

PS&D Policy Background Paper

Revised December 2022

Context and Policy Principles

The introduction to the Philosophical Basis of the Green Party states that:

“A system based on inequality and exploitation is threatening the future of the planet on which we depend, and encouraging reckless and environmentally damaging consumerism.

A world based on cooperation and democracy would prioritise the many, not the few, and would not risk the planet’s future with environmental destruction and unsustainable consumption.”

All Green Party policies should define a path from a system based on inequality and exploitation to the world based on cooperation and democracy, defence and security policy is no exception; it must actively promote peace by working against the factors that destroy peace. These are recognised in our philosophical basis. .

The fact that many people's basic needs are not met has far reaching consequences. This is expressed as anxiety, insecurity, and aggressive behaviour towards others, and exploitation of their environment. These personal factors give rise to and are then perpetuated by, social institutions which actively encourage oppression, pollution, resource depletion, poverty and military conflict. [PB110]

Society should guarantee access to basic material security for all and should provide a wide range of opportunities for personal fulfilment in both a material and non-material sense. If hardship is even a possibility, a sense of insecurity will prevent individuals from acting in accordance with ecological constraints. A guarantee of security will not ensure voluntary ecological behaviour, but it is a necessary precondition. (PB308).

Conflict is a natural part of life and it is vital that we develop equitable ways of resolving conflicts so that they do not lead to war, terrorism or exploitation. Attempts at addressing conflicts between people have varied in efficacy and moral justification. There has been a predominance of peace-enforcement over prevention of violent conflict in terms of priority and expenditure by developed nations, including our own. In the current climate of unrestrained competition for resources and economic advantage, there has been little or no attempt to resolve conflicts by coming to equitable compromises between conflicting interests. .

The resort to war to resolve conflict leads to environmental damage alongside the human suffering resulting from it. War damage includes pollution of air, water and soil, the destruction of society's valuable infrastructure, creation of millions of tons of rubble and widespread damage to food production and wildlife habitats and ecosystems. There are also many toxic remnants of war that cause long term damage to human health and to our natural life support system. Military training, development and production of military equipment is responsible for significant impact on the environment through its emissions and consumption of resources.

Our security policy looks for non-violent solutions to conflict situations that will take into account the interests of all human beings, including powerless minorities and future generations, in order to achieve lasting settlements and peace. We believe that military spending should be gradually reduced and re-channelled into meeting social and environmental challenges that represent current and potential flashpoints for conflict.

Policy Aims:

1. To be congruent with the values of the Green Party
2. To mitigate the risks posed by human conflict and actively promote peace.
3. To develop security measures in cooperation with other countries to build trust, to prevent destructive conflict, and to help build a just local and global society based on a more equitable distribution of resources'.
4. To be consistent with international law, the Geneva Convention and the Charter of the United Nations.
5. To ensure that any military response and expenditure is in line with the scale of the threat to national or international security and is explicitly approved by Parliament.

Peace-building

Policies will be prioritised that will actively promote peaceful relations between the diverse societies of the world. Where it is possible, potential adversaries will be drawn into common security frameworks that enhance all parties' security.

Peace is not simply an absence of war. Building peace is an active process that requires explicit policy. Peace building includes defence, but also recognises that peace cannot be achieved without the recognition of the rights of other countries and their people to security.

A peace-building approach to security is based on:

- Mutual security between nations, recognising that people of other nations have the right to the same level of personal and national security as our own nation and that we cannot be truly secure when other nations are not. This is

- not new but is increasingly obvious, since the biggest threats to the security of all are the global crises of the climate and nature.
- Material security for all people, recognising that when material needs are not met, conflicts arise that can lead to aggression, violence and destruction of the natural and human-made environment (PB110 and PB308).

To build peace we must accept that conflicts occur and seek equitable ways of resolving them, promoting greater equality and opportunity for all within civil society and building cooperative and supportive relationships with other countries.

As part of peace-building, UK diplomatic missions should be given appropriate resources and training to enhance diplomacy and the building of positive relations with their host countries based on trust, mutual respect and understanding.

Building peaceful societies requires countering corruption and building effective law and order systems. The [UN Convention Against Corruption](#), to which the UK is a party, recognises corruption as an international phenomenon that undermines the institutions and values of democracy, ethical values and justice and jeopardises sustainable development and the rule of law

The UK should make greater use of its diplomatic service to collect evidence for violations or breaches of UN resolutions to submit to the UN.

Armed Conflict

Where it is not possible to resolve conflicts peacefully, the aim will be to deliver a defensive, proportional and legal response to hostile acts.

Defence is the protection of the homeland against attack; it does not include preemptive attack or military operations to further economic interests. Securing defence requires an appropriately trained and equipped military force that should not be developed or used in any way to put either global or personal security at risk.

In International Humanitarian Law, the principle of **proportionality** prohibits attacks against military objectives which are “expected to cause incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians, damage to civilian objects, or a combination thereof, which would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated”. Green Party policy should take into account the right of other nations to the same level of security as our nation and the need for common security when determining what damage is proportionate to the achievement of military objectives.

Geneva Conventions and UN resolutions

The Green Party is wholly committed to the [Geneva Conventions](#), and to the principle of rules-based conflict defined as **International Humanitarian Law** (IHL). IHL is a set of

rules that seek for humanitarian reasons to limit the effects of armed conflict. IHL protects persons who are not or who are no longer participating in hostilities and it restricts the means and methods of warfare.

We abhor the use of torture, infanticide, extraordinary rendition, and sexual violence as a weapon of war. The Green Party will never sanction any of these, and will work for international cooperation on ending these practices.

According to the [UN Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment](#), **torture** is

any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.

According to the [All Party Parliamentary Group on Extraordinary Rendition](#), **extraordinary rendition**:

describes the process by which a detainee is transferred from one state to another, outside normal legal processes (such as extradition or deportation). In many cases these detainees are transferred to secret detention or to a third country for the purposes of interrogation, often in circumstances where they face a real risk of torture.

The Green Party will press for the full implementation of UN Security Council resolutions which recognise the use of **rape as a weapon of war** as a war crime and a crime against humanity, and call for the special training for peacekeepers in protecting women and girls in conflict situations.

[SCR 1820](#) (2008) acknowledges that sexual violence, when used as a tactic of war, can be a threat to international peace and security. Rape and other forms of sexual violence are no longer considered an inevitable by-product of armed conflict and, depending on the context, may constitute a war crime, a crime against humanity or an act of genocide.

Since then resolutions [SCR 1888 \(2009\)](#), [SCR 1889 \(2009\)](#) / [SCR 1960 \(2010\)](#), [SCR 2106 \(2013\)](#), and [SCR 2467 \(2019\)](#) have expanded on SCR 1820, defining the responsibilities of parties in an armed conflict as well as authorities in countries hosting refugees to protect women and girls from sexual violence and exploitation. The resolutions affirm the principle of command responsibility in that military and civilian leaders must

demonstrate the will to prevent sexual violence and end the impunity that sends a message that sexual violence during conflicts is tolerated or even weaponised. .

The Green Party supports full implementation of [UN Security resolution 1325](#), calling for greater involvement for women in conflict resolution and post-conflict peace building.

SCR 1325 was adopted in October 2000. It is the first resolution to link women to the peace and security agenda and acknowledge the need for women's active and effective participation in peace-making, including peace processes and peacebuilding. It comprises four pillars:

1. The role of women in conflict prevention;
2. Women's participation in peacemaking and peacebuilding;
3. The protection of women's rights during and after conflict; and
4. Women's specific needs during repatriation, resettlement, rehabilitation, reintegration and post-conflict reconstruction.

Since the adoption of SCR 1325, further resolutions have been adopted calling for women's active and effective participation in peace-making and peace-building. All have expressed concern at the lack of progress in including women in post-conflict

The Green Party supports implementation of [SCR 2475](#) Protection of the rights of **people with disabilities** in areas of armed conflict and recognition of the need for people with disabilities to have a full role in conflict prevention and post-conflict peace-building.

The report [Unshielded, Unseen: The Implementation of UNSC Resolution 2475 on the Protection of Persons with Disabilities in Armed Conflict in Yemen](#) documents the serious failure to implement SCR 2475 in a conflict where [UK-made weapons](#) are used by the Saudi-led coalition.

Domestic legislation and International Humanitarian Law

The Green Party opposes any domestic legislation designed to limit the prosecution of UK military personnel, government ministers or officials for breaches of international humanitarian law.

The **Overseas Operations Act** became law in 2021. The Bill originally proposed that where five years had elapsed, there would be a presumption against the prosecution of UK service personnel where they were alleged to have committed international crimes, including torture, grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions, Crimes against Humanity, and even genocide. This was challenged in the House of Lords as breaching commitments under the Geneva Convention and other international human rights laws, and government accepted amendments to exclude any international crimes from the

scope of the Bill. This means that where British personnel commit criminal offences that do not amount to international crimes then there will still essentially be a five year statute of limitations

Part 2 of the Act still enacts a limitation period for bringing civil claims relating to overseas operations of six years, which would make it much more difficult for survivors of torture to bring a legal claim against the British government where there has been torture or ill-treatment, and for some reason a claim is not brought promptly.

Alliances and Treaties

European Union

Foreign policy (including defence and security) was not included in the UK-EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement. Cooperation between the UK and the EU is fragmented, with bilateral cooperation or cooperation with smaller groups of EU states involved in cooperation

This briefing from the think-tank Centre for European Reform describes the limitations of post-Brexit cooperation on defence and security
<https://www.cer.eu/publications/archive/policy-brief/2021/eu-foreign-security-and-defence-policy-co-operation#section-6>

OSCE

The [Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe](#) [OSCE] is a forum for political dialogue on a wide range of security issues and a platform for joint action to improve the lives of individuals and communities. Established by the [Helsinki Accords](#) in 1975, the organisation uses a comprehensive approach to security that encompasses the politico-military, economic and environmental, and human dimensions. It has 57 participating states in Europe, North America and Asia.

With its [Institutions](#), expert units and network of [field operations](#), the OSCE addresses issues that have an impact on our common security, including arms control, terrorism, good governance, energy security, human trafficking, democratisation, media freedom and national minorities.

Common Security refers to building security between nations through international law, diplomacy and conflict resolution. It is based on the notion that national security cannot be achieved or sustained by threatening or reducing the security of other nations, but only by ensuring that the security of all nations is advanced.

The [Common Security 2022 Report](#) produced by the Olof Palme International Centre, establishes six new principles for common security:

1. All people have the right to human security, freedom from fear and freedom from want.
2. Building trust between nations and peoples is fundamental to peaceful and sustainable existence.

3. There can be no common security without nuclear disarmament, strong limitations on conventional weapons and reduced military spending.
4. Global and regional cooperation, multilateralism and the rule of law are crucial to tackling many of the world's challenges.
5. Dialogue, conflict prevention and confidence building measures must replace aggression and military force as a means of resolving disputes.
6. Better regulation, international law and responsible governance need to be extended to cover new military technologies such as the realms of cyberspace, outer space and artificial intelligence.

The [OSCE Parliamentary Assembly](#) has the remit of establishing cooperation between parliamentarians in the 57 participating states.

At the OSCE PA civil society consultation session, held in June 2022, a briefing paper for annual assembly held in Birmingham in July 2022, a group of parliamentary delegates from Cyprus, Netherlands, Switzerland and the United Kingdom proposed that the Assembly, in its [Birmingham Declaration](#):

- **Re-affirm** the Reagan-Gorbachev dictum that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, and urge all nuclear armed and allied states to implement this through no-first-use declarations and agreements, and by further reducing the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines.

This amendment was accepted and included in the declaration

- **Encourage** OSCE States to implement the disarmament obligation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) by ending investments in the nuclear weapons industry, ending the production of nuclear weapons, and committing to the global, verified elimination of nuclear weapons no later than 2045, the 75th anniversary of the NPT.

This amendment was not accepted, but the following two clauses were included:

- **Encourage** all participating States to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons of 2017 in light of the deterioration of critical nuclear security, which could have dire consequences for the OSCE region and beyond;
- Condemns the Russian Federation's threatening nuclear rhetoric, recalls that the five nuclear-weapon States, including the Russian Federation, have affirmed that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, and calls on all States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to recommit to the treaty's Article VI

on nuclear disarmament, with the ultimate goal being a security environment that allows for a world without nuclear weapons;

The proposals above were originally circulated to OSCEPA delegates in a [PNND briefing paper](#), and presented to the [OSCEPA civil society consultation session](#) on June 10 by former PNND Co-President Uta Zapf and PNND Global Coordinator Alyn Ware.

The PNND paper gives warning of the increased risks of nuclear war arising from the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and highlights the important role of the OSCE to help develop '*security for all through conflict resolution, trust-building, protecting human rights and advancing democracy*'.

United Nations

The United Nations Organisation was founded in 1945 with the stated purposes of [maintaining international peace and security](#), developing friendly relations among nations and achieving international cooperation.

The United Nations Organisation has a wide remit and has agencies that address many of the issues in the wider ranging view of security that the Green Party shares – including promoting sustainable development and responding to humanitarian crises

The power of veto on UN Security Council is the most controversial aspect of the UN. The five permanent members, US, Russia, China, UK and France have veto power over resolutions. The Green Party supports wide-ranging reforms to the Security Council, which would involve abolishing not just the veto but also the permanent seats on the council.

In the short-term the Green Party supports the proposal put forward by Liechtenstein in April 2022, which would require greater accountability from states using the veto.

<https://www.passblue.com/2022/04/26/liechtensteins-veto-initiative-wins-wide-approval-at-the-un-will-it-deter-the-major-powers/>

NATO

The full text of the North Atlantic Treaty is here:

https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

The Green Party has for many years had a policy aim of leaving NATO. In particular, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, we believe that there was an opportunity to review an alliance that was formed as an adversary to the Soviet Union.

Article 12 of the NATO founding treaty (4 April 1949) states:

"After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This clearly recognises that changes in the international situation and the development of other peace and security structures may call for the treaty to be revisited. It was a huge missed opportunity that this did not happen at the end of the Cold War.

As we are developing the policy during a time of armed conflict in Europe, an immediate aim to leave NATO did not seem appropriate though many have serious reservations about membership of NATO. The policy working group has, therefore, included a number of reforms to NATO that should be sought:

- A commitment to a 'No First Use' nuclear weapons policy, while pursuing near term global nuclear disarmament, and fostering the same policies in non-NATO countries
In late 2021, a [letter from a group of NATO country parliamentarians to President Biden](#) supported adoption of No First Use. Biden actually committed to this in his election campaign but now appears to be backing off.
- A greater focus on outreach and dialogue to support global peace-building, solidarity and connections, based on democratic and inclusive values
- A commitment to upholding human rights in all NATO's actions and operations; although this should not be seen as a justification for unilateral military intervention.
- An end to fixed minimum level of military spending by each member state to be replaced with a flexible level set by consensus that will reflect the current military and strategic landscapes.

Other Treaties

Antarctica

The [Antarctic Treaty](#) was signed in 1959 by 12 countries. It now has 54 parties. Its provisions include:

- Use of the Antarctic only for peace purposes
- Freedom on scientific investigation in the Antarctic
- Free exchange of scientific observations in the Antarctic

Outer Space

The [Outer Space Treaty](#) limits the use of space to peaceful purposes. It forbids the placing of nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction on celestial

bodies and into outer space in general. It also states that outer space and celestial bodies cannot be appropriated. However, since then there have been many apparent violations both of the prohibition of military use of space and the appropriation of space for commercial ends.

[Orbital debris](#) is a growing problem. Even if no more objects were launched into space, collisions will cause more creation and fragmentation of debris. Destruction of satellites that are no longer in use has added to the problem.

[Deorbiting](#) of satellites means bringing them back to earth rather than breaking them up or leaving them in space. There are several methods of deorbiting currently being developed.

Conversion of military technology

An imaginative programme of arms conversion could use many of the skills and resources at present tied up in the arms trade and the military, to create new jobs and produce socially useful products. Conversion would also free research and development expertise and capital. New renewable energy industries, for instance, could be set up in the same area and use the same skills and resources as the existing arms industries e.g. wave power (shipbuilding), wind power (aerospace) and tidal power (power engineering).

The Lucas plan, produced by the workers at Lucas Aerospace in 1976. It detailed many technologies, such as wind turbines and air- and ground-source heat pumps. In 2018, a documentary “The Plan” was made that looked at the relevance of the plan today in building a green economy.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Lucas_Plan

<http://theplandocumentary.com/>

<http://lucasplan.org.uk/>

Security

The Green Party maintains that the concept of security cannot be limited to national security or even to a concept international security defined by the absence of war and maintained by military preparedness.

We support the concept of [Human Security](#) as defined in [UN General Assembly resolution 66/290](#) which states that

“human security is an approach to assist Member States in identifying and addressing widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their people.” It calls for “people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented responses that strengthen the protection and empowerment of all people.”

The greatest threats to security today are the global crises of climate and nature. We support the [Hague Declaration on Planetary Security](#), which puts forward an action plan to face the security challenges of these crises.

The [Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2022](#) highlights that:

- The climate emergency and the systemic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic point to a new reality.
- Understanding and reducing risk in a world of uncertainty is fundamental to achieving genuinely sustainable development.
- The best defence against future shocks is to transform systems now, to build resilience by addressing climate change and to reduce the vulnerability, exposure and inequality that drive disasters.

Mitigation of global risks must form a core part of security policy.

[Rethinking Security](#) is a network of organisations and individuals working to define security policies for the UK that are based on the concept of Human Security.

Terrorism

Among the many problems of countering terrorism is the failure to agree on a definition of what terrorism is. The Green Party defines terrorism as:

the use or threat of violence, both in and outside of the UK, designed to influence and intimidate any government and the citizens of that country, for the purpose of advancing a political, religious, racial or ideological cause.

However, this is far from being a universally accepted definition. This is one of the obstacles to terrorism coming under the mandate of the ICJ.

Current counter-terrorism law is enacted in the [Counter Terrorism and Border Security Act, 2019](#)

The [report stage briefing by Liberty](#) when the bill was before parliament highlights some of the concerns shared by the Green Party, particularly the criminalisation of expression of certain opinions.

Green Party policy advocates for a counter-terrorist policies based on the rule of law. Planning and executing terrorist attacks are criminal acts and individuals accused on them should be prosecuted in the same way as those accused of other criminal acts. The [Rule of Law Responses to Terrorism programme](#) of the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism (ICCT) stresses the effectiveness of this type of approach to counter-terrorism.

Radicalisation

We have carefully avoided using the term *radicalisation* when defining policy on protecting people, in particular vulnerable young people, from influences that promote hatred and violence (PSD415). We recognise that these terms are used as a type of shorthand for an abusive process of grooming that can be a path to terrorism, but we do not accept that radical ideas are a problem or that they lead inevitably to violence.

Prevent Strategy

[Prevent Strategy: Eroding Trust: The UK's Prevent Counter-Extremism Strategy in Health and Education](#) is the most comprehensive independent assessment to date of the workings of the UK government's Prevent counter-extremism strategy.

The report concludes that the strategy creates a serious risk of human rights violations and is also counterproductive.

[Government prevent guidelines](#) explain:

8. The Prevent strategy was explicitly changed in 2011 to deal with all forms of terrorism **and with non-violent extremism**, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists then exploit. Our concern over the existing prevent strategy is that it is unspecific and tends to de-platform opinions critical of western military intervention and shuts down legitimate discussion of these key issues in both education and academia.

The current UK definition of 'terrorism' is given in the Terrorism Act 2000 (TACT 2000). In summary this defines terrorism as an action that endangers or causes serious violence to a person/people; **causes serious damage to property**; or seriously interferes or disrupts an electronic system. The use or threat must be **designed to influence the government** or to intimidate the public and is made **for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause**.

Anti terrorism prevent policy/guidance appears to equally well apply to limit activities such as the [destruction of warplanes by the ploughshare four](#). We are also concerned that it could be used against groups such as XR, particularly since it has a strong appeal to young people

Indeed, destruction of property is considered terrorism within the prevent guidelines so the ploughshare four are also be classified as terrorists within the prevent scheme: Clearly the Ploughshare Four caused "serious damage to property", they certainly wished to "influence the government" by preventing further licencing of sales of weapons to Indonesia, and they were obviously "advancing a political, religious (and)or ideological cause". This seems to exactly fit the government definition of terrorism.

Intelligence

The Green Party insists that any surveillance of citizens within the UK must be strictly constrained by the law and not interfere with the right to legitimate protest, which is fundamental to a functioning democracy.

The Philosophical Basis states that [PB 422]

The Green Party does not believe there is an automatic moral obligation on all people to obey their governments. It seeks to maximise the extent to which obedience to laws is based on consent and minimise the need for conformity through deterrence. We believe there are occasions when individuals and groups in society may openly, and peacefully, protest at an unjust law or practice through civil disobedience.

And PB402 in the Freedom section states:

Our commitment to freedom necessarily requires certain restrictions. Firstly, wealth and power are often used to curtail the freedoms of the poor and powerless. The protection of legitimate freedom therefore requires restrictions on oppressive activities.

The [Investigatory Powers Act](#) governs the use of investigatory powers such as interception of telecommunications and digital communications by law enforcement and intelligence agencies. Prior to its enactment in 2016, investigatory powers were very loosely defined and the government was forced to admit to collection of information using methods that breached human rights. So, it's positive that the powers are now defined allowing actions by police and intelligence agencies to be challenged and for aspects of the act to be challenged. Powers are still very wide ranging and it has been criticised as a [Snooper's Charter](#) by civil rights organisations.

Climate and Ecological Emergency impact on security

The climate and ecological emergency is a threat to security that must be dealt with using the concepts of human and common security. It is a dangerous idea to believe that any nation state can protect national security at the cost of more vulnerable states.

The response must be support for coordinated humanitarian assistance to those already suffering from the effects of the crisis and preparation for future effects that are now inevitable. The UNOCHA report [Leaving No One behind in the Climate Emergency](#) details some current crises caused by the climate and ecological emergency and lays out what needs to be done.

The international community must significantly increase **climate-adaptation finance** and invest in **disaster risk reduction** and **anticipatory action**. The humanitarian system also needs to embrace a new mindset that puts adaptation and community resilience centre stage.

Northern Ireland

The [Good Friday \(Belfast\) Agreement](#) [GFA] signed in 1998 has for the most part brought an end to violent conflict in Northern Ireland and to terrorist attacks, related to the conflict, in England. It hasn't really done much to end historic polarisation between communities in N.I. and there have been many periods where the devolved government has broken down because of problems with power sharing.

The [PEACE programmes of the EU](#) have tried to address problems of cohesion and reconciliation. The PEACE IV programme ends in 2023 and one good outcome of the negotiations with the EU is that a joint programme [PEACE PLUS](#) will continue the work of the PEACE programmes following the exit of the UK from the EU.

Summary of the risks for Peace and Security in the UK

[compiled by GP member Ruth Willis]

Issue	
The Protocol is not working but what can replace it?	<p>There are only three solutions, none of which are consensus solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hard border on land 2. T. May's back stop: all the UK remains in the EU single market and customs union. 3. The Irish Sea solution, borders at air and sea ports
The Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement	<p>Original agreement designed to support societies emerging from conflict (consociational model of democracy), brokered by USA and EU. It has polarised politics in NI Whilst the middle ground is represented by the Alliance Party, they do not factor in the real politics. The aim of consensus politics has been given up</p>
The Protocol and GFA are in conflict, what are the pressures	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USA refuses a Trade Deal with the UK whilst the GFA is at risk. 2. Reputational issues if UK abandons international law. 3. The GFA allows Dublin as well as London to have influence on the government of NI if Stormont not working. 4. Despite power-sharing, Sin Fein took the Leader role at the last elections, reducing DUP to Deputy Leader role. How worried are the DUP that the time for a referendum is approaching?
DUP supported Brexit and Johnson's protocol, and were lied to.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loyalists have always hated the GFA (in spite of Ian Paisley), with its road map to a united Ireland. 2. Politicians who supported Brexit will always have known that this would risk the GFA (though perhaps not how) but were always willing to take this risk. 3. 66% NI voters voted to stay. This has not deterred the DUP in progressing their extremist approach to the border.
On-land border in Ireland	<p>Prior to the Brexit vote, British people were told over (and over) that, as we were an island nation, it would be easy to control our borders. Voices piping up to deny this were ignored by the press.</p>

	<p>People who remember the border in Ireland recognise how leaky it was. A swift glance at the border will indicate how unpoliceable it would be (it always was).</p>
<p>Border controls at seaports and airports.</p>	<p>Loyalists will experience tightening of border checks at ports to evidence the separation of NI from the UK. Loyalists already feel lied to and are prepared to disrupt any further developments of this.</p> <p>At some point the EU will have to take a stand against further procrastination on the part of the British as this is the agreement UK and EU signed up to, even if some adaptation is required.</p> <p>Ireland is keen for a negotiated settlement as there will be repercussions south of the border as well.</p>
<p>USA refusing to enter into trade deal due to ongoing risk to GFA</p>	<p>Did the far-right Tories really not understand the position of the Americans? Democrat or Republican, the yanks will protect the Irish over the British, USA do not need a trade deal with the UK.</p>
<p>Potential referendum regarding joining Ireland or not</p>	<p>Just talk of a potential referendum will set wheels in motion and not in a good way</p> <p>YES referendum: There will be fireworks</p> <p>NO referendum: There will be fireworks</p>
<p>Disenchantment by English on retaining Northern Ireland</p>	<p>The basic English person – those without family ties to Ireland – knows little about NI and the English interference in Ireland and their responsibility to sort this out. When things become difficult, there will be cries to let it go.</p>
<p>Transition into any new arrangements, in particular, a united Ireland</p>	<p>Whatever the outcome of any referendum or activity affecting the GFA, there will be a transition period into the new landscape Both parties are likely to understand that to be heard, activity must take place in England.</p>
<p>Safety and protection of UK citizens</p>	<p>All citizens of NI are citizens of the UK, and many will be dual nationality. All deserve the protection of the UK state in times of trouble.</p>
<p>Will Ireland want to take on NI with these difficulties?</p>	<p>Ireland unlikely to want NI without sensible planning and some sort of concord. The people of Ireland would vote to a united Ireland but the government would want arrangements in place that would support them in this transition.</p>
<p>The reputation of Sinn Fein</p>	<p>There are many in NI will never accept SF as anything other than a terrorist group. The SDLP (Social and Democratic Labour Party, republican supporting) and the Unionist Party (Unionist and Conservative Party) are largely obsolete, and SF are seen as extremist as DUP.</p> <p>Yet SF growth in Ireland as well as NI is causing concern amongst the middle ground. There are a sizeable number of protestants in NI who would be unconcerned about a united Ireland but would resist being governed by SF.</p>
<p>The reputation of the DUP</p>	<p>The success of the DUP was born out of the GFA, so it's with some irony that it is so hated by them. By concentrating on sectarian politics, NI politics has not had the capacity to explore the social issues of interest to more of its citizens, such as abortion, LGBTQAI rights etc. The state has a</p>

	huge coastline and a large agriculture, yet is slow to embrace renewable energy (NI has no piped natural gas).
Why is the Irish question such a problem?	<p>Why has there been 7 NI Secretaries since Brexit (June 2016 - Nov 2022)? It is a job no-one wants and seen only as a stepping stone to better jobs. NI citizens feel blamed by the rest of Britain for the situation it is in, reality, of course is the opposite.</p> <p>English people have a vague and inconsistent view of NI, it is not taught in schools hence the frustrated answer is: just give it back to the Irish, it costs too much.</p> <p>It is intentional not to teach the politics of Northern Ireland. It goes hand in hand with British cruelty in Ireland, the loss of the empire, which the majority of Britons still think of as a good thing.</p> <p>The history of the British in Ireland is shameful and all Ireland has received is a 'sorry'. (But then we are taught that Henry VIII is a bit of a hero despite murdering a number of wives).</p> <p>Being joint members of the EU changed things in NI and Ireland so much for the better. This can be seen in the economic, social and political changes for the better in Ireland.</p> <p>Until recently, the term 'English' was interchangeable with 'British'; many English do not understand why even Scotland would want to become independent.</p>

Defence

Non-offensive defence is a military strategy that maximises defensive strength while minimising offensive options of cross-border attack.

Military Carbon Emissions

Reporting of carbon emissions resulting from military activity is voluntary. [Scientists for Global Responsibility](#) estimate the global carbon emissions from military activity to be around 5% of all carbon emissions.

In the UK, the MOD had a target to reduce military emissions by 30% relative to a 2009/2010 baseline by 2020. In fact, they achieved a reduction of 36% but emissions remain high. According to Scientists for Global Responsibility:

- Estimates for the total military carbon footprint for the UK are 3% of national carbon emissions. This is a peace-time estimate for the UK and % would be likely to increase in the event of intensive military operations. SGR estimate an extra 1% globally for war impacts.
- The MOD emitted a total of 3.2 million tonnes CO2e (Estates: 40%/ Capability: 60%). This is higher than carbon emissions of Iceland. These calculations do not include: emissions of contractors or suppliers, emissions of war-related fires, reconstruction etc.

- The carbon emissions of BAE, a major UK arms manufacturing company's total figure for all its sites internationally, between 2017/18 was 1.2 million tonnes of CO₂e.

For detailed information on military carbon emissions and how these might be reduced by a non-offensive defence strategy, see this [background paper](#).

Military Intervention

Chemical and Biological Weapons

The **Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare**, usually called the **Geneva Protocol**, is a treaty prohibiting the use of chemical and biological weapons in international armed conflicts. It was signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925 and entered into force on 8 February 1928

It prohibits the use of "asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices" and "bacteriological methods of warfare". This is now understood to be a general prohibition on chemical weapons and biological weapons, but has nothing to say about production, storage or transfer. Later treaties did cover these aspects:

The [Biological Weapons Convention](#) (BWC) which came into force in 1975

The [Chemical Weapons Convention](#) (CWC) which came into force in 1997.

Both conventions have been ratified by the UK.

Use of Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas

According to UNOCHA

- A total of 18,747 people were reported killed or injured by explosive weapons in 2020. Of these, 11,056 people were civilians.
- When explosive weapons were used in populated areas, 88 per cent of those killed or injured were civilians. This compares with 16 per cent in other areas.
- IEDs were responsible for at least 43 per cent of all civilian casualties from explosive violence.
- Air-launched explosive weapons were responsible for 17 per cent of all civilian deaths and injuries.
- Ground-launched explosive weapons were responsible for 34 per cent of all civilian deaths and injuries.

[The Political Declaration on Strengthening the Protection of Civilians from the Humanitarian Consequences Arising from the Use of Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas](#), sponsored by the Republic of Ireland was adopted by 83 countries at the international conference held in Dublin in November 2022.

Cluster Munitions

The 2010 [Convention on Cluster Munitions](#) (CCM) prohibits all use, transfer, production, and stockpiling of cluster bombs, which scatters submunitions ("bomblets") over an area. and also establishes a framework to support victim assistance, clearance of contaminated sites, risk reduction education, and stockpile destruction.

Nuclear Weapons

Nuclear Weapons do nothing for our security. They are useless in addressing today's real security threats, including climate change, terrorism, extreme poverty, displacement of people and pandemics. In times of conflict they could make the UK a target, and at all times there is the risk of miscalculation or malfunction. Any use of nuclear weapons would have devastating environmental and humanitarian consequences.

The [Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons](#) (NPT) is a landmark international treaty whose objective is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament. The Treaty represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon States. Opened for signature in 1968, the Treaty entered into force in 1970. On 11 May 1995, the Treaty was extended indefinitely. A total of 191 States have joined the Treaty, including the five nuclear-weapon States. More countries have ratified the NPT than any other arms limitation and disarmament agreement, a testament to the Treaty's significance.

The United Kingdom has more than 200 nuclear warheads and at times acts as the host for many more US nuclear weapons.

The UK is an original signatory of the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty and is obliged under the Treaty to 'pursue good faith negotiations on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race, nuclear disarmament, and to general and complete disarmament.'

The [Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons](#) includes a comprehensive set of prohibitions on participating in any nuclear weapon activities. These include undertakings not to develop, test, produce, acquire, possess, stockpile, use or threaten to use nuclear weapons. The Treaty also prohibits the deployment of nuclear weapons on national territory and the provision of assistance to any State in the conduct of prohibited activities. The Treaty also obliges States parties to provide adequate assistance to individuals affected by the use or testing of nuclear weapons, as well as to take necessary and appropriate measure of environmental remediation in areas under its jurisdiction or control contaminated as a result of activities related to the testing or use of nuclear weapons.

[The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons](#) (ICAN) is a broad campaign that mobilises civil society around the world to work for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Its member organisations include NGOs and local authorities. In the UK devolved/local government members include the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly as well as large cities such as Manchester and small towns such as Todmorden.

Drones and Fully Automated Weapons systems

The [Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons](#) aims to ban or restrict the use of certain types of conventional weapons that cause unnecessary and unjustifiable suffering to combatants or affect civilians indiscriminately. It has a flexible structure that allows new protocols to be added as weapons technologies are introduced.

Autonomous weapon systems fully controlled by artificial intelligence are now in development and are a cause of great concern. These systems lack direct human control and it is the onboard artificial intelligence that identifies and fires on human beings. These AI controlled weapons may be some way from operational development and some of the claims are hype from the industry and military. However, it would be wise to stop their development at an early stage.

There are growing calls for an international treaty to retain human control over weapons systems as detailed in the [Stopping Killer Robots report](#) by Human Rights Watch.

Current Government policy is ambiguous about further regulation and seems keener to promote R&D for economic reasons, seeing rich export potential in an economy desperate for foreign trade. It is concerning that the policy seems to be based on the mistaken premise that legally-binding rules would necessarily constrain technological advances in AI. In fact, scientists and developers around the world are calling for more specific and tighter regulations on autonomous weapons and dual-use technology to protect their innovations from being misused. <https://una.org.uk/news/new-uk-position-autonomous-weapons-recognises-lines-need-be-drawn-lacks-detail-or-leadership>

There is rising concern about the adaptation of civilian drones for military purposes, including by non-state actors. There have already been incidents of adapted civilian drones used in attacks and there is now a potential for the conversion of civilian drones to automated weapons. See <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/05/regulate-non-state-use-arms/>

The Arms Trade

Export Licences

The [Export Control Joint Unit](#) (ECJU) administers the UK's system of export controls and licensing for military and dual-use items. There are three main types of export licence issued by the ECJU:

- **Single Individual Export Licence (SIEL)**
Permits a specific exporter to transfer a fixed quantity of specified equipment to a single destination. An SIEL is valid for two years. It is the only type of licence where a financial value is attached to the equipment to be exported.
- **Open Individual Export Licence (OIEL)**
Covers the export of specified equipment to one or more countries. Sometimes the list of approved destinations can include 30-40 countries or more. OIELs are also specific to an individual exporter, but they allow unlimited deliveries of the specified equipment to any of these destinations. They are usually valid for five years.
- **Open General Export Licence**
Allows a company to export certain types of equipment – in some cases a very wide range of equipment – to a list of destination countries, again sometimes covering most countries in the world. The company need not apply for further individual licences to do so, and can export unlimited quantities of such equipment using the OGEL. OGELs do not have a fixed time limit, being valid until they are specifically withdrawn or revised.
Companies need to register and fulfil certain conditions to use an OGEL.

SIELs are the most common form of licence, when considered from the point of view of number of licences granted. However, research shows that the majority of arms exports are licenced under the OGELs since a single licence can cover unlimited quantities and be valid over an unlimited time period.

OGEL's are supposed to cover only uncontroversial arms sales to uncontroversial destinations. However, as detailed in the Campaign Against the Arms Trade report [Open? The UK's secret arms trade](#), use of OGELs, since the start of the Saudi-led war in Yemen, the UK has exported arms and aircraft parts worth billions of pounds to Saudi Arabia under pre-existing OGELs.

Government Support and Subsidies

The report [Special Treatment: UK Government Support for the Arms Industry and Trade](#) by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute identifies many of the mechanisms used to support the arms trade:

- government funding of Research & Development
- government absorption of most of the risk of cost overruns on major programmes
- major political influence of arms companies through a 'revolving door' with the MoD and policy influence through high-level advisory bodies
- shielding of many key arms purchases from foreign competition
- protection from corruption investigations in relation to export deals
- intense lobbying by government ministers, up to the Prime Minister, for export contracts
- direct subsidies for arms exports estimated to be in the range of **£104-£142 million**. These arise from export promotion via the [Defence and Security Exports](#) (formerly the Defence and Security Organisation), the Defence Assistance Fund, the military attaché network, and official visits; and export credit guarantees which act as subsidised insurance against default.