

## WORLD TRIBUNE MAILBOX

### **Eliminating Nuclear Weapons**

Thank you for printing Ann Porowski's illuminating "How and Why To Eliminate Nuclear Weapons" (Dec. 13, 1996, "Perspective"), with its focus on the recent Report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons (address for a copy: Administration Bldg., Parkes Place, Canberra ACT 2600, Australia).

One small clarification: President Clinton in September 1996 signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, not a "Nuclear Disarmament Treaty." Although the CTBT almost certainly will prevent future nuclear weapons testing among its signatories (including the five declared nuclear weapons states), the treaty, ironically, probably will never officially enter into force. The reason is that India and Pakistan must sign, along with the 42 other countries possessing nuclear facilities, before official entry into force. But those two states are on record that they will not sign the CTBT — nor the current, inadequate Non-Proliferation Treaty — until the United States and the other nuclear weapons states agree to eliminate their nuclear weapons.

The abolition of nuclear weapons under worldwide mandatory inspection is definitely achievable, but it will require a nuclear weapons ban treaty which does not go into force until all states have signed and ratified it (otherwise, the United States and the other nuclear powers will not sign and will retain their nuclear weapons). Such a unanimously signed treaty banning nuclear weapons would enhance the security of the current nuclear weapons states, because so-called rogue states would be cut off from nuclear weapons development (because they signed the treaty and because of the geopolitical force of its unanimity). Security of the nonnuclear weapon states (the great majority of states) would also be increased, because they would no longer live under the threat of the current arsenals of nuclear weapons on Earth.

FRED MATTIS, Annapolis, Md.

### **Orientation, Not 'Preference'**

As a new member I find the *World Tribune* to be an excellent tool for educating new members about the organization and as a forum for sharing information. I was particularly pleased to read about the formation of the Diversity Committee (Nov. 29, 1996, *World Tribune*).

However, in educating others there has to be clear communication and/or dialogue. I have always found (as a member of the gay and lesbian community) that I am quite offended by the phrase "sexual preference."

I prefer tea over coffee, jelly over jam, but my sexual orientation is not a "preference." I hope that this will indeed raise the awareness of other members so that everyone does indeed participate in an organization where we all feel comfortable.

MICKY PIZARRO, New York

Title: Mailbox: 01/10/97  
Subject: World Tribune 01/10/97 n.3122 p.3 WT970110p03  
Author:  
Keywords: 01/10/97 January June Mailbox Opinion Organization Society Tribune World