kind of peace. We regard unlimited sovereignty as the enemy of law, and the new factor of nuclear weaponry now makes it imperative that we reconsider whether or not the myth of sovereignty should be maintained.

We know that we face today a very dim picture of the world's future. Yet we see some points of hope. We support the work of the United Nations Committee on Disarmament; we hope to see a development that will give us a true, comprehensive test-ban treaty. We applaud the leadership of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for its offer of on-site inspection in connexion with any chemical warfare treaty, and we laud its courageous pledge in this chamber only a few days ago not to be the first to use nuclear weaponry.

But those happy signs are balanced by others. What is terribly distressing is to learn that 70 per cent of the weaponry regularly used now by NATO forces is nuclear -- so much so that when Great Britain wanted to send the Canberra bombers down to the Falkland Islands they first had to be stripped of their nuclear bombs and then refitted with the older type. It is our conviction that there is only one remedy: we must look for a world security system that will take account not only of national security but also of human security.

In the brief time remaining, I would like to offer you a ray of hope by telling you a story. This goes back to the 1960s, when John Kennedy was President of the United States, when Khrushchev was Premier in the Soviet Union and when Norman Cousins was President of the Organization I now head, the World Association of World Federalists.

Norman Cousins was used by Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev as a go-between and one of the things that came out of that was the McCloy-Zorin agreement of 20 September 1961, when Mr. McCloy acting for the United States and Mr. Zorin for the Soviet Union concluded an agreement incorporating eight principles that should be observed at any time a disarmament treaty was really to be effective. The heart of those eight principles was that they should all lead up to the formation of an international disarmament organization. Those principles were signed by the United States and by the Soviet Union. They were submitted to this Assembly on 13 December 1961 and were unanimously approved. I have started a campaign in my country to revive interest in the McCloy-Zorin agreement, because this is a case of shameful neglect by the United States of an agreement that was signed, sealed and delivered to you.

There is one other thing. Not only were the agreements approved, but treaties implementing those eight points were submitted to the permanent Committee on Disarmament in Geneva on 22 February by the Soviets and on 15 March by the Americans. Those treaties were submitted in Geneva, and you and I, if we wish, can put pressure upon our Governments to agitate for the resumption of those discussions, which offered a way in which the great Powers of this world could come together and provide a ray of hope for mankind.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of the World Conference on Religion and Peace, Mr. Homer A. Jack, on whom I now call.

Mr. JACK (World Conference on Religion and Peace (WCRP)): The World Conference on Religion and Peace (WCRP) is a small, international, Non-Governmental Organization especially concerned with the United Nations agenda in the field of disarmament, development, environment and human rights. Our approach to these global problems is holistic. We see them as part of an integrated effort to save both humanity and the planet, and with increased justice. While the relationship between disarmament and development, and between disarmament and environment, are now well defined, we hope that the United Nations will soon delineate the linkage between disarmament and human rights. It is a human right for succeeding generations - indeed, for this generation - to live free from the fear of a nuclear holocaust, from war itself.

Our organization has taken seriously the potential of the second special session. Perhaps our most notable project was to send some of our officers on a multi-religious mission to China early in May specifically to discuss this special session. Our organization is also concerned about the lack of implementation of the Final Document. Its most important paragraph - paragraph 18 - remains unfulfilled. The arms race has not halted and the world does face annihilation. We disarm or we die.

The people are rightly refusing to accept annihilation without demonstration, if not yet revolution. Thus the most important change since the first special session is public concern world-wide. Public apathy has turned to popular concern in these four years because of the growing risk of nuclear war, the ludicrous talk in high places about "winning" or "limiting" or even "prolonging" nuclear war, the obvious lack of progress in disarmament negotiations, the squandering of vast sums on the military which could be better spent on development in all societies, and the increasing psychological fear and insecurity because of growing nuclear stockpiles. No wonder the people are demonstrating, even though most representatives in this General Assembly Hall appear isolated from the drums and demonstrations outside.

We hope this special session will approve a comprehensive programme of disarmament that will lead unmistakably to general and complete disarmament and contain realistic, if urgent, time frames and we must pay a special tribute to Ambassador Garcia-Robles for piloting the special session thus far in framing a comprehensive programme. We dare to hope that the special session will approve something more - a short list of immediate, specific and achievable measures to help prevent nuclear war.

(Mr. Jack, WCRP)

The first measure on any short list would be a comprehensive test-ban treaty. This remains the single most urgent disarmament measure of our time.

The second measure might be the drafting of a treaty against the use, all use, of nuclear weapons and making their use a crime against humanity. The world community has banned chemical, biological and "indiscriminate" weapons - such as napalm - against civilians but not the most indiscriminate weapon of all - nuclear bombs.

The third measure on a short list might be a verifiable freeze on the testing, production and deployment of all nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, especially by the super-Powers. This measure would relate the popular bilateral freeze movement in the United States today to the special session.

Any short list, if it is to be meaningful, cannot be adopted by consensus. The regular rules of the General Assembly can apply and do provide for voting. A short list of measures could be carefully and politically constructed so as to attract the votes of at least 125 Member States and thus reflect world public opinion even if one or more nuclear-weapon States were opposed. As a United Nations deliberative body and not a negotiating forum, this special session need not demand consensus.

The resolutions, or perhaps one resolution, for these three measures should contain a deadline - the end of this year. With political will, the Committee on Disarmament could draft all three treaties within five months. Deadlines are important to exert political pressure. The resolutions should therefore ask the Committee on Disarmament to reconvene on schedule early in August and continue in special session through December, making a progress report to the General Assembly at the closing meetings of its session in mid-December. Also each resolution on the short list should have another kind of built-in pressure, a moratorium, asking each nuclear-weapon State immediately to announce that it was stopping testing, or the non-use or freezing of its weapons, and urging other nuclear-weapon States to reciprocate.

Thus in all three measures on the short list - and the last-mentioned may well contain other combinations of measures - we strongly advocate unilateralism. The arms race often escalates unilaterally; it can de-escalate unilaterally. Associated with unilateralism are such honoured names as Mohandas Gandhi and

(Mr. Jack, WCRP)

Martin Luther King, Jr. Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko associated Leonid Brezhnev with unilateralism last week; now Ronald Reagan can reciprocate.

The first solid achievement of the second special session has been the solemn promulgation of a World Disarmament Campaign -- again thanks to Ambassador Garcia-Robles. If the world can raise \$600 billion annually for war preparations, it should be able to raise \$60 million annually for disarmament preparations. The structure of the World Disarmament Campaign must still be formulated, as well as the initial programme, and we strongly urge that the Secretary-General appoint -- to establish and supervise policy -- an independent international board composed of representatives from Member States and non-governmental organizations.

Despite the fact that the non-governmental organizations are playing a large role in this second special session, it is increasingly evident that Article 71 of the Charter does not include disarmament, and thus the prerogatives of the non-governmental organizations in the field of disarmament must be explicitly delineated. This could yet be done at this second special session, either in the comprehensive programme for disarmament or through another working group. Any such statement could simply assert that

"international, regional, national and local non-governmental organizations should play a role in disarmament in various organs of the greater United Nations system and are hereby given the prerogative accorded them by the United Nations in the economic and social field".

The refusal of the United States Government to grant visas to more than 300 non-governmental organizations and the delay of visas to an even greater number of non-governmental organizations is a judgement first on the United States Government, but also on the United Nations Secretariat for not trying harder to change this unfortunate policy of the host country. The efforts of some non-governmental organizations to change this United States practice was partly, if belatedly, successful, even if the Federal court case was lost. We hope that this special session will yet make an official statement of regret, both to the United States Government and on behalf of those hundreds of non-governmental organizations excluded or inconvenienced.

(Mr. Jack, WCRP)

Finally, I should like to suggest that the level of disillusionment with this special session might be great unless something more than a World Disarmament Campaign or a comprehensive programme resulted from the session on 9 July. The marches, demonstrations and petitions are desperate manifestations of deep public concern. The people have a right to expect strong leadership from representatives in the remaining two weeks of this session. The people dare hope that representatives might follow their consciences as well as their instructions. You could do no better than recall the poignant plea for nuclear sanity made in 1955 by Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein: "We appeal as human beings to human beings: remember your humanity and forget the rest."

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I now invite the final speaker for this afternoon, the representative of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, Mr. Miklos Barabas, to make his statement.

Mr. BARABAS (World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY)): It is a great honour and privilege for me to be able to greet participants in this special session on behalf of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, its more than 270 member organizations from 123 countries in the five continents and the millions of progressive and democratically-minded young people united in our ranks.

Our delegation which addressed the first special session on disarmament four years ago brought back the hope that Governments would do everything possible to make a concrete contribution to the process of curbing the arms race and safeguarding peace. Today, however, we are facing the future of the planet with even greater anxiety.

Concern for the destiny of the world and a desire to make an active contribution to ending the arms race and to disarmament, and to eliminating the threat of nuclear catastrophe: that was the leitmotif of the eleventh assembly of our Federation, which concluded its work only three weeks ago in Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia. On behalf of all the participants in that assembly, I should like to express our common opinion that the present international situation, when nuclear danger is threatening the whole of mankind, is the direct

(Mr. Barabas, WFDY)

consequence of the imperialist policy, which is aimed at changing the rough military strategic balance now existing in the world, trying to gain hegemony and using military force as the primary means of solving political problems.

Our Federation believes that it is the militaristic circles of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) which now seek to gain military superiority, which have created the neutron bomb and new types of chemical weapons, which plan to deploy in Western Europe deadly cruise and other missiles, and which are to blame for the fact that the last four years have been witnessing a new round in the arms race. It is those circles that have formulated the blatantly cynical concepts of so-called limited nuclear war and preventive nuclear strike. It is those circles that seek to turn the European continent into a nuclear battlefield.

The building up of the arms race is directed first of all against the forces of peace, democracy and social progress, and against national liberation movements. With the help of military interventions, the latest Western arms supplies to reactionary quarters and to reactionary and dictatorial régimes are being continued, obstacles are being created to the advance of the newly liberated countries towards genuine national independence and social and economic progress. It is those quarters that are to blame for the death of thousands and thousands of people killed in the long-suffering land of Lebanon as a result of Israeli aggression. They are to blame for the new tragedies in El Salvador and in other countries about which we are learning every day.

The policy of militarism, an unrestrained arms race and disregard of the basic human values leads to a considerable part of scientific and technological achievements being consumed by the insatiable Moloch of the military-industrial complex, hindering the speediest possible solution of the global problems of poverty, famine, disease and illiteracy and the establishment of environmental protection and the New International Economic Order.

There are many who ask themselves a question which troubles all of us today: is it possible to stop the arms race and eliminate the nuclear danger? Our Federation's assembly in Prague gave a unanimous answer to that question: yes it is possible provided the problems of disarmament are approached not in words but in deeds, and provided that approach is politically responsible. We are inspired by the concrete peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union and the

other socialist countries and by the increasing scope of the movement launched by peace-loving forces. We are convinced that the threat of another war can be eliminated through joint efforts by the peoples of all countries and by all organizations seeking peace.

A fresh example has been set by the Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons whatever the circumstances. If that initiative were supported by other nuclear States the world could breathe a sigh of relief. I say "if" because in his speech the head of the other leading nuclear Power merely bypassed this question, leaving it unanswered, despite the fact that both the participants in this session and the world public were eager to hear his answer.

Our Federation believes that the safeguarding of peace is at least as much the responsibility of the broad circles of public opinion as of Governments. The unprecedented activity of the participants in the peace movement and the great interest they show in all issues of world peace have become a factor that has turned the movement into a real political force, a force which cannot be disregarded by those who sit around the conference table.

We are firmly convinced that it is essential to examine closely all initiatives concerning disarmament that are aimed at saving mankind from nuclear catastrophe, and to invigorate all the talks on restraining the arms race which are under way at the moment. It is of tremendous importance to conduct a meaningful Soviet-United States dialogue on the problem of strategic arms limitation, preserving all the positive results attained earlier, in order to reach an agreement on freezing the nuclear potential of both countries, and to sign a convention on banning chemical weapons.

My organization and I represent the generation which has not known the horrors of war, and we do not want to know them; we do not want to be killed on the battlefield. We want to build a just world, to respect and appreciate each other and to use our energy and our reason for the sake of world peace. For this reason we have sought in the period since the last special session on disarmament to do everything possible so that young people, irrespective of their views and convictions may unite in a joint struggle for the common right of peoples to live in peace. Of special importance among the series of actions carried out on our initiative were the eleventh World Festival of Youth and Students, held in Cuba in the summer of 1978,

EMS/28

A/S-12/AC.1/PV.6
129-130

(Mr. Barabas, WFDY)

and the World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Détente and Disarmament, held in Helsinki in January 1981. Those were the most widely representative youth events of all those held since 1945, when the young people who had won a victory over fascism founded our Federation.

The Federation was among the organizations which created the Framework for All-European Youth and Students' Co-operation, intended to promote the cause of peace and security in Europe.

As a reflection of the desire of the millions of our members, our Assembly in Prague adopted a decision to launch a world campaign of youth action against the nuclear threat, a campaign the aim of which is to involve still greater numbers of young people of the planet in the struggle for peace, in organizing mass anti-war actions. Its slogan is "Join the fight! Peace is our common right!". In our opinion, we could thus contribute concretely to the world disarmament campaign which, according to plans, is to be launched by the special session.

The World Federation of Democratic Youth and the millions of its members, true to the slogan of the Federation adopted 37 years ago "Youth unite! Forward for a lasting peace!", will do everything possible to achieve world peace and to support the efforts of the United Nations to this end. It will mobilize more and more contingents of the young generation for the just and noble struggle for peace. Peace is the only future for mankind.

In conclusion, I sincerely wish the Assembly much success in its responsible work, followed with so much hope by world public opinion, including young people. We hope that that work will be followed by concrete steps in the field of disarmament.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.