

## GUEST EDITORIAL

### An Interview With UNEP's Chief\*

*E*gyptian-born Dr Mostafa Kamal Tolba has been associated with the United Nations Environment Programme since its inception—initially as Deputy to the first Executive Director, Maurice F. Strong, and since 1976 as Executive Director. In 1980 the now 58-years-old plant physiologist and microbiologist was re-elected to a second four-years' term of office by the UN General Assembly. Near the middle of this second term comes the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm in June 1972, which created UNEP to catalyze governments to put into effect the Conference's Plan of Action.

Dr Tolba recently undertook a gruelling tour of many of the world's capitals, inter alia with the object of stimulating governmental interest in a 'Session of a Special Character' of UNEP's Governing Council, which is to be held in Nairobi from 10–18 May 1982. Open to all UN Member States, the Session is expected to amount to a major conference to be attended by several Heads of State and many leading government ministers as well as representatives of the world's major non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Shortly before he departed on this tour, Dr Tolba (on left in accompanying photo) was interviewed on our behalf in the Executive Director's office at UNEP's headquarters on the outskirts of Nairobi, Kenya, by our special correspondent Robert P. Lamb, of Cambridge, England.—Ed.



**Q.** *What is UNEP's main purpose in holding the Session of a Special Character?*

**A.** To rekindle the spirit of Stockholm. The Session is a manifestation of the concern of UNEP, endorsed by the UN General Assembly, that the sense of urgency evident at Stockholm should not be allowed to fade away.

We are looking for a renewed commitment from all UN member states to the environmental cause. In short, we have set ourselves the objective of putting the environment back where it belongs: at the top of the international agenda for action.

**Q.** *But, in practical terms, what do you mean by a renewed commitment?*

**A.** It means, for example, that governments should make environmental considerations a top priority in their bilateral aid programmes; it means that more emphasis should be given to national environment legislation; it means that more resources should be directed to monitoring, which allows a better forecast of future environmental trends and hence establishes more confidence in planning for proper management of the environment.

**Q.** *With so many nations now being forced to make cutbacks in their spending programmes, UNEP will have to find some persuasive arguments to make them renew their commitment—financial and otherwise—to the environment.*

**A.** Well, this is where we really have to find heart. The decision-makers whom we have to convince are pragmatic statesmen, economists, businessmen, planners, and the like. These people are not interested in lectures on the importance of the environment, or in an endless string of doomsday prophecies: they want hard facts and figures to justify making a renewed commitment, and they want to see UNEP and our scientific partners in the environmental movement coming up with cost-effective solutions.

I hope that the Special Session will discredit, once and for all, the view—still held in some quarters—that environmental protection measures constitute a stumbling-block to economic development.

**Q.** *UNEP has produced a paper on what it sees as the main environmental trends for the next ten to fifteen years. Presumably UNEP would like that paper to have an important bearing on the May conference's decisions as to which*

\*Although we do not normally publish interviews, this one impressed us all as so lively and informative that we welcome it in place of the more orthodox Guest Editorial with which Dr Tolba had generously undertaken to open this issue featuring UNEP.—Ed.

areas UNEP and the environmental movement should concentrate on over that period. Which are the trends that worry you most?

A. Here you've put me in a fix. Whatever I choose is certain to hurt the feelings of some groups of countries which have different priorities from others, and even of my colleagues at UNEP who consider that their special concerns should be mine too. In truth—and this is not to side-step the question—every aspect of environmental destruction worries me.

*Environmental Conservation* readers are a special audience and I know that they share my concerns about atmospheric pollution, tropical deforestation, desertification, soil erosion, destructive coastal development, and so forth. Unfortunately, governments ten years after Stockholm are still, in many cases, not doing enough to tackle these environmental problems. So in answer to your question, I would say that what worries me most is that governments are not worried enough.

Q. Dr Tolba, you've held a cabinet post in your own Government of Egypt, and so you know that what worry governments most are such day-to-day concerns as inflation, unemployment, balance-of-payment deficits, threats to security, and so on. Surely in these circumstances it is unreasonable of you to expect nations to worry about the environmental destruction taking place in faraway lands which appears to them to be of no immediate concern?

A. I would like to underline the word 'immediate' ten times. Environmental destruction is already beginning to affect all nations. And the connection between economic well-being and the environment will become much clearer to them in the next few years.

At an obvious level, for example, all nations should be concerned about Man's impact on the atmosphere. The build-up of carbon dioxide caused by the burning of more and more oil and gas, coal, shale-oil, and tar, and by the ever-increasing destruction of the tropical forests, could result in a 'greenhouse effect' which, if it occurs, could certainly alter the climate and affect food production in all areas of the world.

Food production is dependent, too, on the conservation of much of the range of genetic material that is present in wild plants and animals. In the developed world there is not much of a home-grown meal—there, agriculture (and also the pharmaceutical and certain other industries) depend to a large extent on infusions of fresh germ-plasm imported from the genetic 'powerhouses' which, except for a part of the Mediterranean, are all located in Third World countries.

We need look no further than the Stockholm Plan to find the major cause of the environmental deterioration which destabilizes nations and creates both social and political problems for us all. This is poverty. In the Third World, steadily increasing numbers of poor are locked into a vicious circle: in their efforts merely to meet basic needs such as food, shelter, and heating, they are being forced to destroy the very resources on which their future survival—let alone any possible prosperity—depends. And as poverty bites deeper and deeper, the markets for the developed world's manufactured goods become more and more restricted.

Q. Like the authors of the Brandt Report, you appear to be arguing that unless the North helps the South to tackle their environmental problems, we'll all be worse off, both in terms of world peace and economic prosperity.

A. The aims of the North-South dialogue and—if you like—the environmental dialogue, are identical. I think one of the major developments of the previous ten years is the growing realization that we live in an interdependent world.

Ten years ago, delegates came to Stockholm preoccupied with their own national environmental problems—the developing nations with the alleged mis-use of their natural resource-base, and the industrialized nations with pollution. The understanding of, and concern for, the international dimension, was not very obvious.

Now, in the short space of time that has elapsed, much of this has changed. The three aspects I have mentioned—poverty, genetic resource-loss, and the threat to the global climate—are all international problems that require an international solution. But so, too, do desertification, marine living-resources management, tropical deforestation, disposal of toxic wastes, and other major considerations almost *ad infinitum*.

On a positive note, UNEP has been encouraged by the way in which the international community has been responding to these supranational challenges. The priority given to the environment in the new International Development Strategy; the growth in membership of the conservation conventions; the regional environment pacts: these and others can all be taken as evidence of a remarkable expansion in governments' understanding of the need for a cooperative response. I am confident that the Session of a Special Character will endorse the concept of environmental interdependence and call for international cooperation to be strengthened.

Q. Interdependence is only one area in which our perceptions of the environment have developed since Stockholm. In the preceding issue of *Environmental Conservation* your 'Important prospect' lists other areas of change, notably in the direction of alternative life-styles, interconnections, and environmental uncertainties. Does this indicate that UNEP is expecting nations attending the Nairobi meeting to rewrite the Stockholm Plan?

A. No, I do not anticipate that the May '82 Session will feel an inclination to alter in any fundamental way the Stockholm Plan of Action. Thus even a cursory glance at the Stockholm Plan reveals that many of the problems and challenges which it identified are as relevant today as they were a decade ago. It can be added to, or adapted to meet changing circumstances—but its underlying principles are immutable.

Q. Earlier you referred to UNEP's responsibility for providing the decision-makers with 'hard facts and figures'. What has UNEP been doing to meet that need?

A. UNEP two years ago launched a programme of cost-benefit evaluation of environment protection measures to be carried out by certain governments. We set a realistic target by concentrating on evaluation of pollution control

at plant level. So far we have analysed several of these government case-studies, and have attempted to distil and reformulate the experience so that others can use it.

The majority of these case-studies came from the developed nations. For example, the results of a French study on 24 pollutants revealed that the cost of pollution in 1978 came to approximately four per cent of the Gross National Product (GNP), whereas cost-benefit analysis indicated that an investment in environmental protection of between one and two per cent of the GNP could have saved those additional costs. Similar studies have produced parallel results in Italy and the United Kingdom. Further benefits of environmental protection include lower death- and sickness-rates, better productivity, and improved amenities.

It is encouraging to note how governmental demonstration that 'pollution prevention pays' has impressed some sectors of private industry. Pollution is largely a function of waste, and private companies are finding that it makes no sense to allow the waste, quite literally, to go to waste.

In Switzerland, Japan, the United Kingdom, the U.S.A., and the Federal Republic of Germany, a number of companies have increased their profits by up to 40% through retrieving pollutants. I was encouraged, too, by the preliminary findings of a study carried out by the International Labour Organization (ILO) which showed that increasingly stringent pollution control measures introduced by industrialized nations throughout the 1970s have led some industries to introduce new technology. The ILO study points out that Japan has become a leader in this field, with the result that its industry is now cleaner and more efficient than that of many other industrialized nations.

*Q. I think it is fair to say that there is a strong current of opinion in the environmental movement which considers environmental protection an ethical issue and so is not happy about its benefits being expressed in dollars and cents. Surely there is a danger that, by justifying environmental improvements and protection on cost-effective grounds, you're closing off many of the traditional arguments in favour of conservation? It's difficult, for example, to put a price-tag on pure water, fresh air, or an unspoilt landscape.*

A. This point of view is strongly represented within UNEP. To be frank, I had a hard time convincing some of my colleagues over the value of the cost-benefit approach. The preliminary results have fully vindicated the decision to go ahead with our programme of cost-benefit evaluation. Cost-benefit analysis—CBA for short—is not intended to replace the other weapons in the environmentalists' armoury, but to add one more.

CBA, however, is something of an 'infant science'—or at least it involves many imponderables, on which we're trying to shed light. The Secretariat of the OECD Environment Committee is engaged at the moment in the preparation of an environmental economics study and hopes its results can be presented to the Session of a Special Character. Taken together, these efforts will advance the state of knowledge of the subject.

If readers would like to find out just how far advanced that state of knowledge is, I would recommend them to read UNEP's newly-published paperback entitled *The Economics of Survival*,\* which summarizes our findings to date.

*Q. You appear to be able to put forward good arguments for UNEP's success in convincing the decision-makers in government of the vital importance of caring for their environment. But would you agree that UNEP in particular, and the environmental movement in general, has been rather less successful in getting that message through to the man in the street?*

A. Regretfully, Yes. Governments cannot take decisions in a vacuum: they respond to pressure from the public, and if that public is not kept well-informed through the mass media and other public information networks, then of course governmental response will be less effective than it ought to be. In other words, governments will be reluctant to give top priority to the environment unless the governed understand why they're doing it.

Here I would like to say that, were it not for the non-governmental organizations, the level of public awareness about environmental issues would be much lower than it is. However, because many of the NGOs are nationally-based, they often seem overly preoccupied with domestic issues. Of course this is understandable; but they have a responsibility, too, for linking—wherever relevant—their domestic concerns to the international dimension. UNEP is expecting representatives of all the world's leading environmental NGOs, and many others, to take part in the Session of a Special Character, and I'm hoping that many of the representatives will return home with a better understanding of the wider issues.

*Q. With regard to the NGOs, they have been among your fiercest critics—complaining, for example, that UNEP has appeared at times overly bureaucratic and has not consulted them enough. How do you respond to these kinds of criticisms?*

A. Let me say first of all that UNEP attaches the utmost importance to the NGO role in the environmental movement. The fact that the Stockholm conference was held at all owed a great deal to the pressures emanating from NGOs, and the Declaration coming out of the deliberations of their parallel Forum had an important influence on the final Plan of Action.

Of course they have criticized us (and not always without some foundation); they wouldn't be doing their job properly if they didn't. But we are a United Nations organization with all the advantages and drawbacks that implies: I think there is often not enough understanding among the NGOs of the constraints to action which we face constantly as a UN agency. We can't, for example, lambast a government for needlessly felling a stretch of forest or polluting a lake or something like that; instead, we must be more tactful and point out that it is not in their own long-term interests to take such action, while at the same time putting forward an environmentally sound alternative plan. And I'm bound to say that in many instances this 'velvet glove' approach, as opposed to the 'mailed fist', has proved a more fruitful one.

\**The Economics of Survival: The Role of Cost-benefit Analysis in Environmental Decision-making*, Ed. Yusuf J. Ahmad. UNEP Studies No. 4, United Nations Environment Programme, P.O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya: xxiv + 79 pp., US\$ 10.50, 1981.—Ed.

As for lack of consultation, that is a criticism without serious foundation. Obviously we cannot consult everyone; but IUCN, SCOPE, IIED, ICES, and indeed the Foundation for Environmental Conservation, are just a sample of the NGOs with which we work closely.

UNEP is not proud; we know our strengths and weaknesses. If we feel that an NGO knows more about a subject than us, we do not hesitate to call in their expertise. Thus, for example, when it came to producing the background papers for the draft protocol on Mediterranean protected areas, we acquired the services of IUCN which can draw upon those of most of the leading experts in this special area.

Stockholm created UNEP, but at the same time it also created the Nairobi-based Environment Liaison Centre. The ELC now represents some 6,500 NGOs in its liaison work with UNEP, and we have assigned a top priority to consulting with the ELC. Let me give one example: when the ELC sent back their comments on the first draft of the UNEP document for the Session of a Special Character, I spent several hours with their experts discussing in fine detail every point of criticism.

*Q. NGOs and the Western press have said a lot of cynical things recently about UN 'megaconferences'. Their main criticism appears to be that the end-results rarely justify the expenditure that goes in to making them possible?*

A. Yes: but it's odd, isn't it, that they always turn out in force for the conferences? I think there is very great value in bringing people from different nations together to exchange views and ideas. This is usually quite separately from the official proceedings—at NGO forums, in corridors, in hotel lobbies, and so on, where often a lot of valuable work is accomplished. Though we're expecting very many of these NGOs to turn up, as well as Heads of State, leading ministers, and high-level representatives from other agencies, the May Session of a Special Character is not a 'megaconference' in the way I think you mean.

Each year UNEP's 58-nations' Governing Council meets to review our performance over the preceding year and to chart the new course for the following year. The Session of a Special Character will give the other UN states an opportunity to have their say in deciding the course, not only for UNEP but for the entire United Nations System, and after the Session finishes its work we will carry on with the tenth meeting of our Governing Council. In other words, though we're expecting great things from the meeting, it isn't merely a get-together trying to start something new.

As for the legitimate worries over expense: well, UNEP is a poor organization and nearly all the money we're spending on this Session of a Special Character has gone into making sound preparations. The cost of travel, hotel bills, etc., will have to be met entirely by the attending governments and organizations. Of course we can't guarantee that its outcome will be satisfactory: as the proverb puts it, 'you can lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink'. However, I am very optimistic about the outcome.

*Q. Other UN Conferences in recent times have been dogged by the now-familiar cleavage of views between the 'North' and 'South' on what needs to be done and the way it should be done. Has UNEP taken any precautions to prevent this from happening in May?*

A. I don't altogether agree with this analysis. At the recent UN New and Renewable Energy Conference (UNERG) here in Nairobi, there was no difference of opinion over what the international community should be doing about new and renewables. The problems started when it came to deciding the institutional and funding arrangements to implement the Plan of Action. On this occasion we will not have those institutional problems—if only for the simple reason that they were settled ten years ago, when Stockholm established the United Nations Environment Programme and the Environment Fund to finance its activities.

But no, we have not—as you put it—taken 'precautions' to prevent a schism between North and South. When the May conference comes to deciding the areas where we should concentrate our activities over the next ten years, UNEP wants to have open and frank debates. We've been having those for the previous nine years at our Governing Councils, with the result that governments of countries, whether more or less developed, are now on familiar ground. Of course there have been differences; but at the end of each session we have emerged with a balanced programme—not with open disagreement, or, worse, a hotchpotch compromise.

*Q. One of your colleagues mentioned recently that at the May conference UNEP will be 'in the dock'. In the documentation for the conference, UNEP has presented its successes but has also been remarkably candid about its failures. Is there not a danger that this honesty—admirable as it may be—will handicap your attempt to get governments to step up their general support and financial contributions to UNEP?*

A. From the outset, first as Maurice Strong's Deputy and since then as Executive Director, I have always insisted on telling the truth. At every Governing Council we have always presented a balanced assessment of our achievements and failures. UNEP has always been strongly of the opinion that, if we fail to give a clear picture, we lose credibility with governments. And by examining the reasons for the failures, we'll know how to avoid making the same mistakes again. So in our preparations for Nairobi we have merely been carrying on that tradition.

*Q. I think it is fair to say that, even among your partners in the scientific community, few are clear about what actually your successes have been?*

A. There are two fundamental reasons for this. One has been UNEP's failure to disseminate information effectively to NGOs and 'the media'. And the second is due to the limitations imposed by the catalytic role bequeathed to us by the Stockholm Conference. In most cases we cannot take direct action—say to plant a new forest, establish a reserve, or stop a factory from issuing effluents. Our job is to persuade governments and aid agencies, industry, and other UN organizations, to make environmentally sound decisions; and when, 'at the end of the day', the time comes for giving credit, UNEP is frequently overlooked.

*Q. Can you give any concrete examples of the effectiveness of this catalytic role?*

A. I believe that one of our signal achievements, as a catalytic agency, was to promote the 1980 'Declaration on Environmental Politics and Procedures Relating to Economic Development', which was signed by the World Bank, UNDP, and seven more of the world's leading multilateral development financing agencies—which between them spend in excess of \$14 thousand millions on projects every year. The Declaration has since been followed by the establishment of a Committee of International Development Institutions on the Environment, to review and monitor its implementation. Equally encouraging was the recent declaration on environment-based development which was made by the OECD Development Assistance Committee.

UNEP is now putting a major effort into persuading nations to make a similar commitment with their country-to-country development assistance programmes. There are hopeful pointers in this respect. Both Denmark and Holland have recently approached UNEP for practical advice. And Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany have also made important commitments to sustainable development-aid assistance. A number of Arab development funds are taking a similar stand. Projects and activities approved within bilateral aid programmes should contain provisions for preparing environmental impact assessments and ensure that the cost of such assessments is included in the aid package.

UNEP is currently engaged in an activity to turn environmental impact assessments into improved management tools through defining a simplified, cost-effective format for environmental impact statements—particularly keeping the technical expertise and financial abilities of developing countries in view.

Our work on environmental impact statements is a good example of the kind of practical assistance that UNEP provides to development practitioners. Another is a detailed set of environmental guidelines which we recently produced for UNDP, covering such areas as tourism development and pesticides. These are the sort of 'invisible' activities which UNEP has been far too bashful about.

UNEP has also played a major role over the past decade in stimulating the growth of that nebulous commodity, 'environmental awareness', in government circles. The rapid increase in the number of environmental government ministries or other machineries; the explosion in national environmental legislation; the measures now being taken by close-on 40 governments to implement the recommendations of the World Conservation Strategy; the willingness of governments to participate in our Regional Seas Programme,\* the anti-dumping accord, INFOTERRA, our Global Environment Monitoring System (GEMS),† and the International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals (IRPTC),‡ have all been a source of satisfaction to UNEP.

Nevertheless, and despite these successes, this catalytic role has appeared at times a rather thankless brief. So at the Session of a Special Character we will be inviting governments to assess the effectiveness of this role. Should it be modified, or reinforced? This will be an issue for participating nations to decide.

Q. *And what do you consider to have been the major failures?*

A. Well, I've already mentioned public information. I think one of the major priorities for whoever is in charge of UNEP over the next ten years, will be to give much more attention to this activity. I think, too, that UNEP's performance in the field of support measures in such areas as training and technical assistance was not enough to meet the tremendously growing requirements.

However, I would say that some of our apparent failures can be traced to lack of support from governments in certain areas. For example, they have not been ready to provide the data needed to set up a register of radioactive releases called for by the Stockholm Plan of Action. Similarly, governments have been somewhat reluctant to conform to an important Stockholm principle which related to the use of shared natural resources. And, of course, the Stockholm call for disarmament did not receive any adequate response.

The Action Plan also contained within it some seeds of failure. Thus we can now see that, in the light of the funds which were made available, it was overly ambitious. Moreover some of the wording was imprecise. Implementation might have gone ahead more quickly if the Plan had conveyed a clearer sense of priorities.

Q. *The ninth Governing Council set a target of \$120 million for the next two years. But the indications are for a substantial deficit. What effect is this shortfall in funding having on UNEP?*

A. As of now—some months before our Special Session—we are cutting back. There is no alternative, and no firm indications that the traditionally generous support of principal donors to the Environment Fund will be maintained. There is one hopeful sign, however, namely that some nations—for example, the Swedish Government—are coming forward with increased support. There is also a concerted effort to find a way of providing additional resources for funding environmental programmes in developing countries.

Here I should say that meeting the expanding demands of the developing countries is one of the problems weighing heaviest on my mind. We've invested a great deal of time and effort over the previous ten years in convincing the Third World of the importance of the environment. In large measure we've succeeded: so now they're making a series of eminently reasonable demands on our environmental programme, only to find that we can satisfy no more than a small fraction of those requirements. It's like convincing a simple community of the need for education and then saying to that same community: 'sorry, we can't build a school, provide a teacher, or even enough textbooks'.

Moreover, going by recent trends, I'm certain that at the Session of a Special Character these nations will demand even more help from our environment programme. And in this instance we're not talking about any massive infusions of financial or technical assistance—merely the transfer of some reasonable additional resources together with ideas, guidance, and maturing experience.

\*Described on pages 43–9 of this issue by Patricia A. Bliss-Guest and its Director, Dr Stjepan Keckes.—Ed.

†Described on pages 35–41 of this issue by its Deputy Director, Dr Michael D. Gwynne.—Ed.

‡Described on pages 59–64 of this issue by Dr Alexander I. Kucherenko and its Director, Dr Jan W. Huisman.—Ed.



Dr Tolba (on right in front of UNEP emblem) looking happy as he accepts the credentials presented by the new United States Permanent Representative to UNEP, Mr Coleman Nee. Photo: Bernard Wahihia, by courtesy of Uniterria.

Q. At the recent meeting in Rome to decide FAO's programme for the next few years, there was general agreement on what has to be done and on an increased budget. But in the end some of the Western countries, which have to foot most of the bill, used their vetoes. Déjà vu for Nairobi?

A. I hope not. UNEP has made thorough preparations for this meeting. Our documents circulated to governments convey a clear message of what will happen if they fail to meet the challenge of Nairobi. They complement the messages already delivered to the international community in several other documents. I believe governments will not fail to respond to all these warnings. Deforestation, desertification, pollution, the arms race, cities growing out of control—these are only a few aspects of the insidious process of destructive development that is poised to turn our planet into a global wasteland.

Q. Perhaps doomsday prophecies like this only serve to turn nations off, and maybe that's the reason for the lack of adequate commitment?

A. UNEP is emphatically not in the doomsday business, and nor are our responsible partners in the environmental movement. In fact, the only doomsday document I can recall is the first Club of Rome Report, which has been superseded by a number of positive ones. Even the first one served as an eye-opener. If there is good news, then we're the first to tell it. In our shortly-to-be-published thousand-pages' report on the World Environment ten years after Stockholm, for example, we have found that there has been no indication—as far as available data will permit us to say—of really serious pollution of the world's open oceans, which is certainly good news for those who recall some of the alarmist predictions of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

If we see a problem, however, we do not hesitate to say what it is; we also come up with solutions to most of those problems which we see. So what we're saying to governments is: give us the means and we'll show you how to tackle the problems—how to roll back the otherwise increasing wasteland.

Mostafa K. Tolba, *Executive Director*  
*United Nations Environment Programme*  
 P.O. Box 30552  
 Nairobi, Kenya

&  
 Robert P. Lamb

#### GUEST COMMENT [on Last Issue's Stressing of Effects of Nuclear Warfare]

The latest issue of *Environmental Conservation* presented two leading views of the impact of atomic warfare—one from the standpoint of a physician, the other from that of an ecologist.\* Both are factually accurate and useful, though they contain no new insights which have not been available for some 30 years. This I can attest to as one who, in consequence of a long-time involvement with the study of the genetic effects of atomic bombs, has on a number of occasions joined knowledgeable colleagues in public testimony, later published, before various committees of the U.S. Congress (Eighty-sixth Congress, 1959; Ninety-fourth Congress, 1976), or in the preparation of documentation specifically designed for the public (Office of Technology Assessment, 1979). One of these hearings was in fact touched off when the then Secretary of Defense, J. R. Schlessinger, first introduced the concept of 'limited' nuclear war—a concept that many of us who are familiar with the consequences of nuclear war rejected as completely untenable.

These various hearings should long since have demolished any thought of recourse to nuclear war as an acceptable 'political' solution. And yet, the theme is recurrent, and articles such as those of Deans Hiatt and Westing are periodically necessary to remind the public (and Governments) what a 'no win' situation such war must surely be\*. Hopefully, the latest world-wide demonstrations of concern over the concept of nuclear war will *this time* initiate a more meaningful response of *all* the involved governments than in the past.

\*These were the two keynote papers of the stressing of 'Effects of Nuclear Warfare' in our Winter 1981 issue.—Ed.