A Peaceful World: how can we make it so?
Is it too big a job for me or my friends?

In this talk, I hope to persuade you all that working together for peace is effective.

In the United Kingdom I was often asked, why did New Zealand become so strongly anti-nuclear. I had two answers: the first was that other countries used the Pacific as their testing ground and we resented that unwelcome uninvited intrusion in our Pacific region. And the second, which I will develop later, was that we worked on this issue at a neighbourhood level, rather than the policy being formed at the level of central government only. As New Zealanders we own the nuclear weapon free policy.

The New Zealand Nuclear-Free Zone, Disarmament and Arms Control Act is almost 30 years old. It was passed in 1987. We have become focused on other urgent issues and disarmament has gone from our activity radar. Yet we live in a world of distressing violence, from violence in the home to international acts of extreme violence, which we see on our screens.

Sometimes it just seems too much and we do not know how our work might fit into a network of actions to build peace. The public discourse is on terrorism and on fear and retaliation. I want to live my remaining years positively, not in fear.

So this is an attempt to explore disarmament and peace-building and how we might contribute more effectively.

The spiritual basis for peace: three Quaker threads.

In 1987, the New Zealand Society of Friends (short explanation for non-Quakers that the term 'Friends' is also used to describe Quakers) published a strong Yearly Meeting Statement on Peace. One sentence has always stood out for me:

"The primary reason for this stand is our conviction that there is that of God in every one which makes each person too precious to damage or destroy."

That sentence alone has always provided me with the reason to work for peace.

Thread One: each person is too precious to damage or destroy.

Earlier, in 1921, A. Neave Brayshaw wrote:

"The Quaker testimony concerning war does not set up as its standard of value the attainment of individual or national safety, neither is it based primarily on the iniquity of taking life, profoundly important as that aspect of the question

is. It is based ultimately on the conception of 'that of God in every man' to which the Christian in the presence of evil is called on to make appeal, following out a line of thought and conduct which, involving suffering as it may do, is, in the long run, the most likely to reach to the inward witness and so change the evil mind into the right mind. The result is not achieved by war." (my underlining)

For me this aspect of "reaching to the inward witness" has underpinned my work in education as much as in peace. It is just as applicable to a tutor in the prison cell as much as to a teacher in the classroom.
The challenge is so much "following out a line of thought and conduct…." which will result in change. And to do this by the right means…never by war and never by imposed state force.
And it is particularly important today, when we see both deliberate and indiscriminate acts of violence on our screens, and at the same time feel powerless against the actions of corporate greed. We need to work together to reach out effectively to that of God in those who do evil.

Thread Two: To challenge evil and to build peace, we must connect with the goodness within each human being.

In 1952, the following was published by the Friends World Conference:

" Our peace testimony is much more than our special attitude to world affairs; it expresses our vision of the whole Christian way of life; it is our way of living in this world, of looking at this world and of changing this world. Only when the seeds of war – pride, prestige, and lust for power and possessions – have been purged from our personal and corporate ways of living; only when we can meet all men as friends in a spirit of sharing and caring, can we call upon others to tread the same path.

Our Christian Pacifism expressed in lives dedicated to the service of God and all his family, should be an experience from which we may speak to peoples and rulers and which transforms a negative refusal to take part in war into a positive witness to the better way. We must by study, by group discussion, and by experience of active peace work, equip ourselves with reliable knowledge to enable us not only to expound but also to apply our peace testimony."

For me this does give me and, I hope, you, a recipe for living.
By purging, "pride, prestige, and lust for power and possessions" from our personal behaviours, we can work for change.
How we work together for peace and justice will help us meet our goals.

Thread Three: To work for change effectively, we must 'walk the talk'.

In this conversation/ interaction I want to follow these three threads through an examination of meeting the challenges of living peacefully. And my reduction of these three quotes to simple threads can be challenged.

I have some difficulty with the notion of a lecture, because that assumes that I am, for this hour, the fount of wisdom and knowledge, whereas we will build a much stronger basis for wisdom by all contributing. So I will be asking you, at

different stages of this conversation, to contribute, either through jottings on the paper provided, or through sharing of responses with your neighbours.

Living peacefully at all levels of society:

Personal
Familial
Community/Workplace
National
International

How do we apply these three threads to the different levels?

You will find some formatted paper in front of you. Feel free to add your experiences and challenges as I explore mine.

Personal: My life experience, so far, has thrown up many challenges. I have never really had to face the challenge of personally taking another's life, although I have felt the weight of group decisions which may well have led to loss of life. Connecting with the goodness within each human being has, however, often been a challenge, especially in our adversarial style of political argument. And "walking the talk" often throws up many challenges, such as supporting family members and yet avoiding travel? (Unclear on the meaning of this last sentence…carbon footprint?).

My parliamentary experience was that awkward and constant compromise of clashing values. There is loyalty to the team and to the overall goal of fairness for all, even when you have doubts about the wisdom, rightness of some of the individual decisions. But to make a fuss, to stand alone might distract from the main goal. And that clash is replicated in so many workplaces. I can remember my father who was told by the editor that he could not report stories about practical support for the striking workers in 1951. He chose between losing his job and thus his ability to support a young family, and reporting the strong community support for the striking workers. (He chose the latter?) I am still not sure of how we rank our values.

Familial: As I write fresh from family gatherings over the summer, I am very much aware of my father's injunction to love your siblings, even if you do not agree with their opinions!! That is where Thread Two can be of such importance. I need to seek out that goodness and ignore their political preferences.

Community/Workplace: Probably the most important community in my life was my teaching community, in particular the schools in which I worked. As a Principal at Avonside Girls' High School, I needed to harness the collective strength of the teaching staff, and I could only do this by respecting their input into how students learnt effectively. Threads Two and Three really played a role here. We had to build a mechanism , known as shared decision-making, by which

we were each able to contribute to decisions on staffing, timetables, budget, workloads etc. As Principal I did have the ultimate responsibility, but that did not mean that I should have the power to do as I, alone, thought best.

Unfortunately within New Zealand today we appear to value the 'strong leader' and define that as someone who forces their ideas, values, viewpoints on colleagues, who are not encouraged to challenge. Whereas the ability to build an effective team always frees up ideas and energy and the goals are more easily won. Currently we have valued team leadership in our sports captains.

National: There is so much we need to do to as NZ citizens to apply these three threads.

If we really believe that each New Zealander is too precious to destroy, then we would struggle against the tide of inequality, the tide that condemns children to poor health and low educational attainment. Bryan Bruce explored that with us in last year's Quaker lecture.

Our mainstream media too would turn from celebrity focus to a focus on communities successfully making a positive difference, and demonstrate how it is possible to connect with the goodness in every one.

Our prisons would be places of hope, not despair. The programmes for change would be the emphasis, not just about keeping communities safe by throwing away the key.

As a nation, we would "walk the talk". We would not be using shonky international credits to avoid making the changes to reduce our carbon and methane emissions.

When a country sends soldiers to fight, they are implicitly saying that some lives are worth more than others. But even more importantly the country is rejecting the more difficult path of finding goodness in the enemy and through that building a pathway to peace. In recent years New Zealand appears to have joined with allied forces in Afghanistan and in Iraq more to appease the great powers than to defeat "the enemy". We would have more impact on world peace by using our waning diplomatic credit, to build the bridges which will defeat evil: to focus on that second thread.

Interesting thought. On a recent peace vigil I was aware of attitudes that the current activities of Daish (ISIS) seemed to redefine 'the enemy' in some people's minds. The 'conventional' enemy one can perhaps relate to, but fanatics pose a different set of issues.

Also with our current chairing of the Security Council do you see this as a 'waning' influence?

As for Thread Three, I fear we devalue our language. For years we have damaged our environment while boasting of being "100% pure". We rest on the laurels of being nuclear-free, and have lost national energy for peace-making.

There is so much for us to do at the national level to build a resilient society, that has the credibility "to challenge evil and to build peace".

International: The very words 'national' and 'international' are troubling me more as I get older. So many nations are creations of other powers drawing lines without knowledge of the communities. And within the world today there are some many more effective groupings among the non-government organisations, (NGOs) than among the nations themselves. (True! NGOs are re-elected every 3-4 years) At the same time, international corporations have little respect for the laws of individual nations. But for the purposes of this talk, as we look at how we build a peaceful world community, I will use the concepts of nations and NGOs to reflect on how well we are doing.

On the international stage there is little evident respect for value of individual life. New weapons and delivery systems are being built all the time…..think of drones! And there is this awful term, "collateral damage", which dehumanizes the unintended victims of bombing or other weapons. And then there is the deliberate targeting of large groups in markets, schools, churches and transport systems to instill fear in the population. There is not much evidence that as world citizens we believe that each person is too precious to damage or destroy. And yet, there has been a shift out of poverty for over 130 million people. Child mortality rates fell from 103 deaths per 1,000 live births a year to 88. (Globally?)Progress has been made on the Millenium Goals set by the UN in 2000, but the progress has been far from uniform. (Examples?)

Every day we see evidence of evil, whether through the callousness of those who exploit workers, or the acts of violence on students asleep in their dormitories or shoppers at a busy market. But we are inept at challenging that evil in such a way that we build peace. Our media focuses on fear and retribution, rarely on trying to find the "good" inside the perpetrators of such awful acts. And here is something worth pondering: President Obama is responsible for some terrible bombings and destruction, and yet I find it easy to see the good in him as a person. So, why cannot I do this with others?

At inter-government level there does not appear to be much work being done (?) at finding the connections from which to build peace. Although we have seen some excellent work with Iran. As of the very end of 2015, there is evidence that Norway is supplying Iran with natural uranium in exchange for the enriched uranium which is being sent from Iran to Russia. That is about building trust in a process. And throughout the world there are growing examples of third party peace-building. But rarely are these discussed and disseminated through main stream media. It is the work of such as Professor Kevin Clements and Otago's School of Peace and Conflict studies that are spreading the information and improving the practice world-wide. We need to get these success stories to the front of the news and comment.

Possible Action Point: Build a contributory blog with just such evidence of successful peacemaking. (Challenge to the audience?)

So at each level, we can see the difficulties of applying <u>these three threads</u>, that in my opinion underpin peace-building, but we can also sow (?) seeds of hope, that can be shared and learnt from and expanded.

Dispute Resolution:

It would be a static society, with no growth or improvement if we did not have argument. But sometimes those arguments and disputes need to be resolved and not just by a greater might or power.

So as a society, we have built systems to resolve disputes, and instead of reaching for a bigger weapon or a longer punishment, it would be helpful in rebuilding our society, if we used, expanded and improved our dispute resolution systems.

Our courts in New Zealand have varying success with dispute resolution. Mostly it is the power of the state that acts as a temporary resolution by punishing the guilty party, particularly when the offence is a criminal offence. The legal mechanism for arguing the case before a judge and or a jury focuses on the adversarial method, in which sometimes the truth is lost, or an imbalance of power, legal ability (and legal loopholes!)results in an injustice.

In civil law disputes and within family law there is much more use of mediation, again with varying positive results. But even within criminal law judgments there has developed some improvements with restorative justice conferences. They are of a mixed bag, but in my opinion need to be improved further(?) in order to embed the valuable practice.

I am involved in a local voluntary community dispute group: Dunedin Community Mediation. We have been in existence for over a year, and have averaged about a resolution a month. Disputes exist within family groups, community organisations, neighbours. Resolving them involves building trust in the mechanism and having skilled mediators with the ability to listen, to reflect and to step back appropriately to allow the disputants to find a way through for themselves. I would love to see such voluntary services grow in our communities, so that seeking mediation was the norm, rather than reaching for the rule book, or engaging the lawyer.

My experience with courts in recent years has been with Environment Courts. There the adversarial system has not always worked well, with the bigger companies being able to afford the lawyers and experts. In one such case, where four different community groups and businesses all wanted something different from a South Island river, I intended to appoint a panel of commissioners to resolve the disputed claims for water use. They would have used the inquisitorial system, rather than the adversarial, in order to equalize the chances for all points of view to be heard clearly. The main applicant withdrew and we were never able to use that system in my time.

International Courts: These come in many different shapes and with a range of jurisdictions. Rarely are they accessible to the ordinary citizen, but they may well be a way to resolve disputes without recourse to war.

The most senior court is the International Court of Justice. It was established in 1945, as the primary judicial branch of the United Nations. It

issues advisory opinions and one of particular (?)interest to the disarmament community was the advisory opinion issued in July 1996 on the legality of the threat or use of Nuclear Weapons. (Any further information on this?)

Then there is the large network of courts on Human Rights, on Crime and those courts, which adjudicate on trade.

International Forums: These are another example of nations working together at official and political levels to resolve conflicts within the area. The decision of the 2003 Pacific Islands Forum to form a Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI) was an effort to support the government and people of the Solomon Islands in restoring civil order and rebuilding the machinery of government. While its workings were not always the best example of working with people, it was a genuine attempt to restore civil order and to support departments such as Education and Community Policing, two projects that New Zealand was involved in through NZAID.

I am not an expert on the European Union, but it appears to me that its genesis was not just about trade facilitation, but also about lessening the chances of a European war again. And sadly today, the forces of the right, while wanting ease for trade, reject the joint decisions on human rights or joint support for refugees.

Perhaps the major international forum is the United Nations and its specialized agencies. I have had the chance to speak to the Security Council, and to a range of meetings called by the General Assembly. I have taken part in over night negotiations, such as we just witnessed in Paris on climate change. And I rarely felt at ease in any of the forums. As a politician, I felt very much dependent on the officials and their advice. Only on a couple of occasions was I able to speak formally but from the heart, and on those occasions I did feel able to break through to the audience. (Can you recall the issues on these occasions?) But for so much time it was like the formal moves in a courtly dance. Like many of you I read the analyses of how the French officials managed the recent Paris climate change meeting with a great deal of interest. It was like a breath of fresh air and did have a positive outcome in terms of the agreement reached. So, while the United Nations can appear paralysed by vetoes and formalities, I still have some hope for the good it can do as a peacemaker and resolution-maker. (Why do you think the Paris round worked so well?)

Disarmament and Weapons Control:

As we know from history, disputes are not always resolved or even held in check. So alongside the movement for conflict resolution on many levels, there has been the movement for Disarmament and Arms Control.

Under disarmament there is a whole debate on domestic gun control in any country. While this is very important to building a peaceful society, I am not

going to examine the issues surrounding domestic gun control, except to note that the USA gives us almost daily tragic examples of what a lack of gun/gunowner control can result in. And to also note that Australia appears to have found a successful set of rules to protect its citizens. New Zealand still has some work to do on this issue.

Until 2012, New Zealand dedicated a separate portfolio for a Minister of Disarmament and Arms Control. This was consistent with the New Zealand Nuclear-Free Zone, Disarmament and Arms Control Act of 1987. What this meant was that there was a dedicated and reasonably resourced team within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who reported directly to the Minister for Disarmament on an agreed programme of promoting disarmament in many of the international forums. As well there was a public advisory committee, (PACDAC). In my time this committee was used to discuss priorities for action at home and abroad on disarmament. Through the work of Katie Dewes, New Zealand had played a significant role in disarmament education sponsored by the United Nations. We also supported research by David Capie on the threats caused by small arms in the Pacific.
Possible Action Point: Lobby NZ Govt to have a separate Minister for Disarmament and for the team of diplomats to be strengthened.

Then there is the question of sales of small arms to states, as in the Pacific, that cannot afford the police infrastructure to enforce gun control laws, including imports.

We have a 'defence' industry in New Zealand. From memory one of the roles of the Minister for Disarmament was to determine appropriateness of exports of weapon systems to other countries. I have a memory of banning the exports to Israel of an electronic harness, which would have helped sharp shooters improve their accuracy. While this banning of an export does sound principled, the NZ company concerned was subsequently bought out by an American company and the manufacture and export was continued from there. Sometimes it does feel as though you are butting your head against the wall of the world powers, as a very small and insignificant player.

And yet citizen power can achieve change. It was the concerted actions of a coalition of non-government organizations that saw the adoption and ratification of the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition, Use, Stockpiling and Transfer of AntiPersonnel Mines and on Their Destruction. The coalition was formed in 1992 when six groups, including Human Rights Watch, Medico International, Handicap International, Physicians for Human Rights, Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation and the Mines Advisory group agreed to cooperate on their common goal to ban landmines. That original citizens' initiative gained 855,000 signatories world wide. Canada was persuaded by this largely citizen-led movement to lead the Ottawa process, whereby a Convention was negotiated and agreed to in 1997. The lesson from the Ottawa Treaty is that citizens and non-government organizations can effect change at national and international level. This campaign style was repeated with the UN Convention on

Cluster Munitions. One of the leaders of this campaign was a New Zealand woman, Mary Wareham.

(Not peace related as such, but another good recent example has been the effect of shareholder pressure on corporates in terms of fossil fuels and other governance issues)

The motivation for opposition to weapons of mass destruction was probably the appalling incidents of the Second World War when civilians were "collateral damage" or the target of a psychological warfare to destroy the spirit of the civilian population. So we had the bombing of London, Coventry: the fire-bombing of Dresden, of Tokyo, and the final dropping of the nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

There are three groupings of weapons of mass destruction (WMD): nuclear, chemical and biological.

Nuclear weapons:

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) was launched in February 1958. Shortly after in Easter 1958 the first of the Aldermaston marches was held. In those early years of the Cold War, the fear of nuclear annihilation, especially in Europe resulted in many people wanting to see unilateral disarmament of nuclear weapons. British citizens wanted to see Britain get rid of its own nuclear weapons.

But the spread of nuclear weapons continued until 1968. Up until then, USA, USSR, UK, France and China, built more and more nuclear weapons and tested them. 1968 saw the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) being opened for signing after ten years of negotiation. Of the eleven articles in this treaty, the first three articles are concerned with halting the spread of nuclear weapons. So those who had them could not help their allies to develop their own, and those who did not have them could not develop them, and there was a system of inspection through the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The fourth article was a guarantee that all countries had the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. And that there would be an exchange of technology and knowledge between those who had that knowledge and those who did not have the knowledge.

The treaty has a balance which has never been observed: those that do not have nuclear weapons agree not to acquire them, and those that have them agree that they will negotiate to disarm. The emphasis has all been on non-proliferation. And many of the sanctions against Middle Eastern nations and related invasions has been said to be about non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Article Six is worth stating in full.

> "Each of the parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

The flaw in the Treaty is obvious….there was no date by which all countries would have disarmed themselves of nuclear weapons. And nor was a body set up to verify the reduction in arms.

Articles 8 and 10 of the NPT set up a system for review and amendments to the treaty. Every five year a conference to review the treaty is held with varying success. Perhaps the greatest success was that in 1995, 25 years after the Treaty entered into force, a review was held which agreed to the indefinite extension of the treaty. Originally it had said that it would only be in force for 25 years. Perhaps they hoped that all nuclear weapons would have been disabled by then! But we still have the NPT and we still review it every five years.

Until 1968 there had never been any agreement to consider disarmament, nor to stop the spread of these weapons. A total of 190 parties have joined the treaty, including the five nuclear-weapon states. More countries have ratified the NPT than any other arms limitation and disarmament agreement.

There are some notable absentees from the signatory list: Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, India, Pakistan and Israel. Each of these four countries has developed nuclear weapons, and the inconsistency of dealing with them puzzles me. Why do some countries have economic sanctions placed on them while others are welcomed into trade treaties?

Without verification it is difficult to find accurate facts on how many nuclear weapons actually exist. In 1987 it was estimated by researchers that there were about 62,000 nuclear weapons in the world. Today that number is believed to be less than 20,000. That sounds positive….BUT this cannot be verified.

Yes, treaties have been signed between USA and Russia that set limits on the deployment of **strategic** nuclear weapons. These were the nuclear weapons that were essentially long range and aimed at targets continents away. But there has been no attempt to negotiate the reduction of the much more numerous non-strategic **(tactical)** nuclear weapons. These are shorter in range and are delivered by planes, ships, submarines. The planes and nuclear weapons are stored in a range of countries throughout the world – the nuclear umbrella. So countries which do not have nuclear weapons, host the weapons and the matching delivery mechanisms of the five nuclear powers. It is that nuclear umbrella that New Zealand opted to stay "unsheltered" by. This was such a strong stand, one that made me proud to be a citizen led by people such as Norm Kirk and David Lange.

There may well be fewer weapons, but they are being modernized, at great cost. In the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review, the Obama administration indicated that the US Air Force would retain the capability to deliver both nuclear and conventional weapons as it replaced ageing F-16 aircraft with the new F-35 Joint Striker Fighter and that a "full scope" life extension would be developed for the B61 bomb, the weapon that is currently deployed in at least six European states, "to insure its functionality with the F-35". These are not the plans of a nation preparing to disarm.

On the 20 October 2015, the USA launched a third flight test of the newly-upgraded B61-12 nuclear gravity bomb. This was seen by the US Air Force and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) as a "demonstration of effective end-to-end system performance……..(that) marks another 2015 achievement in the development of the B61-12 Life Extension Program." The NNSA states on its website that the Life Extension Program, which was launched in February 2015, allows it to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent without producing new weapons or conducting new underground nuclear tests. Life Extension efforts, at a cost of US$8billion, are intended to extend the lifetime of a weapon for an additional 20 to 30 years.
And President Obama has authorized an expansive programme of strengthening and modernizing the nuclear complex at an estimated cost of $1trillion dollars, according to a federal study in September 2014. The revamp includes requests to buy 12 new missile submarines, up to 100 new bombers and 400 land-based missiles, along with upgraded storage and development sites. And this was the president who received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2009.

The White House will argue that such modernization is because Russia is re-arming and is showing much more aggression, as witnessed in Ukraine. And the Russians military is re-arming. Russian missiles can now engage 36 targets at once, firing a total of 72 missiles.

And then we have the debate about the Trident Renewal Programme in the UK. The name Trident has been popularly used to cover the missiles, the warheads and the submarines. The current controversy is about the replacement of the submarines, and an associated nuclear power plant. The missiles will be developed jointly with the USA under the Life extension programme, and the warheads will be revisited in the 2040's.The cost of building four new submarines has risen from £20 billion in 2006 to £31 billion with an extra £10billion contingency fund, as of November 2015. Again this new expenditure, deemed inappropriate when housing and social welfare is being cut so drastically, is not in keeping with Article 6 of the NPT. This is not a country disarming itself of nuclear missiles. It may not be building brand new armaments, but it is renewing and modernizing what they have. Possibly there is a legal case that could be tested in the International Court of Justice. But also there is the internal debate which is very vigorous within the United Kingdom itself. The Scottish National Party has said that if Scotland were independent it would exclude nuclear weapons and their carriers (the submarines) from their country, which does give the UK a problem of trying to find a suitable port, given that some councils as at Portsmouth have declared an unwillingness to host the fleet. And at the moment, the UK Labour party is riven by an internal dispute among its MPs as to whether to support the renewal of Trident.

<u>Ban on testing nuclear weapons:</u>
In the history of opposition to nuclear weapons , there have been some victories along the way, even though we have not yet achieved disarmament. The first was probably the signing and coming into effect of the NPT, even with its flaws. But there has also been the limitation on testing of these weapons, after it was verified that the testing itself damaged people and the environment. And to make

this worse, tests were often carried out away from "home". Most of the USA tests were carried out in Nevada, but 109 tests were carried out in the Pacific. United Kingdom has carried out 45 tests, 21 of them in Australian territory and 24 in joint tests with USA in Nevada. France has conducted 210 tests, including in the Sahara and the Pacific. While the USSR tests were within the then USSR boundaries, the states that were the "hosts" to these tests have now become nuclear weapon free zones. From the 1960's there were several attempts to limit the testing of nuclear weapons. In September 1996 the agreement to a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was reached. The treaty bans all nuclear explosions anywhere. And an international monitoring system with 337 facilities is being established. 85% of these centres are already operational. As of May 2012 the CTBT has been signed by 183 states, of which 157 have also ratified. However for the Treaty to enter into force it needs to be ratified by 44 specific nuclear technology-holder countries. The ratification of 8 "Annex 2 States" is still needed. China, Egypt, Iran, Israel and the USA have signed but not ratified the Treaty. India, North Korea and Pakistan have not signed it. So it has been a partial victory. Since 1998 the only countries testing nuclear weapons by explosion are Pakistan, India and North Korea.

<u>Nuclear-weapon-free zones:</u>

The other positive activity has been the setting up of nuclear-weapon free zones. They have been set up by the following treaties: Treaty of Tlatelolco, Treaty of Rarotonga, Treaty of Bangkok; Treaty of Pelindaba and Treaty on a nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. As well Mongolia self-declared nuclear-weapon free status has been recognized by the United Nations. The first of these treaties was that of Tlatelolco which prohibits nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean. Mexico played a significant role in gaining this first nuclear weapon free zone. The majority of the 33 countries had signed by 1970. The Treaty of Rarotonga entered into force in December 1986. It has 13 signatories, but it does not include US territory in the Pacific, nor the French territories. The French may have done one last test in 1996. The Treaty of Bangkok was signed by 13 states and entered into force in March 1997. The Treaty of Pelindaba was opened for signing in Cairo in 1996. It did not collect the required number of signatures until July 2009. 39 of the 50 initial signatories have ratified the treaty. But it was with this Treaty that I learnt much. A young New Zealand student of international politics decided to visit as many of the southern and east African States that had not signed in order to reach the necessary number for the Treaty to come into effect. What he found on his travels was that The Ministries of Foreign Affairs in many of these countries were grossly understaffed and this issue took a low priority in getting it through a parliament or its equivalent. It was a salutary lesson, but he kept at it and was rewarded with successfully persuading enough countries to make this a legislative priority that the treaty came into effect in 2009. Again an individual can make a difference. Why Pelindaba was important for the Nuclear-weapon free zone, was that with its coming into force, the Southern Hemisphere was nuclear-weapon free.

Probably the Treaty of Central Asia was a clear rejection of this warfare from countries where nuclear tests had been carried out. 5 new states agreed a treaty to declare themselves free of nuclear weapons: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. At least three of those countries had

had nuclear test explosions on their territories. The people and environment of Kazakhstan have been irrevocably damaged by nuclear weapons tests.

The staunchest nuclear weapons free zone is Mongolia, surrounded as it is by two nuclear powers, Russia and China.

As well the Antarctic, the Moon, Outer Space and the Seabed have been declared no-go areas for nuclear weapons.

The UN Secretary-General has added his voice to those of many activists to encourage the Middle East to form a nuclear-weapons free zone. This issue was very important in the NPT Review Conference last year.

I have attended one meeting in Denmark where the eight bordering countries were represented to discuss the possibility of an Artic nuclear weapons free zone.

The "nuclear-weapon free zone" has been a useful tool in spreading the opposition to nuclear weapons.

<u>The three conferences on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons:</u>
Worrying that the attempts at disarmament were becoming bogged down in procedural debates, three successive conferences have been held in Oslo, March 2013; in Nayarit, February 2014 and in Vienna in December 2014. These three conferences have addressed the humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, including effects on human health, the environment, agriculture and food security, migration and the economy.

There were delegates from 158 states, the United nations, the Red Cross and Red crescent movement, civil society organisations and academia at the Vienna conference.

The Vienna conference built upon the fact-based discussions at the first two 'Humanitarian' conferences.

Among the key conclusions were the following:

- The impact of a nuclear weapon detonation, irrespective of the cause, would not be constrained by national borders and could have regional and even global consequences, causing destruction, death and displacement as well as profound and long-term damage to the environment, climate, human health and well-being, socioeconomic development, social order and could even threaten the survival of humankind.
- The scope, scale and interrelationship of the humanitarian consequences caused by nuclear weapon detonation are catastrophic and more complex than commonly understood. These consequences can be large scale and potentially irreversible.
- The use and testing of nuclear weapons have demonstrated their devastating immediate, mid- and long-term effects. Nuclear testing in several parts of the world has left a legacy of serious health and environmental consequences. Radioactive contamination from these tests disproportionately affects women and children. It contaminated food supplies and continues to be measurable in the atmosphere to this day.
- As long as nuclear weapons exist, there remains the possibility of a nuclear weapon explosion. Even if the probability is considered low, given the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear weapon detonation, the risk is

unacceptable. The risks of accidental, mistaken, unauthorized or intentional use of nuclear weapons are evident due to the vulnerability of nuclear command and control networks to human error and cyberattacks, the maintaining of nuclear arsenals on high levels of alert, forward deployment and their modernization. These risks increase over time. The dangers of access to nuclear weapons and related materials by non-state actors, particularly terrorist groups, persist.

- There are many circumstances in which nuclear weapons could be used in view of international conflicts and tensions, and against the background of the current security doctrines of States possessing nuclear weapons. As nuclear deterrence entails preparing for nuclear war, the risk of nuclear weapon use is real. Opportunities to reduce risk must be taken now, such as de-alerting and reducing the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines. Limiting the role of nuclear weapons to deterrence does not remove the possibility of their use. Nor does it address the risks stemming from accidental use. The only assurance against the risk of a nuclear weapon detonation is the total elimination of nuclear weapons.
- No state or international body could address in an adequate manner the immediate humanitarian emergency or long-term consequences caused by a nuclear weapon detonation in a populated area, nor provide adequate assistance to those affected. Such capacity is unlikely ever to exist. Coordinated preparedness may nevertheless be useful in mitigating the effects including of a terrorist event involving the explosion of an improvised nuclear device. The imperative of prevention as the only guarantee against the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons use was highlighted.
- Looking at nuclear weapons from a number of different legal angles, it is clear that there is no comprehensive legal norm universally prohibiting possession, transfer, production and use. International environmental law remains applicable in armed conflict and can pertain to nuclear weapons, although it does not specifically regulate these arms. Likewise, international health regulations would cover effects of nuclear weapons. The new evidence that has emerged in the last two years about the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons casts further doubt on whether these weapons could ever be used in conformity with IHL. As was the case with torture, which defeats humanity and is now unacceptable to all, the suffering caused by nuclear weapons use is not only a legal matter, it necessitates moral appraisal.
- The catastrophic consequences of a nuclear weapon detonation event and the risks associated with the mere existence of these weapons raise profound ethical and moral questions on a level transcending legal discussions and interpretations.

I could go on and on about the numerous conferences, treaties, partially successful agreements, But I have this awful sense that this is all very remote from peoples' every day lives. We want a world free of nuclear weapons. Some of us are excited by really clever diplomatic skills as just shown in the deal with Iran. But somehow, as ordinary citizens, we do not seem to fit into these processes. In my time as Minister for Disarmament, I did express these concerns,

but for the diplomats and NGOs involved on a daily basis, my concerns did not seem real. For them this is their all consuming daily work. For the teachers, nurses, carpenters amongst us, it is not our daily focus. And somehow we have to bridge that gap and thus give strength to our professional negotiators.

Remember I argued at the beginning that one reason for New Zealand fiercely retaining its nuclear weapon free status, was that this was discussed and argued in big and small towns across the nation. We used to grin at signs that said that this school or small town was nuclear-free…but what was being expressed was the conviction of the locals, not just of government at the national level. Although, today, I worry that a new generation, not faced by tests in the Pacific, sees nuclear warfare as a remote possibility, more remote than the certainty of climate change.

So, today in 2016 where are we in our journey to a world of peace?

The Down Side:

We still have weapons of mass destruction.

There are fewer strategic nuclear weapons, but there are far more effective tactical nuclear weapons that are more mobile in submarines, on rail, on planes and maybe one day attached to drones.

We know that we do not have the capacity to address in an adequate manner the immediate humanitarian emergency or long-term consequences caused by a nuclear detonation in a populated area.

The mechanisms such as the NPT Review Conference and the Conference of Disarmament (CD) are in stalemate and seem unable to achieve consensus to build an agreed process to achieve nuclear disarmament.

165 states have signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, and consequently the treaty entered into force in April 1997. Since the signing there have been fewer reported case of the use of chemical weapons. But recently these weapons were used by the current Syrian government in its civil war. The stockpile of chemical weapons has since been destroyed, although some recent doubt has been cast as to whether 100% of the stockpile has been destroyed and even whether some is now in the hands of other combatants in this war.

110 states have signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction. The Convention entered into force in March 1975. And there has been no proven example of use of biological weapons.

Cluster munitions are prohibited by those 118 states that signed the Convention . The Convention entered into force in 2010. But the Convention has not been signed by Syria or Saudi Arabia. Both these governments have been suspected of using them in the last three years.

And then there has been the campaign on depleted uranium. Peter Low worked very hard on this issue, and, as Minister, I could never find any proof that depleted uranium was the cause of so many health problems in Iraq. I should have done some more of my own reading, because now as I read up on the problem, I see that those disbelieving of the problems caused by the use of depleted uranium, are those whose weapons use it for greater penetration.

As I write it is argued that North Korea has tested a hydrogen bomb. The problem here is trying to find a way into negotiation with North Korea….Thread Two…connecting with the goodness within each human being.

More and more around the world there are groups with access to powerful weapons who are not armies belonging to one state. They are often known as "non-state actors". As such they fall outside the normal means of inter-nation negotiations and agreements. We see such groups in operation in Nigeria, Mali, Syria, Libya. We need to learn and support any work that is developing ways of interacting with such groups, in the interests of peace-building.

The fear has been that such "non-state actors" have gained access to many powerful weapons. Abdul Qadeer Khan, a Pakistani scientist was alleged to have been part of a network that sold nuclear information to Iran, North Korea, Libya and other nations and groups. Although that was a famous case highlighted by USA, not so well understood has been that production and export of arms has often resulted in powerful modern arms being in the hands of small militant groups. Of note is the large amount of arms in Iraq, following the invasion in 2003.

The Guardian reported in January 2016 that arms sales from the UK have not been subject to independent scrutiny for more than nine months. The watchdog committee ceased its work following the retirement of its chair, Sir John Stanley. Amnesty International say more than 100 licences for arms exports to Saudi Arabia have been issued since bombing in Yemen began in March 2015, with a value of £1.75billion.

The export of arms has now reached the highest figure since the end of the COLD War : a total of US$92.8 billion. The largest exporter is the United States with 44.7% of the total exported, followed by Russia (15%), France (8.5%), Germany (5.8% and UK (3%). And these are legitimate sales of conventional arms. These figures exclude those found in abandoned garrisons around the battlefields of the world.

And the last piece of bad news has been the growth of autonomous weapons such as drones and robots and the continuing research on how they may be

deployed. Ranged against their use is a band of academics and activists, many joined together in the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots.

That is a very depressing downside, and I am sure that more could be added. But we cannot ignore the signs of hope and effective resistance.

The UpSide!!:

As New Zealanders we have a strong history of peace-building.

Perhaps one of the first were the people of Parihaka and their non-violent resistance to the wrongful attack on their land and pa.

Archibald Baxter and his fellow pacifists are now well known for their courageous stand against fighting in World War One. Field Punishment #1. White feathers and the public attitude to pacificism

But there are many whose work for peace has been forgotten. In 1909 the Defence Act was passed by the New Zealand Parliament. It introduced compulsory military training for boys between 12 and 30 years of age. It was opposed by the Religious Society of Friends, the New Zealand Freedom League and the national Peace Council. Ada Wells is a familiar name from these struggles.

One of New Zealand's most enduring peace groups is the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, founded in 1916. 1915?

By the end of the Second World War, 800 men were held in camps as conscientious objectors. Speaking or writing for peace was banned. So speakers for pacifism were banned and faced three month prison sentences with hard labour.. Connie Jones was one of those arrested as was Ormond Burton. Also loss of civil rights for COs still in place in the 1960's.

After the bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, many realized that with these new weapons all could be affected by war. Amongst the first to formulate a protest against nuclear weapons were the Quakers. In 1957 they knocked on 10,000 doors in Auckland with their petition. Three quarters of those they approached signed the petition.

This was when Elsie Locke became publically involved in the peace movement. Her support was Mary Woodward, an Auckland based Quaker who died quite recently and who set up the New Zealand Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in 1960. Elsie's children have also worked all their lives within the peace movement: Maire Leadbetter and Keith Locke.

Owen Wilkes worked hard to persuade us about New Zealand's role in international spying, all of which has been accepted as normal with the knowledge of our role in the Five…….campaign.

Quaker roles in the UN (QUNO) and Palestine.

Kevin Clements and Richard Jackson are the two Professors at Otago's Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. Kevin has a world-wide reputation around conflict resolution between warring groups, nations. Richard's recent book, "Confessions of a Terrorist" is an exercise in having the reader connect with goodness.

Katie Dewes and her husband, Commander Green have played a significant role here and worldwide , with education about nuclear weapons, disarmament and with education about conflict resolution applied in schools and communities.

Two of today's contributors from New Zealand are Mary Wareham and Alyn Ware. Mary leads Human Rights watch's advocacy against weapons that do harm to civilian populations. She worked brilliantly on the campaign to outlaw cluster bombs and is now co-ordinating the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots. Alyn Ware is the global Co-ordinator for Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non Proliferation and Disarmament.(PNND).

And when you add the work of Norman Kirk, Marilyn Waring, David Lange and Helen Clark…we have a legacy that is worth honouring by re-energising our work for peace.

And that is just part of the New Zealand story….

Outside of New Zealand, we have the powerful voices of the Hibakusha, the surviving victims of the 1945 bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Despite poor health, they continue to tell their story.

The people of Kazakhstan now tell their story to highlight the dangers of nuclear weapons and testing. Their country when it was part of the Soviet Union was used to carry out 456 tests on nuclear weapons. 340 were underground, but 116 were atmospheric explosions. There were 250,000 people living in the area. Today 10% of the population have health problems related to these tests. In 2012 the President of Kazakhstan launched the ATOM project for a permanent end to nuclear weapons testing.

And in USA we have the example of the three peace activists who splashed blood on the walls of the bunker building holding weapons-grade uranium in 2012. One of their number was Sister Megan Rice, aged 85. Age is no excuse! We are always able to do something!

Earlier I raised the issue of small arms, which in certain circumstances can create massive disruption for a civilian population. In Libya and in Sierra Leone there are groups working to solve the problems caused by ease of access to small arms. In Sierra Leone after a civil war lasting 11 years, the government is granting a three month amnesty for people to hand in their weapons. In Libya, currently struggling with many armed groups loyal to themselves and not to the state as such, women have begun a programme with women as agents of change against small weapons. So these are examples of two communities working hard to eliminate the dangers associated with the profusion of small arms in the community.

Both Myanmar(Burma) and Colombia have seemingly ended internal violence. Both countries suffer from the planting of landmines and now they need to be cleared. The work is about to begin with both communities. Land cleared of mines becomes available for agriculture and settlement and helps return a broken society to peace. We have seen examples of that in Kosovo and Serbia, in Mozambique and in Cambodia.. And it is to the credit of serving officers

in NZ Army who have an international reputation for mine clearance…both actual de-mining and then training the local people how to do this safely.

Throughout, I have explained how some of the processes towards international disarmament are in stalemate. But there is always some hope, some project in hand.

Following the failure of the NPT Review Conference in 2015, it was agreed that an open-ended working group would be established by the UN to establish effective measures for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-free world. That group begins work in 2016.

Following the Vienna Conference there has been discussion about building a raft of ways forward, "building blocks". These include a nuclear weapons convention (i.e. a treaty which includes all nuclear-armed states); a framework agreement; a ban treaty(as an interim measure) or a hybrid arrangement containing a number of measures. In other words rather than argue which is best the NGOs and officials are trying to find a way forward that works.

And then there is the case that the Marshall Islands has taken to the International Court of Justice demanding that the Court instruct the nuclear weapon states to initiate multilateral negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention within one year of the court's judgment. So far three of the nine states possessing nuclear arsenals, the UK, India and Pakistan have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. So the case continues with those three countries. China notified the Court that it declines to accept the Court's jurisdiction in this matter. Proceedings on the merits of this case could take at least another two or three years. But it is all pressure.

So, what can we do?

First let's look back at those three threads and focus on how we might apply them to our immediate lives on personal, familial and community levels.

(Pause here for suggestions)

Have you been made aware this evening of aspects of the disarmament work or the dangers around nuclear weapons that you were not aware of before. And I have not even talked of the injuries and loss of life incurred in nuclear weapon development as recorded in USA. If there is material new to you, then we need to talk more about these issues. I get most of my information through the Disarmament Digest, which is compiled by the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs. But we need to write letters, or articles for our local papers. Working together in small groups to do this increases one's confidence and acts as a good copy editor. I am thinking of blogging at least once a week on various disarmament issues.

We need to inform ourselves so as we can challenge the culture of fear and blame. That is why I so appreciated Richard Jackson's work/novel. Back in the days of being a Labour MP we went to summer holidays with instructions in our ears of what to introduce in the barbecue conversations. We need to do this too. If our forebears could go to jail because they stood in downtown Wellington to speak about pacifism, then we should be able to introduce issues at the pub or the dinner table.

And then there are some campaigns to launch or support:

Where is New Zealand's voice on Disarmament? Where is a Minister for Disarmament?

We should have a strong and well resourced team dedicated to disarmament? (compare the numbers on this with trade?)

Where are our NZ troops deployed, including the SAS? Do we support this? If not, how do we make this known?

Are we happy being part of this information-sharing agreement?

Can we develop support for a campaign on killer robots, as well as highlighting those who are still using cluster bombs and chemical weapons?

How can we support Marshall Is. in its case to the International Court of Justice?

Why do we not seek to meet with every NZ member of parliament to discuss the issues we have thought about this evening and to find out where they stand on nuclear disarmament and ask why they are not members of PNND?

Marian L.Hobbs
11th January 2016