



SOCIALISM, PEACE AND SOLIDARITY

Selected Speeches of
Olof Palme

Edited by
E S Reddy

SOCIALISM, PEACE AND SOLIDARITY

Selected Speeches of Olof Palme

Edited

by

E. S. Reddy

With a foreword by Shri R. Venkataraman, President of India

[Published by Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, in 1990]

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

INTRODUCTION

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM MEANS SOLIDARITY

Opening address to Congress of Swedish Social Democratic Party,
October 1, 1972

STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND UNDERSTANDING AMONG NATIONS AND PEOPLES

Speech during the debate on foreign affairs in the Swedish Parliament,
March 12, 1980

SURVIVAL AND SECURITY

Speech at an "Evening for Peace" at the Riverside Church, New York,
December 7, 1980

TRANSFORM LONGING FOR PEACE INTO POLICY FOR PEACE

Introduction to the report of the Independent Commission on
Disarmament and Security Issues, 1982

STRUCTURE OF COMMON SECURITY

Statement at the Second Special Session of the United Nations General
Assembly on Disarmament, June 23, 1982

EMPLOYMENT AND WELFARE

Jerry Wurf Memorial Lecture at Harvard University, April 3, 1984

THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Keynote address at the Colloquium of the "Groupe de Bellerive" in
Geneva, June 27, 1985

UNITED NATIONS MUST BE ALLOWED TO SUCCEED

Statement at the United Nations General Assembly on the fortieth
anniversary of the United Nations, October 21, 1985

SWEDEN'S SECURITY POLICY

Address to the Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm, December 12, 1985

WORLD SECURITY: THE WIDER CONTEXT

Indira Gandhi Memorial Lecture, New Delhi, January 16, 1986

**IF WORLD DECIDES TO ABOLISH APARTHEID, APARTHEID
WILL DISAPPEAR**

Address to the Swedish People's Parliament against Apartheid,
Stockholm, February 21, 1986

FOREWORD

Olof Palme provided Sweden with a rare calibre of leadership. But he also went beyond his exertions at home to an active espousal of world initiatives on issues of development and peace. As leader of the Socialist International Working Group on the Southern Africa question, as a member of the Brandt Commission, as Chairman of the Commission on Disarmament and International Security and as a member of the Six Nation Initiative on nuclear disarmament, Palme came to reflect the urgent human issues of our time. We in India specially remember his participation in the Six Nation Initiative which was crowned by the New Delhi Declaration on Peace and Disarmament in January 1985. Of no less significance were Palme's role in the Vietnam war while still serving in the Swedish Government, and his attempt to mediate in the Gulf war between Iran and Iraq. Similarly, the pernicious policy of apartheid in South Africa evoked his firm opposition. That Palme's stand on South Africa went beyond intentions and words became clear when he imposed a freeze on Swedish business investments in South Africa. His courageous espousal of these issues made him a popular and esteemed figure in the entire 'Third World.'

Violence has dogged nobility throughout the history. Olof Palme was tragically felled in March 1986 by the bullets of an assassin. Humanity asked in utter disbelief and astonishment why this civilised human being, one who had offended nobody in the world, who personified goodness and friendship, should have met such a cruel end. But the bullets that killed Olof Palme were blind. Above all, they represented the very antithesis of all that Palme stood for: non-violence, mutual trust and justice.

Palme's career was thus tragically cut short. And yet, Palme remains immortal; immortal for what he achieved in his life as well as for the causes that he strove to achieve.

Shri E. S. Reddy has rendered a useful service to the cause of peace and development in the world by bringing together this vital collection of Palme's speeches on a variety of subjects of international interest. I am sure they would be read the world over with interest - and hope.

R. Venkataraman
President of India

New Delhi

INTRODUCTION

For two decades before his tragic assassination in 1986, Olof Palme was a powerful voice in the world for peace and disarmament, freedom and human rights. He was a leader and spokesman for a growing public opinion in Sweden and the world for an end to the cold war, for international cooperation and solidarity in dealing with issues of vital importance to all humanity.

He had an abiding faith in people and in their ability to take joint action in common interest. He welcomed, encouraged and found strength in the mass public movements for peace and liberation. Perhaps no other leader of government has ever given so much attention to promoting public opinion and public action on an international level.

He was instrumental in lifting the Socialist International from the morass to which it had been led by affiliates which supported colonial wars and became too identified with the Western military alliances. He played a key role in restoring and reorienting it as an organisation with a vision of the future, a commitment to international solidarity and consistency in opposing all oppression and exploitation. He tried to help wherever people struggled for freedom against tyranny and oppression - in Greece and Spain, in Vietnam and Nicaragua, and especially in Africa.

Under his leadership, Sweden played a dynamic role in international affairs as the Western country which was most active in seeking a reversal of the mad arms race and one most responsive to the aspirations of the great majority of humanity which lived in the so-called "Third World."

Palme and Nehru

In many ways, Olof Palme's contribution to world affairs was similar to that of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru of India in the first two decades after the Second World War.

They were both intellectuals with a "bourgeois" origin who embraced and espoused democratic socialism. They were both true internationalists who had their feet firmly planted in the traditions of their own nations but receptive to intellectual currents from all over the world. They established a rapport with the youth and with the best intellectuals of the world, and stressed constantly how the struggle for international peace and cooperation was in the interests of every nation, including their own.

They did not speak for countries which exercised great influence through

economic or military power; their strength was their influence on world opinion and their identification with popular movements.

If Nehru rallied newly-independent and non-aligned countries in the 1950s in efforts to end the ghastly wars in Korea and Vietnam, to avert the threat of war between the United States and China, and to press for the cessation of all nuclear tests, Palme helped create the Five Continents Initiative in the 1980's to help reverse the arms race and secure nuclear disarmament.

Pandit Nehru and Olof Palme thus made a historic contribution toward the positive changes now taking place on the international scene. It was, therefore, most appropriate that Palme was posthumously presented the Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding in January 1987 and that a street in Delhi was named Olof Palme Marg.

Life Dedicated to Solidarity and Peace

Olof Palme was born on January 30, 1927, in Stockholm, in an upper middle class family. His father, a businessman, died when Olof was only six years old.

As a child he suffered from poor health and received much of his early education from private tutors. He then studied at the Sigtuna School of Liberal Arts - Sigtuna Humanistiska Laroeverk - one of Sweden's few residential high schools, and matriculated with high marks at an exceptionally early age of 17.

After military service, he enrolled in the University of Stockholm. He spent a year as an exchange student at Kenyon College in the United States of America where he received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1948, and then hitch-hiked across the United States and to Mexico. Returning to Stockholm he obtained the Bachelor of Laws degree in 1951.

He joined the Social Democratic Party in 1949 and was active in the student movement. Elected Chairman of the Swedish National Union of Students in 1951, he took special interest in international affairs. In 1953, he attended an international student seminar in Mysore, India, and spent almost three months travelling in India and other Asian countries (Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand, Singapore and Indonesia).

His travels and his experience in the student movement had a great influence on his thinking. The year he spent in the United States contributed to his abhorrence of racism, inequality and McCarthyism, as much as it helped him to understand and appreciate the liberal traditions in the United States. His feeling of solidarity with the poor countries and oppressed people was strengthened by his journey to Asia.

He was deeply influenced by his stay of ten days in the remote village of

Udaparane in the south of India with an American sociologist. As he recalled more than thirty years later in his Indira Gandhi Memorial Lecture:

"Whenever I hear talk about economic and political development, I return to this village... as a reference point. That is where so much of the future is decided."

After his return from the Asian journey in the summer of 1953, he became personal secretary to the Prime Minister of Sweden, Tage Erlander. His close contact with the Prime Minister helped his development as a political leader. He became popular among young Social Democrats as a speaker and debater. He also gained useful experience as Director of Studies in the Social Democratic Youth League from 1955 to 1961, as member of the Workers' Educational Association and as a member of the Swedish Agency for International Assistance (SIDA) in the early 1960s.

Palme was elected to Parliament for the first time in 1957, and became Minister without Portfolio in the Cabinet Office in 1963. He was Minister of Transport and Communications from 1965 to 1967, and Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs from 1967 to 1969.

He attracted international attention in the mid-1960s by his opposition to the Vietnam War, support to the liberation struggles in Africa and advocacy of assistance to Third World countries. The United States lodged strong protests in 1968 when he took part in a public demonstration against the Vietnam war. Palme asserted the right of Sweden to criticise the war and express solidarity with the struggles for liberation around the world. His courage and his responsiveness to Swedish public opinion enhanced his stature as a leader.

In October 1969, he was unanimously elected Chairman of the Social Democratic Party and became Prime Minister, succeeding Tage Erlander. For the next 17 years he dominated Swedish politics and played an active and significant role in international affairs.

Palme is often described in Sweden as "controversial," mainly because of his dynamism. By the time he became Prime Minister, the Social Democratic Party had been continuously in power for 37 years since the Great Depression. A wide consensus had developed in the country on a "welfare state" and there seemed to be no major contentious issues among the political parties. But for Palme, Socialism meant a constant movement forward. He kept looking ahead and pressing for new initiatives to meet new developments.

Although the "Swedish model" had been extolled abroad, there were still great inequalities in society which needed to be dealt with. Technological developments, structural changes in the Swedish economy and the world economic situation had created new problems and challenges. At the same time,

Swedish public opinion - aroused by the escalation of the Vietnam War, the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia, the colonial wars in Africa and the brutal repression in Latin American countries - called for a more active foreign policy. Palme provided the leadership that many Swedes were looking for. But in a country which was culturally in the Western world and was influenced by the United States view of world affairs, the independence of Palme's thinking aroused apprehensions among the conservatives. There was, as a result, a lively debate on national and international issues during the Prime Ministership of Olof Palme.

Palme, too, sought a national consensus, but it had to be the outcome of contention and debate, rather than an agreement on minimum action. "To the defenders of *status quo*," he retorted, "the demand for change comes as a confrontation." Indeed, most of his ideas - active policy for peace, solidarity with the third world, support for liberation movements - reflected growing public opinion and found ever-increasing support among the political parties.

The Social Democratic Party suffered a slight reverse in the elections of 1970 and further reverses in the next elections under a new Constitution. It formed a minority government which could not carry out the reforms it had promised. It then suffered more serious reverses in the 1976 elections, though retaining its position as by far the most influential party, largely because of its position on nuclear power. (Palme rejected demands for dismantling nuclear power plants if that meant a greater reliance on oil, and the issue remained contentious until 1981 when the major parties reached an agreement to phase out nuclear power by the year 2010.)

A non-Socialist coalition government was formed after the 1976 elections. Though the coalition did not last, non-Socialists remained in power until 1982.

During the period in opposition, Palme devoted great attention to international affairs, despite warnings that his international activities would not help his electoral position at home.

He was active as Vice-President of the Socialist International. With Willy Brandt of Germany and Bruno Kreisky of Austria, he succeeded in making the organisation take a more active role for peace and in support of the aspirations and struggles of the peoples of the Third World. He headed its task force on southern Africa, led a mission to the region in 1977, and pressed for international action against the apartheid regime in South Africa. His campaign in support of freedom of southern Africa helped develop respect for Sweden and the Socialist International among the African States and liberation movements.

Palme was a member of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, chaired by Willy Brandt, which studied the relationship between poor and rich countries and published a report in 1979 suggesting radical reforms in international economic relations.

He initiated and chaired the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues in 1980 when the arms race had escalated with the resurgence of tension between the superpowers and the danger of war had greatly increased. The Commission presented a series of recommendations in its first report, *Common Security*, to the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament in June 1982. It emphasised that in this nuclear age, international security must rest on joint survival rather than the threat of mutual destruction. It continued its work after that session, stressing constantly that the only true security for any country is the common security of all nations and peoples.

These Commissions, both led by Socialists, produced programmes of action based on a spirit of international solidarity. Looking beyond the immediate controversies - the so-called "North-South" and "East-West" conflicts - they pointed to the common interest of humanity in cooperation for genuine development in all regions of the world and in moving away from the arms race and the cold war. If their work did not immediately lead to concrete results, it helped educate public opinion, promote discussion, and develop a large constituency for positive action.

Palme was a member of a three-man Commission which visited Iran in 1980 to negotiate the release of the Americans held hostage in that country. In November that year, he was appointed as the representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for exploring a peaceful solution of the conflict between Iran and Iraq. He visited the region several times and devoted much of his time to this task in the following years.

Palme was again elected Prime Minister of Sweden in 1982 when the country was confronted with serious economic problems and the world with a new level of tension between the superpowers.

He took bold steps for the economic recovery of Sweden, including a devaluation of the kroner, the restraining of wage increases and the establishment of wage earner funds from excess profits of enterprises -and these proved successful.

He continued his intense concern with international affairs, actively encouraging the public movement for peace and disarmament, providing large-scale political and military support to the frontline States and liberation movements in southern Africa, and attempting to promote human rights and peace in Central America. If he was highly critical of the policies of President Reagan of the United States, he was equally firm in opposing Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan as immoral and a severe blow to efforts for peace and disarmament.

He was acutely concerned about the nuclear arms race. With the increase in the knowledge of the grave dangers of nuclear war, it was clear that a nuclear war would mean the annihilation of all life on the earth and the end of human

civilisation. There would be no distinction between nuclear Powers and the non-nuclears, between belligerents and neutrals, between "victors" and the "vanquished". For the same reason, nuclear weapons were utterly useless in serving military purposes. Yet the superpowers continued to build more and more sophisticated weapons and the United States administration planned to introduce nuclear weapons into outer space. There was an urgent need to arouse opinion against this nuclear madness in the name of sanity and humanity.

In 1984, Palme sponsored, together with Mrs. Indira Gandhi of India, the Five Continent Initiative for Peace by the leaders of six countries - Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania. He was actively engaged in promoting the work of this Group and the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security when he was assassinated on February 28, 1986. In fact, on the very day of the assassination, the six nations had sent an appeal to the United States and the Soviet Union for a ban on nuclear tests and offered their services to ensure effective verification.

The Thought of Olof Palme

The speeches in this collection reflect the views of Olof Palme on socialism, the struggle for peace and the implications of human solidarity. They contain unavoidable repetition, for he was a campaigner, deeply anxious about the crisis in international affairs, speaking to audiences in Sweden and abroad to mobilise public action on nuclear disarmament, North-South relations, the growing burden of debt, freedom in southern Africa and the strengthening of the United Nations.

There is, however, a unity of purpose in all the speeches. For, he constantly stressed the basic identity of legitimate national interests and international concerns - and the inter-relationship of major world issues. Socialism, for him, meant freedom, democracy and solidarity; the maintenance of peace and security, and the abolition of racist and other oppression, are its essential goals.

He did not formulate theories but sought to explain current problems and action essential for dealing with them, in simple human terms which people can understand and relate to. However complicated issues like disarmament had become or were made to appear, he had the ability to focus on the moral and political aspects which laymen can understand. His primary concern was to enable an informed public opinion to exert its influence in the solution of problems which concern people's lives.

This collection of speeches begins with an extract from his address to the Swedish Social Democratic Party Congress in 1972, the first Congress after he became Chairman of the Party. That address, and his Jerry Wurf Memorial Lecture at Harvard University in 1984, reflect his approach to the application of the principles of democratic socialism to the problems of a modern industrial society. His specific proposals for Sweden may not be directly relevant to countries under

different social or economic circumstances, or with different traditions. But the general lines of his thinking deserve attention not only in the advanced industrial countries but also in the less developed countries which seek to follow a socialist path.

The remaining statements are all from the 1980`s - both when he was leader of the Opposition (1980-82) and when he was Prime Minister of Sweden (1982-86) - as he campaigned vigorously to mobilise world opinion to assert itself in the face of the resurgence of the cold war with all its attendant consequences, and to promote public action with a sense of urgency.

As a Socialist, Palme was not doctrinaire, nor "radical". He did not seek State control of production or class struggle. For him Socialism was the welfare of all, for which the "great collective" - the members of society acting in concert - must assume responsibility. "The major problems of society," he said, "cannot be solved through the agency of the market. They must be solved on a democratic basis."

Socialism meant moving constantly forward - not in production alone but in freedom and welfare, in the standards and quality of life. It must ensure that economic growth and development would be guided by social and humane objectives, and combined with social equality and increased democracy.

Above all, "Socialism is about solidarity," within nations and internationally: solidarity with people whose human rights are violated, those who are oppressed by colonialism, racism and apartheid, and all who suffer from poverty and its consequences. It is overcoming animosities which are easy to kindle - not only between religions and nations, but also within nations, even those with "homogeneous" populations. It involves cooperation between people who live in different conditions - between generations, between different parts of the country, between the urban and rural people, between farmers and workers, between women and men. Solidarity thus concerns not only the working people but the entire population.

Approach to World Affairs

Palme's contribution to international affairs was based on the Swedish tradition of neutrality and a growing public opinion sensitive to the aspirations of the poor countries and oppressed peoples.

Sweden had a long tradition of neutrality since the Napoleonic wars of the early nineteenth century. It decided after the Second World War, when Europe was split by competing military alliances, that the main principle of its foreign policy would be "non-participation in alliances in peacetime aiming at neutrality in the event of war." There was general agreement that neutrality must be backed by a strong and self-reliant defence force, and that it should not prevent an active and

independent foreign policy.

The Swedish policy of neutrality had much in common with the approach and objectives of newly-independent countries which formed the Non-aligned Movement in 1961, though it had arisen from different historical and geographic conditions, especially from its position after the Second War between two major military alliances in Europe. Palme fully recognised and respected the role of the Non-aligned Movement as a major force for peace and justice, and developed close relations with its members.

Post-war Sweden developed a vigorous public opinion and the people belonged to many organisations which espoused various worthy causes. They took ever greater interest in international affairs and demanded a more independent foreign policy. Public opinion exercised great influence on the evolution of governmental policies and in promoting consensus among political parties.

Already in the 1950s, Swedish public opinion became concerned with colonialism and apartheid, and supported assistance to the poor countries. In the 1960s, there was strong opposition to the Vietnam war, and a desire that Sweden should follow a more active policy for peace.

Olof Palme both led and responded to this public opinion.

His approach to international affairs was also governed by his concept of solidarity and democracy. "If we are to be able to go on living at all," he said "we must be capable of living together."

He devoted special attention to disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, in the 1980`s. He insisted that the "doctrine of deterrence" which led to the manufacture of thousands of ever more efficient nuclear weapons, with hardly a few minutes of warning time, must be abandoned. He was firm that nuclear weapons must be prohibited as part of a process towards general and complete disarmament.

Palme stressed constantly that peace was not a mere "temporary absence of military violence". He saw the question of peace in its broad perspective, analysing the roots of tension and conflict, and called for action on a variety of interrelated and vital issues.

The arms race, which seemed to have become uncontrolled and uncontrollable, environmental degradation, the soaring indebtedness, especially of poorer countries, violations of human rights, and infringements of international law were all grave threats to the peace. He pointed out that action to eliminate these threats was vital to the security of all nations, including Sweden.

For him, international affairs were not divorced from national affairs. He believed

that action for global peace and against the roots of war would be the best contribution to Sweden's own security.

New Opportunities

Palme was assassinated soon after there was the beginning of positive change in superpower relations - resulting from a recognition that a nuclear war cannot be won and that the only real security is common security, as the Palme Commission had pointed out.

While welcoming this change, and recognising the primary responsibility of nuclear Powers to negotiate a reversal of the arms race, Palme cautioned that the destiny of humanity cannot be left for decision by them alone. As a spokesman of smaller countries, which encompass a majority of humanity, he asserted their right to a voice in decisions affecting the survival of all peoples and nations.

In his speech in Geneva on June 27, 1985, he said:

"Our common civilisation belongs to all nations, to all peoples, to present as well as to future generations. And therefore it is simply not acceptable that the future of our civilisation lies in the hands of only one or two or five nuclear weapon States."

The non-nuclears, he continued, must have "the right to demand that nuclear weapons are never used, that the nuclear arms race comes to a halt, and that a process of genuine disarmament is started."

The Palme Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues ended its work with a final statement in April 1989, and the Five Continent Peace Initiative concluded with a Declaration on its fifth anniversary in May 1989. Both note the positive changes and the new possibilities. To quote the Palme Commission:

"... reason and common sense seem at last to be taking hold in the world. Long and bloody conflicts in several regions are ending. The prospects for halting the arms race have rarely appeared so promising. There seems to be a greater spirit of cooperation among countries. The United Nations is again being used as an important instrument for peace..."

"... humanity has an historic opportunity in the final decade of the twentieth century to create a radically more peaceful and more humane world. The opportunity must not be missed; it may not reappear."

Both the statements also contain warnings that much more needs to be done before the disarmament process becomes irreversible, and the opportunity is turned into achievement, so that the world can feel secure. Moreover, poverty and hunger, disease and unemployment stalk vast sections of humanity, and are issues

too urgent to neglect. There must be concerted efforts involving the entire community of nations.

As Palme often stressed, the root causes of tension and conflict must be dealt with. That would require a radical change in international relations, the development of effective international cooperation, the strengthening of the United Nations and other international organisations, and an overriding spirit of human solidarity. They are not matters for the nuclear Great Powers alone, but for all nations, and they require democratic solutions.

The building of a humane world order requires leadership not only by the repositories of power but also by those endowed with vision and a commitment to democracy and solidarity. It requires, above all, an informed and active public opinion.

In these speeches, Olof Palme has left a testament to guide the efforts of governments and the public to bury the cold war, put an end to the threat of a nuclear conflict, consign colonialism and racism to the "lumber-room of history", protect the environment and improve the quality of life for all humankind.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Palme family for permission to edit and publish these speeches. I must also express my great appreciation to many friends for their encouragement and advice - including Mr. Anders Ferm, Mr. Hans Dahlgren and Mr. Anders Bjurner in Sweden; Mr. Pentti Vaaranen, Secretary-General of the Socialist International; and Mr. Nikhil Chakravarty, editor of *Mainstream*, New Delhi.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Shri R. Venkataraman, the President of India, for consenting to write a foreword.

E.S. Reddy

New York
June 1989

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM MEANS SOLIDARITY

Opening address to Congress of Swedish Social Democratic Party, October 1, 1972

The Social Democratic Party has assembled to fix the guidelines for future policy.

We have had three years of hard work since our last Congress...

The 1969 Congress adopted a comprehensive programme covering the whole gamut of politics. Our opponents said: "The programme is impossible. Sweden must not be governed from the House of the People."¹

The programme gave strength and stability to the party. We committed ourselves to the realisation of the resolutions adopted by the Congress.

Most of the People's House programme so disdainfully regarded by the bourgeois has now been put into effect - in the Swedish *Riksdag*.² We are busy putting the remainder into effect as well. Item by item. The bourgeois failed to realise that the strength of democracy is also reflected by a large popular movement democratically defining its aims and exerting itself to achieve them.

Safeguarding our Neutrality - the Common Market

We Social Democrats always begin our programmes of action with an affirmation of our uncompromising adherence to the policy of non-alignment. The Swedish policy of non-alignment and neutrality means security for our nation. It suits our geographical and strategic position. It has stood the test of experience.

The most important political question we have had to consider since the last Congress has concerned negotiations with the Common Market. In these negotiations we endeavoured to reconcile two of the fundamental aims of the labour movement: a firm policy of non-alignment and free trade across the frontiers.

These negotiations have now been concluded. The policy of non-alignment remains unimpaired. At the same time our agreement with the Common Market is the most comprehensive trade settlement that Sweden has ever concluded, giving us access to a European market of 300 million people.

¹ "House of the People" is the conference and cultural centre of the labour and popular movements and the Social Democratic Party.

² Parliament

During the negotiations we were subjected to violent attacks and campaigns at home. But throughout this period there was absolute unity within the party and the big wage-earning groups, which in turn goes a long way towards explaining why the negotiations were successful. It is my hope that this unity and solidarity concerning our Common Market policy will now come to be shared by the entire nation.

The relationship between our neighbouring countries and the Common Market has yet to be decided. Our attitude has at all times been perfectly clear: it is up to the individual countries to decide for themselves. We support one another but we do not admonish one another.

Whatever their relationship to the Common Market, the Scandinavian countries must stick together. This is particularly important during the present period of rapid change in Europe. Our neighbours can count on the willingness of the Swedish labour movement to strengthen and broaden the pattern of Nordic co-operation.

Vietnam

At the last Congress we presented an extensive programme of aid to North Vietnam. It is now clear that this programme will not merely be fulfilled but exceeded.

During the past three years, however, the war has continued and has been constantly extended both in Vietnam and throughout Indo-China. The destruction of environment has been worse and the loss of human life greater than ever before. This abominable war, the bombings, the mutilation of people, the destruction are an abnegation of human dignity.

Our attitude stands firm:

We want peace in Vietnam and national independence for the people of Vietnam. The future of the Vietnamese people is not to be decided by alien masters.

The negotiations now in progress must also lead to a settlement on the future of South Vietnam until such time as democratic elections can be held. For this reason a coalition government must be formed in Saigon. Then there will be peace.

Work for Social Equality

The Extraordinary Party Congress held in 1967 was addressed by Arne Geijer on the subject of social equality. That was a period of decline for the Social Democratic Party. The opinion polls were unfavourable and the bourgeois parties

were discussing candidates for a ministry. Everywhere we read that Social Democracy had shot its ideological bolt. Social equality was an outmoded theme and a pointless one too, so we were told. Greater equality was not a feasible proposition.

But the party responded to Arne Geijer's appeal. Alva Myrdal took the lead in the work of the equality group.³ Throughout the country there grew up a host of discussion groups, study circles, weekend conferences - all on the subject of social equality. Motions setting out detailed proposals began to come in to the district congresses, the party and the unions, women's movements, youth movements and the Christian Social Democrats.

People began to look around them in society. And they found many relics of a class society. The debate aroused expectations. It also aroused fear on the part of those who thought that they stood to lose their privileges.

Work began in the party and the unions. Five years have passed since then. Let me sum up:

1. There have been two collective bargaining periods. On no previous occasion have low wage-earners gained so much in both relative and absolute terms. This has fundamentally affected the status of women. In the public sector we have at last done away with our age-old cleavage between workers and salaried staff.

Is there anybody who believes that this would have been accomplished if the movement had not demanded social equality?

2. Working hours have been reduced: by the turn of the year they will be down to 40 hours a week.

3. Agreements have been concluded on a reduction of retirement age to 65 for LO⁴ members.

Extended rights to early retirement have been secured for those with arduous jobs. Special support has been introduced for elderly employees. Large numbers of people have benefited from these reforms.

4. A taxation reform involving a radical redistribution in favour of low wage groups was put into effect in 1970, at the same time as individual assessment was introduced in fairness to women and single persons. The *Riksdag* this year adopted the reform in favour of the large wage earning groups.

³ Mrs. Alva Myrdal, sociologist, diplomat and a leader of the Social Democratic Party, chaired the Working Group on Equality set up by the Social Democratic Party and the Confederation of Trade Unions. Its report, *Towards Equality*, was published in 1971.

⁴ *Landsorganisationen i Sverige* (Swedish Trade Union Confederation)

5. The number of persons in employment has risen by 165,000. It is above all women who have tended more and more to obtain gainful employment.
6. Thirty-five thousand day care centre places have been provided.
7. Four hundred thousand people have undergone labour market training.
8. The comprehensive school and integrated upper secondary school have been introduced. During these years we have spent 1,500 million kroner on adult education.
9. Five hundred thousand apartments have been built and one and a half million people have moved into new homes.
10. Family allowance has been raised from 900 kroner to 1,320 and a family housing grant system has been introduced. That will give a total of more than 1,000 million kroner to all families with children.
11. All medical services have been made available at a standard rate and the cost of medicine to the individual has been limited to 15 kroner.
12. Aid to the handicapped has risen by almost 2,000 million kroner in five years.

Anybody claiming in 1967, when the Extraordinary Party Congress was held, that we would accomplish all this in five years would have been dismissed as an unempirical dreamer.

But we have accomplished it. And the list could be made still longer.

We have been able to do all this because we have deliberately concentrated on social equality.

Economic Policy Creates Employment

The Extraordinary Congress of 1967 also marked the beginning of our economic policy. The signal was given by Krister Wickman.

Then came all the discussions, the circles in the Work-Security-Development Congresses and the proposals, expectations and apprehensions.

People who felt insecure began to ask: Can we together assume responsibility for work and security, can we together build up the economic strength of our community?

Then began the everyday work of creating the instruments of economic policy and beginning to use them...

The bourgeois contribution to economic policy has for the most part consisted of enumerating examples of what they consider to be unsuccessful state enterprises. And of course there are examples to be found of misguided ventures and difficulties. But we are not in the habit of returning the compliment by enumerating the failures of private enterprise. That is not the way to create employment.

But: public economic policy has created employment for tens of thousands of people. That is a fact.

Our commitment to the heavy industries of northern Sweden, to Gotaverken, Adalen, Oskarshamn, Algots, to regional development policy - all this is concerned with people's security.

For this reason we shall continue to develop our economic policy.

Lessons from the Past Three Years

There are important lessons to be learned from the political efforts of the past three years.

FIRST: Ideologically and practically, our policy has evolved through a constant interaction within the movement.

SECOND: One is bound to meet with resistance when changing society. All this talk of a crisis of confidence, of the perils of equality, of escapism and outmoded slogans of class warfare derives in the ultimate analysis from an ideological aversion to the ideas of equality, not only in terms of social conditions but also regarding power and influence, the ideas of equitable partnership and cooperation between individuals which are the very life-blood of the labour movement. To the defenders of the *status quo* the demand for change comes as a confrontation. They would be better advised to see it as an appeal for solidarity. Contrary to what the conservatives would have us believe, the welfare state of Per Albin Hansson⁵ did not imply any perpetuation of the existing state of things. The idea of the People's Home⁶ was then and remains to this day a bid for a wider form of social partnership.

THIRD: It pays to work for equality and security. Of course realities are often more difficult to change than one had hoped, they often take longer to change. We

⁵ Per Albin Hansson, Social Democratic leader, was elected Prime Minister in 1932 and initiated a welfare state programme.

⁶ Mr. Hansson advanced the concept of a "people's home" to emphasise that all members of society should be treated like one family.

cannot expect to fulfil all of our expectations. A critical appraisal of our policies is always called for. But we must always go forward. This is the task of Social Democracy. Society is not transformed by dreams of bringing about the downfall of the system by violence. Instead change is a matter of hard work on every day basis, thus ensuring the victory of the idea of democratic reformism...

For most people today life is still an arduous business. They are confronted by financial problems and other difficulties. We do not promise to create a heaven on earth. But results have shown that the ideas of security and solidarity can be put into practice...

Problems of Industrial Society

The period following the last Congress has been dominated by current difficulties and by hard work in the realisation of our programme. This has been the experience of people in the rank and file of the party. Nonetheless the movement has been strong enough to engage in an ideological debate which has been fundamentally concerned with the role of democratic socialism in a modern industrial community.

Social criticism must not be allowed to degenerate into a general moaning and censure of the kind practised, for instance by the Moderates⁷ and the Marxist-Leninists (KFML). On any reasonable basis of comparison, this is a decent society to live in.

But there are problems and people do have worries and apprehensions. The destruction of environment is a fact. So is the wastage of natural resources. We know that there are great inequalities in people's earnings and we are aware of the effects of structural change on the lives of individuals. Many people have had first-hand experience of the feeling of alienation in a new home and of the everyday problems of making ends meet. Technological developments are moving progressively faster, but human conditions change slowly.

For this reason there is talk of social unrest in all industrial countries.

Some people react by wishing that they were back in the past, back in what they imagine to have been a pre-industrial, pre-technological idyll.

Some people say they would gladly sacrifice an improvement in their living standards if they could live in the countryside. Presumably this would not be a difficult sacrifice to make if it were limited to colour TV, foreign travel and the latest fashions. But how many people are prepared to go without free medical services, the right to a pension, sewerage and running water and electricity? Not many, of that we can be sure.

⁷ The Moderate Party is the conservative party in Sweden.

One should think twice before pronouncing a general condemnation of industrial society. Industrialisation has given us opportunities for an improvement in economic standards and social welfare which earlier generations never dreamed of. Industrialisation is a form of advanced cooperation and division of labour which still has great possibilities.

Industrial society must still form the economic basis of our community. But a rise in production in return for the ruin of people and the natural environment is not a rise in standard of living. This is not to call in question the desirability of economic growth and development, only to affirm that they must be guided by social and humane objectives, and combined with social equality and with increased democracy.

Democratic socialism starts with the social situation of the individual. The liberty of the individual will benefit most if he is able to find paths to a sense of community with others, to cooperation and solidarity. The individual must be able together with others to control his own situation and to influence his own surroundings.

But in order to realise our ideas we must find practical ways to social equality, solidarity and democracy.

This is what our party Congress is all about.

Renewal in Working Life

The process of renewal must begin at work. Work will retain its central position in human life. Many hours of the day are spent at work. Working conditions leave their mark on the rest of our lives. If the work we do seems pointless, injurious to health and insecure, this is bound to affect our family life and our leisure. The financial return and the social status given by work influence the whole fabric of our lives.

Democratic socialism must safeguard the value and dignity of work, not least of practical skilled labour. Otherwise there will be no renewal of Swedish society. It is on these terms that we must set about reframing the conditions of working life.

Hitherto reform policies have been mostly concerned with conditions outside working life.

In school we have prepared young people for working life. By means of roads, housing, medical services and a great deal more besides we have provided an economic basis for production.

Society has tried to provide security for those who have left the production process or who have been eliminated from it - because they have grown old, ill or

redundant, suffered accidents, become worn out. We have passed legislation regulating working hours to give leisure to enrich people's lives outside of working hours.

Now, however, we must make our social objectives more of a palpable reality in working life. This implies expansion of the traditional concept of social welfare, an expansion which will have far-reaching consequences for the development of our society.

What We Are Going to Do

The renewal of working life must be accomplished by the interaction of legislation to promote the security of wage earners and a greater element of democracy in the work places themselves.

This can only be done by unions and politicians working together. So the union movement and the political labour movement will have to stick together.

Now is the time to act.

What then are our immediate tasks?

1. We are going to draw up a new Act on the working environment, one result of which will be to give safety officers a position enabling them to exert direct influence on the safety of their fellow workers on the spot.
2. We shall draw up a new Act concerning security of employment. The legislation concerning elderly employees was a first step in this direction, and the results have been encouraging. Adjustment teams and partnership groups in which people from the labour market and the union movement are represented are becoming more and more important. We shall go further in order to provide still greater security of employment.
3. We shall increase the influence and partnership rights of employees in the public sector. Experimental activities are already in progress in collaboration with the employees' representative organisations.
4. We shall give wage earners the right to sit on the boards of their companies.
5. We shall build up industrial democracy step by step and with reference to matters which are of real importance to the everyday working lives of employees.

This calls for a detailed review of labour legislation. This review has already begun under the leadership of Kurt Nordgren.

These proposals have been discussed and drafted at union congresses, at committee meetings and in the basic organisations of the party.

Now it is up to the Congress to decide. We will then try to put its decisions into practice.

At a time like the present, when we are perturbed by the problem of unemployment, it may seem rash to raise our standards on the subject of imitating the working party on social equality and affirming the right of every man and woman to work.

The explanation is simple. Two years ago, in 1970, the economy was seriously overheated and there was a grave shortage of labour. Accordingly everybody predicted that the major problem of the 1970s would lie in the insufficiency of our labour resources.

Now, two years later, there are not enough jobs to go round. And yet there are more people seeking employment now than in 1970. The most important explanation is that women have tended more than ever before to find their way into the labour market and assert their right to gainful employment. Most of them have obtained work. It is above all for this reason that there has been a rise in registered unemployment.

The proportion of the adult population in employment has risen throughout the post-war period. To a very great extent this is due to a deliberate policy - labour market policy in all its various forms: regional development policy, fiscal reforms, adult education, family policy.

In simple terms, the result has been as follows: the level of employment is about five percent higher now than it was a decade or so ago and it is also five percent higher than in the other industrial nations of Western Europe. This five percent means about 200,000 more people in work.

This is all very well but it is small comfort to those who today seek employment but are unable to obtain any. If we are to cater for the rising demand for employment among women, if we are to make room for the younger generation in the labour market, if we are to prevent a rise in the number of people worn out by the labour market and eliminated from it, if we are to equalise incomes, we must increase the number of job opportunities.

The present difficulties existing in the labour market are being used by the bourgeois as a pretext for the resurrection of ancient bourgeois demands.

They are against equitable wage policies.

They are against labour market policy - relief work projects and educational

measures for the unemployed.

They wish to increase the share of capital in the total result of production and reduce the share of the wage earners.

We have seen this bourgeois agitation before.

The same demands were made in 1932. They were repeated in the 1940s, the 1950s and the 1960s.

We have never given way to them. Hundreds of thousands of people have found jobs because we succeeded in repulsing the bourgeois onslaught and carrying out the demands of the labour movement.

It is the same now. We must not falter. We will defend labour market policy, our economic policy, regional policy and the efforts made by the public sector to safeguard the security of the individual.

Solidarity Between Groups

Socialism is about solidarity. It is about solidarity between people who often live in different conditions.

It is easy to appeal to animosities - animosities between different generations, different parts of the country.

We have seen many examples of this in political debate. The danger is that one can create gaps instead of bridging them.

This is what happens when people try to create antipathies between town and country.

To the labour movement it is self-evident that the different parts of the country must be united, and this requires an overriding solidarity.

This solidarity applies to the countryside. Last spring it looked as though the Social Democrats would be left alone to settle the food price agreement with the farmers.

An agreement is an agreement, and we stood by ours.

Many people have had first-hand experience of the misery of the Swedish countryside, which has most recently been described by Tage Erlander⁸ in his memoirs. The rural population must also be assured of decent living conditions in return for their labour: this is a question of solidarity.

⁸ Tage Erlander, Social Democratic leader, was Prime Minister of Sweden from 1946 to 1969.

Some local authorities are poor. One of the greatest reforms in the context of equality is the municipal taxation reform whereby the poorest municipalities are given grants corresponding to up to half their local income tax.

This is connected with the even distribution of living standards and welfare amenities throughout the country: this is a question of solidarity.

Regional policy makes demands on the urban population. The task is to create employment and incomes in those parts of the country where rationalisation and depopulation have left their mark. This is a matter of solidarity.

There are people in the urban areas too, many of them in large conurbations. They moved there because the countryside could not support them. They starved, they emigrated or they made their way into the towns and cities in search of work.

People living in urban areas also have to contend with a multitude of problems - noise, overcrowding, bad working conditions, congestion and stress.

There is a tendency in political debate to portray the urban population as lost and doomed.

But we will not improve urban living conditions by constantly repeating that the air is cleaner and the trees greener somewhere else and that people should go to live there.

People live in urban communities. Most of them will continue to do so. Every morning they have to get up and set off to work in factories, offices and shops and on building sites. This is the foundation of our affluence. If people did not do these things there would not be much left for us to share. And that is why we have to make our towns and cities better - create better housing conditions, clean up bad working environments, build better communications, provide play spaces for children and open air and recreation facilities.

All this is in the best interests of the entire country and the people who live in it. It is a matter of solidarity which concerns the entire population.

Instead of contrasting town and country we must improve conditions for both of them. If a nation is to develop there must be an overriding solidarity.

The major problems of society cannot be solved through the agency of the market. They must be solved on a democratic basis.

We in the labour movement have discussed in detail the sectors where public action is needed as an expression of this solidarity. This has been done within the basic party organisations, at committee meetings and at conferences throughout

the country.

Now it is up to the Congress to decide.

1. We shall draw up a programme of regional policy.
2. We shall draw up guidelines for the overall planning of our country's land and water resources with a view to the protection of our national environment.
3. We are presenting a new programme for an active policy on environment.
4. We shall put the money deposited by wage earners in the National Pension Insurance Fund to constructive use in the economy.
5. We shall pursue an active economic policy designed to provide employment and security for all.

Problems Which We Can Only Solve Together

Faced with these demands, our opponents raise the bogey of communal power and centralisation.

There are certain matters for which the great collective, the members of society acting in concert, must assume responsibility. If out of fear of society one is not prepared to do this, there will be no regional policy and no economic policy, no equalisation of local taxation, no aid to thinly populated areas, no security of employment and no industrial democracy.

The security at which we aim can never be achieved unless we are prepared to join forces in accomplishing tasks which are too great for the individual to tackle alone.

If the object of all this talk of centralisation is to force people into greater dependence on the forces of the market, into less solidarity with those who need our combined support, into deepening insecurity, those concerned can count on the uncompromising opposition of the labour movement.

If wage earners are given a successively increasing influence on the economy as a whole, this will provide a way to greater democracy. Let there be no misunderstanding on this point. If society is equipped with better means of steering technical development so as to protect individuals and improve their living conditions, this will lead to greater security. Let there be no misunderstanding on that point either.

At the same time society must be based on the combination of individuals in

popular movements and organisations for the assertion of their interests and demands.

Clearly the bourgeois have still failed to realise that last year's LO Congress and probably this Congress too mark the beginnings of the greatest move towards decentralisation that our society has ever seen, in that ordinary wage earners will be given a bigger say concerning their places of work and their working environment, their security of employment and their working conditions. The aim is to change the power structure of Swedish society by means of democracy and solidarity. This is true decentralisation.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The way ahead is long and arduous. But shall we let this deter us from trying to solve the problems? These problems concern every wage earner and every household in the country and must therefore be solved on democratic lines.

There was a time when the labour movement demanded universal suffrage in the conviction that ordinary workers and salaried employees were capable of deciding for themselves on major and vital social questions. We are equally convinced that workers and salaried staff are capable of comprehending matters concerning their immediate livelihood. This is why we have committed ourselves to democracy and solidarity...

(Original in Swedish)

STRUGGLE FOR PEACE, UNDERSTANDING AMONG NATIONS AND PEOPLES

**Speech during the Debate on Foreign Policy in the Swedish Parliament,
March 12, 1980**

The first foreign affairs debate of the 1980s occurs at a time when we all feel deep anxiety for the happenings in the world. A significant deterioration in the relations between the superpowers has taken place. The cold war atmosphere has returned. The armament race continues at an even faster pace and makes the world a more dangerous place to live in.

But let me, in spite of this serious situation, start with a recent ray of light in the darkness that enshrouds the European policy of national security. Many of us gathered here participated in the Nordic Council meeting last week in Iceland. It gave us reason to bear in mind that an atmosphere of stability and calm still characterises our part of Europe. Not since the Second World War have the Nordic countries been shaken by a conflict that has given any Great Power reason to interfere in our relations.

All of the Nordic countries have - regardless of the national security policy chosen - kept a marked independent position. There are no atomic weapons on the soil of these countries.

These conditions are due to the hard efforts exerted by all of these nations. The Nordic countries have won respect from the entire world for the results that have been achieved from peaceful development.

We can state, without risk of boasting, that the Nordic cooperation is important for peace. Since the general national security debate at the beginning of the year, many have speculated about changes in the national security policies of the Nordic countries in these times of international crisis. We could, during our meeting in Reykjavik, clearly state that no such changes have occurred. The Nordic nations continue, in close contact with each other and in a spirit of mutual confidence, to pursue their chosen national security policies. In these critical times the Nordic stability shows itself capable to meet the test. This is perhaps not dramatic, but nevertheless essential.

World Situation Gives Cause for Deep Anxiety

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has largely contributed both to heightening of the crisis and rendering the international work for peace more difficult.

We have reacted strongly against this action and condemned the Soviet

aggression, which is a flagrant crime against every nation's right to self-determination. A people's liberation must be their own work. The Soviet troops must leave Afghanistan. Today's Soviet leaders have reason to remind themselves of Lenin's instructions to the Soviet ambassador in June 1921:

"Our policy in the East is not aggressive. It is a policy for peace and friendship. In your work you must systematically underline this basic fact, and in Kabul particularly, make our friendship to Afghanistan your main goal.

"You must to every extent avoid the fatal mistake of trying to inoculate Communism into the country by artificial means. We declare to the Afghanistan Government: Not for one moment do we contemplate forcing upon your people a programme that is foreign to their present stage of development."

The Soviet leaders should accept the idea of a non-aligned Afghanistan whose sovereignty would be guaranteed by all concerned parties.

We who are actively trying to make our contribution to peace and détente perhaps feel special bitterness, for in the tracks of this invasion we observe how tension builds up between East and West, and even between North and South. The Soviet adventure in Afghanistan is therefore a blow to the efforts made to fight against the armaments race, starvation and colonialism in already fragile regions. It also inflicts a blow to the Non-aligned Movement and threatens the movement's inner harmony and ability to play its traditional constructive role in world politics.

We further observe how the other superpower, whose history is by no means free from aggressive foreign actions, is given a reason to increase armaments and intensify its military operations in areas that were once free from superpower presence.

It is not surprising that the United States reacted so strongly against the Soviet Union's power politics. That would have occurred under any circumstances. Their reaction must even be viewed against the fact that their relationship to the Soviet Union has been slowly deteriorating for a long period of time: in discussions concerning Africa, Soviet troops in Cuba, SALT, and on many other issues.

The American President⁹ has tried to pursue the politics of détente. There have, however, been strong groups in the United States which have mistrusted this policy, which have never accepted the idea of stability in the balance of military power, but instead have wanted the United States to maintain military supremacy under all circumstances, however illusory this might seem in these times of collective suicide. It is this group which has opposed the SALT-II proposal, and has been behind the demands for increased armament in the United States and an

⁹ President Jimmy Carter

enlargement of the nuclear weapon arsenals in Europe.

Feelings of revenge have existed since the Vietnam humiliation. The Soviet Union has without doubt given these revenge-hungry groups ammunition. They see the invasion of Afghanistan as a confirmation of their belief that the Soviet Union is aggressive and wishes, at all cost, to expand its sphere of influence. This Soviet expansion can only be met, they argue, by strengthening the armed forces, expanding the nuclear weapon arsenals and taking strong political and economic measures.

Thus the situation in the world gives cause for deep anxiety.

Détente, which has meant a great deal during the 1970s, is in danger of being lost. There are many who have misinterpreted détente, who have believed that it would imply some form of ideological agreement or that conflicts of interest between the superpowers would cease. This is of course not the case. Détente has been built upon a military balance of power, on a joint ability to mutual annihilation that would make a war between the superpowers impossible.

Détente has opened possibilities for talks on disarmament and peaceful cooperation in a wide number of areas. It has meant a great deal of relief and benefit for private individuals. A relapse into the cold war with its strict division of the world means a hindrance of the work for peace, lost contacts and a heightening of repression.

We have already noticed how the pressure on the opposition groups in the East European communist countries has hardened. We have seen how demands for discipline have sharpened there. In the Western countries we have witnessed how the human rights demands have been cast aside in the quest for military bases and allies.

Intensification of Armaments Race

It looks unfortunately as though the armaments race, with its increasingly horrifying means of destruction, is on the rebound. Its ultimate consequence is a new world war whose destruction no one may be able to describe.

This also involves a waste of vast resources at a time when poverty and starvation continue to hold a growing majority of the world's population in their grasp.

Thus we can be pushed even closer to the brink of disaster. That is why it is now imperative to preserve peace. Nothing is more important than this.

At the same time as people around the world talk of intensified armament race, we are receiving increasing evidence of the limitations of military power.

Additional eyewitness accounts lay bare the mirage of the armaments race. The world has often seen how one nation with military arrogance has tried to force its political objectives upon another. We have, during the past few years, seen several examples of how invasions, foreign occupations and the establishment of regional vassals do not lead to any advantages in power politics. On the contrary! The feeble legitimacy of military forces can never replace respect and regard for a people's independence and national goals. In Iran a formidable empire was built up during several decades by the United States at an incredible material and human cost. But in spite of all that, the Shah's empire collapsed. Vietnam, once subjected to great suffering by one superpower, is today threatened by another. And now Vietnam finds itself in the tragic role of an occupation force.

In Zimbabwe a highly-equipped South African-supported army could not suppress the determination of a poor people.

And in Afghanistan it is becoming quite clear that the Soviet army is sinking ever deeper in the mire.

It is impossible to win a village by destroying it. It is just as impossible to win a people by invading and occupying their country.

These illusions become clearer and their potential harmful effects greater when we observe the armament race between the superpowers.

Solly Zuckerman, scientific adviser to the former British Government, points, in a recent article in *The Times*, to the lack of logic in the nuclear armament race of the superpowers. This competition reached, already by the end of the 1950s, the limits for mutual deterrence. They were then capable of destroying each other. Since that time, they have increased their nuclear weapon arsenals - fifty-fold.

Already in the early 1960s the principal scientific adviser to the United States President made known that a continued expansion of the nuclear weapon arsenals led not to greater security but, on the contrary, to a diminished one. This expansion has nevertheless continued.

Zuckerman also shows that the continually recurring discussions on tactical nuclear weapons are founded on an illusion. There is a fundamental difference between conventional and nuclear weapons. The latter are deterrent weapons. Their use would mean world war, regardless of whether they are called neutron bombs, cruise missiles, SS-20 missiles or anything else.

Zuckerman also consigns all thoughts of winning an atomic war through "first-strike capability" to the realm of fantasy. There is no technical way to achieve victory. Both sides are doomed to lose. In an atomic war defeat is shared by all.

Lord Mountbatten remarked in a speech last May:

"There are powerful forces in the world that still trust in the old Roman recipe: if you wish peace, prepare for war. In the atomic age, this is rubbish. It is a dangerous misconception that one can increase one's personal security by enhancing the total insecurity."

I refer to these statements solely for the purpose of demonstrating that in spite of the current situation there is no reason to give up hope. More and more people are realising the foolhardiness of armament. We shall never attain peace with more weapons and wars.

Work for Disarmament Must Continue

The work for disarmament must continue. Europe is in the centre of the arms race. Ten thousand nuclear weapons are already located here. The Warsaw Pact has begun installation of the new SS-20 missiles. In December NATO agreed on the deployment of highly modern intermediate range nuclear weapon-carrying missiles in Europe.

In the light of the current situation, the first goal must be the sharp reduction by the Soviet Union of its SS-20 missiles; the cancellation by NATO of the installation of its new missiles; and the reduction by both NATO and the Warsaw Pact of their military forces in Europe. Our ultimate peace aim is to free all Europe from nuclear weapons.

Experience tells us that what is now needed is a popular movement against the mania of armament. People's anxiety and longing for peace must be translated into powerful and specific demands for disarmament, peace and solidarity. The war economies of the superpowers must be converted into those of peace.

Social Democracy has a long tradition of active struggle for peace and international solidarity. We have in this spirit introduced bills in this year's Parliament session. We have tried, through a peace appeal, as well as through studies and conferences, to obtain a general Swedish manifestation for peace.

Internationally we have supported the following demands of the Socialist International: that the preparatory work that is being done for the autumn conference in Madrid on further European security talks be pursued; that all efforts be made to bring about SALT-III negotiations as soon as possible; and that the Soviet Union's proposal for a European energy conference be put on the agenda. Our task as a nation must be to seek, by all possible means, a limiting of this crisis and a lowering of the political temperature between the superpowers. We must take advantage of all the possibilities that are open for dialogue and to advance, not restrain, détente.

Liberation in Africa

The fight for peace and détente cannot geographically be limited to certain areas or peoples. It is indivisible and must concern everyone. At the Non-aligned Conference in Havana last summer, Samora Machel, the President of Mozambique, a man who has been chastened in liberation struggles, called attention to the fact that on the superpower's periphery there is no détente. There is not even a cold war. There are instead hot wars burning. According to SIPRI,¹⁰ 120 wars have been fought in the Third World countries since the Second World War.

It is against this background that we have with the greatest pleasure seen how the world's largest and oldest colonial Power¹¹ has been overthrown during the 1970s. Liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau have, after a long guerrilla struggle, made these countries independent.

During the last few days African nationalism, in the heart of colonialism and racism, has brought about a new great victory: a new nation has been born - a free Zimbabwe.

After a long and self-sacrificing war, the Zimbabwe people have, in a crystal-clear and emphatic way, given the black nationalists their support even in a peaceful process. This result has its logic. Those groups that have fought the longest and liberated the most areas received the majority's support. Those, on the other hand, who chose to cooperate with, and submit to, the minority government and South Africa, were pushed aside with the help of the ballot. Hopefully a ninety-year-old colonial empire and a seven-year-old bitter and bloody civil war can soon be referred to as past history.

History has once again shown that when a people take to arms in order to liberate themselves, the fight is not finished until freedom is attained. Without a successful liberation struggle in Zimbabwe the white racist leaders would never have agreed to democratic elections.

"The core of our ideology is the struggle for independence and justice. We wish to be masters of our home and we want a society where the same rights and duties are shared by all, regardless of race. This is what we mean by socialism." That statement was made by one of the Patriotic Front leaders to Carl Lidbom, who was sent to Zimbabwe on behalf of the Social Democratic Party as an election observer.

For those of us who have followed and given support to the liberation struggle in South Africa for a long period of time, this desire for independence, reconciliation between races and social justice is nothing new. We know that the African people want to reach economic and political liberation by peaceful means and on their

¹⁰ Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

¹¹ Portugal

own terms. But if they are only met by repression and violence, they will be forced to an armed struggle. That is what happened in Algeria, in Angola, in Mozambique, in Guinea-Bissau - and in Zimbabwe. It is indeed deeply tragic that so many lives must be wasted before colonial Powers and dictatorships realise the inevitable lesson of history: that in the end it is never possible to repress a people's desire for freedom.

The election result in Zimbabwe is good news for black Africa and for democracies everywhere. For South Africa's hardened racists, on the other hand, this news is a foreshadowing of the inevitable changes towards black majority rule that are coming even in Namibia and South Africa.

It is important now that Zimbabwe's people are given time and assistance in order to protect their newly-won peace, and through reconciliation and equality build up their war-torn country.

That is why we say it is not enough to pay homage today to a free Zimbabwe. We must also clearly state that we shall support this new nation in its peaceful reconstruction work. We, therefore, urge the Swedish Government to extend an invitation to Zimbabwe's Government to come to Sweden, at the earliest opportunity, for discussions about development collaboration.

If Zimbabwe is successful in its enormous task, repercussions will be felt in South Africa. The pictures of terror that have been used as propaganda against the "terrorists" in the liberation movements will then be found to give way to the vision of a forbearing and gentle transition to majority rule with room even for whites.

South Africa at the Crossroads

I stated three years ago in Parliament that a solution to the problems of Zimbabwe and Namibia can never contain a guarantee for apartheid's continued existence in South Africa. In Rhodesia as well as in Namibia, it is South Africa's future that is ultimately at stake.

South Africa stands at the moment at a crossroads. That country is racism's last outpost. Its strategy was to have a buffer zone of vassal States as neighbours, with Zimbabwe at their centre. Millions of dollars were invested by South Africa for a Muzorewa victory. The new gold rush had given the country a substantially increased income. This, together with the development of Zimbabwe, puts the regime before a decision. It is possible gradually, but resolutely, to abolish apartheid in cooperation with the black nationalists. The possibility exists, but experience has shown that the Pretoria Government never makes concessions unless forced to do so. The rest of the world must therefore maintain and even increase its pressure on the apartheid Government and carry out selective sanctions.

The recent minor cosmetic changes in certain rules in the apartheid system have by no means changed its essence. Death penalties continue, as well as mock trials, disappearances, assault and battery and murder of the opposition. Starvation and forced removals torment great numbers of the population.

The Swedish investment ban¹² has shown itself to have an important international opinion-forming effect at various levels, not the least within the United Nations. For the sake of peace and solidarity we ought to go further.

Social Democrats have therefore proposed in a bill that the Government draw up a plan of action for a further isolation of South Africa. And I wish to emphasise that this is done as an action for peace and reconciliation.

Human Rights

Human rights are trampled upon on every continent. In Indochina the retreat of the United States did not lead to the end of human suffering. Nations which have already suffered without parallel in modern history are still tormented and decimated by the effects of the bombings, the natural catastrophes, the disregard for human rights, the great streams of refugees and starvation, as well as new wars with new actors.

The entire world community must participate in the World Health Organisation's appeal for an international mobilisation against starvation in Cambodia. I share, otherwise, the Government's views stated in its declaration on Indochina.

In the Soviet Union members of the opposition are harassed and banished in spite of the fact that their "crime" was often only to assert the right of free speech and opinion which all the European countries accepted and ratified. Andrei Sakharov is the latest example of how such democratically-minded citizens are pursued in all Communist dictatorships.

Latin America is the continent where the fight for human rights, freedom and independence has come farthest. A wind of change which swept over Brazil, and even more strongly over the Caribbean area, culminated last summer in Nicaragua with the longed-for Sandinista victory. But we also receive almost daily messages of how members of the resistance movements are sacrificing their lives or are being jailed or driven underground by the military dictatorships.

Uruguay, Argentina and Chile, all with democratic traditions, are today gigantic concentration camps where thousands of people have disappeared, been tortured or murdered because of their democratic beliefs. Similar conditions have for a long time prevailed in Paraguay and Haiti.

¹² In 1979 Sweden adopted the Act on Prohibition of Investments in South Africa and Namibia.

Repression in Guatemala seems at present to be especially hard. Forty thousand people have lost their lives there as a result of the political violence that dates back to 1954 when the CIA overthrew the democratically-elected Arbenz government. The violence continues today with undiminished intensity.

The crying injustices are the cause of death and sickness. Seventy-five percent of the population suffer from malnutrition as a result of eighty percent of the arable land being in the hands of only one percent of the population.

Destitution lay also behind the Spanish embassy drama last month where, in spite of the embassy's protests, a brutal military attack killed innocent people.

As Social Democrats we are also reminded of how our party comrades lose their lives in the struggle for basic human rights. Last year two Social Democratic leaders, Alberto Fuentes Mohr and Manuel Colom, were murdered a month or so after they pleaded for democracy in their homeland at the Socialist International Congress. Just recently a leading Social Democrat in El Salvador met the same fate.

And only last week we received new death tidings. The Social Democratic Party's General Secretary, Jorge Jimenez, who succeeded Manuel Colom, was murdered along with two student leaders and a score of farmers.

We want to urge the Government, via the Swedish embassy in Guatemala, to convey the Parliament's deep consternation about the indiscriminate slaughter that this dictatorship's uncontrolled repression and unjust social order means.

We, on our part, shall continue to support the opposition in Guatemala just as we support the Sandinista literacy campaign in Nicaragua. They represent the two sides of the same coin: support to a people's liberation from under-development and dictatorship.

A list of the crimes against human rights in the world is long. We have, in previous Foreign Affairs debates, discussed other areas where these rights have been tread on. I wish however this time, without exhausting the subject but with regard to the actual experiences of our party comrades, to focus Parliament's attention particularly upon Central America.

Our efforts for peace and human rights are closely aligned to a real and farsighted policy of solidarity with the world's poor and oppressed. For injustice and inequality between and within countries of the world, and between industrialised and Third World nations, create fertile conditions for local and regional tensions and conflicts that can lead to the involvement of the superpowers.

New International Economic Order

Six years ago the poor countries demanded basic changes in the prevailing economic order which so one-sidedly favoured the industrialised countries and, at the same time, contributed to keeping the Third World nations underdeveloped.

We, in Sweden, acknowledged this demand for a New International Economic Order. We are forced to state today how the willingness of the affluent countries - perhaps ability on the part of some - to participate in a collective reform of the world's economy has practically ceased to exist.

It is an obvious reality that the industrialised world is shaken by a deep economic crisis: 20 million people, over six percent of the working force, will be unemployed at the end of this year. Production is on the decline. Debits in the balance of payments of almost all of the Western industrialised countries enhance protectionism and anxiety for each other's currency. Inflation grows into two figure numbers, eats away salaries and savings, and deepens society's economic injustices.

Pessimism about the future and the ability to reverse this trend is spreading, and it is understandable that under such conditions, solidarity both within and between peoples is put to the test.

Nevertheless, we must not only protect but even deepen international solidarity. The present state of the world means, quite plainly, a threat to the lives of the people in the Third World.

Eight hundred million people live in absolute poverty - they have neither a daily meal, nor work, nor decent housing. Worsening living conditions for them mean starvation and calamity. The ambitious development plans started in those Third World countries where a national economy and social reforms were being developed, are now torn apart because of the stagnation in world trade and the reductions in food production and foreign aid.

It requires no great imagination to perceive that mass starvation and economic and social disintegration involve a threat to peace between nations. They are even more serious today when they increase at the same time that the armament mania is on the rise.

Report of the Brandt Commission¹³

The Brandt Commission was a result of the crisis situation that occurred when the dialogue between North and South became completely deadlocked and all practical solutions seemed to be totally blocked.

¹³ Independent Commission on International Development Issues, chaired by Willy Brandt, leader of the Social Democratic Party in the Federal Republic of Germany. Olof Palme was a member of the Commission.

I wish to mention this Commission's final report¹⁴ as an example of the feasible solutions that do actually exist to break this vicious circle.

After two years a report entitled *A Programme for Survival*, with rather advanced and radical suggestions, was unanimously approved. Its underlying premise is that the years before the end of the century will be decisive for mankind's future. At the same time the Commission states that it is possible to avoid the dangers, that the course of history is neither unalterable nor fated. It is essentially a question of political will and awareness that this matter is of mutual interest. A new approach must be based on solidarity with the poor and the oppressed in the world. The proposals for a more equitable distribution of resources and different policy decisions for the benefit of the Third World countries are based upon this premise of solidarity.

Let me mention only a few of the areas the report takes up. The world's population is now over four billion. In twenty years' time it will probably be over six billion, in spite of the diminishing population explosion. Starvation and hunger are a part of the lives of at least 800 million people.

How many will there be in year 2000? Will a billion people die of starvation before the end of the century as the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation warns? Or are there possibilities to avoid a catastrophe and be able to meet mankind's most basic need: a daily meal?

The answer from many experts is "yes." The world's physical and economic resources are enough: but this implies not only a reorganisation of agriculture to get a higher food production, but also that people in the Third World are in an economic position to demand and buy more food.

This is for a majority of the people in the poor countries the core of the development problem since most people live in rural areas. Their poverty and under-employment can only be broken by a massive programme for manpower-dominated agriculture. This programme would, at the same time, increase the availability of food and give people jobs and incomes.

It is, however, the Third World's responsibility to increase agricultural production and establish an even distribution of purchasing power among its people. It is only by doing so that they can extricate themselves from their dependence upon the grain-exporting superpowers. It is also they who must set production and self-sufficiency goals, plan soil and water usage, and establish credit institutions. For, without a more equitable distribution of land and support to the small landowners and tenants, an increased agricultural production will, as Lasse and Lisa Berg illustrated in their excellent book *Mat och Makt* (Food and Power), further sharpen the economic and social differences.

¹⁴ *North-South: A Programme for Survival*. Pan Books, London, 1980.

It is a question of great and demanding work. But in spite of this the Brandt Commission has set the goal that hunger shall be wiped off the face of the earth by year 2000. This goal demands a long-term investment programme that would lay claim to large financial resources: 8 billion dollars per year. A great part of this money must come from the affluent countries but an equivalent amount must also come from the Third World countries themselves. But compared to the world's armament expenditures this is only a small amount of money.

The world has the knowledge. It has the economic resources. It must be able to mobilise the political will and resolve that are needed to avoid a starvation disaster.

Another point that the Commission strongly emphasises is that it is essential to try to persuade the governments in the world to begin to carry out long-term reforms in the economic system.

The economic, social and political crisis is so dangerous that immediate measures must be taken. That is why we drew up a limited number of suggestions for a crisis programme for the next five years. This programme has four main points:

- an increase of 500-600 billion dollars a year in aid to the Third World countries,
- energy strategy which guarantees access and price stability,
- extensive measures for increased food production,
- a reform of the international economic system.

The greatly increased monetary transfer implies that the affluent countries meet their foreign aid commitments during the next five years. That alone would give an additional 30 billion dollars for development financing every year. Nearly four billion dollars are needed for immediate help to the least developed Third World countries. In the long run an international taxation is essential.

Aid to increased agricultural production in the Third World would lay claim to a great part of the new resources. The need in the middle-income countries to import both loans and industrialisation in the middle-income countries would also require a great deal of these resources.

As far as energy is concerned, the Commission, including its two representatives from oil-producing countries, suggests that these oil countries take it upon themselves to assure both access to and production of oil.

In return, oil consumers would bind themselves to a strict energy management in

regard to both oil and other energy sources.

The oil countries have the right to demand that the value of their resources is protected. That ought to be done by linking prices to some form of index or money fund. While it is impossible to avoid continued price increases, these price changes must be foreseeable and sudden increases averted.

It is also suggested that a large amount of aid be given to oil and gas prospecting as well as development of alternative energy sources in the Third World.

A basic assumption of this energy strategy is that the affluent countries hold back on their oil consumption. The limited resources ought to go to a larger extent to the poor countries. They are hit hard. Fidel Castro recently mentioned that in 1970 his country paid a ton of sugar for a ton of oil. This year the price is six tons of sugar for one ton of oil. It is here that our Swedish energy programme comes in.

It is an unavoidable fact that a quick dismantling of our nuclear power plants would imply an increase in our oil consumption.

It is also an unavoidable fact that a quick dismantling of nuclear power plants in the world - over 200 in operation - would lead to a disastrous lack of energy that would heighten world tensions and ultimately strike against the world's poor.

I can in front of these people defend a dismantling of these power plants if that would imply their replacement with indigenous, renewable energy sources.

On the other hand, I cannot defend their dismantling if it would involve an increase in oil consumption.

This is a political and moral question which is part of an international solidarity policy. I am left completely unmoved by the jeers that I have received for this point of view from Line 3¹⁵ supporters.

Let me finish this short account with a few examples taken from Willy Brandt's introduction to the Commission's report. While the peaceful development work in the world cries for money, nearly 450 billion dollars a year are spent on military expenditures. But we have become so blind in this armament mania that we hardly understand any longer the reality behind these figures.

Let us therefore be reminded:

- that 30,000 children could have classrooms for the price of only one military tank,

¹⁵ Proposition in the national referendum in 1980 calling for the immediate dismantling of nuclear power plants in Sweden.

- that one jet fighter costs as much as 40,000 village pharmacies,
- that half a day's military expenditure would be enough to eliminate one of humanity's worst friends: malaria,
- that a half-percent of the yearly military expenditures would be enough to pay for all the machines and equipment needed to help the Third World countries attain an adequate food production.

It is by the use of such clear basic facts that we ought to go out and inform others of our struggle for peace and understanding among nations and peoples.

(Original in Swedish)

SURVIVAL AND SECURITY

**Speech at an "Evening for Peace" at the Riverside Church, New York,
December 7, 1980**

The face of war is ugly, always ugly.

Two weeks ago, I was standing in the town of Dizful, not far from the border between Iran and Iraq. It is Biblical land, near the Euphrates and the Tigris, not far from Babylon and Nineveh.

Here an ancient civilisation flourished four thousand years ago. Here the armies of Cyrus the Great, Alexander and Genghis Khan passed by. Not far from here Caliph Harun al-Rashid of *Arabian Nights* fame reigned. Now again it belongs to the richest regions on this earth. Oil is plentiful under the desert.

In Dizful, rockets had landed - some in the day, some at night. One had destroyed forty to fifty houses. Many had been killed. People were still clearing the rubble. One round had hit a school. The children's textbooks were still lying around, as were shoes and scrapbooks with notes and drawings.

That scene from Dizful, Iran, could just as easily have been taken from somewhere in Iraq. The face of war is ugly. Therefore we must always work for peace.

Terror in Latin America

Only a few months ago, in my office in Sweden, I received a delegation from El Salvador. The leader of the delegation was Enrique Alvarez, a prominent businessman and leading democrat. He and his friends in the Social Democratic Party, like Enrique Barrera, represented the hope for democracy and social justice in El Salvador. One day in November these two and other leaders of the Democratic Revolutionary Front had a meeting in the church office of a secondary school. Armed men, both in civilian clothes and in uniform, burst into the meeting and took away eleven people. The next day six of them were found dead. All had been tortured and strangled. Enrique Alvarez was among them. His left arm had been cut off.

This is just one example of the savage terror of the right. The death squads have been at work before. On March 24, 1980, Archbishop Oscar Romero was killed by rightist elements during Mass in his church in San Salvador. He often said, "They can kill me, but never the voice of social justice." He gave his life, having denounced an outrageous social system in which people live in misery, exploitation and constant fear. In 1980, more than 8,500 people have been

murdered in El Salvador. The Archbishop's legal aid office attributes more than 80 percent of the victims to crimes committed by the army and rightist paramilitary forces.

In a letter to the President of the United States dated March 31, 1980, twenty-four United States Congressmen gave their view of the situation in El Salvador: "According to recent reports from a delegation of American church officials, rape, torture, mutilation, decapitation, garroting and murder of defenceless men, women and children are being carried out by that Government; not simply to eliminate opponents but to terrorise the entire population." The Congressmen ended their letter by saying: "We believe that sending military assistance to a government which cannot control its own military, and which continues to brutally repress its own people, is a repudiation of the principles upon which the United States was founded."

Only recently we heard the terrible news about the killing of three American nuns and a lay worker.

Stand up for Human Rights

El Salvador is no isolated case. From many parts of Latin America come reports of daily atrocities so brutal that they are almost unbearable to conceive. In Africa and Asia, millions of people suffer under the burden of exploitation, racial oppression and armed conflict. In Eastern Europe, we witness how the absolute power of the police state is no guarantee of peace and order. We all look with anxiety and hope toward Poland. Of course we must be very careful not to provoke, create uncertainty or raise expectations that cannot be fulfilled. But we must not leave any doubts about our sympathies. We must express our solidarity with the workers in Poland. We must stand up for democratic values and human rights. If we ignore this issue, we can no longer speak of economic democracy and workers' control.

During the recent election campaign here in the United States, I heard all the main contenders for the Presidency express their admiration for the courage and discipline of the Polish workers and voice their support of their democratic aims. Those were timely and fitting remarks. I now look forward to hearing the leaders of the United States express their admiration for the courage and the discipline of the poor and oppressed in El Salvador and Guatemala, not to speak of Argentina and Chile, and their support of their democratic aims. This would indeed be of tremendous importance, because of the influence of the United States in that area.

Recently a White House transition team of the Reagan administration proposed basic changes designed to reduce the influence of human rights advocates and "social reformers" concerned with Latin America in the Carter administration. I sincerely hope that the advice will be rejected.

Human rights is not an abstract phrase. The absence of human rights means torture and death squadrons, the blood of women who have been mutilated, and the lifeless eyes of children who have been slain. Nor is social reform a grey theory. In poor countries the absence of social reform means misery, illiteracy and disease.

Again, it is in the eyes of children that you can tell when hope wanes, when the future somehow disappears.

This is indeed a great country and a great people. I would like to be proud of America, of your democratic values, of what you stand for, of the determined and generous action you could take for other people. There is no better place to show the real value of American democracy than in the fight for human rights and peace in Latin America.

Warning against War

Experience has taught us that human rights are among the first victims in a climate of frigid relations between the superpowers. When tensions increase, when new iron curtains are pulled down between the blocs, then tolerance gives way to demands for discipline, generosity to indifference, dialogue to propaganda. The main winners in a cold war situation are the Husaks of Czechoslovakia and the Pinochets of Chile and their like all over the world. The losers are the people and their legitimate demands for democracy, social justice and national independence.

Now we seem to be on our way back to the cold war. The process of détente has come to a standstill. All around the globe, we meet a climate of crisis and confrontation. From "Evening for Peace", we must therefore extend an urgent Warning against War.

I will concentrate my remarks on the two main threats to our survival and our security. One is the widening gap between rich and poor nations, and the inevitable turmoil that will result from the deepening international economic crisis. The other is the accelerating arms race and the climate of confrontation and apprehension it engenders.

I think it must be clear to all people that mass starvation and growing economic and social differences between and within nations pose a direct threat to world peace. Most people also realise that the more weapons that are added to the military arsenals the more the risks increase that some of those weapons will actually be used. The obvious answer to this double threat would be to organise a massive transfer of resources to the poor peoples. The money for this can be found in the vast resources used for preparation for war. If we could succeed in such a transfer of resources from armaments to development, I believe that we could start a process of eliminating one threat to our survival by reducing another.

But even if this solution seems obvious, it is not the one chosen by world leaders today. Instead, the already enormous sums spent on arms are allowed to continue to grow. And the climax of this irrationality is that we now have more than sixty thousand nuclear weapons in the world. Their total explosive power is said to be equivalent to one and a quarter million Hiroshima bombs.

What Nuclear War is Like

The more bombs are constructed, the closer the day when they will be used. But what does that really mean? What is a nuclear war like?

The experts at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute have given me some answers to that vital question. The effect of a large nuclear war would be that all major cities in Europe and the whole of the Soviet Union and North America would be destroyed. Most of the urban population would be killed by blast and fire. The rural population would be killed by radiation from fallout. And after a war of this kind, international trade in food and other essential goods would probably break down. This would lead to starvation for millions of people in the Third World.

The disaster would not end there. Unpredictable long-term effects might well include changes in the global climate, severe genetic damage and depletion of the ozone layer around the earth. No scientist can really assure us that human life would survive a superpower nuclear war.

Arms Race Getting out of Control

In spite of all this knowledge, the arms race continues. They say that it is because this will strengthen the national security of the respective countries. But I don't believe that. Alva Myrdal¹⁶ claims this is a gigantic miscalculation. The arms race doesn't increase security; indeed, it makes us less secure. More nuclear weapons, more tanks, more fighters can never lead to increased security.

The late Lord Mountbatten, in a speech delivered a year and a half ago, said: "There are powerful forces in this world that still trust the old Roman recipe - if you want peace, prepare for war. In the atomic age, this is rubbish. It is a dangerous misconception that one can increase one's security by enhancing the total insecurity."

Lord Mountbatten and many, many others have made all the arguments against the arms race. But still it goes on and on. I don't think that this is because some evil group here or there is plotting our destruction. But I do suggest that we have not acquired the ability to manage the arms race. Instead, I am afraid, this race has

¹⁶ Mrs. Alva Myrdal was Chief Swedish delegate to the United Nations Disarmament Committee from 1962 to 1973, and Minister in charge of disarmament from 1967 to 1973.

gotten out of control. Why is that? Why can't even the most brilliant politicians keep control over how armaments develop?

Let me put forward some suggestions.

First, look at the role of research and development in the military field. It seems to me that weapons research in itself fuels the arms race. New weapons are added to the arsenals, not because they are needed, but because they are possible to produce. Arms are not produced to implement the strategies that are developed, but strategies are invented to suit the weapons that are developed.

Second, consider how the development of military technology has gotten out of hand. Scientists are now making weapons that seem more suitable for fighting nuclear war than for deterring it. The technological advances may lead people to argue that a so-called first strike is not only feasible but also essential. The old phrase "unless we strike now the other side will soon do so" will be heard again.

Third, the evolution of strategic doctrines has led to a situation where we are now on the verge of a drastic expansion of the strategic nuclear weapons programmes. The tensions between nations targeting even more missiles against each other will no doubt increase. And to fire first will be more important than ever.

Fourth, there is much talk about the possibility of fighting and winning a "limited nuclear war." This is an illusion. I am convinced that a limited nuclear war will rapidly develop into an all-out confrontation. The consequences will be the annihilation of a great part of humanity.

And fifth, there is the grave danger of nuclear proliferation. Many countries are now considering equipping themselves with nuclear weapons. And many of these nations belong to crisis-infested regions like the Middle East, South Asia and Southern Africa.

Threat in Europe

Let me also say a few words about Europe. The disagreements between the great power blocs cast dark shadows across our continent. Even if thirty-five years have passed since the end of World War II, Europe is not a continent where peace can be taken for granted. In fact, Europe is at the very centre of the arms race. People in neutral countries like my own feel this very strongly. The enormous nuclear arsenals on the European continent not only pose a threat to their possessors and their allies, but to all the peoples of Europe.

This threat is with us constantly. Even if a war started as a local conflict in some Third World region, it could easily escalate into a superpower confrontation. Then we will have to assume that one or the other of these Powers will also try to open up a front on the European continent. We have in Europe a ready theatre of war.

Military forces have been stationed on European soil for a long time. There are programmed weapons there, ready for action. In all, there are assumed to be seven thousand American and nearly the same number of Soviet tactical weapons in Central Europe alone. Once a military confrontation has started elsewhere, it is easy to imagine how a superpower would be tempted to use its valuable weapons in this region. Alva Myrdal has predicted that wars which start in other regions may easily be transferred to Europe, even though actual causes for war on our continent do not exist.

This is one reason for deep concern. Another is the introduction of a new generation of nuclear missiles in the European area - the Soviet SS-20 and the NATO long-range theatre nuclear forces (GLCMs). The introduction of these new weapons will mean that another big step upwards is taken on the nuclear armaments ladder. With this the threat of a military confrontation increases even further.

It seems to me that we are being driven towards nuclear war by the sheer momentum of military technology. This may seem to be a rather pessimistic judgement, and indeed it is. I do not hesitate to say that we live in the days of madness. I firmly believe that unless something drastic is done, the uncontrolled arms race will lead to a nuclear catastrophe.

Work for Disarmament and Peace

There is perhaps only one hope for the future. That is that the people will learn the facts in time, and that an aroused public opinion will force the politicians to gain control, to stop the nuclear arms race and to reduce armaments. There is a great risk that political leaders will not be able to prevent a nuclear holocaust even though, as I am sure, they really wish to do so. I am equally convinced that if the public knew the truth about the nuclear arms race, it would insist on action by its political leaders to stop this insanity.

The great challenge to all popular movements - political parties, churches, trade unions and others - is to help inform public opinion, and to organise protests against the arms race. We must present the facts about the arms race to the general public in a way that will make people understand what is going on. We must tell what will happen to us and to our civilisation if nuclear war breaks out. We must also tell what we can have instead, if we can halt the arms race.

We must explain that only half a day's global military expenditure would suffice to finance the whole malaria eradication programme of the World Health Organisation.

We must explain that for the price of one jet fighter one could set up forty thousand village pharmacies in poor countries.

We must explain that for the cost of one modern tank one could provide one thousand classrooms serving thirty thousand children.

These are some of the facts that must be brought out. I believe that rationalism can triumph in the end. I believe that when we have achieved a broad recognition of the dangers of the arms race and the advantages of a change, people who now look upon the military machines with a feeling of helplessness will demand a halt in the arms race as their right. Furthermore, I believe that it will then be possible to start a process of disarmament and development.

It may seem an uphill battle. The prospects for success may not be very great, but I refuse to give up the hope that common sense will triumph in the end. To quote Martin Luther: "Even if I knew that the world would go under tomorrow, I would still plant my apple tree."

And I know that there is a great potential for peace in the people of this country. I can see it in the church today. I have seen it these past few days in Washington, where thousands of people from all walks of life, of all ages, gathered to voice their concern about the prospects for disarming and for peace. These are people who have no access to the military and the billions upon billions of dollars wasted on weapons and war. They convert their anxiety and dedication into tireless and self-sacrificing work to speak to their fellow human beings and to work for peace. We could be more, we must be more. Let us help to liberate the forces for peace in the people. For peace on earth, for solidarity.

"Yes, the people yes!"

TRANSFORM LONGING FOR PEACE INTO POLICY FOR PEACE

Introduction to the Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, 1982

At the end of the first year of our work, in December 1981, our Commission visited Hiroshima. One of the people we met was a photographer who had been in the city on August 6, 1945. He described the horrors of that day, and he continued: "It was a gathering of ghosts and I could not release my shutter on such a miserable scene. But I hardened myself and finally clicked the shutter... After taking a few photographs there, I felt I had performed my duty, and I could not stay there any more. So I called out to these suffering people, 'Take good care of yourself,' and I went back home. But even today I still hear the voices asking feebly for water." And he asked the question: "It was hell on earth. It was an inferno. Was this the real world?"

The Commission began its work in 1980 at a time when the "real world" of nuclear war may have seemed more remote than it does today. There was also very little discussion about the possibilities for ending the arms race, let alone about achieving real disarmament. The process of negotiating arms limitations was moribund.

Since then, the international situation has become both more dangerous and increasingly full of hope. Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union have deteriorated sharply in 1981 and 1982. The arms race is accelerating. The development of new nuclear weapons seems to suggest that the nuclear Powers may actually consider fighting a nuclear war. The threat of war seems closer than for many years. In the Middle East and many other parts of the Third World, war is not a threat but a reality.

At the same time, there are new reasons for optimism. The last two years have seen an extraordinary period of popular and political awakening to the dangers of war. Millions of people from all continents - and young people especially - have become involved in disarmament activities. Their concerns have spread across Europe and Asia into North America. New movements have grown up, such as the doctors' group who describe in clear and factual terms what a nuclear war would mean.

People are questioning the doctrine of deterrence, of a nuclear balance of terror. From inside the political and military systems, there are voices of warning: Lord Mountbatten and George Kennan, scientists such as Jerome Wiesner and Solly Zuckerman. Governments are producing plans for nuclear reductions. There has been a tremendous outpouring of new and revived ideas for ending the arms race:

nuclear-weapon-free zones, freezing the production of nuclear weapons, closing military research establishments, renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons, negotiated and reciprocal moratoria, cutting by half existing nuclear stockpiles.

Work of the Commission

It was against this background of tension and change that the Commission worked together to produce our report. We were in some ways a unique group. The Commission does not primarily consist of experts on arms limitation and disarmament. Its members were chosen, rather, because of their political experience over a broad field. Many have held or now hold high public office, others have a long experience in diplomacy and serving their countries at home and abroad. Three of us were members of the Brandt Commission, the Independent Commission on International Development Issues. We hoped, in bringing together people of such varied backgrounds, to bring new ideas and thoughts to the subject of disarmament.

Members of the Commission come from East and West, from North and South. They are from the Warsaw Pact and from the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, from European neutral countries, from Japan, and from many Third World countries. They differ profoundly in their views on international issues, and in their political and ideological perspectives.

But each has her or his own vision of peace and security, of a better world in which people may live. And each was also committed to the idea that the Commission itself should reach consensus on a common programme. Each was prepared to make the compromises necessary to achieve such unity.

For the Commission was unique, too, in that for the first time - and under difficult international circumstances - prominent people from Warsaw Pact and NATO countries were able to agree with people from neutral countries on a factual description of the military situation in different parts of the world, on an analysis of the dangers to peace and security, on a broad programme of action to avert these dangers. The process of the Commission's own work in this sense was in itself an exercise in peaceful coexistence. Our discussions over almost two years - and above all, I believe, the moving and shattering experience of our visit to Hiroshima - convinced us of the urgency of working together for common interests.

Our report expresses our deep concern at the worsening international situation, and at the drift towards war that so many perceive today. We are totally agreed that there is no such thing as a nuclear war that can be won. An all-out nuclear war would mean unprecedented destruction, may be the extinction of the human species. A so-called limited nuclear war would almost inevitably develop into total nuclear conflagration. Different war-fighting doctrines are therefore a grave

threat to humanity. The doctrine of deterrence offers very fragile protection indeed against the horrors of nuclear war.

It is therefore of paramount importance to replace the doctrine of mutual deterrence. Our alternative is common security. There can be no hope of victory in a nuclear war; the two sides would be united in suffering and destruction. They can survive only together. They must achieve security not against the adversary but together with him. International security must rest on a commitment to joint survival rather than on a threat of mutual destruction.

For a Downward Spiral in Armaments

On the basis of this strategy of common security, we discussed practical proposals to achieve arms limitation and disarmament. The long-term goal in the promotion of peace must be general and complete disarmament. But the Commission saw its task as being to consider a gradual process in that direction, to curb and reverse the arms race. We do not propose unilateral action by any country. We clearly see the need for balanced and negotiated reduction in arms.

Our aim has been to promote a downward spiral in armaments. We have elaborated a broad programme for reducing the nuclear threat, including major reductions in all types of strategic nuclear systems. We propose the establishment of a battlefield-nuclear-weapon-free zone starting in Central Europe. We also propose a chemical-weapon-free zone in Europe. Even the process of beginning to negotiate such limitations, we consider, would reduce political tension in Europe.

Many of our proposals concern nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. But we lay great emphasis on reducing conventional armaments. A large-scale conventional war would be enormously destructive in any densely populated area. There is also a clear connection between a negotiated agreement on mutual force reductions leading to a guaranteed approximate parity in conventional forces in Europe and the possibility of reducing nuclear weapons. Parity in conventional forces opens the way for denuclearisation in Europe.

We are convinced that the search for ever more advanced weapons - conventional, nuclear or "post-nuclear" - is itself a force which perpetuates military competition. We therefore propose a programme for curbing the qualitative arms race through a comprehensive test ban treaty, a chemical weapons disarmament treaty, agreements to limit military activities in space, and other measures.

Our programme does not cover all measures of arms limitation and disarmament. During our work we became familiar with many problems and opportunities which we could not examine thoroughly. We are deeply aware of the complexity of the problems that governments face today in the search for peace and security. We have concentrated our work on areas where we felt we could make a useful contribution to this common effort. For similar reasons, we have not taken up

many of the very interesting proposals - such as for a weapons freeze or moratorium - which have stimulated the disarmament debate during the Commission's work. Several of these proposals have the object of achieving a temporary halt in the arms race. Our purpose was rather to work out a programme aiming at direct and substantial reductions in weapons: a downward spiral.

Security Needs of the Third World

The danger of a nuclear holocaust, which could destroy neutrals as well as belligerents, the South as well as the North, is for obvious reasons in the foreground of the disarmament debate. But the Commission was constantly aware that almost all wars since 1945 have been fought in non-nuclear countries in the Third World. Some calculations suggest that more than 120 wars raged during the first twenty years after the Second World War. The human suffering has been terrible. Many of the most devastating famines of this period - for example in Uganda, Bangladesh, Kampuchea - have come in the aftermath of war, directly caused by the upheaval and disorder of military conflict.

While serving on the Commission I have paid many visits to Iran and Iraq as a special representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I have seen at close hand the terrible consequences of war - the bloodshed, the destruction, the horrendous costs for two Third World countries intent on social and economic self-development.

Even the most powerful Third World countries feel insecure in a world of global tension and local conflict caused by border disputes and other animosities. Their security is threatened by poverty and deprivation, by economic inequality. Many countries look increasingly to armaments - usually imported from developed countries - as a means of trying to defend their security. Yet this diverts resources from economic development and further reduces security. There are moreover some 62 States with populations of less than one million, of which 36 have less than 200,000 inhabitants. They are vulnerable, and cannot possibly afford to build up military strength.

The principle of common security applies with great force to Third World countries. Like the countries which live in the presence of nuclear weapons, they cannot achieve security against their adversaries. They too must find political and economic security through a commitment to joint survival.

Collective Security

We are convinced that it is absolutely necessary to meet the security needs of the Third World by collective responsibility. These needs are closely intertwined with efforts to safeguard peace and improve relations between the nuclear Powers.

We propose in our report to strengthen the role of the United Nations in safeguarding security. We describe a programme to improve possibilities for anticipating and preventing conflicts through new collective security procedures within the United Nations, and by an improved peacekeeping machinery.

We also emphasise the importance of regional approaches to security. We propose to strengthen regional security by creating zones of peace, nuclear-weapon-free zones, and by establishing regional conferences on security and cooperation similar to the one set up in Helsinki for Europe. We believe that regional discussions - including negotiations leading to chemical-weapon and battlefield-nuclear-weapon-free zones in Europe - can play an important role in achieving common security in all parts of the world.

In the Third World, as in all our countries, security requires economic progress as well as freedom from military fear. Our report describes the tremendous economic costs that the arms race has imposed on countries from the United States and the Soviet Union to poor arms-importing countries in Africa. These costs are even more serious in the present economic crisis, which itself threatens the security of every country. We share the view of the Brandt Commission that the North and the South have a mutual interest in the recovery of the world economy. Government revenues now spent on the military - and the scientists and technicians and other skilled workers who work to perfect the gigantic military machine - are one of the few resources available to meet social needs and to finance development. The East and the West, the North and the South have the most compelling common interest in reducing the economic costs of military competition.

Vision of a New International Order

When our Commission started its work, our aim was to have our report ready for the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in June 1982. Our recommendations are addressed to governments, to the representatives of the nations assembling at the United Nations, to the people who take part in disarmament negotiations in different fora.

But we have a larger audience in mind. For the tremendous popular and political awakening of the past two years has created a new public concerned with peace and security. People no longer see nuclear war as something distant and unreal. They see the costs of military spending in terms of cuts in health programmes, lost jobs, lost hopes for development. They know with chilling exactitude what would happen in war to their cities and neighbourhoods, to their relatives, friends, to those they love. They understand, often more clearly than some security experts, the tenuousness of mutual deterrence.

This popular insight is already a considerable political force, and already has influenced events. It is very unlikely that disarmament will ever take place if it

must wait for the initiatives of governments and experts. It will only come about as the expression of the political will of people in many parts of the world. Its precondition is simply a constructive interplay between the people and those directly responsible for taking the momentous decisions about armaments and for conducting the complicated negotiations that must precede disarmament.

The beginning of the 1980s has brought an unprecedented international manifestation of concern about nuclear war and insecurity. It is of the greatest importance to maintain the momentum of this period, not to disappoint people's hopes and efforts to transform their longing for peace into a policy for peace. Our own hope is that our work can contribute in some modest way to this endeavour. We hope that the factual background in our report will provide a broad public with knowledge and insight, that our analysis will stimulate their thought and our practical proposals solicit their support. Our vision is of an international order where there is no need for nuclear weapons, where peace and security could be maintained at much lower levels of conventional armaments and where our common resources could be devoted to providing greater freedom and a better life for people.

I am convinced that this vision is shared by most people around the globe, and I have great faith in their ability to work for its realisation.

STRUCTURE OF COMMON SECURITY

Statement at the Second Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament, June 23, 1982

It is a great privilege for me to speak here today as Chairman of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. It was to the Second Special Session on Disarmament of the General Assembly of the United Nations that we wanted to provide some input by our work. I can assure you that we consider it important to be able to present our findings and our conclusions to the United Nations and the delegations here present.

Also I would like to express the Commission's gratitude to the governments, organisations and individuals that have supported our work - by financial contributions, by inviting us and receiving us, and by meeting and discussing with us.

I would like also to express a special appreciation of the non-governmental organisations, the popular movements, the peace groups, the churches, the doctors, the trade unions, the scientists - all those that have together formed public opinion and have created such a strong popular support for disarmament in the last two years or so.

I certainly do not agree with all arguments, or all slogans or all proposals from these groups but I think that we should all recognise what a great service they have rendered. They have made us all much more aware of the dangers of the arms race. They have questioned the necessity of a continued build-up in nuclear weapons and the wisdom of common strategic thinking. They have changed public opinion and thus influenced political leaders, for these are normally sensitive to criticism. Many of the groups have often been small and worked under difficult circumstances. Many have had limited financial means, only large resources of idealism.

I am convinced that without all these arguments put forward in books and articles, at seminars and conferences and without these marches and demonstrations, we would not have been able to see how negotiations that have been idle are now being revived. And we would not have had the many proposals that have been put forward lately to reduce, to freeze, to cut or not to use nuclear weapons.

It is sometimes said that the flamboyant rhetoric of popular movements must be tempered by the realism of statesmen. In these days I rather feel that the rhetoric of statesmen should be tempered by the down-to-earth realism of ordinary people who have come to understand what nuclear war would mean and demand practical action to prevent it.

The Commission and its Work

The Commission started its work in September 1980. The international atmosphere at that time was part of the explanation why we decided to set up the Commission. The international dialogue was more or less silent - apart from accusations. Negotiations had stopped. New weapons were deployed or planned.

One thing that we had in mind when we started was to contribute to a revival of the international dialogue and to try to draw public attention to current arms limitation and disarmament problems. I remember that at our first meeting it was said that the most acute problem was to try to help saving the SALT-II¹ treaty and keeping the SALT¹⁷ process going. I can only express my satisfaction that the SALT process is being reborn whatever the acronyms.

The members of our Commission were not primarily experts in the disarmament field. What we may possess though is experience from policy making and from a broad political field. Five were former Heads of State or leaders of governments, five others had served as cabinet ministers, some of us had had a long diplomatic career. We come from both NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, from non-aligned or neutral countries, from industrial nations and from the developing world. This means that we had in our Commission different interests, different ideologies, different perspectives. But the members did not represent governments, they were all invited in their personal capacities.

We did not want to interfere with on-going negotiations or with disarmament work already under way. And we did not want to try to cover the whole ground or to elaborate a complete programme of disarmament. Others do that, and in a much better way than we could hope to.

We had a more limited objective. We tried to show what practical steps could be taken to create a downward spiral in the arms race. General and complete disarmament is of course the final goal. But there is a need now to initiate a process that with time can gather momentum and lead us towards the goal. Results are badly needed if people shall keep any confidence in us. So we tried to identify measures that in the years ahead could reasonably be negotiated and implemented and contribute to disarmament.

We also tried to identify a starting point, a basis that would be agreeable to the different interests and the different security needs. We did not try to find out who was guilty of what. We asked what we did have in common, despite our different backgrounds, and different opinions. To find such a basis is, I think, essential for any practical work towards disarmament.

¹⁷ Strategic Arms Limitation Talks

So our report contains some principal conclusions that we all think are essential. And it outlines a practical programme of actions. We propose a set of short- and medium-term measures. The short-term measures could and should be implemented within the next two years; the medium-term measures within the next five years. If you study the programme you will find that the concrete measures that we propose do not imply or presuppose a total change of policy of governments. The proposals are not revolutionary in the sense that they mean that governments have to give up basic convictions. But if the whole programme is implemented, the security situation will be changed in a revolutionary way - and to the better.

We spent much time studying the effects of nuclear war. We met with experts in the East and the West, we discussed with doctors, we travelled to Hiroshima to hear about the effects of the only two nuclear attacks that have taken place in reality, and we heard testimony from survivors of those attacks.

Nuclear War Cannot Be Won

Our conclusion was unambiguous: a nuclear war cannot be won. Victory is not possible. It would be such a catastrophe that the notion of victory would be meaningless.

It is sometimes argued that the losses of life and the damages, even if they are great, are in some meaning "acceptable." But who is to decide what is "acceptable" - to your own country, to other countries, to the world as a whole, to the unborn generations? Can this question be answered by strategic institutes, by military planners? To my mind this is a political and moral issue of the highest magnitude. We in the Commission used our humble moral and political judgement and this is our answer: any doctrine based on the belief that it is possible to wage a victorious nuclear war is dangerous and irresponsible.

Further we do not believe that a nuclear war can be controlled and limited. Some claim that conflicts involving the use of nuclear weapons and extending over days or even months could remain limited. We conclude in our report that "to envisage such a conflict seriously one must make incredible assumptions about the rationality of decision makers under intense pressure, about the resilience of the people and machinery in command and control systems, about social coherence in the face of unprecedented devastation and suffering, about the continuance of effective governmental operations, about the strength of military discipline."

The limited nuclear war is simply an illusion and to contemplate it as a serious possibility is equally dangerous and irresponsible.

Security in Nuclear Age Means Common Security

When the Commission visited Hiroshima, four survivors of the nuclear attack on Hiroshima and Nagasaki told us about their experience those days in August 1945. One of them was Dr. Tatsuichiro Akizuki from the San Franciscan Hospital in Nagasaki and now an old man. He told us how helpless he felt as a doctor on that day, and he went on to say that science and technology had made great advance and transformed the world. "But unfortunately the moral standards of human beings have not caught up with the development of science and technology."

I think that Dr. Akizuki, this healer of human wounds from Nagasaki, is right. We have fantastic skills and tools - but we lack in wisdom, we have not yet understood. But I am after all optimistic, wisdom will grow with every generation, even if there are temporary setbacks.

One thing that we all must understand, and that we must teach those who not yet understood, is that nuclear weapons have transformed the very concept of war. In the nuclear age no nation can achieve absolute security through military superiority. No nation can defend itself effectively against a nuclear attack. No matter how many nuclear weapons a nation acquires, it will always remain vulnerable to a nuclear attack. And thus its people will ultimately remain insecure. This is a central fact that all nations must realise.

Security can thus not be achieved through unilateral measures - there is not such a thing as a modern *Pax Romana*. Security must instead be achieved through co-operative efforts. Even political and ideological opponents must work together to avoid nuclear war. They can survive only together. They would be united in their destruction. A nuclear war would not end in victory for one, but in mutual destruction. Security in the nuclear age means common security.

The principle of common security does not deny that nations have a legitimate right to a secure existence. But it does mean that security cannot be based on military competition. Stability based on armaments cannot be sustained indefinitely. Deterrence cannot be made foolproof. The international system based on armaments may suddenly crumble.

Common security means that nations should show restraint and renounce policies which seek advantage through armament and military power. The search for military superiority must not be a goal for national policy, but instead parity ought to be the guiding principle. And once you have accepted military parity as a principle, you are committed to negotiations. For parity can be defined only by the parties concerned in negotiations. This also means that the notion of linkage must be abolished. Linkage is an unsound principle. Negotiations for the limitation of arms require continuity and stability, and cannot be regarded as rewards for an adversary's good behaviour.

We therefore conclude that "a doctrine of common security must replace the present expedient of deterrence through armaments. International peace must rest on a commitment to joint survival rather than a threat of mutual destruction."

Structure of Common Security

Of course the changes in thinking will not occur overnight. But nations must start now to build an international structure of common security. I would like to outline to you some of the components of that structure of common security, the practical steps that we propose. These steps cover both nuclear and conventional armaments, they concern both US/USSR strategic arms competition and regional conflicts. We strongly urge limits on the qualitative arms race, including an early conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear tests, and a treaty banning chemical weapons altogether, universal adherence to the NPT treaty,¹⁸ and so on. We discuss verification problems in connection with our proposals. In this short time, however, I cannot give you a complete account of the whole programme, but would like to concentrate on some of them.

Local Wars and Regional Security

Let me start by taking up the question of regional security.

In the last few weeks stateswomen and statesmen have come to this session on disarmament to talk about peace. Not one, I believe, has claimed that war as such is good or that it gives glory to men and countries. Not one, I believe, has objected to disarmament as a goal. On the contrary all who have spoken here have supported the high principles, have warned of the nuclear arms race, have reminded of the horrors of war.

In these same weeks several wars have been fought around the globe: between Iran and Iraq; in Lebanon where Israel has invaded; there has been a war in the South Atlantic; fighting is going on in Afghanistan; and there is a war in El Salvador. The war in Chad has continued and recently the capital was taken by one of the sides.

These are only the latest examples of a list of some 130 to 140 so-called local wars that have been fought since 1945. Nearly all of them have taken place in the Third World.

All these wars mean loss of life, human suffering, tragedy. Young men that in March of this year were alive and laughing and planning for their future are now in June dead - killed on the Malvinas or drowned in the South Atlantic Sea. Children in Lebanon have been mutilated, families uprooted, homes destroyed. And we know from previous wars that once the fighting has come to a halt, the suffering continues for the civilians. There is often widespread famine. There are

¹⁸ Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, 1968

perhaps millions of refugees. There is often a society unable to cope with the problems that war has created.

And all these wars will have served little purpose. When after some time we will look back at the wars of these last few months, we will be able to see that the real causes of conflicts have not been removed. But one thing is certain: these wars have not awakened the noblest feelings in the nations and among the peoples concerned. The rhetoric accompanying these wars has not been one of great cultural and humanistic advancement.

Furthermore, these wars may have created new problems, more difficult to solve. The Palestine question, to mention one example, cannot be solved by the destruction of the PLO. Desolation is not peace even if you call it that.

It is quite obvious that in the Middle East nations cannot achieve security at each other's expense. The nations in the region can only destroy each other if they do not accept the fact that the peoples and their nations have to live together, side by side. They must seek security together, they must accept to cooperate even with the prospective opponent. Security in this region must be common security.

Local wars have the potentiality of developing into larger conflicts, perhaps involving the major Powers. The developing world is fragmented and torn by a variety of indigenous conflicts. There are territorial claims, often with roots in a colonial past. There are ethnic and religious animosities. And there is struggle for political influence and privilege among disparate elements of society. Pressures from economic under-development and the maldistribution of resources and wealth produce strains that may result in violence and war.

All these local and regional tensions are further complicated by the East-West rivalry that often is superimposed on the conflicts in the Third World. The developing world has a great interest in détente between East and West.

There is another important dimension to security. Many nations in the Third World see no other alternative but to arm themselves. But economic resources are unevenly distributed among nations and so is military power. Many of the nations that have emerged after 1945 are small States. Some sixty-two States have less than one million inhabitants. They cannot possibly afford large standing armies or expensive modern military equipment. Their very smallness and weakness may be a temptation to other more powerful nations. Indeed, whole new questions of security arise for the international community, problems that call for a joint, common effort.

Strengthen Security Role of The United Nations

The most important and most valuable tool for common security that we together possess is the United Nations. We believe that this instrument can be used in a

more determined way and that the United Nations and its security role must be strengthened. In particular we think that the capacity of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to pre-empt conflicts ought to be enhanced.

We propose therefore in our report a procedure to deal with Third World border conflicts. This procedure would constitute a first step towards collective security. After the emergence of a border conflict, the procedure involves the Security Council and the Secretary-General at an early stage and includes the sending of fact-finding missions, military observer teams and United Nations military forces to the area in question.

Its purpose would be to prevent conflicts from being settled by armed forces, but the purpose would not be to pronounce on the substantive issues in dispute. An introduction of substantial United Nations forces before the outbreak of hostilities would, in most cases we believe, prevent violations of territories from occurring at all.

The procedure, if it is to be effective, must have the support of the veto Powers and of the Third World. The Security Council and the Secretary-General must have the power to act and be able to act. The cooperation of the permanent members of the Security Council is particularly important. Their consent is a prerequisite for the effective functioning of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security.

What are the chances for such a concordat? I believe the chances should be rather good. The scope of the "concordat" is clearly limited both in procedural and operational terms. But the prize could be great in terms of conflicts that may be solved peacefully instead of violently. And I believe that in many ways, we would all benefit. The regions would be more secure. We could limit the resources spent on arms. Major Powers would not feel induced to get involved in remote areas, as their opponents could also be expected to keep out.

While I am speaking about the United Nations, and about efforts to strengthen the role of this Organisation, I would like to add one important aspect. It concerns the role of international law. If the United Nations shall be the effective instrument for peace, the countries of the world must pay universal adherence to the rules of international law. There must be certain established rules for the international behaviour of nations. And when I say universal adherence, I mean universal.

We cannot have one set of rules for the rich countries of the world and their friends, and another set of rules for the poor countries. As within nations, the law must apply equally. Otherwise, it can never be respected.

East-West Confrontation in Europe

Let me now turn to another area.

The confrontation between East and West has found its military expression primarily in Europe. On that continent with its dense population that twice in this century has been ravaged by war, we find today the greatest concentration in history of military power. Nowhere in the world is there such an amount of conventional and nuclear weapons poised against each other.

This confrontation takes place between the two military alliances. Their perceptions, their security needs, their decisions are major factors behind the military build-up in the United States and the Soviet Union.

Some countries in Europe have decided to remain neutral, outside the alliances and to alleviate in that way the East-West confrontation. But they cannot totally escape from the military logic of the alliances, for these maintain military forces that have a relation to the general level of military confrontation around them.

Even a conventional war in Europe would be a catastrophe regardless of who would prevail, given the quantity and the quality of the weapons. And it would almost inevitably escalate into a nuclear war. A nuclear war in Europe would affect also the neutral States that have deliberately given up the option of nuclear weapons. And most likely such a war would result in a total nuclear conflagration.

There are many problems in Europe and there will be difficult developments in the next decades. But one thing is certain: war is not a solution of Europe's problems. Security in Europe must be common security.

The Commission has devoted much time to discuss the situation in Europe. We believe that the armies in Europe today are much larger than basic security needs of each of the sides would motivate. Drastic reductions would enhance security. And we do not believe that the military build-up has resulted in a net increase in the security of either side. The ratio of forces has not changed much over the last twenty years. The main difference is merely that the confrontation continues but at a much higher level of potential destruction than before.

Security in Europe is a complex and difficult problem. There are different opinions as to the military doctrines, about the credibility of deterrence and so on. I will not go into that. Personally I do not believe however that security in Europe can be sought solely on the basis of a continued military build-up. It would be too risky and too costly - politically and economically. Something more must be done than developing new weapons. Europe needs détente and cooperation. But the continued military confrontation is an obstacle to détente.

The large deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe or targeted at Europe raises special problems. There must be substantial reductions in the stockpiles of these weapons. But there is a link between the nuclear weapons in Europe and the balance of conventional forces between East and West. NATO introduced nuclear

weapons in Europe to compensate for what it perceived as an inferiority in conventional forces. So we believe that a precondition for denuclearisation in Europe is that the two sides reach a negotiated agreement for rough parity in conventional forces.

When our proposals for Europe have been discussed, this point seems to have been missed. What the Commission has stressed is not just withdrawal of nuclear weapons but the need for an agreement on conventional forces to facilitate nuclear reductions. We have therefore called for an early conclusion of an agreement in the negotiations in Vienna on conventional force reductions. In our report, and this I would like to repeat and stress here, we urge that the Foreign Ministers of the participating States get together to solve the remaining problems and conclude an agreement before the end of this year.

An agreement on conventional forces in Europe would facilitate reductions in nuclear weapons. Of these weapons the so-called battlefield ones constitute a special risk, since they are likely to be used early in a conflict. We have therefore proposed that these weapons be withdrawn from the forward areas, and a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons be created in Europe. This scheme would also be implemented within the context of a negotiated agreement on conventional forces.

It has been said that such a zone would be of limited military significance and value. Well, in that case the risk that you take by agreeing to such a zone is equally small. This objection rather speaks in favour of the idea. It has also been said that nuclear weapons could quickly be reintroduced in the area. This is probably true even if you do not move around nuclear weapons as if they were sacks of potatoes. The Commission recognises this in the report itself and says: "However, we consider the establishment of the proposed zone an important confidence-building measure which would raise the nuclear threshold and reduce some of the pressures for early use of nuclear weapons." Especially, as we also say that there would have to be provisions for verification, including a limited number of on-site inspections in the zone on a challenge basis, this scheme would contribute to an increased mutual confidence. I am convinced, in short, that if our proposals for Europe were implemented we would have more stability, more security, more confidence and less armament in Europe.

Other Dimensions to Security

There is an economic dimension to security. The arms race makes us not only more insecure, it also makes us poorer. We should remember what Adam Smith once taught, that great fleets and armies are "unproductive labour." I do not need to elaborate at length on this theme. Many speakers have discussed it, and the question of disarmament and development has been carefully analysed by a United Nations study group under the leadership of Inga Thorsson.

Let me just say that in the long run, real security for any nation lies in economic and social progress, and in economic cooperation between nations, in regions and world-wide. We share the conviction of the Brandt Commission that the South and the North, the East and the West, have mutual interests in economic progress. No country can resolve its problems alone. A reduction in the present high level of military spending would therefore be in the economic interest of all countries, even those which spend relatively little on their own military efforts.

Seen from another angle, a reduction in military spending which gives more resources to fighting poverty is also a contribution to peace. That rich nations grow richer while poor nations become poorer is intolerable from the point of view of solidarity and justice. But it is also intolerable because of the dangers inherent in such a situation of conflicts between the poor and the rich, between North and South. A widening gap between rich and poor nations will inevitably lead to increased tensions, and ultimately become a threat to world peace. A world where hundreds of millions of people are literally starving to death, where millions and millions are without water, where children die because of diseases that could be cured with just a fraction of the resources spent on arms - in such a world, tensions will persist, and the threat of war will not go away. This is, in my mind, another decisive argument in favour of disarmament, and in favour of using the resources for the economic and social well-being of people.

No country can hope to win military advantage by outrunning its competitor in an economically costly arms race. All countries are hurt by the economic difficulties of the major economies. Common security is not only a matter of freedom from military fear. Its objective is not only to avoid being killed in a nuclear apocalypse, or in a border dispute, or by a machine gun in one's own village. Its objective, in the end, is to live a better life: in common security and common prosperity.

EMPLOYMENT AND WELFARE

Jerry Wurf Memorial Lecture at Harvard University, April 3, 1984¹⁹

Some time ago in Vienna, I had the opportunity to hear Dr. Bruno Kreisky's speech when he retired as Chancellor and leader of the Austrian Social Democratic Party. As we in the audience sat there listening, we expected to hear an account of his long and eventful life and of his wide-ranging and successful political experiences. But not at all! Bruno Kreisky talked only about the future. At his retirement from official life, the whole of his thinking was looking forward.

His first concern was unemployment. He pointed to estimates by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) of changes in the age structure of the population. Those data show that if the already record-high unemployment in the OECD countries is not to rise even higher, eighteen or twenty million new jobs will have to be created between 1984 and 1989. This means that 20,000 new job opportunities must be created in the industrial nations each day throughout that period.

With this view of the future, Bruno Kreisky established his main theme: that the crucial divergence in politics today is over attitudes toward unemployment and toward welfare. The Chancellor expressed his concern in this way: "I am afraid of the spread of the following philosophy: when unemployment does not disappear even when there is a boom on the way, people will say that this is not a matter of some crisis. It is, rather, a perfectly normal state of affairs that millions of people are out of work, since we can see today that even when there already is a marked economic upswing, it has relatively little effect on unemployment. This means that we are faced with a long period in which we have millions of people who are out of work for months and months or even years.

"And then the theorists come along. In the first place, they cannot agree on a definition of the crisis. They come and say that there isn't any crisis at all, or it was also like this in the thirties. And then they say that the fact that there are millions of unemployed is, very unfortunately, a natural state of affairs.

"I must admit," Kreisky went on, "that I was somewhat shocked by what happened a couple of months ago at a meeting in Washington, where very eminent representatives of the World Bank and the International Monetary

¹⁹ The lecture was established in honour of Jerry Wurf, President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, from 1964 to 1981. Olof Palme delivered the first lecture at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government.

Fund spoke. For example, Jacques de Larosiere²⁰ said that we must consolidate the economic upswing. And how were we to do this? First, by slowing down the inflation rate. Second, by reducing budget deficits. Third, by continuing structural changes in industry. And, fourth, by resisting protectionism. But there was one thing M. de Larosiere said nothing about, and that was that we must do something about reducing unemployment. He did not mention it at all."

Then Bruno Kreisky went on to talk about the other great divergence: the question of the welfare society. The fact of thirty-five million unemployed had not led to the disintegration of society which we saw in the thirties in many countries. This was because it had been possible to develop the welfare society in such a way that blue-collar and white-collar workers "had been protected from the worst." But when economic growth stagnates and when the cost of unemployment increases, then the welfare society is attacked. This has already happened in many countries.

Fight Against Unemployment - Prime Goal of Economic Policy

These two themes of Kreisky's - employment and welfare - are the main subject I will discuss today. There are a number of theorists and political practitioners who argue that the power of the trade unions and the growth of the welfare state are in fact the causes of the economic crisis and unemployment. I will return to these arguments. But I want first to talk about why the fight against unemployment must, when viewed from the values in which I believe, remain the prime goal of economic policy.

First, unemployment is a terrible waste. At present, production resources all over the world are grossly under-utilised. This is certainly not because all human needs are satisfied. Quite the opposite. In many parts of the world, not even the most basic needs of the people can be met. All societies have vast unfulfilled needs. And human labour is necessary to meet these needs.

Meanwhile, an enormous amount of production capacity is lying idle. People who would like nothing better than to have a job are also forced to be idle, day after day, week after week, month after month. So production goes down - unnecessarily. This is why unemployment is a waste.

Second, unemployment means human suffering. The hard facts of labour market statistics hide the distress of innumerable individuals. It is only too easy to forget that each and every one of those millions of unemployed is a human being.

There is the father in one of the developing countries who sees his children starve because the development project, which is going to give him work and enable him to support his family, lacks funds. Or the potential market in the developed countries for what he is to produce is no longer there.

²⁰ Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund

There is the so-called "guest-worker" from southern Europe or North Africa who came to the industrial centres of Europe and for years took all the lowest-paying jobs but still found it possible to support himself and the family he left behind. Now he is told to return home.

There is the girl I met at a youth employment office in my own country. She is not starving. Her parents and the community provide for most of her basic needs - but they cannot meet her need to be wanted, to feel that she is necessary.

"I sleep in the morning," she said. "About lunch-time, I may go down to the employment service. Sometimes, they have something that might suit me. If so, I go and see the company in question. Usually there are lots of other applicants. Often I have the wrong kind of education. Sometimes they say they will call me. So I go home and wait for them to call, but they never do. This has happened to me fifty or sixty times. In the evening, I stay at home and watch TV or go downtown to see my friends. I'm quickly losing hope and confidence, and I get worried when I see what is happening to some of my friends."

I mention these different aspects of unemployment because I want to emphasise that although work is primarily a way to earn a living, it is also much more than that.

Work - having a job - is an essential part of people's social being. Ask anyone who they are, and they will answer by telling their name and their profession. I saw a short film produced by the Swedish labour unions. A number of young people were asked about their future. Everybody mentioned a profession. Nobody looked forward to being unemployed. Work is closely associated with values like self-confidence, human dignity, and the purpose of life. Thus, it is not surprising that increased unemployment coincides with rising mortality rates, poor health, more suicides, more broken families, increasing crime rates, the widespread use of drugs, and more prostitution.

We should not have to be reminded about the social ills of mass unemployment. We could read the numerous research reports about what happened in the thirties. One of the classical studies - *The Unemployed of Marienthal* - described what happened in a village outside Bruno Kreisky's Vienna when the single industry, a textile mill, closed down. People reacted by starting to look feverishly for new employment. As time passed, most people lost confidence in their own ability, they became ashamed, avoided contact with former friends, and finally settled for extremely circumscribed lives with drastically reduced expectations for the future. While still young, they simply stopped living as social individuals.

This brings me to the third reason to fight unemployment. I believe that mass unemployment will ultimately constitute a threat to the type of open democracy

that we believe in. It may in the long run not survive in countries with persistent high levels of unemployment. Unemployment undermines the fabric of society on which democracy has to be built.

We talk about the crisis of the economy. We say that everyone has to contribute to the solution of our economic problems. But when young people get out of school and want a job, when they want to take full part in the world of adults, when they want to make their contribution, they are told that they are not wanted, not needed. Their contribution to the solution of the crisis is to be unemployed. This causes young people to lose hope and confidence in themselves. It also creates bitterness and despair, loss of confidence in society, in our democratic institutions. If we deny young people the right to be full members of society, they may choose to place themselves outside the society.

Countries with Strong Trade Unions Have High Employment

So the fight against unemployment is of paramount importance if we are to avoid wasting our economic resources, alleviate the social disruption and human suffering resulting from unemployment, preserve faith in democratic government, and strengthen democracy. Full employment not only creates welfare. It is also a means of sharing it. There is no greater gulf than the gulf between those who have work and those who do not. Those who are already worst off run the greater risk of becoming unemployed.

Everything I have said so far may seem obvious, almost commonplace. The trouble is that these kinds of truths are not expounded so often nowadays. They need to be repeated, not forgotten.

Are trade unions a threat to employment? The unions themselves, of course, say that one of their main objectives is to work for policies that will result in full employment. But some are of the opinion that the resistance of trade unions to necessary changes in the structure of production has in fact pushed up unemployment.

It is not difficult to find examples of trade unions pursuing unwise wage policies that have had adverse effects both on individual companies and on the national economy as a whole. Or examples of their having tried to prevent effective structural changes in industry. The explanations of these unwise policies can often be found in poor organisation and internal fights within the unions.

But there is a good deal of evidence that countries with strong and co-ordinated trade unions also have comparatively high employment and low unemployment. Austria, Norway and Sweden are examples of this. There is a long-standing tradition of strong trade unions in the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden). One reason for this is that they have not had to cope with a large number of small competing unions. Employees have organised

themselves in accordance with the principle that all workers at the same workplace belong to the same trade union. This main principle also applies to salaried employees.

This is probably one of the main reasons why so many wage earners are trade union members. The most recent figures are from 1980, when 85 percent of the wage earners in Sweden were members of trade unions. That figure has been increasing all the time. In the United Kingdom the comparable figure is 54 percent, and in the United States 25 percent.

Compare these figures with unemployment rates in the same countries. Unemployment in Sweden was 3.5 percent in 1983, in the United Kingdom the figure was more than 13 percent, and in the United States more than 9 percent. Sweden also had very high labour force participation among the general population. In 1980, 81 percent of the active population - and 74 percent of the women - were in the labour force. In the United Kingdom the overall figure was 74 percent and in the United States 72 percent; no more than 60 percent of the women in this country were in the labour force.

Other studies show that a high level of trade union membership results in a more even distribution of income. A Swedish sociologist, Professor Walter Korpi, has demonstrated that the degree of inequality in the distribution of income after taxes tends to be lower in countries with high levels of unionisation than in countries with weak union movements. He concludes that the distribution of the power to influence decision making can affect the shaping of policies of importance for the distribution of income.

Conditions differ from one country to the next, and these conditions govern both people's values and practical politics. Therefore, one must be wary of making comparisons. The strength of unions depends on political relations as well as on the level of union membership. Some highly unionised countries have experienced high unemployment. But it does seem to be well established that in countries with strong unions that can rely on support from social democratic governments, there are policies that aim to achieve full employment and more even distribution of income. Often such policies also create a more stable labour market.

Vital Role of Trade Unions in Strengthening Democracy

In country after country, we see how the trade union movement is now under strong attack. These campaigns follow in the wake of neoconservative or neoliberal tendency to give greater scope to market forces. Trade unions are regarded as a "market-disrupting element" and in this sense are said to be a threat to freedom. Some critics even go one step further and suggest that trade unions are barely compatible with democracy. One may even ask whether the most enthusiastic advocates of a free market really continue to accept a system of

collective bargaining.

Unions or no unions, the efficiency of the market economy is severely limited in the labour market. Professor Lester Thurow is right when he says: "To deny the existence of unions or to ask that they disappear is to develop an economic model of a non-existent economy."

It is my conviction that labour unions, by strengthening the voice of the common people, play a vital role in strengthening democracy. They are rooted in democratic mass organisations where people joined together to assert claims that they were too weak to make as individuals. Work in a union was in itself a democratic experience based on equal rights. In countries like mine this has been of fundamental importance. It was quite simply an exercise in democracy. The unions represent a countervailing force to employers and to governments and thus have a self-evident role to play in the democratic process.

Over the years, unions have gradually entered new fields other than collective bargaining for wages. They must play an important role in efforts to renew working life. We have found that if you want to renew and improve conditions in the working life of wage earners, detailed regulations in the law are not the best way to go about it. It is better to strengthen the position of employees at the workplace so that they have a chance to influence their own situations. In most cases, it must be through the local branch of the trade unions that this influence can be exercised.

In Sweden we have laws governing the working environment: a law that gives a union representative the right to stop production if employees are exposed to grave occupational hazards; a law on job security, which among other things, protects workers from unwarranted dismissal; a law on worker representation on corporate boards by at least two representatives; and a law on the joint regulation of working life, which gives trade unions the right, for instance, to negotiate on all issues relating to the organisation of work and the management of the corporation. These laws have resulted in increased participation on the part of the wage earners and have not, by and large, had any adverse economic effects. We are now evaluating their impact.

Wage Earner Investment Funds in Sweden

There has been widespread discussion about another step in the same direction - the so-called wage earner investment funds. These funds were introduced on the 1st of January 1984. How do they function and what is their role in our mixed economy? Companies contribute a small portion of the payroll as well as a portion of their surplus profits - that is, profits that exceed a certain level - into the funds. With that money, the funds buy shares on the stock exchange. And the income earned from these stocks goes into the pension system. The boards will have members representing the employees, the companies, the public and the

national interest.

To understand why we have introduced these funds, one must look at what is happening in the Swedish economy. Sweden has a large public sector, but more than 95 percent of industry in Sweden is privately owned. After 44 years of Social Democratic governments, Sweden was, and is, less nationalised in terms of industry and business than perhaps any other country in Western Europe. In fact, conservative governments have often nationalised more than Social Democratic governments. And the power over private industry in Sweden is concentrated in relatively few financial centres. The strong unions and the large public sector are considered to have balanced that private power. This is a mixed economy.

Sweden, like other countries, has had to go through the economic recession of recent years. Our problems are familiar - slow growth, budget deficits, inflation, rising unemployment. There have been, and there still are, conflicting opinions on how to cure the economic ills of the present. "Monetarism" and "supply-side economics" are some of the catchwords of the debate.

When we were in opposition, we tried to develop a strategy for the economic policy that we could follow if the voters did put us back in government. These were the main points: (1) We had to restore our competitiveness in the world markets. We rely on our export industries and are and will remain an industrial country; (2) We had to defend employment with all our means; and (3) We had to protect the weaker members of our society in the inevitable process of readjustment and rationalisation of the economy.

When we formed a new government after the elections in September 1982, we immediately devalued the currency by 16 percent. We adopted a policy of holding back public spending in order to stop the growth of the budget deficit and then gradually to reduce it. We said to our capitalists and managers: Go out on the world market and sell all that you can. We will help you. Do make a profit and use that profit to build up new industries and develop new products. We told the unions that wage earners cannot in the coming years expect any large increases in real wages. On the contrary, we held out the prospect of rather lean years for households as a whole.

It has been a rather tough policy. Many problems remain, but we can point to some results: exports have boomed and profits in industry are increasing substantially. Inflation has come down and our target for this year is four percent. Investments are picking up. The budget deficit has been brought down. Unemployment has gone down. The aim of the policy has been to make our industry grow. And this is clearly happening. One result has been a redistribution of incomes from wages to profits.

It is against this background that one should see the wage earners' funds. I can defend, as a social democrat, an increase in profits simply because profits were

very low before. But we cannot expect the wage earners to sit by and let increased profits slip exclusively into the pockets of the owners of capital. It is only fair that they should have a share of these growing profits and take part in decisions on how they are to be used.

Naturally, unions should be careful not to set their sights too high. But at this time of unwarranted attacks on trade unions, I find it important to stress their positive role in society. It is interesting to note that dictators - from the right or from the left - first crush unions and jail union leaders. This in itself is proof of their importance in a democracy. We can today witness this process in Chile and in Poland. It is not surprising that right-wing dictators dislike organised labour. But the emergence of Solidarity in Poland has a deeper significance. It means that communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe have been unable to come to reasonable terms with the wishes of ordinary people. In this situation, the people turn to the trade unions as a democratic instrument for shaping their future.

I am glad to be able to make these positive remarks about trade unions in a lecture in honour of a great democrat and union leader - Jerry Wurf.

Social Programmes Must Be Universal

Let me turn now to my second theme, one which was also close to Jerry's heart and of great importance to members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, and which is also under attack by neoconservatives - namely, the welfare society and the role of the public sector.

T.H. Marshall has talked about the desire to augment civic rights - equal protection of the law for all citizens - with political rights, which consists of the freedom to mould public opinion and universal and equal suffrage to elect the government of a country. In a welfare society, these rights are further augmented with the social rights that are part of social democracy.

Conservatives attack the very idea of welfare. Not only do they dislike it from a general ideological point of view, but they also justify their opinion with economic arguments. In times of economic difficulty, they believe, the efforts of the community should be directed only toward the weakest groups in society - the very poor.

However, if society's efforts are focussed only on its weakest members through selective social policies largely based on "means tests", taxpayers come to think in terms of "we" and "they". "We" - the better-off wage earners and the middle class - have to pay to the state, but get nothing in return.

The ground is thus prepared for the disintegration of social solidarity, which in turn encourages tax revolts. The fact is that it is not the weight of the tax burden that causes such revolts, but rather the feeling among taxpayers that they do not

get anything for their money. People who derive some benefit from a welfare system are its greatest supporters and therefore pay taxes without feeling exploited.

An efficient and stable welfare state must be based on universal social programmes, such as health insurance, pensions and child-support allowances - programmes that are directed to all citizens. Official "poverty lines" or "means tests" would not have to define "the poor" (which would minimise the need for bureaucratic controls). At the same time, people in difficult financial circumstances would not have to put up with the degrading classification of "poor". And because they would have the same rights as others to universal social services, they would enjoy services of a much higher standard - services that would be acceptable to the rich. Moreover, universal programmes would help eliminate the "poverty trap", in which the poor are discouraged from increasing their earnings since to do so decreases their benefits.

Importance of Public Sector

A policy shaped along these lines obviously leads to an extension of the public sector and criticism of big government. But critics of the public sector tend to forget some simple truths. A well-functioning public sector is of paramount importance in a progressive economy. A well-developed infrastructure is crucial for industrial expansion. The central government and local authorities also influence the profitability and production of industry directly through extensive procurement of goods and services. Many people in the private sector depend upon local government activities for their livelihood.

But what primarily concerns me today is the importance of the public sector for people's personal fulfilment and freedom. The public sector and the work of public servants can be described in many different ways: the teachers who do their best to educate our children; the home-care workers who help our senior citizens with housework in their homes; the personnel in our medical services who take care of the sick.

I think that one of the finest aspects of our welfare society is the prenatal and postnatal care given to mothers and babies at our maternity and children's clinics. This type of care started, like so much else, as a private initiative of eminent physicians. We made use of their great skill and experience, and today this service is available to everyone as part of the public sector. All mothers and their children without distinction enjoy free treatment at these clinics. Without any competition whatsoever and without any profit-making motives, Sweden's maternity and child care is so good that we have the lowest infant mortality rate in the world and no social difference in the results of care.

The point I am trying to make is that the weak members of society are best protected not by being given special treatment but by being included in

programmes that extend to all members of society. Only then can social reforms become deeply rooted among the people.

Opponents of the welfare state say that a large public sector leads to inefficiency and slow economic growth. There are no data to support assertions of this kind. It is impossible to establish that there is any connection between a large public sector and low economic growth in the leading industrialised countries. Many countries are, of course, struggling with large budget deficits and economic imbalances. And it goes without saying that the expansion of social welfare and the public sector is dependent upon general economic development.

But the government I lead has refused to resort to a one-sided cutback policy that hits people's welfare and leads to increased unemployment. We have come to the conclusion that the problem is not primarily that the public sector is too large, but that the industrial sector is too small and that we have too much idle capacity in industry. Therefore, we are concentrating our efforts on promoting industrial expansion that will ultimately give us the resources for a continued build-up of much-needed public services.

Vision of the Future

Sometimes, even in these trying times, people talk about the need for visions of the future. There are those who tie their visions almost exclusively to the market and to the wonders this market might perform in the service of freedom. In a speech in Hamburg not so very long ago, Friedrich von Hayek, one of the great theoreticians of conservatism, said that the market economy requires that certain natural instincts among people are suppressed. You must suppress feelings of solidarity and human compassion. In the place of such feelings, abstract rules to protect private property, freedom of contract and free competition must be established; otherwise the free market will not function.

I suppose that this is what some call the magic of the marketplace. To me it sounds rather like a conservative counterrevolution against the social and democratic development of the last sixty years. I would much prefer to talk about the magic of human compassion. In order to find this magic, it is important to perceive visions in terms of the everyday experiences of ordinary people.

Our efforts to develop society and our dreams of the future must bear in mind that which is continually recurring - the invariables in all human life that are relevant across all national borders and through all time. The uniting links between all people are great undertakings of life - let me call them the life projects - which are the same for people in all countries and will also be so in the future.

During the course of life, we all meet the same challenges: to grow up and be educated; to find playmates and friends; to prepare ourselves for our different roles in adult life; to find a place in working life and make our own living; to find

somewhere to live and make it into a home; to form a family and bring up children; to keep healthy throughout life and cope with illnesses and other misfortunes that may beset us; to secure a decent living and preserve our dignity for the inevitable frailty of old age; to live as free citizens, equal with other members of society; and to take a share in being responsible for the common good.

These things always recur in human life - the life projects we all have in common. All the technological innovations - from the steam engine and the tractor to nuclear power and computers - all the new possibilities we have as a result of higher material standards, have done nothing to change the life projects. We may cope with them practically in different ways, but they are essentially the same. And every human being continues to be responsible for his or her own life within the framework of the new opportunities created by development. The life projects will stay the same in the future for as long as human beings remain human beings as we have known them until now.

These are the main points of departure when we discussed the kind of society we want to create. The purpose of society is not to realise any singular idea, unrelated to the conditions of human life. It is not to be built for the yonder, nor as a goal in itself to manifest the greatness of the nation or the State, nor in the interests of any particular group or class. It is not to be built according to any rigidly determined blueprint for the perfect society of the future.

Society and its institutions are to serve people here and now, so that they shall be able to realise their life projects, live their lives. Then they will threaten no one's future. Then people will be able to go on building on the life experiences of earlier generations. The aim of society and of solidarity is that everyone shall have access to resources so that they will be able to realise the essential undertakings of human life, the great life projects. These are the aims that have formed the foundation of the welfare society. These are the foundations of a free community, built on voluntary collaboration between independent and free citizens.

THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

**Keynote address at the Colloquium of the "Groupe de Bellerive", Geneva,
June 27, 1985**

...There is no more vital issue to be discussed today in the international community - or anywhere, for that matter - than the threat of nuclear proliferation and the inherent dangers of an atomic war.

To put it simply, we are today in a unique situation in the history of mankind. Today's weapons and today's warfare are such that we can kill not only ourselves and all others living on this planet. We can also take the lives of animals and plants, and we can destroy cities and villages, we can ruin everything which has been built up through generation after generation. And above all: we can destroy the future of our whole civilisation, everything that would come after us.

This is the simple truth about the potential of today's nuclear weapons. This is the threat which we, in this nuclear age, are confronted with. It has opened up awesome perspectives and terrible possibilities for us and our children.

And as if this is not bad enough, we are now faced with a threat of nuclear weapon proliferation which increases the dangers for our peoples, our societies and our future. The number and quality of nuclear weapons are increasing, a new arms race in outer space may be initiated, and the risk of proliferation to other nations is very real. There is also a threat to results already achieved in the field of arms limitation.

I do not wish to sound overly dramatic, but I am convinced that the nuclear threat is the gravest menace to the very existence of mankind that it has ever faced. This is the situation as I perceive it, and the basis from which I think one has to start searching for solutions to these urgent problems. I am therefore honoured to have been invited here to spark off the discussion about this threat and about the search for a way out.

I will be speaking almost exclusively about nuclear weapons. That does not mean that I wish to minimise the threats posed by so-called conventional weapons. Having been involved for some time in the Iran-Iraq war, I have been reminded very personally about the immense suffering caused by warfare today. And this is only one example. Since World War II there has been an almost uninterrupted series of wars, which have been fought with conventional weapons and which have caused untold suffering and destruction. The casualties, direct and indirect, have been in the millions. And the resources spent are immense: it is estimated that well over 80 percent of total military spending is absorbed by conventional arms and armed forces.

But nuclear weapons pose a unique threat. A large-scale nuclear attack would not only destroy the enemy. There are strong indications that such an attack would also have severe climatic effects, for a nuclear exchange would throw dust and soot into the atmosphere for long enough to have disastrous effects on all life on earth... The findings about the effects of nuclear war have convinced me that nuclear weapons are militarily useless. There is no situation in which a nuclear weapon State, with enough probability of success, can launch a nuclear attack and count on achieving anything for itself. For a long time now, nuclear weapons have been obsolete as a tool for warfare. The only motivation for keeping them would be to try to deter the opponent from attacking. Consequently, these arms are solely political weapons. They are in a real sense useless, since their use would mean annihilation of the user.

Growing Nuclear Threat

This has not always been the case. It is sometimes useful to go back in history and see how people reflected in the past on issues which now seem very clear. In August 1945 atomic bombs were dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. At that time this was seen in many quarters as a necessary way of finally ending World War II. And in the years immediately following, the atomic bomb was not seen as much more than a powerful addition to the overall strength of the United States.

Later the view of nuclear weapons changed radically. When the Soviet Union developed into the second nuclear Power, nuclear weapons became the main elements in the policy of deterrence which came to be practised by both superpowers. This also became the starting point for the development and production of a great number of new nuclear weapons systems.

Such weapons are no longer merely a question of a number of aircraft or silos on Soviet and United States territories, loaded with intercontinental ballistic missiles. The risk of nuclear confrontation has come much closer, not least here in Europe. This is where new intermediate-range missiles are being deployed just now, and this is where one finds thousands of small battlefield nuclear weapons along the border between East and West. This forward-basing has increased dramatically in the 1980s, as pointed out last week in the new yearbook from SIPRI, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. It not only enlarges the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war by mistake. It also increases nervousness on both sides, and thereby the risk that someone will try to "shoot first" in a crisis situation.

The nuclear armament process has now resulted in some 50,000 nuclear weapons in five nuclear States. Their accuracy is vastly improved, thanks in part to a wide network of satellites. Warning times are getting shorter and shorter, since the period from firing a weapon to its reaching its target has shrunk

considerably. A missile from the Soviet mainland to the United States Midwest takes 30 minutes; submarine-launched missiles could hit the same target in less than fifteen minutes; a Pershing II takes less than ten minutes from West Germany to Moscow.

Nuclear Realities

The question is: for what purpose could a nuclear weapon State use all this sophisticated machinery?

One actual use could be to start a large-scale nuclear attack. This would most certainly destroy the enemy. But it would with almost equal certainty also destroy the attacker.

Another use could be to start a limited war, or to launch a limited nuclear response to a conventional attack. But such a project would most probably get out of hand, and escalate to a major nuclear confrontation. In that case, it would also lead to the destruction of the attacker as well as the enemy.

Lord Zuckerman has summarised today's situation very clearly in what he calls "the nuclear realities":

First: Nuclear war would bring terrible destruction. A full-scale nuclear attack would destroy not only the party attacked, but also the attacker and many other nations, and would most certainly pose a threat to the survival of our civilisation.

Second: There is no defence against nuclear weapons. The people of Hiroshima could not defend themselves. The perfect symbol of this is found in the memorial museum in Hiroshima. There, on some stairs, one can see the shadow of a human being, the only thing remaining of a man or a woman who sat on those stairs when the bomb exploded. Protection against nuclear attack has not been improved much since then. There would not be enough doctors and nurses to take care of the victims even after one single attack.

Third: There is no possibility of a disarming strike. The opponent will always have enough weapons left to cause massive destruction to the attacker. Even if he had only one submarine left, that one ship would have enough weapons to kill many millions of people in New York or in Moscow, in Paris or London, or in Beijing.

Fourth: There is no way of ensuring that a limited nuclear war stays limited. On the contrary, strong evidence supports the theory that limited nuclear wars will escalate.

Doctrine of Nuclear Deterrence Leads to Abyss

These nuclear realities, if translated into political realities, imply that no responsible political leader could seriously conceive of using nuclear weapons. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States have both declared that a nuclear war cannot be won. President Reagan has even called nuclear weapons immoral.

Nevertheless, nuclear weapons are still very much an ingredient in military forces and in actual war planning. This, it is said, is to deter the enemy from using his weapons. Even if it is not said in so many words, it is probably also a way of trying to gain ground politically by applying pressure by threatening with nuclear weapons. The nuclear realities have changed the role of nuclear weapons from being tools of warfare to instruments for pursuing political aims.

It is sometimes argued that in this role, nuclear weapons have served a good purpose. No war has broken out in Europe for forty years; this is said to prove that deterrence works and that nuclear weapons have preserve peace.

That may have been true in the past, even if it is far from proven. What we do know is that the deterrence doctrine has been linked to an arms build-up of enormous proportions. We also know that deterrence only works if it is credible. That means that there must be a technical capacity to wage war, as well as a political preparedness to use this capacity.

During the era of nuclear deterrence, we have seen a continuous and unbridled arms race which has produced ever more sophisticated and accurate weapons. The very fact that the *technical* preparedness and capacity to wage a nuclear war have increased is destabilising and a threat in itself.

From the point of view of *political* preparedness, leaders in the nuclear weapon States have to face the fact that a nuclear war would have devastating effects all over the world, including on the attacking party. The near certainty that what was intended to be defended would also be destroyed presents the leaders of those States with a serious practical, political and philosophical dilemma.

The idea of deterrence is to induce fear in the opponent. The object is to make him afraid, to be unpredictable, to make him uncertain of the next step. But to induce fear is also to encourage distrust. And in the face of fear and distrust of the opponent, it is difficult for any political system to conduct rational, reasoned and sound policies.

All this, in my experience, has contributed to making people in general more and more suspicious of nuclear deterrence, which keeps the whole of humanity as a hostage. Its stability is constantly being undermined in the never-ending arms spiral. It is like addiction to a drug - you continually need a larger and larger dose. And at the end of the road, nuclear deterrence holds out the

prospect of the apocalyptic abyss.

S.D.I. Will Accelerate Nuclear Arms Race

The shortcomings of the nuclear deterrence doctrine have led to a lively international debate on alternatives to this doctrine. These shortcomings have also been recognised by at least one prominent political leader in one of the nuclear weapon States. This is fine, and should be welcomed, even if one heartily disagrees with some of the alternatives proposed. One of these alternatives, the one perhaps most widely discussed nowadays, poses a direct threat of an enormous vertical proliferation. I am thinking of what is called the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI).

In the Independent Disarmament Commission, of which I have been Chairman, we had a detailed discussion four years ago - actually here in Geneva - about military technology in the 1980s and about plans for ballistic missile defence. Now, as we have heard in the last few years, a technological breakthrough which would provide a fool-proof defence is being brought forward as a real possibility. To meet the scepticism about deterrence, and to reassure one's own people, the prospect of a water-tight system, which will stop every ballistic missile, is being seriously explored.

Much could be said about this - about the cost, about the possibility of actually building an absolute defence, about the worries over "decoupling", about how SDI conforms with present arms control treaties, to name but a few of the questions raised. I will not go into any detailed discussion here about this project. What I want to say, however, is that it is absolutely clear to me that an initiative of this kind will accelerate the nuclear arms race instead of making nuclear arms obsolete, and that it will therefore be another contribution to the continued vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. The number of warheads on each missile might be increased as a counter-measure. The offensive missiles may be modified to make them less vulnerable. The number of airborne weapons - particularly cruise missiles - may be substantially increased. And systems for actually fighting a ballistic missile defence system may be developed. In short: the nuclear arms race would accelerate yet again.

Instead of talking about "Star Wars" and other efforts aiming at a further militarisation of space, the international community should, in my opinion, reserve this domain for peaceful, constructive purposes. One attractive idea is the launching of a satellite for the international supervision of how various arms control agreements are being adhered to.

Danger of Nuclear Terrorism

Another serious nuclear threat is that of horizontal proliferation. The risk of a nuclear catastrophe will increase dramatically if the capacity to make use of

nuclear weapons would be spread to others than the present members of the nuclear club.

One has often talked about totally irresponsible States. But in these days, when the news are filled with gruesome details of terrorist acts, one has reason to think of what it would mean if private groups, if terrorists, got hold of nuclear weapons.

Terrorists, now as in the past, show an utter contempt for human life and human values. In pursuing their goals, they are using fanatic methods which are totally inconsistent with all basic rules of a civilised society.

Many believe that it has now become quite possible that a terrorist group could be able to acquire a nuclear device. Very small nuclear bombs are being constructed, and one could even imagine that such weapons can be smuggled into a country. This development increases the risk that we might enter an era of nuclear terrorism.

This serves as a strong reminder of the awesome responsibility which rests with all of us for fighting nuclear proliferation, also as a part of the struggle against terrorism.

NPT and Obligations of Nuclear Weapon States

The Non-Proliferation Treaty is the most important political and legal instrument we have for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. And I do not hesitate to characterise the NPT as one of the most important international treaties signed since World War II.

It is now fifteen years since the Non-Proliferation Treaty entered into effect. The Review Conference which starts in this city in exactly two months will put the Treaty to its hardest test so far.

We all know that the non-proliferation regime has its flaws. Some actual nuclear weapon States and several potential ones are still outside the Treaty. Some States keep the option of acquiring nuclear weapons for the purpose of deterring other States in their region from acquiring such weapons themselves. Much has also been said about the discriminatory character of the NPT, the non-nuclears having done their share and the nuclear-weapon States not having fulfilled their obligations.

I will soon return to this question. But before doing so, I would like to add that, in spite of all its flaws, the Non-Proliferation Treaty has actually functioned in one very important way: no *new* nuclear weapon State has appeared since the Treaty was concluded. The misgivings of many people that a number of States would step over the nuclear threshold have not been borne out in these fifteen

years. And no less than some 130 States have become signatories to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. To sum up: the implementation of the undertakings by the non-nuclear weapon States has been adequate and satisfactory.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the undertakings in the Treaty of the nuclear weapon States with respect to vertical proliferation. This Treaty, solemnly signed and ratified by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, talks literally, in its preamble, about the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, about the liquidation of all their existing stockpiles, and about the elimination from national arsenals of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery. Article VI of the Treaty spells out the undertaking in detail: "... to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

That is a very clear language. Still, it does not seem to have been understood. If the authority is to remain with the Treaty, it is above all necessary that the nuclear weapon States, which have signed and ratified it, should also live up to the spirit and letter of their obligations. It is, in my opinion, the nuclear weapon States themselves that have the key to progress in the work to prevent both horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear arms.

Future of Civilisation is Concern of All States

It is therefore a welcome development now that the superpowers are sitting down together here in Geneva, talking bilaterally about eliminating nuclear weapons everywhere. But this is not a question for them alone. It concerns all States. Our common civilisation belongs to all nations, to all peoples, to present as well as to future generations. And therefore it is simply not acceptable that the future of our civilisation lies in the hands of only one or two or five nuclear weapon States.

This is the point which I would specifically like to make today. The non-nuclear weapon States together constitute the larger part of the world. The five States with nuclear arms have together some 1,500 million inhabitants. But there are twice as many people living outside the nuclear Powers. These non-nuclear countries want to maintain their independence, they want to preserve their national identity, they want to keep their self-determination. And last but not least: they want to survive physically.

President Alfonsín of Argentina has put it most directly: it is a question of our right to life. And therefore, we, the non-nuclears, must also have a say. We must have the right to demand that nuclear weapons are never used, that the nuclear arms race comes to a halt, and that a process of genuine disarmament is started.

Nuclear Weapons Do Not Enhance Security

I shall not hide the fact that I can understand how, in the face of the very discouraging results through the many years of disarmament talks, some nations feel that they have as much right as the present nuclear weapon States to arm themselves with these kinds of weapons. In fact, we had an extensive debate in my own country in the late 1950s about the advantages and disadvantages of acquiring nuclear weapons. After much deliberation, we finally came to the conclusion that a Swedish nuclear weapon would be detrimental for our own security. It would increase the risk of our neutral nation being involved at an early stage in an international armed conflict. As the then Swedish Prime Minister, Tage Erlander, said at the time about Swedish nuclear arms: "That which should be our protection could equally well be transformed into the greatest threat to our neutrality and our peace." Without nuclear weapons, we would stand a better chance of staying out of war. Our security - and probably also that of our neighbours - would be enhanced if we refrained from acquiring the atomic bomb. So even though we certainly had the technical capacity to build a nuclear weapon, we decided not to, and Sweden joined the NPT from the beginning.

Even if the arsenals of some of the present nuclear weapon States are smaller than those of others, this does not exonerate them from the awesome responsibility connected with possessing these weapons. This should also be contemplated by those who may now be planning to go nuclear. They would not increase their own security by acquiring these weapons. They would only decrease the security of all of us.

What Can Non-Nuclear Nations Do?

What, then, can a non-nuclear nation do instead to safeguard its security and independence?

The majority of the non-nuclears are poor countries. They need to develop their economies, and they need to meet very basic and simple needs like food and shelter. They definitely need to devote their scarce resources to civilian purposes, and not to military spending.

Many of the independent States on the earth are also very small States. There are sixty nations in the world with less than one million inhabitants. Most of them are Third World countries, and they are not only small but also economically weak. Their security dilemma is very real, vulnerable as they are. What should such a small State do to ensure its security?

Should it arm itself? It could do so, but how large an army can it afford when the price of a few tanks or aircraft might be higher than its whole government expenditure?

Or should it put its security in the hands of a more powerful neighbour, and perhaps lose some of its independence?

Or should it become an ally of one of the superpowers? This could make it part of the East-West conflict, and bring superpower confrontation to its region.

The security dilemma of these nations is a very real one. And whatever road they chose, they will always - as the rest of us - be potential victims of a nuclear exchange. And what can we do about that?

The allies of the major nuclear weapon States can try, within their respective alliances, to influence their leading partners.

But all of us can work together to seek to build a system of collective security. Such a system - as envisaged when the United Nations was born forty years ago - must first of all build on respect for international law. The territorial integrity of each nation must be guaranteed. But it must also be a system which recognises and promotes common interest, and which helps to avert common threats. To this end we must strengthen the peacekeeping role of the United Nations.

The most obvious common threat is the threat of nuclear war. Therefore, while seeking a system of collective security, it is also an urgent task to join forces in order to put pressure on the leading military Powers. We must make it perfectly clear to those with the power to decide about the use of nuclear weapons - as well as those who may plan to acquire such weapons - that they are not only gambling with the survival of their own countries. They are also putting our lives in jeopardy. They must be made to realise that they have a responsibility to us too.

Doctrine of Deterrence and Nuclear Proliferation

Three of the nuclear weapon States have in fact recognised this responsibility in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. They have undertaken to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament. But they have not lived up to this obligation: on the one hand, the non-nuclear weapon States that are parties to the Treaty have fulfilled *their* undertaking not to acquire nuclear weapons. The failure of the superpowers to comply with their treaty obligations may well endanger the future of the non-proliferation regime itself. The uncontrolled expansion of the nuclear arsenals, in contrast to the restraint with respect to horizontal proliferation, puts severe strains on the NPT.

The very fact that the nuclear Powers, in spite of their treaty obligations, continue to strengthen their nuclear weapons arsenals - and do so increasingly -

may also serve to legitimise these weapons as instruments of national security. And the risk is obvious that some non-nuclear weapon States may deem it justified to try to acquire nuclear arsenals of their own, both to deter a massive strike against civilian populations and to gain advantage in regional conflicts.

There is indeed a direct connection between the threat of proliferation and the dangers of deterrence which I was talking about earlier. The nuclear weapon States are in effect saying that they can achieve security by building nuclear weapons, that they can gain political advantage and that they can also prevent war. People in other countries have so far been less convinced of the benefits of nuclear deterrence. But as they too consider the option of proliferation, it becomes ever more urgent to understand the addictive instability of the deterrence doctrine.

Steps Toward Nuclear Disarmament

The struggle to avoid the threat of nuclear proliferation must be fought on many different levels. The most obvious step would be to conclude a comprehensive nuclear test ban. A treaty banning all nuclear weapon tests would be the single most important step to slow down the qualitative arms race. It would be a good complement to the bilateral negotiations by reducing the risk that cuts in the arsenals eventually agreed upon in the strategic talks would be nullified by the development of new nuclear systems. The work done by experts in my country in this field for a long time has convinced me that existing scientific and technical capabilities make it possible adequately to verify a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

There are many other steps which can be taken in the field of nuclear disarmament, to help uphold the non-proliferation regime. A halt to the development, production and deployment of all nuclear weapons would, in my view, be helpful in promoting negotiations on nuclear weapons. This is the main proposal in the Delhi Declaration, which was signed by six Heads of State and Heads of Government who met in the Indian capital in late January this year. The question of an immediate halt to the nuclear arms race has also been discussed in the United Nations, these discussions resulting in several resolutions on a nuclear freeze which were adopted by overwhelming majorities.

A ban on all space weapons would be another important contribution. Negative security assurances by the nuclear weapon Powers to the non-nuclear weapon States also belong here. The non-nuclears have every right to demand effective guarantees containing unequivocal undertakings by the nuclear weapon States that they will not attack or threaten to attack them with nuclear arms.

I spoke in the beginning of my statement of the risk of the very early use of, for instance, battlefield nuclear weapons. That is why I think that the idea of a

corridor in Central Europe free from such nuclear weapons is worthy of further exploration. There are several other suggestions - some of which can be taken up by the non-nuclear states themselves - aimed at avoiding nuclear confrontation and proliferation. These include the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, such as has been brought about through the Treaty of Tlatelolco in Latin America, and such as we are at the moment talking a great deal about among the Nordic countries here in Europe.

Only Security Is Common Security

It is our duty, as political leaders, to use as much as we can of our energy to try to find solutions of this kind. If the work we do could be just a tiny contribution to a general public demand for a halt to nuclear proliferation, even such an effort would be something to be proud of. I am personally convinced that the repeated threats from both sides, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the continued arms race that has ensued, the threat of the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, all these factors do not make people feel any more secure. I also think that those who look for an alternative to deterrence in a technological breakthrough which, ultimately, will result in an absolutely infallible system will seek in vain. I believe that this is an illusion. It is in fact a fruitless search for an illusion of safety, which will again lead to increased insecurity for all of us.

Security and protection from annihilation by nuclear weapons cannot be reached by further technological innovations. The placing of greater emphasis on destructive technology cannot give any lasting security. It is only we human beings, in agreement with each other, who can provide that security, a common security. What we require is a security system which is achieved in cooperation with other nations, and not at their expense. We require political, negotiated innovations. The only answer to the increasing threat of nuclear proliferation and the present danger of nuclear war is, therefore, to initiate a process of international disarmament, in forms which do not favour either side, but which ensure better security for all.

Need for Leadership

A word at last about leadership in world affairs.

The nuclear Powers play a unique role in today's world: unique in comparison with other nations, and unique also in a historical perspective.

These Powers, and particularly the two superpowers, control larger resources than any two nations ever have had before. They have at their disposal technological facilities without comparison. But above all: they can kill us all, their military might can extinguish all mankind from the face of the earth.

One can ask for what purpose this unique concentration of power is used. We can see how the superpowers treat their small neighbours - how they brutally invade them or declare that they wish to get rid of their elected governments. One is given the impression that the internal affairs of these small countries is a decisive problem in the world today, a major threat to the security of the Great Powers. Hardly anybody else sees it that way.

We can see how little attention - if any - they pay to the desperate needs of the poor countries in the Third World. They are dismissed as victims of the colonisation of the past, or to the magic of the market place.

Above all, we can see how they continue their armaments, now reaching also into outer space, in a deadly race which, if continued, can only end in a catastrophe.

This accumulation of destructive machinery, as Willy Brandt pointed out in his Third World Prize lecture in April, is actually killing people without the arms being used, because it eats up the money without which people are condemned to death through starvation. The billions of dollars which the world spends on military purposes this year, Brandt said, really amount to a death sentence for millions of human beings.

What I have said now has perhaps been harsh and somewhat unfair words. But I believe that there is serious lack of leadership in the world today. The Great Powers do not provide it, they tend to aggravate the problems instead of solving them. They tend to deal with peripheral issues and their own confrontation around the globe and above it, thus avoiding the fundamental problems of disarmament and development which are the key to long-range peace and security.

New Opportunities

Smaller and medium-sized nations cannot provide this leadership. But they can at least, in all humility, point out the absurdities and raise voices of sanity. They can act together and thus take a joint responsibility for our common future.

I have already said that in matters of nuclear weapons, the non-nuclears must also have a say. It is all very well that here in Geneva bilateral talks are going on, with the aim of halting and reversing the nuclear arms race. But these talks have so far produced nothing. And we who are on the outside, but who are as affected by the outcome as the negotiating parties, definitely have the right to expect more.

An active participation in the work of international organisations - especially the United Nations - is a cornerstone in a practical policy of common security. To help uphold the respect for international law is another. To put more emphasis

on multilateral security solutions is the best way of helping the process of cooperation for common survival.

This, again, directly connects with the theme of this colloquium. To sustain such a process, concrete disarmament measures must be taken. In the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the parties - including the major nuclear weapon States - have made a contractual undertaking to negotiate in good faith on effective disarmament measures. And this is also the only possible answer to the international security dilemma.

This may seem a hopeless endeavour at times, in the face of the discouraging state of international affairs. But we should remember that the opportunities are larger now than ever before. It may be easy to forget these opportunities when we face the terrible threats to our common future. But these threats have been created by man. They can also be eliminated by man. And behind and beyond these threats lie the new, great opportunities. Never before have there been so large resources available for creating a livable world for all: the economic resources, the technological development, our own knowledge of how people and societies work and function.

UNITED NATIONS MUST BE PERMITTED TO SUCCEED

Statement in the United Nations General Assembly on October 21, 1985, on the Occasion of the Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary of the United Nations

Let me at the outset from this rostrum convey this message from the people of Sweden and their elected representatives to all assembled here: We believe in this Organisation and we are committed to it. We are all aware of the problems of the Organisation and can look back at both failures and successes. But the experience of forty years has not weakened our dedication to the purposes and principles laid down in the Charter (of the United Nations). And, more important, we look at our world today and remain convinced that the United Nations is only at the beginning of its history.

Let us not make the United Nations the scapegoat for problems that reflect our own shortcomings.

It is not the United Nations that has not lived up to us. It is we who have not lived up to the ideals of the United Nations. It is by improving ourselves and our policies that we can improve the United Nations.

Eliminate the Nuclear Threat

The United Nations is contemporary with the atomic bomb. During the forty years it has been our common fate to live under the nuclear threat, under the risk of total destruction of civilised life on earth.

There is no more urgent task than to try to reduce, and ultimately eliminate, this risk. Negotiations have produced some concrete results. But by and large the nuclear arms race continues unabated. The main responsibility for halting and reversing this ominous process falls on the nuclear Powers themselves. However, as pointed out in the Five Continent Delhi Declaration, during the last forty years, almost imperceptibly, every nation and human being has lost ultimate control over their own life and death.

Many countries are technically able to produce nuclear weapons. When they have decided to forego this option, it has been in the knowledge that they would not increase their own security but decrease the security of all. Many of us have formally committed ourselves by acceding to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) which was brought about by the joint efforts of the two leading nuclear Powers. We are now entitled to demand that the nuclear Powers fulfil in the near future their part of the deal, that is, measures of real disarmament and,

as a first step, a comprehensive test ban treaty.

We also have to make it perfectly clear to the nuclear Powers that although there were, at the time, no international rules prohibiting them from acquiring these awful weapons they should certainly not consider themselves free to put them to use at their own discretion. The non-nuclear countries, which would also suffer death and destruction in case of nuclear war, have a legitimate claim to make their voices heard and to discuss, with the nuclear Powers, ways and means to reduce the risk of the planet being blown up, be it by mistake or adventurous calculation.

Any use of nuclear weapons would be deeply reprehensible. One can speak of an international norm which is gradually gaining acceptance. Time has come to consider whether mankind should not begin to study, in earnest, how this utter moral reprobation could be translated into binding international agreements. We should consider the possibility to prohibit in international law the use of nuclear weapons as part of a process leading to general and complete disarmament.

Strengthen the United Nations

The United Nations offers a machinery for cooperation between the large and the many smaller States in the world. It offers every nation an opportunity to participate in the work for peace and a better future.

The veto has far too often prevented the Security Council from taking action. The cure does not lie in the abrogation of this rule, but in the creation of an international climate in which the leading Powers recognise the necessity, also in their own interests, to reduce tensions between themselves and to take collective action against disturbances of the peace.

Much can be done within the Charter to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to maintain peace and prevent conflict. The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues has put forward some proposals. The Secretary-General has in his annual reports described several concrete ways to strengthen the United Nations, and he should have our full support in his admirable efforts to improve the Organisation's functioning.

The Nordic countries have presented concrete proposals in this regard. The potential of the United Nations could be better used if actions were taken early to prevent conflicts. The Secretary-General should be given full cooperation by all members of the Security Council for a more active role of the Organisation in this field. In this regard the possibility of peacekeeping operations, not only to contain but also to prevent conflicts, should be considered.

The United Nations has financial problems. Let me say quite frankly that it is deeply disturbing that the United Nations should have to struggle year after year

with these difficulties. The sums involved are small according to any yardstick. The United Nations system cannot possibly be a heavy financial burden to any country. Selective withholding of assessed contributions and refusal to participate in the financing of certain United Nations activities do not reflect an economic necessity but a political consideration on the part of some countries.

Ideas have been put forward to reduce the maximum share of the assessed contributions that any one member State is required to pay. A more even distribution of the assessed contributions would better reflect the fact that this Organisation is the instrument of all nations and make it less dependent on contributions from any single member State. In that case the rest of us would have to shoulder a somewhat greater financial responsibility. Sweden, for its part, is ready to participate in discussions to explore these ideas.

Observe the Rules of International Law

Peace is, of course, the fundamental aim of the United Nations. We have come to recognise that peace is, certainly, more than absence of military violence. It is also stability in relations between States, based on the observance of legal principles. One field where cooperation between States is absolutely necessary is the fight against terrorism in all its forms, these cruel slayings of innocent civilians.

The rule of law is of vital importance to peaceful international relations. In particular, this is strongly felt in smaller countries. When the integrity and independence of one small country is violated, it sends a vibration of anger and anxiety through the hearts and minds of citizens in other small countries. For them, the rule of law and the observance of our common commitments under the Charter are seen as imperatives of a future in peace and security.

My own country has experienced serious violations of its territorial integrity. To us this has brought home the seriousness of breaches of international law.

Article 51 of the Charter entitles a member State to self-defence if subjected to armed attack. Unfortunately this provision has many times been twisted to justify all kinds of military action. Should we continue on this road, the prohibition of the use of force, which is basic to the United Nations system, will become a farce and the law of the jungle will become legitimised. You may sympathise with the motives behind some of these actions. They may serve national security interests, as perceived by the different States. They may be caused by provocation from others. And they may be very popular among the citizens and voters of the respective countries.

But the fact remains that these acts break the rules of international law and infringe in some way or another upon the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States.

In such situations, we must react and protest, in the interest of world peace and international law, but in the long run also in our own interest.

This is not a question of working against anyone's interests, of favouring one Power over another. It is simply a question of upholding certain rules and laws which are there for the benefit of all.

Human Rights, Debt Crisis and Problem Of Racism

In our era of growing international interdependence we have to recognise that threats to peace frequently originate from conditions inside the countries. Misery, hunger, denial of basic human rights are the causes of political and social upheaval.

Many speakers at this session of the General Assembly have voiced their concern over the world debt crisis. I share this concern. We sense a growing rebellion among the debtor countries against what they perceive as a lack of fairness in the international economic structure. Demands for internal adjustment efforts are testing the limits of political tolerance.

We cannot allow heavy debt burden to tear at the fabric of society. Relations between the developed and the developing countries must always be based on the realities of economic and political interdependence. The solution of the debt crisis will be a test case of the possibilities for a sensible cooperation between North and South.

Brutal violations of human rights occur in many countries, but in South Africa they are written into the very laws of the country. In this way, the policy of apartheid is unique in all its moral abomination. Apartheid is doomed, as is South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. While fearing that it will end in a chaos of destruction and bloodshed, for which the white regime will bear the full responsibility, we should not abandon hope that a peaceful transition to a non-racial, democratic society might still be possible through dialogue and agreement. And it is the duty of the outside world to assist this struggle for freedom, *inter alia*, by applying sanctions.

We are witnessing massive migrations on an unprecedented scale, between States and between continents. The reasons are many - hunger, war, natural disasters, persecution amongst them. The cultural clashes that are inevitable in this process have led in many countries to a renewal of chauvinism and racism. It is time that we become more attentive to this particular danger. We are helped in this task by the rising anger, enthusiasm and readiness to act that are demonstrated by some people in the younger generations. It does honour to them, in this International Youth Year, that they have adopted the watchword "Don't touch my pal". There are many adults, in and out of government, who

should do well to listen and take notice.

No Alternative to International Cooperation

For many people around the world, the United Nations stands for something very concrete, a significant element in their personal everyday life.

A child in Africa learns to read in UNESCO-financed²¹ school. A farmer in Asia receives a sack of seed labelled FAO²² or WFP.²³ UNDP,²⁴ with its technical projects, touches almost every developing country in the world. Refugees in all continents are protected by the activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Women fighting for equality and dignity are encouraged by discussions in United Nations fora such as the recent Nairobi Conference. Many civilians in many countries have felt more secure due to the presence of United Nations peacekeeping forces. If, as we sincerely hope, the initiative taken by WHO²⁵ and UNICEF²⁶ to immunise children in the world against serious infectious diseases by 1990 is crowned with success, innumerable families will think of the United Nations as a benefactor.

Many of the people who have such direct experience of what the United Nations stands for may have scant knowledge of the intricacies of Great Power politics and the workings of the United Nations organs. But they instinctively feel that the United Nations is essential, in various ways, to their wellbeing, perhaps to their survival. It can be hoped that they will form, over time, a much needed United Nations constituency, that they will make their voices heard, claiming a say, demanding that power politics, high over their heads, do not jeopardise their lives.

But there is already now a large United Nations constituency. It is all those people who believe in the United Nations as an idea. There are tendencies, in times of cynical power politics, to underestimate this idea. But it carries a strong moral force. All people who believe in international cooperation, in peaceful solutions of conflicts, in solidarity with others, make up this force.

There are groups and organisations in many countries which actively work for the recognition of the imperative of peace. A fine example is the Nobel Peace Prize-winning International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. Their members, doctors all over the world, say that there is no cure for the effects of

²¹ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

²² Food and Agriculture Organisation

²³ World Food Programme

²⁴ United Nations Development Programme

²⁵ World Health Organisation

²⁶ United Nations Children's Fund. The acronym is from its former name, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

nuclear war. The only way is prevention.

The United Nations must be permitted to succeed, succeed in the efforts to promote peace and disarmament, succeed in preventing ecological catastrophe, succeed in the fight against hunger and deprivation. There is simply no alternative to international cooperation. Only through joint endeavours can we hope to move from common fear to common security.

SWEDEN'S SECURITY POLICY

Address to the Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm, December 12, 1985

When the Social Democratic Government took office in October 1982, I, on behalf of the whole Government, made a statement on the direction of our policy. It began with a section on Sweden's security policy:

"The Government will pursue the policy of neutrality with firmness and determination. This independent policy supported by a strong defence relative to our situation contributes to the calm and stability in northern Europe. Should war threaten, this policy will help us to keep the peace.

"Swedish territory will be protected against violations with all available means. Confidence in our will and ability to preserve neutrality must be maintained. No fears nor expectations may be aroused that Sweden will even under strong external pressure abandon its policy of neutrality."

What I said on October 8, 1982, is an expression of the firmness and consistency with which Sweden's policy of neutrality is pursued. We will maintain this direction in the future too.

We follow this security policy line because we believe that it best serves the purpose of safeguarding our country's independence, our democratic social order and our right to determine our own future.

Neutrality Policy Requires Strong Defence

It is a basic principle that the policy of neutrality must never be pursued in a way that can create expectations on the one side or apprehensions on the other of deviations from the chosen line of action.

This is a rule that bears repeating and continually recalling. We must be extremely mindful of the confidence in our declared intention out in the world and not even under strong external pressure abandon our policy of neutrality, never become an outpost of one or the other military alliance.

In a time when strategic interest in our part of Europe has increased, there is all the more reason to observe always this cardinal rule of neutrality policy.

Sweden's policy of neutrality shall bear the mark of steadfastness. One should be able to rely on the non-aligned Swedish line. It is important that this policy

be underpinned by a strong defence relative to our situation. But however strong our defence is will be of little use if the world around us begins to doubt our non-alignment. The possibilities of pursuing an independent policy of neutrality would then be limited and the risk of our being drawn into a possible conflict would increase. That is why our foreign policy is always our first line of defence.

Confidence in our policy of neutrality requires that we are prepared for, and capable of, defending our territory.

Our defence shall be of such strength that whoever plans to direct an attack on Sweden should think twice on account of the risks such an enterprise would involve - and decide to desist since the price would be too high.

Every year we allocate a considerable part of the resources of the Swedish national economy to be used for purposes of maintaining this strength. Very few in our country advocate unilateral Swedish disarmament. The Swedish Social Democratic Party has always opposed such disarmament, and has always been prepared to take responsibility for the country's defence...

We have an army of conscripts which enables us to mobilise at short notice a defence force of imposing size, even compared with many larger nations. In just a few days we can have 850,000 men prepared to take on tasks they have both training and equipment for.

We have one of the finest civil defences in the world, with comprehensive programmes for production of gas masks and construction of shelters. A further 300,000 persons would serve in the civil defence in the event of war, including 100,000 voluntary Home Guard representatives.

We are paying 40 billion Swedish kroner to be able to manufacture a new advanced aircraft which in a 1990s environment can handle a number of different combat missions as well as modern foreign counterparts.

And we ourselves produce most of what our defence needs in order to be independent as far as possible in this area too. In addition to aircraft, this applies to armoured vehicles, missiles, submarines and much else.

One of the tasks of the Swedish defence is also to contribute towards the safeguarding of our territory in peacetime. We are determined to turn away with all available means those who violate our territory, our air space or our waters. We set great store by our territorial integrity. We are and shall be the masters of our own house. This is also an essential part of the Swedish policy of neutrality.

Strengthening of Anti-Submarine Defence

During the past three years steadfastness in this policy has been put to the test. At the time of the change of government in 1982 the Navy was carrying out an intensive search for foreign submarines in Harsfjarden and adjoining waters. In April 1983, the Submarine Defence Commission made public its assessment that it was Soviet submarines that had violated Swedish territory. On the same day the Government lodged the strongest protests against the Soviet Union.

Since then, in his quarterly reports, the Supreme Commander has recorded observations and indications leading to the conclusion that foreign submarine activity has also taken place after 1982. The difference is that despite persistent attempts it has not been possible in this case to determine the nationality. The preconditions have therefore not existed for taking diplomatic action against any individual State.

Work on submarine defence and related issues has been strengthened in three important areas in recent years...

Already in October 1982, I made it clear in a special statement that the Swedish Government has the possibility of ordering the military forces to sink a foreign submarine in Swedish waters. I said that anyone considering violation of Swedish territory should take into account that the Government will avail itself of this possibility. This statement fully applies also today.

There has been and there still is consensus on Swedish policy in these aspects. Appropriations to submarine defence are based on a four-party agreement between the Government and the Opposition. There has also been and there still is agreement on these issues between the political leaders and the defence leaders. We have close and trusting cooperation with the Supreme Commander and his colleagues...

Our determination is not only being expressed in a tightening-up of the rules for action against violations but also in a much stronger effort to increase our capacity in this respect.

The strengthening that has taken place does not mean, however, that we can issue any guarantee that there will not be any violations of Swedish territory in the future. No country can give such guarantees, not even the best armed of the world's superpowers.

This is a pure statement of fact. Consequently, it does not signify any lessening of the seriousness of what has taken place up to now, and on which the Supreme Commander has reported. And I can assure you that we will continue to take powerful action against all violations of our territory.

We have made our measures public in the area of submarine defence. This means that we know that anyone who contemplates illicitly crossing Swedish

territorial borders is now aware that our possibilities of intervening have increased and will increase still more.

Everyone knows that we have new rules which mean that these options can quickly be used and that the military forces may come to sink a foreign submarine in Swedish waters. Everyone knows that we have new equipment which is more effective than the old as regards achieving success in anti-submarine operations.

And everyone is aware of the importance Swedish public opinion attaches to anti-submarine defence and how important it is for relations with our country that they desist from engaging in violations of our territory.

We have clear indications that other countries are aware of this. And even more important we know that the world around us realises that the Swedish policy of neutrality stands firm.

Relations with the Soviet Union

The grave submarine violations by the Soviet Union during 1981 and 1982, as well as the approach by aircraft to the island of Gotland in the summer of 1984, put strains on our relations with the Soviet Union.

We did not hesitate to protest strongly against the Soviet encroachment. We do not bend in questions of our own sovereignty. And we consider it best for all parties that our viewpoints are put forward in the form of a free exchange of opinion. I said at last year's Social Democratic Party Congress that we shall have sufficient self-confidence to look the Great Power straight in the eye.

This implies of course that we shall be able to visit each other and state our opinion, both on questions that concern the vital interests of our country and in a mutual exchange of viewpoints on what takes place in the world around us.

We want good and stable relations with the Soviet Union. It is clearly in Sweden's objective interests to have regular contacts with representatives of this nation. This applies to a number of areas, for example trade, culture and science. We have nothing to gain from diminishing relations that are to our mutual benefit. This also applies to the political arena.

This spring I will make an official visit to the Soviet Union on the invitation of that country's Government.²⁷ In Moscow I will say that we in Sweden want good relations with their country. I will emphasise that these relations must be built on a foundation of mutual respect for our territorial integrity. And I am convinced that such a visit is in accord with the wish of a broad majority of the

²⁷ The visit did not take place as Mr. Palme was assassinated in February 1986.

Swedish people for good and friendly contacts with all our neighbours.

Risk of War in Europe May Have Decreased

Sweden's security policy aims to safeguard our independence. In the event of war in our vicinity, we will do our utmost to keep out of it. But also part of this policy is seeking to contribute towards preventing armed conflicts from breaking out at all. Participation in the work for peace and reconciliation in the world, pursuing a policy of international solidarity, are also important parts of our security policy.

Against this background it is important to try to analyse and estimate from time to time what risk of war there is, in our own vicinity and on a global level, and what it is in different conceivable patterns of events that can directly affect us here in Sweden.

Last spring the 1984 Defence Committee presented its report on Sweden's security policy: entering the 1990s. The Committee stated that the North European and North Atlantic area has become of increased strategic importance and that the Great Powers are therefore showing a growing interest in developments in our part of the world. Increased military activity on the part of both blocs is to be observed in our border areas. To this may be added military technical development. Tactical aircraft have acquired increased range, low-flying cruise missiles are being deployed which can cross our air space, strategic and operative mobility has increased, and submarine technology has developed rapidly.

But this increased interest, this increased tendency to move in close and the more advanced technology are not tantamount to an increased risk of war.

An isolated attack on Sweden is improbable. The military threat to Sweden continues to be essentially connected to the situation as a whole between the power blocs.

The great threat to our survival is the nuclear threat. If an atomic war should break out, no human anywhere can be sure of surviving.

What our defence planning mainly directed at is an attempt to make use of our country in connection with conflicts that flare up or are in progress in other parts of our continent, primarily in Central Europe.

And the question is, what can we say today about the probability of such a conflict in Europe, a conventional war in our part of the world?

The Defence Committee says in its report that the Great Powers have a mutual interest in attempting to get out of the impasse that East-West relations entered

during the first years of the 1980s. They are trying to limit antagonisms so that they will not directly jeopardise stability in Europe and other vital areas. Manifest caution is observed, anything that might jeopardise peace in Europe is avoided, and methods and means have been procured both for handling crises and to be capable of settling acute crises - e.g. the modernisation and development of the "hot line" as also the treaties on avoidance of incidents at sea.

The overall assessment is that a war between the power blocs in Europe as a result of considered decisions to attack in order to win a victory in Europe in its entirety is improbable.

In my opinion this is a correct enough assessment. And I think the conclusion to be drawn from the stability in our continent must be that the risk of a conventional war in this area has decreased rather than increased.

The probability may have increased of our being drawn in at an early stage in the event of a conventional war in Europe. But it is equally essential that the risk of this large-scale war breaking out at all has not increased. The opposite may even be the case.

Five Areas of Concern For Security

Earlier this autumn I made speeches in public on the importance of close cooperation between the Nordic States and the States of Europe. At present there is special reason to emphasise how important the European process is, which is being expressed in the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and in which together with other neutral and non-aligned States we are playing an important role. This is very much connected with the political side of the stability in our part of the world. In connection with the United Nations fortieth anniversary, I spoke in detail on membership of the United Nations as a cornerstone of Sweden's foreign policy.

But without wishing to underestimate the importance for our security of what takes place in Europe and our own vicinity, I should like to take this opportunity of also looking at some other developing tendencies in the world around us from a security point of view.

I shall mention five areas which are of obvious importance for the security of the whole world, in the short or long term. All five cases apply to us in Sweden too. I refer to the nuclear arms race, the economic conditions of the poor countries, the degradation of the environment, human rights and international law.

Effects of Nuclear War

This year we have honoured the memory of the many innocent victims of the dropping of the first atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki forty years ago. Hiroshima and Nagasaki symbolise to us the incomprehensible, the unprecedented which must never be repeated. Nuclear weapons have once and for all changed the face of war.

From the catastrophe in Japan in 1945 we have learnt what the heat and the shock wave and the radioactive radiation can do. People are still dying there today from damage and illness that afflicted them four decades ago.

In recent years our knowledge of the effects of nuclear weapons has been dramatically widened. Representatives of different sciences and professions have submitted the results of research that give essentially the same picture. A nuclear war has not just terrifying immediate effects. It also contains long-term consequences that can destroy our earth and irrevocably affect the conditions for all human life on our planet.

The studies around the nuclear winter have marked a new era. It has been reported how enormous amounts of smoke and particles of soot would rise into the atmosphere from all the fires which would follow upon a nuclear war. It would be dark, and it would be cold, for weeks or months.

And among the most terrible things that would follow from all this is the effect on the world's agricultural production. Distinguished scientists claim that a reduction in temperature of four to five degrees would be sufficient to cut down drastically the possibilities of producing crops and pasture. In countries which do not have large stores of foods, a starvation disaster would ensue very quickly. More people would presumably die of starvation in India than of direct effects of a nuclear war in the Soviet Union and the United States, according to the most recent of these scientific studies.

Our stores of food would keep us going for a while but a shortage of food would gradually become acute here too. And it is said that a future nuclear war would not produce a spectacle like Hiroshima or Nagasaki - but like Ethiopia. Famine will claim most victims.

It has thus become possible for us humans not only to annihilate an enemy but also all others living on this planet.

We can kill animals and plants, we can destroy towns and villages, we can devastate all that has been built up over the generations around the whole of our earth.

And above all: We can destroy the future of our entire civilisation, devastate all that would have come after us.

This is the role of nuclear weapons if they are used.

The results of scientific research all lead to the same conclusion: A nuclear war can hit all peoples and all States, including those who are farthest away from the direct theatre of war.

We Must Demand Action on Disarmament

But it also means that all peoples and all nations have a just right to have some say in the matter when it comes to these weapons of mass destruction. We who live in the nuclear-free States are a clear majority of the world's population. But our future also - Sweden's future as that of all other countries - is manifestly threatened by the nuclear arms race. It is therefore our right and our obligation to be firm and make demands - demands that real disarmament in the nuclear weapon area finally be commenced. I am therefore convinced that the whole of the Swedish people supports the idea that we should vigorously participate in arousing public opinion for international disarmament.

I have myself tried to make such a contribution by participating together with Heads of State and Government from five other countries in the so-called Five Continent Peace Initiative. We have demanded a ban on continued nuclear armament, and we have especially stressed the importance of preventing an arms race in outer space and of bringing about a total ban on all nuclear tests.

In my opinion it is fruitless to invest large resources in a defence system in space which in all probability would never function, which instead would lead to continued armament on both sides, which would tear up valid international treaties, and which would mean a gigantic waste of resources that should be used to combat poverty in the world.

On the test ban issue, the participants in the Five Continent Peace Initiative have themselves offered to contribute to an effective control that the test ban be truly observed. We in Sweden have long been working to bring into existence an international control system, and we know that with one, even small nuclear explosions would be detected.

We who are participating in this Initiative have often been surprised at the sympathy for our views that we have met with around the world. Our proposals have not been especially original. Similar views and requests have been put forward at the General Assembly of the United Nations for several years. But what we have done has been to underscore especially how we, who do not have any nuclear weapons, are also directly involved, and that we therefore also have a right to influence.

Representatives of our country have therefore put forward or supported in

different forums a number of proposals in the area of disarmament:

- on a freeze of nuclear weapons;
- on a complete test ban;
- on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons;
- on non-first use of nuclear weapons;
- on a corridor free from battlefield nuclear weapons in Central Europe;
- on a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic region;
- on the marine arms race;
- on biological and chemical weapons;
- on radiological weapons;
- on especially inhumane weapons;
- and on confidence- and security-building measures.

We are working for these proposals, not because they further any individual nation's or pact's interests, but because they promote the common security of us all.

A few weeks ago, President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev said in their joint statement in Geneva that they had "agreed that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought."

It is really quite a dramatic statement. It means that both sides admit that nuclear weapons are useless in a military context. This arouses hopes that must not be disappointed. It should be possible to perceive the statement as a joint signal that the nuclear arms race should now at last be turned into disarmament. But neither in Geneva nor afterwards have the two recorded any concrete conclusions in this direction. Yet it is this we must set our hopes on. But it is more than this. It is something that all of us in the nuclear-free States in fact have a moral right to demand.

Environmental Degradation

The scientists who worked on the issue of what will happen on the earth if a nuclear war should break out have made exceedingly important contributions to the international debate on how peace is to be assured. This applies not least to the organisation, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which received the Nobel Peace Prize last Tuesday in Oslo.

But scientists in other disciplines who are following changes in the environment today have also important things to say.

For, even without a nuclear catastrophe, our countryside and our environment are being exposed to strains, changes and degradation that may also ultimately threaten peace, directly or indirectly, in many regions.

It will soon be twenty years since Hans Palmstierna wrote in his book *Plundring svalt forgiftning* (Plunder Famine Contamination) that "the earth is a small globe with a limited surface area... People must be made aware that the world is an entity in which all parts are inseparably connected to each other and dependent on each other." Palmstierna himself pioneered the spreading of this conviction. It had a certain international breakthrough in connection with the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972.

Today, the scientists are telling us about the role of environmental degradation in the emergence of international conflicts. One example is the refugee problem which in several cases is the result of deforestation, soil erosion and other environmental damage.

Another example is the recurring disputes concerning the best fishing waters which many countries want to use, perhaps instead of waters which, as a result of environmental degradation, no longer give the same hauls as they once did.

There are several examples of conflicts between countries about the use of waters from boundary rivers and boundary lakes, especially in areas where access to fresh water is otherwise very limited.

Devastation of the tropical rain forests directly affects us here in Sweden, since it is from precisely these forests that we get much of the genetic material for our highly processed agriculture and for our production of pharmaceutical preparations.

An example that perhaps lies closer in time is the ongoing acidification of soil and water in Sweden which threatens to disturb seriously the basis of our economy and also our health.

I do not want to assert that these emissions, which come in over our country, should jeopardise peace in our part of the world. But they illustrate equally as well as the other examples that we are facing a number of problems that none of us can solve alone. International cooperation and an international joint responsibility is required in order to get the better of the threats to the environment. If we cannot agree on cooperation and joint responsibility, the forests will be ravaged and die, the waters will be contaminated and the soil destroyed. Then clearly tensions between the countries involved will grow and the risk of desperate measures will continually increase.

The conclusion is, once again, that organised international cooperation is required. Environmental issues must be given much bigger scope in discussions on the relations between different countries. And there is no time to lose. Acidification will not cease pending the crystallisation of the forms for such cooperation. Environmental degradation goes on every day.

For many people this has become something of an existential question, not least for the young. I notice this very tangibly in my daily work, in the letters and essays that schoolchildren send to me. Let me, as a break in the text, take just one example. Linda Hedlund in class 2-3b in Tunets school in Borlange writes:

Thoughts about the future

The rich shall give to the poor.
There shall never be war in the world.
It shall always be warm.
And all animals shall be allowed to live.
And all exhaust emissions shall disappear
and instead there shall be horses.
If this should be, my future will be fine.

Growing Burden of Indebtedness

Eight years ago, Willy Brandt asked a group of men and women from different parts of the world to get together to study what he called "the biggest social challenge of our time."

It was then that the Independent Commission on International Development Issues was formed to go through the whole question of economic relations between North and South, between rich and poor countries. Willy Brandt considered that these relations were as important for the future of humanity as arresting the arms race.

In the report that his commission submitted a few years later, we put much work into describing the mutual connections between countries in different parts of the world. We showed that a successful economic development in developing countries is also useful to us in the rich, industrialised countries. We described how an opposite development constitutes a serious threat to stability in the world, and in the long term to international peace and security. And we proposed massive transfers of resources to the poor States in forms which in the long term would benefit all of us.

The Brandt Commission was really first in international debate to point out the curse of the growing burden of indebtedness. And not many really listened. The proposals are far from being realised.

Now, six years later, many are saying that this is the great threat to the future. I noticed this particularly in connection with the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations this autumn.

Let me refer to a speech given by the President of Peru, Mr. Alan Garcia, who in a dramatic way reflected some of the feelings that exist among the indebted developing countries. He said that in Peru they are obliged to buy corn from the United States to use as fodder for chickens which they were obliged to breed in order to send on to the Soviet Union in payment of their debt to that country. Thus, what is happening is that a country threatened by famine has to pay off its foreign debt with food. "We are just a stopping-place for goods being transported from one Power to another," said Alan Garcia. He meant that it was impossible, with the rules that applied, to pay off the country's foreign debt without getting caught up in domestic violence and destitution. We are facing a dramatic choice, said Garcia: We must choose between debt and democracy. And in his United Nations speech the President of Peru maintained that his country can only use ten percent of its export earnings for payment of its foreign debt.

I do not wish to recommend the method advocated by Alan Garcia in his UN speech. But it was worth listening to as an expression of a feeling of powerlessness and anger in the face of the situation that a growing burden of indebtedness and increasing destitution is causing in his country.

In less than a decade, practically from the time the Independent Commission was initiated by Brandt, the burden of indebtedness of the developing countries has increased almost five-fold. Today it amounts to approximately 7,000 billion Swedish kroner. It is almost exactly the equivalent of the world's military expenditures during one year. The indebted countries have to use almost a quarter of their total export earnings for payment of debts. For a number of States the figure is much higher.

The effects of the growing debts are now becoming more perceptible. Imports are being reduced and investments slowed down with the aim of carrying out a necessary adaptation. Exports are impeded on account of a lack of inputs. Long-term development efforts are put to one side when short-term economic survival is at stake.

Up to now it has been possible to handle the debt problems without causing the collapse of the international financial system. Among other things, this is surely due to the fact that we have had a relatively good growth in the world economy in the past two years, which has sustained the export earnings of the developing countries.

Also, many of the heavily indebted countries have carried out very extensive adaptation themselves. But this has been at the cost of great sacrifices in many poor countries. It has had social consequences in the form of increased unemployment and a lowered standard of living. Now that the growth in the world economy is slowing down, the problems may become still more aggravated. In several indebted countries, large parts of the population are

already living on the brink of starvation. In some regions, the governments have decreased subsidies to basic foods and drastically reduced investments in education and health service. And it is natural that this hits the poorest groups in the respective countries the hardest.

For a number of the very poorest countries these problems obviously cannot be solved through continual renegotiations of foreign loans alone. That is merely delaying the issue and time is certainly not on the side of these countries. It is no use counting on the ability of the poor countries by their own efforts to raise through exports the foreign currency earnings needed to pay back the loans.

What is needed is political initiatives for a well-thought-out and long-term strategy in the area of debts:

- A strategy which bears in mind that the high international level of interest rates makes today's burden of indebtedness too heavy to bear.

- A strategy that takes into account that the developing countries must be able to produce in order to be able to export.

- A strategy which is based on the recognition that all parties - developing countries and industrial countries, as also banks and international financial institutions - have contributed through their actions to the situation in which we find ourselves.

As we said in the Brandt Commission, we are all dependent on something being done about the international economic inequality. We therefore all have a joint responsibility to try to solve these problems. We must all make sacrifices. The burden cannot be unilaterally placed on the indebted countries. The international commercial banks must also accept some of the costs. The United States Secretary of the Treasury has recently put forward a plan for tackling the debt problems. It should be welcomed if it means that one is prepared for more joint solutions.

A number of different measures will be needed:

1. Growth in the world economy must be maintained at a sufficiently high level. This is the only way the poor countries can find markets for their exports.

2. The markets in the industrial countries must remain open to the products of developing countries. Protectionist forces must be restrained.

3. Adaptation in the developing countries must be based to a lesser extent than up to now on restraint only and more on measures which promote

growth and long-term solvency.

4. We in the rich countries must be prepared to put new credit at the disposal of the developing countries, and also to pursue an economic policy aimed at reducing the international level of interest rates.

5. Direct debt relief must also be contemplated in the future when other measures are inadequate. In the first place it should take the form of consolidation of the debts of individual countries.

Some of the poorest countries are already in such an exposed position that it is difficult to see how they will be able to pay back their loans in the foreseeable future. Extraordinary measures are required, preferably in the form of an internationally co-ordinated programme based on increased assistance efforts both bilaterally and multilaterally. Whether it would be possible to give these countries softer terms when their debts are renegotiated should also be deliberated.

During the discussions of the 1970s about a New International Economic Order, Sweden put forward several proposals of debt relief for the poorest countries. Most of the other industrial countries concurred in this Swedish initiative at the United Nations conference in 1978.

In this year's development assistance budget (of Sweden), 400 million kroner were earmarked for a so-called balance of payments support. The money will be used as additional support to, among others, countries in which Sweden is involved in development cooperation programmes and which are trying to settle their foreign debt as part of their own adaptation programmes. The Government now intends to proceed by actively seeking to contribute towards internationally co-ordinated action in the area of debt. For this purpose we will appropriate money in the development assistance budget for co-ordinated support to the poorest countries.

The dialogue between industrial and developing countries during the 1970s was about a New International Economic Order, a long-term development in the broadest sense. Today the dialogue is largely about how to collect monthly interest payable. Stiff requirements of rapid domestic adaptation are imposed by banks and the IMF and the governments of rich countries. This is met by a growing opposition on the part of the indebted countries, which see it as yet another expression of the injustice of the international economic system.

I believe that there is a danger of this leading us very close to a direct confrontation between industrial and developing countries. Such a confrontation would not be in anyone's economic interests. The political costs would be immeasurable. And the threat to international stability and security would be even more direct.

It therefore rests with the governments of the rich Western countries, which in fact have opportunities of acting, to prevent such a confrontation and to break the vicious circle. For, in the end, the same applies here as in any other community: If we are to be able to go on living at all, we must be capable of living together.

Violation of Human Rights

Last week the issue of respect for human rights was debated in the United Nations. During its forty years, the United Nations has done important work by creating norms in this area. A year ago for instance, on a Swedish initiative, the General Assembly adopted a Convention on Torture, which Sweden will now also ratify.

Flagrant violations of fundamental human rights are perpetrated in many countries. They are manifested as torture, disappearances and summary executions. They constitute a hotbed for tension and insecurity within the countries but also a strain on relations between States. Respect for human rights is therefore a question of international importance. It has to do with the question of peace and security, and it is a question which we in other countries also have a right to involve ourselves in.

Sweden has, therefore, never hesitated to point out such crimes, in the way that was judged suitable on each occasion. In our own part of the world, conditions in Eastern Europe have often roused Swedish public opinion to indignation. There has been such a reaction above all whenever an attempt at reform in a democratic direction, with wide popular support, has been brutally put down. We will never silently accept restrictions in fundamental freedom and rights, or persecution of those opposing and holding a different opinion.

It is risky to compare conditions in one country with those in another. I do not want to make any gradations, but I think most people are agreed that the apartheid system in South Africa is a flagrant example of how crimes against human rights can constitute a threat to international peace and security.

The opponents of racial segregation policy in South Africa struggled by only peaceful means from 1912 - when the African National Congress was founded - to 1961, i.e. for almost fifty years. This was inspired by Mahatma Gandhi and his philosophy of non-violence.

When in 1961 ANC took to armed struggle it was in answer to the murder of more than sixty peaceful black demonstrators at Sharpeville, a suburb of Johannesburg, by the minority Government. ANC was forbidden after this demonstration. Its leaders were imprisoned or forced into exile.

Since then we have experienced continued oppression of the non-white majority by the white minority. Last year showed how oppression breeds protests which in their turn are put down with increased oppression. In this way, it all proceeds in an apparently unending spiral of increasing violence.

In defence of apartheid, the regime also hits out at neighbouring countries. The accusations and threats against Zimbabwe are the latest phase of in this aggression against neighbouring States. These States are said to harbour what are termed "terrorists". They are also considered to set dangerous examples to the black majority of South Africa if they meet with success.

During 1984, the South African regime entered into a so-called security treaty with Mozambique and an agreement with Angola regarding withdrawal of its troops from Angolan territory. It has now openly confessed both to violations of the treaty with Mozambique and to military attacks on Angola in support of the oppositional UNITA guerrillas.

Sweden condemns the apartheid system in South Africa because it is a morally repulsive system of discrimination and exploitation of the larger part of the population by a small minority. We have, on our own or together with others, taken a large number of measures in support of change in South Africa.

But this is not just action in solidarity with the oppressed in South Africa. The development I have just described makes it increasingly apparent that the conflict in the area, even in the short term, threatens international peace and security.

According to the United Nations Charter, for the Security Council to be able to decide on binding sanctions against a country, it is required that there is such a threat. The Swedish Government favours such sanctions against South Africa. It is gratifying that more and more countries are following the same line. We hope that it will be possible gradually to break down the last resistance, so that the international community can finally make joint and vigorous efforts to end the oppression in South Africa.

For, one thing is clear: If the world outside decides to abolish apartheid, the apartheid system will disappear. And we in Sweden shall be among those who exert most pressure to realise this.

Safeguard International Law

International law is fundamental when it is a question of how relations between the world's nations are to be formed.

Through its rules, it has been established what is permitted and what is not permitted in dealings between nations.

It may be seen there what a State can do on its own, and what requires the assent of one or more other nations to be carried through.

It is of utmost importance that these rules are observed, if international peace is to be maintained. The smaller countries perhaps feel this most strongly. When a State ravages the independence and integrity of a small country, the people in other small countries feel both anger and concern. For us, it is an urgent necessity that the rules of international law be observed.

Among these rules are also provisions on the right of self-defence. Unfortunately they have often been abused in order to justify all kinds of military actions. Those who carry out these actions can perhaps quote other reasons which justify them in their eyes. But the fact remains that military action, which is not in answer to an armed attack, and which is not for the protection of the territory of one's own country, is in contravention of international law. Such action violates in one way or another the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States.

We in Sweden must therefore safeguard international law with complete consistency. We cannot accept a law of the jungle in which might shall always be right. We want a legal order in which all are equal before the law and in which all States must respect the rights of each other.

For this reason we reacted forcefully when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan almost six years ago. We continually receive reports of how attempts are being made to crush popular resistance. We will go on demanding that Soviet troops leave Afghanistan.

Nor can we accept the United States' invasion of Grenada, the mining of the waters off Nicaragua, or the support, in contravention of international law, to the so-called contras. It is especially serious that this Great Power declared in connection with these interventions that it would no longer heed the decisions of the International Court of Justice on questions relating to Central America.

A special issue that has been discussed in international law is whether or not the use of certain weapons is in contravention of this law. Recently the discussion has in particular dealt with nuclear weapons. The question has been asked whether every use of nuclear weapons is a violation of international law, or whether only an unprovoked surprise attack with such weapons should be counted as being prohibited today.

For my part I find this discussion somewhat academic. My definite opinion is that nuclear weapons should never be used. A number of reasons speak for this standpoint - it is a question of the survival of all humanity.. I therefore proposed in my United Nations speech this autumn that, irrespective of what the legal

situation is today, we should begin to study the question of how a clear and binding international agreement can be achieved in this area also. We should consider the possibility of including a ban on the use of nuclear weapons in international law, as a part of a process which leads to general and complete disarmament both as regards nuclear weapons and conventional weapons.

Sweden's Security and Contribution to Peace

In this address I have brought up several international issues and tendencies in the world around us which, all in their own ways, affect us in Sweden too.

Developments have been such that we in our country have become more dependent on what happens in other parts of the world. This applies to many areas. But what they all have in common is that whatever happens within these fields will in time be of importance for our own security.

It is natural that a security policy debate in Sweden should largely be about our policy of neutrality and about conditions in our vicinity. But I believe that Sweden can also make important contributions in other areas which are also essential for our security in a world where peoples' fates are becoming increasingly interwoven. We will actively work for solutions to overall international problems - for disarmament, against environmental degradation, for economic justice, against violations of human rights, and defence of international law and the United Nations Charter.

We do this out of international solidarity. But we also do it to strengthen our own security.

(Original in Swedish)

WORLD SECURITY: THE WIDER CONTEXT

Indira Gandhi Memorial Lecture, New Delhi, January 16, 1986

I deem it a privilege and an honour to have been asked to deliver this first Indira Gandhi Memorial Lecture.

The sudden and tragic death of Indira Gandhi a little over a year ago came as a terrible shock for the entire world community. The rich tributes paid to her by all the world's leaders demonstrated the high esteem of the international community for her, and also the deep sense of loss that it shared with the people of India.

I had the privilege of meeting Mrs. Gandhi several times. I found her a political leader of outstanding quality, sophistication and sensibility. She combined high political acumen with a clear, intellectual mind, and with an acute perception of the dynamics of international relations. And she had a great warmth and personal charm.

It is not for me, as an outsider, to judge her leadership in Indian internal affairs. I had, however, the opportunity of seeing her in action, and of co-operating with her, in various international fora. She spoke enormously effectively for the Third World and the Non-aligned Movement. Forthright, forceful and constructive in her statements, she was invariably heard with great attention and respect.

India's and its Prime Minister's importance to the Non-aligned Movement was amply demonstrated when the country was asked, on short notice, to organise the Seventh Summit of the Movement in 1983 and, consequently, to take on the responsibility of chairmanship of the Movement for the following three years. This was indeed a proper recognition of the importance of the lasting principles of Indian foreign policy, based on the ideas of peaceful coexistence, constructive cooperation and active non-alignment.

Mrs. Gandhi's personal engagement in formulating the policy of the Non-aligned Movement became particularly evident during that historic summit meeting here in New Delhi in March 1983. She strove, during her tenure as Chairman of the Movement, with unflagging enthusiasm, to achieve political settlements of existing international problems. She sought particularly to foster a sense of common purpose, linking the many members of the Movement to meet their common challenges. She maximised the scope of cooperation, and the spirit of conciliation for the benefit of the Movement as a whole. Not being a member of the Movement, Sweden has nonetheless had the privilege to follow its work closely, as invited guest to many of its important meetings.

Swedish Interest in India

Right from the inception of India as an independent nation nearly forty years ago, we in Sweden have followed with deep interest and admiration the continued development of this country. But, of course, this admiration goes back much further in time, based on the knowledge of India as a civilisation much older than our own.

Already in the 18th century, Swedish ships were sailing to Indian harbours, and in the 19th century Swedish missionaries, working in India, were spreading knowledge of Indian culture in Sweden. They generally sympathised with the increasingly stronger movement for independence. Their views were spread and shared, particularly amongst liberal and social groups in Sweden.

Personal Affinity to India

Let me insert a very personal note. My great-grandparents lived in the provincial town of Kalmar in the south-east of Sweden. A little more than one hundred years ago they sent one of their daughters to London for language studies. She wanted to become a teacher. There she met an Indian doctor, Upendra Dutt, and he came as her fiancé to Sweden.

Sweden is a cold and shy country. In earlier days ladies used to attach specially made mirrors to their windows. By this device they could observe from inside everything happening on the street without being seen themselves. These were called "gossip mirrors". I have heard that the fair ladies of Kalmar paid handsome sums to be allowed to sit at the "gossip mirrors" along the street from the railway station to the house of my great-grandparents where this very beautiful young Indian doctor was expected to proceed.

They duly married. One of their sons was R. Palme Dutt, who later played an active and somewhat doctrinaire role in British and Indian politics.

My personal affinity to India is great also for another reason. In 1953 I took part as a student representative in a seminar in Mysore, led by Dr. Zakir Hussain. Subsequently I travelled widely to Indian universities and cities. What I remember most is a visit to an isolated village. I followed a sociologist who was writing about the influence of modern civilisation on different types of villages. We went a whole day by bus from Bangalore, slept in a school house and walked another day up a mountain to the village. I stayed there for ten days, living in a section of the temple, following the daily life of the village. I became deeply impressed by the quiet dignity of the people. Whenever I hear talk about economic and political development, I return to this village near Bangalore as a reference point. That is

where so much of the future is decided. As this happened in my most formative years, I will always carry a bit of India with me.²⁸

When I came back to Sweden, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Tage Erlander, called me up and asked me to come to his office to tell him about India. I did so, and stayed - first as his collaborator, and subsequently as his successor.

The first visit of a Prime Minister of India to Sweden was in 1957, when Jawaharlal Nehru paid an official visit to our country. He made a tremendous impression on the Swedish people. Two years later Tage Erlander came to India on a similar visit.

Shared Values of Sweden and India

The contacts on a personal level which were established between Jawaharlal Nehru and Tage Erlander were continued by Indira Gandhi and myself. We found that in spite of the many differences between our two countries, and the geographical distances that separate us, there is a common base of shared values which unites us. Both our countries subscribe to a democratic parliamentary system of government based on free association, a free press and a multitude of political parties. We believe in peace and in the promotion of peace through international cooperation, and I am very pleased and privileged to be able to continue this dialogue now with Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi.

India and Sweden have been able, through the years, to work together in many fields, and we are glad that in our country have been able to become an active partner in India's economic development. Our views on the questions of international security have often coincided, in spite of the differences in size, geography and history of our two nations. Sweden pursues a policy of neutrality: non-participation in alliances in peacetime, aiming at neutrality in the event of war. This policy is supported by a relatively strong defence. The object of Swedish security policy, like that of all other States, is to safeguard our country's national independence. But this policy also includes an endeavour to contribute to the prevention of conflicts. To participate in the work for peace and reconciliation in the world, to pursue a policy of international solidarity, is part of our security policy as well.

It is natural that each country's security debate perhaps first deals with the situation in the immediate neighbourhood. In India, the relations between the South Asian nations is accordingly a matter of primary importance. In Sweden, we strongly emphasise the value of the long-term stability of the security arrangements of the Nordic countries.

²⁸ Mr. Palme visited the village of Udaparane, in Salem district of Tamil Nadu, with an American sociologist, Alan R. Beals.

But in this age, as Indira Gandhi pointed out many times, national security must also be seen in a wider context. And I would like here to deal with four specific areas which are all important to world security, directly or indirectly. All four cases apply to us in Sweden as well as to you here in India. They concern the economic relations between States, the environmental crisis, human rights in a wider context and the threat of nuclear war.

Debt Crisis - A Joint Responsibility

Indira Gandhi had a deep concern for the inherent inequalities in development between the so-called first and second worlds on the one hand, and the third world on the other. She always expressed a firm commitment to international cooperation in order to pave the way for the economic achievement of the developing nations. Her premise, which I share, was that without strengthening and broadening the economic base of the developing countries, their general progress would be slow - to the detriment also of the developed world. She said that "no sustained revival of the North is possible without the development of the South." And she urged that cooperation between the two sides should be intensified, particularly to support the indigenous potentialities of the developing countries.

Another person in the forefront of international politics, Willy Brandt, formed his own Commission²⁹ eight years ago to study this, as he said, "the biggest social challenge of our time". I had the privilege to belong to that Commission, and in our report we put much work into describing the links and interdependence between countries in different parts of the world. We showed that a successful economic development in developing countries is also useful to us in the rich, industrialised countries. We described how an opposite development constitutes a serious threat to stability in the world, and in the long term to international peace and security. And we proposed massive transfers of resources to the poor States in forms which in the long term would benefit all of us.

The North-South dialogue is now more or less at a standstill, and the Brandt proposals are far from being realised. But the curse of the growing burden of indebtedness of so many of the developing nations, and its great threat to the future, is again high on the agenda of international politics. I noticed this particularly at the United Nations fortieth anniversary last autumn.

In less than a decade the debt burden of the developing countries has increased almost fivefold. Today it amounts to close to 1,000 billion dollars. It is by the way almost exactly equivalent of the world's military expenditure during just one year. The indebted countries have to use, on an average, almost a quarter of their total export earnings for debt service. For a number of States the figure is much higher.

²⁹ Independent Commission on International Development Issues

The effects of the growing debt burden are now becoming ever more perceptible. It is true that up to now it has been possible to handle the problems without causing a collapse of the international financial system. But the actions taken so far have meant great sacrifices in many poor countries. They have had social consequences in the form of increased unemployment and a further lowering of the standard of living. Now that growth in the world economy might be slowing down, the problems would become still more aggravated.

For a number of the very poorest countries, these problems obviously cannot be solved through continuous renegotiations of foreign loans alone. There is an urgent need for political initiatives aiming at a comprehensive and long-term strategy in the area of debts.

Such a strategy should bear in mind that high interest rates make today's debt burden particularly heavy to bear. It should take into account that the developing countries must be able to produce in order to be able to export. And it should be based on the recognition that all parties - developing countries and industrial countries, as well as banks and international financial institutions - through their own actions have contributed to the situation in which we find ourselves.

The debt crisis is a common crisis. We therefore all have a joint responsibility to try to find the way out of it. We must all make sacrifices. The burden cannot be placed only on the indebted countries. For example, the international commercial banks must also accept some of the costs, as must the taxpayers of industrialised countries.

What is needed in this situation are political initiatives to reach long-term solutions to the debt problem. More co-ordinated actions are necessary as a complement to the pure case-by-case strategy employed so far. From this point of view the initiative by the United States Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Baker, is welcome inasmuch as it endeavours to take a comprehensive view on the debt problem.

A number of measures in the economic, financial and trade policy fields are necessary. I would like to emphasise the following elements in a possible strategy:

1. Growth in the world economy must be kept on a sufficiently high level. This is the only way by which developing countries can be ensured to receive the export earnings that ultimately must be brought about in order to settle debts. This calls for a policy for higher economic growth in major industrialised countries.
2. Markets in the industrialised world must remain open for goods from the developing countries. Governments must refrain from protectionist measures and continue to liberalise trade.

3. Adjustment in the developing countries themselves should to a lesser extent than hitherto consist of one-sided tightening and restraint but to a larger degree build upon efforts to support growth and the long-term repayment capacity.

4. The industrialised countries must be prepared to supply developing countries with new credit on reasonable terms and pursue an economic policy which would lead to a lowering of interest levels.

5. Debt relief measures will undoubtedly prove necessary also in the future when other action is insufficient. Such measures ought, primarily, take the form of consolidation of the debt of individual countries.

Action of this kind could significantly improve the situation, especially in middle income countries which constitute the major problem of the debt issue. I do, however, feel that a special plan is called for to improve the situation of the poorer debtor countries. Their assembled debt burden is perhaps not so big as to constitute a threat to the international financial system, but their overall difficult situation points to the urgent need for special action to alleviate an often overwhelming debt burden.

My Government is prepared to participate in internationally co-ordinated actions, and we have earmarked special funds to be used as part of the contribution to such actions.

The dialogue between industrial and developing countries during the 1970s aimed at a new economic world order, a long-term development in the broadest sense. Until recently, the dialogue has largely dealt with how to collect monthly interest payments. Stiff requirements of rapid domestic adaptation have been imposed by banks and the IMF³⁰ and the governments of the rich countries. This has been met by a growing opposition on the part of the indebted countries, which see it as yet another expression of the injustice of the international economic system. Today the debate fortunately focuses to a greater extent on how to reverse the present flow of resources from developing to industrialised countries.

I believe there is a danger that this may lead us very close to a direct confrontation between industrial and developing countries. Such a confrontation would not be in anyone's interest. The political costs would be immeasurable. And the threat to international stability and security would be even more direct.

Therefore, we must bear in mind that we all - governments of rich countries as well as governments of developing countries, banks and financial institutions - share a great responsibility to prevent such a confrontation and to break the vicious circle. For, in the end, the same applies here as in any other community: If

³⁰ International Monetary Fund

we are to be able to go on living at all, we must be capable of living together. Or, as Indira Gandhi said at the UNCTAD³¹ Conference in Belgrade in 1983:

"International relations must be reorganised gradually but surely on the basis of living and evolving together, starting by finding areas of commonality and enlarging them, identifying the links and strengthening them."

International Cooperation Essential to Handle Threat to Environment

Indira Gandhi came to Stockholm in 1972 to be the main speaker at the first United Nations Conference on the Environment. It was at a time when the world had started to realise how that common heritage of ours - our land, our waters and the air around us - was being increasingly threatened. Mrs. Gandhi's statement to the Conference was both stimulating and realistic. It was a source of inspiration when it came to the drafting of the now historic Declaration of the Conference on the Human Environment. She said:

"It is clear that the environment crisis which is confronting the world will profoundly alter the future destiny of our planet. No one among us, whatever our status, strength or circumstance, can remain unaffected. The process of change challenges present international policies. Will the growing awareness of 'one earth' and 'one environment' guide us to the concept of 'one humanity'? Will there be more equitable sharing of the environmental costs and greater international interest in the accelerated progress of the less developed world? Or will it remain confined to a narrow concern, based on exclusive self-sufficiency?"

Indira Gandhi's questions are equally valid today, almost fourteen years later. Our countryside and our environment are being exposed to strains and changes which directly or indirectly may also threaten peace. The scientists are telling us about the role of environmental degradation in the emergence of international conflicts.

One example is the refugee problem which in several cases is related to deforestation, soil erosion and other environmental damage. Another example is the recurring disputes concerning the best fishing waters which many countries want to use, perhaps instead of waters which, as a result of environmental degradation, no longer give the same hauls as they once did. There are also several examples of conflicts between countries about the use of water from boundary rivers and boundary lakes, especially in areas where access to fresh water is otherwise very limited.

³¹ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

These examples all illustrate that we are facing a number of problems that none of us can solve alone. Nor is it just a question of finding the technical solutions - they are often already available. As Indira Gandhi said, also in Stockholm in 1972:

"The fault lies not in science and technology as such but in the sense of values of the contemporary world which ignores the rights of others and is oblivious of the larger perspective."

These values must be changed. We must realise that international cooperation and a joint responsibility is required to handle the threats to the environment before it is too late. If we cannot agree on this, the forests will be ravaged and die, the waters will be contaminated and the soil destroyed. Tensions between the countries involved will grow, and the risk of desperate measures will continually increase.

There is no time to lose. The acidification and deforestation will not cease while we try to find the proper forms for international environmental cooperation. We must act at once, since environmental degradation goes on every day.

Apartheid, a Threat to International Peace

Flagrant violations of fundamental human rights are perpetrated in many countries. They are manifested as torture, disappearances and summary executions. They constitute a hotbed for tension and insecurity within the countries, but also a strain on relations between States.

Respect for human rights is therefore a question of international concern. It is related to the question of peace and security, and it is a question which in my opinion, we in the international community also have a right to involve ourselves in.

It is risky to compare conditions in one country with those in other countries. I do not want to make any gradations but I am convinced that most people agree that the apartheid system in South Africa is a particularly flagrant example of how crimes against human rights can constitute a threat to international peace and security.

Mahatma Gandhi and his philosophy of non-violence became an important source of inspiration for the opponents of racial segregation policy in South Africa. From 1912, when the African National Congress was founded, up to 1961, the opponents of apartheid struggled by peaceful means only.

When in that year the African National Congress resorted to armed struggle, it was in response to the murder by the white minority regime of more than sixty

blacks peacefully demonstrating in Sharpeville. After Sharpeville ANC was banned and its leaders were imprisoned or forced into exile.

Since then, the oppression of the non-white majority by the white minority regime has continued. During the last two years, actions by the regime have led to increasing unrest, repression and bloodshed. The violence of the regime breeds protest, which in turn is put down by even more oppression. This leads to an apparently unending spiral of increasing violence.

In defence of apartheid, the regime also hits out at neighbouring countries. The regime in Pretoria has now openly confessed to both violations of the security treaty with Mozambique and to military attacks on Angola. It has launched military attacks also in Lesotho and Botswana and threatened Zimbabwe.

In my country the condemnation of the apartheid system in South Africa is virtually unanimous. We regard it as a morally repulsive system for discrimination and exploitation of the majority of the population by a small minority. We have, therefore, on our own and together with other countries, taken a large number of measures in support of change in South Africa, the latest being a ban on the imports of agricultural products from South Africa.

But this is not just action in solidarity with the oppressed in South Africa. Recent developments have made it increasingly apparent that the conflict in the area threatens international peace and security also in the short term.

According to the United Nations Charter, for the Security Council to decide on binding sanctions against a country, it is required that there is such a threat. My Government advocates sanctions against South Africa, and I know that the Government of India does so too. It is gratifying that even more countries are following the same line. Let us therefore hope that it will be possible to gradually break down the last resistance to sanctions so that the international community can finally make a joint vigorous effort to bring an end to the oppression in South Africa.

One thing is clear: If the rest of the world decides to abolish apartheid, then the apartheid system will disappear. Let us jointly realise this goal.

Five Continent Peace Initiative

I have come to India this time to take part in a meeting of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. We have been generously invited by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to hold our fourth follow-up meeting in New Delhi.

This Commission was formed in 1980, at a time when disarmament was not much of an international issue. The dialogue between East and West had almost come to

a standstill, while the world military expenditure continued to increase, absorbing resources that were desperately needed for basic human needs.

But we who formed the Commission also got some encouragement. One person who supported us was Indira Gandhi and she let one of her distinguished Foreign Service collaborators, Ambassador C.B. Muthamma, join the Commission.

At this meeting, the Commission will deal mainly with two items: the United Nations' peacekeeping role and questions of regional security. Both are subjects which also engaged Mrs. Gandhi. She and I met several times in the United Nations and I particularly remember her initiative in 1983 when she asked leaders from all kinds of nations, North and South, East and West, to join her in New York for an informal discussion on main obstacles in international relations. We had no agenda, there were no communiqués, there were no spectators or microphones around - but we had a very good and open and frank discussion. And I think that that discussion inspired many of us to think again about how we could achieve common goals by working together for our common security, not least in the United Nations itself.

At about the same time, in 1983, what we now call the Five Continent Peace Initiative was taking form. It was the last project on which I had the privilege to work with Indira Gandhi. I would therefore like to say a little about how I look upon the philosophy behind this initiative.

Last year, we honoured the memory of the many innocent victims of the dropping of the first bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki forty years ago. These two names symbolise the incomprehensible, the unprecedented which must never be repeated. Nuclear weapons have once and for all changed the face of war.

From the catastrophe in Japan in 1945 we have learned what the heat and the shock waves and the radioactive fallout can do. People are still dying there today from damage and illness that afflicted them over four decades ago.

In recent years our knowledge of the effects of nuclear weapons has been dramatically widened. A nuclear war has not just terrifying immediate effects. It also contains long-term consequences that can destroy our earth and irrevocably affect the conditions for all human life on our planet.

The studies about the nuclear winter have marked a new era. It has been reported how enormous amounts of smoke and particles of soot would rise into the atmosphere from all the fires which would follow upon a nuclear war. It would be dark, and it would be cold, for weeks or months.

Scientists claim that a reduction in temperature of four to five degrees would be sufficient to cut down drastically the possibilities of producing crops and pasture. In countries which do not have large stores of food, a starvation disaster would

ensue very quickly. More people would presumably die of starvation in India, following a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, than in these two States themselves, according to the most recent of these scientific studies. They say that the face of a future nuclear war would be more like Ethiopia than like Hiroshima and Nagasaki - famine will claim most victims.

It has thus become possible for us not only to annihilate an enemy, but also all others living on this planet. We can kill animals and plants, we can destroy towns and villages, we can devastate all that has been built up over generations, all around the whole of our earth. And above all: we can destroy the future of our entire civilisation, devastate the existence for our children and grandchildren, eradicate all that would have come after us. That, simply, is the role of nuclear weapons if they are used. A nuclear war can hit all peoples and all States, even those who are farthest away from the theatre of war.

But this also means that all peoples and all nations have a right to have a say about these weapons of mass destruction. This was the message that went out from the capital of India almost one year ago when we had the Six-Nation Summit and issued the Delhi Declaration. We said that we who live in the nuclear-weapon-free States are a clear majority of the world's population. But our future is obviously also threatened by the nuclear arms race. It is therefore our right, as well as our duty, to make firm demands - demands that nuclear weapons will never come to be used, and demands that a process of real disarmament in the nuclear field be finally commenced.

In the Delhi Declaration, we particularly stressed the importance of preventing an arms race in outer space, and of bringing about a comprehensive test ban treaty.

In my opinion, it is fruitless to invest large resources in a defence system in space which in all probability would never function, which instead would lead to continued and perhaps increased armaments on both sides, which would undermine valid international treaties, and which would mean a gigantic waste of resources that should be used to combat poverty in the world.

Stop All Nuclear Tests

Equally important is the task to stop all nuclear tests. It was more than thirty years ago that Prime Minister Nehru of India for the first time brought attention to this issue by advocating what he called "a standstill agreement" on nuclear explosions. That was in 1954.

Since then, some progress has been made. In 1963, the Partial Test Ban Treaty was signed and both superpowers seem to adhere also to the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty, even though neither of them has ratified it.

But this is not good enough. Nuclear tests do continue. Since 1945, there have been over 1,500 such tests which we know about. During the 1980s, there has been one nuclear test each week on average.

As we said when we met here in New Delhi for the Six-Nation Summit, these tests are simply not acceptable to the rest of the world. They are one of the means whereby the nuclear arms race is fostered. If we are to stop this race, we must also stop this testing. And in my opinion, a total test ban would be an important step forward in the work of preventing both horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear arms.

Sweden has put forward many proposals for such a step, from the late 1950s onwards. In 1983, we submitted a complete draft treaty. It would forbid all nuclear weapons tests in all environments and in all countries. This would include peaceful nuclear explosions as well, until internationally acceptable rules for their management can be agreed upon. Several linked data centres in different countries would monitor and verify compliance with the treaty.

Therefore I am very pleased that this issue is so central also to the Five Continent Peace Initiative. When Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and I met in New York in October last year, together with representatives of the other four participants in the Initiative, we also singled out this question. We turned directly to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, and urged them to agree to a suspension of all nuclear tests for a period of twelve months to begin with.

Opponents of a total test ban on one side have often pointed out that such a ban must be possible to verify, and on the other side there has been reluctance to agree to various verification proposals. We also took up this question when we met in New York in October. And we said that we will take our responsibility here as well. We offer our assistance to facilitate the establishment of effective verification arrangements. And we propose to establish verification mechanisms on our own territories.

With the advanced technological know-how, for example in both India and Sweden, and with the geographical spread of the six nations in the Initiative, we should be in a good position to make a substantial contribution. We in Sweden operated a verification data centre in the autumn of 1984 as an experiment, and this centre can be reactivated within a week or so.

The final statement from last year's Geneva summit³² did not say anything about a test ban. That was unfortunate. But other developments have perhaps been more promising. The United States has invited Soviet officials with instruments to on-site inspections of its Nevada test site, and General Secretary Gorbachev has gone

³² Meeting of President Reagan of the United States and General Secretary Gorbachev of the Soviet Union

very far in proposing on-site inspections on Soviet territory. It must also be welcomed that the Soviet Union has now decided to prolong its moratorium on nuclear tests.

The advantages of a test ban are, as someone said, obvious: it would be a first concrete step in the arms control process that could lead to other moratoriums and then to firm treaties complete with inspection and other safeguards.

A total test ban by all the nuclear Powers would help to stop the development of new weapons. It would give time for reflection and dialogue on how to start also a process of real disarmament. Not least, it would be a signal to the rest of the world that at last there is hope for tangible results in the field of disarmament. People could begin to have confidence in the assurances from Geneva last year that a nuclear war must never be fought.

It is clear that there is no need for long, elaborate negotiations. There is more and more evidence that the verification issue could be solved in a satisfactory way, and there should be continued efforts of assistance from our side.

So what is needed is above all a political will by the Powers concerned. A test ban would be in the interest of all nations. People would be better off, now and in the future, if all the nuclear tests were stopped. It is therefore in the interest of mankind if we try to rouse public opinion to exert pressure on the nuclear Powers during the coming months.

In about six months, the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union will meet again for another summit. That is the time and the place when these two men could, and should, enter into an agreement to halt all nuclear tests.

So let the call go out, again and again - as it did from Delhi a year ago, as it did at the United Nations anniversary, and as it should as the next summit comes closer: The nuclear tests must come to a halt, for our sake, and for the sake of the future of civilisation.

Honour Indira Gandhi by Working for Her Goals

When Indira Gandhi came to power as Prime Minister in 1966, she took over a formidable task: keeping this vast country together, safeguarding its democratic institutions and developing its faltering economy. Her political stature reached its height when she took the chair of the 101-member Non-aligned Movement in 1983. The world acclaimed her as a great leader.

I would like to conclude my homage to the memory of Indira Gandhi by quoting what she said in yet another of her speeches:

"The time has come to rise above petty quarrels and to tear down meaningless barriers, to unite, not only to bring about a better life but also to lift ourselves up to those values which make us better human beings.

"Each of us can make his contribution, however small.

"Each of us can help to give the world new dignity and new courage.

"Each of us can contribute to its happiness and goodness, its beauty and wisdom."

Let us honour her by working incessantly for those final goals of hers.

IF WORLD DECIDES TO ABOLISH APARTHEID, APARTHEID WILL DISAPPEAR

Address to the Swedish People's Parliament against Apartheid, Stockholm, February 21, 1986³³

It is a great pleasure for me to speak to this People's Parliament against Apartheid. We are very pleased to see leaders of ANC and SWAPO here, as also representatives of the active opinion against apartheid from the United Nations and from all over our country.

I should especially like to address myself to Oliver Tambo, the indefatigable champion of freedom in South Africa for many decades. Because of his convictions, he was forced to leave his country twenty-five years ago. I met Oliver Tambo for the first time more than twenty years ago and since then we have had very many opportunities to converse. His work, his optimism and his belief in the possibility of change, that it will be possible finally to send apartheid to the lumber-room of history, has been a great inspiration to us all.

The other day I read a big advertisement published in the South African press by the white minority regime in Pretoria. The advertisement read:

"Revolutionaries may stamp their feet. The communists may scream their lies. Our enemies may try to undermine us. But here is *the reality*."

Further down in the advertisement we are told what "the reality" is: "Our government is committed to power sharing, equal opportunities for all, equal treatment and equal justice."

As an example it is mentioned, amongst other things, that the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act and provisions of the Immorality Act have been repealed.

The Reality of South Africa

What then is the reality of South Africa today?

When the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act was repealed slightly more than a year ago, it was after considerable pressure had been put on the Government. The

³³ The last major speech of Olof Palme before his tragic assassination was his keynote address to the Swedish People's Parliament against Apartheid, held in Stockholm on February 21-22, 1986. Organised by the Swedish United Nations Association and the Isolate South Africa Committee, it was attended by almost one thousand representatives of political parties and public organisations. Mr. Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress of South Africa, also addressed the conference.

Minister responsible said in an explanation of the revision of the law that "the responsibility now rests with parents, teachers, religious and other leaders." The responsibility for what? one may well ask. Of course, the responsibility for seeing to it that no mixed marriages take place. In Parliament, where the black majority is not represented, the following questions, amongst others, were posed about the proposal:

- Where may a couple consisting of a white and a black live?
- Where may their children go to school?

The Government's answer revealed that the intention was not to change anything except the formal prohibition. Thus, a "mixed" couple may not live in a white area. If they are accepted in an area for blacks, they can live there. They can also apply for permission to live in an area for a minority that neither of them belongs to.

The children of the couple are classified, as has been the case up to now, according to three criteria: heredity, appearance and acceptance. A child of a mixed marriage may be completely white or completely black, or "coloured", i.e. of mixed blood.

May a white child of a mixed marriage go to a school for whites? asked one member of parliament. Schools for whites receive far more resources and can therefore maintain a higher standard than schools for other races. For this reason it is natural to try to get the child into one. It is possible that the white child may go to a school for white children, was the reply. But if the couple have another child that is "coloured", may this child go to the same school as its sibling? Out of the question, was the answer.

The reaction to the abolition of the prohibition of mixed marriages among black apartheid opponents in South Africa was, to put it mildly, lukewarm: "We are not struggling in the first instance for the right to marry white women," as one of them said.

But let me go back to the apartheid regime's advertisement. There, as I said earlier, they talk about equal opportunities for all.

Another Language

The reality speaks another language. We know that South Africa is a country where black people do not have the franchise, where destitution in the so-called black "homelands" is in glaring contrast to the affluent white areas. We know that the richest and most fertile 87 percent of the land has been reserved for the white minority of scarcely 15 percent of the population, while the majority of the population has been relegated to the poorest 13 percent of the land. This deeply

unjust distribution is the result of a conscious policy and one of the cruellest cases of the removal of people in modern history.

And these forced removals of black people continue: we have examples from as late as a few weeks ago. The removal began of thousands of people from Moutse in Eastern Transvaal, ninety kilometres to a newly established homeland. The removal was carried out when the men were at work. Women and children were loaded onto buses and driven off. We must not forget this reality when we hear the regime talk expansively of their reforms.

200,000 Black People Imprisoned Yearly

In the advertisement we are told that the passes, which all black people have to carry, are to be abolished as also influx control in the towns. We are also told that the passes will be replaced by a new identity document which will be issued to everybody. For the black majority, this only means that they will get a new document. Many believe that this document will be connected to a computer system to make the control of black people's movements stricter than ever. More than 200,000 black people are imprisoned yearly for breaking the pass laws. Black people will still not be allowed to live where they like. The Group Areas Act, which regulates where different ethnic groups may settle, is not to be amended: this information was given recently by Pretoria.

In the advertisement, it says that the South African Government is committed to a single education policy. At the same time the regime has declared that "the multi-cultural character of the South African community" must be recognised. They mean that the system with separate schools for different racial groups will be preserved.

Cannot Be Reformed, Can Only Be Abolished

Thus the truth is that apartheid in South Africa is not being reformed as the regime is trying to assert in its advertising campaigns. A system like apartheid cannot be reformed, it can only be abolished.

To the majority of South Africans all this is nothing new. By this stage they have a fundamental scepticism of everything the Government says. They have already heard that "South Africa must adapt or die," as was said a few years ago. What is new now is that even the white people are beginning to doubt their Government.

The Leader of the Opposition, the liberal Van Zyl Slabbert, resigned from Parliament on 7 February in protest against the regime's inability to set about the country's problems. And those white people that can are leaving the country. Emigration, mainly of well-educated, English-speaking people, is increasing and now amounts to more than a thousand a month. Industry is demanding rapid

reforms and has entered into contacts of its own with the African National Congress, which is banned since the time of the Sharpeville massacre in 1960.

The Regime Doubts Itself

Many of the keenest supporters of the regime interpret all talk of reforms as a sign of weakness. The result is that the regime has begun to doubt itself.

At the same time the opponents of apartheid have begun to rely on their ability to force the regime to abolish the system. Young blacks have boycotted the schools for nearly two years and defied both the police and the military forces. Quislings have been chased out of black residential areas. Black consumers have boycotted the shops of white people until the businessmen have moved over to their side and demanded reforms. Trade unions have organised strikes and built up new organisations. The United Democratic Front has grown up as a nation-wide, non-racial popular movement against apartheid. In 1984, UDF organised a successful boycott of the elections to the new parliament chambers for Asians and Coloured people (i.e. people of mixed blood), mainly because the black majority was still excluded.

Unequalled Violence

All this has happened - and continues to happen - despite the fact that the Government has unleashed a violence that is unequalled even in South Africa's history. More than one thousand people have been killed in disturbances since the autumn of 1984, most of them victims of police bullets. Military forces have been stationed in the black suburbs where there is a new state of emergency. More than seven thousand have been arrested under the emergency laws. Reports reach us of torture and deaths in the jails. Last year a member of the ANC, Benjamin Moloise, was executed despite protests from the outside world. Six more have been sentenced to death, against their denials, for the murder of a representative of the Government. UDF leaders have been accused of high treason, but some of them have been released and the indictment withdrawn because the court was unable to accept the grounds for prosecution put forward by the prosecution side. At present, the UDF leader Murphy Morobe is in prison in Johannesburg. In 1984 Morobe had accepted, on behalf of the UDF, the "Let Live Prize" of *Arbetet* (Work), the Swedish newspaper. Cheryl Carolus, a Coloured UDF leader from Cape Town, who visited Sweden just a few weeks ago, was released from prison a few days ago with strict bail conditions which, amongst other things, forbid her to work for UDF.

Threats and Attacks on Neighbours

In its defence of the apartheid system, the regime has not only intensified the oppression internally. Violence has also been escalated against neighbouring countries, which have been subjected to both threats and direct military attacks.

South Africa regularly invades southern Angola and supports the UNITA guerrillas. During 1985, it was revealed that South Africa had continued to give support to the opposition MNR guerrillas in Mozambique, in contravention of the security treaty that South Africa and Mozambique entered into in 1984. South Africa's commando troops carry out sabotage in the neighbouring countries and kill refugees from South Africa.

Threat to International Peace and Security

The destabilisation policy in relation to the neighbouring countries reveals ever more clearly that apartheid and the regime's defence of the system constitute a threat to international peace and security. Nor are there any indications that South Africa is prepared to withdraw its army of occupation from Namibia and accept a peaceful solution in accordance with the United Nations plan of 1978. Quite the contrary: according to several reports, South Africa is increasing its presence, especially in northern Namibia. According to reports that reach us through SWAPO and the churches, the oppression there has been increased still more.

During 1985, South Africa installed a new "government" in Windhoek. The South Africans have expressly removed security and foreign policy issues from the new government's area of responsibility. The government in Windhoek has not succeeded in any other areas in showing that it is capable of pursuing an independent policy in relation to South Africa. No one, apart from South Africa, has recognised this internal government.

Independence for Namibia

In the discussions that have been held between South Africa, the United States of America and Angola on the Namibian issue, no progress has been made despite the fact that, in the autumn of 1984, Angola declared itself prepared to discuss a withdrawal of the Cuban forces from southern Angola. South Africa obviously continues to protract and delay a solution according to the United Nations plan. A great responsibility rests therefore with the United Nations and its Security Council to put power behind its plan and force South Africa to agree to independence and free elections in Namibia. The plans for foreign military and other assistance to the oppositional UNITA guerrillas is an example of a measure which can logically only obstruct a negotiated settlement and would be perceived as support of South Africa.

What we are now witnessing in South Africa is a vicious circle of increased violence in defence of a system that is already doomed. It is only short-sightedness, a disinclination to see reality as it is, that makes the white minority cling firmly to power through continued oppression of its own population and terror against neighbouring countries. The white people must be aware of their own interests in a peaceful solution, while such a solution is still possible.

Pressure Must Continue

In this situation, the reaction of the outside world is of great importance. Pressure on the regime must increase. It must be made clear to the minority regime that it has no support in the world around.

The United Nations has a very important role to play as regards mirroring world opinion. It is a positive step that the Security Council, as a result of the increased pressure of opinion, recommended economic sanctions against South Africa for the first time last summer.

The United Nations also has the possibility of applying means of compulsion provided that consensus can be achieved in the Security Council. A decision in the Security Council for mandatory sanctions would in itself be an important signal to the apartheid regime that the patience of the rest of the world is at an end, and it would perhaps constitute the most important means of pressure on the white minority to abolish apartheid.

The main aim of our efforts is, as earlier, to bring about such a decision. I would like to repeat our appeal to the members of the United Nations Security Council, who have special possibilities of influencing South Africa, to take their responsibility.

If sanctions were applied, they would hit the whites' privileges very hard. The white people know this. The idea of economic sanctions has the wide support of the black majority's leaders. The liberation movements and the rest of Africa are also in favour of economic sanctions.

Swedish Sanctions in The 1970s

When, in the 1970s, we in Sweden began to pursue the issue of unilateral Swedish sanctions against South Africa, many people shook their heads and said it would have no effect and that no one would follow suit. But what spurred us on was the knowledge that, if we wanted to try to contribute to a peaceful settlement of apartheid, we must start in good time.

The Swedish initiative has now been followed by many countries. Criticism has died down. More and more people who were earlier doubtful are now beginning to understand that this type of action is necessary. Sanctions are not a guarantee that a bloody settlement can be avoided. But the rest of the world must take its responsibility and seek every opportunity to contribute actively. The United Nations and its Security Council can also play an important role.

We are naturally prepared to contribute towards alleviating any destruction caused to South Africa's neighbouring countries and to work towards persuading other United Nations Member States also to do so.

New Nordic Action Programme

Pending the achievement of consensus in the Security Council for mandatory sanctions, we must all make our contribution towards maintaining and increasing pressure on the apartheid regime. On the Nordic side we have long sought to coordinate our measures to give them extra weight. Last October we adopted a new joint Nordic programme of action against South Africa as a follow-up and extension of the 1978 programme.

Included in the programme are intensified joint efforts in the United Nations to increase the pressure on the apartheid regime.

The earlier ban on investments has been extended with a ban also with regard to loans, financial leasing and transfer of control of patent and manufacturing rights.

Within the framework of our international commitments we have included a number of measures in the trade policy area.

In the Nordic programme there is also a recommendation to importers and exporters to look for new markets. It includes measures to prevent public procurement of South African products and the discontinuance of government support to trade promotion activities. We undertake to prohibit the import of Krugerrands and the export of computer equipment to South Africa. Furthermore, we pledge to ban new contracts in the nuclear field and to end commercial airlinks with South Africa.

Together with the other Nordic countries, we have also undertaken to further limit our contacts with South Africa in sports, cultural and scientific fields. Visa rules for South African citizens are to be tightened up.

Last but not least we have agreed to increase, on a Nordic basis, our humanitarian assistance to the victims and opponents of apartheid, as also our development assistance to States neighbouring South Africa.

However, we will not rest there. We see the Nordic programme of action as a platform for continued joint and unilateral measures against apartheid.

Ban on Import of Consumer Goods

On a national basis, Sweden has introduced a ban on imports of agricultural products from South Africa. It means in practice a ban on the import of all consumer goods from South Africa. We have recommended that Swedish companies voluntarily limit their trade with South Africa. Trade has already dropped, and there are examples of companies that are actively looking for suppliers in countries other than South Africa.

The Government is now carefully following developments. If companies do not follow the recommendations of the Government and Parliament, new measures must be considered.

To speed up the reorientation of companies from South Africa to other countries in the region, the Nordic countries and the so-called SADCC³⁴ States have recently agreed on widened cooperation. It is a question of promoting trade, investments, technology transfer, cultural exchange and communications between the Nordic countries and these countries in southern Africa.

Support to Frontline States

At the same time as we put greater pressure on South Africa, we must be prepared to support the frontline States.

The Government is substantially increasing assistance to the countries and people in southern Africa that are hit by South Africa's destabilisation and apartheid policy. Under the proposal the Government recently put forward, more than forty percent of the bilateral assistance will be appropriated for southern Africa. This is equivalent to an amount of slightly more than two billion Swedish kroner for this fiscal year. To this is added our contributions to the various United Nations agencies.

Sweden gives development assistance to the individual countries so that, despite the destabilisation policy, these countries can develop and reduce their economic dependence on South Africa. Our support to the development co-ordination conference, SADCC, also aims to contribute towards enabling the countries jointly to increase their own trade and thus get away from South Africa. ANC and SWAPO will directly receive increased assistance for their humanitarian activities for, amongst others, their refugees in the neighbouring countries. Through extensive and increasing assistance, other organisations and people, who are victims and opponents of the apartheid policy, will obtain both economic and political support from Sweden. Many popular movements are involved and are making a valuable contribution to this assistance.

We all have a role to play in opposing apartheid. I have described the Government's work in the United Nations and other international forums. We are also actively working to induce other countries to take similar measures of their own. One of the reasons why we very carefully make sure our measures are within the framework of international treaties is that it is then far more probable that other countries will follow our example. This was the case as regards the ban on investments. Likewise, the interest in the Swedish ban on imports of agricultural products from South Africa has been very substantial.

³⁴ Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference

Speeding up the Fall

Municipalities and county councils in Sweden have been given the opportunity of participating in the boycott of South Africa. Several members of Parliament, from all parties in the Parliament, are participating in a European action group against apartheid.³⁵ The organisers of today's meeting are a further example of how widespread is the interest today in southern African issues. This is exceedingly gratifying, especially since we know that our work here has its counterpart in many other countries. It is gratifying also because with increased international pressure on the minority regime, we can contribute towards speeding up the fall of the apartheid system.

It is by taking joint responsibility that we can contribute towards abolishing the apartheid system. This system can live on because it gets support from outside. If the support is pulled away and turned into resistance, apartheid cannot endure. If the world decides to abolish apartheid, apartheid will disappear.

Insanity of the System

I have chosen to speak in very practical terms about what apartheid really is and also about what we are doing.

Fundamentally this is a profoundly emotional question and one which goes to the depths of our feeling because it is such an uncommonly repugnant system. Simply because, on account of people's colour, it abandons them to poverty. This system will be to the discredit of the world for as long as it persists.

But when expressing these feelings it is important for us to remember the very simple, basic facts which I have presented. And we know that we have a duty, knowing as we do that this system is sustained by the internal apparatus of oppression, the entire police force, the military and this wretched complex of legislation making up the apartheid system. This is why they are still able to put the leaders of opposition in prison. It goes without saying that Nelson Mandela must be released.

We have such an incredible example of the insanity of the system in their refusal to talk to the leaders, and to us. Because if you refuse to talk to the leaders who have people's confidence, this will inexorably result in the whole thing ending in a fearfully violent and bloody conflict. It is a legacy of history that the black people of Namibia and South Africa have a wide popular movement, a really eminent leadership which would be a possible interlocutor in a dialogue to dismantle this despicable, doomed system. But the regime responds by intensifying oppression and putting the leaders of this people in prison. This, then,

³⁵ Association of West European Parliamentarians for Action against Apartheid

is a classical example of madness of which nothing can come but evil - until the day it disappears, and one day it has to come to an end.

That was one point. The other is that this system cannot, would not, be able to survive if it were not, in various ways, supported or accepted or tolerated by the rest of the world.

We Are All Implicated

And so the rest of the world is directly implicated in the continuance of this system. If the rest of the world decides, if people all over the world decide that apartheid is to be abolished, the system will disappear. This is a simple way of expressing this responsibility. It also shows the classical truth that, among those with vested economic interests in the survival of this system, there is resistance. There is also hesitation and resistance on the part of the establishments. From those who regard people's longing for liberty in a country as a potential cause of global contest between different superpowers, there is resistance. And all this, in my opinion, is another example of madness, because the apartheid system is also a classical example of a threat to peace which people must jointly abolish.

Mobilising Public Opinion

But given this economic and superpower interest, there is also the classical way, namely that of mobilising popular opinion in support of human dignity. And that is the essential importance of a popular assembly like this one.

On the one hand we have the apparatus of oppression, which is undermining itself and is being undermined by the courageous struggle waged by the black popular movements in South Africa. On the other is outside support, and so by declaring our support for the black struggle, and by helping to isolate the apartheid regime, we must live up to our responsibility for bringing this repulsive system to an end.

(Original in Swedish)