

**WORLD
GOODWILL
COMMENTARY**

**FREEDOM FROM FEAR AND WANT:
DISARMAMENT, PEACE AND SECURITY
IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD**

Number 21

September

1995

WORLD GOODWILL COMMENTARY

A bulletin on current trends in world affairs

FREEDOM FROM FEAR AND WANT: DISARMAMENT, PEACE AND SECURITY IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

There are thousands who have dreamed the same dream, seen the same vision, believed in the divine possibilities which are latent in all human hearts and who know, past all controversy, that selfishness and universal greed have brought the world to its present desperate plight. They know also that selfless sharing and cooperative understanding between all men and women of goodwill everywhere can rebuild a new world, bring into being a more beautiful life, and restore that which humanity itself has destroyed. The best is yet to be.

Alice A. Bailey

The basis of all wars is fundamentally the sense of separateness. This fundamental individualism or pleased recognition of isolationism leads to all the secondary causes of war: greed, producing economic disaster; hatred producing national and international friction; cruelty, producing pain and death.

Alice A. Bailey

The cold war created a destructive dynamic; insecurity bred armament while armament bred insecurity. In the post-cold war era there are three historic tasks before us: to undo the armament legacy of the cold war; to strengthen the UN-based security system; to address non-military sources of insecurity... the present moment is a great opportunity.

Ann Hallan Lakhdir, UN/NGO Committee on Disarmament

WORLD GOODWILL is an activity of LUCIS TRUST, a non-profit, educational organization first incorporated in the USA in 1922.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Disarmament In an Interdependent World | 5 |
| <i>Reassessing Existing Disarmament Plans</i> | 7 |
| <i>Nuclear Weapons</i> | 9 |
| <i>Non-Proliferation Treaty</i> | 9 |
| <i>Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty</i> | 10 |
| <i>Chemical Weapons</i> | 10 |
| <i>Conventional Weapons</i> | 11 |
| <i>Relationship Between Increased Arms Transfers and Wars</i> | 11 |
| <i>Transparency</i> | 12 |
| <i>Conversion/Peace Dividend</i> | 12 |
| Preventative Diplomacy, Peace-making and Peace-Keeping..... | 14 |
| <i>Peace-keeping</i> | 14 |
| <i>Current Peace-keeping Problems</i> | 15 |
| <i>Improving the UN's Ability to Maintain Peace</i> | 16 |
| Peace and Security in an Interdependent World | 18 |
| <i>The World Summit for Social Development</i> | 19 |
| <i>Possible Solutions</i> | 21 |
| Conclusion | 22 |

INTRODUCTION.

"We the Peoples of the United Nations Determined..... to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours..."

Charter of the United Nations

After witnessing the unspeakable horrors of two world wars, humanity at long last was determined to change its ways. In San Francisco, June 1945, the founders of the United Nations sought to encapsulate the hopes and aspirations of a world about to be freed from the horrors of a war against tyranny, the systematic suppression of human rights, ruthless and unprovoked aggression, and the contemptuous disregard of international law, ushering in a period of stability, righteousness and healing. The United Nations Charter was to provide the road map to a new international order under law.

Unfortunately, as we know today, the world's hopes and aspirations for a lasting and durable peace were put on hold for the more than four decades of what we term, the cold war. Although, it needs to be noted that the "cold war" is a seemingly inappropriate term to many in the developing countries who since World War II have experienced over 125 conflicts, major and minor (from Korea and Vietnam to Iraq, Nicaragua and Afghanistan to Somalia and Rwanda) in which over 22 million people have died.

When the cold war began, the world was populated by about 2.5 billion people. Today more than twice as many inhabit the earth. During the cold war, the United Nations was limited to peace-keeping. More recently, the UN has participated in preventive diplomacy; it has managed elections and literally rebuilt a nation in Namibia. Today our understanding of peace, security and disarmament is wiser and more mature. Although we recognize the urgent necessity and moral imperative of the eventual elimination and until then, the wise control of nuclear weapons, we also know that peace is not only and not necessarily the absence of armaments and war. Rather, peace is recognized as the result of right world conditions and right human relationships based on the dignity of each human being. It is an effect and not a cause. We now better understand that peace cannot exist without sociopolitical and economic justice and the active principle of goodwill. We now better understand that the security of national borders must be complemented by the security of peoples - including the protection and restoration of the weak and the oppressed. And we now better understand that right living conditions and wise education for the youth of the world must be present before there can be any lasting peace.

Many recent United Nations documents and reports emphasize and elaborate on this wholistic nature of peace and security. For example, the 1993 UNICEF report *The Progress of Nations* refers to this new standard of assessing national progress:

The day will come when the progress of nations will be judged not by their military or

economic strength, nor by the splendour of their capital cities and public buildings, but by the well-being of their peoples: by their levels of health, nutrition and education; by their opportunities to earn a fair reward for their labours; by their ability to participate in the decisions that affect their lives; by the respect that is shown for their civil and political liberties; by the provision that is made for those who are vulnerable and disadvantaged; and by the protection that is afforded to the growing minds and bodies of their children.

As we are witnessing, many of the conflicts today, in contrast to those of the past, are among people *within* nations as opposed to conflicts *between* nations, thus testing human solidarity and challenging national sovereignty. The former Yugoslavia, Somalia and Rwanda - three major and tragic examples - have tested our political and humanitarian will, wisdom and skill. Does the world stand by while those within a particular nation State wage atrocities against each other? Do we have a right to intervene? In what way? With what means? We agonize and anguish over such questions which are debated on the nightly news, in the United Nations and in the capitals of the world's nation States. With the end of the cold war, the question of who will keep the world at peace and in what way is a question without an answer.

We are aware too that the threat of weapons and arms - nuclear and otherwise - are only one of the many threats to global peace and security. Equally dangerous are such threats as environmental degradation, drugs, poverty, ethnic and racial strife, and political instability. Reflecting this new understanding, the United Nations Security Council in its first Summit ever on January 13, 1992 declared:

The absence of war and military conflict among States does not in itself ensure international peace and security. The non-military sources of instability in the economic, social and humanitarian and ecological fields have become threats to peace and security.

This declaration echoes the now historic speech when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in the idealistic tenor of the times, first proclaimed to the Congress of the United States on January 6, 1941, the essential need and right of every citizen of the world to Four Freedoms: freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear. President Roosevelt elaborated on the third and fourth freedoms:

"The third freedom from want - which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants - everywhere in the world;

"The fourth...translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbour - anywhere in the world."

Both the Security Council declaration and the Four Freedoms speech deal with the

issue of right human relations as expressed through international relations, national policies and general human affairs. Necessary to the fulfilment of both is the application of spiritual values to all areas of daily life. Social justice can only be achieved as we each recognize the equality of all people - an equality founded upon a universal and basic divinity within the heart of each human being.

Thus, in our contemporary world of the nineties, disarmament, peace and security issues are, on the one hand, more complex: greater numbers of people are awakening to their basic and human rights and challenging the status quo; corrupt and selfishly aggressive leaders are by turn resorting to increased oppression and brutal violence; military intervention is becoming less appropriate and less effective; the greatest threats of the future now include "survival issues" such as poverty, the environment, human rights and population pressures; and our increased awareness of the integrated and interdependent nature of all sectors and aspects of life challenges national sovereignty and highlights the ineffectiveness of past single-sector solutions to the global problems facing humanity.

Yet, in spite of this complexity, disarmament, peace and security issues are today paradoxically simpler because we are becoming better aware of the *causes* of the global ills surrounding these issues. We recognize therefore that the solutions to our problems of disarmament and security, as well as all other global problems, lie within our grasp. We are learning to invoke and apply the power of mobilized goodwill through global public opinion. Greater numbers of us are striving to adhere to and to implement in our daily lives those spiritual principles and values basic to the "general welfare of all the people". More clearly defined are the distinctions between the self-oriented values of materialism, selfishness and separativeness, and the more inclusive and liberating spiritual values such as selfless sharing and cooperation based on a synthetic understanding of life which alerts us to the crying needs of our planet and all its inhabitants. Thus, very simply put, as we stand today at the threshold of a new millennium, our challenge and our opportunity lies in whether we can create a better way of life for *all* people on our planet, insuring for every individual the Four Freedoms of which President Roosevelt spoke, or whether we will choose the brutality, chaos, and destruction of continued warfare and conflict. Can we break down the barriers of separateness, divisiveness and selfishness, letting go of our "Me and Mine-First" or "Me and Mine-Only" worldview, embracing instead the collective good? Can we let go of the lesser and embrace the greater? Finally, can we realize that the basis of true peace and security is right relationship and not force? Can we develop international goodwill and trust each other to the point where we are not dependent upon our weapons and arms which, in the words of one UN official, have boomeranged and are now killing and maiming the civilians they were meant to protect?

Within the following pages, this commentary will look at the renewed vigour and optimism surrounding disarmament, giving an indication of our current global response to the above questions. A discussion will be included of not only nuclear and

chemical weapons, but also conventional weapons as we realize how many of our current conflicts have been preceded by major transfers of arms to the areas experiencing the conflicts. Additionally, this commentary will highlight the newly evolving role of the UN with regard to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping - all important aspects of disarmament negotiations.

The steps that humanity takes today will condition the new age and determine our destiny. Will it be a destiny of annihilation...worldwide famine and pestilence, of nation rising against nation and of the complete collapse of all that makes life worth living? [Or, will it be...a period of adjustment, of concession and of relinquishment...a period of right recognition, of shared opportunity, of a united effort to bring about right relations, and of an educational process which will train the youth of all nations to function as world citizens and not as nationalistic propagandists?

Alice A. Bailey

DISARMAMENT IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

They shall beat their swords into ploughshares. And their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation. Neither shall they learn war any more.

Isaiah 2:4

All the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers, they (President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston S. Churchill) believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

The Eight Points of the Atlantic Charter, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston S. Churchill

Taking a global and general view of the now fast-fading 20th century, we realize that the first half of this century was characterized by the atrocities of the first and second World Wars, while the latter half was dominated by the cold war with its frenzied nuclear arms race between the United States and the former Soviet Union, the proliferation of nuclear weapons worldwide and the emergence of other weapons of mass destruction, many of which have been used in some 150 additional wars, resulting in over 20 million deaths. During the cold war from one-third to one-half of the world's scientists and engineers were engaged in this military research and production. Thus, much of the incredible potential of human creativity and ingenuity that could have been used for the uplift of humanity was instead diverted toward the production of nuclear weapons and armaments designed to destroy rather than to enhance life on our planet.

With regard to issues of peace and war, the events of the past few years have provided a roller coaster experience. The end of the cold war and the tearing down of the Berlin Wall led to a pinnacle of new hope, expectations and opportunities for the pursuit of peace and disarmament. Yet, this was immediately followed by an overwhelming range of new and difficult challenges and atrocities. Since 1989 alone there have been over 33 armed conflicts worldwide, with tens of millions of refugees and uncountable suffering. The extent of present-day religious, ethnic, and other conflicts assault us with horrors we thought had been left behind long ago.

Since the end of the cold war, we have come to understand that not only nuclear, chemical and biological weapons are to be feared and recognized as "immoral" and a crime against humanity. The conflicts in many parts of the world involving the use of

sophisticated conventional weapons, have caused us to realize that these too are to be abhorred as we have watched these weapons turn areas of conflict and tension into hotbeds of war.

The recent wars, for example, in the former Yugoslavia, Somalia and Rwanda have also called into question the traditional notion of a sovereign State, pitting it against the right of nations to self-determination. In the words of Prvoslav Davinic, the Director of the Office of Disarmament Affairs at the United Nations, "the international community is confused, [asking] where should the line be drawn? The response is sometimes too fast, sometimes too slow [while] the tragedies of those caught in between continue in an agonizing fashion".

In the past, our vision of peace was mainly founded upon a stubborn idealism that loved the ideal more than humanity. As we learn the unworkability of this stance, we also become aware of the undeniable spiritual truth that energy does follow thought and consequently, thought can revolutionize the world. Today, more than ever, we realize the truthfulness of the UNESCO Charter which states that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that we have to erect the ramparts of peace". We are thus beginning to understand that peace and disarmament are, in reality, a state of mind and heart reflected in the attitudes we each hold about fellow human beings. By becoming more attentive to our own inner state of mind and heart, and by becoming aware of the causative and direct impact our thoughts and feelings have on our environment near and far, we can increasingly move away from anger, fear, attack and war and move instead toward cooperation, compassion and goodwill.

Unlike in the past, during the cold war era, when the main goal of arms control and disarmament was to stabilize a precarious balance of power between the two heavily armed alliances, the new priority is to establish the highest possible degree of transparency and confidence among States which would foster a new international security system. The aim is to create conditions conducive to significant disarmament and arms control measures in order to reduce the risk of conflict.

The United Nations, our only existing universal organization that offers a possibility of viewing the issues of war, peace and security from a global perspective, is the major vehicle for the realization of arms control and disarmament objectives - as it has been since its inception. Over the years, different approaches have been taken in pursuing disarmament. During the first 40 years, a number of important first steps in the form of international arms control agreements, dealing primarily with the threat of nuclear weapons, were taken. Although these kept the dialogue and possibility for disarmament alive, their success has been measured, indeed. Today the new sense of vigour and urgency brought to this issue is reflected in the following passage from a recent United Nations press release posing an unequivocal case for disarmament:

The world today is a dangerous place. Not only is there the obvious and continual warfare that we witness waged with the conventional weapons of warfare, but lurking

beneath the surface are the many weapons of mass destruction that pose an especially gruesome and potentially, planetary threat to humankind. These are the nuclear, chemical and biological weapons which have been used in limited instances and yet linger within the world's arsenal, holding humanity subliminally, if not overtly hostage, usurping both human and planetary resources that could be used more constructively and beneficially elsewhere.

Reassessing Existing Disarmament Plans

The existing disarmament machinery has remained essentially unchanged since it was agreed upon at the UN General Assembly's first special session on disarmament in 1978. In the October 1992 report, *New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold War Era*, the Secretary-General recommended that this disarmament machinery be reassessed to meet the new realities and priorities. He stressed the need for a coordinated system "which would allow the international community to address major disarmament problems promptly, flexibly and efficiently".

Possible changes of the system are discussed and analyzed in three basic post-cold war documents - all of which were made public in 1992: a statement adopted by the Security Council at its first ever Summit Meeting on 31 January 1992; a report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping, known as *An Agenda for Peace*, and a subsequent report of the Secretary-General, *New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold War Era*. These three documents together provide, for the first time since 1978, a comprehensive statement on strengthening international peace and security and the contribution that arms limitation and disarmament could make to achieve that goal. Currently, three concepts are under consideration by the world community as the foundation-stones of an enhanced international effort in disarmament and arms regulations. These are: integration, globalization and revitalization.

Integration refers to the need to view disarmament in a holistic, integrated manner, recognizing, for example, the need for improved economic conditions as a complimentary and integral part of disarmament. Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and peace-building, detailed in *An Agenda for Peace* are all seen as the necessary and complimentary "tools" which would allow us to achieve and attain international peace and security,

Globalization implies an all-inclusive, multidimensional, non-compartmentalized approach. The goal is to extend disarmament efforts to include not only bilateral agreements such as those that have taken place between the Russian Federation and the United States of America, but also multilateral arrangements in a worldwide process, involving all States. Suggested is the reduction and regulation of armaments on global, regional and sub-regional levels. The need for globalization is also

emphasized by Dr. Mahbub ul Haq, chief architect and principal author of UNDP's yearly *Human Development Report* who makes a strong case for the need to target a.11d include third world countries in disarmament efforts:

All negotiations, Geneva talks, disarmament. treaties have been East-West. There has not been a single negotiation regarding Third World disarmament. And what has happened in the developing countries? In the last 30 years military expenditures there have increased three times as fast as in the industrial countries. Despite their level of poverty, in the last 30 years of increased military expenditure, globally, one-third was contributed by the developing countries, even though their per capita income is one-twentieth that of the industrial countries.

Revitalization refers to the need to build a new system of international security. This new system must cope with the new dimensions of insecurity and the complexities of achieving international peace while instilling sufficient confidence in States to assure them that they no longer need abundant weaponry.

Further support for the above work comes from the fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations recently declared the 1990's as the Third Disarmament Decade, following the two earlier disarmament decades, in the 1970's and 1980's. The Declaration of the 1990's identified common objectives of the international community, including the following: reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons; attaining a comprehensive nuclear-test ban; strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime; halting the nuclear arms race; reducing conventional arms and armed forces; the negotiation of a convention prohibiting all chemical weapons and greater transparency in military matters.

Because the path towards the attainment of the targeted goals still seems so long and non-ending it is sometimes hard to appreciate the steps which have already been taken towards what often seems the "journey of a thousand miles". Yet, the Decade has already witnessed major achievements in arms reduction and disarmament. Some of these significant trends are highlighted below. If these are to be more effectively developed and implemented in the future, a far greater application of the active goodwill of the world's people is required.

The real issue is the intangible one of Direction. Which way will humanity go? Will it go the way of selflessness, expressed in a willingness to act always in the interest of all, thus promoting world understanding and world unity, or the way of selfishness and aggression, expressed in an intense nationalism, thus sacrificing the true and larger values of liberty, independence and freedom to think. This selfishness may show itself through active aggression or an active neutrality.

Alice A. Bailey

Nuclear Weapons

The international community can aim for no less a goal than the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, October 1992

The end of the cold war in many ways has increased our anxieties over the existence and danger of nuclear weapons. The officially declared nuclear weapon States are China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States. But the "Pandora's box" of nuclear weapons has been open for nearly half a century. Knowledge of nuclear technology is widespread. It is an acknowledged fear, realized in Iraq and to a lesser degree in North Korea, that proliferation of these weapons crossed the threshold from the realm of the possible to that of the probable. The concern that either terrorists or other States may have already acquired or may soon acquire nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction raises new problems of their control, reduction and eventual elimination. Other countries such as Pakistan, India, China, Israel and South Africa are also thought to possess much of the technology for the creation of nuclear weapons. Added to this is the increasing fear of the physical deterioration of nuclear weapons while accidents remain a frightening possibility.

In the early 1990's, an estimated 50,000 nuclear warheads remained deployed in the world, with a combined explosive energy of some 15,000 megatons- over one million times that of the bomb that fell on Hiroshima. Although the elimination of all nuclear weapons has been the rhetorical goal on our planet for more than 40 years, it seems that finally this is a goal towards which we are today more assuredly progressing - albeit haltingly and slowly.

For example, in 1992, the world heralded the Trilateral Agreement among the United States, Russia and Ukraine which provided for the elimination of all nuclear weapons located in Ukraine. And in September 1994, Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin agreed to speed implementation of a Start II agreement, reached in 1993, which calls for the reduction of each nation's arsenal to between 3,000 and 3,500 long-range nuclear warheads by 2003. Instead of taking the nine years allowed in the initial agreement, the two Presidents agreed to begin dismantling as soon as the accord is ratified which is expected to happen by mid-1995.

Non-Proliferation Treaty

A widely acknowledged benchmark in the elimination of nuclear weapons is universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The NPT is the fundamental instrument for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear-weapon States and for promoting the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Formulated in 1968, this treaty which entered into force in March 1970 is not an end in itself, but it is recognized as a

stage towards a denuclearized world. Ambassador Douglas Roche from Canada, a strong proponent of disarmament, referred to this treaty as "the world's most important multilateral instrument."

Currently, there are 163 States which have acceded to the NPT. This makes it the most widely adhered-to arms agreement in history, regardless of the fact that it has several contentious aspects. In spite of its shortcomings it is widely hoped that all governments will agree with Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali who has strongly called for all nation States to adhere to the Treaty, c tending it indefinitely and unconditionally.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Reaching universal agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty (CTBT) is generally considered of crucial importance for strengthening and complementing the NPT. In his *New Dimensions*, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali points to the very positive advancements in this area: "The annual number of tests carried out in the last several years indicates a most welcome downward trend. In only two years, from 1987 to 1989, the number of tests dropped from 47 to 27. This was followed by further reductions to 18 tests in 1990 and 14 in 1992."

More encouraging news is that in 1994 at a UN plenary meeting, the US Ambassador announced the US decision to continue its unilaterally declared moratorium on nuclear testing until September 1995. Additionally, the 48th General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution on the comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty sponsored by more than 157 Member States. The Secretary-General referred to this as "a milestone in the efforts of the international community to ban all nuclear tests in all environments for all time".

Chemical Weapons

In October 1992, Boutros Boutros-Ghali stated that some 20 States possess or seek to acquire a chemical weapons capability. Recognition of this fact and awareness of the atrocities committed by Iraq when it recently used chemical weapons made world leaders aware that a Chemical Weapons Convention was indispensable. The Conference on Disarmament, a 39-nation multilateral negotiating body, completed, after more than a decade of negotiations, the text of the landmark agreement which would ban chemical weapons and ensure the destruction of declared stocks under a comprehensive verification regime allowing for on-site inspections of any facility suspected of non-compliance. This *Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction* was the first disarmament agreement negotiated within a multilateral framework that provided for eliminating an entire category of weapons of mass destruction. All States are asked to become parties to this historic Convention at the earliest possible date.

Conventional Weapons

The lethal threat of conventional weapons is becoming increasingly and shockingly clear. Since 1945 conventional weapons have killed over twenty million people. In the words of Dr. Inge Kaul, the Director of UNDP's Human Development Report Office, "we have armed ourselves to the teeth and now these weapons are boomeranging. The weapons that were meant to protect us, are now being used against us". Today, civilians make up 90% of the victims of war, with the largest part of that percentage being women and children.

In a 1991 speech, then UN Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, pointed out the "the arsenal at Saddam Hussein's disposal on 2 August 1990 was supplied mostly by the major powers. The same is true for the arsenal in Somalia which aggravated the existing conflicts within that country". And Dr. Mahbub ul Haq underlines the fact that current hotbeds of war could have been predicted based on the enormous amounts of weapons sold to these countries over a given period of time. Thus, efforts to curb the conventional arms race have been occupying much of the disarmament dialogue.

Special attention is drawn to the existing 100-120 million land mines which in the words of Peter Hansen, the UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs, "make life difficult in sixty of the world's countries and daily life impossible in 24-25 of the world's countries". These mines, which cost as little as US\$3 per mine to purchase, are interred during times of war and then left to maim and kill innocent civilians, including women and children, as they forage for food or till the soil for planting crops. In an address to a community of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in 1994, Mr. Hansen called attention to the need to remove existing land mines and eliminate them for ever from the face of the planet. He implored NGOs to help mobilize public opinion against these weapons of terror.

Looking at the question of conventional arms proliferation, Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali recently pointed to the irrational aspects of the broader north/south dimension of this problem in the UN publication, *The Disarmament Agenda of the International Community in 1994 and Beyond*:

Some donor countries... are restricting overseas aid when arms expenditure in the developing country rises above a certain percentage of GNP. But some of those same donor countries are now exporting arms which are surplus to their military requirements or their industrial capacity. In other words, while one hand is offering incentives to restrict arms expenditure, the other is encouraging arms purchases.

Relationship Between Increased Arms Transfers and Wars

With regard to the international arms trade, a true collective security system requires that this immoral practice be ended. Sadly, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council have also

been the principal arms merchants, with the United States being a clear number one in this unworthy contest.

Paul Warnke, Founder, Committee for National Security

A case for the direct relationship between increased arms transfers and eventual conflict and wars is convincingly made, especially by Dr. ul Haq who points to the data that UNDP has been collecting (published since 1990 in the yearly *Human Development Report*) on the ratio between a country's military spending and social development spending. During the 1980's, the three countries in which the ratio was the greatest were Iraq which was spending eight times more on the military than on its education and health programs, Somalia which was spending five times more on the military than on education and health, and Nicaragua which was spending three times more. Dr. ul Haq states, "You could have predicted right at that time which three countries were going to be in trouble themselves, and bring the rest of the world into trouble as well." He refers to the ironic fact that certain countries "push" arms into the third world by paying huge subsidies to arms exporters and then must spend huge sums of money again to arm the soldiers who have to go into the conflict areas to stop the bloodshed created by the initial arms exports. Existing data indicates that today 86% of all arms to the third world come from the five permanent members of the Security Council.

Transparency

Because of the global proliferation of conventional weapons and the recognition that military expenditures continue to drain resources away from the real needs of people, the issues of transparency, confidence-building and the creation of an arms register have created a new focus of attention at the United Nations. In 1992, transparency (the systematic provision of information under formal or informal international arrangements) was for the first time placed on the disarmament agendas of both the UN's General Assembly and the UN Conference on Disarmament. Transparency to be sure is no substitute for reductions in arms; however, it can be a confidence-building measure and alert the global community to excessive accumulations of armaments, thus facilitating non-proliferation efforts, predictability, restraint and, as a result, stability. As a first step in promoting transparency in conventional weapons, the General Assembly established a Register of Conventional Arms in 1992 which requests data on international arms transfers as well as available background information on military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies.

Conversion/Peace Dividend

The "turning of the cannon into ploughshares" must be carried out with judgment, and only wide international planning can take care of this stupendous process. The settling of national boundaries and

spheres of influence will be one of the utmost difficulty and can only be satisfactorily determined if goodwill is actively present and consciously used and when the wishes of the people involved are consulted in a non-partisan spirit.

Alice A. Bailey

In the late 1980's many were euphoric, claiming that for the first time in a lifetime, military expenditures were beginning to go down. It was expected that there would be many new opportunities for building a "new edifice for global human security". As a result, the General Assembly of the UN in 1990 requested a report on the economic aspects of disarmament, particularly disarmament as an investment process. Prepared by the UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), the study's conclusions addressed the issue of what began to be referred to as the "peace dividend" - an investment process in which current costs were incurred in the expectation of future benefits - and the role of public policies designed to optimize it.

The report concluded that disarmament had major economic consequences involving costs as well as benefits. It soon became obvious that a whole new set of problems would have to be considered and that much forethought and careful planning were going to be needed if we were to transform military-oriented industrial complexes into enterprises serving social, humanitarian and development needs.

To initiate the conversion from military to civilian production, significant advances in the reduction and limitation of armaments are needed. Yet the existence of huge military production capacities makes disarmament an uncertain development as the arms industry and the military establishment which usually enjoy considerable privileges, resist changes. Also, especially in economically advanced countries, there are large segments of the population dependent on military production. Restructuring industry and retraining skilled and unskilled labour has had and, without additional forethought and planning, may continue to have an even more debilitating effect on many economies.

Another factor to be considered is the means with which we will deal with the environmental hazards and the related expenses of dismantling weapons. In addition, the technical assistance and the capacity for the safe transport and long-term storage of highly toxic weapons material have also become a necessary concern.

Complicating the issue is the fact that the *1994 Human Development Report* offers statistics showing that from 1987 until 1994, global military spending declined at such a rate that a cumulative peace dividend of US\$935 billion was realized. However, the Report continues, "it is difficult to track where these funds went. And there has been no clear link between reduced military spending and enhanced expenditure on human development".

Although these problems are substantial, their resolution is not beyond our grasp. We

have witnessed time and again in the history of humanity that once there is commitment and will behind a particular goal, that goal is accomplished. Such a determined resolve must now be applied to ensure the attainment of disarmament.

PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY, PEACEMAKING AND PEACE-KEEPING

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

Charter of the United Nations; Chapter VI

As the above excerpt indicates, the UN Charter prefers diplomatic and economic instruments and envisions military action only as a weapon of last resort to maintain or restore peace. However, as past events have shown, it often remains the exception rather than the rule that State parties turn to anything other than this weapon of last resort.

It was as a result of the first Security Council Summit on 31 January 1992 that the international community began to seriously and finally consider the importance of preventive diplomacy, peace-making and peace-keeping as the means to maintain international peace and security. Today, it is generally recognized that these approaches must be integrated with, and become part of the disarmament effort. Emphasis has also been placed on crisis management techniques such as early warning, the collection and analysis of information, fact-finding, and other forms of confidence-building as suggested by Chapter VI of the Charter.

Unfortunately, there is as yet no international consensus as to what constitutes an effective program of preventive diplomacy, peace-making and peace-keeping and the concept of peace enforcement has not yet been unanimously accepted as an international norm. All too often one or another of the parties is not ready to allow the UN to play a role in helping to resolve a potential or actual conflict, and thus, Chapter VI of the Charter has not been exercised as it is hoped it will be in the future. When tried, preventive diplomacy and peace-making have been found to be highly preferable as well as cost-effective. The finances they require are paltry by comparison with the huge cost in human suffering and material damage which war always brings or with the less huge, but nevertheless substantial, cost of deploying a peace-keeping operation after hostilities have broken out.

Peace-Keeping

Peace-keeping, which has become the most visible and controversial aspect of peace

maintenance, was pioneered and developed by the UN as one of the means for maintaining international peace and security. Interposed between hostile States, or sometimes between hostile communities within a State, international military personnel under UN command have saved countless lives and contributed to creating conditions necessary for the peaceful settlement of disputes through negotiations.

Until recently the effectiveness of such peace-keeping forces was due, first and foremost, to the moral authority of the UN and the concern of the international community. In 1988, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to UN peace-keepers for "demanding and hazardous service in the cause of peace". In accepting the award on their behalf, the then Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar said, "Peace-keeping operations symbolize the world community's will to peace and represent the impartial, practical expression of that will." Unfortunately, the reality of his statement was short-lived as today we have much acrimony and controversy over the role and function of UN peace-keeping forces.

Of the 28 peace-keeping operations established by the UN since its inception, 15 have been set up since 1988. Only five of these "post-cold war" operations have been of the traditional military kind. Such operations have included the protection of relief shipments, the provision of services for victims, response to refugee needs, enforcement of embargoes, and the removal of mines. In addition to military-related aspects, many UN operations have involved human rights verification, humanitarian relief, administrative management, institution-building and the restoration of infrastructure and services.

However, as operations have become more complex, dangerous and expensive, the international community has not been able to reach consensus or maintain the resolve necessary for effective solutions. The UN as a result has been confronted with intractable problems in, for example, Angola, Bosnia and Somalia- chilling the world community's earlier hope that peace would be the result of the end of the cold war.

Current Peace-keeping Problems

Peace-keeping problems include the lack of established criteria for what constitute threats to peace and security and the related problem of how the Security Council is to arrive at politically difficult decisions as to when and how to intervene in matters formerly considered to be the difficulty of a Member State. Added to this is the lack of clarity on the missions for UN troops and mounting credibility problems for the Security Council which is often criticized for making each decision independent of any other and thus posing questions of certainty, consistency, and reliability. Some suggest that the Security Council is losing its credibility. It is also increasingly accused of acting completely arbitrarily in the interests of its permanent members and of lacking the will to carry out its missions. For example, in the case of the former Yugoslavia, the Security Council is seen as little more than a resolution-producing

machine and, in Somalia, it is seen by some as representing developed-world interests. Additionally, it is pointed out that objective, authoritative intellectual analysis and input are often lacking in Security Council deliberations.

It has become increasingly difficult to find sufficient troops and other personnel for the most challenging peace-keeping operations. This is exacerbated by the fact that the UN is in acute financial crisis. When Members fail to pay their assessments in full and on time, reimbursements to troop contributors are delayed, making it burdensome for some countries to participate in UN operations. Recent experience has also demonstrated that a Security Council resolution mandating a peace-keeping operation no longer automatically implies that it will happen as authorized. For example, on 18 June 1993 the Security Council mandated an increase of 7,600 troops to UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force) for the safe areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It took one year for these troops to be made available and deployed. The 5,500 troops authorized in May 1994 for Rwanda began to arrive only after more than two months had passed, and at the end of August 1994 only about 4,000 had been deployed. In view of the dangers of some of the new types of operations, national governments have been reticent and cautious about placing their forces in such missions under UN control.

Another major problem which has come to light is that of command and control. It is obvious that if an operation fails to function as an integrated whole, both the mission's ability to reach its objectives and the safety of its personnel are jeopardized. Given the current confusion and debate about peace-keeping missions, and who should control and command troops and to what end, such integration has been lacking.

Effective and credible peace-keeping requires not only a cohesive operation on the ground, but also sustained political resolve. In these challenging times, the international community has, at times, resorted to "peace-keeping in the midst of war". The success of this type of operation, more than any other, depends on timely involvement, on judicious assessments of the type and level of forces required, and on the ability of Member States to work together and to combine their strengths to good effects. These as yet are challenges to be met.

Improving the UN's Ability to Maintain Peace

Many have offered ideas for improving the UN's ability to maintain peace. One such group is the Commission on Global Governance co-chaired by Ingvar Carlsson, the former Prime Minister of Sweden and Shridath Ramphal, the former Secretary-General of the Commonwealth. This task force made up of twenty-six international leaders worked together: for a period of two years searching for solutions to some of our most pressing global problems. In the report, *Our Global Neighbourhood*, the Commission addresses the need to improve UN peace-keeping efforts.

The Commission points out, as do others, that a fundamental obstacle to the UN's

ability to be effective in the early stages of conflict is that, without any soldiers of its own, it cannot respond swiftly even with the backing of the Security Council. Thus it calls for the need to have a highly trained and standing UN Volunteer Force that could be deployed at an early stage in a crisis. It is suggested that such a force should be under the exclusive authority of the Security Council and, like peace-keeping forces, under the day-to-day direction of the Secretary-General. Such a force could give the Security Council the ability to back up preventive diplomacy with a measure of immediate and convincing deployment on the ground. Its very existence, it is argued, would be a deterrent and would give support for negotiation and peaceful settlement of disputes.

The report also calls upon the international community to provide increased funds for peace-keeping which could be made available as a result of reductions in the defence expenditures of individual States who could increasingly rely on the UN peace-keeping machinery. This would include the creation of a peace-keeping reserve fund which would facilitate rapid deployment when necessary.

The obvious need to develop a more comprehensive system to collect information on trends and situations that may lead to violent conflict or humanitarian tragedies is also emphasised in the report. And, expressing the newly-formed perspective of many, the Commission points to the necessity of focusing on the underlying political, social, economic and environmental causes of conflict. As we shall see in the next few pages, the international community has recognized that in the long run, attention to these areas is the most effective way to prevent conflict.

In the face of indifference, you never lose your sense of the good that one person can do for another alone. You take it into the field by yourself if you must. You take risks. You endure the discouragement of those who do nothing but say that you do not do enough. You ignore the "quick fix" and you go for the heart of the problem. You learn to live without the support of those who promise it and without the welcome of those who would undermine the good you do. Against whatever odds and pressures, you push your challenge forward and you count each step a victory... Our situation today is complex, confusing, and difficult. But we must not lose hope. Even where we cannot quickly solve a problem, even where the magnitude of that problem seems overwhelming, we absolutely must not let ourselves be deterred from helping those who need us. We must let nothing erode our belief that we - as individuals or as nations - can ease the suffering and better the lives of our fellow human beings. This, to me, is what it has come to mean to be a peace-keeper.

Kofi Annan, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

PEACE AND SECURITY IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

What do I mean by non military threats to security? I would call it a silent war.... Security, in the modern world, can neither be completely defined in military terms nor can it be insured through military means. Those who believe that the more armed you are the more secure you are, are not understanding that there is a rising array of non military threats to security which must be met through non military means.

*Swadesh Rana, Coordinator, Disarmament and Development, UN
Department for Disarmament Affairs*

Today global peace and security are at risk because human security and environmental security are at risk. The concept of human security is taking on a broader, more comprehensive dimension and as a result, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the world can never be at peace unless people have security within their daily lives. Finally, we are recognizing what Douglas Roche, former Ambassador of Canada and proponent of disarmament, calls the three pillars of global security: disarmament, economic and social development, and environmental protection. All three are equally crucial and interlinked.

The *1994 Human Development Report* states that "for too long, the concept of security has been shaped by the potential for conflict between States. For too long, security has been equated with the threats to a country's borders. For too long, nations have sought arms to protect their security. [Yet,] for most people today, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. Job security, income security, health security, environmental security, security from crime - these are the emerging concerns of human security all over the world". The report elaborates on the possible world wide impact of insecure people: "When the security of people is attacked in any corner of the world, all nations are likely to get involved. Famines ethnic conflicts, social disintegration, terrorism, pollution and drug trafficking are no longer isolated events, confined within national borders. Their consequences travel the globe."

At last, the world and the United Nations are harkening to the necessity of the Four Freedoms first enunciated by President Franklin Roosevelt and echoed by the US Secretary of State in June 1945 when reporting to his government on the results of the San Francisco Conference that created the United Nations:

The battle of peace has to be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front where victory spells freedom from fear. The second is the economic and social front where victory means freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace... No provisions that can be written into the Charter will enable the Security Council to make the world secure from war if men and women have no security in their homes and their jobs.

The World Summit for Social Development

Seeking to begin a global dialogue and to initiate a global plan of action that will address these two forms of freedom, the United Nations convened a World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen, Denmark from March 6-12, 1995. Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali stated in advance of the Summit (which coincided with the UN's 50th anniversary), that it "will lay the foundations of the work of the United Nations in the social development sphere for generations to come". The Summit addressed the major social development dilemmas facing societies the world over as we approach the 21st Century: the eradication of poverty, enhancing productive employment, and social integration.

In outlining the need for such a gathering of heads of State, UN literature pointed out that the promising unprecedented social and economic progress expected from the end of the cold war has not materialized. Rather, we are experiencing a "cold peace", reflected in widespread political fragmentation and social destabilization. Instead of the long-awaited social harmony and affluence for the people of the world, there is increasing poverty and unemployment and a growing sense of insecurity. In the words of the Secretary-General, "the world is suffering from a social and moral crisis which, in many societies, is of immense proportions".

This assessment is rooted in facts and figures which indicate, for example, that one out of every five people lives below the poverty line and that an estimated 13 to 18 million die annually of poverty-related causes; that the ranks of those suffering extreme poverty are expected to quadruple within one lifetime if current economic and demographic trends continue; and instead of increasing, productive employment is decreasing, with one out of every ten people of working age not able to find work paying a decent wage while twenty percent of the world's total wage earners receive only two per cent of the world's income.

A further indication of the disintegration of society is reflected in the following additional facts: of the 82 armed conflicts between 1989 and 1992, 79 were domestic, many along ethnic lines, with 90 per cent of the casualties being civilian. Reported crime has grown at a worldwide average of five per cent each year since the 1980's. Also, illegal drug trafficking rakes in profits of some \$500 billion a year - a sum equal to the combined gross national products of two thirds of the UN Member States put together. Violence in the home which is both a symptom and a result of the breakdown of family values makes tragic victims of children and women. Alarming, statistics report that women are today more at risk of being killed by their male partners than by any other kind of assault. Additionally, public corruption is becoming commonplace to such a degree that in some countries financial frauds are estimated to cost the equivalent of 10 per cent of the country's annual gross domestic product.

These facts and figures, as the Summit literature points out, are symptoms of a sick

world. What is called for is a new ideal of social progress based on responsibility, as well as freedom and solidarity. Summit organizers insisted: without "intensive care" in the form of a compelling new vision of human-centred economic growth, environmental protection, societal justice and democracy, peace may remain forever beyond our reach. Ambassador Juan Somavia, Chairman of the Social Summit, plaintively asked, "Shouldn't the improvement in conditions of people's lives and the planet become the new organizing factor of international life?"

Within the General Assembly of the UN, the nations of the world unanimously identified the Summit's core issues of poverty, unemployment and social integration as severe problems of modern society - problems whose solutions are crucially important to the well being of all. In a December, 1992 resolution authorizing the Social Summit, the General Assembly declared: "Increased international cooperation for economic and social development would significantly contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security." The ultimate goal of the Social Summit, according to Ambassador Somavia, was to help make "ordinary people throughout the world feel less insecure, less threatened and more dignified".

A major international concern also addressed at the Summit is that the benefits of the unprecedented material progress of the last half of the twentieth century have not been distributed equally. Economic inequities, for example, in terms of trade, investment, savings or access to credit have tripled and quadrupled during the past 30 to 40 years, so much so that the richest 20% of the world's population today have 150 times the income of the poorest 20%. Lack of financial resources alone is not the reason for this gap between the haves and have nots. According to many, what seems to be lacking is the political will to bring equity and balance to an unjust and unacceptable situation.

For example, Federico Mayor, the Director-General of UNESCO, alerts us to the need to change our energy consumption patterns and work habits:

The world has changed. We must learn to pay the price of peace just as we paid the price of war. We must rediscover a humanism equal to the challenges facing the planet. Part of the vast sums spent on the military will have to be invested in reducing poverty. We still gird ourselves against enemies who no longer exist, yet stand defenceless before those who threaten us. The most developed countries must realize they can solve their problems only by contributing to the development of the countries of the South. Will this mean that we will have to change our energy consumption patterns and our work habits? It does indeed... There can be no doubt that the world is one. Either we forge ahead together or we shall be unable to avoid chaos and despair.

A similar insight and note of urgency is echoed by the late James Grant, former Executive Director of UNICEF:

It would be foolish - to say the least - to believe that we can continue to live

indefinitely, side by side, amidst the kind of obscene disparities in wealth, health, and in levels of freedom and participation, that persist today...Radically narrowing those disparities is not only an ethical priority of the highest order, it is increasingly a question of global survival

Possible Solutions

One of the solutions to these economic problems being proposed by many is the creation of an Economic Security Council. Such a Council would be a decision-making forum at the highest level to review the threats to global human security and agree on the necessary actions. While it is recognized that the establishment of such a Council would be difficult, the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report indicates that it "need not be such a daunting prospect if the world community agrees on the urgency of the task". And if necessary, intermediate steps could be taken. Defending the idea, the Report leaves us with the reminder that "many heresies of yesterday have become the conventional wisdom of today".

Speaking to the 1993 international conference of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) affiliated with the United Nations' Department of Public Information, Mr. Gustave Speth, Administrator of UNDP, summarized well the urgent need for everyone to become involved in our present struggle to create a secure and therefore peaceful environment for everyone in our interdependent world:

My fervent wish is that...we bring a sense of urgency to our efforts. As we look around the world, we see social disintegration...spreading like a metastasized cancer. Armed conflicts, crime, violence, corruption, humanitarian emergencies, displaced people, refugees - all seem to be mounting. While behind the headlines is the silent crisis of... chronic and growing poverty, of mounting population pressure, and spreading environmental deterioration. In such a world, a sense of urgency is merely common sense. Above all, bring urgency to your work, and bring ideas and hope on a scale to match the challenges. Urgency, boldness, vision - for these we need NGOs as never before.

The newly recognized challenges to global peace and security demand new concepts, new policies and new institutional initiatives. And more than ever they demand the involvement and participation of all sectors of society. Willy Brandt foresaw what so many in the United Nations and elsewhere are today declaring: "The shaping of our common future is much too important to be left to governments and experts alone." In his introduction to the North-South agenda which he set out in 1980, Mr. Brandt made an appeal to all sectors of society, an appeal that has been echoed especially at all United Nations conferences of this decade:

Our appeal goes to youth, to women and labour movements, political, intellectual, and religious leaders, to scientists, and educators, to technicians, and managers, to members of the religious communities, may they all try to understand and conduct their affairs in the light of this new challenge.

CONCLUSION

*Peace...is a condition of mind brought about by a serenity of Soul.
Lasting peace can come only to peaceful people.*

Horace E. DeLister

That we are entering a new age is verified by the growing recognition from those in positions of power that leadership today must come from "we the people" - everyday people in everyday walks of life. Today it is popular knowledge that when 20% of the people within a given community adopt an idea, that idea is on its way to becoming public policy. Through experience we are learning that focussed, determined, enlightened public opinion is the most potent force in the world.

Dr. Vaclav Havel, playwright and President of the Czech republic, makes this point well when he refers to the defeat of communism:

Communism was not defeated by military force but by life, by the human spirit, by conscience, by the resistance of being and man to manipulation. It was defeated by a revolt of colour, authenticity, history in all its variety and human individuality, against imprisonment within a uniform ideology.

Alice Bailey refers to the men and women of goodwill everywhere who must be mobilised and set to work. She states, "it is upon their efforts that the future of humanity depends; they exist in their millions everywhere and - when mobilised - represent a vast section of the thinking public." These individuals wield the energy of goodwill - the energy which is the active principle of peace. Goodwill is love in action. It is a practical, dynamic and constructive force. There is no problem which cannot be solved by the energy of goodwill, and no problem can be solved without it. Goodwill truly practised among groups and among nations is capable of revolutionizing the world.

Men and women of goodwill realize that, as with all the problems facing humanity, today's challenges of disarmament, peace and security, can only be surmounted if we collectively work to establish a new world order based upon right human relations, on justice and on the recognition of inherited rights and opportunity for all - irrespective of race, colour or creed; a new world order based on the recognition of the divine potentialities in all human beings.

As we have seen in the previous pages, men and women of goodwill recognize that the resources of the earth must be set free to be used justly and fairly by all of the world's people. Instead of competition and self-interest, many today realize the necessity of cooperation and sharing. Where there is uneven distribution of the world's riches; where there is a situation in which some nations have or take everything and other nations lack even the necessities of life, it is obvious that there is a trouble-breeding

factor which demands attention.

"We the people" are largely responsible for our current challenges and "we the people" must awaken to our responsibility and potential to right that which is wrong. To date, it has not been the will of the people to establish tight human relations. Hence, we have been subjected to the experiences of war and the misery in human living. As we become aware of the causative behaviours and attitudes which have led to the present world problems, so we can begin to take the wise, compassionate and skilful steps which will lead to the resolution of these problems, within ourselves and within our immediate and global environment. Peace security and world stability fit within our grasp if we but take the necessary steps. One such step, made obvious in the previous pages, is the deflecting of the millions of dollars currently being spent on war and war related resources and activities into areas of sustainable human development.

The Ageless Wisdom as presented by Alice Bailey indicates that it has been the prostitution of matter to selfish ends and for separative purposes which has been responsible for the misery, the suffering, and many of the problems which have characterized the life of humanity down the ages and which precipitated the past World War.

That same Ageless Wisdom indicates that today we have the opportunity to make a fresh start - to build again on sounder and more constructive lines. We have the opportunity to create that better civilization which is the dream of those who love their fellow human beings, and to attain a new aptitude in handling substance. If "we the people" can demonstrate a gained wisdom in the creation of forms which will house the spirit of resurrection and express the enlightenment gained by the bitter experiences of the past, then we will be able to realize the promise of the new age of Aquarius. We will be able to create a civilization of peace, love and harmony- a civilization which is concerned with the good of the entire family of nations and not only of the one nation or group of nations; a civilization wherein the resources of the entire planet will be shared collectively because it will be realized that the products of the earth, the gifts of the soil and the intellectual heritage of the nations belong to the whole of humanity and to no one nation exclusively.

Individually, yes, we can do some important things. But we are setting out to do something that is beyond the powers of any of us individually. But what we have been demonstrating in the last 10 years is that, when we work together, we really can begin to change the face of global society, the face of the world.

*James Grant at the sixth Bellagio Conference
in New Delhi, India, February 1994*

THE OBJECTIVES OF WORLD GOODWILL

To stimulate and encourage men and women of goodwill everywhere to establish right human relations between races, nations, and classes by an intelligent understanding and adequate communication.

To assist men and women of goodwill in their studies of world problems and in the effective application to these problems of goodwill, cooperation and sharing for the common good.

To cooperate with other organisations in constructive activities contributing to world unity, stability and right human relations.

To make available up-to-date information on constructive current action in the main areas of human life through the publication of a quarterly newsletter.

To establish a goodwill Commentary on issues of world interest.

To aid in establishing goodwill as the keynote of the new civilisation

To create a worldwide mailing list of men and women of goodwill.

To support the work of the United Nations and its Specialised Agencies as the best hope for a united and peaceful world.

World Goodwill Commentary is not offered on subscription: it is financed by the voluntary donations of men and women of goodwill. To receive future issues or to secure additional copies of this issue, please write to:

WORLD GOODWILL

**3 Whitehall Court
Suite 54
London SW1A 2EF
ENGLAND**

**120 Wall Street
24th Floor
New York 10005
U. S. A.**

**1 rue de Varembe (3e)
Case Postale 31
1211 Geneva 20
SWITZERLAND**