

Constitutional Change and Security Policy in Scotland

10 am – 4 pm Saturday 27 August 2011

Room 3.15, St Leonard's Land, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh

Morning Session

1. How should we define national security so that it is broader than conventional defence but not a catch-all for everything desirable? How did the UK Defence Review define this? How should we differ?

(David Mumford)

2. Can we develop a vision of what we would want a Scottish Defence Force to do? Specialise in UN peacekeeping and civil emergency work? Are there other national defence models we should look to?

(Helen Steven)

Afternoon Session

3. How would this fit with current military and civil resources? The job implications?

(John Ainslie)

4. If a Scottish Parliament had responsibility for security/defence issues, what would be the political policy options. What would we want as red, pink or green lines?

(Isobel Lindsay)

Session 1 – David Mumford

1. What is security – national, human or responsibility to protect?

Traditional models of defence have been tied to the concept of national security – that armed forces exist primarily to defend the nation state against invasion and conquest. Conflict takes place between opposing armed forces, preferably in a battle space which does not impact on non-combatants and civilians.

The moral framework governing warfare (just war theory – both for what justified going to war and how war should be conducted) primarily relates to the national security paradigm. Wars can be declared by sovereign nation states and violation of national boundaries is an acceptable *casus belli*.

International law also laid great stress on the sanctity of national boundaries and militated strongly against intervention in the internal affairs of another country.

In an increasingly interconnected world, the distinction between ‘battle space’ and ‘humanitarian space’ is eroded. Nuclear war would eliminate such a distinction altogether. Mary Kaldor (1) is one among a wide number of people who have espoused an alternative view of human security. The United Nations Development Programme in 1994 in promoting the concept of human security identified seven core elements – security at the personal, community, food, economic, health, environmental and political levels. The European Union in the Barcelona and Madrid reports has encouraged thinking about moving away from a conventional security policy to one that looks as to how Europe and contribute to human security.

Human security is about the everyday security of individuals and the communities in which they live, rather than the security of states and borders. So it is, for example, about the security of people in Scotland – not about the security of the Scottish borders.

It is about different sorts of security – it would cover not just defence against foreign enemies, but being secure from being forcibly evicted or expelled from your home, or having enough to eat and drink.

A narrower view of human security was proposed by the Canadian government under the heading of ‘Responsibility to Protect’. This is the concept that the international community has a responsibility to protect people threatened by genocide, ethnic cleansing and other massive violations of human rights when their governments fail to act. The United Nations is usually seen as the legitimising body for such intervention.

The Responsibility to Protect approach is criticised for ignoring many insecurities which imperil human life. It does, however, put people before respect for national boundaries.

There is also the practical problem as to which areas of conflict the ‘international community’ chooses to intervene in and a deep suspicion that while the stated reason may be that of protection (as with protecting civilians in Libya) the real reasons for choice of intervention are to

do with oil, international finance and regime change rather than the size and extent of human rights violations.

Conversely, Sri Lanka, Syria and Gaza are among those places where there has been massive abuse of human rights but no international intervention.

A recent (July 2011) paper produced by the Westminster government Ministry of Defence, Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Department for International Development entitled 'Building Stability Overseas Strategy' gives the following definition of the kind of stability which promotes security: 'The stability we are seeking to support can be characterised in terms of political systems which are representative and legitimate, capable of managing conflict and change peaceably, and societies in which human rights and the rule of law are respected, basic needs are met, security established and opportunities for social and economic development are open to all.' (page 5)

2. In my view, S4P should endorse the human security model.

This model can include a recognition of the particular threat that violence poses to women, endorsement of much of UN resolution 1325, the role of gender in vulnerability and the precipitating of violent conflict. This model can also in principle recognise the threats posed to security by climate change or the widespread poverty caused by unjust economic and social structures. A human security model is not in itself committed to non-violence as it has a role for military intervention and for armed policing. However a pacifist/nonviolent approach can operate within and critique a human security model.

3. The human security model has not had the attention paid to it in terms of moral theology that the just war model has. To give one example, about *casus belli*, a human security model might demand the following:

- Economic and social justice for minorities
- Negotiations with all stakeholders in the conflict, including non-state actors and militias
- Mediation between the parties to the conflict
- Alternative employment for militias
- Control of arms entering and leaving conflict areas
- Control of illicit resource extraction
- Material support for 'insider' local peace initiatives
- Full legal authority for war, including parliamentary debate or equivalent – including a justification as to which authority has the competence to permit military intervention

There is a challenge here to the faith communities to explore the ethical aspects of a human security model.

4. Current developments:

a/ More conflicts are now ended by negotiated settlement rather than by military victory. There is a slow development of public bodies committed to peace building. The Un has set up its Peace

Building Commission and the EU has a (very small) peace building unit. Scotland could have its own department of conflict resolution. However for every \$1 spent on peacebuilding, \$1885 is spent on arms production and military capacity. (OECD figures – 2009)

b/ Local civilian initiatives to prevent killing are now widespread in conflict areas. (see, among other documents, the Oxford Research Group's publication 'War Prevention works')

c/ Programmes to prevent violent conflict are much cheaper than post-conflict intervention (\$1 prevention vs \$60 programme costs to respond to violent conflict).

d/ The use of IT is transforming the speed and efficiency of local peace building (eg Ushanti in Kenya in 2008)

e/ Improved number of people with practical skills in mediation, conflict resolution and peacebuilding. Germany has now established a standing Civilian Peace Service made up of professionals trained for a broad spectrum of roles in peace building and working with conflicts. The Nonviolent Peaceforce has a small number of teams of trained adult professionals using proven and effective means of nonviolence and civilian intervention for the prevention of violence and armed conflict.

f/ The international arms trade continues. Between \$30 and \$40 billion dollars worth of arms go to developing countries annually. The five permanent members of the UN security council together with Germany and Italy account for over 80% of the arms sold between 2001 and 2008.
g/ War and civil conflict are massive brakes on human development.

4. Suggested ways forward:

a/ Instead of talking about defence, we should aim for a paradigm shift to systemic peace building.

b/ Creating national infrastructures for peace – both in Scotland and overseas. South Africa and Kenya have embarked on such an approach. The UN is encouraging other countries to follow suit. Such an infrastructure would empower the resources for reconciliation from within societies as well as being open to outside input.

Aspects of such an infrastructure:

- A national peace forum for consultation and co-operation between all stakeholders
- Peace education – both in schools and in civil society
- Faith communities to be encouraged to affirm all that makes for peace within their own tradition
- Local peace forums to encourage dialogue, promotion of mutual understanding and trust building together with joint action to prevent violence.
- Readily available training in the skills and techniques of mediation, conflict resolution and non-violent action.
- A national centre for nonviolence and reconciliation

There is much information in the work of the United Nations decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence and in the World Council of Churches Decade to Overcome Violence.

c/ Emphasise the essential role played by women. Men with guns should not be the only arbiters of peace deals. In Northern Ireland, the women's movement played a crucial role in bringing an end to violence – but women were squeezed out of the final settlements.

UN Resolution 1325 on Women Peace and Security (October 2000) was a major step forward in formally calling for the greater participation of women in peace processes. It should not be used to recruit more women into the armed forces.

Gender sensitive nonviolence is an important component both in Scotland and internationally. Domestic violence is unacceptable. The paucity of positive male role models for young people with little chance of permanent employment which do not involve criminal behaviour or the abuse of women, drugs or alcohol, makes working for human security for all in Scotland a greater problem.

d/ Recognise the global scale of the challenge of systemic peace building.

This means that an independent Scotland could contribute well above its size if it chooses to concentrate its effort in key areas. The UN Security Council is primarily concerned with the management rather than the prevention of conflicts. There is no formal opportunity at the global level for all the various stakeholders to come together in dialogue. It may be that the current World Peace Festival in Berlin will point a way forward – but offering to host an international conference is a relatively cheap way of having an impact....!

e/ Tax arms exports

Even a 10% tax on arms exports could provide a very significant amount to be used to address the root causes of violent conflict. The UK exported some \$1,024m worth of arms in 2009 and 10% would be just over \$100m. I do not have the separate figures for Scotland.

5. Concluding thoughts:

I am envisaging an independent Scotland which would be a member of the European Union but not a member of NATO. [The Irish Republic would be an initial paradigm.] The fact that NATO is a nuclear alliance whose members are willing for weapons of mass destruction to be used on their behalf of itself is sufficient to make membership morally unacceptable. NATO has also been used for cover for a range of overseas activities of dubious legal and moral status in which British forces have been involved. In my view S4P should very strongly oppose any suggestion that an independent Scotland should be a member of NATO. (a red line...)

Scotland could act with effective compassion to support actions that would give a strong preference to settling conflicts without the use of violence. Scotland could adopt a model of human security, support international efforts to prioritise non-violence and work for non-violence within Scotland.

As a member of the EU, Scotland could support the EU Peacebuilding Programme and encourage the EU to work more closely with OSCE to help with current European conflict and potential conflict situations (such as Kosov@).

I would very much welcome specialist military input in looking at details. I assume that both overseas work and assistance with civil emergencies would be part of the remit. I would assume that a non-pacifist option would require trained and qualified infantry together with the logistics and communications for service overseas. It would also require a substantial increase in civil staff. This should include teams of people employed full time skilled in nonviolence.

It would also require a much wider range of skills in the Territorials - or the establishment of a separate Civil Defence Unit (on the lines of the ZDF in Germany). People with skills in mediation and non-violence would need to be included in this unit. Some of the tasks faced in peace keeping include (for example) policing and justice issues as well as development issues. This wider group could be called on in case of need.

I could not see a place for Trident, nor for bombers or fighters. Anti-aircraft missiles would be an adequate deterrent if one was required. Helicopters and transport planes would be required, and one or two fishery protection vessels. This would require a process of decoupling Scottish defence from the command structures for England, Wales and Northern Ireland. I cannot see how the military jobs associated with Faslane and Rosyth could be retained. It would mean accepting the closure of Leuchars and looking for a further downgrading of Lossiemouth. However it would need increased non-military staff.

Military and non-military would need to work closely together although I would prefer to have separate departments rather than try to bring military and non-military under one department.

David Mumford
22nd August 2011

(1) Beebe S.D. and Kaldor M: The Ultimate Weapon is no weapon (Public Affairs, New York 2010)

Session 2 – Helen Steven

In this paper I invite us all to think large, to imagine, to have a vision of how Scotland might be. It is not full of facts, arguments and statistics – these are the details and the tools. It is simply a challenge to think creatively and boldly about how Scotland can truly be ‘for peace’.

True security

It is a well-known saying that the purpose of good government must be the wellbeing of its people. Well-being is far more than simply the absence of conflict or defence of the realm. We must consider what are the real threats to the well-being and security of the people of Scotland.

- **Terrorism?** We are led to believe that this is one of the greatest threats to our security at the present moment, and indeed the justification given for our weapons of mass destruction, our foreign interventions and the erosion of many civil rights. While not denying the seriousness of the threat, we need to look deeper into the disaffection and divisions of society that are the root causes of alienation. *Can we envisage a Scotland that is a welcoming, tolerant community?*
- **Environmental collapse.** We are all well aware of the devastating effects of global warming, depletion of the earth’s resources and climate change. Scotland is already a world leader in developing alternative sources of energy. *Can we envisage a Scotland that is no longer dependent on global oil reserves?* This in turn would have a profound effect on our foreign policy.
- **Poverty.** The gap between the poor and the immensely rich has been widening steadily over the years. Not just in the UK, but in the division between rich world and desperately poor world, this puts enormous strain on global politics and is an inevitable source of conflict. *Can we envisage a Scotland where the creation of a meaningful sustainable economy is a priority?*

International Relations

Defence policy is based on political decisions, so our political thinking must be reconsidered with regard to Scotland’s place in the world. I would suggest that Scotland is a small country and in military terms strategically indefensible. We may once have participated in Empire, but Scotland is not an imperial power, nor do we want to be, although much of UK foreign policy seems to be based on delusions of past glory. We in Scotland must put shades of a dying empire behind us.

- We do not have a God-given right to control of the earth’s resources, and yet our defence policy, and Trident in particular, is based on the doctrine of protecting Britain’s interests anywhere in the world. Scotland needs to develop international trade agreements based on new economic thinking, rather than diplomacy out of the barrel of a gun. *Can we envisage a Scotland playing its part in an international economy based on justice and fair trade?*
- We do not have any moral authority to be the world’s police, and yet we presume to decide which countries have the right to possess nuclear weapons, which tyrants we will support and which ones must go, and we seek to justify our interventions with a cloak of spurious legality. I would argue that NATO is the military wing of this dubious policy and

that Scotland must be free to choose its own allies and consider with humility our place on the world stage.

- International peacekeeping. Rather than membership of NATO, I would urge a far greater involvement with international bodies. For all its faults (and they are many), the UN does represent the only global peace-keeping organisation. I would urge that Scotland become a full member of the UN, thus enabling us to play a responsible part in its decision making. (I am well aware that this begs a certain question!) Scotland should also comply with the judgements of the International Court of Justice, the Geneva Conventions, and the Nuremberg Principles, which at the moment are largely ignored by the UK government. Our legal system is independent and should act forthwith to implement these international decisions. *Can we envisage Scotland playing a positive role in contributing to respect for international law?*
- Diplomacy. In place of NATO Scotland could inaugurate an International Peacemaking Academy that would become renowned as an international centre of excellence. Such training would include nonviolence, diplomacy, mediation, cultural awareness and conflict resolution. By establishing a career in peace-making, university degrees would be awarded and schools would include it in their curriculum. *Can we envisage a Scotland world famous for its peace-making and diplomatic skills?*
- Welcome. In the past Scotland has always been famed for its warm welcome to the stranger. It is to be hoped that as the global community grows closer Scotland can be known as a country of welcome, opening its doors to immigrants and asylum seekers. After all many Scots were in the same position once. *Can we envisage a compassionate welcoming Scotland?*

Nuclear Weapons

I want us to get real about Trident. Somehow it has been debated to and fro so much, that I feel as if we have almost got used to it without fully appreciating the real horror of the nuclear threat it is. In the 80s we scared ourselves rigid with visions of the abyss, from Helen Caldicott, *The War Game* and Jonathan Schell. Nothing has changed, it is still there and by having it in Scottish waters we are complicit in the willingness to use it, which is an even greater horror. It is no kind of protection against terrorism, it is a threat to our own security, it costs the earth and it is immoral and illegal – we have all been saying that for years. Trident must be scrapped. If it is wrong, it must go, and no government has the right to deny us. *Can we really envisage Scotland without Trident and can we assert our right to act morally and legally?*

Conventional Defence

(I will only touch on this as I know others are speaking to this in more detail.)

In this I am a pragmatist. I know that in a culture of *Scotland the Brave* it would be naïve to talk about scrapping the Scottish Regiments. However, I can talk about a whole new role and a whole new kind of bravery as Scottish service people are trained in peacekeeping, disaster relief and emergency help and logistics. For example, Kinloss could become a centre for maritime and mountain rescue at a time when these services are being drastically reduced. The UK army was first on the scene offering trained help in Fukushima; the Scottish army could become well-known as an immediate emergency task force. Of course military training is required as part of this, but it would be combined with a whole variety of other skills as well. Most soldiers I have

met would value this role. *Can we envisage Scottish soldiers being welcomed as highly skilled rescue and relief experts?*

Defence Industry

Of course the argument always used is that this would all cost jobs. This is being argued elsewhere, and there are convincing statistics to show that there is a great opportunity to re-deploy industrial skills into alternative employment – particularly in alternative energy sources. It is well known that the defence industry is a particularly unreliable employer as arms contracts can be cancelled whenever there is a regime change, and the bottom line is that the whole industry depends on more people killing each other. If we were to change the whole dependence of our industrial base away from the defence industry into socially useful production, this would have a knock-on effect in research institutions and universities as well. *Can we envisage a Scottish industrial base flourishing on a whole variety of innovative developments?*

We can do it. I end by quoting Gene Sharp; *We have to a degree lost confidence and even hope that we can solve our most serious domestic and international problems. That alone must be placed high on the list of tragedies of the twenty-first century.*

In Scotland there is a great flourishing of new ideas and hope, and it is this that must give us the confidence to believe that we can indeed show the world that **Scotland's for Peace**

Session 3 - John Ainslie

The following is an outline of the current military footprint in Scotland and the projections in the 2011 basing review.

Army

Regular army units recruited primarily from Scotland

Unit	Alternative name	Recruiting area	Current Base
1 st Battalion Royal Regiment of Scotland	Royal Scots Borderers	Lothians	Dreghorn, Edinburgh
2 nd Battalion Royal Regiment of Scotland	Royal Highland Fusiliers	Strathclyde	Glencorse, Penicuik
3 rd Battalion Royal Regiment of Scotland	Black Watch	Tayside & Fife	Fort George, Inverness
4 th Battalion Royal Regiment of Scotland	Highlanders	Grampians, Highlands & Islands	Germany
5 th Battalion Royal Regiment of Scotland	Argyll & Sutherland Highlanders	Central	Canterbury
Scots Guards			Catterick
Royal Scots Dragoon Guards			Germany
40 th Regiment Royal Artillery	Lowland Gunners		Northern Ireland
19 th Regiment Royal Artillery	Highland Gunners		Salisbury Plain

Air Force

RAF Lossiemouth – 12, 14 and 617 squadrons of Tornado GR4, 2 search & rescue Sea King helicopters, RAF Regiment squadron; transition to Typhoon beginning in 2013 and number of service/civilian staff will be around 2,000.

In 2010 the government announced that the RAF would withdraw from Kinloss.

Navy

Faslane – Vessels based at Faslane - Four Vanguard class Trident submarines; Three Trafalgar class submarines are moving to Faslane from Devonport; Astute class submarines as they enter service; Eight Sandown class Mine Hunters. Faslane will become the sole submarine base for the Royal Navy. Faslane & Coulport employ around 2,500 civilians and 4,000 service personnel.

Coulport – storage and servicing of nuclear warheads and missiles and torpedoes.

Rosyth – accommodation for crews of ships in refit, plus support and headquarters functions.

Reserves

There are currently 5,000 reservists in Scotland.

Training areas

Training areas - Barry Buddon (Dundee), Castlelaw (Pentlands), West Freugh, Kirkcudbright, Galloway forest, Cape Wrath.

Hebrides Missile range - Benbecula, Uists and St Kilda

British Underwater Testing and Evaluation Centre - Applecross, Kyle of Lochalsh, Inner Sound
Submarine Noise Ranges – Rona (Raasay) and Lochgoil

Support sites

Defence Munitions - Beith, Glen Douglas and Longtown

Fuel depots - Loch Ewe and Garelohead

Defence Industry

BAe Marine operate Govan and Scotstoun shipyards which are involved in the construction of the new aircraft carriers, Type 45 destroyers and other navy vessels, employing 4,000 staff.

Babcock Marine operate Rosyth dockyard which is involved in the construction of new aircraft carriers and refits of surface ships. Babcock Marine also maintain and repair nuclear submarines at Faslane.

Selex Galileo in Edinburgh is the largest defence electronics site in the UK. It produces electronics for Eurofighter, SAAB Vixen and the F35 Joint Strike Fighter.

Thales Optronics, Glasgow, manufacture submarine systems and range / targeting systems.

Vector Aerospace Component Services, Almondbank, Perthshire, repairs components for military helicopters and aircraft. 270 staff.

2011 basing review

Army presence will increase from 3,000 to 6,500

RAF in Scotland will decline from 4,700 to 2,500.

Net increase in Navy presence of 1,200.

Increase in the Territorial Army to 30% of the army.

Withdrawal of RAF from Leuchars.

Withdrawal of 45 Commando & 29 Commando Regiment Royal Artillery from Condor, Arbroath.

Closure of Headquarters 2nd Division, Craigiehall near Edinburgh.

Sale of Redford and Dreghorn barracks, Edinburgh.

Future army bases: Kirknewton (near Edinburgh, new barracks for 1,200 personnel), Glencorse (Penicuik), Condor (Arbroath), Caledonia (Rosyth), Leuchars, Kinloss and Fort George (Inverness).

Session 4 – Isobel Lindsay

The peace movement will have to navigate some difficult waters in the context of the referendum campaign which is likely to take place in 2014 with the year prior to this being dominated by the pro- and anti-independence debates. We have supporters who will take different positions and this could be problematic but there are potential advantages for us in that defence issues are likely to be an important strand of the debate. How do we turn this to our advantage? We can't take a stand as an organisation on the constitutional issue per se but we can argue about what we wish to see from the Yes and No sides on defence issues and challenge them during the referendum campaign. While the result of this given present policy issues is in practice going to be rather one-sided from our viewpoint, it still gives us a stance which I think all our members and affiliates will be able to live with.

There is one other objective for which we need to prepare and that is to keep the SNP's defence policy strongly anti-nuclear and anti-NATO while also encouraging it to think more creatively than at present on security issues. There will be strong pressure on the SNP to trim their policy and to move to 'defence unionism'. This pressure would become even stronger if the outcome of the referendum was Yes. If we can go into these debates with some vision of a new security policy for both an independent Scotland and the UK, we will have a positive role to play.

Policy for a Scottish State

There has been media chatter about 'independence-lite' i.e. getting control of economic policy but remaining within UK defence institutions. This assumes that an alternative vision for the defence/foreign affairs function is of no great interest or importance for Scotland. But it is the prospect of taking responsibility for these, we can argue, that can give the independence campaign one of its strongest moral dimensions and expose the worst of the British state policies.

The important things we have to do are to identify the defence issues which should be absolutely non-negotiable, those which we might accept could have a negotiated transitional period and other aspects that are of lower significance.

Clearly our priority is to get rid of nuclear weapons. The whole UK delivery system is at Coulport/Faslane. Massive amounts of money have gone into this facility over the past forty years. If Westminster were required to remove Trident from Scotland, this would in effect mean the end of their nuclear programme since finding an appropriate site in England together with the huge cost of new infrastructure would be prohibitive. If we were asking for the immediate removal of the submarines, there would be all kinds of protests that it was unreasonable not to allow a transitional period for relocation. However, a Scottish Government could ask for the immediate removal of all nuclear warheads from Scottish land and waters. This would disarm Trident and could be achieved in a matter of weeks.

The other issue which we should argue is a red-line one is NATO membership. We need to emphasise that it is an alliance with nuclear strategy at its core and that any pretence that it is a defensive alliance has been abandoned in recent years with its out of area wars. Non-membership of NATO is established SNP policy and maintaining it will strengthen Scotland's potential as an international advocate for global nuclear disarmament.

A more difficult issue for us is what we say about the nuclear-powered submarines. Faslane is now the base for all UK submarines, including the new Astute Class. Most of the jobs are not Trident-dependent. Of the three thousand civilian jobs at Faslane, only 160 are specialist jobs related to Trident and around 400 are general service and security jobs that are Trident related. There has been a new floating jetty and terminal building for Astute and the R(rest of)UK would be very anxious to maintain this facility. While we would prefer not to have these based here, it might be an issue where we could argue for a transitional but time-limited period for their removal. This would also guarantee most of the jobs while giving some time to develop alternative employment. Other defence centres in Scotland are of limited significance for us e.g. Leuchars and Kinross air bases are now to be turned into housing facilities for forces personnel.

We should argue that there is potential for Scotland to develop a new and positive security policy. We need some capacity to defend the resources in our territorial waters. Apart from that, the most important contribution we could make would be to develop a national and international humanitarian rescue service to help in disaster situations and a small force that could be made available for UN peace-keeping projects. The existing Scottish military personnel could transfer to these and we could bring defence expenditure to levels comparable to other small nations. Peace organisations need to put some flesh on these ideas.

Policy for the Constitutional Status-Quo

We are on familiar ground here in that we have been campaigning in this context. So we would challenge those in the No camp whether they are prepared to support cancellation of Trident renewal, promotion of UK and international nuclear disarmament, and a shift in defence policy away from constant warfare and towards more limited territorial defence.