Ucapan bekas Perdana Menteri, Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad di 'The Perdana Global Peace Forum'

Mukadimmah

FORUM KEAMANAN GLOBAL yang berlangsung pada 14 hingga 17 Disember 2005 di Pusat Dagangan Dunia Putra, Kuala Lumpur berjaya menarik minat ramai bekas pemimpin dunia seperti bekas Perdana Menteri Australia, Bob Hawke dan Presiden Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe.

Forum Keamanan Global tersebut mengutuk sekeras-kerasnya campurta ngan kuasa-kuasa besar seperti Amerika Syarikat dan Britain yang membogelkan erti 'keamanan' setelah menghancurkan bumi Iraq dengan alasan bahawa bekas Presiden Iraq, Saddam Hussein menyim pan 'senjata pemusnah' atau *"Weapon of Mass Destruction"*.

Menurut Tun Dr Mahathir, alasan tersebut adalah satu pembohongan besar Amerika Syarikat dan sekutunya, Britain yang tidak boleh diterima.

Forum tersebut juga menekankan tentang erti hak kemanusiaan dan hak orang awam yang tidak bersalah menjadi korban pepe rangan, bagi memenuhi hajat dan cita-cita golongan tertentu yang mempunyai kepenti ngan masing-masing di Iraq.

Ikuti teks ucapan bekas Perdana Menteri, Tun Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad sebagai Penge rusi Forum Keamanan Sejagat bertemakan *"Peace Dividends and War Profits"* yang menyebabkan semua perwakilan yang hadir dalam dewan bangun serentak untuk membe rikan tepukan yang gemuruh kepada beliau.

CINTAI KEAMANAN... Bekas Perdana Menteri, Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad menemui Presiden Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe yang turut serta dalam Forum Keamanan Sejagat di PWTC baru-baru ini.

MAY I, at the outset, welcome all participants, speakers and guests to this Perdana Global Peace Forum.

I am sure that many of you have been to peace conferences before. But I would like to think that this is not the usual peace conference. It is not one where we get to vent our anger and frustration over the failure of Governments to achieve and sustain peace, or where we get to bash certain countries for their warlike ways and their rejection of peaceful means.

We would like this Conference to be the beginning of a worldwide-sustained effort to criminalise war and banish it as an option in the settlement of disputes and conflicts between nations; to recognise and define war as legitimised mass murder, as inhuman and uncivilised. We would like this conference to reject war totally and to accept peace as worthy of being the true expression of the humaneness and nobility of humankind, that peace be the ultimate measure of the level of civilisation humanity should strive for, should attain.

We had fought wars to end all wars. The First and Second World Wars were billed as such. After killing more than 70 million people, maiming many millions more, razing innumerable towns and cities to the ground, we still have wars, we still have no peace.

We set up the League of Nations after the First World War, but that failed to remove disputes from the battlefields to the negotiating table. During the Second World War the Allied nations worked on a new post-war international organisation to enable peaceful solutions for international conflicts and to limit war to the policing work of the United Nations Organisation only.

But the principal promoters themselves immediately waged a Cold War resulting in a terribly costly arms race and wars between client states of the opposing blocs. And when the Cold War was over, there emerged one super power which was also one of the main promoters of the UN but which now regards the UN as irrelevant and a hindrance. Indeed if the UN gets in its way, it would simply be swept aside. And so the UN has failed; failed to bring about the peace that we all desire so much.

The horror caused by the Atomic Bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki appears to deter the nuclear powers from going to war against each other. But they did not mind instigating wars among non-nuclear nations and the people to whom they sell ever more costly weapons. And large numbers of people continue to be killed in these wars. And now the nuclear powers wish to ensure that their potential victims will not have nuclear weapons, which have become good deterrents so they may war against these hapless countries with impunity.

So what do we do? Do we resign ourselves to being slaughtered periodically or do we try to find some new way to stop the needless slaughter. The easy way out is of course to let things be. But the wars are getting worse, are killing more people, are more destructive of towns and cities, and causing after effects such as diseases which last for years.

In the past wars were fought by professional armies on battlefields. These soldiers, the trained killers would try to kill as many of their enemies as possible because the side with the biggest number of kills would be declared the winner, the glorious victor.

But in today's wars whole countries have become the battlefield. The killing is no longer confined to soldiers, but often targets the non-combatants, the children and the aged, the infirm and the invalids, babies, men and women of all ages. No one is safe in today's wars.

The super-powers already have huge arsenals of nuclear weapons. The way the leaders, who are authorised to unleash these weapons on the world, are talking is not very reassuring. Their current behavior is even less reassuring. They have lied in order to go to war, in order to visit horror and death on hundreds of thousands people. They consider the killing of half-a-million children as a result of the sanctions they imposed as being worth the price-the price being ultimately access to the wealth of the country.

One day one of them may press the button and the others would have to do the same in support or in defence. And then we would have a full-scale nuclear war destroying the whole world and all its inhabitants.

These warlike nations are not going to stop warring. They glory in their military power and prowess. They are not going to give up killing people in the pursuit of whatever ambition or quest they might have at a given time. In the past it was territorial gain, empire, ideologies, and the pursuit of their happiness. If people stood in their way they would be hunted and killed and their lands occupied and new nations set up. For achieving egalitarian societies tens of millions more have been killed. Now it is the turn of other millions to be killed so human rights and democracy are upheld, or so they claim.

And the people who must be killed so they may enjoy the blessings of democracy have to defend themselves and their territory by retaliatory killing. Not having weapons to match those of their enemies they resort to blowing themselves up, not to stop their tormentors but to take revenge. Their acts of retaliation have now spread to the four corners of the globe. They kill innocent people largely. And they are called terrorists because of that. Yet when their tormentors, in an attempt to out-terrorise them, also kill innocent people, they are not called terrorists. They claim that it is accidental, and their innocent victims are "collaterals". They excuse themselves by saying that the collaterals are guilty of being where they want to drop their bombs or aim their missiles. This injustice has only aggravated the situation and made peace even less likely. And to the brutalities of war have been added the use of torture and killing of prisoners arbitrarily arrested. Attempts are being made to legalise these inhuman acts. Truly war has made casts of men, including the most civilised of them.

If we cannot trust the democratically elected to secure peace than whom can we trust? Democracy has failed to ensure that good people are elected as leaders of the world. Instead blatant liars and warmongers and the oppressors of the weak readily get re-elected. The choices of leaders are of course the right of their own people. But what these elected leaders do affect us all, the people of the world. They literarily have the power of life and death over us.

The reality of this is made clear when the leaders of these powerful countries arrogate to themselves the right change the governments of independent nations. They talk openly of effecting Regime Change. And they want to do this even if they have to subvert Governments, apply sanction, invade countries, kill people, destroy towns and cities and precipitate civil wars. They talk of pre-emptive wars and they openly legislate to legitimise their aggression.

Sokongan.... Kelihatan beberapa perwakilan asing yang turut serta dalam Forum Keamanan Sejagat.

For the Iraq War the US Congress had in 1998 passed the "Iraq Liberation Act of 1998", five years before the actual invasion and certainly before 9/11 and the Al-Qaeda phobia. Obviously the invasion was pre-meditated and was neither about the WMD nor about Saddam's oppressive dictatorship. It was about getting in greater numbers because they have no oil. Under "Omnibus Consolidated Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act 1999" the US provided $8 million to assist Iraqi oppositions. This is nothing more than legalised subversion. If subversion is frustrated than sanction, invasion, war, may be used.

The US has now invaded Iraq. But the US has also prepared legal authority for aggression against other countries.

On Dec 12, 2003 the "Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2004" was sign into law. Fortuitously Rafic Hariri of Lebanon was assassinated and Syria is implicated. Whether the findings are factual or not is irrelevant. I am not being cynical but remembering the lies about Iraq, I cannot help but just wonder. What is important of course is that the invasion of Syria or more probably sanction and bombings of the country have been provided with additional grounds.

Then there is the "Iran Freedom and Support Act of 2005". The Act wan intended to "hold the current regime in Iran accountable for its threatening behavior and to support a transition to democracy in Iran". This sounds like blackmail. No embarrassment is felt that democracy is being promoted through blackmail, through the threat of war.

Again monetary grants can be made under this law to "foreign and domestic individuals, organisations and entities" that support democracy and the promotion of democracy in Iran. Democracy, human rights, possession of WMD are convenient excuses for war and killings.

Additional grounds for aggression against Iran have been provided by the new President asserting that Israel be removed from the map of the world. This is considered anti semitic and offensive. But Israel's objection to the existence of a Palestinian state is considered as right and worthy of international support. Effectively the state of Palestine has been removed from the world by Israel's objection to its existence.

The call will soon be coming for the Iranian leader to be removed and regime change effected. Sanction, i.e. the killing of hundreds of thousands of innocent children and others, bombings and rockets will do the work of the devil, for the Iranians have shown their willingness to fight to retain their independence when the last attempt was made by the U.S. ally and proxy, Saddam Hussein.

What is significant about these laws of the US Congress is that it supports and provides for direct interferences in the politics of other countries. It is bound to cause conflicts between the different groups, conflicts that may result in violence, even civil wars. That is what happening in Iraq today. Saddam may have been a cruel dictator but the tens of thousands of Iraqis deaths of even more Iraqis? Whether this Iraqis die at the hands of Iraqis or not irrelevant. The fact remains that the invasion has precipitated these killings. Is this how democracy is to be promoted.

The treat to peace clearly comes from the injudicious choice of

leaders of these militarily powerful democracy countries. If they consider that effecting regime change is legitimate for them, then other countries of the world should also have the right to effect regime change in these powerful countries.

I believe that there are a lot of people in these countries who are unhappy with the leaders they have chosen. We have to help thee people make better choices. And we can do this by making dedication to peace a major issue in their elections, and indeed in elections everywhere.

We can take a leaf from the environmentalists. Here again the leaders, i.e. the elected Governments, had failed. And so the people, the environmentalists were forced to act on their own. Maybe some of the thing they did were insane, were violent. Some were too extreme, demanding that humanity go back to the Stone Age almost.

Bust the fact is that since the environmentalists began their campaign many all over the world have taken up the cudgels. Non-Governmental Organisations appeared everywhere and condemn their own governments and leaders for their failures to protect the environment.

They may not have been completely successful. But the world has now been made more conscious of the environmentalists seriously. Today many countries, including Malaysia have Ministers of Environment. World leaders discussed the environment in Rio de Janeiro and the Kyoto Protocols have been formulated and acceded to by most countries.

Can we not do the same for peace? This conference neither should nor be just about voicing our flustration. It should be about positive action to make peace a serious political, economic and social issue for every country. Hose who are against peace, who believe in killing people in order to solve international disputes, should be rejected and disgraced. They should never allow participating in Governments in any country. They should never become the Presidents and Prime Ministers of any country.

This is the primary purpose of this peace Conference. It is meant to initiate and help make effective a sustained campaign against war, a campaign to make the killing of people as a means of solving disputes between nations illegal. If in the process we have to refer to specific cases, name specific countries, it is no more than citing the truth in order to illustrate our message more graphically.

For this purpose, for this conference let us not confuse ourselves by giving peace too many interpretations. Let us merely say that peace means the absence of war, just that. Once there is peace other matters to make life bearable and the pursuit of happiness possible for all can be attended to.

In any society killing is a crime, a very serious crime deserving of the most severe punishment. It is called murder. Long ago we had prohibited dueling, i.e. the killing of your opponent as a way to settle disputes. It was not a fair way because it is not the righteous who would win but the skilful. And rogues can be more skilful than the righteous and the just.

But today we still train people to fight and kill in what amounts to duels between nations. The winner would be the best-trained killer with the best weapons, not the forces of the right, the forces of justice. If duels are allowed to settle disputes in society, then the best duelists, the best killers will eventually fill up society and lead it. How safe would a society made up of and led by successful killers be. By the same token if duels between nations were still considered a proper option to settle disputes between them, then the nations with the best killers would win. Justice would not prevail in such a world. It would be a very primitive world where killers rule, where might is right. Is this the 21st century civilisation is about. We cannot claim to have made much progress since the Stone Age.

I say this because in today's wars we kill large numbers of people at one stroke, most of whom would be civilians. The carpet-bombing of Dresden, the atom bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed defenseless civilians almost entirely.

In the wars that we are witnessing now, we know that a few soldiers lost their lives but many times that umber of civilians have been killed. In a world ruled by people who glory in killing, which are good at international duels called wars, there will be no peace. We know these killer nations are busy inventing all sorts of diabolical weapons in order to increase the numbers they can kill, to prolong the killings, so that it goes on long after the war is over. We know that long after the Vietnam War, people, innocent people, children were still being killed by exploding and the effects of Agent Orange. It is the same in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

As if this is not inhuman enough, the merchants of death have invented the cluster bombs, designed to scatter bomb lets far and wide which exploded and killed people, the bomb lets would go on killing the people, children mostly who might step on them or pick them up.

In Palestine and Iraq we hear of the use of depleted uranium in bullets, missiles and bombs.

In John Pilgers book, " The New Rulers of the World" Professor Doug Rokke who was responsible for cleaning up Kuwait after the Gulf War has become a victim of radiation. He said he has 5000 times the recommended level of radiation in his body. He described depleted uranium contaminated shells and bullets were fired. The Israelis, the British and the Americans use them in Palestine, in the Gulf War and now in Iraq!

What aggravated matters were the sanctions against Iraq after the Gulf War prevented treatment of those suffering from radiation and other diseases resulting from it.

The United Nations Sanction Committee in New York mostly Americans and British had vetoed or delayed the dispatch of a range of medical equipment, chemotherapy drugs and even morphine. The drugs were said to be of dual use i.e. they could also be used allegedly as chemical weapons. Assurance by medical experts that the quantities needed would be far too small for any other use was just ignored.

A team of American professionals and academics estimated that during the first eight months of the sanctions i.e. in 1991, when all shipments of food and medicine were blocked, 47,000 Iraqi children under the age of five died.

Pilger's book recorded that, over and above the anticipated rate, more than 500,000 children died. This was reported by the United Nations Children's Fund - Unique. And now they have phosphorous bombs capable of burning the skin of living victims the way napalm did. What else will they think of next?

In the old days it was common for cities to be laid under siege until hunger forced them to surrender. Sanctions are present day equivalent of siege, only the areas and populations are bigger. And the sufferings and deaths are correspondingly on a bigger scale. The people could not surrender because that was not the desired objective. The objective was supposed to be to force Iraq to renounce "weapons of mass destruction", to rid itself of its allegedly inhuman dictator. That the people were powerless to do this did not matter. For failing to do what they could not do they had to suffer the pains of sanctions and the war that followed.

But when the inspection team reported that Iraq had no more weapons of mass destruction, the reports were ignored and sanctions continued. In fact there is no way for Iraq to prove that it had no WMD, Paul Wolfwitz, the most warlike of the Neo-con members of the American Administration, now the President of the World Bank declared that "If Iraqis deny they have WMD, then they are lying. If the WMD cannot be found, then they are hiding". Obviously if the Iraqis had no WMD then they cannot be found, and according to Wolfwitz this simply means they have but they are hiding. As we now know the Iraqis really had no WMD. But the sanctions continued and then Iraq wan invaded causing more deaths and destruction, and unleashing the forces of civil war and terror, which had been kept under control by the cruel dictator.

And all these deaths and destruction have been for nothing for Iraq had already complied, and must have already destroyed whatever WMD it may have had, so that it could hide nothing. Do the warmongers regret the deaths and destruction? Not at all. They still insist that it was justified. Now it is because Saddam had to be removed because he killed his own people. Now Saddam has been removed and can no longer kill anyone. But more of Saddam's people are being killed by the very people who claim they wanted to stop the killing of Iraqis.

But the research and development of new weapons for killing more people more efficiently continues. Now Unmanned Ariel or UAV and robots have been developed. It would be a good thing if these robots are made to fight each other. But that is technologically superior attackers who will operate the robots to kill defenseless human enemies, without exposing themselves to danger. Safe from any danger of being killed by the enemy, their soldiers will kill more willingly.

Research is now being made into fighting future wars. The American soldiers who will fight wars in 20-year time have been designated FW or Future Warriors, a more glorious title than more soldiers. As Future Warriors, they will be equipped with:

i) Tiny UAV - for each platoon to scout from the air

ii) Smart Helmet which will enhance vision and hearing with head-up display to identify targets

iii) Liquid Armour which will detect bullets and harden briefly

iv) Robot Mole, or small Unmanned Ground Vehicle to scout tight spots - caves, sewers, tunnels

v) Fast Gun firing 200 round of light-weight, ceaseless, ammunition embedded in high-ignition-temperature propellant (whatever that might mean)

There is no thought at all about peace. Rather preparations are being made to fight future wars, to kill more people in future conflicts between nations, which they have already decided must be resolved through wars. Every now and again a break-through would be reported on new ways to kill the enemy more efficiently. The idea of killing more seen to fill these powerful nations with glee and immense satisfaction.

So far the world has avoided a nuclear war. Even the nuclear powers fear that a nuclear war would be destructive for them as well. The whole world may be made uninhabitable by radiation. Chernobyl is a reminder of how far nuclear fall-outs can reach and the harm they can do. The Victors will not be any safer than the losers. But can we be assured that there will be no nuclear war in our future.

Missiles are being developed to knock out missiles in mid-air before reaching their targets. If they are knocked out where would they fall? In the target country or some other countries. Wherever, the country would suffer death and damage from the falling non-nuclear or nuclear warheads, the major nuclear powers are working on so-called clean nuclear bombs and missiles. But how would they know that these explosives are clean.

Despite their knowledge of nuclear fission and despite the tests that they carried out they did not know of the dangers of radiation from their Fat Man and Little Boy Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs and the diseases that would follow later. It was years after Hiroshima and Nagasaki that they learnt what kind of a doomsday weapon they had used. They thought it was just going to be the biggest and most spectacular explosion ever. But it was more than that.

Would their clean nuclear bombs and missiles be really clean? I don't think they know. But the fear is that they would want to try it out in real life situation. There must be a convenient war for this. If there is none, then they will start one. Thousands upon thousands of innocent people will have to be sacrificed to increase their knowledge of nuclear weaponry.

We have seen that for these leaders of democracy, killing a few hundred thousands people in peace time is acceptable if it is in pursuit of their national objectives. Madeline Albright, when she was Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations was asked by a journalist about the sanctions US and Britain had imposed on Iraq, "We have heard" the journalist said, "that half a million children have died... is the price worth it."

Albright replied and I quote, " I think this is a very hard choice, but the price ...we think the price is worth it" unquote.

So can we hope that the Albright among the leaders of the nuclear powers would consider sacrificing thousands of people to improve their knowledge too big a price?

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Killing is habit-forming. That is why there are serial killers. War, the killing of people is just as habit-forming. Having killed a few thousands, killing tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands would come naturally, especially for those giving the orders.

Bombing pilots are quite ordinary people. If you give them a machine-gun and order them to shoot a crowed of defenseless men, women and children, they probably would not be able to pull the trigger. But give them a bomber, and ask them to drop bombs to kill thousands of innocent people, they would not hesitate to depress the button to drop bombs which would kill all those people. They would probably feel nothing at all. They would fly home to report, "Mission accomplished" and celebrate it with a glass of beer in the officer's mess. The missile launching teams a thousands miles away from the targets would feel the same and would celebrate their strike.

We too can be quite sanguine about other people losing their lives. We read in the papers about the numbers killed and we seem to assume that they died instantly, painlessly. We do not want to think of what really happens. But when heads are torn from the bodies by explosives, there must have been terrible pain even if it lasted for an instant. Would we like to have our heads torn off this way. Would we feel no terror expecting this to happen to us? And the limbs being similarly torn off. With torn limbs death may not be instantaneous. There must be terrible pain and sufferings. The limbs may still hang by strands of muscle and skin, causing great suffering and pain. Or the stomach split open and the guts spilled on the ground. Imagined the pain and the horror at seeing one's own guts spilled out and no medical or any kind of help for unbearable lengths of time.

That is what happens when people are killed by explosions. They are not just numbers but they are people like us. If we do not like this to happen to us, to feel the terrors of exploding bombs and missile warheads, the we must do something to stop these killings, these wars, and this absence of peace.

It is necessary for us to describe the horrors of war, the killings and the destruction so that peace to will come meaningful and desirable, so that we would want to struggle for peace. The route that we must take, seeing that most of the warmongers are elected to office in the great democratic countries is to make as many members of the electorate as pro-peace and anti-war as possible. Peace must be made by the majority of the electorate the main issue in every election. The candidates must be made to declare their stand on peace. They must be made to reject war totally. If they don't than they should get no votes. Peace-lovers must make sure that these people will be defeated always.

Is this possible? As with the environment it would take a long time for the struggle for peace to be taken seriously, to be acted upon. But if we succeed in setting up peace NGO's in every country, if we demonstrate to the electorate the horrors of war, if we explain that they themselves may become the collaterals no matter what security measures their Governments take, then there should be enough votes to tilt the elections in favour of candidates for peace, against candidates who still believe war is an option.

Among the electorate there would be various groups who have been affected by past wars or who are likely to be affected in future wars. The invalid veterans must have their group, as should the other veterans. They should display their disabilities, their soars when they demonstrate or agitate against war and for peace. They should talk of the horrors and the pain they had suffered. The medals are not for valor. They are for killing, for snuffing out the life of fellow human beings. There is no glory in the victory achieved.

The parents and siblings of those killed in wars should have their groups, should speak for peace, and should campaign against war during elections and at every opportunity. They should show pictures of the beloved ones they had lost. The community should be reminded often of their sadness and their losses.

The women and children against war must be mobilised and empowered. They should be among the most vocal for they are the ones going to lose their children, their brothers, husbands and their fathers who have to go to strange lands to fight wars which will make the world no better, probably worse. Their sacrifices and those of their loved ones would come to nothing would be sheer waste. Look at Iraq and Afghanistan - victory was declared a long time ago by the American President but their brothers, husbands and fathers have still not come back. And the casualties are mounting with no sign that withdrawal will soon be taking place. In the end, when the invaders withdraw there would still be no real democracy in these countries. What were the sacrifices, the lives lost for? It is easy for Presidents and Prime Ministers in the safety of their heavily guarded offices and homes thousands of miles from the war scenes to talk about sacrifices. But it would lose their lives for nothing.

We have today in Malaysia the Physicians against Nuclear weap-

Ucapan bekas Perdana Menteri, Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad di 'The Perdana Global Peace Forum'

ons. And now we have Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. The movements must be made worldwide and active, particularly in the most belligerent countries. Doctors should agitate for peace and should refuse to go to war.

The most important NGO against war should be those of the scientists. These are the people who are being ordered to invent and develop new weapons, to upgrade them constantly. These are the people who built the nuclear bombs, the cluster bombs, Agent Orange, nerve gases etc. They have become killers even if they don't do the killings themselves. They must realise they are guilty of aiding and abetting murder, mass murder.

The scientists in the Manhattan Project protested against the use of the Atom Bomb that they had helped to build. But it was too late. And the Bombs they built were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing nearly 200,000 civilians, unnecessary acts because Japan was already on the verge of surrendering. The scientists who invented and built the bombs are as guilty of mass murder as the crew of Enola Gay.

Scientist should refuse to do research that would lead to more lethal weapons. Today in the countries of the super powers everything that scientists discover is being investigated for its killing potential. Electronics, laser, radar, radiation, magnetic fields, chemicals, germs and virus, outer space etc are all being investigated for war applications. And invariably defence against these weapons would be developed or would be suspected of being developed by the enemy's scientists. Against these defence new weapons have to be invented and developed.

There is talk of the anti-missile shield. No doubt the potential enemy will invent a missile to penetrate this shield. Then there would be the upgrading of the shield to make it impenetrable to the new missile. But the missile scientists will come up with a new missile to penetrate improved missile shield. And so it will go on, as the best brains among the scientists think up of more weapons to counter more defence weapons, continuously. The cost is enormous.

During World War II, a fighter aircraft would cost USD 1 million or thereabouts. Today fighters cost USD 100 million to procure and fly. Others may cost as much as a billion. With each invention, with each upgrade the countries of the world together have to spend trillions to prepare for war, which may never come.

Perhaps there is no war because of the Roman dictum that "To have peace, you have to prepare for war." But those were the days of bows and arrows, of swords and spears. They cost almost nothing. Today the weapons cost millions and billions. Surely it is better to have an arms limitation agreement, to control research into more killer weapons.

The arms salesmen use high-pressure methods to sell costly sophisticated weapons system to countries whose people can hardly buy enough food to eat. They want to recover a part of their development cost. Unscrupulously they would hint that the neighbors or nearby unfriendly nations are buying such weapons. Frightened or ashamed these countries are forced to buy. And a costly arms race would start.

All these because scientists are being paid and provided with trillions of dollars to devise new weapons and to upgrade old ones.

Yet we are now faced with new contagious diseases with the potential for causing world pandemics. The money and the scientists should be directed to researches to find vaccines and medicine for such disease, etc. all in urgent need of prevention and treatment. Certainly we need to find treatments for cancers, which are affordable, to all.

Scientists should take a stand against the use of their talents for killing people. Like doctors they must swear a solemn oath upon being qualified to apply their knowledge for peaceful applications only. During the Holocaust in Germany doctors abused their knowledge and tortured their patients. We condemn them.

< Forum Keamanan Sejagat merupakan antara usaha murni yang diperlukan untuk menagih kembali kerjasama antarabangsa dalam menangani keganasan termasuk yang diterajui oleh Amerika Syarikat itu sendiri.

But are the scientists who develop diabolical weapon for mass killings any better. They need to ask their conscience. They need to ask whether they should not come together to campaign for peace, against war.

Lawyers too have a role to play in the promotion of peace. We need international laws, which will render wars illegal. We need to define acts of war and terror. We need to provide proper punishment for people who commit mass killings of innocent people, whether they be by irregulars or they are by elected leaders of nations; whether in formal wars or undeclared wars. The idea that only the victors have the right to prosecute the losers is neither just nor morally right.

There must be a properly constituted World Court for crimes against humanity, for wars and the killing of innocent people. The judges should be free. They should be from neutral countries, protected from the powerful. The victors and the vanquished must be charged under the same laws.

It may not be possible to bring the guilty party or leaders of the powerful before the court. But the courts may try such people in absentia. If found guilty this should be widely publicised and rogues gallery pictures distributed. The rest of the world should shun such people and treat them as pariahs. No one should have anything to do with these criminals.

There must therefore be an international NGO of Lawyers for peace, lawyers against war.

We need the cooperation of the Press. We must persuade them to work with us, to publish condemnations of war, the atrocities committed, the rogue leaders and rogue countries responsible for the wars waged. The press must dedicated itself to the truth. The press must be independent, not embedded in anyone's armed forces. The press must be an active partner in the worldwide struggle for peace.

The Internet must be used extensively so that an alternative media would be available to publish and expose lies, be downloaded and distributed.

We must resuscitate the United Nations and help it to perform its original role - that of resolving conflicts through negotiation and mediation rather than through wars.

The UN must be democratised. The veto of the permanent five mist is modified so that no single one of them can frustrate the whole organisation. Eventually the veto should be abolished and world democracy established.

The UN must be given certain powers so that the globalised world will have a limited but meaningful global government, which can act positively to prevent war and maintain peace.

I am quite sure this forum will come up with more and better ways to promote peace, way that are, practical and effective. Let us hear them and let us resolve to make this forum the first step in the struggle of humanity for a peaceful and more civilized world.

The desire for peace, for the elimination of war for whatever reason is not a concern only of this forum. For decades now there have been attempts to promote peace. Mostly they are linked to specific wars, such as the Vietnam War when anti-war demonstrations in the U.S. finally brought about U.S. withdrawal.

But the campaign for peace was not coordinated and would die down soon after the particular war ended. Then other groups would form up when a new war looms. There appears to be no concerted and sustained efforts to denounce and criminalise war and promote peace.

At present with wars still being fought in Palestine and Iraq and the strong possibility of new wars against Syria and Iran, many groups have emerged worldwide, in particular in the countries most likely to start war, to campaign against war and the promotion of peaceful solutions. This Peace Forum must not be a one-off thing like the others. Pro-Peace Anti-War NGOs that will be formed after this must establish contacts and links with all the existing like-minded groups. It is important that the movements for Peace Against War to be mutually reinforcing, to be coordinated and to take concerted action worldwide. We would obviously be more effective if we work together, we strategies and design our campaigns properly and we act together as much as possible.

It is necessary that a permanent Secretariat be set up for this purpose, staffed with permanent and voluntary workers. The location of the secretariat must be where it will be most effective and convenient.

With all groups and NGO's presently active, working together with the proposed new ones particularly in ensuring that "Peace" become the main issues ia all democratic election everywhere, it is quite possible that those who advocate warlike policies would not be elected. It may take time. It will not be easy. But we need just one major success for the Peace Campaign to gain momentum.

We must always remember that Peace for us simply means the absence of war. We must never be deflected from this simple objective.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

What I have suggested is all do able. We must act to stop this madness, these killings, this idea that the ones able to kill the most are the victors, are right, and are the ones who should rule the world. What kind of a civilisation would we have with mass murderers as world leaders?

We must therefore promote peace as a creed for everyone. We must make peace an issue in all for a on security of the states, the regions and the world. No country should resort to war and the destruction of the security of others, in order to promote its own security.

We hope that this Global Peace Conference will mark the beginning of a serious, active and sustained struggle against war and for peace. We hope and prayers to the Almighty, I declare open this Global Peace forum with the theme "Peace Dividends and War Profits"

Thank You.

YAYASAN KEPIMPINAN PERDANA