

Realising the peace and security of a nuclear disarming world:
*A critical contribution to an inclusive ODA for Global Peace,
Democracy and Human Rights*

Alyn Ware

Global Coordinator, Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament

12th Seoul ODA International Conference

Your excellencies: **CHO Hyun**, Vice Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. **LEE Mikyung**, President, Korea International Cooperation Agency

I join my esteemed colleague Mr Sachs and the rest of the participants in this conference in commending you on this initiative to advance a comprehensive and effective approach to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Overseas Development Aid (ODA) through the discussion and incorporation of peace, democracy and human rights.

I thank you for inviting me to contribute to this discussion on behalf of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (PNND), a global, cross-party network of legislators for which the honorable LEE Mikyung was one of the inaugural Co-Presidents when she was serving in the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea.

I will be discussing the important contribution that the peace and security of a nuclear-disarming world makes to ODA and the achievement of the SDGs.

On the plane to Seoul to participate in this conference, I took the opportunity to re-read the classic novel 'Lay down your arms' by Bertha von Suttner – the novel which elevated Baroness von Suttner to becoming a leader of the peace movement in Europe, and to being the first woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

The novel is full of discussions on the armed conflict, arms races and their impact on people and on economic development back in the later 19th century. The key messages in the novel are that arms races too often lead to war, and that war destroys lives, families, property and indeed society itself, but that war is not inevitable – it is a human construct that can be prevented.

What I found so interesting was that these ideas are still so relevant today including to the topic of peace, development aid and sustainable development.

The relevance of peace – or at least the absence of war – to ODA and the SDGs is fairly obvious. Armed conflict not only causes damage to humans, infrastructure and the environment, but also makes delivery of aid and implementation of development programs that much more difficult.

The SDGs recognize this negative impact of armed conflict on development in Target 16.1 of SDG 16, which calls for the *'reduction of all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere.'*

But what about nuclear weapons?

If we are considering the use of nuclear weapons in wartime, then it seems obvious that such use would be detrimental to sustainable development. Even the use of a small number of nuclear weapons, which these-days are tens or hundreds of times more powerful than the two that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would be detrimental to development in the regions where they are used.

Imagine if nuclear weapons were used on the Korean Peninsula, either by the DPRK or the United States. The devastation to humans, infrastructure and the environment would likely be catastrophic.

Perhaps only one or two nukes would be used before leaders came to their senses. More likely, if nuclear war erupts today, it would not be one or two bombs used but tens, hundreds or even thousands of them, as they are deployed under policies of massive retaliation, not for single battlefield use.

Recent computer studies demonstrate that the use of about 50 nuclear weapons – less than 1% of the global stockpile - could cause catastrophic consequences to the climate causing global famine and unprecedented economic loss rendering the SDGs not only unobtainable but irrelevant, as human survival itself would be at stake.

So we can probably agree that the use of nuclear weapons is not conducive to ODA and the SDGs.

But what if we are considering instead nuclear deterrence – not the use of nuclear weapons?

Since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nuclear weapons have not been used in wartime. Rather the primary purpose of their development and possession is to deter war and keep the peace. Are nuclear weapons in this way a contributor to peace and security, and therefore an enabler of sustainable development?

The SDGs are silent on the question of nuclear possession and deterrence. But the United Nations is not. The very first resolution of the United Nations, which was adopted by consensus, established a commission of the UN Security Council to ensure *'the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.'*

The UN followed this with a number of resolutions affirming that the very possession of nuclear weapons creates a real threat that they could be used – whether by mishap, malfunction, miscalculation or malice.

As such the UN has consistently reaffirmed the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world as the only way to ensure that nuclear weapons will not be used. This goal has also been locked into a legal obligation in the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons adopted in 1970 and affirmed by the International Court of Justice in its historic opinion of 1996.

There is reason for this approach. Nuclear deterrence to work, relies on the willingness to use the weapons. Yet that very willingness to use them could lead to their use and then nuclear deterrence fails.

Indeed, nuclear deterrence postures have brought the world dangerously close to a nuclear exchange or nuclear war on a number of occasions.

After the Cuban Missile crisis in 1962 nearly resulted in nuclear war, Robert McNamara, the architect of the mutually assured destruction policy of the United States, realized that nuclear deterrence was fallible – and that if it fails, then it's game over. Before he passed away in 2009 he noted somberly that humanity had managed to avert nuclear war only by unbelievably good luck – but that luck could not last forever.

Despite these risks from nuclear deterrence, over half of the world's population lives in countries which ascribe to nuclear deterrence policies, either as possessors of nuclear weapons or under extended nuclear deterrence relationships.

For these countries the deterrent value of nuclear weapons outweighs the low possibility of nuclear weapons use and the security risks of nuclear disarmament. They perceive security threats - such as the threat of aggression, coercion or regime change – as very real and which can be contained by nuclear deterrence.

To persuade these countries to relinquish nuclear deterrence will require a focus on how to achieve security without nuclear weapons. A nuclear-weapon-free world will not just be today's world minus nuclear weapons. It cannot be a world where there are less nukes but more wars. It will be a world where governments, parliaments and civil society resort to diplomacy, negotiation, mediation and law – not to the threat or use of force – to resolve conflicts and address security threats.

This is the basis of the United Nations, which lays out both the obligation to resolve conflicts peacefully, and the common security mechanisms by which this can be achieved. Common security means that the security concerns of all sides or stakeholders must be considered. By replacing reliance on nuclear deterrence with reliance on common security we can phase out nuclear weapons and achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world.

PNND, in cooperation with the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the Parliamentary Assembly for the OSCE, has developed a parliamentary action plan for a nuclear-weapons-free world which includes actions parliamentarians can take to phase out nuclear deterrence and strengthen common security.

We honour the government of Republic of Korea which is taking a common security approach in the difficult situation regarding the DPRK's nuclear weapons. This includes dialogue, diplomacy and exploring the economic benefits - to both countries - of normalization and cooperation. Members of our parliamentary network are dedicated to supporting this approach and the leadership of the Republic of Korea in the Inter-Korean peace and denuclearization process. We have been promoting the peace process and the proposal for a NE Asian Nuclear Weapon Free Zone as frameworks that can meet the security needs of all in the region.

There is one more aspect about the nuclear arms race which is linked closely to ODA and the SDGs.

Ban Ki-moon during his term as Secretary-General of the UN remarked that 'The world is over-armed while peace is under-funded.'

Nowhere is this remark more true than with respect to nuclear weapons. We have 15,000 nuclear weapons in the world. The annual budget for maintaining and modernizing nuclear weapons is over \$100 billion. Allocating this money to nuclear weapons means taking it from somewhere else – from education, health, poverty alleviation, overseas aid, climate protection, diplomacy, realizing the SDGs...

Under UN Article 26 of the UN Charter, the Security Council has an obligation to regulate arms in order to '*promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources.*'

The Security Council is failing in this task. It's up to like-minded governments, parliaments and civil society to cooperate to implement this.

With respect to nuclear weapons, there is now a global campaign called *Move the Nuclear Weapons Money* which builds global cooperation to cut nuclear weapons budgets and shift investments in nuclear weapons production – whether they be investments by banks, government funds or private investments - to better purposes, including to support the SDGs.

As Liza Minnelli sings in *Cabaret* – ‘*Money makes the world go around.*’ Let’s ensure that money, i.e. our economic resources, is used correctly to support sustainable economies, peace and the SDGs, and not nuclear weapons or war.

This is an area where there can be cooperation between the peace, security, disarmament and sustainable development communities – to move the economic resources from nuclear weapons to peace and sustainable development

Thank you