

Nonviolence Speaks To Power

NONVIOLENCE SPEAKS TO POWER

Petra K. Kelly

Edited by
Glenn D. Paige and Sarah Gilliatt

Center for Global Nonviolence
2001

Copyright ©1992 by the Center for Global Nonviolence
Planning Project, Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace,
University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i, 96822.

Copyright ©1999 by the nonprofit Center for Global
Nonviolence, Inc., 3653 Tantalus Drive, Honolulu, Hawai'i,
96822-5033. Website: globalnonviolence.org. Email:
cgnv@hawaii.rr.com

Copying for personal and educational use is
encouraged by the copyright holders.

ISBN 1-880309-05-X (alk. paper)
JA 75.8.K46 1992

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Introduction</i>	
<i>Glenn D. Paige</i>	1
Towards a Green Europe, Towards a Green World	15
For A Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Nonviolent World	29
Poisoned Food and World Hunger: The Poor Are Feeding the Rich	41
Global Green Politics	53
A New Challenge for the International Peace Movement: The New World Order of President Bush	79
A Green View of German Reunification and Europe's Future	87
Tibet Must Not Die <i>with Gert Bastian</i>	113
Morality and Human Dignity	121
Open Letter to the German Green Party	149
<i>About the Author</i>	161
<i>Abbreviations</i>	167
<i>Selected Bibliography</i>	169
<i>Name Index</i>	171
<i>Subject Index</i>	176

PREFACE

Though Petra Karin Kelly, nonviolence speaks to power. This selection of five speeches and four essays covering the period from August 1987 to July 1991 provides insights into the nature and scope of her concerns. It also contains lessons of nonviolent political leadership she has learned as a cofounder of the German Green Party (1979), as a candidate heading the Green list in four national elections (1979, 1980, 1982, and 1987), and as a two-term member of the parliamentary Green Bundestag (1983-90).

The Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project is pleased to present this book, which will be of worldwide interest to all who study and practice nonviolence. This includes peace workers, ecologists, feminists, human rights advocates, workers for economic justice, health workers, and all who engage in and support direct nonviolent political action. We think that nonviolent political leaders now and in the twenty-first century can benefit much from her vision, analysis, and experience. The seeds of a practical nonviolent global political theory are undeniably present here.

In presenting her speeches, we have tried to preserve a sense of being there. They were meant to be spoken and heard, not read. Some parts, before different audiences, are repetitive, but reoccurrence aids understanding of the consistency and comprehensiveness of her thought. We have not tried to provide precise citations of the sources of ideas and information to which she refers. They represent the style of the political speaker rather than that of the reference scholar, who may, however, trace them to their origins if needed. First names of persons mentioned may be found in the index. We have maintained many abbreviations

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

in the text, but have added an explanatory list of them, especially for the benefit of readers in the future.

We are grateful to Petra Kelly for permitting us to publish this book in support of the idea of building a global institution dedicated to nonviolent research, education, and service to human needs. Her visits to Hawai'i with Gert Bastian in 1988 and 1991 happily nurtured the spirit of nonviolence in these islands. We also thank Stanley Schab, publications specialist of the Matsunaga Institute for Peace, for his indispensable technical support.

The Editors
Honolulu, Hawai'i
July 1, 1992

INTRODUCTION

Glenn D. Paige

Since all of us have power, Petra Kelly speaks to each of us. She speaks to power of the top and bottom; of the Left, Center, and Right; of the inside and outside; of women and men; of the old and young; of the individual and society; and of nature and humanity. She speaks of, in, and to a planetary circle. She is not always critical; she celebrates as well as censures. Her voice is well worth listening to because we are all dependent for life upon each other and upon our planetary home.

Like Mohandas K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., from whom she has drawn nonviolent inspiration (Kelly 1989), however, she has a special sense of the beings for whom she speaks. Amidst the formal institutions of political power she is the voice of the voiceless, those whom she calls "the victims of established power." "To my mind," she explains, "the purpose of politics and of political parties is to stand up for the weak, for those who have no lobby or other means of exerting influence....I view my political work as acting for and with people" (p. 125; unless otherwise noted, page numbers refer to this volume). Thus she speaks on a global scale for cancer-ill children, victims of nuclear radiation, the impoverished, indigenous peoples, and women--as well as for trees, plants, animals, and all the "offspring of Mother Earth."

She speaks as a human being and a worker for a nonviolent world out of a specific context and experience. This includes keen awareness of being in the economically favored "North" as contrasted with the impoverished "South." She speaks as a

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

German, mindful of Germany's violent past, experienced in peaceful efforts to transcend the East-West division, and knowledgeable about violent aspects of German reunification at the end of the USA-USSR superpower confrontation. Like other political innovators she is bilingual (German-English), has lived in another culture (the United States), and has traveled extensively to other countries (e.g., to Australia, India, Mexico, Turkey, and many others). Her travels aid her in finding alternative ways of being in the world.

She is an experienced European Community civil servant, a cofounder of the German Green Party (Die Grunen), a veteran social activist and electoral campaigner, and an experienced legislator who knows parliamentary life from the inside as a two-term member of the German Bundestag with special service on its Foreign Affairs Committee.

As a woman she can understand and explain things beyond the ken of men. As a grieving sister, she knows the painful loss of her little sister Grace who died of cancer at age ten.

Petra Kelly speaks in and contributes to an era of growing global consciousness. This includes awareness of the threat of nuclear annihilation, ecocide, economic injustice, and massive violations of human rights produced by nationalism, ethnocentrism, racism, patriarchy, and fundamentalism--as well as by greed, hatred, and ignorance. Amidst unprecedented threats to survival and well-being, she calls for unprecedented nonviolent cooperative action to remove them.

To whom does she speak? And what does she say?

She speaks to governments and their leaders, to ministries, parliaments, and parties. She addresses them in Germany and across national boundaries. Her conscience as a nonviolent human being transcends both her role as a government official and the diplomatic niceties of national boundaries. She uses

Introduction

neither her official position nor her nationality as an excuse for silence. For her, sovereignty is no defense against nonviolent truth.

She tells governments to stop exploiting their own and other peoples; to stop lying, secrecy, deception, and inaction; to open up decision-making processes for debate and popular participation on crucial issues; and to critically examine the global consequences of their actions. She especially condemns governments for failures to protect the earth, public health, and human rights as well as for failure to stop the spread of nuclear and other lethal technologies. As she explains, "the superficial way in which vital issues are dealt with in Bonn often shocked and angered me" (p. 133).

She praises as well as censures. For example, she lauds the Indian government for providing a refuge for Tibetans in exile (p. 29), while at the same time she questions its human rights policies toward Sikhs, opposes its missile testing programs, and calls upon it not to develop nuclear weapons. She praises the Australian government for proposing to establish a World Wilderness Park in the Antarctic (p. 54), while protesting its missile tests and appropriation of Aboriginal lands for military use.

She speaks to globally powerful domestic and multinational corporations and calls for an end to profit-seeking actions that corrupt governments, exploit the poor, devastate the environment, spread lethal technologies, and poison people. She praises the Gerber and Beech-Nut corporations for removing noxious substances from baby foods (p. 46). She speaks also to labor unions, praising their defense of the environment, as in Australia's Green Ban movement (p. 58), while criticizing them for complicity in life-threatening governmental and corporate actions such as the mining and export of uranium for use in nuclear weapons and nuclear power.

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

Speaking to the press and mass media, she appeals for more courageous reporting of truthful "counterinformation" that spotlights problems and conditions contrary to official interpretations, thus providing bases for greater responsiveness to human and ecological needs. She also asks them to stop the mislabeling and misquotation that create unwarranted conflict and misunderstanding.

Speaking to the consumers of rich countries and well-off classes, she asks us to reduce our consumption of energy and other global resources so as to stop destruction of the environment (e.g. rain forests), impoverishment of people ("the poor are feeding the rich"), and military aggression to control sources of supply.

Speaking to men, she calls for an end to patriarchal domination and exploitation. Speaking to women, she urges assertive solidarity in feminist restructuring of male power. She praises courageous feminist leadership in the antiwar, economic justice, ecological, human rights, freedom, and other movements for the well-being of all--while recognizing also the contributions of "many brave and courageous men" (Kelly 1990, p. 15). To all adults she asks that we consider how our political and economic policies and practices affect children, the elderly, the weak, and the poor.

She also speaks to large and sweeping collectivities, encompassing all the foregoing. She calls upon Germany to be honestly critical about its past atrocities; to democratize, demilitarize, and neutralize itself; to liberate itself from racism; and to assume responsibility for domestic and global democratic and ecological well-being. She appeals to all humanity to speak up against abuses of power on behalf of its victims. To all she cries out, "Save the planet!"

Ultimately she speaks to the self--the essence of the reflective, moral individual. "If we want to transform society in

Introduction

an ecological way, we must transform ourselves profoundly first" (Kelly 1991, p. 2). Abruptly she reminds us that if we want nonviolent global change, "we must first point the finger at ourselves" (p. 51). This is completely in the spirit of nonviolent politics, which may be the world's first political movement that does not divide the "good" self from the "bad" enemy, king, or class, but rather sees in each of us the potential for rectifying wrong. It recognizes also that mass acquiescence by individuals permits the perpetuation of direct and structural violence. (Sharp 1973, 1979; Galtung 1969).

In what directions should we move?

The essence of political leadership is to point the way (Tucker 1981) and the highest form of it is morally transforming for both leaders and those who respond to or call for their action (Burns 1978). Petra Kelly's leadership exemplifies both of these qualities.

For *global peace and disarmament* she calls for the rejection of war as a political instrument; radical disarmament; removal of foreign military bases; replacement of military defense with civilian-based social defense; dismantling of military alliances; abolition of production, testing, sale, and use of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons; abolition of the world arms trade; and transformation of military industries and budgets to serve social and economic needs.

For *global economic justice*, she appeals to the affluent industrialized countries to limit their consumption of global resources; to stop exporting dangerous technologies; and to stop using superior economic power to subordinate and exploit less favored peoples. To these ends, she urges economic decentralization of "monolithic modes" of production and technology as represented by the "military-industrial complex" (p. 63).

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

For *global human rights*, she demands adherence to universal standards--not just condemning violations by enemies, while overlooking those of allies; freedom of dissent for all; an end to male domination and an assertion of feminine power; cessation of suppression of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities; termination of invasions and occupations (e.g., Tibet); and care for children, the aged, and the sick.

To *protect the biosphere* and its inhabitants, she calls for an end to nuclear technology ("No more Chernobyls!"); the prohibition of the dumping of toxic wastes ("Garbage Imperialism"); an end to commercial destruction of the rain forests; and the prohibition of all other practices and technologies that threaten to destroy the planetary life-supporting capacity. Instead, she calls for the creation of "soft" energy and other technologies as well as for cleanup, restoration, recycling, and respectful preservation. She urges creation of "a global culture of ecological responsibility" and establishment of "binding principles governing ecological relations among all countries" (p. 76).

For *global problem-solving cooperation*, she calls for the combination of demands from below and responsiveness from above that will bring about the well-being of all. She appeals for solidarity and participation of peoples across national boundaries and across all of the foregoing problem areas. In this way people can urge governments to adopt policies that are responsive to global needs and insist upon change.

Furthermore, viewing global life from a holistic perspective, she reminds us of the interconnectedness of all these issues. She explains, "Green politics is different from all other forms of politics because it acknowledges the complexity of that web of life" (Kelly n.d., "Greens...", p. 10). Firm commitment to life-respecting principles is the basis of problem-solving action: "Living our values is what Green politics is all about" (p. 28). "Complete demilitarization and complete

Introduction

democratization" are imperative for saving the planet and its inhabitants from destruction. "An ecological society is a truly free society" (p. 22). Furthermore, "environmental problems cannot be solved without understanding the economic issues of which they are a part" (Kelly n.d., "Greens . . .," p. 8). And, the converse of this is also true. "Over and over again," she insists, "we must stress that a healthy ecology is the basis for a healthy economy" (Kelly n.d., "Introduction...", p. 8). Finally, to solve global problems and their local manifestations universal human cooperation is necessary: "Green politics means that, on a global scale, we must act responsibly for each other and practice solidarity across boundaries and ideologies" (p. 62).

In sum, Petra Kelly's message to all who have power is simply this: respect life; be truthful about threats to its existence; and work nonviolently to remove them. Of special interest is what she has learned as a political leader about putting this message into practice. Neither Tolstoy, nor Gandhi, nor King created a nonviolent political party, stood in electoral competition as its candidate, and served as an exponent of its values in a national legislature. Many nonviolent figures in history have deliberately separated themselves from direct participation in formal political institutions (parties, legislatures, executives) as violent instruments of the state. In this tradition, some participants in Germany's Green ecological movement opposed the formation of a political party. They favored seeking nonviolent social transformation by working outside formal political institutions. This debate continues as the Green movement and parties spread throughout the world.

Nevertheless, Petra Kelly and her German Green colleagues, coming out of an anti-leader subculture in a country with a spectacularly violent history, chose the enormously difficult path of direct nonviolent political leadership. Her objective was to create an "anti-party party" based upon a new form of "shared power" from the bottom up rather than upon dominating power from the top down--this being "the power of

nonviolent change" (pp. 21, 41). Such a party would act simultaneously with "courage and conviction" in the streets and in legislatures at all levels as a "conscience and moral force" to control executive governments. Such a party would seek to strengthen democratic processes from below.

She recognizes that "the question of nonviolence is the biggest challenge to all Green parties." One reason for this is that all members do not accept nonviolence as an uncompromisable principle rather than merely as a useful political tactic. Another problem is that the more successful Green parties become, sometimes in coalitions with other parties, the more responsible they are for the direct and structural violence of the state. With characteristic frankness she observes, "I do not believe we have yet found the answer, but we all know that we must try to transform these violent institutions into nonviolent institutions" (p. 67). This is precisely the challenge to nonviolent politics, combining nonviolent movements for social change with direct nonviolent political participation for nonviolent global transformation.

What are the lessons from her experience?

These are reflected mainly in her essays on "Morality and Human Dignity" and an "Open Letter to the German Green Party." First, as she admits, "The Greens, originally intent on transforming power from below, have meanwhile become victims of power from above" (p. 127). This might well have been foreseen on the basis of the classic study of *Political Parties* by Robert Michels (1915) in which he posits an "iron law of oligarchy." This is a process by which the politics of the many becomes the politics of the few cut off from their popular base and engaged in factional and personal struggle for power. This text is an indispensable challenge for all who seek to disprove such a "law." In Petra Kelly's analysis the co-optation of the German Greens in power struggles from the top, combined with failure to adhere uncompromisingly to their principles,

Introduction

contributed to their foreseeable failure to gain 5 percent of the votes in the December 1990 national election, with consequent loss of all their seats in the Bundestag.

But the difficulties encountered by Petra Kelly and other nonviolent leaders reflect also the inadequacy of preparation and support that societies are prepared to give political leaders in general. In contrast, compare the great social investment in education and training for military leaders, businessmen, lawyers, and civil servants. On the contrary, political leaders are supposed to emerge spontaneously out of a struggle for power, relatively unaided--except that in violence-accepting societies they are apt to be recruited from the forenamed professions. This is accompanied by virtually universal criticism of the quality and behavior of political leaders in every type of society.

These conventional problems of political leadership are compounded for nonviolent leaders who seek to question, challenge, and change the policies and institutions of violence-prone societies--political, military, economic, social, cultural, and ecological--not only locally but also globally. The lonely paths to martyrdom of Gandhi and King provide prototypical examples. Therefore Petra Kelly's analysis of the personal, organizational, and structural factors that contribute to "self-defeating" electoral, legislative, and executive politics is especially important. The problem of egotistical, jealous, and aggressive personalities--more self-oriented than issue-oriented, compassionate, and constructive--is a fundamental one. It results in an atmosphere of mutual distrust that Petra Kelly characterizes as "Kill the Leaders!" (p. 18). To create nonviolent politics with personalities produced and scarred by violent societies is indeed difficult because nonviolence means noninjury in thought, word, and deed. Since nonviolence applies to friends as well as to enemies, it should be assiduously practiced in a nonviolent political party or movement. But given global resources for spiritual and organizational change, given the will and means, this problem is no more insoluble than to take relatively peaceful

citizens and to train them to lead, kill, and die in military combat. The scientific combination of meditation and nutrition offers one nonsectarian point of departure (e.g., Yuvacharya Mahapragya 1986, 1988).

Humans are capable of both violence and nonviolence. How we act depends upon which qualities we wish to develop in ourselves, our leaders, and others for the well-being of all. Better human relations are possible among nonviolent leaders, parties, and all who support them. It will take research, education, training, and hard work to accomplish this. But nonviolent movements should take the improvement of organizational performance no less seriously than do military establishments and corporations.

Although Petra Kelly does not mention it, nonviolent political leaders, both inside and outside formal institutions, need opportunities for rest, recreation, and reflection--for spiritual, psychological, and physical revitalization. They need this no less than soldiers in combat or professors who take sabbatical leave. Gandhi's periodic withdrawals from campaigns into ashram life provide an illustration. Driven by events, under attack from both inside and outside the civil rights movement, Martin Luther King, Jr., had virtually no chance for this. Therefore the provision of completely supportive havens for spiritual and physical revitalization is a service to nonviolent leaders in which visionary benefactors and life-uplifting institutions should cooperate.

Petra Kelly's emphasis upon the acquisition, study, and use of "counterinformation" for effective nonviolent political action is of central importance. Such information is needed to counter governmental ignorance, secrecy, deception, and inaction. The stress of information overload experienced by the conscientious nonviolent political figure who seeks to respond to human needs on a wide range of local and global issues is readily understandable. This can be made more manageable by skilful

Introduction

combination of technologies and highly competent staff assistance. Both of these are apt to be in short supply for nonviolent leaders. It is not that they do not exist, or cannot be created. Their absence results from two reluctances: the reluctance of dominant, violence-accepting institutions to provide them; and the reluctance of nonviolent political figures who are nurtured in principles of self-reliance and frugality to insist upon them. Supporters of nonviolent political leadership must help to remove these obstacles.

Another lesson can be learned from the fact that although Petra Kelly speaks for the victims of dominant power, she works amidst elite institutions: parties, governments, bureaucracies, the media, and universities. On behalf of power from the bottom up she works primarily from the top down. For comparison, consider the elite person who goes to work for nonviolent change among the poor. Both are essential for nonviolent global transformation--as are poor who work among the poor and elites who work among elites.

But working at the top entails two dangers--isolation and co-optation--for which Petra Kelly suggests corresponding remedies. The first is to try in every way not to lose touch with the various social movements that challenge governmental failure to respond to people's needs. For increasing responsiveness to them is the heart of the nonviolent political process (Burton 1979). She insists, "We cannot stop our ecological consciousness-raising in the streets, even while we are in Parliament. We cannot forget our commitments to the social movements outside!" (p. 67) The other recommended remedy is to engage in civil disobedience within the dominant institutions. This means not to lose contact with those at the top, contact characterized by principled dissent against misuse of power. She explains, "All of us in Germany would benefit if we were to learn at last the liberating and constructive art of civil disobedience--not just in the extraparliamentary movement, but also within parliament and political parties. Civil disobedience

has to be practiced in parliament or even within our own party if we become too dogmatic, powerful, or arrogant" (p. 148).

Still another lesson for nonviolent political leadership to be learned from her experience is her sense of constituency that differs radically from conventional representational politics. Petra Kelly's constituency is the planet. Imagine it yours as seen from outer space--an increasingly dirty, white-smudged, blue-green spinning ball. From this perspective violent divisions melt away and the nonviolent unity of life is evident. Her constituency includes all the human beings on earth. One expression of their interests is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). Her constituency also includes all nonhuman forms of life and everything that supports them. These basic ideas of constituency help to explain why she refuses to be confined within national boundaries, why she works locally for global good, and why she works globally for local well-being. Nonviolent political leaders of the future and their supporters have much to learn from this.

Comparison of Petra Kelly with Gandhi and King, whose nonviolent tradition she continues, is appropriate. Although all three share these qualities to some degree it is nevertheless fair to say that she is more ecologically and globally oriented, more expressive of feminist concerns, more clearly opposed to militarization in all its forms, more experienced in electoral and parliamentary politics, and more informed by global travel. She is a pioneer in carrying nonviolent politics directly into the heart of formal political institutions from a global perspective. She is at one with Gandhi and King, as with the earlier Tolstoy, in possessing a keen sense of the spiritual roots and strength of nonviolence. "We cannot solve any political problems without also addressing our spiritual ones!" (p. 17) For her this means developing "respect for all living things" and understanding their "interrelatedness" and "interconnectedness." This for her is the core of Green ethics and politics. "I believe," she declares, "that

Introduction

unarmed truth and unconditional love will have the final word in reality" (Kelly 1987b, p. 32).

Petra Kelly deserves to be seen now and will in the future be recognized with Tolstoy, Gandhi, and King as a preeminent contributor to nonviolent global change in the twentieth century.

REFERENCES

- Burns, James MacGregor. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burton, John. 1979. *Deviance, Terrorism and War: The Process of Solving Unsolved Social and Political Problems*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Gandhi, Mohandas K. 1970. *The Science of Satyagraha*. Edited by Anand T. Hingorani. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Galtung, Johan. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 3: 167-92.
- Kelly, Petra K. n.d. "Introduction." *Green Politics: The Irish Alternative*, ms., 15 pp.
- _____. n.d. "Greens, Europe and Global Peace." ms., 20 pp.
- _____. 1987a. "Towards a Green Europe! Towards a Green World!" Closing speech at the International Green Congress, Stockholm, Sweden, August 30.
- _____. 1987b. "The Green Movement." In Tom Woodhouse, *People and Planet: Alternative Nobel Prize Speeches*. Bideford, Devon: Green Books. 22-32.

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

- _____. 1989. "Gandhi and the Green Party." *Gandhi Marg* (July-September), 192-202.
- _____. 1990. "For Feminization of Power." Congress of the National Organization of Women, San Francisco, June 30, 1990.
- _____. 1991. "Politics and Ecology." Speech at the Morelia Ecology Conference, Morelia, Mexico, September 2.
- Michels, Robert. 1915. *Political Parties*. Reprint. New York: Dover, 1959.
- Paige, Glenn D. 1977. *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: Porter Sargent.
- _____. 1979. *Gandhi as Political Strategist*. Boston: Porter Sargent.
- Yuvacharya Mahapragya (sic). 1986. *Jeevan Vigyan* (Science of Living). Translated by R. P. Bhatnagar and Rajul Bhargava. Ladnun, India: Jain Vishva Bharati.
- Yuvacharya Mahaprajna (sic). 1988. *Preksha Dhyana: Therapeutic Thinking*. Ladnun, India: Jain Vishva Bharati Press.

TOWARDS A GREEN EUROPE, TOWARDS A GREEN WORLD

Many, many years from now, when the telling of history is told, people will hear about the 1980s. A fragile era where a hydra of tensions and conflicts threatened the survival of the planet--where terrorists menaced the innocent, racial and religious wars overtook great countries, and children became armed militia. . . . The time was also marked by an uprising of the human spirit--founded on peoples' faith that within them was a vast reservoir of good.

People knew . . . they could be trusted with Peace.

Carl Rogers

Dear Friends in the International Green Movement
and in the International Green Parties!

I would like to thank the Green Party of Sweden for having invited me, together with Jakob von Uexkull, to speak at this closing session.

I was only able to arrive last evening in Stockholm because of a family reunion we celebrated in Germany. I hope this first International Green Congress has been a valuable and constructive one. I can think of no better place to have an International Green Congress than in a neutral, nonaligned country like Sweden, especially at a time when some prominent

*Closing speech at the International Green Congress, Stockholm, Sweden,
August 30, 1987.*

Green members in the Green Party of the Federal Republic of Germany are trying to convince us that we must accept NATO membership, arguing that the Green position on nonalignment leads us into "a nation-state and nationalist" way of thinking.

I think the line of tactical thinking and argument, that we should abandon our platform on "nonalignment" and "active neutrality" as a concrete Green goal, is wrong and very destructive. To me, the Green parties and movements in West and East, North and South, must give new life and new commitment to the debate on nonalignment and active neutrality in Europe and elsewhere. Neutrality is not an end in itself but is an instrument for active peace policy. In my opinion Green parties and movements who must work in countries belonging to military alliances must keep nonalignment clearly and courageously in their political program and should act accordingly in political practice. That means also taking the first calculated step out of the military alliance.

I hope also that the Green parties in neutral countries such as Sweden, Finland, the Republic of Ireland, Austria, and Switzerland will cooperate more and more closely and will show us the way to a bloc-free Europe.

The recent internal turmoil in my own Green party concerning the question of NATO membership and unilateral disarmament is troubling me--as are a whole range of other internal Green squabbles which worry me and from which others should learn. I can only plead with all of you here in Stockholm: Don't repeat our mistakes!

What has always given me hope is the fact that authentic Green movements, action groups, and Green parties have not been wedded to old styles and old ideologies. We were and still are genuinely open to new, radical, nonviolent, feminist, and ecological as well as pacifist approaches. Albert Einstein once stated that the splitting of the atom has changed everything--

except the way people think. And that is and was what we set out to do--to help change the way people think--to help people make their own grass-roots decisions, to help them act locally and think globally. As Murray Bookchin, an American ecologist, has stated:

The great project of our time must be to open the other eye: to see outsidely and wholly, to hear and to transcend the cleavage between humanity and nature that comes with early wisdom.

What is the meaning of "seeing outsidely and seeing wholly" for us within the Green movement? What does this imply for our future? For a truly Green world? And what is meant after all by Green politics? At the U.S.A. National Green Gathering in Amherst, Massachusetts this summer, which I could not attend because I was in Moscow, there was much controversy between the political and spiritual/political wings of the Green movement. But why? I believe that both wings belong together, complement each other, and are part of each other because we cannot solve any political problems without also addressing our spiritual ones. Those who intentionally keep confusing the spiritual content of Green politics with a "religious movement," as some do on the Left, detract attention from, and, in fact, ridicule the core of Green politics, the ethics of Green politics. Green politics has always had a spiritual base. This means respecting all living things and knowing about the interrelatedness and interconnectedness of all living things.

Whether in the macrocosm or microcosm, the political is the personal and the personal is the political. Theodore Roszak stated that the spiritual void in our lives is the prime political fact of our time. I believe we must learn to get in touch with the nonmaterial states of consciousness. We must talk about alienation and self-alienation. We must talk about the alienation many of us have suffered at some point in time within the Green movement. Perhaps we should all talk less about political or

spiritual problems and begin acting ourselves more from a spiritual place!

It is a very, very sad thing. On the one hand we watch how we upset traditional voting patterns and how we can disturb traditional politicians on the Right and on the Left, gaining great electoral successes in parliamentary elections, as we did in January 1987. And then on the other hand we watch how we bring just as much disarray and just as much upset upon ourselves. We bring it right smack into our own Green movement through internal fighting; old power tactics; loveless, hard, and endless argumentative turmoil in the process of "full-consensus decision-making;" and through a game familiar to all here, called "Mistrust the People You Have Just Elected!" In the 1960s, this was called "Kill the Leaders!" We have been self-destructive through envy and intolerance and are often rather violent verbally with one another. I have experienced all of these things within our own Green Party at home to a very frightening extent.

We also experience conflicts between those coming from a rather dogmatic, old, Leftist political perspective, which shares, rightly so, many anti-capitalist positions and those who come from a holistic New Age perspective, whose aims I also very much support. There is often a great clash of interest, not so much in what we are aiming for, but about how we are to do it, about what strategies we should pursue toward our common goal.

Also there are those who are called in our party the "Realos" In fact, at every step of the way, they try to moderate our political program so as to become more acceptable political partners to the Social Democrats.* *[Ed. Note: For much of the 1980s and 1990s, West--and then united Germany--was led by a coalition government whose leading members were the Christian Democrats (CDU and CSU), the party of Chancellor Helmut Kohl),*

Towards a Green Europe, Towards a Green World

and the Free Democrats (FDP). The Social Democrats (SDP) were the leading opposition party during that period.]

In the past few weeks the "Realos" have begun questioning our green strategy of "unilateral disarmament" and our aim of dismantling the two military blocs by starting first at home with NATO. Of course, demanding to leave NATO is in itself not a program, but the beginning of a much-needed discussion about taking the first calculated step out of military alliances. It is a most necessary and important one, when we think about what the NATO alliance has been all about in the past few months. Think about Libya, think about Grenada, think about the Gulf crisis, think about the Cuban crisis, and think about the NATO maneuvers taking place in Turkey under the guise of which Kurdish minorities are being killed by Turkish troops.

There are also the undogmatic, radical independent ecologists and pacifists in the Greens, among whom I count myself, who hope to reconcile the differences I have described if the Green Party is to survive. We do not want to moderate or soften the program for the sake of power tactics!

The title of this closing session, "Toward a Green Europe and a Green World," poses questions about our own political survival at a time when major Green parties, in Germany, for example, begin to split internally on basic questions such as establishing power coalitions, and where and when to make certain compromises. The Green Party in the Federal Republic of Germany, as "the lesser of the political evils," is becoming increasingly co-opted into the existing political system.

At the recent peace demonstration in Bonn during the summer of 1987, a Green sympathizer and well-known doctor committed to the fight against nuclear war told me that he is not about to vote for the Green Party again. The reason he gave was the following: "I voted for the Greens because they set out to solve the most burning questions in society or at least they set

out to try to solve them. But in the past few months all they have been doing is creating their own problems and discussing them at such length that it becomes absolutely disgusting." Constantly debating our own internal problems, running down our opponents within the Green Party, humiliating and threatening others in all sorts of ways--these have been the media headlines of the Green Party over the past few months, despite all the very valuable and efficient political work that we are doing in the extra-parliamentary and parliamentary areas. We have failed to make known the concrete political projects in which we are engaged. We ourselves have done everything possible to make the media interested only in our internal squabbles and personal wars. Worst of all, the Green Party is facing a political wing within its own ranks which is beginning to moderate or make compromises on key Green issues and principles that have been an essential part of the Green program since 1979.

I believe that the Green way of thinking and living is here to stay, even if some of the Green parties will not survive into the nineties. I also believe that we as a party are here to stay if we do not make compromises when it comes to life and death questions. There is no such thing as a little bit of cancer, or a little bit of malnutrition, or a little bit of death, or a little bit of social injustice, or a little bit of torture. It does not help us in any way if we begin accepting, for example, lower and so-called safer levels of radioactivity, or lower and so-called safer levels of lead and dioxin. We must speak out clearly, loudly, and courageously if we know that there are no safe levels. We must not begin to compromise our aims and our demands for the sake of joining others in power, others who are not yet ready to go on the ecological path, for the sake of wanting to exercise power in those very same institutions which we wanted to transform--not violently but through grass-roots pressure and through "Greenpeace" type nonviolent actions and campaigns.

Simply repairing the existing systems, whether they are capitalist or state-socialist oriented, should not be our aim. Our

aim is nonviolent transformation of societal structures. Our aim is radical, nonviolent change of a patriarchal society which has been militarized and which has been so much accustomed to the use of force. Decentralism, global responsibility, developing at the grass-roots level new soft technologies and soft energies scaled to a comprehensible human dimension, developing a truly free and truly nonviolent society in our own communities, showing solidarity across all national boundaries and ideologies with people who are repressed and discriminated against, practicing civil disobedience against the nuclear and military state--all this can be done very effectively without having to send a lone Green minister into a Social Democratic cabinet accompanied by making compromises all along the way to the point of no return. This recently occurred in Hessen!

I believe that we already have considerable power. I also believe that we have much responsibility without joining any government. We can be successful if we truly believe in our own concept of power. First, it is important to realize that we do not talk about "power over" or "power to dominate" or "power to terrorize or oppress." When we speak of a new type of power, the power of nonviolence, it is rather about abolishing power as we know it. We define the power of nonviolence as something common to all, to be used by all, and for all. Power over is to be replaced by shared power, by the power to do things, by the discovery of our own strength as opposed to a passive reception of power exercised by others, often in our name.

At the founding of the Green Party in the Federal Republic of Germany, I coined the term "anti-party party" for the Greens--trying to express that new kind of power. The Hungarian writer Gyorgy Konrad expressed it all the better with the term "anti-politics," as a moral force: "Anti-politics strives to put politics in its place and makes sure it stays there, never overstepping its proper office of defending and refining the rules of the game in a civil society. Anti-politics is the ethos of civil society, and civil society is the antithesis of military society."

The time may or could come one day when we will have a truly ecological political partner. Then we could form a "Green government." (We already have Green mayors!) But that time is not yet in sight. Many more must first be convinced of ecological politics as the only choice for survival on planet Earth before we can have truly alternative governments.

Years ago, recalls Murray Bookchin, the French students in the May-June uprising of 1968 magnificently expressed their sharp contrast of alternatives in their slogan: "Be practical. Do the impossible!" To this demand, we, the generation that faces the next century, can add the more solemn injunction: "If we don't do the impossible, we shall be faced with the unthinkable." As one poet put it:

Where would we get to
If everyone said
Where would we get to
And no one went
To have a look
Where we'd get to
If we went.

We would like to get to a Green Europe and a Green World. But there are a few important preconditions that must be part of Green thinking.

First, an ecological society is a truly free society that is based on ecological principles that can mediate humanity's relationship with nature. That means searching for soft, decentralised technologies and energies and for ways of true co- and self-determination. It means rejecting and moving away from monolithic modes of production and monolithic technology and monolithic institutions like the military-industrial complex. I believe it is true, as Professor Seymour Melman of Columbia University points out, that there is no economic necessity inherent in capitalism which gives the war-economy dominance. That is a political choice. But at this moment, the five hundred

largest industrial corporations control nearly one trillion dollars in corporate assets in the United States. The six hundred largest multinational corporations will control over forty percent of the planetary production by the end of the 1980s. The result of all of these monolithic modes and trends has been wastefulness, overdependence, and unnaturalness.

But a truly free society must also mean the guarantee of economic, social, and individual human rights. It means that we must speak out loudly to be heard and counted wherever basic human rights are not respected, regardless of country or ideology, regardless of where human rights are violated, whether in Poland or Chile, South Africa or Turkey, El Salvador or Afghanistan.

Unfortunately, at this congress of Green parties, our friends working in the independent Green initiatives in East Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia are missing, unable to join us. "Glasnost" must also include them and their right, as well as ours, to travel and consult one another. Green movements are growing daily within Eastern Europe and in the Third World. We must never forget or ignore them, for all too often we are too "Eurocentric" in our thinking. Each of us must have the right to practice detente from below!

A truly free society must also mean that we do not want peace that oppresses us. We must learn, on our terms, what peace and freedom mean. The phrase "peace and freedom" all too long has been part of Right-wing vocabulary and ideology, at times sadly neglected by the Left, sometimes even within our own ranks. I have been disappointed when I have seen the amount of time, effort, and money we have put into campaigns against the Contras in Nicaragua while at the same time neglecting the question of Afghanistan or the question of releasing certain political prisoners in countries of Eastern Europe. There can be no peace if there is social injustice, if there is suppression of human rights. Internal and external peace are inseparable!

Second, when we try to rid the world of things as oppressive as nuclear, chemical, and conventional weapons, or poverty, sexism, and racism, it can help us to look at their structural underpinning. This is a system of patriarchy which is found in all systems, whether they are capitalist or state-socialist. Patriarchy is a system of male domination, prevalent in both capitalist and socialist countries, which is suppressive of women and restrictive to men. Patriarchy is a hierarchical system in which men have more value and more social and economic power. Under it women suffer both from oppressive structures and from individual men. It shows itself in all areas of our lives, affecting political and economic structures, our work, our home, and our personal relationships. To put it bluntly--men are at the center of a patriarchal world in East and West and South and North--whether they want to be or not. But I believe that norms of human behavior can and do change over the centuries and these aspects also can be changed. No pattern of domination is necessarily part of human nature. However, that means that certain men within the Green parties must give up their privileges and their male-chauvinistic ways of "politics."

Third, the type of true disarmament we are talking about has been best expressed by women coming from five European countries where deployment of American and Soviet nuclear missiles has taken place. I quote from their joint statement:

Despite our differences, we are united by the will for self-determination, to struggle against the culture of militarism in the world, against uniforms and violence, against our children being educated as soldiers, and against the senseless waste of resources. We demand the right of self-determination for all individuals and peoples. We want to make a specific cultural contribution to changing existing social structures. That is why we also challenge conventional gender roles and why we ask men to do the same.

Towards a Green Europe, Towards a Green World

The freedom to determine one's own fate also means freedom from exploitation and violence: in our thoughts and actions, at our places of work, in our relationship with nature, and in the relationship between men and women, between generations, between states, between East and West, and between North and South in global terms.

We must, I believe, hold onto our strategies of unilateral disarmament, always making the first step and never pointing at the other side before we look at our own glass house.

Fourth, the most internationalist task for us all is to practice "detente from below" across all national boundaries and ideologies. This means that we should stay in touch with those high up in places of power, but at the same time we should devote our time and efforts equally to those in nonviolent political opposition, to those working on independent initiatives who are still harassed and politically suppressed. Some Greens in my own country prefer to speak only at a selected high level. But speaking with politicians at a very high level should never make us compromise or make us less committed when it comes to our friends in the independent ecological, peace, and women's movements from below. For example, some who want to speak to Mr. Erich Honecker may moderate or lessen their contacts with the independent peace initiatives in Eastern Germany or may begin to ignore them in order to be reinvited. They have not yet understood what can be done when one speaks to both levels on an equal basis and when one devotes energies and time both to Mr. Honecker and to those working in the independent initiatives. Mr. Honecker and the rest will respect the Greens all the more if we continue our solidarity work in favor of the independent peace and ecological groups in Eastern Germany without losing touch. We need not take up the game of "silent" diplomacy. Too many do that already!

Practicing "detente from below" also means doing everything possible to build up a demilitarized, nonaligned Europe in the spirit of Olof Palme, as opposed to Western European military and nuclear superpower now in the making. The German Christian Democrats and the CSU want a hand on the nuclear trigger and more co-determination in nuclear affairs. I need not explain again the Pershing 1-A debate in our country. For the time being Mr. Helmut Kohl has begun to understand at last the arguments of the peace movement concerning the Pershing 1-A missile. But we all know that between the lines, conservative and reactionary forces in the Federal Republic of Germany are in favor of the idea of British and French nuclear cooperation including, one day, German participation on the basis of full equality. I believe that one of the most important tasks for the European Green Parties is preventing a third military and nuclear superpower called Western Europe.

Fifth, recently our Minister of Justice, Mr. Hans Engelhard, claimed that there is no such thing as the right to civil disobedience in a democratic society. But we continue to insist upon this right as an integral part of every democratic society. We shall continue to reply to the violence of the state with effective nonviolent campaigns. Nonviolence is stronger than violence. We must do everything possible for nonviolent conflict resolution within our own ranks and to spread knowledge and training concerning social defense, i.e. nonmilitary forms of defense. We must be very clear about what we mean when we call ourselves a nonviolent party and a nonviolent movement. The means and the ends must be parallel. You cannot reach a peaceful end with violent means and you cannot reach a just end with unjust means.

Those who call themselves part of the "autonomous" movement and who use violent means at mass rallies and demonstrations must realise that they are not helping us. They are not aiding our cause but rather are deliberately or involuntarily doing our adversaries a service whenever they act

side by side with paid provocateurs as if they themselves were supporters of the nuclear lobby and of the nuclear state which we reject. Nonviolent struggle does not mean passive acceptance or inaction. Nonviolent struggle gains its meaning and impact from massive civil disobedience, creatively planned and carried out without confirming conventional establishment expectations of violence. Therefore, we must learn from similar situations in other countries and develop effective methods of nonviolent action.

I was very saddened last April while in Guernica in the Basque country to find that some Green members of the Rainbow Fraktion of the European Parliament have sympathies with the ETA, which is nothing but a criminal organisation using very violent means to try to bring about change. It was embarrassing to see how frustrated and how upset nonviolent groups in the Basque country have become because a few prominent Green members of the European Parliament have suggested that an organisation such as ETA should begin discussions and talks with the Spanish army. This is like asking the Red Army Faction to have discussions with the German government. Actually, as I discovered in the Basque region, there is so much hope and support for nonviolent forms of change that the majority of the Basque people are not on the side of violence and senseless killings. I hope that all Green parties will become more and more Greenpeace-like, firmly committed to nonviolent action. This is a model that all of us should follow.

Sixth, last but not least, in the process of trying to bring more peace, justice, and harmony to this world, we ourselves must become more peaceful, just, and tolerant with one another, within our own ranks. The hurt, the hypocrisy, the intolerance, the mean-hearted spirit, and the attitude of always "controlling" and not "trusting" each other within the Greens at home has been a strong disappointment to many of us. Such ways have minimized our appeal, our chances, and our concrete results. Participatory democracy must not become a new formula for

demagoguery--for misuse of grass-roots power and for tactics such as making decisions for others after most members have left a long and tiring meeting. We must not hurt each other just because there is a disagreement, just because some may not think the same way that the "grass-roots level" has decided. The question always remains: who are the grass roots? This can often be manipulated. There must always be room for tolerance, for accepting each others' positions and points of view. There must always be room to act according to one's conscience.

The Green Party in the Federal Republic of Germany has often complained about the types of pressure other political parties have applied on their own members. But within the Green parliamentary fraction as well there is a lot of pressure on the individual. Considerable psychological pressure is applied if he or she expresses a dissenting opinion. Respecting each individual, his or her talents and individuality without coercion, without mistrust, and without committees and bureaucracies to control and watch over him or her--this is also part of Green politics. Living our values is what Green politics is all about!

FOR A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE AND NONVIOLENT WORLD

Dear Friends of Peace!

Thank you for this special opportunity to address this plenary session at the invitation of the Indian Foreign Minister. Gert Bastian and I are grateful for the invitation to this special peace conference in New Delhi, which we are combining with a visit to Dharamsala at the invitation of His Holiness the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan Government in Exile.

Peace has a wide meaning, I believe, for all of us here. It means far more than the absence of weapons of mass destruction or the absence of military-bloc thinking. Peace is also the positive external and internal condition in which people are free, in which people are not exploited and are living so that they can grow to their full potential. Therefore I want to mention the very positive attitude of the Indian government toward the many refugees from Tibet, refugees who have suffered so much since Chinese troops invaded Tibet in 1950. In 1959 His Holiness the Dalai Lama, together with his family, government, and many Tibetans, were forced to flee. It was Prime Minister Nehru, whose November 14, 1988. birth centenary is celebrated today who offered asylum to the Dalai Lama and to a hundred thousand Tibetans. I mention this because we can never discuss the issue of peace or the issue of a nonviolent world order

Congress on Towards a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World, New Delhi, India, November 14, 1988.

without discussing human rights. They belong inseparably together. We do not want a peace that suppresses! We welcome the Five-Point Peace Plan suggested by the Dalai Lama including the idea of Tibet becoming a zone of peace and nonviolence between India and China.

India has often expressed anguish over the increasing violations of human rights and fundamental freedom all over the world and has called for urgent measures to stem this trend. Unfortunately, I am told, India has rebuffed an Australian attempt to establish a UN agency for monitoring human rights violations in Asia and the Pacific. I hope that human rights is also a domestic issue in India when it comes to the human rights of the Sikhs. Amnesty International has written an alarming report on this subject, of which the Indian government should take note.

As Martin Luther King, Jr., a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, stated, we are all caught in a network of mutuality. We are tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects us all indirectly. I would like to quote Mahatma Gandhi--someone who has deeply influenced the philosophy and political work of the German Green Party---someone whose life and writing has deeply moved me. "I do not believe in the doctrine of the greatest good for the greatest number. The only real, dignified, human doctrine is the greatest good for all." Gandhi considered his most important work not so much the political struggle he was involved in, but his efforts nonviolently to truly transform Indian society itself. Gandhi insisted that India could become healthy only through a revitalization of its villages, where over four-fifths of its people lived, a figure that still applies today. He envisioned a society of strong villages, each one politically autonomous and economically self-reliant. I strongly believe that we must work toward transforming all of our societies if we want to reach a nonviolent world order.

For a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Nonviolent World

Mahatma Gandhi often referred to the *charkha* (spinning wheel)--which he suggested should be used for the national flag--with its connotation of humility, the development of spiritual resources, and self-sufficiency. Exactly these three elements are necessary for the nonviolent transformation of our militarized, patriarchal, and often aggressive and violent societies and societal orders.

But what must we do in order to sustain a nuclear-weapon-free (let me also add nuclear-free) and nonviolent world order? What can we in Western and Eastern Europe do? What can India do as a leading voice in the community of nonaligned nations?

Robert Muller, the chancellor of the UN University for Peace in Costa Rica, has stated it very well:

Education for all remains a first priority on this planet. We must manage our globe, so as to permit the endless stream of humans admitted to the miracle of life to fulfill their lives physically, mentally, morally and spiritually as has never before been possible in our entire evolution.

The most important among the elements of learning are values and establishing human dignity and human survival as fundamental values.

There is one simple sentence that I want to add here which, as Robert Muller advises in quoting Norman Cousins, should be displayed in every classroom on this planet. He quotes, "The tragedy of life is not death, but what we let die inside us while we live."

It was James W. Douglass who stated that the greatest power which nuclear weapons have is their power to kill us spiritually. "Nuclear weapons have the power of spiritual death so long as we despair at overcoming their physical and political power." Albert Einstein was correct, when he wrote that "the problem is not the atom-bomb, but the heart of the people."

Nuclear weapons, if I take one category of weapons, are killing people long before they are exploded. They are killing us through radiation poisoning and through the entire weapons production cycle from the mining of uranium in Australia to the testing of the weapons in the Pacific, in Nevada, or in the Soviet Union. Another way the weapons are killing people right now, right this very minute, is through misplaced resources. While hundreds of billions of dollars are still going towards preparation for war, people are starving by the millions. We know that fifteen to seventeen million children under five years of age from the poorest countries die every single year. That is comparable to the Second World War "Holocaust" happening over and over again every four and one-half months. As I state this a child is dying every two seconds. As Robert Aldridge stated in his book *First Strike*: "Something has to be dead within us to allow the gross injustices on this planet to continue."

The Green Party in the Federal Republic of Germany, the many ecological, antinuclear, and peace and pacifist groups all over the globe, also here in India (for example, the inspiring Chipko Movement or the Movement against the National Testing Range in Orissa), have begun to think globally and act locally. This gives me much hope for our future work.

Democratically and without violence we must change and transform society from its very foundation and throughout its entire structure and pattern of motivation. That means first of all changing ourselves, our behavior, and our consumer habits within Western economic growth societies.

We can begin by reducing our consumption of goods in the West to such an extent that we do not provide a market for big business. We can reduce our consumption of goods to where we will use only our share of the world's resources and not take what belongs to someone else. This is just one small aspect of nonviolence in everyday life and the ultimate personal noncooperation with corrupt practices. I believe that those who

have the faith to take these steps will find new dimensions to living. The actual danger as well as the potential solutions are not "out there." Both lie within us and taking responsibility for our personal behavior is just about the only thing in this world over which we have one hundred percent control.

In one particular area of our political work we have been greatly inspired by Mahatma Gandhi. That is in our belief that a lifestyle and methods of production which rely on an endless supply of raw materials and use those raw materials lavishly, also furnish the motive for the violent appropriation of raw materials from other countries. In contrast, a responsible use of raw materials, as part of an ecologically-oriented lifestyle and economy, reduces the risk that policies of violence will be pursued in our name. The pursuit of ecologically responsible policies within a society provides preconditions for a reduction of tensions and increases our ability to achieve peace in the world.

We have an uphill struggle facing the continuing militarization on earth, in space, in the oceans, and in the skies. But we are also facing an uphill struggle in the ecological sphere. As Aldo Leopold has stated, "We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which to belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect." It is saddening not only to hear about and witness ecological catastrophes in the North Sea and the Black Forest, and to think about the implications of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor disaster, but also to read about the ecological crisis facing India and the Himalayan region. Only one-third of the soil here in India is in good condition. The loss of top soil is dramatic. The earth, soil, water, plants, and animals also need a radical lobby if we are to make the transition to a truly nonviolent society.

The spiritual dimensions of nonviolence as lived by Gandhi are to me most important. Gandhi firmly believed that

nonviolence is more natural to men and women than violence. His doctrines were built upon his confidence in humankind's natural disposition to love. He stated:

Democracy can only be saved through non-violence, because democracy, so long as it is sustained by violence, cannot provide for or protect the weak. My notion of democracy is that under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest. This can never happen except through non-violence. . . . Non-violence cannot be preached. It has to be practiced.

This leads me to the most important question posed to us in the letter of invitation from the Indian Foreign Minister. We were asked to address the question of "non-violence as a means for building a new structure of international relations." The thought of Mahatma Gandhi that relates so directly to our nuclear age and which provides an answer is the following: "In this age of the atom-bomb unadulterated non-violence is the only force that can confound all the tricks of violence put together."

Gandhi never envisaged a tactical nonviolence confined to one area of life or to an isolated movement. His nonviolence is a creed which embraces all of life in a consistent and logical network of obligations. For example, one cannot be nonviolent in interpersonal relations and violent with regard to conscription and war. Furthermore, the means and the ends must be consistent. One cannot achieve a just end with unjust means; or, one cannot achieve peace through violent means. The road to peace is peace!

In conclusion, let me try to state what this means for the Green Party when it comes to security and disarmament policies. One of the basic contentions in Europe at present within the peace movement is that the goal of arms control--the development of a so-called "stable deterrence"-- cannot be achieved! If we begin to accept a "deterrence" perspective, we simply allow the military complexes to modernize their weapons

and redefine nuclear warfare. So-called modernization, the continual search for new weapons that are both "usable" and "stabilizing," prevents stability from ever being achieved! We see this clearly now after the successful Intermediate Nuclear Force Agreement. Already NATO plans to fill the gap left behind, to modernize shorter-range nuclear weapons; that is to say, to compensate for what has been removed!

A provision in the INF-Treaty allows nuclear warheads and missile guidance mechanisms to be reused. Thus the Pershing II nuclear warhead will come back to Europe on the new, modernized version of the Lance missile. Soon NATO will deploy sea-launched cruise missiles on submarines and there are plans for new air-launched cruise missiles. As U.S. General John R. Galvin (Supreme Allied Commander in Europe) described it, there will be "a new nuclear arsenal of short-range weapons."

If we accept deterrence thinking, there will never be a time when both sides will say, "Things are stable--our forces are equal--let's stop!" The military-industrial complexes and the secret services continue to put pressure on governments as long as the deterrence philosophy functions and is accepted by our leadership and the various arms control negotiators. The present arms control community accepts the view that a stable nuclear balance and effective deterrence is an achievable goal. But I feel that this is not so! This is still part of the "old thinking," as Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev would say! We must get rid of the entire notion of "thinking the other side to death" in our mind, in our heads! We must stop believing in deterrence, stop believing in the lie that more refined and accurate weapons of all types can give us more security.

We spend more and more on military hardware every day--militarizing the oceans, the skies, the space above and around us. Yet, we are less secure than ever in history! Defense spending generates fewer jobs than other areas of spending. "It produces," Jesse Jackson reminds us, "nothing of utility to our society--no

food, no clothes, no housing, no medical supplies or equipment! In short, nothing of social value!" As the Brandt North-South Report pointed out, the cost of one new jet fighter- bomber could pay for inoculating three million children against the major childhood diseases.

We the Greens have made unilateral disarmament the cornerstone of our political approach to peace. This is perceived not merely as a series of unilateral steps to induce arms control and disarmament negotiations, but as a new principle of foreign policy and of peace movement strategy. By breaking with multilateralism, which implies the logic of balance of power and the built-in limits of diplomatic exchange, governments can start to pursue truly internationalistic policies which refrain from potentially threatening definitions of national interest. It is a way to enter into a deescalation process that can mobilize deeply rooted feelings of "making the first step," reduce threat images, and open the field for popular debate about new policies.

If I may state the following here as a guest, I truly hope that India, as a member of the "Five Continent Initiative" and as a "crusader against nuclear proliferation," will also pursue policies of taking the first step out of the vicious cycle of nuclear deterrence-thinking rather than following hardliners (both in India and Pakistan) who argue for a nuclear-weapons option. Pakistan is reported to have acquired equipment for designing and efficiently detonating a nuclear device, and they also have tested the nonnuclear triggering component of a bomb assembly. We realize that U.S. policies toward Pakistan and the clandestine illegal technical assistance from industry within the Federal Republic of Germany have made that development possible in Pakistan. I sincerely hope that the "pronuclear bomb lobbies" in both India and Pakistan do not grow any stronger!

The idea and concept of a South Asian Nuclear-Free Zone, for example, is something that gives all of us hope. Discussions about it have gone on in the UN since 1978. I realize that India

often has opposed such resolutions, on the ground that they could detract from the perspective for general and complete disarmament. But are such Regional Nuclear-Free Zones not a positive psychological first step? It is one that we want to take as well in Europe with our neutral Northern neighbours showing us the way. The Green Party strives for a nonaligned, nuclear-free, demilitarized Europe, a Europe of the Regions, a Europe that does not stop at WEU, EEC, and NATO borders, even though then we will not have reached the perspective of complete disarmament!

I have heard some Indian policy-makers state: "We do not really want to make nuclear weapons, but might have to do so in order to deter Pakistan, a power that is not as 'responsible' as we are!" And there are those who see a possible "European" or even an "Indian" bomb as a guarantee against superpower blackmail and as a means of reducing national dependence on superpowers! We also hear these same arguments in Western Europe in discussion of a possible future "European nuclear deterrent" that should, according to some conservative politicians, reduce military dependence on the U.S.A. Those who believe so here in India cite particularly the relationship between the United States and Pakistan that has developed since the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and see the new U.S.-Pakistan equation and the 3.1 billion dollar aid package as signifying the active presence of a nuclear superpower in South Asia. But I do not believe that an Indian atomic bomb could ever be the answer to this problem.

To argue that Indian military supremacy is needed on the subcontinent for stability is no answer in these times of new thinking. We should never confuse nuclear weapons with some notion of defence. One cannot defend anything with nuclear weapons!

Browsing through documents before I came here, I realized that India's principle nuclear scientist, H. J. Brabha, suggested

keeping the nuclear option for India open after the first Chinese nuclear test. It was Nehru who said in 1961: "How can we, without showing the utter insincerity of what we have always said, go in for doing the very thing, which we have asked other powers not to do?" I think that is a very good answer!

The French political weekly, *Le Nouvel Observateur*, quoted the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, as stating that India may be "forced to change its stand (against making nuclear weapons) . . . if a nuclear bomb appears on our frontiers" (quoted in the *Times of India*, June 8, 1985). In November 1985, the Prime Minister told reporters: "We have not decided that (to go nuclear) yet." Perhaps the news reports were incorrect. I hope so! I sincerely hope that India will never opt for the nuclear bomb, but I also sincerely hope that the two nuclear superpowers and France and Great Britain and China will soon lead the way out of the atomic spiral of destruction, out of the perverse arms race and the cycle of producing and exporting weapons. If they do not, their appeals to others who are on the verge of creating nuclear weapons through the production, sale, and import of so-called civilian nuclear power plants are meaningless! Already some twenty countries could possibly become members of the Nuclear Club

The Green Party considers civilian and military applications of nuclear power to be Siamese twins. It will come as no surprise when I state that we support fully the antinuclear movement here in India because there is a clear link between the so-called atoms for peace and atoms for weapons programmes. Of course we also reject nuclear power on many other grounds which I am sure are known to all here. Many countries that are developing nuclear power lack efforts to develop appropriate technologies for energy utilization and soft energy forms such as solar, wind, waves, hydro power, and biomass conversion. Such efforts are also part of nonviolently transforming society.

Let me add that we are also in full solidarity with the nonviolent resistance movement against the proposed national missile testing range in the Balasore district of the State of Orissa. In 1985 it was announced that the Baliapal National Test Range is needed, where missiles with a range of one thousand to five thousand kilometers will be tested, and maybe one day launched. Missiles with such ranges usually carry nuclear weapons. This missile test area, I am told, will also be used for launching space vehicles in the future and in due course even intercontinental ballistic missiles. I sincerely hope that this does not mean the introduction of sophisticated nuclear weaponry onto India's coast. A missile test area is one stage of development. Is a missile launching center the next inevitable step?

Photographs and articles have reached us of women and young children from surrounding villages nonviolently blocking the road leading to the barricaded site of the proposed national missile test range at Baliapal. Many local farmers and fishermen also have joined this opposition.

We ourselves have put questions in the German Parliament to our government about the involvement of the German Research Agency for Air and Space Travel (*Deutsche Forschungs und Versuchsanstalt für Luft und Raumfahrt*) in delivering certain materials and software to the missile industry here. We do so because we believe that we must see our interconnectedness to these problems here in India and see our local responsibility in global peacemaking efforts. We need to take the first step before asking others to do so!

More and more military hardware such as atomic submarines, new missiles, and more production and export of weapons cannot be the answer for Europe and cannot be the answer for India. *The road to peace is peace!*

POISONED FOOD AND WORLD HUNGER: THE POOR ARE FEEDING THE RICH

Thank you so much for the invitation to speak to you here on World Food Day. As most of you know I am always glad to be here in Dublin, together with my very close friend Gert Bastian. The theme of this year's meeting is "Food for the Future." I would like to address the issue of poisoned food and world hunger, and the issue of the poor feeding the rich.

Let me begin by stating a few of our Green principles. First of all, the Green Parties in Europe are trying to use a new type of power--a counterpower from below, the power of nonviolent change and nonviolent transformation, a power common to all, to be used by all and for all. "Power over" is to be replaced by "shared power," by "the power to do things," by the discovery of our own strength as opposed to a passive receiving of power exercised by others, often in our name. It is not a power to dominate, nor power to terrorise or oppress, but the power of nonviolent change. Eastern European authors, writers, and dissidents have expressed it better with the term "anti-politics"--anti-politics as a moral force. The subject of poisoned food and world hunger is a subject that concerns "power over," the way in which our method of politics and economics has kept people oppressed, hungry, and dying. The Green society we strive for is based on ecological principles that can mediate humanity's relationship with nature. This means first and foremost searching for a soft and decentralised energy system; for soft,

World Food Day Seminar, Dublin, Ireland, October 16, 1990.

decentralised technologies; and for methods of true codetermination and self-determination moving away from monolithic modes of production and monolithic technology. This also has to do with poisoned food and world hunger. At the present time, the five hundred largest industrial corporations control nearly one trillion dollars in corporate assets in the United States. The six hundred largest multinational corporations will control over 40 percent of planetary production by the end of this decade. All of this has to do with poisoned food and world hunger.

We have always been in favor of radically dismantling all those branches of industry which are hazardous to life--above all, the nuclear, the chemical, and of course, the defence industries. But again, these industries also have to do with poisoned food and world hunger. Here in the West we are overproducing and overconsuming and then dumping our highly poisonous, hazardous wastes and also our food wastes in developing countries! Just think about the radioactive milk powder, made radioactive through the Chernobyl disaster and then given away to Third World countries! And think about the Lactogen Nestle scandal--the milk powder that is being mixed with dirty water causing the deaths of many thousands of African children.

We must learn that we can be an agent of change, that we are part of the problem and that together we are also part of the solution. The actual danger is not "out there." The real danger as well as potential solutions lie within us. Our personal behavior is just about the only thing in this world over which we have 100 percent control and so we must take responsibility for it.

This week, the magazine *Der Stern* in the Federal Republic of Germany published a leading article about our daily food. It is quite strange to read that, on the one hand, millions and millions of women are trying to lose weight through Jane Fonda diets, while on the other hand, the European Community countries are importing grain to feed cows and other animals of which we have far too many and which produce far too much

meat. We eat too much meat, thereby getting ill, and we also end up eating poisonous and contaminated food which makes us even more sick, and the vicious cycle begins all over again!

But what has made me most angry is that fruit and vegetable pesticides can cause childhood cancer. A private environmental group in Washington, D.C., has recently reported that preschool children are consuming cancer-causing chemicals in fruit and vegetables at levels that expose them to health risks many times greater than the government considers safe. The National Resources Defense Council (NRDC), a group specialising in environmental and health matters, has concluded that the typical preschooler receives four times greater exposure on average than adult women to eight carcinogenic pesticides the group evaluated and that in some cases the exposure is as much as eighteen times that of adults. "Our children are being harmed by the very fruits and vegetables we tell them will make them grow up healthy and strong," concludes this report! The group's conclusions were based on fruit and vegetable consumption figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and on levels of pesticide residues found in twenty-seven types of fruits and vegetables.

Even more disgusting is the news that radioactive milk powder has ended up in Third World countries, for example in Africa, in El Salvador, in Thailand, and in Jamaica, as well as other areas of the world. The milk powder, made radioactive by the Chernobyl tragedy, was packed in twenty-five kilogramme bags, without labels and without any information about where it came from. This radioactive milk powder was then given to the children, the poorest of the poor, the weakest of the weak, those suffering the most from hunger. One could cynically call it a training programme for the "survival of the fittest." "For free distribution," the label reads, and children in the Sudan and other areas receive this milk powder, not realising the deadly mixture that they are going to drink. This type of European Community food aid is simply criminal! All the figures are correct that up to 20 percent of EC milk production was radioactively

contaminated in 1986. This means that ten to twenty million tonnes of radioactive milk powder went to Third World countries and this is not counting the contaminated grain and the meat that also went there. This is a form of racism! Let me cite the example of Jamaica. Jamaica wanted to return five hundred tons of contaminated milk powder. It did not want to accept them. The EC representative, K. Billerbeck, told them that Jamaica would not get any more EC food aid in the future if it refused the milk powder! He told them the levels of radioactivity were acceptable to all Europeans. This was of course totally untrue. But who cares about levels of radiation? Who cares about levels of radiation for African children when we here do not even care about them for those children living near Sellafield or other nuclear reactors?

In the case of Germany, one need only ask our German embassies abroad how the milk powder was distributed. Many of those in so-called high places know quite well what crimes have been committed in the name of food aid, so-called food aid gifts of the European Community, or through exports done through commercial companies.

But let me return again to the pesticides right here in Europe. The food system is unnecessarily contaminated and children would be in the line of fire even if Chernobyl had never taken place and even if we did not have any other nuclear and chemical industries. Let me just cite one figure: of the 560 million pounds of herbicides and fungicides used by American farmers annually, 375 million pounds are probably or possibly carcinogenic, according to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Under one scenario, these chemicals may cause an extra 1.4 million cases of cancer among Americans over their lifetimes. Children are particularly victimised by these compounds. A child has some seventy years of life ahead--seventy years to ingest pesticides and seventy years for carcinogens to exert their tragic effects. Children are also at heightened risk because their neurological, digestive, and other systems are still forming. Do we in Europe in fact know what

producers of food are the most diligent about cleaning up their food supplies? Do we know what food producers use what types of ingredients, for example, in baby food? I am reminded here of the EPA plans to ban alar, a chemical that regulates the growth of apples. The agency announced that the industry uses alar on 5 percent of U.S. apples. But the agency decided to postpone action for at least eighteen months while health tests were being completed. The most potent carcinogen cited in the report by the NRDC is called UDMH, a by-product of the chemical alar. For children who are heavy consumers of foods contaminated by UDMH (the poison emerges during processing of apples in juices and sauce), the study predicts cancer risks of one in eleven hundred. This example shows clearly that the EPA and other such agencies ignore childhood consumption patterns when regulating pesticides. Preschool children are being exposed to intolerable risks at a time when they are most susceptible to danger from toxic chemicals.

The question remains open--what can we eat? I believe we can have no faith in our governments' assuring us that our food is safe. To this day, no one within the EC seems to know precisely what hazards many common pesticides may pose to humans. Fifty thousand pesticide products in six hundred chemical categories are in use today. After working within the European Community for over ten years I can well tell you how, in fact, the EC deals with the chemical lobby, how it deals with big food companies and food chains. It hardly deals with them at all! It often bows to their lobbying pressure. I myself have experienced this on the subject of asbestos, a carcinogenic substance that should have been banned long ago!

The question has also arisen as to how easy it is for a terrorist to inject something into a few crates of fruit on the docks, in the fields, or on boats. We know of the lacing of oranges in France and West Germany with mercury in 1978 and we know of injecting blue die into grapefruits in Rome. In 1984, Japanese terrorists threatened to place cyanide-laced chocolates

on the shelves in an attempt to extort money from a candy company.

Let me add that in general our food industry officials and public health authorities worry far more about micro-biological threats to the food supply than chemical residues. Yet how many times have our parliaments in Western Europe rejected attempts to mandate safety levels and sampling programmes, on account, in part, of industry pressure.

Even more frightening, studies indicate that right from the day babies begin to suckle, they are taking in pesticides deposited in breast milk. Ready-made baby foods were also contaminated, although thankfully now several baby food companies like Gerber and Beech-Nut are cleaning up their food supply! Neither of these two companies, for example, accepts apples treated with alar.

Recently, after having been in India, I was told that Indian food is laced with some of the highest amounts of toxic pesticide residues in the world. In Uttar Pradesh, 250 people suffered from sudden convulsive seizures. They complained of noises, saw flashes of coloured light, and suffered from headaches. The reason: farmers in this area had ignorantly been using BHC (benzene hexachloride) to preserve their food grain. In another area, three hundred people were struck by a mysterious crippling attack of arthritis. Studies indicated that these people had switched to eating crabs from nearby fields after their wages were cut. Since the fields were sprayed regularly with pesticides, the crabs ingested large doses of toxins. The people eating the pesticides were poisoned by them as well. Let me quote another figure for India: pesticide use has risen tenfold in just three decades and is expected to pass eighty thousand tonnes this year. India is now the largest manufacturer as well as consumer of pesticides in South Asia. There are over 131 different types of pesticides marketed under 203 different formulations by over 350 companies in India. In 1984 the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) analysed 1,500

samples of cereals, oil, and milk from different parts of India. The finding: almost all the samples were contaminated with DDT and BHC. Almost all the samples also had exceeded the World Health Organization (WHO) safety limits. There has been no real effort at the governmental level either here or in Third World countries to work out the risk from pesticide residues to the general population.

The rise in Green consciousness has meant that the consumer now truly desires clean, pesticide-free, and hormone-free food. Much of the food we eat is responsible directly or indirectly for environmental pollution because many methods of agriculture are energy-intensive and use a lot of pesticides and artificial fertilizers. Food processing also means that much of the food contains chemical additives and is hardly nutritious. Now we must also be fearful that more and more food is being irradiated. It is far too easy to preach that organic foods ought to become a daily part of our diet. It is difficult for those who do not live near a biological food store or a biological farm.

We must demand that the labelling include all additives with suspect additives highlighted. We must make sure that all those which show evidence of toxicity be banned! And there must be severe restrictions on additives which are suspect.

Irradiation of food is now officially permitted under EC law. I am glad that in Ireland there is opposition to food irradiation. I see that the Irish Green Party and Labour Party are campaigning to ban food irradiation. I hope the Irish government will act responsibly and ban irradiated food. Health hazards to consumers have been clearly established and we all know that irradiation causes new chemical reactions which are unknown and untested. The high radiation levels permitted under the EC directive give cause for real concern. The directive forms part of the legislation related to the so-called Single Market after 1992 which will allow the free movement of goods and services. Food irradiation is permitted already in France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and now the British government

wants the ban against it removed. Because of insufficient labelling, most of us have already eaten irradiated food which has been imported.

Let me now turn to the hazards of the affluent diet. Among Westerners, fats have accounted for an increasing proportion of total caloric intake over the last century. Because we eat more meat and dairy products, we now consume more fat than in any previous period. And we know by now that a high intake of saturated fats, supplied mainly by animal products, may promote cardiovascular problems and cancers.

In the United States 10 to 20 percent of all children and 40 to 50 percent of the middle-aged are overweight. So while the newspapers on the one hand fill the women's pages with crash diets to be undertaken at any age and to be effective in a short time, the other pages of those newspapers are full of daily reports about increasing world hunger! Central to all of this is an insane, corrupt, and immoral EC agricultural policy--an agricultural policy which takes away the grains so desperately needed in Third World countries to import them to feed our overfed cattle. In turn we have silos filled with excess grain, excess butter, excess vegetables and fruit, and excess meat.

The vicious cycles are many: *in fact, the poor are feeding the rich*; in fact, the rich are living off the poor countries they exploit! Ironically, the conventional strategy of development agencies in many Third World governments--to encourage greater exports--only makes matters worse. Increased exports from Third World countries only benefit the international agribusiness which dominates Third World agricultural production and maintains the large landholders there. But it will not feed hungry Africans. The question, "What can poor countries do to become self-sufficient?" requires a small but critical change to "What can rich countries do to become self-sufficient?" (*International Herald Tribune*, July 19, 1985) There are so many myths about world hunger, myths which concern us directly.

Poisoned Food and World Hunger

The unequal distribution of food can be described as world cannibalism! There is really no such thing as world hunger, but only the hunger of particular areas and particular social groups. The total food resources available in the world would be perfectly adequate to feed everyone properly if they were only fairly distributed. We need only look at the terrible complications in the Soviet Union when trying to bring home the harvest of this year! Seen over the long term, total food production in the world has defied Malthus's predictions that it could not keep up with population growth. The "world food problem" is not so much one of overall production as one of local production and above all of distribution. The world's food supply is not shared in such a way as to maximise human welfare. The distribution is just as unequal, unjust, and iniquitous as that of every other element in life. Food inequality is the most damaging form of all inequality. It is inequality not in material possessions but in human flesh and bones (Paul Harrison, *Inside the Third World*).

Protein is distributed just as unevenly. The overconsumption of the developed countries is intimately linked with the underconsumption of the Third World. One man's heart attack is another man's malnutrition. Much of the best land that should be used for domestic food production in the developing countries is growing cash crops for the West: five of the most common--sugar, tobacco, coffee, cocoa, and tea--are not doing the West much good either.

Milk production is not wrong in itself. There are many agriculturally marginal areas that are fit for little else. But in Latin America cattle are being raised on prime agricultural land for export to the West or consumption by local elites. Cereals can give five times as much protein per acre. And cows do not only eat grass. A large proportion of the world's protein supplies--grains, soy beans, and other products--is fed to them. In the United States alone, some 118 million tonnes of grain and soy beans were consumed in 1971 to produce only twenty million tonnes of meat. In 1972, 43 percent of the world's cereal

production was used as feed for livestock, whose meat was consumed largely in the West.

One of the saddest aspects of this business is the massive protein consumption of household pets in the West. Britain's six million dogs and five million cats consume around one and a half million tonnes of food a year. Most of that is of animal origin. The equivalent in grain would be enough to feed the entire population of Egypt.

And we realise that we do not benefit from this dietary bonanza. Indeed, this is also killing us. Excess consumption of calories leads to obesity, which increases the likelihood of death from heart disease. Thus as Paul Harrison has written in *Inside the Third World*: "The rich of the world are eating themselves as well as the poor!" Unless the distribution of food is changed, hunger will go on spreading at the same time as food production rises.

The criminal maldistribution of the world's food resources is possible because income is so inequitably distributed. What the poor need, they do not get, unless they can pay for it. The world food market will not match food supply with real human needs until world incomes are more equally distributed.

There are so many myths concerning hunger. One is that famine stalks the continents because of climatic changes. Of course, global exploitation of the environment, the degradation of the soil, oceans, and rivers brings on even more poverty and thereby malnutrition and hunger. But we must also take a look at the type of agricultural practices in the Third World. Bad agricultural practices, for example, do not make good use of rainfall. We must, of course, also realise the tragic consequences of deforestation. Lack of forest was a factor in Ethiopia's recent famines. Half of Ethiopia loses an estimated two thousand tonnes of topsoil per square kilometer every year. It is true "that food will last as long as forests do," but we must ask why people in the Third World are forced to cut down their own forests. Forced by us in the West! Just look at the debt crisis and you

will know the answer. Another myth is that Africa cannot feed itself. As recently as 1970, Africa was self-sufficient in food. The rich soils of Chad alone, with the right techniques and proper distribution, could feed the entire Sahel. Let me also say something about the myth that Africa is overwhelmed by population growth. In some countries, yes, the rates of population growth are faster than anywhere else in the world, yet Africa as a whole is not overpopulated. The average population density is sixteen people per square kilometre compared with one hundred per square kilometre for China and twenty-five for India. Let me also add something about the myth that most aid has been spent on agricultural development. For example, billions of dollars of aid have been poured in to the Sahel zone. But only 4 percent of the aid was used to grow rain-fed crops and only 1.5 percent on tree planting or soil and water conservation.

Malnutrition is not the result of inadequate world food production. It is the result of poverty for which we in the West are responsible, of growth inequality in the distribution of income and of land, and of government bias against the poor resulting in the lack of provision of clean water and sanitation which could prevent so much malnutrition.

The recent United Nations Summit on Children and their Needs was unable to answer the questions I have tried to pose here. We must begin to answer these on our own by becoming critical consumers, critical taxpayers, and critical citizens in general! We must stop abusing the Earth. This means that we must point the finger first at ourselves, and we must force our governments to end the exploitation of the Third World. This calls for significant and radical changes in our lifestyles, politics, and economics. It means also creating a climate for sustainable development and the Gandhian concept of self-supporting communities.

GLOBAL GREEN POLITICS

Gert Bastian and I are very happy to be here at the Ecopolitics Conference of the University of Adelaide and we thank especially John Young, the conference convenor. We thank also the Centre for Environmental Studies for their generous hospitality. We are all the more happy to be here because our very close Australian friends, Bob Brown, Dr. Helen Caldicott, Jack Munday, and many others are with us. All of them are very close friends of the Greens in Europe and they are a great source of inspiration for all of us in the ecological movements across the world.

I must use this opportunity to correct a few unfortunate misunderstandings, especially with the newspaper *The Australian*. For several days I have been reported as saying that I labeled Prime Minister Bob Hawke a "fraud" or as "faking concern" for the environment. The reporter for *The Australian* never spoke personally with me. Those who attended the press conference of Gert Bastian and me will know that I do not use such words as "fraud" or "faking." That would not be any way in which to attempt to encourage anyone into a dialogue and it is not my way of speaking. I do not lessen my criticism of the policies of the Australian Labor Party (ALP) and of the various decisions made by it up to now, but I did not present my criticism in the way *The Australian* reported it!

Ecopolitics Conference, University of Adelaide, Australia, September 21-24, 1989.

These newspaper reports led to further breakdown in communication. Yesterday Environment Minister Graham Richardson stated that I labeled Mr. Hawke's record as "posturing" (a term I did not use) and noted that on the contrary the Green Party "was full of praise for Bob Hawke's efforts, particularly in relation to a Wilderness Park in the Antarctic when Bob Hawke visited Germany earlier this year." Here again let me set the record straight. It was not the German Green Party, but precisely Gert Bastian and I who gave Bob Hawke a personal Open Letter in Bonn on June 27, 1989, raising a number of environmental concerns but at the same time welcoming and supporting his move to establish a Wilderness World Park in the Antarctic. We expressed our personal hope in the letter that Bob Hawke would receive support from our Kohl government and other European governments. This was also the nature of our statement during our press conference here in Adelaide. I hope that Minister Richardson will take note of our Open Letter of June 27, 1989, to Bob Hawke, which was reported at that time in Australian newspapers!

It is quite sad that the media cannot differentiate and often substitutes dramatic headlines for in-depth reporting. In his speech Mr. Richardson criticized terms I had used to describe Mr. Hawke, but I did not use those terms.

This morning I read in a newspaper that Mr. Richardson found my remarks on Australia's commitment to uranium mining "ill-founded." I do not believe that they were ill-founded because yesterday evening I heard directly the positions of the Labor and Liberal Parties on uranium mining and uranium export. I was, just like Dr. Helen Caldicott, shocked and saddened. The Environment Minister stated that the Australian uranium mining industry was unlikely to expand after 1991. Gert Bastian and I not only questioned and criticized the possible future expansion of uranium mining, but we also criticized that there is not a total phase-out of uranium mining and exports right now! I believe the Labor Party reviewed its uranium policy up

to May 1989 and that the public response was overwhelmingly negative, with 90 percent of the submissions opposing uranium mining in Australia. The right wing of the ALP has reopened this debate and I hear that there is a desire to increase the number of mines. We are just as worried that German mining companies will continue to demand Australian uranium--all this while radiation deaths increase around Chernobyl, while children around Sellafield die of cancer and leukemia at alarming rates, and while France continues to test atomic bombs in the Pacific!

How anyone in the Labor and Liberal Parties can speak about "effective" Australian safeguards is beyond my understanding, because of the history of loopholes since the German Nukem/Alkem scandals--this is embarrassing enough. The argument that nuclear power can help solve the greenhouse effect is also invalid. Effective energy conservation is one of the best answers! Everywhere countries are beginning to cancel orders for new nuclear power plants because corruption and bad economics are causing the nuclear industry to begin a retreat. The Federal Republic of Germany has just cancelled its most prestigious nuclear project, the Nuclear Reprocessing Plant in Wackersdorf, for economic reasons.

Australia could lead the movement out of the "nuclear power phobia" by deciding to keep its uranium in the ground! Mr. Richardson stated that mining on Kakadu National Park's Coronation Hill should not be approved until the impact of further proposals affecting the park are considered. But why not declare clearly and simply that no mining at all will take place in Kakadu National Park?

Please let me not bore you with further corrections, but let me add one last urgent one regarding our statements concerning the proposed weapons range that stretches from Woomera Rocket Base in the East to Maralinga in the West. We stated our fears that foreign air forces as well as the Australian air force and arms companies will fire rockets, missiles, and other war materials on this range. A spokesman for Prime Minister Hawke

dismissed our claims as "non-sense." Yet in the very same newspaper (*Advertiser*, September 20, 1989) the Premier Mr. John Bannon stated that "it is expected that this open-air laboratory will cater for both civil and defence aerospace requirements well into the 21st century." Yet Mr. Bannon's spokesperson also stated in the same paper: "It has never been suggested by this or the Federal Government that there will be any testing of hostile weaponry on this range. . . . The Woomera Range Redevelopment Programme will be used primarily for civil purposes, including radar." I ask you, is there a difference between hostile and non-hostile weaponry? Are not all weapons and all weapon materials hostile to life? Hostile to the present age of new thinking--for example the disarmament thinking that is going on in Poland, Hungary, and the Soviet Union?

We ask, why will there be a commercialisation of the former Woomera Range? Why are international media reports not corrected or challenged when they speak of Defense Minister Kim Beazley and the South Australian government wanting to expand the Woomera range into a military "mega-range?" *The Bulletin* of July 25, 1989, reported that the Australian Defense Department faxed on May 9th a document to the Aboriginal people of Maralinga, seeking consent to fire rockets, missiles, and other war materials into their lands.

The Aborigines are the same people who were driven off the very same land to make way for the British nuclear tests more than thirty years ago--Aborigines who have just managed to get their land back after a long legal battle. This saddens me very much, for only recently it was reported that some of the Australian victims (ex-servicemen) of British nuclear bomb tests will receive compensation. However the compensation does not extend to Aborigines who suffered the effects of radiation after explosions in the South Australian outback. History seems to be repeating itself. Whereas Sir Robert Menzies once let Whitehall test its nuclear bombs, with grave consequences only now admitted, Bob Hawke now plans to commercialize a vast range

to allow the White House and other countries to try out their latest airborne weapon systems.

I am stunned by this. On the one hand Bob Hawke plans to protect the Antarctic; on the other, the go-ahead is given for a military scheme without much public debate! I am told that the new Woomera Instrument Range will be unique for its size alone, 130,000 square kilometers, roughly the area of England. This will allow weapons testing on a scale unimaginable in the northern hemisphere! It will be a weapons range where the Australian air force and other countries with the necessary cash can test weapons, warplanes, and electronic equipment under "life" conditions.

It is rather ironic that even before the deadly Maralinga plutonium that spread beyond the range is cleaned up, the Aborigines are asked to agree to a new military programme there. We in Europe must do everything possible to find out which European companies have registered interest in this new weapons range (there have been many) and we must see this as a central issue for all ecologists. It concerns us all because together we must prevent Australia from becoming a training ground to test weapons and rehearse battle scenarios. Is this Australia's bid to expand its military role overseas? Is this another expansion of the military industry, since already arms export controls have been eased in the hope of doubling Australian arms sales? Will it become increasingly likely that Australia will supply oppressors with arms? This also includes my concerns about United States military bases in Australia, because the Labor Government is not being candid about all the functions of the bases. I support wholeheartedly the closing of all U.S. bases here as well as the present campaign to close Nurrungar, which has a renewed lease for another ten years. Close down Roxby Downs, close Woomera and Nurrungar! The thirty million dollars a year contributed to the running of the Nurrungar base by Australia should be used for action-oriented peace research toward a nonaligned, nonnuclear Australia.

Last but not least, news has reached us that the German company Blohm and Voss are a big part of the twelve FFG class frigates deal for the Australian and New Zealand navies. If we are to change the direction of this trend, then, as Jack Munday stated yesterday, we must revive the Green Ban movement, labour union actions similar to those of the 1970s which stopped work on forty-two building sites. I hope that workers and progressive parts of the trade union movement will join us for such ecological action, but we must intensify the dialogue with unions from our side as well. Spelling out employment opportunities that are in harmony with nature and in harmony with a peaceful society must be an action priority for us. I hope that the "Green Bans" will return right here in Australia so that we may follow! When I speak about green global politics and about the green movements in both Western and Eastern Europe, I recall the magnificent slogan of the French students in the May-June uprising of 1968: "Be practical! Do the impossible!" To this demand, we, the generation that faces the next century, can add the solemn injunction: "If we don't do the impossible we shall be faced with the unthinkable."

We want global green politics and a green world, but there are still many hurdles and obstacles before we can reach that goal. Exactly ten years ago, at the founding of the German Green Party, I coined the term "anti-party-party" for the Greens, trying to express the new type of power (counterpower) that we are all speaking about. This is the power of nonviolent change and nonviolent transformation, a power that is common to all, to be used by all and for all. "Power over" is to be replaced by "shared power," by "the power to do things," by the discovery of our own strength as opposed to a passive receiving of power exercised by others, often in our name. It is not power to dominate--not power to terrorize or to oppress--but the power of nonviolent change. The Hungarian writer Gyorgy Konrad expressed it even better with his term "anti-politics," a moral force:

Global Green Politics

Anti-politics strives to put politics in its place and makes sure it stays there, never overstepping its proper office of defending and refining the morals of the game in a civil society. Anti-politics is the ethos of civil society, and civil society is the anti-thesis of military society.

These are very dramatic times. Some of the major green movements in Western Europe or in other parts of the world are beginning to celebrate their anniversaries and there are miracles happening in many countries, including France where the French Green Party, Les Verts, has had a most dramatic success in the recent European elections. British Greens with fourteen percent of the votes are now the strongest Green Party in Europe! We now have over thirty Green members in the European Parliament--three from Belgium, eight from the Federal Republic of Germany, eight from France, seven from Italy, two from the Netherlands, one from Portugal, and one from Spain. There are Green Parties growing in India, which Gert and I have visited twice in the past year. And there are Greens struggling in Japan against the nuclear fuel cycle complex that is now being built in Rokkasho village at the northern tip of the main island of Honshu. Green activists are giving us a lot of hope, like those in India who recently formed a human chain across a river to stop the building of a dam. Just a few days ago, the Green Party in Quebec, Canada, held an international symposium on energy and sustainable development. In the United States of America many local Green political organizations have sprung up around the country, contesting local elections and occasionally even winning. Green-affiliated candidates have been elected to municipal offices in Connecticut, Wisconsin, Michigan, and North Carolina. In 1987, there were seventy-five unaffiliated local Green parties in the U.S.A.

When we look to the roots of the Green Parties, we must look to the "New Politics" programme which was founded in the

late 1960s in New Zealand under the name of the New Value Party.

In Scandinavia Green Parties are growing in Finland, Sweden, and Denmark. They are also growing in Ireland, Austria, Switzerland, and Italy. One of the most hopeful developments has been that of the Green Party in Great Britain and their incredible success in the recent European elections. Although they gained fourteen percent of the votes in Britain, they did not get a single seat because of the unfair British majority electoral system, where smaller parties have hardly any chance of winning seats in the national Parliament or in the European Parliament, despite receiving such a high vote. Here in Australia, of course, there is the great success of the Greens in Tasmania, made possible by our friends like Bob Brown and others. We congratulate them and wish them much strength and courage for their future political negotiations. Gert and I are also looking forward to meeting with Jo Vallentine in Perth because of the formation of the Green Alliance there. There are also the efforts of Helen Caldicott to turn the Australian Labor Party green from within and the efforts of Jack Munday to create a new ecological left party. All in all, there is much Green growth!

As I stated before, these are very dramatic times and we are all looking at the most exciting developments of this decade as well as the coming decade in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. There we see the emergence of independent citizens' peace and ecology movements, coupled with a widening discussion about disarmament, militarism, ecology, and civil, political, social, and economic rights. Although the many human rights and other social movements of the Eastern European countries are very different in nature, they all have a common desire to reclaim from the state what is called "civil society" or what might be called "public life" or "community activism" in the West. The notion of "civil society" implies a space where independent discussion and criticism can grow, where an

alternative to the state's monopoly on information and education can thrive, where an effort can be made to restrain the state's arbitrary or arrogant use of power against its own citizens or other countries, and, finally, where the rigidity and isolation of the bloc mentality can be challenged. Activists in Eastern Europe have described this process as the restoration of citizens as subjects in history, rather than as objects controlled by the state.

Just recently we have witnessed the governmental declaration of Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki in the Polish Parliament [Sejm]. We have also witnessed discussion in Poland about humanizing the police and armed forces. We have witnessed a nonviolent transformation of Polish society through the nonviolent leadership of Solidarnosc [Solidarity], a true grass-roots movement. In Hungary we are witnessing how the "European House" can be built in a nonviolent way. We are witnessing how over twenty thousand East German refugees leave freely through the Hungarian border into Austria and on to other European countries. The Hungarians have put human rights first, above any bilateral agreements with the German Democratic Republic! The Hungarians have stated very clearly that Hungary will not change present policies even if its neighbours are irritated or angry. The Hungarian Foreign Minister Gyula Horn stated that Hungary has come to the point of respecting the life of every single individual and of respecting the rights of those individuals to determine their own life and where they would like to travel. He has stated clearly that in the Europe of today Hungarians will not depart from this position--the position of human rights having priority over all others. And there are, of course, most exciting developments in the Soviet Union, although at the same time we are still so very fearful that the road Mr. Gorbachev is travelling on could suddenly be cut off! The leadership--the old stubborn heads of concrete in the governments of East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Romania--have so far refused to go the path of "glasnost" and "perestroika." And there is a very bitter struggle ahead between the

independent peace, ecological, and human rights movements in those countries and the repressive machinery of those three governments. Very recently there has been a new group initiated in East Germany called Neues Forum [New Forum], one further ray of hope in trying to bring "perestroika" and "glasnost" into East Germany. In those three countries all independent ecology, peace, and human rights activities have been met with harsh retaliation from the security forces which regard any unofficial citizen initiatives as a challenge to their authority and power.

All of us in Europe look to Solidarity, the free trade union and democracy movement in Poland, as a symbol of hope. At its height it has reached ten million strong! Solidarity has continued nonviolently to transform Polish life. In an unprecedented development, this grass-roots mass movement has been able to force an agreement with the Communist government to initiate a true democratic process. All of this after the imposition of martial law in December 1981.

We should not forget that the nuclear disaster in Chernobyl in May 1986 provoked a tide of fear and indignation among the peoples of Eastern Europe who were in the path of radioactive clouds. Calls to abolish nuclear power began to be heard and many green or ecological movements gained impetus. The independent peace and environmental initiatives in Eastern Europe have been all the more courageous. Repression and oppression have long inhibited their work. They have had to face many more obstacles than any of us here or in Western Europe. Green politics, on a global scale, means that we must act responsibly for each other and practice more solidarity across boundaries and ideologies. I was glad to hear, for example, of the protest of the Tasmanian Greens against a dam in the Siberian wilderness. On the other hand, it would be excellent if East European activists could travel to Australia to help close down uranium mining or to participate in nonviolent actions against wood-chipping right here.

Global green politics has never had such an opportunity and such a chance as today! But, at the same time, Green parties that have been successful for a long time, like the German Greens, are also facing many existential choices and changes. I will try to deal with them later on.

But what are the important preconditions for global green thinking? Let me mention just a few. First, an ecological society must be a truly free society, based on ecological principles that can mediate humanity's relationship with nature. This means searching for a soft, decentralised energy system and for soft technologies and for ways of true co-determination and self-determination, rejecting and moving away from monolithic modes of production, monolithic technology, and institutions like the military-industrial complex. At the present time, the five hundred largest industrial corporations control nearly one trillion dollars in corporate assets in the United States. And the six hundred largest multinational corporations will control over 40 percent of planetary production by the end of this decade. The result of all these monolithic modes and trends has been wastefulness, overdependence, and their unnaturalness.

A truly free society must also mean the guarantee of economic, social, and individual human rights. Regardless of country or ideology, regardless of where human rights are violated--whether in China, Tibet, Chile, Romania, South Africa, Kurdistan, El Salvador, or Afghanistan--we must stand up and never ever be silent when it comes to helping those who are oppressed. The past few months in Western Europe have been most depressing, especially in regard to the solidarity movement for the Chinese students, intellectuals, and Chinese workers who staged such a brilliant nonviolent struggle for over seven weeks on the Square of Heavenly Peace in Beijing. I have been very disappointed in parts of the German Green Party and in large parts of the European peace movement because of weak solidarity. The same criticism also applies to the German Green and European peace movements when it comes to standing up

for the nonviolent people on the high plateau of Tibet, the last ancient nonviolent culture, which is literally being killed off. Over one million Tibetans have been killed since the military invasion of the Chinese and over thirty thousand Chinese people have been put to death through capital punishment in the past three years in the People's Republic of China.

Pol Pot of the Khmer Rouge still holds a seat at the UN General Assembly. Why was the protest so moderate when we all knew about the genocide of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia and that this might occur again due to the failed Paris Conference? Thousands and thousands of committed peace activists marched in the streets of West Germany and Western Europe when it came to supporting Ho Chi Minh and to opposing the Vietnam War, but where were they when it came to standing up against Pol Pot and the atrocities which he committed against his own people? Now, after the failure of the Paris Conference, we are most fearful of new massacres in Cambodia. But where is the international pressure and morality? Where is the international conscience that will stand up for human rights? If we, the global green movement, do not do it--who will?

A truly free society must not include a "peace" which oppresses us. We must learn on our own terms what peace and freedom mean together. All too long peace and freedom have been part of Right-wing vocabulary and at times sadly neglected by the Left. There can be no peace if there is social injustice and suppression of human rights, because external and internal peace are inseparable. Peace has a wider meaning for us. It is not just the absence of mass destruction, but a positive internal and external condition in which people are free so that they can grow to their full potential. Within that framework of peace we also believe in nonalignment and active neutrality. We believe in taking unilateral steps not only to dissolve military power blocs, but also to dissolve armies and to get rid of "deterrence" thinking. And within that framework of peace we also believe in

civilian-based defence--social defence. Our idea of social defence presents an alternative to the dead-end self-destruction of the arms race. Social defence or defence by nonmilitary means against any military attack from outside or within is based on the idea that a society cannot be controlled if it is not prepared to cooperate with the oppressor.

In this process of bringing more justice, peace, and harmony to the planet earth, we must also learn to become more peaceful, just, and tolerant with ourselves and with one another, within our own ranks. The small-hearted spirit and the attitude of "not trusting" and "always controlling each other"--something so common in the German Green Party--has been a strong disappointment to many of us and has done much to minimize our appeal, our chances, and our concrete results. Participatory democracy must not become a new formula for demagoguery, for misuse of grass-roots power, for tactics. It cannot mean hurting each other just because there is disagreement. There must always be room in Green politics for tolerance, for accepting each other's positions and points of view, just as there must always be room to act according to our own conscience in certain questions like the question of abortion. Living our values is what Green politics is all about. It was Carl Rogers who stated:

Many many years from now, when the telling of history is told, people will hear about the 1980s. A fragile era where a hydra of tensions and conflicts threatened the survival of the planet--where terrorists menaced the innocent, racial and religious wars overtook great countries and children became armed militia. . . . The time was also marked by an uprising of the human spirit--founded on people's faith that within was a vast reservoir of good.

This "vast reservoir of good" is what Albert Einstein also meant when he wrote, "The problem is not the atom bomb, but the heart of the people."

We must ask the question of whether or not we will be moving toward an intensification of the many present crises -- from the global greenhouse effect and the plundering of tropical rain forests to acid rain and daily militarization. Or will we be able to build up a global community without frontiers that will be founded on ecology, nonviolence, and social justice with a spiritual base? If there is a future, it will be green! This could be the motto of this conference!

These are both very good and very bad, but certainly dramatic times. When I speak about the disappointing developments within the Federal Republic of Germany, I am speaking about the great concentration within my own party on internal power struggles to get into power in the next national elections, when there could be a numerical coalition between the Social Democrats and the German Greens. As a former Social Democrat, for many years I have been warning about the danger of joining all too easily Social Democratic governments as we have done in Hessen and as we have done now in Berlin. Of course, there will be a time when the Greens might end up in the government and certainly that time could come in Germany next year. But, becoming a coalition partner and becoming a junior partner in government cannot mean losing our Green identity. It cannot mean giving up our key principles of radical and ecological solutions, of nonviolent means and ends, of democratic grass-roots decisions, and of working for a demilitarised and denuclearized society. More and more the German Green Party is moving toward giving up those positions for the sake of becoming acceptable to the Social Democrats, for the sake of having three or four ministers in a red-green cabinet. But how high will the price be? Will the SPD embrace the Green so much as to destroy the Green movement?

We cannot afford to make compromises when trying to protect human lives, when trying to protect the health of peoples and of all living things on the planet! Talking suddenly about "limit values" of, for example, dioxin or lead, or accepting here

and there a little bit of deterrence or radioactivity cannot be green politics! We must provide healing, life affirming answers, not just repairing a little bit here and there. We must empower people at the grass-roots level to start initiating political action themselves; we must help them share more power. We cannot stop our ecological consciousness-raising work in the streets even while we are in Parliament. We cannot forget our commitment to the social movements outside! Effective work inside Parliaments cannot become a replacement for effective nonviolent transformation work outside in the streets! Both go hand in hand and both are interdependent in ecological politics. Our future, our potential, and our credibility lies in inter-connecting the issues of peace, human rights, employment, ecology, and social justice. Mahatma Gandhi stated:

Democracy can only be saved through non-violence, because democracy, so long as it is sustained by violence, cannot provide for or protect the weak. My notion of democracy is that under it, the weakest should have the same opportunities as the strongest. This can never happen except through non-violence.

Exactly this question of nonviolence is the biggest challenge to all Green parties, especially when we are on the road to sharing power in governments. How should one deal as a green minister with the violence inherent in the state? How should one deal as a green minister with the structural violence often inherent in governmental policies? I do not believe that we have yet found the answer, but we all know that we must try to transform those institutions of violence into nonviolent institutions.

Where do we begin with nonviolent transformation? Consider just one example. We are correct in stating that a lifestyle and methods of production which rely on an endless supply of raw materials and which use those raw materials lavishly also furnish the motive for the violent appropriation of raw materials from other countries. In contrast, a responsible use of raw materials, as part of an ecologically-oriented lifestyle and

economy, reduces the risk that policies of violence will be pursued in our name. Thus we must learn that we can begin by reducing our consumption of goods to where we do not provide a market for big business. We can reduce our consumption of goods to where we will use only our share of the world's resources, not taking what belongs to someone else.

Up to this point, no official economic policy, whether in the West or East or North or South, has taken into consideration the global damage resulting from human activity. But the damage is being done, and considerable parts of our natural base have already been destroyed while other parts are seriously threatened--and all this solely on the grounds of economic gain. In the end, I believe, these old economic systems will pull the rug out from underneath their own feet. What we are beginning to see in Poland and in Hungary is the emergence of a third way in economics-- neither capitalist nor socialist, but a new self-determined grass-roots ecological economy! But we also see Western capital and Western companies now attempting to put their blueprints on Eastern Europe. Our friends must be watchful!

We welcome the many reforms announced by Mr. Gorbachev and the good will behind them. But at the same time we also criticize the German and European banks and businesses who are about to export all those things we have finally gotten rid of; e.g., German nuclear reactors going to the Soviet Union and Mr. Gorbachev passing on nuclear reactors to India--a vicious cycle that we must stop! There has been so much imperialism, whether it is "garbage imperialism" through the sending of highly toxic wastes to Third World countries, or testing unwanted technology in other areas of the world because there has been so much opposition to it at home. We must be very clear in favouring the dismantling of all those branches of industry which are hazardous to life--above all the nuclear, defence, and chemical industries.

We favor the development of production techniques which are more in conformity with the environment. They should be sparing in their use of natural resources and energy; they should produce little waste; and they should function as small decentralized production units. We must turn to the production of more socially useful and durable products and learn to revive the Green Ban movement and Green Ban thinking which took place in the early 1970s in Australia. We must never be prepared to allow social justice and employment questions to be played off against the ecological/environmental concerns or vice versa. The fight against unemployment is simultaneously a fight for meaningful employment, for ecological and socially useful investments, and for alternative production and conversion schemes.

Let us note one other hopeful movement, which is the movement in Switzerland for a "Switzerland Without an Army." Within that movement, which is having its referendum very soon in November on the question of Switzerland abandoning its army, there are also many models for alternative production and conversion of the military. There is even hope that over one fourth of the Swiss voters will vote to abandon the Swiss army! [The actual vote was 36 percent, eds.]

Environmental statistics usually bring boredom, but I would like to mention just a few which will describe the present situation. Every year, the European Community produces 2 billion tons of waste, of which 160 million tons are industrial waste, including 25 million tons that are highly poisonous. Existing facilities for treating toxic waste can only handle 10 million tons a year. The resultant illegal dumping and incineration makes a mockery of EEC directives on toxic waste disposal. We must drastically reduce our rubbish mountains by outlawing wasteful packaging and using recyclable containers. We must press for local waste management plans to encourage recycling and the use of unrecyclable waste for creating energy. And we must work for an EEC ban on the shipment of hazardous

wastes from one country to another, in particular to Third World countries, and seek an early halt to the dumping of waste at sea.

At present there is no coherent transport strategy for Europe. We are having great difficulties fighting for transport policies which are based on energy efficiency and environmental protection, while providing local transport facilities that people most need.

Consider the tragedy of acid rain over Europe. The sky over Europe is poisoned; acid rain from power stations, cars, and factories is corroding buildings and poisoning lakes, soils, and forests. It is also killing people. Without radical action to stop acid rain, the chemical cocktail above our heads can only become more deadly. Our forests and fish, cathedrals and crops, and our lungs are all under attack. As wind spreads pollutants from factories in the Midwest to Canada or from Western Europe to Norway and Sweden, the problem has become truly a global one.

Take the example of the North Sea. The North Sea is perhaps the most conspicuous example of the hazards of using coastal waters as a dumping ground for industrial wastes. Three rivers, the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Elbe, discharge each year more than 38 million tonnes of zinc, nearly 13,500 tonnes of lead, 5,600 tonnes of copper plus arsenic, cadmium, mercury, and even radioactive wastes into the North Sea. Ships annually dump another 145 million tonnes of ordinary garbage. Furthermore the North Sea is dotted with four thousand wells and 150 drilling platforms, all connected to the shore by five thousand miles of pipes. The pipes leak some thirty thousand tonnes of hydrocarbons into the surrounding seas every year. The impact of all that waste is not hard to see. Salmon, sturgeon, oysters, and haddock have simply vanished. The fish that survive often suffer from skin infections, deformed skeletons, and tumors. Last year we heard about seals dying along the North Sea by the hundreds. Scientists in Neumunster have performed autopsies on some of the dead seals. All told, they

found traces of more than one thousand toxins in the tissue samples.

According to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 35 percent of the earth's land surface, on which about one-fifth of the world's population depends for its livelihood, is threatened by desertification, a principal threat to the economic well-being of many countries. In such countries as Ethiopia and India, which are severely affected by desertification, it is human survival itself that is at stake. Because environmental degradation and pollution respect no human-drawn borders, they jeopardize not only the security of the country in which they occur, but also that of others, near and far. The tragic explosion of a nuclear reactor in Chernobyl in 1986 hurled radioactive waste and debris far into the atmosphere. All too often we forget that in Europe there are 119 nuclear power plants located within a hundred kilometers of national borders. The Danish Parliament decided to ask Sweden to close a plant thirty kilometers from Copenhagen. The French government rejected a similar plea by local West German authorities in the Saarland to cancel construction of four atomic reactors at Cattenom. All environmental problems and disasters have an all-encompassing global effect from which no one country can insulate itself.

As stated in a report by the Worldwatch Institute, the security of nations is similarly compromised by the specter of the "greenhouse effect," global climate change brought on by the accumulation of carbon dioxide and other gases in the atmosphere that trap heat. Global average temperature records from 1880 to the present reveal a gradual warming trend compatible with greenhouse scenarios predicted by computer simulations. In a passionate speech before the United Nations General Assembly in October 1987, the President of the Maldives declared that a sea-level rise of only one meter will jeopardize the survival of his island nation. He observed, "We did not contribute to the impending catastrophe to our nation and alone we cannot save ourselves." His comments highlight the

particular predicament faced by Third World nations. Except for China (which burns a lot of coal) and Brazil (where the decimation of the Amazon rain forest causes large-scale carbon release), global warming is caused primarily by industrial countries. Industrial countries account for 70 percent of carbon dioxide emissions and 84 percent of chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) production.

Reflecting on the true dimensions of what "security" really means, Wendell Berry, a noted American writer and farmer, has asked:

To what point...do we defend from foreign enemies a country that we are destroying ourselves? In spite of all our propagandists can do, the foreign threat inevitably seems diminished when our air is unsafe to breathe, when our drinking water is unsafe to drink, ...when our forests are dying from air pollution and acid rain, and when we ourselves are sick from poisons in the air.

Of course it is clear that modern welfare and so-called security and defence policies, based on deterrence and mass destructive weapons, entail large-scale environmental destruction. Nuclear war, with its potential for massive devastation, destruction of all life, and the triggering of a nuclear winter, is the ultimate threat to the global environment. But even peacetime military operations, the production and testing of conventional, nuclear, and chemical weapons, the conduct of maneuvers, and the generation of military wastes involve activities that imperil both the environment and the health of workers. As the Worldwatch Institute observes:

Again there is the irony that the pursuit of military might is such a costly endeavor that it drains away the resources urgently needed to protect against the environmental perils that are most likely to jeopardize our security.

The Brundtland Commission put the dilemma in the following way. "The Earth is one but the world is not. We all depend on one biosphere for sustaining our lives. Yet each community, each country, strives for survival and prosperity with little regard for its impact on others." Consider another example, the exploitation of Southeast Asian rain forests which is currently in full swing. In Malaysia, two-thirds of the forests have been logged or converted to oil palms. Virgin rain forest clearing is being funded by the World Bank. All of Malaysia's rain forests will be gone by the next generation.

The largest stands of tropical rain forests are in South America. Amazonia contains fifty percent of the world's tropical rain forest. Twenty percent of this forest has been cleared for cattle ranging for McDonald's, mining, pulping, and farming. Yet, we all know that tropical rain forests are the earth's richest gene pool, on which we depend for our food and medicine. Seventy percent of the three thousand species of plants with anticancer properties come from the rain forest. Rain forests are a memory bank evolved over billions of years, a library of knowledge we have only just begun to read. Australia also dramatically has lost 75 percent of its rain forest through logging, agriculture, and settlement. Pacific islands such as Fiji and the Solomons have stands of rain forest--much of which have been allocated to local and multinational timber companies. Since 1900, 50 percent of the world's tropical rain forest has disappeared, never to return. If the destruction continues, there will be five hundred million hectares left by midway in the next century, and by the year 2100 there will be nothing! The consequences of this are catastrophic, not only for humankind but for the millions and millions of living inhabitants of this planet. I can only express my deepest wish here that Australia will save its remaining tracts of tropical rain forest in North Queensland and Tasmania.

Siegfried Lenz, a German author, recently stated that we live in peace but are still at the mercy of force, a privileged kind

of force that is condoned by public authorities and is making our world more and more uninhabitable. Against our will, he stated, they are taking away our lakes and oceans, allowing our rivers to die, and turning our forests to skeletons. Anyone who resists, a German court has declared, is acting on legitimate moral grounds but is still legally in the wrong! That is how far we have come. Anyone who still maintains a certain amount of loyalty towards creation may be legally in the wrong. Here we cannot but question the nature of laws which allow this force to take action against all those who are not earning money from the destruction of the environment. Unfortunately, observes Lenz, the domain of business is considerably greater than the domain of politics. The end of life on this planet earth has become conceivable. Creation is dying. As Siegfried Lenz so eloquently mourns: "A grave-stone for our dying age could well bear the inscription: 'Everyone wanted the best--for themselves.' "

Global green politics means to acknowledge the vital importance of our whole environment. That environment, its health, its safety, and its wholeness, affects our lives, our politics, and our future. Whenever we damage the environment, we must realize that we are damaging ourselves.

Green politics is different from all other forms of politics because it acknowledges the complexity of that web of life. We need to rediscover our roots and our histories and to learn from those cultures which are more in harmony with their environment than we have ever been. Over many years we have set ourselves up to control, dominate, and exploit the planet. We must learn from the Aborigines here in Australia, learn from the Indian tribes in the United States and Latin America, and learn from the Tibetans on the roof of the world struggling to survive.

I remember the terrible accident of the *Exxon Valdez* in Prince William Sound. The pictures of the Alaskan oil spill sickened all who saw it. But had this oil safely reached its destination and had it been burnt in power plants and car engines, then the eleven million gallons of crude oil lost in the

wreck of the Exxon Valdez would have released into the atmosphere about sixteen million pounds of carbon in the form of carbon dioxide. As the *Herald Tribune* wrote, "The whole planet is an Exxon Valdez." But President Bush continues to say that oil drilling in the wildlife refuge must proceed because the oil is needed. It is not clear to him that the refuge for the wildlife is also needed. Regardless of how many rocks Exxon had polished by the time it pulled out, the chaotic response in the first few days after the spill has cast a very dark shadow over the oil industry's repeated assurances that it can safely operate in fragile environments.

In conclusion, let us not forget the terrible environmental destruction in Eastern Europe, which looks more and more like an industrial waste land. In Molbis, East Germany, the air pollution is so thick that drivers even turn on vehicle headlights in the middle of the day. Women with newborn babies in Czechoslovakia have priority access to bottled water because the tap water there is considered a hazard to infant health. The Polish government has recently declared five villages in the industrial region of Silesia unfit to live in because of high levels of heavy metals in the soil. In Eastern Europe, water contamination is so severe that many portions of those supplies that do exist are unfit for industrial use let alone for drinking. Eastern Europe's burning of brown coal, combined with a lack of scrubbers and other pollution control equipment, has made the air quality in some regions among the worst in the world. In Silesia, rates of respiration ailments and cancer are 30 to 50 percent above the Polish average. A writer in Krakow stated recently:

All around are signs of the city slowly rotting from pollution. Pieces of masonry regularly fall off church steeples, balconies crumble and graceful saints lack faces. What centuries of war and pestilence have spared, chemical pollutants have destroyed.

But public revolt and environmentalism is emerging as a major force in Eastern Europe. With the rise of Glasnost in the Soviet Union an entire environmental movement has emerged across the whole of Eastern Europe. This process is irreversible, opening many new doors to public participation in Eastern Europe. What is happening is the Greening of Glasnost. Although the Soviet government still remains one of the world's most ardent supporters of nuclear energy for so-called "peaceful" uses, at least five planned nuclear power plants have been cancelled since the Chernobyl atomic power station exploded. There are Green parties rising up everywhere in Eastern Europe, for example, in Estonia, in other Baltic republics, and around Leningrad. There are Green parties in Poland and Green movements in Hungary, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia.

Increased Green cooperation and solidarity across the West-East borders must be given a high priority on our political agenda. As Martin Luther King, Jr. stated, "We are caught in a network of mutuality. We are tied in a single garment of destiny. What affects one directly, affects us all indirectly!" And as Theodore Roszak, echoing Gandhi, has written, "The world has enough for everyone's need but not for everyone's greed." This message is also being passed on to us from all the indigenous peoples of the world. And this message must be absorbed by us in humility if we are to learn from the native women and men.

We must build ecological alliances and get rid of and ban all military alliances. Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, the Wilderness Society, and the many conservation societies and ecological groups all over the world are linking East and West and North and South at the grass-roots level. We are at the beginning of creating a global culture of ecological responsibility and we must start to establish binding principles governing ecological relations among all countries.

Most important of all, we must begin to give higher priority to social and environmental issues than to military ones. Instead of building a Trident-II submarine and F-16 jet fighters, we can

use that same amount of money to clean up the three thousand most hazardous waste dumps in the United States. We should get rid of the Stealth Bomber Program and use that money for an action plan to save the world's tropical forests. Cancelling one nuclear weapon test could provide the money for the installation of eighty thousand hand pumps that would give many Third World villages access to safe water. The money for one Trident submarine could provide a five-year immunization programme for children against six deadly diseases, preventing one million deaths a year. Ten days of EC military spending could provide the annual costs of cleaning up hazardous waste sites in ten European Community countries by the year 2000.

Finally, global Green politics must give people hope that a future without the use of force is possible. This is not a utopian dream. As the abolition of slavery changed from once seeming unrealistic to becoming a normal state, so too can radical disarmament come to be the norm of international affairs. A disarmed world is not defenceless for there can be nonviolent, civilian-based defence, a revolutionary concept that is the only sane answer to the atomic age.

A new beginning in security thinking could be an independent, nonaligned, neutral, and nonnuclear Australia, pursuing true environmental and ecological policies, and working for nonviolent civilian defence together with the South Pacific Islands. Australia must stop being "a suitable piece of real estate" in which to locate various vital elements of U.S. nuclear war strategy. We truly hope that Australia can and will follow the courageous example of New Zealand and start to declare its ports and air space truly nuclear free! And we are hoping that Green alliances all over Australia, following the example of the Tasmanian Greens, will provide motivation and examples for us to follow.

Green parties all over the world will grow. They will start to replace Socialists and Social Democrats and will, in the course of their political growth, also make many mistakes. That is

natural and also something from which we can learn. But I truly hope that the Green parties will never make the mistake of giving up their Green identity for the sake of being in power!

Barbara Ward and Rene Dubos wrote in 1972:

Alone in space, alone in its life-supporting systems, powered by inconceivable energies, mediating them to us through the most delicate adjustments, wayward, unlikely, unpredictable but nourishing, enlivening and enriching to the largest degree--is this not a precious home for all us earthlings? Is this not worth our love? Does it not deserve all the inventiveness and courage and generosity of which we are capable to preserve it from degradation and destruction and, by doing so, to secure our own survival?

We have only one Earth and this Earth has no emergency exit. But the question remains open--can we save the Earth?

A NEW CHALLENGE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE MOVEMENT: THE NEW WORLD ORDER OF PRESIDENT BUSH

Having just visited the United States for two weeks, speaking at several peace and justice conferences, I am astounded at how often I came across President George Bush's new catchphrase of the "NEW WORLD ORDER." Or is it not really the "OLD WORLD ORDER?"

I had the "New World Order" in my pocket all the time because it appears on the reverse of every dollar bill (*Novus Ordo Seclorum*)! And the slogan of Yale University, the alma mater of President Bush, is the same! A special issue of *Fortune Magazine* (Summer 1991) has just simply put on the cover: "A New American Century." This is to make clear to its readers that the American nation and all the rest of us on Planet Earth are moving toward a century dominated by the United States, whether we like it or not

Fifty years ago, Henry Luce of *Life Magazine* also titled an essay "The American Century" and demanded that the United States strive for world leadership. Now, after the breakup of the military Warsaw Pact to be finalized on July 1, 1991, after the breakdown of Communism and State Socialism in the Eastern part of Europe, and after Panama and the Gulf War, President

Written in June-July, 1991.

Bush is taking up this theme once again. In his past speech to the Joint Session of Congress, he stated: "At this very moment, Americans serve together with Arabs, Europeans, Asians and Africans in defense of the principles and the dream of a New World Order. This is why they sweat and toil in the sand and the heat of the sun." Now we know--I am speaking ironically--why so many people involved in the horrible Gulf War sweated and toiled in the sun. It was all for the building of Bush's New World Order!

I became very sensitive and upset over this terminology, as it reminds me of other "grand designs" that have little or nothing to do with authentic democracy or social and economic justice. Being here in Berlin I am reminded of Hitler's call for a "Neue Ordnung" [A New Order].

Christopher Hitchens in *The European* (June 14, 1991) wrote that the concept of Bush's New World Order did not surface until mid-August 1990. The time was just after President Saddam Hussein's annexation of Kuwait and had to do with Bush's search for a way to globalise his response to the Iraqi aggression. Thus the "New World Order" was born, even if it also meant inclusion of members listed in "Who's Who Among Tyrants of the World" in the alliance against Saddam Hussein. Here I mean countries like Syria, China, and others, who have leaders quite comparable to Saddam Hussein.

Building up a New World Order means for President Bush also making exceptions to the rule, for example, for China! No matter how ruthless or how barbaric the Chinese leadership has been towards its own people, towards the Democracy Movement, and towards Tibet, Bush still campaigns vigorously to give "most favoured nation" status to Beijing. "We live," said the President defensively, "in a world of lesser evils." He went on to say that the world has very few absolutes. Thus China is a case of being a lesser evil. The same goes for Syria or for that matter for Pol Pot of Cambodia, who up to a few months ago had

been indirectly supported by the pro-Chinese U.S. government as well as European governments.

That is what the New World Order is all about--Realpolitik a la Bush and his allies. It is not about moral forces or about nonviolent politics or about indivisible, universal human rights policies. The questions I have heard from U.S. policy-makers in the past months have been along the line "Will the next century be a new American Century or will Japan or a United Western Europe (the East is being kept out) command the stage?" All of these questions have little or nothing to do with the real situation as we know it: the terrible greed of the Western industrialized nations and Japan for Third World resources and the continued subordination of the Third World to Western interests in the economic, political, and military-strategic areas.

This can best be seen in the statement President Bush made in September 1990 at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. He spoke once again about the New World Order and then stated: "In a world where ideology no longer confronts and big power blocs no longer divide, the Bank and the Fund have become paradigms of international cooperation." If not for the global consortia of NGOs (nongovernmental organizations) that have been trying to stir things up at the World Bank and IMF meetings, one would become utterly hopeless about what is ahead of us all if Bush and his New World Order get their way. Here are just a few examples of the New World Order of the World Bank. In 1989 alone, the World Bank took 724 million dollars more out of the Brazilian economy than it put back in. Is this how the World Bank is dedicated to sustainable growth and poverty reduction? Other countries like Ghana, whose debt burden has doubled from 1.5 billion dollars to an estimated 3 billion dollars since 1983, are actually worse off after taking the World Bank's medicine. The net flow of capital from South to North, in the form of profits and interest payments, has turned into a virtual torrent. This annual torrent has now topped fifty billion dollars! And the

antidemocratic nature of decision making on project funding at the World Bank must also be at the center of our concerns. Most of the time, local communities are ignored and forgotten in the funding process. It is time that we, together with our friends in the Third World, expose how harmful development projects are when they are dropped in the laps of local communities without any consultation whatsoever.

As my good friend, the former Environment Minister of India, Maneka Gandhi, has stated:

Everything had to be big. Big dams, big factories, big steel mills, big power houses, huge spraying by pesticides, big cities, big cutting of forests by big contractors, big nuclear plants, big missile sites, big politicians who decided ad hoc industrial sites at one big stroke of the pen.

We are now into the 1990s, when the EARTH has decided that she has had enough! As Maneka Gandhi states, it is the time "when the inhabitants of her womb should be made to pay for kicking her and punching her and trying to eat their way out with acid." The World Bank and the IMF themselves desperately need a policy of glasnost--so that an informed public debate can take place. And the lamentable record of the World Bank on the environment must be disclosed! As *The New Internationalist* wrote in December 1990, "the World Bank has turned out to be an ecological Frankenstein, armed with a chain saw!" In September 1989, a hearing of the Human Rights Caucus in the U.S. Congress found that more than 1.5 million people are currently being displaced by World Bank projects! When Bush and company praise the World Bank and the IMF, they completely ignore the disruption caused by its projects, the forced resettlements of populations, and the threats to the livelihood and survival of indigenous and tribal peoples. Forgotten also are the refugees--the millions of refugees who are a by-product of this century's environmental and social

dislocation, a by-product of military and economic violence! But then--these people are not part of the New World Order.

The Green Parties and Green Movements across the globe, together with movements in the Third World, have called for the creation of a South Bank. This would provide an alternative credit system to the IMF and the World Bank, and would be set up by Third World countries and indigenous movements of the South. Some of us are calling this a form of "counter (or ecological) development." It would be, as Jeremy Seabrook states, disengaging, where possible, from a single, damaging world-system--disengaging from the New World Order! This is, in fact, one of the most difficult challenges ahead of us.

The Gulf War has revealed that the U.S. is relying more and more on military and ideological forces to expand its global influence, especially in the absence of a Soviet counterthreat and counterweight. High-tech, so-called limited air wars are in store for those refusing to toe the line. Noam Chomsky spells it out even more directly. The central message from the White House in these days is: "We are the masters and you shine our shoes." He states rightly, "A truism about the New World Order is that it is economically tripolar, and militarily unipolar." The United States and Western Europe will support the most murderous tyrant as long as he plays along, and will labour to overthrow Third World democrats if they depart from their service functions (*Third World Resurgence* No. 9-90).

In the discussion about a New World Order we must not forget that the recent Gulf War has heralded the dawn of a new era of high-tech warfare, sending Third World countries scrambling to arm themselves with missile capability. Iran, for example, will soon start mass production of long range, surface-to-surface missiles with high destructive power. Aside from the Soviet Union, both China and North Korea manufacture SCUD missiles, making them one of the more readily available medium-range missiles. The Gulf War has prodded India into accelerating its plans to develop an indigenous missile

capability. China has vastly benefited from imported U.S. aerospace technology and is selling deadly rockets to raise cash and win friends in the Third World. And let us not forget that Egypt previously cooperated with Iraq in developing Argentina's Condor II rocket, using German technology.

Also, we cannot forget how President Bush opened the post-Cold War era with the invasion of Panama, imposing the rule of the 10 percent white minority and guaranteeing U.S. control over the Canal and its bases. Since 1971 the U.S. has been in the lead in vetoing UN Security Council resolutions and blocking United Nations peacekeeping functions, followed by Great Britain. Noam Chomsky reminds us that Bush began to head the CIA in 1975, just in time to support near-genocide in East Timor. While Bush philosophizes about the New World Order, we are to forget his new friend President Hafez al-Assad of Syria, who occupied and still occupies a part of Lebanon. We are to forget how he has stood side by side with Turkey, while the Turks have intensified their repression of the Kurds!

The hypocrisy and prejudice contained in the Old New World Order is simply disgusting and must be exposed by the international, independent peace and ecological movements. Western racism is quite evident when one looks at how the West dealt with South Africa and with Iraq and the differences inherent in Western policies towards them.

For people in the Third World, the New World Order looks grim. Up to now, the West could hide and disguise its practices of hypocrisy behind the veil of "defending against the Soviet threat." But that time is now finished and the veils are gone. Perhaps we now have a better chance than ever before to expose these lies, these prejudices, and the double standards of Western governments.

The nineties and the coming new century bring environmental, economic, and social catastrophes home here in the West and the same problems to an even greater extent to the

rest of the world. The uniting of Europe, I believe, will slowly be "Germanised" and will carry out the task of "Latin-Americanising," as Noam Chomsky states, most of the domains of the collapsing East European-Soviet economy. Japan will do its very best to compete with Germany and the U.S.A. They will all compete for who will exploit the most. Branch offices of Western and Japanese corporations will be set up all over the globe, controlling the Third World by economic pressure or, if necessary, by force. That is more or less the New World Order ahead of us, as it is coming into view for me. We must reject a Pax Americana. We must work for complete demilitarisation to counter the new military discipline as imposed by the West and a global NATO. We must work towards "counter- development" at the grass-roots level, to counter GATT and the multinational-company-controlled world economy. And we must become radical in changing our own consuming habits and lifestyle if we are to have any hope at all in changing and transforming the present production and consumption habits of the West. I am rather pessimistic, I admit, but I have not yet given up!

A GREEN VIEW OF GERMAN REUNIFICATION AND EUROPE'S FUTURE

Dear friends at American University, dear family and friends in the School of International Service, dear friends in Washington, and dear Dr. Mott!

I have just come to Washington from a conference on German reunification at the Goethe Institute in Los Angeles with the title "How normal are the Germans?" Soon I shall be on my way back to Germany to arrive right in the middle of German national elections for the National Parliament on December 2nd. These will be elections for the Parliament of a united Germany. I have had the privilege to be a member of the German Bundestag since 1983, as a cofounder of the Green Party and as someone who has continued to think independently within my own Green Party since its founding. I have been the exception to the rule up to now as I have been able to serve two full terms in Parliament. Most of the regional groups of the German Green Party do not accept a third full term and thus I have had no chance to run again from Bavaria. My attempts to run for a third term in Hessen failed because my thinking on ecology, disarmament, and on German reunification is too radical for those who are in the majority in the Hessen Green Party.

Alumni dinner, School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C., November 19, 1990.

This is the Realo Wing (meaning the pragmatic, pro-Social Democrat Wing, which is, in my opinion, willing to make too many compromises). Only a few weeks ago, the citizen action movement of East Germany, including Neues Forum, Demokratie Jetzt [Democracy Now], and other groups nominated me for a second place on the candidate's list in Sachsen-Anhalt. For the past nine years, together with Gert Bastian I have worked with an independent citizen action group in East Germany, especially in those times when our friends were repressed, harassed, or imprisoned. It was the newly founded East German Green Party that opposed any Green Party candidate from the West being nominated by the independent citizen action groups. Thus again it has not been possible to stand for a third term.

Certainly I will now face some difficult years ahead without my efficient, international parliamentary office that was able to reach out to cancer-ill children, to Chinese students in the democracy movement, and to Tibetans who have been struggling so long for their independence and freedom. Through this office we were able to reach out to many dissidents and independent thinkers in Eastern Europe and to be in solidarity with Indians in the United States and Canada, with Aborigines in Australia, and with many others who had no voice when it came to party politics in Germany.

The past eight years have given me a very critical perspective upon what has now become German reunification. Before that, eleven years with the Economic and Social Committee of the European Community in Brussels have also given me a broad view of Europe's future and the possibilities that exist within it. While in the German Parliament, I have been a member of the prestigious all-male Foreign Relations Committee, the Western European Union Parliamentary Assembly, and the Sub-Committee on European Affairs and Disarmament. I have worked on issues of human rights, foreign policy, neutrality, and disarmament, as well as on the question of children's cancer, and many ecological concerns. Of course, one of my overriding preoccupations has been that

of feminism. In fact, I believe it all began here at American University between 1966 and 1970 when, for example, I ran for the Student Senate with quite a feminist agenda and when I initiated the first International Week in 1966-67.

I have often stated that much of the thinking which I try to bring into discussions within German party politics derived from my years in the United States between 1961 and 1970. First I worked in Europe within the framework of the Social Democratic Party. Then after having been a loyal Willy Brandt voter, I became very disillusioned with the politics of Helmut Schmidt, politics of economic growth at any cost, politics of pronuclear power, and politics of prodeployment of nuclear weapons in Western Europe. Thus, between 1976 and 1978, I began thinking, together with a small circle of my friends, about leaving the SPD and creating an ecological, feminist, and antimilitaristic party called the Green Party. At that time many of my colleagues and friends felt that this party development would be a wrong signal, that it would be better to work within the existing SPD and turn that green. But being quite stubborn and determined to find new ecological roads, since the old socialist roads had seemed to go crooked, I decided to dedicate all of my energy and creativity to help form a new political party--in my view an "anti-party-party" called the Green Party. By 1979 I headed the first national list for the Green Party in the European elections. We received 3.2 percent of the votes the very first time we stood in a national election--about one million votes. At that moment I knew we were doing something right!

Much of what I was taught here in Washington, D.C., about civil disobedience and about the ethics of nonviolence by such mentors as Dr. Abdul Said and Dr. Albert Mott, I was also able to put into practice at the time by being an active member of the antiwar movement, the civil rights movement, and by becoming a very critical and very anti-authoritarian person. It was Dr. Said who conveyed to me the essence of international politics as active solidarity with the poor, the repressed, and with those who are exploited. And it was also Dr. Said who

added an element of spirituality to all he taught about international relations--a rare combination that you usually do not find in universities. And Dr. Mott, one of the most challenging professors of history, made me confront my own German past like no one else in my years in the United States. Coming from a small Bavarian town called Gunzburg on the Danube river--the same town in which the family of the notorious Auschwitz doctor Mengele had lived--having been raised in a Catholic convent school under the influence of a very independent and radical grandmother, and having come to the United States through the remarriage of my mother, I experienced quite a bit of culture shock, living first in Georgia, then Virginia, and then Washington. Through the courses with Dr. Mott I was able to get a different perspective on all that I had left behind in Bavaria. For in my convent school there was no talk about Auschwitz, no talk about Bergen-Belsen, no talk about Anne Frank, no talk about Buchenwald! Today, in November 1990, twenty years after I graduated from the School of International Service, I feel there is quite a direct line between what I was taught here and what I put into Green political practice!

In the past ten years I have worked, laughed, and cried with someone very close to me--someone known to many here, but who is not here tonight--former General and former Green MP Gert Bastian. He had the courage to leave the German Army while on active duty out of protest against the deployment of mass destructive American missiles in Western Europe. He set a courageous example which, unfortunately, other military officers have not followed. With him I have nonviolently blockaded military bases across Europe, as acts of civil disobedience, together with friends like Phil Berrigan and many others. Gert Bastian has also been one of my most important mentors and thus I dedicate these comments to him.

Together with a very close Tibetan friend who is here tonight, Dr. Palden Tawo, we have worked intensely on various human rights campaigns, especially concerning Tibet and China. Human rights work and standing up for a free and

independent Tibet has been one of the most difficult tasks amidst the process of reuniting Germany. As the Iron Curtain between East and West was about to thaw, a new Ice Age broke in the South. We, the Germans, speaking now collectively, seemed to have no time at all any more for those who live outside of Germany, outside of Europe, in other parts of the world. Suddenly we centered all of our concerns on reunification and on our own problems, forgetting all the others who are far worse off.

I personally and the majority of Greens did not want nor did we foresee the present speedy process of German reunification. Our model would have been the model of a confederation: two separate German states competing with each other for more ecology, more direct democracy, more women's rights, and more social justice; two Germanys in solidarity with one another who cooperate and grow together slowly and carefully. The East German Revolution of last November, the first revolution on German soil, was led by very strong women who I count among my best friends, including Barbel Bohley, Katja Havemann, Ulrike Poppe, and many other brave and courageous women and men. It was these friends of ours from the independent human rights and peace groups from East Germany who suffered oppression for many years and were imprisoned time and again. Gert Bastian and I travelled back and forth to East Germany in the 1980s. We demonstrated on the Alexanderplatz in East Berlin in 1983 and were arrested there. On account of that experience we had our very first dialogue with Erich Honecker in November 1983. That critical dialogue with him continued throughout the 1980s. We made quite clear to him that we did not intend to be frightened away by his measures of not allowing us into East Germany on several occasions or by his writing to us and warning us of our breaking the law by helping the GDR dissidents. We continued our dialogue with Mr. Honecker, making clear that we would see our dissident friends despite the measures he took against us. That type of position was not always supported within my own Green party, since many of the Left-wing dogmatic Green

Party members wanted to make sure that they had good relationships with the old SED regime. They saw their dreams of socialism in some strange and nebulous way come alive in the old GDR!

Sitting in those tiny kitchens and in those smoke-filled living rooms of our dissident friends in East Germany--in a world quite its own--was something I shall never forget. Over and over again our friends in East Germany dreamt of nonviolent revolutions, dreamt of nonviolent change and of nonviolent resistance against the SED regime. Though they also dreamt of another type of GDR, they did not dream of getting rid of it altogether! Erich Honecker was quite frightened by that small nonviolent nucleus of dissidents in East Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden, and in the countryside. In fact, it was Horst Sindermann, SED President of the Volkskammer, who stated after the Revolution took place that the one thing the SED really could not calculate or understand was the notion of nonviolent protest.

I also had the privilege to get to know courageous dissidents in the Soviet Union in the 1980s, brave women like Larissa Bogoraz, wife of Anatoly Marchenko. I had the privilege of getting to know Andrei Sakharov and his wife Jelena Bonner, talking with both in their Moscow kitchen! Through my long friendship with Lew Kopelew, the Russian writer and dissident, and through his circle of friends in Moscow, I came to know and understand what the notion of a civil society was all about--civil society and anti-politics--the two most important concepts which I learned from the citizens' rights movement in Eastern Europe. It does not seem so long ago when, in 1986, Anatoly Marchenko went on a hunger strike demanding the release of all political prisoners and criminal persecution of the jailers who had beaten him. Marchenko died of a cerebral hemorrhage in prison on December 8, 1986, after spending twenty of his forty-eight years in the Soviet penal system! And it was not so long ago when I visited his widow in Moscow, when perestroika and glasnost were beginning, and when some bricks were thrown through the window of our car

which was parked outside of her apartment to warn us that our visits to her were still unwelcome. It was in February 1987 at the Moscow Peace Forum where Gert Bastian and I had the chance to meet and speak with President Gorbachev. At that time we were still requesting him to allow Andrei Sakharov to travel freely to West European countries. Now it all seems like a very long time ago!

Three years later our West German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, found himself concluding a treaty that would give Germany full sovereignty in its October 3rd merger with East Germany. In September 1990 Helmut Kohl had only one obstacle left--the disposition of Soviet troops in the East. Within half an hour both Gorbachev and Kohl had what they wanted after their talk in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev wrested from Kohl a commitment of eight billion dollars, most of it for the withdrawal and resettlement back home of Soviet troops stationed in East Germany. Five billion dollars was for thirty-six thousand new apartments in the Soviet Union and the rest was for retraining the soldiers for civilian jobs. In return, Kohl got a virtual guarantee that the Two-plus-Four Treaty ending all postwar rights for the World War II victors would be concluded smoothly in Moscow. As *Time* wrote on September 24, 1990, for such a significant historical event, the ceremony was a mercifully brief five minutes.

When I think back one year to the nonviolent revolutions in Prague, East Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden, Warsaw, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union, I also have the sense of how quickly revolutions can be snuffed out. The East German Revolution was quickly reversed by Chancellor Helmut Kohl's Ten-Point Plan, by the West German banks and businesses, by West German and West European companies who are all on their way to making Eastern Europe the new Sicily of Western Europe. The East German Revolution was cancelled by West German established politicians from the Liberal, Christian Democrat, and Social Democratic parties who travelled back and forth between December and March 1990 and took their blueprint from our so-called perfect Western capitalist society.

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

Suddenly nothing was of any value in East Germany. Suddenly nothing was of any value in Eastern Europe, not even the provision of children's creches or the more liberal abortion law in East Germany.

Suddenly, the West, Western capital, the NATO alliance, even the Pope, the WEU, and the European Community triumphed and acted as if they themselves had liberated Eastern Europe and had removed the Wall and the Iron Curtain! Pastor Heinrich Albertz stated a few months ago: "A West German military invasion of the GDR would be more honest than what is going on now!" Most of our politicians, even Willy Brandt from whom I expected it the least, reverted back to German nationalist rhetoric. Suddenly "being German" takes on a new, special meaning. Does this mean that the nasty and arrogant German could be back soon? We must do everything to prevent this!

In a recent meeting of East German authors in the former East Berlin on November 5, 1990, Christa Wolf stated that she had the feeling that her life was being taken away. She explained that one cannot take away forty years of East German history and East German identity; one cannot take away the identity that people have formed over forty years; one cannot tell them that this identity never meant anything at all.

In December 1989, at the time when Egon Krenz was still in power but about to resign, Gert Bastian and I took His Holiness the Dalai Lama to East Berlin, across Checkpoint Charlie. It was an odd feeling. For years we had had the Stasi following us in their Trabis. Now suddenly they were leading the way and helping us move through the streets to the place where the legendary Round Table was about to begin. The Dalai Lama was invited by the independent Citizens Rights Movement and when he passed Checkpoint Charlie he was still fearful of being arrested. It was a momentous day for us because we felt we were taking him to meet the future government of East Germany--our friends in the independent

citizens and human rights movement! But we were far too hopeful.

While the Round Table in East Germany discussed radical programmes and aims and drafted a more progressive and better Basic Law than we have, the German Revolution was already being snuffed out by the West--by Western governments who did not want to confront an antinuclear, antimilitaristic, and perhaps even feminist future GDR government. In October and November 1989, East Germans marched on the streets with signs and slogans proclaiming "We are the People," meaning that they were determining their fate, their goals, and their future society. Two months later more and more West German flags appeared on the scene, more and more German hymns were being sung, and suddenly the slogan was "We are One People." That, I feel, was the end of the East German Revolution!

By March 1990 when the first free elections took place in East Germany, the media had almost forgotten those brave women and men who were in the forefront of the Revolution and who were also in the front line of the demonstrations in October 1989 when Honecker and his regime almost opted for the Chinese Solution. It was not Minister de Maiziere and it was not the new Volkskammer President, Sabine Bergmann-Pohl, who had walked in the front lines of the demonstrations in the fall of 1989, about to be beaten up by the East German police. Suddenly everything seemed turned on its head. The East German voters opted for the Deutsche Mark (understandably so) as well as for a blueprint of West German society *a la* Kohl.

In the summer of 1990, laden with billions of brand new Deutsche Mark, a fleet of thirty armored cars drove through East Germany. This vast fortune, 120 billion DM or seventy billion dollars, was the price of German reunification. On July 1, millions of East Germans stood in line at some ten thousand bank branches and police stations to convert their Ostmark into Deutsche Mark at a rate of 1:1 and then at a rate of 1:1.5 for

anything beyond four thousand Ostmark. A few months later, nearly half a century of Communism was abandoned and East Germans came under West German rules on corporate and union practices, welfare, insurance, and other standards. But they never really had a chance to discuss the aims of their Revolution. They never had a chance to determine the process of reunification, not even through the exercise of a referendum.

It was a very strange and eerie feeling when the German Democratic Republic was formally abolished. We met October 2-3, 1990, in that notorious Reichstag building in Berlin where we also held our first joint session of Parliament. It was strange seeing East German policemen and soldiers wearing East German uniforms with a little plastic emblem telling others that they were now West Germans. And it was very eerie and frightening to hear television discussions with East German soldiers and officers who were asked whether or not they could cope with having previously served under Honecker and now having to serve under a West German Minister of Defence. Their answer, unfortunately, was typically German. They replied that they were loyal under Honecker and they are now loyal under Mr. Stoltenberg and that this makes no problems for them, because they are simply loyal to whoever gives them their orders. Is this another example of the German who cannot be entrusted with responsibility for himself and for his conscious actions?

The change in direction since the revolution of 1989 has been due to money, not conscience. I am frightened by the eighty to ninety million Germans coming together in a unified, centralised German state, since this unified German state during the seventy years of its previous existence always brought a lot of suffering to its neighbours and to the Germans themselves. I am anxious about German reunification and such anxiety is widespread. I personally feel that only an honest policy of "self-restraint," meaning complete demilitarization and complete democratization, can be the answer when so many Germans come together. Gunter Grass, one of the lonely voices

and opponents of this speedy reunification process like ourselves, stated, and I fully agree with him:

Auschwitz speaks against even a right of self-determination, because one of the pre-conditions for the horror, besides other, older urges, was a strong, united Germany. Not Prussia, not Bavaria, not even Austria alone could have developed and carried out the will and the method of organised genocide; it required a united Germany. We have every reason to be afraid of ourselves as a functioning unity. . . . We cannot get by Auschwitz. We shouldn't even try! (*Time*, June 25, 1990).

First I would like to take the example of the Unification Treaty, which we debated with very little passion in the German Parliament. The Central Council of Jews in Germany submitted a memorandum to Chancellor Kohl in a meeting in July 1990. Heinz Galinski, spokesperson of the council, suggested the following compromise solution for the preamble of the Unification Treaty:

Aware of the continuity of German history and especially bearing in mind the unprecedented acts of violence committed between 1933 and 1945 as well as the resulting obligations towards all victims and responsibility for a democratic development in Germany committed to respect for human rights and to peace.

The German government submitted the following draft:

Aware of the continuity of German history and bearing in mind the special responsibility arising from our past for democratic development in Germany committed to respect for human rights and to peace.

This was the governmental version that received a large majority in the German Parliament. It was not possible to include even one word about the Holocaust in Germany; it was

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

not possible to include one word about the unprecedented acts of violence committed between 1933 and 1945!

In a recent discussion concerning November 9th and the meaning of that date in German history, Heinz Galinski rightly stated that November 9th will be remembered as the day the Wall came down. But it was hardly remembered as the "Reichskristallnacht." That day, November 9, 1938, was never accepted as a memorial day, though it would have been much better for German democracy in the past if it had. The Germans went into the streets prior to November 9, 1989. If only they had gone into the streets in the years before 1945! Heinz Galinski reported at the recent meeting in Berlin that there are increasing acts of anti-Semitism in Germany, especially through acts of violence in Jewish cemeteries. He warned us about the increasing Right-wing radicalism now occurring in East Germany and about the increasing hatred of all that is foreign and not German.

I myself have experienced much of this while travelling in East Germany--football hooligans singing songs about Hitler, about winning the war against Jews or foreigners; German Right-wing radicals singing the German hymn and the old text that was sung under Hitler. Time and time again foreigners are beaten up in subway and railway stations. There is, for example, a home for foreigners at the end of a tram track in Magdeburg where every single night Right-wing groups come to demolish and to destroy not only the windows and doors but to threaten those who live there. This is what daily life is like in the former GDR!

Just recently we discovered that every week four huge airplanes from the Russian airline Aeroflot leave the former East Germany with Vietnamese migrant workers on board, sending them all back home, whether they would like to leave or not, making ex-East Germany Vietnamese-free. In 1989 there were over 160,000 foreign workers in East Germany; fifty-three thousand of them were Vietnamese. Vietnamese women who were pregnant had to have an abortion in the GDR

and were flown back to Vietnam. Now that Germany is reunified, Vietnamese workers and their families experience even more repression, oppression, and hatred than ever before. Suddenly intolerance and hatred are creeping out of the woodwork everywhere.

On September 1, 1990, the annual date to commemorate the "*Überfall*" [attack] on Poland, the German government made another error by introducing restrictive immigration regulations for all Polish women and men. At least this will now change for the better, but it was embarrassing enough when it happened.

There is another embarrassment that I must mention--the fact that we cannot pass compensation bills for the forced labourers [*Zwangsarbeiter*] under the Nazi regime. Thousands and thousands of former forced labourers will now be dying in terrible poverty. The German Green Party and the SPD had demanded that a foundation be created for the compensation of forced labourers. The governmental parties did not go along with it and recommended further and further investigations to the German government. This means that, in the near future, none of the former forced labourers will receive any type of financial compensation, not even something small and symbolic. I see this as pure cynicism--cynicism because we are unable to make a constructive decision for the surviving slave labourers of the Nazi regime in their elderly years of poverty. Only about 1.3 billion Deutsche Mark would be needed for such a foundation. In German parliamentary debates one constantly hears that one should not hold present and future German generations responsible for the crimes of the past. I have heard this over and over again during our Guernica parliamentary debates, where I have tried to raise the issue of making a symbolic gesture of reconciliation toward the people of Guernica--again and again, embarrassing moments, because our government argues so primitively against mercenary gestures of reconciliation!

Another example puts me to shame. We Germans, through governmental regulations, are now stopping Soviet Jews from coming into this country (*Einwanderungsstopp für Sowjetjuden*). After the Green Party raised this issue in the parliamentary debate, the German government announced that it "might" be ready and willing to allow some Jews to come into this country, but how this is supposed to be done and when, no one knows. At this moment, Soviet Jews cannot legally come into the country. What is even more embarrassing is the fact that the German government is considering allowing at the maximum only three thousand Jews to immigrate in the next three to five years. But should not every Jewish man, woman, and child who now looks to Germany for protection have the right to come here? Is this not what our own history has taught us? It was the Soviet Jews who were able to survive the German policies of "*Endlösung*" [Final Solution]. We have all the more responsibility to help them now as much as we can. The arguments against Soviet Jews in Germany have been very shameful. There has been the argument that Germany is not an immigration country (*Einwanderungsland*), that there would be new anti-Semitism throughout Germany, and that Israel would be upset if we took the Soviet Jews. Forty-five years after Auschwitz, Jewish people in the Soviet Union would like to come back to Germany. Is this not all the more a moral and historic responsibility for us?

I recently attended a public hearing concerning the victims of the Stasi, the state security system in the former East Germany, which was one of the most perfect repression systems ever to be designed in the Eastern bloc. Until now, the incredible amounts of money from the old SED--now PDS--and from the old bloc parties (*Blockparteien*) have gone right back into the pockets of those who possessed it under Honecker. And yet there is still no provision for financial funds for the victims of that regime! What is even worse--the old state lawyers and the old SED judges in East Germany are now the new judiciary! They are simply being retrained in three-week courses! This reminds one all too much of the time after the

fall of Hitler when key persons involved with the Nazi industry, the Nazi judiciary, and the Nazi police were treated with much generosity. Former Nazis took up bureaucratic positions in the administration of the Federal Republic of Germany in the 1950s. In 1952, for example, according to the programme "Report" by Franz Alt, there were more former members of the Nazi Party sitting in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bonn than in the "Reichsaussenministerium" during the Third Reich! At the present time there are still eighteen hundred state lawyers who worked under the SED regime, loyal as usual. Now they will be loyal to quite another system! Under Hans Modrow, the successor of Egon Krenz, the personal files of the thousands and thousands of bureaucrats under the SED regime were legally cleansed. Therefore, it is difficult to even try to trace the past of any one of these judges or lawyers.

In this regard, consider another example. In the *Sächsische Olefinwerken AG* in Bohlen, two out of every three workers will be fired because of the rationalisation and total reconstruction and renovation of the factory. The people at the bottom of the ladder will lose their jobs and will be unemployed while on the upper rungs of the ladder the old SED directors and administrators sit glued to their seats. Previously there were sixteen SED administrators; now fourteen of them are still employed in this company, praising the mechanisms of the market economy. As one worker commented, "Some of those who claimed to be fighting for socialism under Honecker now want to pressure us within a system of pre-capitalist structures!"

And then the problem of rewriting history comes up again. As *Newsweek* reported in September 1990, "Lenin still hangs around." East German students in September returned to a school system in chaos. Many principals had been fired because pro-Communist zeal was their main talent. Then half of them were rehired for lack of replacements. Teachers were kept on, even though most were former Communist Party members. West Germany donated two million new textbooks but they are not enough to teach a host of new or revised subjects to 2.6 million students. But even the revised texts still

carry strange allusions, like the mathematics exercise that counts East German soldiers rather than apples and oranges! Now that students have a choice of languages, 90 percent choose to study English instead of Russian, and so unwanted Russian teachers are scrambling to learn English. A student recently complained: "We have to learn social studies about a society we have never lived in." And another student sums it all up: "All this time we were told our country was the best and we had achieved the most. Now they tell us it was all wrong."

This means, in fact, that German history of the past fifty years has to be rewritten for the third time, rewritten and revalued. First there was Josef Goebbels, the Minister for Propaganda and "Volksaufklärung." Twenty-five years later, there was a former pupil who was taught under the Nazis and later became Minister for Education, Margot Honecker. She demanded that teachers implant hatred of the barbaric system of capitalism into the hearts of children. Now once again history and school books will be rewritten.

There is something else that depresses me about the way in which we cope with German reunification. Erich Honecker is awaiting trial in a military hospital near Potsdam with his wife. A few others like Mielke, the former head of state security, are lying in prison hospitals. But all the rest of the Politburo & Company who supported and were part of that very same regime are sitting in their new and old villas and are pointing the finger at the one who supposedly did it all --Erich Honecker! It was Barbel Bohley who recently said, "Erich Honecker should get a pension and find a place in an old-age home! Just leave him alone. We don't need revenge and we don't need vengeance!" On the other hand, our Justice Minister wanted to give amnesty to almost all Stasi members. The criminals high up in the SED hierarchy are living in luxury at Tegernsee and elsewhere, partly being protected by West German intelligence agencies! What German-German irony!

These are just a few examples that I wanted to mention in talking about the years it will take to repair the damage caused

by four decades of Communism. Former East Germany will be changed, but I also hope that in the process West Germany will change and become more modest and more willing to learn. Former East Germany is now considered bankrupt. Most of its eight thousand decrepit enterprises are on the verge of failure and unemployment is headed towards two million--perhaps much more-- out of a work force of 8.9 million. Building or upgrading plants and equipment, constructing roads, establishing communication networks, and cleaning up industrial pollution are expected to cost up to 455 billion dollars. Estimates run now as high as 775 billion dollars for a ten year period. Unfortunately this rebuilding of East Germany will not be done in the soft, ecological, decentralised way that we had hoped for. It will be done in the hard, capitalist, and nonecological manner that we have been used to in the West and against which we have been struggling. Instead of developing soft energy systems, the West German nuclear-lobby is right back again trying to build better and more efficient West German nuclear reactors. Have they ever heard of Chernobyl? No, they've forgotten completely!

There is, of course, also a very strong psychological separation--the wall in the mind--a split that may not be overcome for a generation or more. Many West German politicians always talked of the two Germanys as if they were essentially one. But they were not! The West thrived while the East, those "over there," lived under fifty-seven years of uninterrupted totalitarian dictatorship, first under the Nazis, then under the Communists. Many people feel and see now that their future in former East Germany is not "prescribed time" but "free time." This is something people did not learn and are afraid of! They have to cope with a whole new attitude about life and living!

Now many questions are being asked, especially about the intellectuals and artists in past East German society. They played a small role or none at all in bursting through the Wall. In fact, many of them resented the very idea of a multiparty society. Jurgen Fuchs, an East German writer who was

imprisoned for nine months in 1976 and was then expelled to the West, stated recently: "Where were the GDR writers and intellectuals with the moral strength to fight Stalinism as well as Fascism?"

All power emanated from the Party under the SED in a nationwide network of command and control run by hundreds of thousands of professional operatives of the state security service. It involved millions of part-time informers, volunteer watchdogs on party block-committees in every town and every village. Many of them are still working in important positions in the post-Communist state.

The Stasi files contain the names of six million people (including two million West Germans), and report on their financial problems, their sexual lives, and other details. How can one digest that now? Many East Germans, rightly so, want to see the personal files. They don't want to be haunted by the question, "Was it really my neighbour or best friend who betrayed me?" They simply want to know.

Another aspect is troubling me: German foreign policy. Most Germans have been so preoccupied with the problems of unification that they have forgotten the rest of the world. The Foreign Minister Genscher has been giving assurances that Germany will live up to its responsibilities in Europe and in the world. On the same day that Mr. Genscher was quoted to that effect, the newspapers reported comments of the President of the EC Commission, Jacques Delors, who had warned of a diminishing political commitment to Europe. Delors stated that he is fearful that there could be at the centre of a weak Europe a strong, tough, and powerful German economy. He added that if a strong Germany were to appear in Europe the fate of a large part of the continent would depend on German public opinion.

I agree. We must be watchful! All too quickly I am hearing the calls of CDU colleagues wanting to send German soldiers to the Gulf as soon as the Basic Law can be changed. All too often I hear that German soldiers will be even better

than the rest against Saddam Hussein. On top of all that, one hears that Germany should be on the Security Council of the United Nations and should have no second thoughts about becoming an economic and military world power. But up to now West Germany has not been acting like a responsible growing power, but more like a kind of merchant of death, a merchant without any morals. One need only be reminded of the many weapons export scandals which fill files--files of shameful history of the German weapons industry. Over one hundred German companies have been involved in deadly arms transactions with Iraq, and not only with Iraq, but also with Pakistan, South Africa, Iran, and many other countries around the world. German arms exports are about to become one of the main pillars of the foreign policy pursued by a united Germany. How are we to interpret the fact that, roughly fifteen months after the suppression of the Democracy Movement in Beijing, Germany has lifted the economic sanctions against China which I and my colleagues had initiated in the German Bundestag over one year ago? This reversal of policy towards China is evidently prompted by the outstanding export transactions of GDR companies with China as well as West German interest in the China market. And of course one had to "be good to China again" because of the Chinese vote against Saddam Hussein in the United Nations Security Council. How disgusting!

A new and united Germany cannot afford to continue to act so arrogantly and immorally when it comes to uncovering the arms export scandals. The U.S. newspaper *Nuclear Fuel* of March 6, 1989, declared that the United States had sent over one hundred formal protest notes against planned German exports to a nuclear weapons factory in Pakistan. Over and over again these United States protest notes landed in wastepaper baskets of German ministries! A study of the U.S. Congress has made very clear where Germany is heading. Germany was the only country of the leading arms exporters that had increased its weapons sales to the Third World, from 830 million U.S. dollars in 1988 to over 1.3 billion dollars in 1989. I must remind you that the use of poisonous gases by the

dictator Saddam Hussein against the Kurdish population in Iraq was made possible only through German know-how and German export of plants for so-called pesticide production. It did not worry us too much then that Kurdish children were dying a terrible death by the poisonous gas. Now our politicians are worried that in the future German soldiers could be killed by German weapons and by our own poisonous gas. But what have we been doing in these past few weeks? We give and sell gas masks to the people in Israel and we also end up selling little gas chambers for testing dogs in Iraqi poison gas factories. The Kolb company ordered these little gas chambers for animals and the Rema Labor Technik Company delivered them. Even the dogs come from Germany. Pesticide research was simply the cover-up. But the gas chambers, the crematoriums, show what is really happening in those pesticide plants in Iraq! I should also add that we face further scandals when it comes to providing nuclear know-how to Pakistan. The scandals have no end! It was almost ten years ago when the West German government first promised to examine whether West German companies assisted Iraq in building a poison gas factory. The German authorities took nearly seven years to ascertain this!"

Heleno Sana wrote in his book *The Fourth Reich* that all too often Germans make a distinction between private and public morals. At this particular time I miss my old friend Heinrich Böll who once said: "We live in a country that has suppressed its history . . . in a country that has delusions about its popularity." And I also remember that President Gorbachev stated: "Nobody should ignore the negative potential that emerged in Germany's past." The German question, I believe, was not invented abroad. The German question is a constantly recurring legacy of our own German history. In the past few months, one could hear from Rudolf Augstein right down to Helmut Kohl: "Nobody need fear the Germans!" But Gunter Grass rightly stated: "We shall be united again, strong and clearly audible even when we try to speak quietly."

In this regard let me cite one more worrisome case. In the Four-plus-Two talks with the four victorious powers of the Second World War on the external aspects of German reunification, the two German governments had pledged that Germans would not possess any nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher reaffirmed that Germany will not possess or have control over such weapons. But a closer look at the Four-plus-Two Treaty reveals that it is still possible for Germany to participate in future development and manufacture of nuclear weapons in another country. We should not forget the fact that on signing the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1974, the German government expressed the reservation that the possibility of shared control over nuclear weapons within the scope of a future Western European Union would not be affected by Germany's signature of the NPT. Such a European Political Union, as is sought by the present Kohl government, could be a nuclear power if any of its member countries were to possess nuclear weapons. This provision was additionally enshrined in a bilateral agreement between Bonn and Washington and was not retracted in the recent declarations renouncing atomic, biological, and chemical weapons. This provision thus remains valid. Since it can be assumed that both France and Britain would be members of a West European Union, united Germany would in this manner obtain shared control over nuclear weapons. Also unaffected by the solemn pledge not to possess nuclear weapons of our own is German coparticipation in the nuclear weapons programmes of other countries. Within the allegedly redesigned NATO, the option of procuring new tactical air-to-surface missiles (TASMs) for combat-aircraft of the German Air Force is now being discussed. In times of crisis, the nuclear TASMs are to be handed out to the German Air Force [*nukleare Teilhabe*].

By the Four-plus-Two Treaty the former East Germany was made nuclear-free; at least that is claimed. But after the Soviet troops leave in 1994 there will be NATO troops and NATO maneuvers on East German soil. We cannot know

whether or not they will be carrying conventional or nuclear warheads! Verification in this area is quite difficult. Our hope for a completely demilitarised East Germany has thereby been cancelled. We wanted to make at least one third of this united Germany a demilitarised zone. But now our German Air Force is even flying MIG airplanes! Instead of creating a huge scrap heap of East German weapons, airplanes, and tanks, etc., we are simply selecting what might be of best use for us in future times. And this is called the "Age of Disarmament!"

When I turn to Europe at large, I realise that we in Western Europe have hardly changed. No matter what we, as West Germans and West Europeans, say about cooperation and fair play, we still believe instinctively in the struggle for supremacy. Such an ideology befits our dog-eat-dog capitalism.

In the Green Party we always had a lot of hope for a complete transformation of EC and WEU structures. We also hoped that NATO would dissolve itself in response to the dissolved Warsaw Pact. But I am afraid that what we are going to have to deal with is an increasingly strong NATO trying to dictate a weak CSCE process. The Warsaw Pact is almost gone. It seems to have had hardly any reason for existence. Countries like Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia are thinking of joining the EC. Some are even thinking of joining NATO and others are wanting to choose the road towards neutrality. But Mr. Manfred Wornier, the Secretary-General of NATO, still holds on to all of the policies of nuclear deterrence and sees NATO as an integral part of the process of creating a new unified Europe. The only answer to this would be for the Soviet Union and all of Eastern Europe to join NATO. Maybe that is one way to transform this entire alliance.

As to the construction of a new Europe of solidarity, I doubt that the EC will transform itself. Chancellor Kohl has stated that he does not want many East European countries applying for membership in the EC. He has stated that membership is only possible for those who desire a strong

military, economic, and political European Union along the lines set up by the West European countries. Will we then ever get our chance to build up a nonaligned, neutral Europe including, of course, the Soviet Union? At the moment all the signs point in another direction!

In the meantime, many of the former dissidents in Eastern Europe and West European peace activists, including myself, have founded the Helsinki Citizens Assembly. We recently met in Prague and tried to initiate a dialogue from below on future European cooperation. This is an extension of our "detente from below" strategy.

We now have a real possibility of constructing new relationships in Europe that do not depend on the threat or use of military force. But huge military infrastructures and large stockpiles of weapons are still in place. And there are many major differences in the level of economic development and standards of living between East and West, North and South. Environmental degradation poses a serious threat to survival and gives rise to new conflicts. The Helsinki Citizens Assembly hopes to create a new type of security system and to do away with military power blocs. We want to make sure that it is no longer necessary to maintain troops on foreign territory, that all weapons of mass destruction are eliminated, and that military spending and conventional arms are drastically reduced.

The peaceful transition of Europe is unthinkable without the full observance of all human and civil rights. This becomes all the more important now since racism is on the rise in the former Eastern bloc. The reported 12 percent rise in attacks by neo-Nazi youth gangs on synagogues, Asians, Hispanics, and others causes us grave concern. Discrimination against Africans and other Third World people as well is increasing in Eastern Europe and there is now a rejection of internationalism and support for Third World liberation movements. In their quest to return to "Europe," there is the danger that many people in Eastern Europe will throw away the values of

universalism and internationalism and promote national chauvinism instead. No event demonstrates this attitude better than the demand by miners in the Ukraine during their strike last year that all aid to the Third World be stopped. There were twenty-two thousand Africans studying in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe up to 1988. This year there are only five thousand.

Now that people are able to open up and express themselves, racist ideology is creeping out. The pluralism now erupting everywhere is also revealing many bad attitudes. I am afraid that the EC, becoming more of a single market in 1992, will turn into a fortress--a fortress against all that which is not European! Immigrant workers in Europe face a rising tide of racism as well as prospective job losses and deportation. Political and economic refugees will soon feel that the doors to both Eastern and Western Europe are more tightly closed than ever. This is not the kind of Europe we wished for. May I also add that John Kenneth Galbraith was right when he stated recently that the Western European countries are reacting not with concrete help for Eastern Europe but only with their own ideologies!

I share another worry with my friend Vandana Shiva, an Indian environmentalist and feminist. With the end of tensions between East and West, she states, the Third World will increasingly become the supplier of raw materials for the new unified North and the dump for its hazards and wastes. She uses an African proverb: "When elephants make war, the grass gets trampled. When elephants make love, the grass gets trampled." The Third World environment and Third World communities have paid the highest price for the superpower rivalry. The Cold War in Europe had always been translated into real and burning wars in the Third World--in Central America, in Central Asia, and in the Horn of Africa. Since 1945, two hundred wars have been fought in the Third World. As the industrialized world now moves from an over-armed peace to a disarmed one, the military producers and traders merely find alternative markets in the Third World. As the

superpowers withdraw from Afghanistan, the neighbouring region of Kashmir goes up in flames and Pakistan and India become new markets for arms. Similarly the U.S.A. has sold tanks removed from Europe to Egypt. There is now a very real danger that arms released from East-West disarmament will be dumped in the Third World.

There is, of course, much environmental devastation in Eastern Europe. Thousands of Bohemian school children must now wear oxygen masks for the short walk to school. Pollution levels in Czechoslovakia this winter are soaring ten times above internationally accepted "safe" limits. The death of the Aral Sea in the Soviet Union is another example of this destruction and is connected with the ecology of overirrigation and chemicalisation of agriculture. But, this sudden exposure of environmental problems in the East should not blind us to the many ecological problems also existing in the market economies in the West. Unfortunately aid and expertise coming from the industrialised North continues to be the main support for environmentally destructive projects in the Third World. Here I need only mention the large dam projects in India. It is the Third World which will have to bear again the ecological costs of the new industrialism and consumerism in the North, including the cost of cleaning up Eastern Europe. East and West Europe will increasingly use the Third World as a dump. And when the transportation routes are too long to the Third World, then the West will use Eastern Europe for its dumping ground.

President Gorbachev has been one of the very few statesmen in the world who has understood that the world is interrelated, interdependent, and integral. He seems to have understood what the common environmental danger and the problem of human survival is all about. But do President Bush and Chancellor Kohl understand? I doubt it very much. Thus, we must work even harder in convincing others about green solutions.

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

Europe, if it is to become a true continent of peace, ecology, and nonviolence, must begin to understand that 20 percent of the world's population has been using 80 percent of the world's resources and that the planet is already devastated. Not only Germany has to learn policies of self-restraint, Western Europe also has to follow such policies.

Our goal must be European unity in diversity, through policies of nonalignment, active neutrality, and solidarity with the Third World. We must build a civil society, a fully demilitarised and socially just community whose economic development will not be at the expense of the environment and at the expense of the Third World.

Germany and Europe at the end of the Second Millennium have a chance of transforming themselves into a country and continent of peace, human dignity, justice, and worldwide solidarity. The hope comes from the independent citizens' rights movements that together with President Gorbachev and his policies have liberated Eastern Europe. Now, in Western Europe, we find ourselves learning to become dissidents so that we too can begin building a civil society at home. Learning from the nonviolent days of November and December 1989 must be one of our priorities. We have that chance of transformation now. Let us not spoil or lose it!

MORALITY AND HUMAN DIGNITY

I am writing this in the last few days of my membership in the Bundestag. At the beginning of December, eight years of parliamentary and extraparliamentary work for the Greens in the Bundestag will come to an end. This is, of course, very painful as over the past eight years I have been able to help numerous people, especially via the infrastructure of the Bundestag office. Very often I did so quietly because virtually no member of the established press in Bonn was interested in the issues. Precisely this apathy and disinterest induced me all the more to stand up in the Bundestag for children suffering from cancer, Aborigines, Tibetans, members of the Chinese prodemocracy movements, and for many others, and I shall continue to stand up for them. On the one hand, I was hardly ever supported by the press in the Federal Republic of Germany, but on the other, I was always able to count on the support and solidarity of the members of the Bundestag belonging to other parties.

Cancer-stricken children, old people, the handicapped or people in Cambodia, Tibet, China, and elsewhere are victims of power--victims of established power here in Bonn! I was partly ridiculed because of my efforts on behalf of these people, and I also met with a great deal of spite and ignorance in the ranks of the Greens themselves when I first espoused the causes of Tibet and Cambodia, for example. Numerous regional associations of the Greens and the national office started to mock my support for the Tibetans and the Dalai Lama, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989, by writing ironical commentaries and satires on this subject and even distributing these inane papers at national congresses. Sometimes I even had to ask myself what I am still doing in this

Written in February 1991, near the end of the Persian Gulf War against Iraq.

party, which had started out as a party committed to human and civil rights and now handles these rights in a selective manner. In my book *Mit dem Herzen denken* [To Think With the Heart] I tried to record the things that disturbed me so deeply in Bonn in recent years, not only in parliament but also in regard to my own party. There was practically no other means available to me because somehow I always felt that everything I tried to achieve was strictly censored by the Bonn press. Of course, I did not have a regular drink at the pub with journalists, nor did I deliver grandiose speeches at press conferences in order to impress journalists. I find this whole system of interdependence between parliament and the press in Bonn rather suspicious. In this system it does not matter at all whom you actually help or what you specifically do for people who petition parliament. What matters is to sell the ideas you constantly preach in a cool and professional way. At the same time you can stay ignorant, inactive, or even completely idle. The main thing is merely to sell your ideas well without concrete action and to disseminate them well via the media. I have discovered that many politicians do not remain at all honest in this system.

Over the last eight years I have succeeded in setting up worldwide parliamentary and extraparliamentary networks in diverse fields, for example on such subjects as cancer in children, ecological health policy, cooperation with centres for peace activities throughout the world, collaboration with feminist, ecological, and disarmament groups, as well as cooperation in the domain that I consider highly important: human and civil rights. As a result, I have accumulated a large collection of papers and files, which now fills three offices, a corridor, and a filing room. In a few weeks I have to move out of my office in the parliamentary building and take these archives with me so that I can use them in my new situation and develop them further. Information from social and alternative movements all over the world was one of the cornerstones of my parliamentary work in Bonn, precisely because I encountered so much ignorance there with regard to foreign affairs and human rights issues. I discovered that state secretaries, officials in the various ministries, and especially those responsible for, say, the weapons and human rights scandals were the most ignorant of

all. In the past eight years I repeatedly tried to introduce counterinformation into the debates on such subjects as Brazil and the construction of nuclear bombs, the participation of German engineers in a missile project in India, and Guernica and the lack of German reparations. Maybe I got on some fellow MP's nerves with this counterinformation, and it is true that Helmut Schafer, Minister of State at the German Foreign Office, and I frequently had passionate disputes over this information.

But this was and remains my attempt not to make political decisions until I have informed myself in depth on both sides of a question. This led to an intensive working day for me; in other words, I spent a large part of the day reading and analyzing the voluminous papers and files, conscientiously studying the roughly eighty to one hundred letters received daily, endeavouring to find out as much as possible through direct contact with various grass roots and social movements while abroad, and reading up on counterinformation whenever possible. Thus time for virtually no numerous press conferences, visits to embassies, joint luncheons, and joint trips. Parliamentary life in Bonn is not high life. For me it was almost always distressing because I did not know how to cope with the deluge of information. If you want to stay honest in politics you have no choice but to handle all information, inquiries, and subjects very conscientiously. This means becoming highly selective and concentrating on the areas in which you have acquired specialized knowledge and expertise. I do not think much of superficial and global statements or grandiose speeches in the Bundestag which in the final analysis have very little to do with the subject under consideration but amount to playing to the gallery.

It is somewhat painful to remember the days when I was one of the initiators and founders of the Greens at the time when I was working for the European Community in Brussels. The media regarded this as new, exciting, and exotic; the newspapers often even invited me to write articles. But when I began in 1983 to deal concretely with my subjects and in many cases also cosponsored unusual nonviolent activities, the media were no longer interested because this did not involve grand, top-level politics. I recall the

four alternative art auctions for the benefit of cancer-stricken children that I organized in order to rouse people engaged in the arts and to persuade the public at large to take up this cause at long last. It proved possible to give several hundred thousand marks to a spontaneous fund for clinics and centres providing psychosocial care for cancer-stricken children and adolescents. Panel discussions in Bonn on this subject, which were intended to encourage parents' action groups and nursing staff to seek public attention, were likewise ignored by the press in Bonn. Peaceful action in East Berlin in 1983, in Moscow in the winter of 1983, and in the occupation of the German embassy in Pretoria--all these were also very hard to put across, especially in the ranks of the Greens themselves. It took over three years for financial resources to be released and approved by the Bundestag for a pilot project benefiting children who suffered from cancer.

This was one of the reasons why I did not then give up my seat in accordance with the system of rotation within the Greens. Looking after cancer-stricken children was and remains a key priority of my political work. For this I would even have accepted my political death within the Green party. Other questions, such as a symbolic gesture of reparation for the destruction of Guernica and reconciliation with the people of Guernica, occupied me for many years and entailed a desperate struggle to inform the public. Very often I did not succeed simply because newspapers remained silent in spite of my press releases, press conferences, and detailed documentation. I am not bitter about this because I feel that in this way I was able also to retain my political independence both in parliament and among the Greens. This independence enabled me to help bring about changes through other circles of society. To my mind, the purpose of politics and of political parties is to stand up for the weak, for those who have no lobby or other means of exerting influence in Bonn. I view my political work as acting for and with people. This political work must extend far beyond one's own Green base, the oft cited grass roots. It must be based not only on the local or regional associations of the Greens, but also on the Chinese students, on the people of the Basque region with whom I planned a centre of peace and encounter at Guernica, on the

Aborigines in Australia whom I visited several times and whose cause I have been backing for many years, on parents' initiatives and self-help groups in the health sector, on the Tibetans with whom I arranged many joint activities and political events, and on the many people who turn to MPs like myself for advice and assistance.

I have always found it very annoying how the Greens national office and individual members of parliament handle the letters and petitions they receive. They reveal a specific type of arrogance: that of putting the mail aside, ignoring it, not being able to deal with it because there are far more important things to do. But surely a primary duty is to try to respond to people who modestly turn to Bonn and rightly expect a useful and constructive reply. I have frequently been unable to cope with all the mail that I receive. After devoting seven to eight hours almost every day to seeing to the mail, one often feels absolutely worn-out and devoid of energy for other political work. Almost every week another file was filled with letters from Germany or abroad together with the replies sent. At the same time there were heaps of letters to which it was not possible to find an answer or which required weeks of research for a proper reply. Yet even fellow party members make life difficult for anyone who tries to deal conscientiously with this matter and not ignore the letter writers. All too often other members of the Greens smiled condescendingly and said, "Why don't you just send a standard reply?" Or, "Why don't you let your staff answer the mail?"

Sometimes I almost despaired of this attitude, particularly within my own party. What is left of the honesty and credibility of a party that set out to do things completely differently? How quickly the established behaviour in Bonn was assimilated by our party! Many members attached more importance to a regular drink with journalists, a reception at an embassy, or party infighting than to everyday political problems, which we had wanted to solve in a different, more caring spirit of solidarity. Struggles for power within the Green party, whether at the parliamentary or constituency level, suddenly became the navel of the world, and everything else

was overshadowed by this maneuvering and infighting. I never became involved in this, nor did I want to. I found it exasperating to see the so-called mullahs of the party's various wings perniciously combating each other for hours on end almost every week. Since our meetings are always open to the public, no matter how painful for those being rebuked or criticized, the press in Bonn has always been present, eagerly absorbing the occurrences and obtaining news of Green parliamentary work fit for the headlines. But it is not the fault of the press--we are the ones to blame for the impression created. The passion displayed in the infighting was all too often lacking in our treatment of genuine political issues.

The Greens, set up as a kind of anti-party party, have turned into a party obsessed with power, into a "dead boring German party," as Josef Beuys so aptly put it shortly before he died. In my opinion, it is still very doubtful whether the civil rights movements from the former GDR, united as the Greens/Alliance '90, can help us to evolve further and overcome our own sterility. The power blocks that emerged when the Green party was founded still exist, and nearly all fundamental and strategically important discussions are conducted within a group of sixty to seventy Green members. This certainly has little to do with thriving grassroots democracy. You only have to look at the lists of speakers at party congresses and delegates' meetings to discover that little regeneration is occurring in the ranks of the Greens and that there are few signs of a feminist, imaginative, and caring party. Thus the Greens, originally intent on transforming power from below, have meanwhile become victims of power from above. The individual members of the party have to be honest about this.

Here I would like to quote from the New Year's address given by Vaclav Havel:

Let us learn and make it clear to others that politics should reflect the desire to contribute to society's happiness and not the intention to deceive and violate society. . . .And let us also learn and make it clear to others that politics need not just be the art of the

possible . . . but also the art of the impossible, namely the art of improving oneself and the world.

This is basically the essence of the Greens' programme and objective. Maybe it is a kind of alternative oath that each of us should take to heart: politics is an expression of the desire to contribute to society's happiness and not of the intention to deceive and violate society. Many find it easy to say this because they simply point to the East and say, "Oh, how the people there have been deceived and violated over the last forty years!" But I feel that Vaclav Havel's words are also valid in the Federal Republic of Germany. Vaclav Havel, Charter 77, the People's Forum, Solidarity, the civil rights and ecology movements in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and Hungary--they are all a challenge for us in the West. At the moment we are merely offering the East an ideology, inspired by a know-it-all attitude, and very little tangible assistance. The answers given by the West, by NATO, by the European Community and the WEU, are still sadly unimaginative ideas that are not commensurate with the radical changes in Eastern Europe. The people who took to the streets in the autumn and winter of 1989 brought home to us what it actually means to participate in building a common European house. The people in Eastern Europe who created and pursued a kind of anti-politics as defined by Gyorgy Konrad know what conflicts are and that conflicts are not a unique phenomenon to their situation. For them, conflicts are seen as a normal part of life. Consequently, people in Eastern European civil rights movements face up to these crises much more boldly than we tend to and do not deny their existence or gloss over them. Above all, the people in those civil rights movements, with whom I have worked for many years, have courage and no fear. They demonstrate a new kind of sovereignty I would like to see displayed by every German parliament member and minister.

At the time of the revolutions in Eastern Europe Stephanie Sand ("1992--The Europe of Big Business") wrote:

Our political representatives evidently also failed to notice the emergence of new faces in the midst of the movement in Central Europe, where the face of state

and party functionaries grew pale. Yet these new faces accompanied the radical changes. It is easy to spot these people. They know how to engage in conversation without preaching. They blush with shame when not saying what they believe. They are able to speak freely and with subtle distinctions, to depart from the notes. They do not just tolerate questions, but are pleased to be challenged. They master all skills of irony and humour . . . And they have patience, which they have acquired in decade-long conflicts.

In my view, there is still a faint hope that this new thinking in the Eastern European civil rights movements will generate new energies and outlooks here, too, in the 1990s. The goal is to move away from the prevailing bureaucratic language and measures and make a genuine effort to find new forms of perception and communication in politics in order to fundamentally alter and improve social life in Central Europe.

The rhetoric of most politicians in the Federal Republic of Germany on, say, the European Community or the single European market is incessant, without any pause for reflection on the concept of a future common house in Europe. When I ask whether a different kind of Europe might be possible, people reply, "How else could it be?" shrugging their shoulders. My vision is of a completely demilitarised Europe without military blocs, without nuclear power stations, without a chemical industry that causes cancers, and without an Iron Curtain in people's minds. It is not our friends from the Eastern European movements for civil rights and democracy who have a great deal to learn. No, it is we in the West who still have much to learn and who must acquire the courage to stand up for our own convictions in the political field. The tasks which we must now perform demand the very abilities that the bold people in the independent civil rights movements in Eastern Europe have demonstrated. There is no longer any time for silly claims of victory or for German or Western European self-content.

Hans Magnus Enzensberger recently declared that at the end of this century it is essential to treat the earth with care. Should this not be our political precept?

I would like to give all my colleagues in the Bundestag Erich Fromm's book on ethics and politics. In political action we must always take account of the moral and humanistic dimensions of decision-making processes. As Hans Kung wrote in his latest book, this one world needs one ethic; this one world society does not need a single religion or ideology, but rather some binding and unifying standards, values, ideals and goals. What I have found so annoying in Bonn during the last eight years has not only been a deliberate policy of secrecy in certain vital areas but also intentional deception and even downright lies which are seen as legitimate means of attaining specific political objectives. Truthfulness must at last be regarded as a political virtue, whereas lying, secrecy, and deception must not be allowed in politics.

With the aid of some examples I would like to show why politicians in general are falling into disrepute. Of course this has to do with the numerous political, military, and economic scandals of recent years in Bonn and with the cool professionalism and sterility of debates in the Bundestag, which almost no member of the public takes an interest in any longer and which merely increase the discontent with political decision-makers.

For instance, there is the scandal involving nuclear power supplies. In North-Rhine/Westphalia, it has not been possible to shut down the thorium high-temperature reactor at Hamm, although this was unanimously agreed upon in mid-1989, because nobody knows where to put the roughly six hundred thousand fuel elements, each the size of a tennis ball. The highly radioactive elements will be temporarily stored at Ahaus. No one knows for how long. And after the abandonment of the Wackersdorf reprocessing facility our ministers have been taking for granted costly reprocessing contracts with the toxic Sellafield plant, formerly Windscale, as well as the toxic La Hague facility in France. Although we do not want to poison our children at Wackersdorf and nearby, we are nonetheless

participating in poisoning children and the environment at Sellafield and La Hague by letting our spent fuel elements be reprocessed there. Now, following German unification, there is the question of what to do with nuclear waste from reactors in the former GDR. Ironically enough, the Soviet Union originally undertook to accept spent fuel elements from the GDR. Now it rightly refuses to do so, as recently confirmed by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. I cannot imagine any compromise in this manner with the nuclear lobby because, in view of the increasingly evident long-term effects of Chernobyl in the Soviet Union, it is very obvious that the Soviet population does not want to be deceived or lied to about these issues any longer. In the Soviet Union there is growing firm resistance to the use of nuclear energy. It ought to be evident to all of us that we have been deceived and lied to for many years. And yet it is still not possible to organize the abandonment of nuclear power. Although it has been decided to shut down the high-temperature reactor at Hamm, the German Research Ministry since October 1988 has devoted 8.34 million DM to improving the nuclear fuel elements initially intended exclusively for that reactor. According to the Ökoinstitut [Ecology Institute], in 1990 alone a total of twenty million DM, hidden in various budget items, has been earmarked for research on high-temperature reactors. The German nuclear lobby regards these as the reactor type of the future, with Eastern Europe and China being the main markets for them.

Noted nuclear physicists have repeatedly accused the German Health Office of delivering one-sided opinions in favour of the Siemens company. Whenever independent nuclear physicists carry out tests, they measure Becquerel values several times higher than those recorded by the Health Office. I would like to mention once again the reprocessing of German nuclear waste at Sellafield because only a few months ago Roger Berry, safety director of the British nuclear industry, who is responsible for health matters at nuclear plants, advised workers there not to have any children for the time being. Mr. Berry thus augmented the fear that the increased incidence of leukemia in children living in the vicinity of Sellafield is due to changes in the genes of workers caused by

radiation. His advice is absolutely outrageous. The aim cannot be to persuade workers at nuclear power plants to change their way of life, but to shut down at long last the toxic and deadly nuclear industry. The tragedy in Chernobyl, like that at Three Mile Island, roused many people who until then had been indifferent towards the type of power generation used. This affords an opportunity for decisive and radical reorientation. But such reorientation simply does not take place at the governmental level. Time and again in the debates on this subject we hear the professional appeasers on the government benches and in the ranks of the government parties. Those of us who have long been involved in the antinuclear movement, who have long been together with cancer-stricken children and supporting their cause, are fed up with hearing the justifying, appeasing, and belittling remarks and downright lies of the people who bear responsibility for what has happened and continues to happen. Ever since Chernobyl, any politically minded and responsible person ought to realize that nuclear technology, whether military or civilian, is a declaration of war against life.

As Yuri Shcherbak put it, we have a nuclear war zone right in the middle of Europe! By this he means the contaminated areas around Chernobyl and some others which, owing to the whims of weather conditions, are several hundred kilometres away from Chernobyl. At least two million of the roughly ten million White Russians are in acute danger. Twenty percent of the territory is considered uninhabitable. The world needs to be told, a Russian doctor recently said to me on the phone, that nuclear genocide is occurring in White Russia. Officially, the situation there has been alarming only since July 24, 1989, when the first secret map of the contamination was presented to the Supreme Soviet, and was also leaked to the press. But here in Germany, in the Bundestag in Bonn and in the regional parliaments, the belittlement and appeasement continue so that the nuclear lobby can still flourish in the 1990s. In the Soviet Union hundreds of villages have levels of contamination of sixty curie or more per square kilometre. Milk is contaminated in 530 towns. Deformities in animals have increased several hundred times. Two million people have been contaminated and thousands of children have cancer. The children suffering from leukemia die

in the hospitals before the eyes of the living, the doctors being powerless. Yet no real, full-scale emergency aid in the form of donations, medicine, or medical equipment has been provided by the German government. This is again left to private and charitable organizations. The full scope of the occurrences in Chernobyl simply has not been recognized. The radioactivity, which is constantly played down here, will remain with the people around Chernobyl for many years to come. In forty years the situation there will be the same as it is now, four years after the disaster. When will the members of the Bundestag at last realize that even radiation below the allowable limits can be dangerous? Usually cancer is regarded as the only result of radiation. Yet there are manifold effects which occur even with low levels of radiation, such as the impairment of the immune system and genetic consequences.

During my membership in the Bundestag over the last eight years, we made every possible effort to draw attention to the danger of low levels of radiation. We presented data on the effects of nuclear tests in the atmosphere and data on Kerala in India. We submitted studies of and statistics on workers in uranium mines in Malaysia and Australia. Anyone who follows how radiation limits are set by parliament inevitably becomes filled with anger. The sole criterion given consideration until now is the lethal cancer rate. Whenever we present studies on changes in the blood count that may be caused by the operation of nuclear plants they are quickly cast aside and any discussion of them is avoided.

The superficial way in which vital issues are dealt with in Bonn often shocked and angered me. Is there anybody in the government parties who reads the motions that we Greens table on such topics as the nuclear disaster in Chernobyl? Who takes our demands seriously, and are they considered at all by the comfortable majority on the other side of parliament? This is what makes me so depressed and angry. Occasionally an individual MP's conscience may be pricked, as occurred in the case of the cancer-stricken children and human rights violations in Tibet, China, and Romania. But by and large the party whip reigns supreme; the comfortable majority dominates the helpless minority, and an in-depth debate is

avoided when it is already clear that the majority will dismiss the opposition's motion. But what does this have to do with truthful life-affirming politics? Is everything or almost everything that comes from the opposition inherently wrong?

The entire parliamentary debate on nuclear energy and weapons reminds me of a comment by Henry David Thoreau:

They hesitate, express regret and sometimes even sign petitions, but they do nothing seriously and effectively. In their position of ease, they wait for others to remedy the grievance so that they no longer have to take offence at it. At most they cast their vote in the elections, this does not cost much. And they give a brief nod to justice as it passes by, wishing it well.

Given the elimination of the long-standing East-West conflict and the virtual dissolution of the large military blocs (at least of the Warsaw Pact; we are still waiting for NATO to follow suit), disarmament has come within reach for all of us. This is the current state of the discussion, not least in the Bundestag. But this is somewhat odd--again the political debate is lacking sincerity and truthfulness. Although Helmut Kohl and his government talk a lot about peace and disarmament in the united Germany, this year's defence budget will reach an unprecedented 57.5 billion DM as a result of the third supplementary budget. Military spending will set a new record. Something else should not be overlooked. Bill Arkin, a recognized arms researcher, recently told the magazine *Stern*, "When the last Pershing II missiles have disappeared from Europe at the end of the next May, as envisaged in the INF Treaty, the first converted Pershing warheads will return as nuclear bombs."

Old into new! Thus the warheads of the scrapped Pershing II missiles will come back to Europe as nuclear bombs. The elimination of INF missiles was celebrated worldwide at the time. Now it is becoming evident that the INF Treaty has by no means reduced the nuclear arsenal in Europe. The Pershing IIs are returning in a different shape. "How is it possible?" people in my constituency ask me. The politicians and members of the military

did not act unlawfully then; they simply deceived the public. I remember well my efforts in the Bundestag after the signing of the INF Treaty to draw attention to the provisions of a supplementary protocol which largely went unnoticed and that stated, "Before the missile is destroyed at a site intended for this purpose, the nuclear warhead . . . may be removed." As U.S. General Yates told the Senate Armed Services Committee, "In the future the number of nuclear aircraft bombs will increase exactly in step with the number of intermediate-range missiles withdrawn."

This means that we were deceived once again because the U.S. Senate and military establishment had planned for the further use of Pershing II warheads even before the treaty came into force. While we were staging peace festivals it was already clear that NATO would reuse the warheads in a slightly changed form. When I pointed out in the Bundestag that the two superpowers can do as they please with the warheads, I was not only sneered at and mocked by the government parties, but also interrupted by the Social Democrats. They simply did not want to believe me. In my own party, too, there were some who just refused to take note of this.

To my mind, the same tactics of deception are evident in the Moscow concluding document of the Four-plus-Two negotiations. Despite the announcements renouncing the production of nuclear weapons, united Germany retains all the options that the Federal Republic of Germany possessed for shared control over nuclear weapons of other countries and for participation in production outside its own territory. This was recently confirmed by Frau Adam-Schwaetzer, minister of state at the German Foreign Office, in a reply to a parliamentary question tabled by the Greens. Time and again Foreign Minister Genscher reaffirmed the Federal Republic's declarations of renunciation and ruled out any German control over nuclear weapons in the future. Genscher's declaration to this effect was incorporated identically in the Moscow concluding document of the Four-plus-Two negotiations. In response to the Greens' question of nuclear participation and of shared control over the nuclear weapons of other countries, Frau

Adam-Schwaetzer stated that Herr Genscher had "reaffirmed the obligations of the two German states without altering their substance in any way." This clearly shows that Bonn fully upholds the reservations and restrictions expressed in connection with earlier declarations of renunciation. Within the WEU, Bonn pledged in 1954 not to develop or produce nuclear weapons on German territory, but expressly left open the possibility of participating in production carried out in collaboration with other countries on their territories. On ratifying the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1975 Bonn expressed a reservation, which is contained *inter alia* in a bilateral accord with Washington, to the effect that the possibility of shared German control over nuclear weapons within the scope of a future European political union would not be affected. The Federal Republic possesses delivery systems for NATO nuclear weapons, which of course means that nuclear participation continues to exist.

The German renunciation of nuclear weapons is therefore full of gaps; it is highly desirable that these be eliminated. We have thus long been demanding a comprehensive and unlimited renunciation of nuclear weapons in the constitution so that the Bundestag and the Federal Government can send a positive and enforceable signal. It remains open why the present government has not advocated the inclusion of such a renunciation in the Constitution. Despite the historical legacy, in my opinion the Federal Republic has in the past few decades weakened rather than strengthened the international nonproliferation regime. You need only think of the German arms industry and its criminal actions in many parts of the world. Proscribing any assistance in the construction of nuclear weapons as a violation of the Constitution and completely renouncing the military attributes of a great power with binding effect--these are not just necessary, but ground-breaking steps logically ensuing from our country's history.

Whereas the Warsaw Pact is nearing its end, NATO has acquired new momentum and is becoming the architect of the new Europe. But what will then be left of the vision of a new, nonaligned, and peaceful European house? At present many options are being discussed: some Eastern European countries want

to leave the Warsaw Pact and even join NATO, while others wish to abandon the Warsaw Pact for the sake of a truly European, neutral concept--which I fully support. Yet others want to withdraw from the military structure of the Eastern alliance, while retaining the political links. Still others seek the reform of military and political structures until comprehensive arms control renders the two alliances superfluous. So far new thinking has been lacking within NATO. This discussion is virtually not being conducted in the Bundestag, and many of the facts needed for it are simply not disclosed. Disintegration of the two blocs is a prerequisite for pan-European collective security.

In my opinion, NATO, a military pact, cannot be incorporated into the creation of a security system for the whole of Europe. We advocate that use be made of the CSCE framework to develop collective peace and security structures serving the people themselves. The CSCE process must be intensified from below, which means that societies in East and West alike must be democratized. Particularly in the ecological, economic, technological, transport, and scientific fields there are common interests transcending any borders between blocs. And there are new kinds of threats which confront all European countries and thus call for close cooperation. In my view, the logical step is to dissolve the two military blocs and establish a creative and imaginative European system of collective security, even a system of collective social defence.

But Europe seems to be evolving in way completely different from what we had hoped for. The European Community is turning into a military and security league, and the "European pillar" is to take on the shape of a relatively independent "European Defence Union." Thus Western Europe can become a fairly autonomous military power--under German leadership, as many of us fear. Only recently Jacques Delors, President of the EC Commission, warned of a strong, united Germany. He fears the emergence of a tough and powerful German state and a powerful Germany economy in the heart of a weak Europe.

There is something else about which we are constantly being deceived. For months now, German industry, trade unions, and many social groups have been demanding that the European Community should be open to accession by Eastern European countries. But on October 30th newspapers reported on an article by Chancellor Kohl in the *Financial Times* in which he defined the EC's borders. He opposed any excessive expansion of the Community, stating that the aim now could not be to include in the EC as many European countries as possible. He added that only countries which are able and willing without reservation to set up a European Union should be allowed to join. Have we again been deceived in recent months, or did we in our euphoria once more fail to notice the ideas and reservations hidden between the lines of European declarations/ Are we not again being duped about the common European house? Will the Eastern European countries remain poor backyard on a continent that is Germanized step by step?

There are other examples that I find very annoying--examples that are connected with ethics, examples revealing that military, economic, and strategic objectives and considerations have far greater influence and significance in our world than does humanity's suffering. One such instance is that nuclear tests are still being carried out. At this time of so-called disarmament, a comprehensive nuclear test ban is needed all the more urgently. Recently the former GDR expressed its support for such a ban and voted in favour of a conference of all signatories to the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty to be held in New York in January 1991. Over two-thirds of the signatory countries wanted the treaty to be amended at that conference so as to include a ban on underground nuclear tests. The Federal Republic of Germany abstained from voting--probably out of consideration for its nuclear allies, the U.S.A., France, and Britain, as one ironically might state. It is evident that Mrs. Thatcher and President Bush do not want to agree to an early test ban. Yet there are increasing reports that half a million people in the Republic of Kazakhstan alone have suffered lasting damage as a result of Soviet nuclear tests. One in every three babies born there has deformities, and the mortality rate for leukemia is 200 percent higher than elsewhere in the Soviet Union. This was recently stated

by Soviet medical experts at a seminar of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. All nuclear tests entail maximum risks for man and nature, as Anthony Robbins, chairman of the IPPNW Commission, recently pointed out to the UN conference on nuclear testing. The reports on the harm done to public health in the Soviet Union ought to alarm all individuals and governments in Europe and the United States.

French President Francois Mitterand in particular ought to heed these reports from the Soviet Union, considering the consequences of the French nuclear tests in the Pacific region for the people living there. In the past few years forty-six holes at a distance of five hundred metres apart have been drilled under the Mururoa Atoll. Every explosion tears open cavities over one hundred metres large in the base of the islands. The atoll has already broken apart at four places. In 1985, thirteen countries of the South Pacific Forum proclaimed a nuclear-weapons-free-zone in the Treaty of Rarotonga. This is a binding document, which is again ignored by France alone! Nobody in France bothers about the dramatic increase in serious cases of poisoning following the consumption of the fish contaminated by nuclear testing in French Polynesia. Nor is there any mention made of the stringent curtailment of civil rights and personal freedom on account of nuclear testing. We all remember the bomb attack in 1985 by the French secret service that sank the Rainbow Warrior in Auckland harbour in New Zealand. This Greenpeace ship had protested against France's nuclear tests. The response was state-sponsored terrorism! Why did the European allies not protest strongly? State-sponsored terrorism is viewed as a kind of petty offence if it occurs within any of the Western European democracies.

Gert Rauhaus rightly stated in the *Nürnberger Nachrichten* last August that parliamentarians themselves are to blame for their loss of power. He cited the Cerberus case and the Bundestag's powers of control. In that affair the Defence Ministry for years had squandered 1.2 billion DM and intended to spend another 900 million DM for good measure. The Bundestag was systematically bypassed--this was the real scandal. Neither the Defence

Committee nor the Budget committee ever examined the huge spending on Cerberus. This was not only a violation of the Bundestag's decision of 1982 stating that all projects involving more than 50 million DM have to be made known to the Budget Committee. Such an attitude by the government towards parliament also touches on the very substance of our democratic system--a system that we are currently recommending to the whole of Eastern Europe as a tried-and-tested form of popular control of the executive. But in the last eight years I discovered all too often that reality did not tally with the Constitution. In many instances, the loss of power was the Bundestag's own fault. Time and again it acted as a kind of implementing body for the Federal Government.

I witnessed very few occasions where government sponsored bills or political projects were stopped by the majority in parliament. Joint motions and unanimous decisions are also a rarity in the Bundestag and are thus celebrated as "historic moments." I recall the Bundestag's unanimous adoption of my first motion on Tibet and human rights violations in October 1987. On that occasion Vice-President Stücklen interrupted the sitting and stated after the vote that miracles still occur in parliament. During my parliamentary work over the last eight years, I repeatedly initiated cross-party motions--precisely because I considered it the greatest challenge to obtain the backing of the entire chamber for an important initiative. I attempted this twice in connection with Tibet, which proved very successful, twice with regard to China after the terrible massacre at Beijing in mid-1989, and several times on the issue of psychosocial care for cancer-stricken children. I was also able to participate in bringing about and experiencing such "historic moments" in parliament regarding biological treatment for cancer victims, Romania, and other issues. Whenever I tried to obtain joint motions, I gained the impression that such conduct is regarded as very unusual. Basically everyone stays within the confines of his or her own party, complies with the party whip, and otherwise generally keeps quiet. Since I never wanted to become nor never did become a "party soldier," I felt it was all the more essential to seize the initiative for joint Bundestag motions and decisions, at least within my own party.

Morality and Human Dignity

In this context it became clear to me time and again how much energy and effort are required of each of us in order to peruse all of the relevant material and grasp the matters that are up for decision. If you try to do this conscientiously as an MP, you use a vast amount of time and energy, even harming your health. I never understood why some colleagues did not feel this stress and pressure, why many of them dealt so nonchalantly with the information presented to them. Often I was simply not able to digest and analyze the extensive documentation presented to me, even if it was needed merely for a single committee meeting. I only have to mention the final reports of a committees of investigation on the Nukem-Alkem affair and on submarine blueprints for South Africa. They covered thousands of pages, and it is impossible to make them intelligible to the man in the street.

In the Bundestag I also experienced boundless inertia and opportunism in all forms, even in the ranks of the Greens. What I noticed most is a lack of courage among many MPs to stand up for their own convictions. Every day we have to fight for our rights as MPs, and every day there is a struggle with the government. I strongly welcomed the many attempts by Dr. Hamm-Brücher to imbue the German parliament with life and more credibility. Parliamentary reform is still pending and must at last be taken seriously not only by parliamentarians but also by the government. Why should Chancellor Kohl not have to face MPs' questions for at least one hour a month, as Mrs. Thatcher regularly has to do in London? What point is there in sending state secretaries into parliament when really we want to question Chancellor Kohl himself? And why are we not able to speak more often and more spontaneously, without wretched party discipline always prevailing? Of course parliament becomes boring for the public at large if always the same leaders and spokesmen of parliamentary parties take the floor in debates. Sometimes the Bundestag is nothing short of a "vanity fair."

Particularly in the last few years I held back completely in this connection. I found it unbearable to have to put up a fight within my own party for the right to speak in parliament, even if I had been

handling a specific subject for years. In this respect there were also some painful experiences that are not easily forgotten; for example, due to one missing vote I was not permitted by my party to speak in the Bundestag debate on China after the massacre in mid-1989, even though for many years I had been dealing with China and human rights and a few months earlier had initiated an international hearing on Tibet and human rights, at which fifty experts spoke from Germany and abroad. Precisely because I refused to take part in this vanity fair for the sake of the media in Bonn, I had all the more time to dedicate myself to concrete issues. Should I have the opportunity to return to the Bundestag in four years, which I would very much like to do, I already know in which direction I would steer my energy and commitment. I would again focus on quiet, substantive work concerning certain priorities rather than on grandiose speeches in parliament, which in the final analysis have far more to do with party discipline than with one's own convictions. To my mind, a good parliamentarian occasionally has a real row even with her or his own party. Here, too, courage to stand up for one's own convictions is called for. Party-political opportunism has hindered many a parliamentary decision to the detriment of the public at large. Unfortunately I know of only a few cases when the legislature as the so-called "first power" acted with sovereignty vis-à-vis the executive. I remember all too well what happened a year ago in the Foreign Affairs Committee when I tabled my second motion on Tibet after the massacre in Lhasa. Minister of State Adam-Schwaetzer actually told me that she considered the motion inappropriate because it would hamper relations between the Federal Republic and China. Did she think I would withdraw it? Or did she believe something like that would influence me? Such occasions are not exactly "historic moments" of German parliamentarianism!

In the summer of this year Gert Rauhaus raised an interesting issue: the increasing intermingling of the legislature and the executive. One such example consists of ministers and parliamentary state secretaries retaining their seats in parliament after their appointments to those posts. A more obvious case of incompatibility is scarcely conceivable.

Morality and Human Dignity

Permit me to mention another instance displaying the lack of courage of the MPs. We all know that the overexploitation of the earth's irreplaceable resources has to be ended, or else we people living in the twentieth century will bear the blame for the greatest environmental disaster in the history of humankind. Once depleted the tropical rain forests will be irretrievably lost because reforestation can never restore the original condition of the primeval forests. The destruction of the rain forests will deprive the Aboriginal population who have been living there for millennia of their basis of existence. This ought to be clear to everyone; we all know that we have to change our lifestyles if the earth is to survive. The people living in the Northern Hemisphere, the rich one-fifth of the world population, must of their own accord limit their consumption of food, raw materials, and consumer goods. While hundreds of millions of people continue to live below subsistence level, the rich North in the last forty years has experienced a consumption boom. The quarter of the world population that regularly eats meat indirectly consumes one half of the world's cereal supplies. Per capita energy consumption in the United States has risen sixty percent since 1950. Returning to the tropical forests, a worldwide ban on trade of tropical timber suggests itself. We should also introduce a luxury tax on products manufactured at the expense of the rain forests. And we should share the cost of preserving the tropical forests. German companies and consumers alike are involved in their destruction. Motor saws made by the Stihl company are used to fell trees in the rain forests of Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa in order to satisfy the desire of German consumers for fancy furniture, teak trays, and window frames made of tropical wood.

I recall the debate in the Foreign Affairs Committee on the emergency measures initiated by us to protect Malaysia against the disastrous consequences of commercial logging in Sarawak (Bundestag document 11/7114). In the motion we called upon the Federal Government to implement the European Parliament's resolution of 1988 demanding an immediate ban on imports of all tropical timber from Sarawak until it can be ensured that such imports come from concessions which do not cause unacceptable

ecological damage and do not jeopardize the livelihood of the native population. The Federal Government's reply again lulled half of the committee, generally referring to measures for the protection of tropical forests in which the Federal Government claimed to be involved. There was no mention of the fact that these measures are much too late to protect the rain forests and the inhabitants of Sarawak who are dependent on those forests. The native tribes of Sarawak themselves urged governments throughout the world to discontinue all imports of tropical timber from Sarawak. But who listens to the native tribes, to the Aboriginal population? I have not forgotten that debate in the Foreign Affairs Committee. As usual, we had only half an hour or even less to discuss this subject. Some colleagues took the trouble to deal with the substance of the motion. Others just read their tabloid newspapers and refused to take note of the matter under consideration. A few found it frustrating and annoying that such an issue was again being treated so superficially. On such occasions I would have liked the Bundestag to have had the courage to invite representatives of the native tribes to the committee meetings so that we could hear at first hand what the people want and how they wish to participate in decisions. The smooth, ready-drafted replies of the state secretaries cannot convince me, whether in this or other cases. For the debate on this motion I had gathered many options from the Third World from my own collection of documents, and I was also in the possession of the latest Third World Network Features report on the demands of the native tribes in Sarawak. Yet there was little point in quoting from this report or from an analysis of a report by the International Tropical Timber Organization. I had gone to great lengths to find and compile this counterinformation, but during my speech on this subject, lasting only few minutes, it was not possible to induce anyone in such a short time to vote differently than they had originally intended. As a result, one leaves another committee meeting completely frustrated, picks up the newspaper, and reads about continued excessive consumption on the part of the world's wealthy nations. You shake your head, feel depressed, believe you could perhaps make even better preparations next time around, and resolve--as I did so often during the last eight years--to send the counterinformation directly to each member of the committee.

Maybe they will take note of it, read it instead of immediately throwing it away, and be influenced by it.

Another recent occurrence dismays me. In the Budget Committee the government parties rejected humanitarian assistance for the Iraqi/Kurdish victims of the use of poison gas by Iraq. To me the rejection of such aid is incomprehensible and shocking. In the draft of the third supplement to the 1990 budget, the Federal Government proposed that humanitarian assistance for Egypt and Jordan be increased by twenty million DM. But the Government's draft did not envisage any funds for the Iraqi/Kurdish refugees in Turkey who had fled there after massive poison gas attacks by Iraq on the Kurdish civilian population (using German know-how). During the deliberations the Greens tabled a motion for a minimum sum of five million DM as humanitarian relief for the refugees living under disastrous conditions in Turkey. Even the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously adopted a decision acknowledging the urgent need for humanitarian assistance and calling upon the Federal Government to make provision for it. Despite this clear vote and despite the fact that Iraq relied on criminal German companies to produce the poison gas used against the Kurds, the government parties dismissed the Greens' motion in the Budget Committee. Under these circumstances one is lost for words, and the many government declarations on human rights, dignity, and freedom are simply not credible. But where is the public outcry when the press reports, albeit meagrely, on such subjects? Is it not a kind of flight from responsibility to stay silent when you ought to speak out, to refrain from action that is necessary? Is courage needed at all to vote in favour of such an obvious motion? What political opportunism prompted the government parties to vote against it?

The things one sometimes witnesses in the Bundestag makes one shudder. This applies, for example, to the debates forty years after the war on the people who were compulsorily sterilized or to debates on compensation for other victims of Nazism. It does not surprise me at all to read that the headmaster of the Geschwister Scholl Gymnasium in Waldkirch wanted to inspect the manuscript

of Inge Aicher-Scholl's speech before delivery. Inge Aicher-Scholl is the sister of Sophie Scholl and Hans Scholl, who were both executed by the Nazis in 1943. At a commemorative ceremony in Waldkirch, the headmaster of the school wanted to see the text of the speech in advance on the grounds that this was necessary to ensure the speech did not contain any reference to current political affairs or any comparisons between the Nazi era and the present-day situation. This is yet another of the unbelievable things now happening in Germany. Of course Inge Aicher-Scholl had no intention of submitting the manuscript. This showed once more the signs of censorship existing in our democracy, a censorship diametrically opposed to democratic principles.

It also makes me shudder to think of the Bundestag debate on the unification treaty with the GDR. The preamble to the treaty drafted by the Federal Government failed to mention the Nazi crimes; the efforts by the Central Jewish Council to include a reference to them were ignored. As Heinz Galinski said, the preamble is an affront not only to Jews throughout the world but also to all victims of Fascism. The Central Jewish Council demanded that the preamble state unequivocally that the division of Germany was a logical consequence of the Nazi disaster and that, in connection with German unification, accounts must be taken of that legacy. The Central Jewish Council and the Greens wanted the preamble to contain a clear reference to the "unique nature" of the atrocities committed between 1933 and 1945 and to the obligations incumbent on the whole of Germany vis-à-vis the victims of Nazism. Yet the Federal Government refused to accept these obligations and responsibilities. All that remained in the end were the words "conscious of the continuity of German history." What makes me shiver is that during the debate on the unification treaty the Bundestag was unable to muster the courage to vote in favour of including the proposal made by the Central Jewish Council. This prompts me to recall Heinrich Böll's apt remark: "We live in a country that has suppressed its history . . . in a country that has delusions about its popularity."

Morality and Human Dignity

One of the questions asked by the Hesse Broadcasting Corporation is whether politicians have to be honest. Without honesty they cannot really call themselves politicians. All of us must learn anew every day what it means to think with our hearts and to make political decisions with our hearts. The electorate rightly demands more credibility and sincerity in politics. I believe that the voters have had enough of the Federal Government's countless contemptible arms scandals, of the vanity fair and grandiose speeches, of maneuvering to form coalitions, or party discipline, and of jockeying for publicity. It is up to us to ensure that the public does not become indifferent to politics.

President Havel recently stated in a speech to the People's Forum in Prague that upright, honest, credible people are needed in politics--people who have the courage to stand up for their convictions, who are not afraid, and who can act and think independently. All of us in Germany would benefit if we were at last to learn the liberating and constructive art of civil disobedience--not just in the extraparliamentary movement, but also within parliament and within political parties. Civil disobedience has to be practiced in parliament or even in our own party if we become too dogmatic, powerful, or arrogant. Restricting a party's power and consistently reducing its power is also a manifestation of credibility in a democracy. Precisely for this reason I am highly skeptical when I think of the Social Democrats and the Greens joining forces for the purpose of a government coalition in Bonn. Will the Greens be able to set out with the aim of paring down power? For me, this remains an open and important question!

OPEN LETTER TO THE GERMAN GREEN PARTY

In the midst of a war in the Gulf it is very difficult to sit calmly at one's desk and mull over the Greens' past mistakes and omissions. Besides, it is almost uncanny to hear all the reports confirming yet again that we Western Greens are no longer represented in spaceship Bonn, despite the fact that even as I write, a macabre scenario is proving the correctness of the warnings and predictions we have expressed over so many years.

After we first entered the German Bundestag in 1983, for example, we persistently denounced the unscrupulous policy of "legal" and illegal arms exports to countries all over the world. In particular, we also revealed the criminal shipments of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons components to Iraq. Yet, the responsible Federal ministries reacted with bored arrogance, and all our political demands for an immediate halt to arms exports were voted down in the German Bundestag. The same people who are now calling for similar measures in light of the current threat unfortunately voted against us then.

We also warned about the ecological catastrophes which are inevitably associated with any military activity, and about the growing danger that this kind of environmental catastrophe could be used as a weapon in war. This has now become a reality. More than 1.5 million tons of crude oil have poured into the Gulf. That is over sixty times the amount spilled during the *Exxon Valdez* tanker disaster in Alaska. According to

Written in February 1991, near the end of the Persian Gulf War against Iraq.

Greenpeace, this is a catastrophe on a massive scale. The sensitive tropical waters of the Gulf region have been irreparably damaged for decades to come, with all the adverse consequences this will entail for the millions of people in the Gulf States who rely on this water for survival.

We took the victims' side, not only when the Iraqis marched into Kuwait, but also during the early and equally criminal acts of military intervention, such as China's rape of Tibet, Morocco's occupation of the Western Sahara, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Syrian war in Lebanon, and Israeli injustice towards the Palestinians, to name just a few violations of international law. We did so because we believe that questions of international law and human rights issues have always been and remain indivisible. They can only be judged according to immutable moral standards and must not be used by any government as instruments to further political, military, or economic interests.

In the debate about modernization of forces in the wake of NATO's dual-track decision, the Greens, as a nonviolent political party, supported the ethical principle that injustice must not be repaid with possible, even greater, injustice, and that there can be no justification for military violence. Many of us wanted to introduce a bit of the Sermon on the Mount and civility into Bonn's politics and not just save them for fine sermons at Church rallies. Yet our modest efforts to develop nonmilitary, nonviolent strategies for conflict settlement in Bonn met with nothing but weary smiles from the defence experts of the established parties. Now in these awful February days the failure of the traditional military philosophy with its hollow phrases about a "just" war and "surgical" strikes is becoming apparent in the most saddening way, and the military censorship has laid a blanket of silence over the mass murder of innocent people in a bloody slaughter which cannot solve problems but will create a host of new ones.

Open Letter to the German Green Party

What is more, in the almost prophetic peace manifesto published just after the Green Party was founded, we highlighted the devastating consequences of a lifestyle and manufacturing methods which are based on a steady flow of natural resources, squander them recklessly, and then resort to violent appropriation of foreign raw materials. Seen in this light, the Gulf crisis is a harbinger of future crises which will arise in the struggle for increasingly scarce resources.

This confirms that our ecological approach to policy, which transcends the usual definitions of Right and Left and is free from outmoded rigid dogmatism, is correct. According to this approach, only an ecological lifestyle and economic management which are based on responsible utilization of resources can reduce the danger that such crises will occur. Without this sensible approach a catastrophe is inevitable, for the exploitation of human beings by their fellows (for example, North versus South) and the exploitation of nature have already driven humankind to the brink of self-destruction.

So why did the voters turn away from the far-sighted ecological policy of the Greens in the German Bundestag on December 2, 1990, despite the fact that our position on numerous other issues (often agreed upon only after a long struggle in frustrating meetings) have also been tragically confirmed in many other problem areas? We need only think of the Chernobyl disaster, the poisoning of thousands of people by Western companies in Bhopal, the progressive destruction of the rain forests, the greenhouse effect, the toxic holocaust which is dramatically increasing the number of cancer victims, and the increasingly frequent paralysis of traffic on our roads.

Why was it not recognized that at least some, admittedly ever fewer, of us had taken nonviolent action again and again--wherever agitation and unconventional, audacious behavior were necessary--to draw attention to abuses and ills? I am thinking in particular of our protest in Alexanderplatz against human rights violations in what was then the GDR, of our appeals in the

Kremlin and in Red Square in the winter of 1983 on behalf of Sakharov and against SS-20 missiles, of our nonviolent protest against the Turkish military dictatorship in Ankara, and of our occupation of the German Embassy in Pretoria to protest the Federal Government's policy towards South Africa. Of course I am also thinking of the countless symbolic pickets, together with many friends from other countries, of nuclear missile sites, chemical weapons storage sites, and nuclear power plants. Did the voters not notice that after all, it was almost exclusively the Greens (even when they were having to fight sections of their own party and their lack of understanding) who showed solidarity with the oppressed civil rights and ecology movements in the GDR and in Eastern Europe right up to the peaceful revolutions in those countries, whereas the established parties still gave preference to "quiet" diplomacy and attached virtually no importance to contacts with the oppressed groups?

Did the voters also fail to notice that the Greens were by far the most hard-working members of the German Bundestag, tabling many carefully researched questions, motions, resolutions, and bills which embodied a wealth of Green ideas and hopes? These are now being shifted in neat bundles from the Tulpenfeld building to some dusty archive.

What was the real reason, then, for our being thrown out of Parliament? However much it hurts to say so, it was not that the voters failed to understand us. On the contrary, we ourselves were to blame.

I believe that we failed first and foremost on a human level. And we failed even though we had enjoyed a long period of indulgence on the part of the voters. But eight years of self-destructive and fruitless infighting amongst the various factions and their "gurus" paralysed our political activities and created an atmosphere steeped in jealousy and distrust. This proved too much even for the Greenest voter. Of course we could not succeed if the way we treated each other caused more of a sensation and made the headlines more often than did the

Open Letter to the German Green Party

substance and the aims of our policies. I was involved with the Green Party right from the start. I helped found it and build it up and devoted all my energy and strength to the Green project as the anti-party party. Yet I was forced to look on helplessly as the human interaction within the Green Party degenerated into a permanent state of ideological warfare between the various political factions. No wonder the media increasingly tended to view the tussles in front of the television cameras and the continual talk of splitting the party as more newsworthy and more appealing to the viewers than the constructive, diligent political work about which the voters were given less and less information.

For someone like me, who has always been independent of the factions within the Green Party and who has every intention of remaining so, there were fewer and fewer opportunities to locate one's own political identity within the party. Nor was there much chance to get other members of the party or the general public to understand and accept the results of one's political work. The dominance of the various factions and groupings very nearly squeezed out the independents altogether. One only needs to look at the records of the national delegates conferences to see that they were nothing but a vanity fair.

Considering the situation within the Green Party, it was almost a miracle that the national conference in 1983 in Nuremberg adopted my motion to implement the "international tribunal opposing first-strike weapons and weapons of mass destruction in East and West," and that the national conference in 1988 adopted my motion to conduct a hearing on Tibet in Bonn in 1989.

The electoral defeat of December 2nd must be the starting point of a completely new phase of learning for the Greens if we want to survive at the national level with any hope of reentering the German Bundestag in four years. This means that we have to tackle our grievances and our failings, and throw out the various fetishes which I have criticized and opposed for a very long time,

much to the chagrin of certain self-styled political commissars in the Green Party.

This applies first and foremost to certain structures which the party has defended whenever they were considered necessary or expedient, despite experience showing that they make no political sense whatsoever. One example is the principle of rotation, which had devastating effects even during our first legislative term and impaired the efficiency of our work in the Bundestag. Mid-term rotation, i.e. after two years, inevitably generated a sense of rivalry between members of Parliament and their assistants who were to replace them. This placed a considerable strain on human relations in our offices in Bonn from the moment we were elected and created an atmosphere poisoned with mutual distrust. It is true that with rotation after four years the problems associated with members' replacements no longer arose, but then the point of the exercise was even more difficult to fathom, since the nomination of candidates prior to every legislative term already presented sufficient opportunity to remove candidates.

So it was quite dishonest to maintain, as many people did, that rotation would reduce the risk of power concentration, because the real power bases developed within the Green Party quite irrespective of rotation. In any case, the fact that all the party officials, including the federal party manager and the parliamentary staff, were exempt from rotation led to a calamitous level of bureaucratization and rigidity in the party and parliamentary group apparatus. I was therefore particularly pleased to hear Antje Vollmer, who was a great supporter of rotation for many years, state in Bonn on December 4, 1990:

The incorporation of the rotation principle in the statutes of the Green Party was simply the party-political expression of a pervasive climate of mistrust amongst the Greens which caused an unprecedented amount of distress to party members.

Open Letter to the German Green Party

Furthermore, the persistent abuse of the terms "grass roots" and "grass-roots democracy" must finally give way to a democratic definition of the "grass-roots" concept. "Grass roots" is not merely a collective term defining the people who are present at a particular moment and consider themselves to represent the grass roots. The grass roots of the Green Party of course encompass all those whom the Green policies are intended to help, and those who support these policies, whether or not they are party members. Anyone who still remembers the saddening document on child sex published in North Rhine-Westphalia is aware of the damage caused on the occasion by the dictatorship of a minority passing itself off as a "grass-roots democracy."

One other fetish which it is time to abandon is the favourite grass- roots sport of hounding "celebrities" within the party ranks. Having experienced this myself, I know how distressing and discouraging this can be. Some of us have acquired a higher media profile than others as a result of our experience and competence in Green affairs, and the party is quite happy to utilize this to boost attendance at its events. However, it is a shame that this is also considered a reason to punish these members for their commitment, as it were, by vilifying their "celebrity" status. This attitude is particularly short-sighted and uneconomic given that human resources within the party are notoriously inadequate. As Gert Bastian rightly stated on retiring from the Parliamentary Group, it leads to a real "dictatorship of incompetence" which no party can afford.

In this connection, I hope that some of you still remember the shameful treatment meted out to people like Heinrich Böll by certain grass-roots vigilantes. It was obviously felt that he was good enough to be included in various Green campaigns and events, but at a national party conference after his death he was denounced as a "chauvinist," a "superfather," and a "naive sentimentalist." Or, to take another example, Joseph Beuys, a pioneer of Green philosophy, was forced to endure the

humiliation of ten ballots at a selection meeting for parliamentary candidates in North Rhine-Westphalia and was not selected. How many other valuable people capable of promoting Green issues may have been deterred by similar incidents, with the party thus being deprived of their services? How many more people will we lose if we allow this to continue?

The party has another practice which many members are reluctant to question, and that is the method used to collect "voluntary" donations from members of Parliament. It must not be allowed to continue. When mature people are working together towards a common goal and have established a relationship based on trust, there is really no need for control mechanisms or intrusion into their private affairs in order to extort "donations" for Green projects. A much more effective and dignified approach would be to collect a flat rate contribution affordable at all levels of income, thus allowing individual members to select any projects they wish to support with further discretionary donations. For example, I found it absolutely intolerable to be subjected to intrusive questioning by three members of the Greens' Commission on Remuneration for Members of Parliament who wanted to know why I supported my eighty year-old grandmother financially, and why I wanted to continue to sponsor a Tibetan family in exile in Northern India as I had done for many years. They even suggested that this sponsorship should be transferred to a Third World group so that I could contribute more to the ecology fund instead. I found it very humiliating to be forced to explain why I had been supporting my grandmother for years and why I did not want to stop sponsoring a family with whom I had developed a close relationship over many years. So even the way in which donations are collected reflects the atmosphere of pervasive mistrust in the Green Party which must finally be overcome.

The Green Party must also learn to adopt professional and efficient approaches to policy-making at all levels of political activity. In the first years following the Green Party's creation, it

Open Letter to the German Green Party

was accepted as normal that there was exploitation of and constant self-sacrifice by good-natured members who took office and had to rely on their own resources without having even the most basic professional support structure. This did us no credit. It is simply unrealistic to assume that every individual is able to do everything and that everyone is interchangeable. A clear division of labour and at least a minimum of professionalism are necessary to ensure that at long last Green politics place less strain on people. If I think of all the years when I acted as unpaid spokesperson of the federal executive committee in tandem with my full-time job in Brussels, as well as the year I had to take unpaid leave to participate in routine pre-election campaigning on behalf of the Greens, I would not wish these years on anyone. Although the party realized that this sort of thing was not very sensible, the Parliamentary Group continued to nurse its illusion of an egalitarian utopia. This was the reason why the Parliamentary Group's work was bound to fail, as Kalle Kollnegg, the person in charge of Antje Vollmer's office, pointed out in an interview in December 1990

Furthermore, the Green Party federal headquarters, currently the only administrative centre at the national level, must be completely reorganized. To achieve this there should be individual specialist sections for which various members of the federal executive committee would be responsible. An office for international contacts, particularly in the area of peace, ecology, and human rights, must be established. There is a substantial backlog of work to be done in this area because for far too long the Green Party has been too wrapped up in its own affairs, in the best tradition of German associations, to be concerned about the more important matter of international networking.

In my view, the Party's executive committee should be able to call upon some sort of "think tank" composed of competent and critical experts who are capable of telling the executive committee some fundamental truths and of assisting in working out possible solutions. The Federal Main Committee should be

replaced by a council consisting of members from the *Lander* (federal states), or, in other words, by a body in which the associations from the federal states and the parliamentary groups from the state parliaments are represented.

One of the greatest weaknesses in both the parliamentary group and in the party has been that of media relations. The party must have the courage to appoint really independent, bright, and audacious media spokespersons who are very experienced and competent in dealing with the national and international media. One thing must change very quickly in the Greens' public presentation. We have to try to brighten up our party's image because until now we have appeared unremittingly gloomy and intolerant. We are no longer able to laugh or show a bit of enthusiasm and zest for life. This is particularly evident at the national party conferences, and it is very depressing.

In this brief letter I have attempted to concentrate primarily on the party's distorted organizational structures, since those are the very things that deter or even repel potential supporters. As far as our political orientation is concerned, however, I am convinced that after the shock of December 2, 1990, the Greens in the regional and *Lander* associations will revert to the real Green priorities in all areas of policy and will continue to hold true to Green principles, to the historic cornerstones of our philosophy: uncompromising nonviolence, radical ecology, indivisible human and civil rights, civility, social emancipation, justice, and solidarity with the weak.

However, this also means freeing ourselves from dogmatism, whether it stems from the Left wing or the Realo camp. The days of factional infighting must finally be consigned to history, for today's Green Party has no room for old-fashioned Left-wing notions of cadres or even tactical coalitions with the PDS, that party which lacks credibility. Nor can we allow our party to be brought to heel, becoming the springboard for the SPD, nor should we become a sort of Green FDP.

Open Letter to the German Green Party

I have never rejected outright the possibility of coalition with the SPD. I do think, however, that my doubts about the visions of red-green cooperation at the federal level are still justified. Future voting in the German Bundestag on issues such as German participation in UN peacekeeping forces, deployment of troops in the Gulf, halting the nuclear energy programme, and the ban on arms exports will show whether the SPD seriously intends to go ahead with renewal of its peace and ecology policies in the 1990s as it has stated.

As far as I am concerned, the most important and most credible coalition partners of the Greens continue to be the committed human rights groups like Amnesty International and pioneering ecology groups such as Greenpeace. These are the people who we, the anti-party party, must be sure not to disappoint.

The term "anti-party party," which I invented, has been frequently misunderstood and many people seem to think that it is outdated. Even so, I shall continue to use it, for to me the term denotes a party capable of choosing between morality and power, which uses creative civil disobedience to combat every form of repression, which combines audacious imagination with efficient working methods, and which recognizes the link between world peace and peace in every individual. And anti-party parties do not exercise power in the old authoritarian sense; they try to transform power in order to enable people to achieve self-determination in their lives.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Petra Karin Kelly was born in Günzburg, Bavaria, then in West Germany, on November 27, 1947. She attended the Englisches Institut, a Catholic girls boarding school, until 1960, when she went to Columbus, Georgia, with her mother and stepfather, U.S. Army Lieutenant Colonel John E. Kelly. In Georgia she became involved in civil rights activities helping black children in special projects, while simultaneously learning English. She attended high school in Hampton, Virginia where she had a weekly radio program on current issues.

In 1966 she entered the School of International Service at American University in Washington, D.C.; majored in political science, international relations, and world politics; and graduated cum laude with a B.A. in 1970. She won a Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship and served as a teaching assistant for one year. She was active in student government and foreign student affairs at American University and initiated its first International Week in 1966, which has become an annual tradition. As a student--active in the antiwar, civil rights, antinuclear, and feminist movements--she worked as a volunteer for Senator Robert F. Kennedy's 1968 presidential campaign, founding Students for Kennedy in Washington. After Kennedy's assassination she worked as a volunteer in the office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, helping his electoral campaign, becoming his friend and the recipient of many letters on political subjects and requests for advice on European questions. She recalls, "After supporting

the civil rights and anti-war movements in Georgia, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., I became very much a nonviolent activist after 1968."

Her half-sister Grace Patricia Kelly died from eye-cancer at age ten in 1970. In 1974 Petra Kelly founded with her grandmother the Grace P. Kelly Association for the Support of Cancer Research for Children in Nuremberg. This is a European-wide citizen action group which studies the connection between children's cancer and environmental causes, especially from the nuclear industry. It helps to provide psychosocial care in children's cancer wards in Germany and elsewhere. She continues to head this association. She, Gert Bastian, and Kunigunde Birle, her eighty-six year old grandmother, do all the work, unassisted and without pay. She also launched a continuing project to establish a model psychosocial children's health care center, the Children's Planet, to care for children with chronic life-threatening illnesses. She has sponsored a formerly orphaned Tibetan foster-daughter, Nima, adopting her in 1973. Nima is now married and has two children.

In 1971 Petra Kelly received an M.A. degree in political science from the University of Amsterdam (European Institute) for a thesis on European integration. From 1972 to 1983 she served as a European civil servant on the staff of the European Community's Economic and Social Committee in Brussels, working on a wide range of issues covering European politics, labor, women, social problems, environment, health and consumer affairs. She took one year's unpaid leave in 1982-83 in order to campaign full-time for the Green Party. In one year she held over 450 meetings and lectures to get Greens elected to the German national Bundestag. Her role as European civil servant continues, although she is now on temporary leave once again.

About the Author

In 1972 she became active in the West German Federal Association of Citizens for Environmental Protection and was elected to its executive board in 1979, responsible for international ecological contacts. In 1972 she joined the Social Democratic Party headed by Chancellor Willy Brandt, resigning in 1979 to protest the defense and energy policies of Brandt's successor Helmut Schmidt. In 1978-79 Petra Kelly was one of the spokespersons of the BBU, the umbrella organization of the German ecological citizen action groups. In November 1980 she and Gert Bastian initiated the Krefelder Appell against the stationing of Pershing II and Cruise missiles. They collected over five million signatures. She also was a co-initiator of the Bertrand Russell Campaign for a Nuclear-Free Europe.

In 1979 Petra Kelly helped to found the new nonviolent ecological Green Party (Die Grünen), a party she had been dreaming of creating since 1976. Other founders were Lukas Beckmann, Joseph Beuys, Gerda Degen, Rudi Dutschke, Milan Horacek, Halo Saibold, Roland Vogt, and about twenty-five more from the ecological action movement, the SPD, the Free International University (FIU), and other groups. She became chairperson and speaker of the Party's eleven-member executive board in 1980-82, becoming the first German female head of a political party. She headed the Green national list of candidates in elections to the European Parliament in Strasbourg in July 1979, gaining 3.2 percent of the vote--short of the 5 percent necessary for representation. After modest Green Party advances in local and state elections in 1980-82, she was among twenty-seven Greens elected to the 498-member national Bundestag on March 6, 1983, when 2,164,988 Germans voted for the Green Party list, comprising 5.2 percent of the total. In 1987 the Greens received 8.4 percent, allowing her to serve in the Bundestag for a second

term until the national elections of December 2, 1990, when the West German Greens failed to gain the 5 percent required for parliamentary representation. The East German Greens and citizen action movement did receive over 5 percent, enabling eight people from East Germany to enter the Bundestag. She plans to run in 1994 for the Bundestag or for the European Parliament.

From March 1983 to April 1984, she served as one of the three political spokespersons of the Bundestag Group of the Greens. From March 1983 to December 1990 she served two terms as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Bundestag. From April 1985 to 1987 she was a member of the Assembly of the Western European Union (WEU) of the Council of Europe and of the Bundestag Subcommittee on Disarmament, focusing on human rights, disarmament, neutrality, and foreign policy. During her second term in the Bundestag she served on the Subcommittee for Europe. During 1989-90 she was national chairperson of the German Association for Social Defence working on non-military defense and security alternatives.

Among extraparliamentary actions, in February 1983, together with Green MP colleague retired Major General Gert Bastian, she organized an international "war crimes tribunal" at Nuremberg to indict the possession of nuclear and mass destructive weapons by five countries--led by the U.S.A and the USSR and followed by Britain, China, and France--as "a crime of immense proportions." This was a major national political event involving fifty speakers and two thousand people. In May 1983, together with four other Greens, she staged an antinuclear, pro-human rights, antiwar demonstration in East Berlin where she was arrested. This was followed in November by a similar demonstration in Moscow. In September 1983 she participated in a three-day

About the Author

blockade of the U.S. military base at Mutlangen and Bitburg and later on at many other military bases. Petra K. Kelly and Gert Bastian were sentenced by German courts and paid very high fines in several cases for their nonviolent actions at U.S. and other military bases. They have also protested in the U.S., Australia, and the GDR. In June 1984, with other Green MP's she organized an international expert hearing on social defence as a nonviolent security alternative for Germany going beyond NATO and the Warsaw Pact. In 1985, together with Gert Bastian, she organized in Bonn the Forum Reconciliation (The Other America) with six hundred participants. With Gert Bastian and other Green MP's she also occupied for forty-eight hours the German Embassy in Pretoria to protest German economic ties with South Africa.

In April 1989, with Gert Bastian, she organized the first international hearing on Tibet and human rights. It was held in Bonn's Parliamentary House and brought together more than forty experts with six hundred other participants. This was followed by similar hearings in other countries. In 1987, 1989, and 1990 she introduced parliamentary resolutions condemning Chinese human rights and martial law violations in Tibet that were unanimously passed by the Bundestag in October 1990.

In private life since 1991 she has been greatly in demand as a speaker and activist, receiving two hundred to three hundred letters each week. In January 1992 she began to moderate a weekly television program on global environmental issues. She has written books on children's cancer, on Green politics, on Tibet and China, on Hiroshima and Guernica, and on Green issues together with Gert Bastian, whom she celebrates as her soulmate.

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

Among honors Petra K. Kelly has received are the Swedish Parliament's Right Livelihood Award (known as the Alternative Nobel Prize, endowed by Jakob von Uexkull), in 1982; and the peace prize of the U.S. group Women Strike for Peace in 1983. Unofficially she has been called the "Jeanne d'Arc of the Peace Movement." Recently the *Sunday Times* of London placed her among the one thousand most influential personalities of the twentieth century.

[Editor's note by G. Paige (2001): Petra Kelly and Gert Bastian belatedly were found dead of gunshot wounds in their Bonn house on October 19, 1992. The police concluded that Bastian had killed her and then committed suicide on October 1. An interpretation of the circumstances and Bastian's motivation can be found in Sara Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly* (London: Pandora, 1994).

Petra, who was eager to see her book *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, apparently never saw it, although 10 copies were air mailed to her upon its publication in late September 1992. Also sent at that time were 100 copies that she wanted to distribute personally to colleagues in Europe, in addition to many copies mailed from Hawai'i to a list she provided of friends in the United States and other parts of the world. Her death was a shocking loss to all who knew her. In this book Petra Kelly courageously continues to speak].

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABC	Atomic, biological, and chemical weapons
AI	Amnesty International
BHC	Benzine hexachloride, a contaminant
CDU	Christlich-Demokratische Union [Christian Democratic Union]
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CSU	Christlich-Soziale Union [Christian Social Union]
CTBT	Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
DM	Deutsche Mark
DDT	Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloro ethane, an insecticide
EC	European Community
EEC	European Economic Community
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ETA	Basque Homeland and Freedom fighters
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization, U.N.
Four-plus-Two-Treaty:	Britain, France, U.S.A., and USSR, plus FGR and GDR

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

FGR	Federal Republic of Germany
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GDR	German Democratic Republic
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INF	Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces
IPPNW	International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
IRA	Irish Republican Army
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
NRDC	National Resources Defense Council
PDS	Partei des Demokratischen Sozialismus, Party of Democratic Socialism, former SED
PTBT	Partial Test Ban Treaty
RAF	Rote Armee Fraktion [Red Army Faction]
SDP	Social Democratic Party, same as SPD
SED	Sozialistische Einheits Partei [Socialist Unity Party], became PDS
SPD	Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands [Social Democratic Party of Germany]
UDMH	Poison by-product of the chemical alar
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WEU	Western European Union

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PETRA K. KELLY

1982. *Offener Brief an Willy Brandt* [Open Letter to Willy Brandt]. Bonn: Die Grunen.

1983. *Um Hoffnung Kampfen*. [In Hopeful Struggle]. Bornheim-Merten: Lamuv Verlag. Translated into English, Japanese, Spanish, and Turkish.

1984. *Fighting for Hope*. Introduction by Heinrich Böll and translated by Marianne Howarth. London: Chatto & Windus. The Hogarth Press. Translation of *Um Hoffnung Kampfen*. U.S. edition: Boston: South End Press, 1984.

1986a. *Hiroshima*. Bornheim-Merten: Lamuv Verlag.

1986b. *Viel Liebe gegen Schmerzen*. [Love Over Sorrow]. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag.

1987a. "Towards a Green Europe! Towards a Green World!" Closing speech at the International Green Congress, Stockholm, Sweden, August 30.

1987b. "The Green Movement." In Tom Woodhouse, ed. *People and Planet: Alternative Nobel Prize Speeches*. Bideford, Devon: Green Books. 22-32.

1988a. with Gert Bastian, eds. *Tibet--ein vergewaltigtes Land* [Tibet--A Violated Country]. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rohwalt-Verlag.

1988b. "Religiose Erfahrung und politisches Engagement" [Religious practice and political engagement]. In Gunter Hesse and Hans-Hermann Wiebe, ed. *Die Grunen und die Religion*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum. 1989.

1989 "Gandhi and the Green Party." *Gandhi Marg* (July-September): 192-202.

1990a. *Mit dem Herzen denken* [To Think with the Heart]. Munich: C.H. Beck Verlag. Translated into Japanese and Spanish.

1990b. "For Feminization of Power." Congress of the National Organization of Women, San Francisco, June 30, 1990.

1990c. with Gert Bastian and Klemens Ludwig, eds. *Tibet klagt an* [Tibet Accuses]. Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag.

1990d. "The Need for Eco-Justice." *Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* (Medford, MA) 14, no. 2 (Summer): 327-31.

1991a. "Politics and Ecology." Speech at the Morelia Ecology Conference, Morelia, Mexico, September 2.

1991b. with Gert Bastian and Pat Aiello, eds. *The Anguish of Tibet*. Berkeley: Parallax.

1991c. "Germans in a Murky Landscape." *Index on Censorship* (London) 20, no. 10 (November 1): 21-22.

NAME INDEX

Adam-Schwaetzer, Irmgard, 135, 141
Aicher-Scholl, Inger, 145
Albertz, Heinrich, 94
Aldridge, Robert, 32
Alt, Franz, 101, 113
Arkin, Bill, 133
al-Assad, Hafez, 84
Augstein, Rudolf, 106

Bannon, John, 56
Bastian, Gert, 53, 54, 60, 88, 90, 93, 94, 155, 162, 164, 165
Beazley, Kim, 56
Beckmann, Lucas, 163
Bergmann-Pohl, Sabine, 95
Berrigan, Philip, 90
Berry, Roger, 130-1
Berry, Wendell, 72
Beuys, Joseph, 126, 155, 163
Billerbeck, K., 44
Birle, Kunigunde, 162
Bogoraz, Larissa, 92
Bohley, Barbel, 91, 102
Böll, Heinrich, 106, 145, 155
Bonner, Jelena, 92
Bookchin, Murray, 17, 22
Brabha, H.J., 37
Brandt, Willy, 34, 89, 163
Brown, Bob, 53, 60
Bush, George, 75, 79-80, 81, 82, 84, 111, 116, 119, 137

Caldicott, Helen, 53, 54, 60

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

Chomsky, Noam, 83, 84
Chonzom, Nima, 162
Cousins, Norman, 31

Dalai Lama, 29-30, 94-95, 113-4, 121
Degen, Gerda, 163
Delors, Jacques, 104, 136
Douglass, James W., 31
Dubos, Rene, 78
Dutschke, Rudi, 163

Einstein, Albert, 31, 65
Engelhard, Hans, 26
Enzensberger, Hans Magnus, 129

Fromm, Erich, 129
Fuchs, Jurgen, 103-4

Galbraith, John Kenneth, 110
Galinski, Heinz, 97, 98, 145
Galvin, John R., 35
Gandhi, Mahatma, 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 31, 33, 34, 67
Gandhi, Maneka, 82
Gandhi, Rajiv, 38
Genscher, Hans Dietrich, 104, 107, 117, 134-5
Goebbels, Josef, 102
Gorbachev, Mikhail, 35, 61, 68, 93, 111, 112
Grass, Gunter, 96-7, 106

Hamm-Brücher, Hildegard, 140
Harrison, Paul, 49, 50
Havel, Vaclav, 114, 126-7, 146
Havemann, Katja, 17, 91
Hawke, Bob, 53-56, 57
Hitchens, Christopher, 80
Hitler, Adolf, 80, 98, 101
Ho Chi Minh, 64
Honecker, Erich, 25, 91, 92, 95, 96, 100, 102
Honecker, Margot, 102

Name Index

Horacek, Milan, 163
Horn, Gyula, 61
Humphrey, Hubert, 161
Hussein, Saddam, 80, 105-6

Jackson, Jesse, 35-36

Kelly, Grace P., 2, 162
Kelly, John E., 161
Kennedy, Robert F., 161
King, Jr., Martin Luther, 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 30, 76
Kohl, Helmut, 26, 93, 95-7, 106, 108, 111, 133, 137
Kollnegg, Kalle, 157
Konrad, Gyorgy, 21, 58-59, 127
Kopelew, Lew, 92
Krenz, Egon, 94, 101
Kung, Hans, 129

Lenin, V.I., 101
Lenz, Siegfried, 73-74
Leopold, Aldo, 33
Luce, Henry, 79

Maiziere, Lothar de, 95
Malthus, Thomas R., 49
Marchenko, Anatoly, 92
Mazowiecki, Tadeusz, 61
Melman, Seymour, 22
Mengele, Josef, 90
Menzies, Sir Robert, 56
Michels, Robert, 8
Mielke, Erich, 102
Mitterand, Francois, 138
Modrow, Hans, 101
Mott, Albert, 87, 89-90
Muller, Robert, 31
Munday, Jack, 53, 58, 60

Nehru, Jawaharlal, 29, 38

Nonviolence Speaks to Power

Palme, Olof, 26
Pol Pot, 64, 80
Poppe, Ulrike, 91

Rauhaus, Gert, 138, 141
Richardson, Graham, 54-55
Robins, Anthony, 138
Rogers, Carl, 15, 65
Roszak, Theodore, 76
Russell, Bertrand, 163

Saibold, Halo, 163
Said, Abdul, 89, 90
Sakharov, Andrei, 92, 93, 152
Sana, Heleno, 106
Sand, Stephanie, 127
Schafer, Helmut, 123
Schmidt, Helmut, 89, 163
Scholl, Hans, 145
Scholl, Sophie, 145
Seabrook, Jeremy, 83
Shcherbak, Yuri, 131
Shiva, Vandana, 110
Sindermann, Horst, 92
Stoltenberg, Gerhardt, 96
Stücklen, Richard, 139

Tawo, Palden, 90
Thatcher, Margaret, 137, 140
Thoreau, Henry David, 133
Tolstoy, 7, 13

Uexkull, Jakob von, 15, 165

Vallentine, Jo, 60
Vogt, Roland, 163
Vollmer, Antje, 154, 157

Ward, Barbara, 78
Weizacker, Richard von, 114

Name Index

Wolf, Christa, 94

Worner, Manfred, 108

Yates, Ronald W., 134

Young, John, 53

SUBJECT INDEX

Aborigines, 3, 56-7, 74, 88, 125, 143
abortion, 65, 94, 115
acid rain, 66, 70, 72
Afghanistan, 23, 37, 63, 111, 150
Africa, 42, 43, 44, 48, 110, 142
agriculture, 48, 73, 111, 115. *See also* "Poisoned Food and World Hunger"
Amazonia, 71, 73
Amnesty International, 30, 117
Antarctic, 3, 54, 57
anti-politics, 21, 41, 58-9, 92, 127, 159. *See also* power.
anti-Semitism, 98, 100, 109
Argentina, 84
arms control, 36, 137-9. *See also* demilitarisation; disarmament; neutrality; nonalignment; nuclear weapons treaties
Asia Watch, 117
Auschwitz, 90, 97
Australia, 2, 3, 30, 32, 73, 77, 132. *See also* "Global Green Politics"
Australian Labor Party, 53-5, 57, 60
Australian Liberal Party, 54, 55
Austria, 16, 60, 61, 97

Baliapal National Test Range, Orissa, 39
Baltic Republics, 76
Basque Province, 27, 124
Belgium, 47, 59
benzine hexochloride (BHC), 46-7
Bergen-Belsen, 90
Bhopal, 151
Black Forest, 33

Subject Index

- Brandt North-South Report, 36. *See also* North-South relations
Brazil, 72, 81
Brundtland Commission, 73
Buchenwald, 90
Bulgaria, 127
Bundestag, 121, 138-9, 140-1, 142, 149, 151, 152, 159
- Cambodia, 64, 80, 121
cancer, 1, 20, 43-5, 55, 75, 88, 124, 130-3, 139, 151
capitalism, 20, 22-3, 68, 103, 108
censorship, 140-1, 145, 150
Central America, 110
Central Asia, 110
Central Europe, 128
Central Council of Jews, 97, 145
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), 84
Cerberus scandal, 138
Chad, 51
Charter 77, 127
chemical industry, 42, 44, 45, 68, 111
Chernobyl, 6, 33, 42, 43, 44, 55, 62, 71, 76, 103, 131-2
children, 1, 4, 6, 32, 36, 43, 51, 55, 77, 88, 121, 124, 130-3, 139
Chile, 23, 63
China, 30, 38, 51, 63-4, 80, 83, 88, 90, 105, 132, 141, 150. *See also*
 "Tibet Must Not Die"
Chipko Movement, 32
Christian Democrats, 26, 93, 104-5
civil disobedience, 11-2, 21, 26, 89-90, 146, 159
civil rights, 127-8
civil society, 4-5, 21, 60-1, 91-2, 112
civilian-based social defence, 5, 26, 64-5, 77, 136
Communism, 68, 79, 96, 101, 103-4
Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), 108,
 136
consumption, 4, 5, 32-3, 42, 51, 67-8, 85, 111-2, 143-4. *See also*
 resources.
counterinformation, 4, 123
courage in politics, 128-9, 142, 143-4, 146

- Cuba, 19
Czechoslovakia, 23, 61, 75, 76, 108, 111
- DDT, 47
debt crisis, 81. *See also* economics; North-South relations; South Bank; Third World
decentralisation, 5, 21, 103. *See also* globalism, localism
demilitarisation, 4, 5, 85, 96, 108, 109. *See also* arms control; disarmament; neutrality; nonalignment; nuclear weapons treaties
democracy, 4, 6, 27-8, 34, 65, 67, 96, 128, 136, 139, 145
Demokratie Jetzt, 88
Denmark, 60, 71
desertification, 71
deterrence, 35, 37, 72, 108
development, 48, 59, 82, 83, 85
diet, 42-3, 48, 50
disarmament, 5, 16, 24-5, 26, 34-6, 60, 72, 88, 109, 111, 133-6. *See also* arms control; demilitarisation; neutrality; nonalignment; nuclear weapons treaties
dioxin, 20
- Earth, 1, 6, 11-2, 33, 51, 82. *See also* ecology; environment
East Germany, 23, 25, 61-2, 88, 91-2, 93-6, 101-4
Eastern Europe, 23, 31, 41, 58, 60-1, 62, 68, 75-6, 79, 85, 109, 127-8, 137, 152
East Timor, 84
East-West relations, 2, 91, 111, 137
ecology, 2, 4, 20, 22, 33, 41-2, 53, 60, 62, 67-8, 111, 151, 158. *See also* earth; environment
economy, 2, 4, 33, 35-6, 68, 81-3, 93-4, 95-6, 101, 103, 109, 115, 137, 138
education, 9, 31, 101-2
Egypt, 50, 84, 111
El Salvador, 23, 43
energy, 25, 59, 63, 69, 70, 103
environment, 43, 69-76, 111. *See also* earth; ecology
Environmental Protection Agency, 44-5
Estonia, 76

Subject Index

- ETA, 27, 118
ethics in politics, 17, 129-30
Ethiopia, 50, 71
European Community, 37, 44-5, 47-8, 69, 77, 94, 108-9, 117, 123, 128, 137. *See also* "A Green View of German Reunification and Europe's Future"
European Parliament, 27, 59-60
Exxon Valdez, 74-5, 149
- feminism, 12, 16, 24, 89, 126. *See also* patriarchy; women
Finland, 16, 60
food: aid, 43-4; baby food, 45, 46; contaminated, 43-4, 45; diet, 42-3, 47, 50; distribution, 49-51; milk, 42, 43-4, 49-50, 131; processing, 47; radiation, 47-8; waste, 42
Four-plus-Two talks, 107, 134
France, 38, 45, 47, 55, 59, 71, 107, 137-8
freedom, 6, 22-3, 25, 29, 30, 63-4
Friends of the Earth, 76
- GATT, 85
German Green Party: anti-nuclear policy, 132; in Bundestag, 141; "celebrities" in, 155; donations to, 156; evolution, 126-7; factions, 17-20, 66, 88, 153, 158-9; failure, 152-4; founding, 21, 89, 123, 153; and Gandhi, 30-3; in government, 21; in Hessen, 21, 66, 87; Left wing, 18, 23, 158; NATO policy, 16, 150; principles, 16, 28, 41-2, 63, 65, 66, 91-2, 125-7, 129, 151, 158; Realos, 18, 88, 158; reorganization, 156-8; reunification policy, 91, 96-7; Right wing, 18, 23; rotation policy, 124-5; and Social Democrats, 66, 158-9; Tibet policy, 121
Germany: 2, 4, 11, 39, 44, 45, 55, 58, 66, 68, 87; anti-Semitism, 97-8, 100; China policy, 116-8; foreign policy, 104-5; nationalism, 95, 98; nuclear waste, 130; nuclear weapons, 135-7; reunification, 91, 95-6; weapons industry, 105-6, 137. *See also* "A Green View of German Reunification and Europe's Future"
Ghana, 81
Glasnost, 23, 76, 92
globalism, 1, 12, 17, 32, 76-8. *See also* localism

- grass-roots organization, 17, 20, 27, 65-7, 85, 155. *See also*
localism
- Great Britain, 38, 47, 56, 59, 60, 84, 107, 137
- Green Ban Movement, 3, 58, 69
- Green Party in: Australia, 60, 77; Austria, 16; Belgium, 59;
Canada, 59; Denmark, 60; Europe 59-60; Finland, 16; France,
59; Great Britain, 59, 60; India, 59; Ireland, 16, 47, 60; Italy,
59, 60; Netherlands, 59; Poland, 76; Portugal, 59; Spain, 59;
Sweden, 16, 60; Switzerland, 16, 60; Tasmania, 60, 62, 77;
U.S.A., 17, 59
- greenhouse effect, 66, 71-2, 151
- Greenpeace, 27, 76, 138, 150, 159
- Grenada, 19
- Guernica, 27, 99, 123-4
- Gulf War, 79-80, 83, 149, 150-1. *See also* Bush, George; Hussein,
Saddam; Iraq; Kuwait; "The New World Order of President
Bush"
- La Hague nuclear facility, 129
- Helsinki Citizens' Assembly, 109
- Hessen, 21, 66, 87
- Holocaust, 97. *See also* anti-Semitism; Auschwitz; Bergen-Belsen;
Buchenwald; Hitler; Nazis; neo-Nazism; racism
- human rights, 2-4, 6, 12, 23, 30, 60-1, 64, 90-1, 109-10, 118, 122-3,
132, 141, 142, 150, 152, 158, 159
- Hungary, 23, 61, 68, 76, 108, 127
- hunger, 32, 50-1, 115. *See also* "Poisoned Food and World
Hunger"
- India, 2, 3, 29-31, 33, 36-9, 46-7, 51, 71, 82, 111, 123, 133
- indigenous peoples, 1, 5-7, 74, 76, 83, 88, 125, 143
- Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF), 35, 133
- injustice, social, 1, 23, 32, 63-4, 150
- interconnectedness: of issues, 6, 12, 30, 39, 67; of life, 1, 12, 17,
30-1, 72-4, 111
- International Monetary Fund, 81-2, 83
- International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, 137
- Irish Republican Army (IRA), 118
- Iran, 83, 105

Subject Index

- Iraq, 80, 84, 105, 106, 116, 119, 144, 150. *See also* Gulf War; Hussein, Saddam; Kurds
- Ireland, 16, 47, 60. *See also* "Poisoned Food and World Hunger"
- Iron Curtain, 91, 128
- Israel, 106, 150
- Italy, 59, 60
- Jamaica, 43-4
- Japan, 45, 81, 85
- justice, 4, 5, 27, 64, 65, 80, 91, 112
- Kakadu National Park, 55
- Kashmir, 111
- Kazakhstan, 137
- Kerala, 132
- Khmer Rouge, 64, 80
- Kurds, 19, 63, 84, 106, 144
- Kuwait, 80, 116, 119, 150
- Lactogen Nestle scandal, 42
- Latin America, 49, 74
- leadership, 4, 5, 7-12, 61
- Lebanon, 84, 150
- Liberal Party, 93
- Libya, 19
- life, respect for all, 7, 17, 30-1, 61
- Lithuanians, 119
- localism, 17
- Malaysia, 73, 132, 142
- Maldives, 71
- malnutrition, 20, 32
- Maralinga, 55
- meat, 50
- media, 4, 10-1, 53-4, 121-2, 125-6, 158
- men. *See* patriarchy
- migrant workers, 98-9
- military, 5, 9, 19, 21, 24-5, 29, 34-5, 39, 55-9, 64, 72, 76, 83-5, 105, 109-11, 133-7, 149. *See also* NATO; Warsaw Alliance

- military-industrial complex, 5, 22, 35, 63
milk, 42-4, 49-50, 131
missiles, 26, 35, 39, 83-4, 107, 135
Mit dem Herzen denken, 122
morality in politics, 5, 21, 31, 41, 58-9, 64, 129-30, 150, 158-9
Morocco, 150
multinational corporations, 3, 23, 42, 63, 85, 93
- nationalism, 2, 95, 98. *See also* racism
National Resources Defense Council, 43, 45
NATO, 16, 19, 35, 37, 85, 94, 107-8, 133-6, 150
Nazism, 97-8, 99-103, 109, 144-5; neo-Nazism, 98, 109. *See also*
 Holocaust.
Netherlands, 47, 59
Neues Forum, 62, 88
neutrality, 4, 16, 37, 88, 109, 112. *See also* nonalignment
New Zealand, 58, 60, 77, 138
Nicaraguan Contras, 23
nonalignment, 16, 26, 37, 57, 64, 109, 135. *See also* neutrality
nonviolence, 16, 20-1, 26, 30-1, 33-4, 41, 67-8, 89-90, 92, 158
North Korea, 83
North Sea, 33, 70, 83
North-South relations, 1, 81, 91, 109, 142, 151. *See also* Third
 World
nuclear: annihilation, 2; industry, 5, 42, 54-5, 68; power, 3, 38, 55,
 62, 71, 76, 89, 129-31; pollution, 131-3; proliferation, 36;
 waste, 68, 69, 72, 129-30; weapon-free zone, 31, 36-7, 77, 107,
 109; weapons, 3, 26, 31-2, 35, 37-9, 55-6, 72, 107, 135-7;
 weapons testing, 3, 32, 55-6, 76-7, 137. *See also* "For a
 Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Nonviolent World"
nuclear weapons treaties: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, 137;
 INF Treaty, 35, 133; Non-Proliferation Treaty, 107, 135; Partial
 Test Ban Treaty, 137; Treaty of Rarotonga, 138
Nukem/Alkem scandals, 55, 140
Nurrungar, 57
- oil, 74-5
- Pacific Islands, 73, 77

Subject Index

- Pacific Ocean, 32, 138
Pakistan, 36, 37, 106, 111
Palestine, 150
Panama, 79, 84
patriarchy, 2, 4, 24. *See also* feminism; women
PDS (Party of Democratic Socialism), 100. *See also* SED
peace, 25-6, 29, 34, 38, 64, 73-4
People's Forum (Prague), 127, 146
perestroika, 92
Pershing missiles, 26, 35, 134
pesticides, 43-6
Poland, 23, 61, 62, 68, 75, 76, 99, 108
population, 49, 51
Portugal, 59
poverty, 1, 3, 4, 11, 32, 89. *See also* economy; hunger, "Poisoned Food and World Hunger"
power, 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 19, 21, 25, 26, 31, 41-2, 58, 64, 66-7, 121, 126-7, 146, 154-5, 159. *See also* anti-politics
public health, 69-70, 121, 139-40. *See also* "Poisoned Food and World Hunger"

racism, 2, 4, 44, 89-90, 98-9, 109-10
radiation, 20, 42, 43-4, 47, 55, 62, 68, 131-2, 137-8. *See also* cancer; toxic waste
Red Army Faction (RAF), 27, 118
rain forests, 4, 6, 66, 72-3, 142-3, 151. *See also* deforestation
recycling, 6, 69
refugees, 29-30, 61, 82-3, 110, 144
Rokkasho, village, nuclear plant, 59
Roxby Downs, 57
Romania, 61, 63, 132, 139

Sahel, 51
Sarawak, 142-3
security, 72, 77, 136. *See also* civilian-based social defence, deterrence
SED (Socialist Unity Party), 92, 100-1, 104
self-determination, 23-4, 30, 42, 48, 51, 159. *See also* power
Sellafield Plant, 55, 130

- Sermon on the Mount, 150
Sikhs, 3, 30
Social Democrats, 18, 21, 66, 77, 88, 89, 93, 99, 134, 146, 158-9
socialism, 20, 68, 89
Solidarity, 61, 62, 127
South Africa, 23, 63, 84, 152, 165
South Asia, 36-7
South Bank, 83. *See also* IMF; World Bank
Soviet Union, 23, 32, 37, 49, 60, 68, 76, 83, 92-3, 108-11, 127, 130-2, 137, 150
SPD. *See* Social Democrats
Spain, 59
spirituality, 12, 17, 31, 33-4, 65, 90
Stasi, 100-2, 104
Sudan, 43
Sweden, 15, 16, 60, 70
Switzerland, 16, 60, 69
Syria, 80, 84

Tasmania, 60, 62, 73
technology, 3, 6, 21, 22, 33, 38, 42, 63, 68-9, 83-4
terrorism, 27, 45, 118, 138
Thailand, 43
Third World, 23, 68, 72, 81, 83, 84-5, 105, 110-11. *See also* North-South relations
Three Mile Island, 131
Tibet, 3, 6, 29-30, 63-4, 80, 121, 125, 139, 141, 150. *See also* "Tibet Must Not Die"
tolerance, 27-8, 65
toxic waste, 6, 42, 68-70, 72, 75, 110-11, 151. *See also* cancer; radiation
Trident submarines, 76-7
truth in politics, 130, 133-5, 146
Turkey, 2, 19, 23, 84, 144, 152. *See also* Kurds

UDMH, 45
UNEP, 71
Unification Treaty, 97-8
United Nations, 31, 36, 46, 51, 64, 71, 84, 105, 116, 138

Subject Index

United States, 35-7, 42, 43, 45, 48-9, 57, 63, 74, 76, 88, 105, 111, 138, 142. *See also* "The New World Order of President Bush"

uranium mining, 32, 54-5, 62, 132

violence, 5, 7-8, 9-10, 18, 67. *See also* nonviolence; power

Warsaw Pact, 79, 108, 133, 135

weapons, 5, 35-6, 38-9, 55, 72, 76-7, 83, 105-6, 111, 135, 144

Western Europe, 31, 58, 59, 62, 70, 83, 88, 93-4, 107-12, 128, 138

Western European Union, 37, 94, 107, 108, 128, 136

Wilderness Society, 76

women, 2, 4, 23-4, 39, 42, 48, 91. *See also* feminism; patriarchy

Woomera Rocket Base, 55-7

World Bank, 81-3, 83. *See also* IMF; South Bank

World Health Organization, 47

Worldwatch Institute, 71-2