

**BEYOND DISARMAMENT - A THIRD WORLD PERSPECTIVE ON**  
**THE WORK FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE**

**(Paul Gregorios)**

**I The INF Treaty, Detente and Euphoria**

It is now more than a year since the I.N.F. treaty was signed in December 1987. Certainly, it was an epoch-making event. It has kindled new hope in the hearts of human beings. People can hope, in realistic terms, for a peaceful future for humanity. It has now become possible to conceive of a humanity without weapons of mass destruction. Peace movements have received a new dose of credibility. They can no longer be accused of being unrealistic and utopian.

President Gorbachov of the Soviet Union has emerged as a genuine world statesman of the calibre of a Jawaharlal Nehru, with his global humanist vision. Even the image of President Reagan of the U.S.A. has gone up in the estimation of many people as a genuine lover of peace.

A general atmosphere of detente has been generated in the world, though tensions still remain. So many regional conflicts have begun to subside and to seek peaceful resolution. The Afghanistan settlement, and the cessation of

the Iraq-Iran war are outstanding examples of the fruits of this detente. Even ~~in~~ Central America, Southern Africa and the Middle East, three regions of world where conflicts once seemed so acute have begun to show hopeful signs of a democratic, peaceful settlement.

Israel, which seemed to be so intractably and stubbornly committed to State terrorism, on December 2nd 1988, showed a radically new attitude of anti-terrorism when the hijackers of the Ilyushin-76T Soviet Plane landed in Ben Gurion airport in Tel Aviv and were arrested and imprisoned by the Israeli militia.

And now the UN General Assembly has adopted a resolution to hold a Middle East Peace Conference, with only U.S.A. and Israel opposing. (Dec 15, 1988). The U.S.A. has agreed to hold direct talks with the P.L.O. The P.L.O. has now received the new designation: "Palestine" in the U.N., though U.S.A. and Israel have voted against it.

<sup>vi</sup>  
The Brazzaville Peace Accord for Namibian independence from April 1, 1989 is another major achievement of the post-INF detente.

"Summitry" has become a major instrument of international diplomacy. Gorbachov met Reagan and Bush in Dec.88, Rajiv Gandhi in November 88, and the Brazilian President also earlier. Rajiv Gandhi went to Beijing for an India-China summit, and had a visit to Pakistan earlier.

x

x

x

President Gorbachov's UN address has substantially helped the detente. His unilateral pledge to reduce Soviet military strength within two years has in some sense made history just as much as the INF Treaty. The pledge to reduce the Soviet armed forces by half a million men has sent earth-quake like tremors even in the Soviet military establishment with its new head, 50-year old General Moiseyev. 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery pieces and 800 combat aircraft are to be eliminated.<sup>1</sup>

There can be no doubt that the general detente created by the four USA/USSR summits leading up to the signing of the INF treaty and the more recent Gorbachov initiatives have been eminently productive and fruitful.

---

1. Critics point out that imbalance would still remain between NATO and WFO. Since NATO has only 16,412 tanks compared to WFO's 51,500, and 14,458 artillery pieces compared to WFO's 43,400. This does not take into account the factors of technological quality, and non-NATO tanks and artillery pieces on the Western side.

And yet there is a danger of euphoria in that very fruitfulness. First of all the signing of the INF treaty to eliminate intermediate and short range land-based missiles of the USA and the USSR does not necessarily lead to the second step<sup>(2)</sup> signing of the agreement for 50% reduction of strategic weapons. The START talks are proceeding very slowly indeed.

Second, the INF treaty deals only with about 3.6% of the world's nuclear arsenals, and the remaining 96.4% is there, still threatening all humanity and all life with total destruction.

Third, so long as there is no freeze on the manufacture of new nuclear weapons, thousands of more deadly and more accurate nuclear weapons are being added to the arsenals of the nuclear powers every year. The world nuclear arsenal today, a year after the signing of the INF Treaty has both quantitatively and qualitatively increased, after the treaty was signed, and goes on increasing every day.

Fourth, most people are not aware of the fact that not a single nuclear warhead (out of the world's 60,000 nuclear warheads) will be destroyed as a result of the INF Treaty. It relates only to delivery systems - not warheads.

The distinction between Intermediate Range and strategic Range applies only to missiles, i.e. delivery systems, not warheads. So the INF treaty does not lead to the reduction of nuclear weapons at all.

Fifth very few people realize that the Soviet Union had to make a heavy concession in accepting the principle of asymmetry in reduction of weapons. Six Soviet missile system are destroyed, compared to only four on the U.S. side.<sup>2</sup> Out of the total reduction of 1599 IRM's and 1096 SRM's with a range of 500 to 5500 kms (all land-based), the vast majority are Soviet missiles (USA - about 800 missiles, USSR about 1800).

Sixthly, though it may not be quite fair to say so, one factor which made it easier for President Reagan and the USA to agree was the fact that these are weapons against which SDI is not effective (due to their shorter trajectory and consequently less time to intercept), and in a first-strike strategy the elimination of the cruise missiles of the enemy is important.

- 
2. Soviet systems to be dismantled are : (a) SS-20 (RSD-10) ballistic missiles - range ca 4000 Kms, with their launchers; (b) SS-4(R-12) missiles and launchers - range 2000 Kms. (c) SS-5 (R-14) (d) SSC-X-4 (RK 55) Cruise missiles, (e) SS-12 (OTR-22) ballistic missiles and launchers- range 900 Km. and (f) SS-23(OTR-23) BMs- range 500 Kms). U.S. system are (a) Pershing 2 cruise missiles (1800 Kms), (b) Tomahawk cruise missiles and their mobile launchers (2500 Kms), (c) Pershing 1-A BMs (750 Kms) and (d) Pershing 1-B BMs.

If we take all these factors into consideration, the INF treaty gives no ground for the peace movements to engage in euphoria or rest on their oars. The campaign for elimination of all nuclear weapons within a time-bound programme must proceed with redoubled vigour. Peace movements should now vigorously campaign for

1. speeding up the START process to achieve agreement on 50% reduction of strategic weapons by the middle of 1989.
2. Drafting, negotiating, signing and ratifying a comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before the end of 1989;
3. agreeing universally on a total freeze on the manufacture and deployment of all weapons of mass destruction and their delegitimation;
4. agreeing on a total ban and illegalisation of all chemical and bacteriological weapons;
5. a drastic reduction of conventional weapons and forces, both by bilateral or multilateral agreement and by unilateral measures like the ones announced by President Gorbachov in his UN address in December 88;
6. the convening of a world disarmament conference in which nations will come to agreement on a time-bound programme for the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction by 2010 at the latest, if possible earlier.

7. concentrating attention of peace movements on naval disarmament, in view of the fact that as land-based missiles (which are very vulnerable) are being eliminated, more and more warheads and delivery systems are being shifted to the oceans and deployed on aircraft carriers, nuclear-powered submarines and battleships;

8. continuing to watch the strategies of weapons manufacturers and traders to maintain or increase their profit by devising new schemes for space-based defence, radar-escaping delivery systems, and new technologies like directed energy weapons;

9. watching smaller nations developing or acquiring rockets for use with chemical, biological and climatological weapons (some nations in the Middle East and North Africa seem to be moving in this direction);

and 10. concentrating on building public opinion for an alternate system of comprehensive Global Common Security.

## II

### PEACE AND JUSTICE - THE PRIORITY QUESTION

The concern for Disarmament has definitely grown outside the industrially advanced countries. Two-third World initiatives like that of the Non-Aligned Movement seem to be becoming more effective than before. The Six-Nation initiative has lost some of its strength, since most of the senior statesmen who initiated it are no longer in power (Olof Palme, Julius Nyerere, de la Madrid, Alfonsin). The Delhi Declaration signed by Mikhail Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi in 1986 laid down ten important principles which could promote disarmament. Their second summit (November 20, 1988) issued a major statement emphasizing "th importance of efforts by all states to develop a comprehensive global system of international security", as the foundation for "a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world". India had already put forward an "action plan for ushering in a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world order by 2010 A.D." The second summit statement (1988) affirmed:

"The Soviet Union and India believe that universal peace and stability can only be built on economically sound foundations. A new international economic order should be established on a just and equitable basis. Urgent and serious steps need to be taken to resolve the growing global debt problem, and the crisis of the international monetary and financial system".



In the socialist world as well as in the Two-third World, there is a growing recognition of the integral relation between justice and peace. I shall try to show that relation more clearly in the third section of this paper on comprehensive common security. Here we need only to point out that one of the temptations facing western peace movements is to separate the issue of peace from that of justice, and to give a higher priority to peace over justice.

Almost as a consequence most Two-third world people do not take any great interest in the issues of peace and disarmament. In Africa or Latin America, Asia or the Caribbean, it is very difficult today to enlist the interest of the masses in the Peace Movement.

This problem should receive the special attention of European and American Peace movements. The impression outside the western world is that while western peace movements are anxious to eliminate the possibility of a nuclear war, and are also actively concerned about conserving the ecological balance, there is no corresponding concern evident in their activities about justice in the world, both within nations and between nations.

As far as the Two-third World is concerned, peace without justice is not a desired goal for most of us, especially for those who are aware that even without war millions die every year in our part of the world from poverty, malnutrition and lack of hygiene, and millions live a sub-human life without their basic material needs being met.

It may be useful in this connection to point out that even in leftist circles, there is some questioning of the New Thinking in the Soviet Union in this regard. We can understand the statement that if there is a nuclear holocaust, humanity and life itself on this planet may *not* survive. There is some logic therefore in the argument that the survival of humanity should receive a higher priority than class conflict and class confrontation. It is obvious that if humanity does not survive there will be no classes to conflict or confront each other.

It is possible that the Soviet Union has more inside information about the intentions of other nations to wage a limited or an unlimited nuclear war. The Soviet Union's apparent view that there is imminent danger of a nuclear holocaust which could imperil the survival of humanity has therefore to be treated with respect. But to the oppressed

and exploited millions of our world, and for those who are vitally concerned about their emancipation, even the threat of a nuclear war is not sufficient to make them downplay the class struggle or refrain from class confrontation. The threat of a nuclear war should not be used as an argument for de-emphasizing the demand for justice within and among nations. The survival of human life is important, because human life has value in itself, particularly for Christians who believe that humanity to be created in the image of God. But an unjust and oppressive human life is not the image of God who is good and just. If the quality of the humanity which survives is as low as it is for the non-affluent of the world, the argument about subordinating the class struggle to the higher priority of human survival may not carry much weight with them.

The counter-argument is: "what if class confrontation increases the danger of a nuclear war? Is it not necessary, even as a strategy, to play down class confrontation in order to promote detente, and to create an atmosphere more conducive to nuclear disarmament? There is some weight in that argument, especially for those not totally dissatisfied with their present quality of life.

It is clear that two different strategies are evolving. The socialist countries, where the working class is already supposed to be in power, may not find the class struggle concept particularly useful in the analysis of their own domestic problems including economic stagnation. For them restructuring the economy and being able to cope with production demands may constitute a higher priority than the international class struggle. But in the Two-third World where the State is still largely an instrument of the exploiting class, the oppressed and exploited working class may not see clearly the need to raise productivity, when they know that a good portion of the surplus value created by their labour would be appropriated by the owners of the means of production and by the growing middle class. In the socialist countries perestroika means greater sharing by the working class in the power and the profit of the production system; this is not so in most Two-third world countries where higher economic productivity helps only to swell the middle class and to make the rich richer.

The Two-third world countries are therefore likely to go on ascribing a higher priority to justice over peace, while socialist countries seem willing to put the priorities the other way. This does create an aspect of alienation

between socialist peoples and the oppressed peoples of the Two-third world. There is also alienation between the Peace Movements of the west and the Two-third world peoples.

III. WORKING FOR DISARMAMENT MEANS

WORKING FOR COMPREHENSIVE GLOBAL COMMON SECURITY

There is no room for euphoria. Mikhail Gorbachov has given us cause to hope -

a. by making the unfair concession necessary for securing the INF agreement, b. by creating an atmosphere of detente, and c. by making bold moves for unilateral conventional disarmament.

The responses from the other side have been constrained and far from enthusiastic. The attitude still is that of taking advantage of the other's genuine desires for peace and disarmament. The philosophy prevailing is still that of the superiority of one side over the other. The intention to overthrow and trample on the socialist system is far from disappeared. Not only the concessions made by the Soviet Union, but its very attitude of reconciliation and detente is taken to be a consequence of the strength of the West and the weakness of socialism.

Let us hope, though it cannot be a fully sanguine hope, that the START talks and the Vienna talks will move very fast and achieve some dramatic results in both the nuclear and the conventional<sup>onal</sup> fields.

We would still be highly insecure and in danger of perishing as a race, even after 50% of nuclear warheads, and delivery systems have been destroyed, even after a 50% reduction of conventional weapons and forces is implemented, even after getting a comprehensive Test Ban Treaty signed, even after S.D.I is totally abandoned and space technology is used only for peaceful purposes.

The fundamental problems of our present quest for human security are: (a) trying to make an unjust system secure for those in power and (b) seeking to build that security on force, weapons and terror.

A Comprehensive system of Global Common Security is intended to take care of both these problems. It involves radically different perceptions. There Three of these perceptions are

- (a) the non-military aspects of security
- (b) Security without weapons of mass destruction
- and (c) Security that goes beyond national defense to a common programme of ensuring security to all nations and peoples.

The UN Conference on the Relation between Disarmament and Development has clearly recognized the significance of the non-military factors in security and insecurity. Economic and Social Security is just as important as security against external attack. There are explosions developing which are just as threatening as nuclear explosions - not only in Southern Africa, Central America and the Middle East, but also in every situation where the very socio-economic structure promotes injustice and discontent. Until all peoples and all human beings are given the possibility of living a dignified and secure human life, there cannot be real security for anyone. People need to live in freedom and creativity and sustain their identities, They have to share in social, economic and political power in an equitable way in each nation as well as in the international community. This is the central plank of the platform of comprehensive Global Common Security (SGCS).

The second plank of SGCS is security without weapons of mass destruction. These include nuclear weapons and delivery systems, directed energy weapons and chemical/bacteriological/climatological weapons. The total elimination and legal banning, enforced by international democratic authority, of these three classes of weapons of mass destruction should receive a very high priority



with peace movements for this is the necessary foundation for a system of comprehensive Global Common Security.

Mass destruction weapons do not increase human security or the security of a nation. Mass destruction weapons owned by one nation provide the incentive and the occasion for other nations to acquire the same; this makes both sides equally insecure, driven to a suicidal arms race.

How then is security to be assured for all nations, when mass destruction weapons are eliminated? Clearly this is the third plank of the C G C S system - a democratically controlled international system for the peaceful resolution of conflicts, in which the security of each nation becomes the responsibility of the whole international community. This would involve a radical restructuring of the UN system and especially the Security Council, a global system of international law and courts for adjudication, a democratically controlled high-tech system of global observation and verification, and a global system of taxation for the support of the new international machinery and for undertaking the eradication of poverty and ill-health, for removing ignorance and injustice, for fighting backwardness and lack of cultural creativity, as well as a democratically

controlled global international peace keeping forces stationed all over the world. It will also require huge efforts to remove misunderstandings, prejudices, wrong perception of conflict of interests and hostilities among nations, through cultural exchanges and scientific and technological co-operation, through new global and regional institutions for the same, and through radical restructuring of educational systems and media programmes. New global and regional institutions will be needed to regulate trade relations as well as fiscal and banking relations among nations and peoples.

It is only as we begin to build the basic skeleton for such a CGCS system that the movement towards General and Complete Disarmament will receive a new momentum.