

*Government Orders*

Before I was of age, I debated that with myself, with pastors, and with anybody else, starting with my parents. I was finally persuaded that I could see at that time no other alternative to surrendering to violence and so I joined the army. I volunteered and took the parachute training at Camp Shilo. When I was ready to go overseas the war in Europe ended. Then I volunteered for the Pacific and that ended soon.

• (1650)

I had made the moral decision that I was ready to go overseas and take the chance of killing people or being killed on the ground that it was necessary to do that for peace, good order, democracy, and basically for the survival of the civilians who were behind the front lines.

I began to rethink that when I heard about the bomb our ally dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, killing about 60,000 people, nearly all civilians. The Japanese war was already ending. They had begun to sue for peace. It seems likely that the use of the bomb was not so much to save American lives as to send a signal, a threat, to the Soviet Union that America had the monopoly on nuclear weapons.

As nuclear weapons multiplied and became the property of other countries, including the Soviet Union, I remember a sermon preached by the Rev. George Macleod, then of Iona, Scotland, who argued that if some other country is using nuclear weapons against us we do not accomplish any good by joining in the nuclear exchange. It will only ensure annihilation of all concerned. Nobody is to be protected in a nuclear war.

I was persuaded and became what he called a nuclear pacifist. I still thought that other weapons, hand weapons, small weapons, guns like rifles and so on, were fair to use. My young brother disagreed with me and said: "You are inconsistent. If you accept pistols and knives, you accept nuclear weapons". And I said: "No, we draw the line".

This year I have decided my young brother was right. I cannot tell him so now. It happens that he died in the fall. But if he was here I would tell him: "Larry, you were right and I was wrong in 1956 on that point". I see the outcome of it now. At that time, I thought that people defending their land against invaders or against dictator-

ships with guerrilla warfare, using what is called small arms weapons, were fighting a just war.

I now think that it is impossible to draw that line in our time. Perhaps it was possible in ages past. Perhaps it was possible before 1945. I am not sure. But I do not think it is possible now to draw that line.

Somebody has mentioned at least three million people killed in wars since World War II. They were killed mostly in the south between southern countries fighting each other, but with weapons sold to them by the north.

As the Prime Minister has said, the weapons industry and weapons trade is lucrative. Arms bring some of the highest profits of any of the manufacturing industries. In fact, for example, a group like Litton Systems gave up manufacturing civilian goods entirely in order to concentrate exclusively on manufacturing war goods. It produces fewer jobs, as was also pointed out, than producing the means of life, but with more money, more profit on the dollar. It also produces more dictatorship. It shores up dictators or it causes originally democratic countries to become more dictatorial because of the secrecy and the power and the repression associated with war or with the preparation for war.

In the last two or three years I have become very interested in what I heard called the civil society. I heard about it occurring in eastern Europe, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in East Germany, principally in those countries of northern eastern Europe, but also in the Baltics. Then I heard about it in the Soviet Union when I visited there nearly two years ago. I found there was a great spread of what were called "informal organizations," that is to say, they were not registered with the government. This was considered by people who talked with me to be an important advance. They said there had not been any real growth of civil society there either under the Czars or under the Bolsheviks.

In other words, they thought of the civil society as voluntary groups that sort of mediate, provide a cushion, between the state and the individuals. They considered that the growth of civil society in the Soviet Union was very hopeful. But the more clear example of that has been in Poland and Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Hungary where a tremendous change was made in the