

all participating groups, who debate them in their own meetings and decide on their recommendations or guidelines to delegates. Finally the delegates from all the organizations meet in a collective formal session of the People's Parliament, debate all the resolutions and vote on them. Their recommendations are then forwarded to the appropriate official body: the national government, the Nordic Council or the UN. The Swedish (Nordic) People's Parliament is like a "Second UN Assembly" organized from the grass-roots, on a regional level. If it became global in scope and then received official UN status, it would link up with the proposal for a Second UN Assembly discussed earlier.

Conclusion

To have so many peace proposals in a period of only 6 years (and our list does not claim to be complete) is encouraging. But why then are international relations still in such a sorry state? Why does the nuclear sword of Damocles still hang over all our people?

The answer is this: If we were to compile all the war plans, plans for new or modernized weapons, plus all the implementations of such plans (deployments), plus actions to weaken or by-pass or oppose the United Nations or international law, the list would be much longer; especially if the weapons still on the secret list could also be included. It is a race, a competition between two opposing trends, and my guess is that the war side is still winning.

This is reflected by (or caused by) the wide discrepancy between spending on war and on peace. Anatol Rapoport recently estimated that the average person spends \$120 a year on war and 7 cents a year on peace. Ruth Sivard has implied: "Show me how people apportion their money, and I will tell you