

PART I Section 2

London Nuclear Warfare Tribunal

2 - 6 January, 1985

The British Group of Lawyers, "Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament", organised and convened the London Nuclear Warfare Tribunal together with the assistance of the following supporting organisations:

Architects for Peace
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
The Ecology Party
The Haldane Society of Socialist Lawyers
The International Peace Bureau (Geneva)
Journalists against Nuclear Extermination
Medical Campaign against Nuclear Weapons
British National Peace Council
National Union of Public Employees
Scientists against Nuclear Arms
Scottish Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament
The Society of Friends (Quakers)
Teachers for Peace
The United Nations Association

One of the primary concerns of the Organisers was to ensure that the Tribunal should work with complete political independence and without influence from any Government.

The Members of the Tribunal consisted of the following:

Sean MacBride, Senior Counsel, Chairman of the Tribunal
Professor Richard Falk, Member of the Tribunal
Dr Dorothy Hodgkin, Member of the Tribunal
Dr Maurice Wilkin, Member of the Tribunal

The Organisers made diligent efforts to obtain the participation of Government Representatives from the main nuclear powers, but

without success. To offset the absence of participation by current political and military leaders, each witness appearing before the Tribunal was cross-examined by a trained and properly briefed lawyer, whose task it was to test the evidence from the point of view of the nuclear governments and military establishments. The following are the names of the lawyers who appeared before the Tribunal for the purpose of cross examining witnesses in order to test their evidence and to ensure that every aspect of the problems under consideration were duly put forward fully and objectively:

(Here set out the names and titles of the Counsel who appeared for the Tribunal)

The Registrar, Clerk, and Secretariat of the Tribunal consisted of the following:

(Here set out the names of the Registrar, Clerk and Secretariat)

In the course of the four days during which the Tribunal sat in London (2-6 January 1985,) the Tribunal received a considerable amount of oral and written testimony. A full list of all the witnesses who testified will be found in Appendix A and a full list of the written submissions, papers and treatise submitted to the Tribunal will be found in Appendix A and B respectively at the end of this Report.

The expert commentary presented to the Tribunal can be divided into five categories:

- (a) Evidence relating to the medical, physical and environmental effects of nuclear warfare including information concerning the secondary effects of a nuclear explosion as regards radiation effects and atmospheric pollution resulting in what is known as "a nuclear winter".

- (b) Evidence relating to the history of the quantitative and qualitative growth of nuclear weapons over the last forty years, including their methods of delivery in different parts of the world.
- (c) Evidence relating to the concept of the deterrence, counterforce, mutually assured destruction, and societal or genocidal destruction and a relation between each of these concepts and a possibility of error of judgement, accident, mistake, computer errors, mis-information, mis-calculation, human and mechanical failure.
- (d) Evidence relating to the moral and religious implications of nuclear wars and of wars involving the use of weapons of mass destruction, including the moral issues involved in the preparation or planning of such wars.
- (e) Evidence relating to the legality of wars in general and in particular of wars involving the use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of societal destruction, as well as the individual legal responsibility of leaders and others associated with the planning, preparation and involvement in the use of such weapons.

Preliminary Conclusions

Following upon the hearing of the evidence and the consideration of the written submissions made, the Tribunal met on the 6 January and reached the following preliminary conclusions;

- (1) It is now established beyond any reasonable doubt that any major nuclear exchange would be an unprecedented human and environmental catastrophe, posing a serious threat to the survival of all life on the planet. One aspect of this threat has been dramatised by the experimental findings that soot and dust

from nuclear explosions totalling no more than 100 megatons could produce a "nuclear winter" of at least several month's duration. What life or vegetation if any, could survive such a "nuclear winter" is, as yet, unascertainable.

- (2) The evidence presented overwhelmingly convinced the Tribunal that current weapons developments and strategies for their use (such notions as "limited nuclear war", "first strike options", and "winnable nuclear wars") are creating acute public anxiety and produce a set of tendencies in international affairs that make the outbreak of nuclear war virtually inevitable at some point in the years ahead.
- (3) The evidence established beyond doubt that governments of nuclear weapons states have preferable alternatives to their current reliance on deterrence and maintaining a favourable position in the nuclear arms race.
- (4) The evidence was overwhelmingly convincing that there is no acceptable way to reconcile these weapons developments and strategies with prevailing morality, either as interpreted by non-religious political ethics.
- (5) The Tribunal was satisfied that current and planned weapons developments, strategies, and deployments violate the basic rules and principles of international law both customary and conventional. The procurement and use of such weapons involve infringements of the Charter of the United Nations, the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 on the Law of War, the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the Geneva Protocols of 1977.
- (6) The evidence was convincing that the Principles of the Nuremberg Judgment ("the Nuremberg Principles") unanimously endorsed by a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as the Genocide

Convention, are being violated in the most extreme fashion by ongoing preparation to wage nuclear war, especially to the extent that plans include indiscriminate, poisonous and massive destruction of civilian populations amounting to a conspiracy to wage aggressive war. It appears to the Tribunal that this is particularly true of newly-developed and highly accurate weaponry.

- (7) The evidence overwhelmingly established that war preparations are undermining the maintenance of political democracy and constitutional government in the nuclear weapons states, and compromising the sovereign rights of non-nuclear states, especially for those states that adhere to a policy of neutrality.
- (8) The evidence established that resources devoted to war are excessive and wasteful, even given a commitment to military methods of self-defence, and that this circumstance greatly complicates the challenge of overcoming widespread poverty at home and abroad, an effect especially shocking at this time of massive famine in sub-Saharan Africa.

Interim Recommendations

These conclusions led the Tribunal at that stage of its deliberations to offer the following Recommendations:

1. That official studies be undertaken by governments and international institutions to consider longer term alternative security policies to that of nuclear deterrence including comprehensive disarmament (within the framework of the 1962 McCloy-Zorin Principles), non-provocative defence arrangements, and the strengthening of the United Nations and regional security organisations (as distinct from Alliances).

11. That immediate steps be taken by governments to renounce unconditionally any reliance on weapons, doctrines, and manoeuvres being developed or possessed for potential first strike or first use roles;

111. That lawyers and lawyers' groups throughout the world accept as a matter of professional responsibility an urgent obligation to create an awareness as to the viatal importance of the issues involved and the role which lawyers should play;

- 1V. That, also, political and military leaders as well as scientists, engineers, soldiers, and workers consider their own moral and legal responsibility for participating directly or indirectly in preparations for nuclear war and to uphold their personal and collective obligations;

- V. That peace groups and individual tax-payers consider adopting extraordinary means of non-violent direct action to increase levels of public opposition to current preparations and plans for nuclear war;

- VI. That moral authorities, legal specialists, and educators, re-examine and extend notions of citizenship and conscientious objection to justify refusals of individuals in military or governmewnt service to participate in any way in nuclear war preparations.

dated this 6th day of January, 1985,

signed by the Members of the Tribunal,

Sean MacBride,
Chairman of the Tribunal

Richard Falk,
Member of the Tribunal

Dorothy Hodgkin,
Member of the Tribunal

The "Nuremberg Principles" of International Law

Principle 1

Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefore and liable to punishment.

Principle 11

The fact that internal law does not impose a penalty for an act which constitutes a crime under international law does not relieve the person who committed the act from responsibility under international law.

Principle 111

The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible government official does not relieve him from responsibility under international law.

Principle 1V

The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

Principle V

Any person charged with a crime under international law has the right to a fair trial on the facts and law

Principle VI

The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under international law:

- (a) Crimes against peace:
 - (i) Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances;
 - (ii) Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i)
- (b) War Crimes:

Violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.
- (c) Crimes against humanity:

Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts done against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds, when such acts are done or such persecutions are carried on in execution of or in connection with any crime against peace

or any war crime.

Principle V11

Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle V1 is a crime under international law.

NUCLEAR WARFARE TRIBUNAL

Back cover

(London January 1985)

THE VIOLATION OF ALL LAWS

The back page should contain some
publishers (?) notes as to the
reasons for convening the Tribunal
and some details of the members

Jurists' Call For
General and Complete Disarmament

Members of
The Tribunal

Sean MacBride, S.C. Chairman
Professor Richard Falk
Dr Dorothy Hodgkin
Dr Maurice Wilkins

Published by the International Peace Bureau
Geneva, and the International Progress
Organisation, Vienna.

\$25.00

REPORT OF THE LONDON NUCLEAR WARFARE TRIBUNAL JANUARY 1985

Table of Contents

Part 1

Introduction

1. Preface by Sean MacBride, S.C.
Appendices to Preface:
 - (a) Nuremberg Principles
 - (b) General and Complete Disarmament Accord
 - (c) The Moral Stand - Baden and Kyoto Consultations
2. The London Tribunal (Jan. 85) provided by Francis Boyle
3. Organising Committee and Supporting Organisations
4. Members of Tribunal and Biographical Notes
5. Officers and Secretariat of Tribunal
6. Nature of Evidence
7. Preliminary Conclusions
8. Interim Recommendations

ick:
the by book
should not
call the Jan 85
Proceedings a "trial"

Part 2

The Report

1. Introduction to Report on The Role of Lawyers by Professor Francis A. Boyle Professor of Law, University of Illinois
2. Brief historical review of the history of war
3. Brief survey of efforts made to stop or limit war from the Declaration of St Petersburg 1858, right up to the Charter of the United Nations on 24 October 1945
4. Brief survey of the development of humanitarian law from the Geneva Conventions of 1864 right up to date

5. The development of the laws of Human Rights from the abolition of slavery to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and of subsequent human rights enactments right up to date
6. The Nuremberg Principles; collective and individual responsibility

Part 111

Nuclear Weapons

1. The advent of nuclear weapons
2. The efforts made to outlaw and/or limit use, including the Zorin McCloy principles
3. The condemnation of nuclear weapons by religious leaders, scientists, and medical leaders.
4. The devastation that would be caused by nuclear war in the present circumstances
5. The survival of the human race
6. The dangers of accident, error or miscalculation
7. The policy of "Mutually Assured Destruction" and of Genocidal annihilation
8. The cost of military expenditure and its impact on the developing world.
9. Extra-terrestrial weapons.

Part 1V

1. The Moral Implications involved

Part V

1. The legal implications involved including the provisions of de Martens Clause and Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice
2. The conventional provisions involving the use of such weapons.
3. Nuclear weapons under Customary International Law

Part VI

Conclusions and Recommendations.

SODEPAX Report of the Baden Consultation

3-9 April 1970, Rights and World

Peace, paragraphs 29-32

"The Rights of Conscientious objectors

The consultation considers that the exercise of conscientious judgment is inherent in the dignity of human beings and that accordingly, each person should be assured the right, on grounds of conscience or profound conviction, to refuse military service, or any other direct or indirect participation in wars or armed conflicts:

The right of conscientious objection also extends to those who are unwilling to serve in a particular war because they consider it unjust or because they refuse to participate in a war or conflict in which weapons of mass destruction are likely to be used.

The consultation also considers that members of armed forces have the rights and even the duty, to refuse to obey military orders which may involve the commission of criminal offences, or of war crimes or of crimes against humanity

It is urged that the Churches should use their best endeavour to secure the recognition of the right of conscientious objection as herein before defined under national and international law.

Governments should extend the right of asylum to those refusing to serve in their country for reasons of conscience".

"JOINT STATEMENT OF AGREED PRINCIPLES FOR DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS"

In 1961, at President John F. Kennedy's direction, John J. McCloy, advisor to President Eisenhower and eminent New York lawyer, held three meetings with Valerian A. Zorin, representing the USSR, in an effort to reach agreement on the fundamental principles for future disarmament negotiations. They met in Washington, D.C. June 19-30, in Moscow July 17-29, and in New York September 6-19. On September 20, 1961,

they signed the Joint Statement of Agreed principles for Disarmament Negotiations, known as the McCloy-Zorin Agreement. Both governments then reported their agreement to the United Nations General Assembly which adopted the McCloy-Zorin Agreement on December 13, 1961 as the foundation for future negotiations toward general and complete disarmament. Here is the complete official text:

The United States and the USSR have agreed to recommend the following principles as the basis for future multilateral negotiations on disarmament and to call upon other states to cooperate in reaching early agreement on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world in accordance with these principles:

1. SECURE DISARMAMENT AND PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES, ... WAR NO LONGER

The goal of negotiations is to achieve agreement on a programme which will ensure:

- (a) That disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and
- (b) That such disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. RETENTION OF NON-NUCLEAR FORCES FOR DOMESTIC ORDER AND A UN PEACE FORCE

The programme for general and complete disarmament shall ensure that States have at their disposal only such non-nuclear armaments, forces, facilities, and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens; and that States shall support and provide manpower for a United Nations peace force.

3. ALL MILITARY FORCES, BASES, STOCKPILES, WEAPONS, AND EXPENSES TO BE ENDED

To this end, the programme for general and complete disarmament shall contain the necessary provisions, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for:

- (a) The disbanding of armed forces, the dismantling of military establishments, including bases, the cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;
- (b) The elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction, and the cessation of the production of such weapons;
- (c) The elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction;

- (d) The abolition of organizations and institutions designed to organize the military effort of States, the cessation of military training, and the closing of all military training institutions; and
- (e) The discontinuance of military expenditures.

4. IMPLEMENTATION BY TIMED STAGES WITH COMPLIANCE AND VERIFICATION AGREED TO AT EVERY STAGE

The disarmament programme should be implemented in an agreed sequence, by stages, until it is completed, with each measure and stage carried out within specified time-limits. Transition to a subsequent stage in the process of disarmament should take place upon a review of the implementation measures included in the preceding stage and upon a decision that all such measures have been implemented and verified and that any additional verification arrangements required for measures in the next stage are, when appropriate, ready to operate.

5. EQUITABLE BALANCE AT EVERY STAGE SO NO ADVANTAGE TO ANYONE AND SECURITY FOR ALL

All measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all.

6. STRICT CONTROL TO MAKE SURE OF COMPLIANCE BY ALL PARTIES AND CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT ORGANIZATION WITH INSPECTORS HAVING UNRESTRICTED ACCESS EVERYWHERE WITHOUT VETO FOR FULL VERIFICATION

All disarmament measures should be implemented from beginning to end under such strict and effective international control as would provide firm assurance that all parties are honoring their obligations. During and after the implementation of general and complete disarmament, the most thorough control should be exercised, the nature and extent of such control depending on the requirements for verification of the disarmament measures being carried out in each stage. To implement control over and inspection of disarmament, an international disarmament organization including all parties to the agreement should be created within the framework of the United Nations. This international disarmament organization and its inspectors should be assured unrestricted access without veto to all places, as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.

7. DISARMAMENT PROCESS MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY MEASURES TO MAINTAIN PEACE AND SECURITY AND A UNITED NATIONS PEACE FORCE STRONG ENOUGH TO DETER OR SUPPRESS ANY THREAT OR USE OF ARMS IN VIOLATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. During and after the implementation of the programme of general and complete disarmament, there should be taken, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligation of States to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments. Arrangements for the use of this force should ensure that the United Nations can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

8. STATES SHOULD SEEK WIDEST AGREEMENT AT EARLIEST DATE WHILE CONTINUING TO SEEK MORE LIMITED AGREEMENTS WHICH WILL FACILITATE AND FORM PART OF THE OVERALL PROGRAM FOR SECURED GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

States participating in the negotiations should seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date. Efforts should continue without interruption until agreement upon the total programme has been achieved, and efforts to ensure early agreement on and implementation of measures of disarmament should be undertaken without prejudicing progress on agreement on the total programme and in such a way that these measures would facilitate and form part of that programme.

Preface

By Sean MacBride S.C.

Chairman of the Tribunal

The aim of the International Peace Bureau, which was founded in 1892, are "to serve the cause of peace by the promotion of international co-operation and non-violent solution of international problems" and "to serve the independent peace movements of the world". It is the oldest international peace organisation in the world and has its headquarters in Geneva. It is a federation of peace organisations from all parts of the world. The International Peace Bureau does not see peace merely in economic or political terms. It seeks to spread the conviction that a life of dignity and justice is the inalienable right of all men and women and that it is capable of realisation only on the basis of peace.

Shortly after its foundation, the International Peace Bureau became engaged in the promotion of the first Hague Peace Conference which was convened on 18 May 1899 and which adopted two important international conventions described as:

- (a) The Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes
- (b) The Convention for the respect of the laws and customs of war on land.

In recognition of its work at the Hague Peace Conference of 1899, the International Peace Bureau was in 1900 awarded the Grand Prix and the Paris Exhibition of 1900. The International Peace Bureau continued its work and supported the 1906 Geneva Convention on Wounded Persons and also the Second Hague Conference of 1907. At the Second Hague Conference thirteen Conventions were adopted all aimed at restricting and limiting the use of force in international relations.

In 1910 the International Peace Bureau was awarded the Nobel

Peace Prize for "Serving as a channel of communication between Governments and the Peace Movements".

After World War 1, the International Peace Bureau in collaboration with the Society of Friends worked actively on the preparation and adoption of the 1925 Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and other Gases. It also worked for the adoption of the General Treaty for the Renunciation of War in 1928 known as the "Treaty of Paris". It is well to recall at this stage the first two articles of this important Treaty which provided:

Article 1 "The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare...
... that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."

Article 2 "The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or whatever origin they may be which may arise among them, shall never be sought except through pacific means"

Ineffective as the Treaty of Paris was to prevent the Second World War it is of some importance in that most of the judgments of the Nuremburg Tribunal were based on the provisions of the Treaty of Paris. The Nuremburg Tribunal in 1946 laid it down that:

"The solemn renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy necessarily involves the proposition that such a war is illegal in international law; and that those who plan and wage such a war, with its inevitable and terrible consequences, are committing a crime in so doing".

The Charter of the United Nations signed in San Francisco came into force on 24 October 1945 and its Preamble proclaimed:

"WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

determined

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends

to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and

to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and,

to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

have resolved to combine our efforts

to accomplish these aims"

In Article 1 of the Charter, the purposes and the principles of the United Nations are set forth:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

The Nuremberg Trials were open to criticism in that they were held under a retroactive law and were a trial of the vanquished by the victors. Subsequently, however, it was recognised that the principles upon which they were based should be applied in the future to all cases of crimes against humanity and of war crimes. Accordingly, on 11 September 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously affirmed "the principles of

international law recognised by the Charter of the Nuremburg Tribunal and the judgment of the Tribunal". Subsequently, the General Assembly entrusted the formulation of the Nuremburg Principles to the International Law Commission, an organ of the United Nations composed of experts in international law representing all the legal systems in the world and expected to promote the progressive development and codification of international law. It should be noted that the United States, the Soviet Union, France and Britain all took a leading role in the drafting of the Nuremburg Charter and the elaboration of the Nuremburg Principles. The Nuremburg principles were formulated by the International Law Commission in 1950 and were finally unanimously adopted by the United Nations on the .

For convenience, the full text of the Nuremburg Principles are reproduced in Appendix A, and they form part of international law.

From 1945 onwards all the world leaders worked closely together to ensure that there would be no further wars and that nuclear weapons would be outlawed; as a result, after several years of work the Soviet Union and the United States of America reached an agreement on 20 September 1961, known as the Zorin-McCloy Accords, which were submitted to the United Nations and unanimously adopted on the proposition of the Soviet Union and the United States on 13 December 1961. This agreement, unanimously adopted, was the biggest step forward ever taken to bring about General and Complete Disarmament. For convenience, the full text of the Accords as adopted are set forth in Appendix B to the Preface.

-5-

On the moral plane both the Vatican and the World Council of Churches at the Consultation on 3-9 April 1970 at Baden in Austria laid it down that the right of Conscientious objection to participation in a war is extended to the right to refuse to participate in a conflict in which weapons of mass destruction might be used. The same stand was adopted by the World Conference for Religion and Peace held in Kyoto some months later in 1970. For convenience, the full text of the principles laid down by both these religious conferences, which encompassed all the religions in the world, are included in the appendix "C" to this preface.

At an international conference held in Bradford 29 August - 1st September 1974, convened by the International Peace Bureau the call was issued to all the Governments of the World to proceed to implement the programme for General and Complete Disarmament adopted by the United Nations on 13 December 1961. A million copies of this call, issued in the different languages of the United Nations were distributed throughout the world. From then onwards, conferences and consultations were organised by non-governmental organisations which ultimately led to the First Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament in 1978 . The first Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament again called for the achievement of General and Complete Disarmament and pointed out:

"Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth Removing the threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to Disarmament or face Annihilation."

At it's General Conference held in Helsinki 4-6 September 1981 the International Peace Bureau decided to initiate studies and

- 6 -

conferences as to the ethical morality and legality of the use of nuclear weapons. As a result, conferences of specialists in law, morality, and medicine have held conferences in most parts of the world and have come to the conclusion that nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction or of social annihilation are indefensible morally and legally. Such conferences were sponsored either by the International Peace Bureau or by other non-governmental organisations of Jurists, of Religious leaders or of medical scientists. In many countries organisations of lawyers have been formed such as Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament (Britain) the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy (USA) and on 24 June 1982 the International Peace Bureau presented to the Second Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on Disarmament concrete proposals which had been adopted by an International Symposium sponsored by the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy in the United States and the International Peace Bureau. These proposals contained a draft convention for General and Complete Disarmament. Since then many important conferences of jurists, scientists and medical experts have been held in Geneva, Amsterdam, London, Helsinki, Tokyo, New York, Greece, and Moscow, all calling for the outlawing of Nuclear Weapons.

Finally, it was decided on the initiative of Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament in Britain, in collaboration with the International Peace Bureau and a large number of supporting organisations to *create* a Nuclear Warfare Tribunal that would sit in London to take evidence and to report on the legality and morality or otherwise of nuclear weapons. This Tribunal, over which I had the honour to preside, sat in London from 2-6 January 1985. Particulars of my distinguished colleagues on this Tribunal and of the organisations which helped to make it a success will be found later in this Report. By a lucky combination of circumstances the International Progress Organisation became interested and involved in the task of the preparation and publication of the Report of the London Tribunal and have extended to us its most helpful and constructive assistance in this task. To the International Progress Organisation, to the members of the Tribunal, to all those who worked so selflessly at the preparation and conduct of the Tribunal, I would like to extend the most sincere and grateful thanks of the International Peace Bureau. The task of eliminating conflicts of Societal destruction

and doing away with nuclear weapons is no easy one. There are tremendously powerful and wealthy interests that are opposed to world disarmament. There are many military groups and many industrialists that profit from the sufferings that war imposes upon humanity. Those that work for peace are voluntary workers that have little or no resources at their disposal. Therefore a great debt of gratitude is due by the public at large to all those who have been involved in this work