



**Svenska Kvinnors Vänsterförbund SKV, the Left League of Swedish Women, is an undenominational and independent organisation for women, which dates back to 1914.**

The objectives of SKV are:

- gender equality based on equal rights and obligations between women and men in both private and professional life as well as in society as a whole.
- peace and the peaceful resolution of conflict and the prevention of all forms of violence, oppression and acts of war..
- the equal value of all human beings and the abolition of trafficking and slavery
- a society careful with its resources, in harmony with nature and orientated towards satisfying basic human needs
- solidarity between individuals, social groups, regions and nations.

**Svenska Kvinnors Vänsterförbund**  
**Linnégatan 21 B, 413 04 Göteborg**  
**Tel: 031 - 14 40 28**  
[skvgoteborg@telia.com](mailto:skvgoteborg@telia.com)  
[www.skvbloggen.wordpress.com](http://www.skvbloggen.wordpress.com)  
[www.vimanskor.se](http://www.vimanskor.se)

Report from a Seminar at European Social Forum  
in Malmö September 19 - 21, 2008



*Photo: Jens Ergon*

**Working for a Nuclear Free and  
Peaceful Europe with Perspectives  
from Women and the Global South**



## Money for surviving not for killing!

According to Lester Brown, director of the Earth Policy Institute in Washington, a budget corresponding to 1/6 of the military expenditures of the world would be sufficient to save our Mother Earth and the “civilisation”. The money would be enough to stabilize the climate, the population growth, to erase poverty and to repair our eco-systems.

## Networking

When considering all the things mentioned above we all realize that we have an extremely strong nuclear mafia to fight. It will not be easy – but it is not impossible!

We have to use the link between social and environmental security and military security and network with NGOs in these fields.

We have to link with NGOs working for renewable energy, NGOs working against nuclear power and uranium mining.

We have to head for women. Most – but unfortunately not all – women are carrying a strong responsibility for future generations.

We have to network with all kinds of movements, persons, institutions heading for getting rid of nuclear weapons.

A fantastic example is the Mayors for Peace campaign to abolish nuclear weapons. The total membership is now some 2.400 members in 131 countries and regions. In 2008 and 2009, Mayors for Peace will be going to the United Nations General Assembly to urge the nuclear weapons states to dismantle their nuclear arsenals before 2020.

So for the survival of mankind, let's get connected on a global, never before experienced, broad basis. We have a very good reason - and we have the tools.

## Preface

The European Social Forum of 2008 took place in Malmö Sweden Sept 16-21. As usual organisations interested in participating launched their individual projects of seminars and workshops and as usual these were eventually merged with others on a similar theme. The number of activities would otherwise be too numerous to accommodate. We found a common ground for the seminar without too much difficulty:

Working for a Nuclear Free and Peaceful Europe with Perspectives from Women and the Global South.

How to create a culture of peace in Europe promoting nuclear disarmament, solidarity and justice, cooperation with the South, the resolving of conflicts by peaceful means (within the framework of the UN and OSCE) and the involvement of women in decision-making.

We would like to point out that also Berit Ås från Norway participated but without a preprepared speech and would like to thank her for her share in the seminar. We would also like to thank former Kirsti Kolthoff and Anne-Lise Ebbe from WILPF for co-chairing the seminar.

There is a lot of preparation months in advance. Then in three hours a seminar is over. Do we remember what was said? We feel it is important to follow up by printing the interventions thus giving added value to the efforts of each person and each organisation to be there and to contribute to our understanding of the world we live in and the part we all wish to play in building a better world.

Thank you very much everybody!

## Participating organisations

Campaign for nuclear disarmament (CND) – speaker Rae Street

The Left League of Swedish Women (Svenska Kvinnors Vänsterförbund, SKV) – speaker Berit Ås

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, WILPF (Internationella Förbundet för Fred och Frihet, IKFF) – speaker Cynthia Cockburn

Women for Peace (Kvinnor för Fred) – speaker Ulla Klötzer

Operation 1325 – speaker Maj-Britt Theorin

Le Mouvement de la Paix – speaker Raoul Alonzo

## Working for a Nuclear Free and Peaceful Europe with Perspectives from Women and the Global South

Rae Street, CND (Britain)	5
Cynthia Cockburn, WILPF (Britain)	9
Maj Britt Theorin, V. president of Operation 1325 (Sweden)	13
Raoul Alonzo, Le Mouvement de la Paix (France)	17
Ulla Klötzer, Women for Peace (Finland)	21

### Participating organisations

**Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND)** campaigns non-violently to rid the world of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and to create genuine security for future generations.

**Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF)** is an international Non Governmental Organization (NGO) with national sections. WILPF works for peace by non-violence means, promoting political, economic and social justice for all.

**Operation 1325** is a cooperation between five women's organizations in Sweden in order to implement the UN resolution 1325 and to educate women to participate in the handling of conflict and peace work.

**Le Mouvement de la Paix** is the French peace movement. It was founded in 1948 to oppose war, nuclear armament, to achieve a reduction of the military budget and to promote peaceful cooperation between peoples.

**Women For Peace Movement and Women Against Nuclear Power Finland** aims to disarm the world, and to abolish nuclear weapons and nuclear power.

istan, former Yugoslavia, Iraq, Iran and Lebanon for all eternity.

The half-life of uranium 238 is 4.5 billion years.

DU is chemically toxic. It is an extremely dense, hard metal, and can cause chemical poisoning to the body in the same way as can lead or any other heavy metal.

DU is also radiologically hazardous, as it spontaneously burns on impact, creating tiny particles that are small enough to be inhaled. These uranium oxide particles emit all types of radiation, alpha, beta and gamma, and can be carried in the air over long distances.

The results of using DU-weapons are disastrous; cancer, genetic mutations, birth defects, neurological damage, skeleton and kidney damage and so on. Inside the body uranium creates risks both as a toxic heavy metal and as a radioactive material.

Robert C. Koehler, an award-winning, Chicago based journalist reported in 2004 on DU effects in Afghanistan. His headline was: "Silent Genocide".

Some 20 countries have DU weapons in their military arsenals (UK, USA, France, Russia, Greece, Turkey, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Egypt, Kuwait, Pakistan, Thailand, Iraq and Taiwan).

DU metal is used in weapons because of its extremely dense, pyrophoric qualities. It is cheap and available in huge quantities. It is given practically free of charge by the civil nuclear industry to the military and arms manufacturers.

DU is used both as tank armour, and in armour-piercing shells known as depleted uranium penetrators.

Prior to her death from leukemia in Sept. 2004, Nuha Al Radi, an accomplished Iraqi artist and author of the "Baghdad Diaries" wrote:

"Everyone seems to be dying of cancer. Every day one hears about another acquaintance or friend of a friend dying. How many more die in hospitals that one does not know? Apparently, over thirty percent of Iraqis have cancer, and there are lots of kids with leukemia...The depleted uranium left by the U.S. bombing campaign has turned Iraq into a cancer-infested country. For hundreds of years to come, the effects of the uranium will continue to wreak havoc on Iraq and its surrounding areas."

proliferation standards. India has not signed the NPT Treaty. It has some 60 nuclear weapons and is thought to be increasing its stockpiles.

Some courageous countries led by Austria, Holland, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland tried to stop the deal but were overrun by the interests of the US and the other nuclear weapons states.

According to many proliferation experts this deal will be a mortal blow to the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The nuclear-armed states that have signed the Treaty have a legal obligation, confirmed by the World Court, to live up to Article 6 of the NPT, which calls on them to carry out good-faith negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons entirely. None of the nuclear states has lived up to it and now they embrace a deal with a nuclear weapons state that has not even signed to NPT.

On top of this the French president Nicolas Sarkozy promotes a global nuclear power renaissance by signing new bilateral nuclear trade agreements with Algeria, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates.

Unfortunately you have to see this in a long range of new nuclear proliferation.

- The US wants to develop new, more precise and effective nuclear weapons.
- The UK is replacing its Trident-system by a new more efficient one.
- France renews its missile defence and gets 6 new submarines equipped with nuclear weapons.
- Russia announces that since they want to be on the same line as the US they have to get more nuclear weapons.

At the same time all these countries have announced big plans for new nuclear power plants in their countries. They are once again playing the dirty "peaceful atoms game" as a disguise for their military nuclear ambitions.

## Depleted uranium

On top of this we have to fight a new type of nuclear weapons: the depleted uranium (DU) weapons.

Here again the connection between the civil and the military use of nuclear production becomes evident. DU is a bi-product of the nuclear fuel production for civil reactors. It is also a bi-product of recycling nuclear waste.

Depleted Uranium (DU), weapons have polluted extensive areas in Afghan-

## Rae Street, CND

### European security

Today I am speaking as a representative of CND, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, in the UK, whose 50th anniversary it is this year. This is the group which you all know from its symbol which has become known as a peace symbol throughout the world. We are very proud of that. So that brings me to make one clear opening statement:

**'Nuclear weapons do not bring peace and security'.**

When we speak of European Security, I think we need to be mindful of the implications of the words and how they are used by our governing institutions.

Take the word 'European'. What geographical entity do we mean? Do we mean the close, western dominated, European Union or the member states of NATO, neither of which include Russia, or do we mean the wider area of the OSCE, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which does include Russia – but then again, as with the two other bodies, also includes the USA and Canada?

Even more importantly, do we mean safeguarding some tight, safe well supplied life for ourselves our energy, food and water supplies, ignoring the cost to the other peoples of the world? Speaking of my own government, the UK and their ally the USA, they make it very clear that a prime definition of security is to keep hold of the world's resource, especially energy.

When we speak of security, we **should be thinking** of all the children, women and men in the world.

When our governments speak of security 9 times out of 10 they speak of achieving security through military might.. Defence Ministers regularly appeal for more money for the military, the NATO Secretary General asks for more money, the European Union wants more money for the military. And now there is the Lisbon Treaty which plans a much larger role for the military under the Articles of the Foreign and Security Policy which is in no way altered from the Draft Constitution rejected by France and the Netherlands.

Now the whole process is still not settled because of the referendum in Ireland where a majority of the people said 'NO'. One of the main reasons the Irish people said 'no' was because of the militarism enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty. Since Ireland gained its independence from Britain, it has taken a traditional neutral and peaceful stand. The establishment press in the UK has claimed, with their usual patronising attitude, that the Irish people didn't understand. But I believe the Irish people were very well informed of the dangers in the Treaty. The moves towards a common Foreign and Security policy (the 'soft' title of the articles of course don't mention armies and military), which must ultimately mean a European army and more spending on arms (for which the defence contractors lobbied heavily). And who will decide on military intervention? The Foreign Ministers. There is one new move here. The EU is to have one spokesperson for Foreign Affairs. He in turn will discuss decisions with the Foreign Ministers.

However, the elected members of the European parliament will only be consulted from time to time. There is a huge democratic deficit at the heart of the European Union. The EU also includes two nuclear weapon states: the UK and France. Will there be moves to a Euro bomb? Certainly, the other huge military alliance, NATO, is not only nuclear armed with US nuclear bombs and the Trident nuclear armed submarines which are 'integrated' into NATO. With NATO's policy of nuclear sharing, since its expansion in the last decade has effectively created a nuclear armed Europe from Iceland to the Russian border. In NATO's Strategic Concept, published in 1999, and never changed to this day, it is stated that nuclear weapons "preserve peace". Nothing could be further from the truth. Look at the situation we are in now. A new Cold War is arising in Europe between the NATO powers, dominated by the US and the UK, and Russia, with the constant concern of NATO (whatever happened to the North Atlantic part?) pushing further and further towards China. Or take another area of deep concern, the Middle East. NATO troops (shouldn't we call it a NATO army?) are waging war in Afghanistan. We can all know of the continuing dangers there. But were you aware that NATO conducts military exercises with Israel? Will that contribute to bringing justice to the Palestinian people – or indeed security to the Israelis themselves?

Let us try to think of some practical steps which would lead to security. Let us try to think of disarmament and not re-armament. One initiative which

occasions. But a "no" easily turns into "yes" in the EU circles.

But back to the Lisbon Treaty that stipulates, that Member States shall undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities.

This article does not only mean that national parliaments are obliged to raise more money for military purposes. It also means that there is less money for social and environmental security that are the foundations for a strong socially engaged society.

The Treaty also says that commitments and cooperation in the common security and defence area shall be consistent with commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty.

When you consider that 21 of the present EU states are also NATO members this article is very logical. It also shows that there is very little difference between the EU and NATO.

The EU shall have the capacity to use military force outside the Union and NATO is expanding to a global superior power. This is an extreme militarisation of our planet.

The EU enlargement has swallowed 10 Baltic, Central and Eastern European Countries, and all these countries have become members of NATO. Ukraine stands in line for both NATO and the EU, and Georgia is heading for NATO membership.

If you consider that the population of the Western world represents less than 15 % of the population of the whole world – all the above mentioned matters are certainly not contributing to peace and disarmament in the world.

## **The connection between nuclear power and nuclear weapons**

The connection between nuclear weapons and nuclear energy is crystal clear but also confirmed by

Abel J. Gonzalez in a IAEA Bulletin in 1998 under the title "A Radiological Legacy". He states:

"The fuel cycle for military purposes is similar to that for the peaceful programmes for nuclear electrical energy generation: uranium mining and milling, uranium enrichment, fuel fabrication, operation of material-production reactors and fuel reprocessing mainly for the separation of plutonium."

Thus it is clear that the recent deal between the US and India about supplying India with "civil" nuclear technology is a serious threat to global non-

that NATO includes 21 EU Member States.

The militarisation of the EU is clearly to be seen in the astounding figures for exports of weapons. The nine biggest EU Member States have increased their export of weapons by 160 % between 2002 and 2006. In 2006 the export figures were 30 % higher compared to the US and 55 % higher compared to Russia.

Additionally the EU militarisation has advanced step by step by every new Treaty. It was confirmed in the EU Constitution, agreed upon by EU leaders in 2004 and rejected by the electorates of France and Holland in referenda in the summer of 2005.

The same strong military dimension is included in the Lisbon Treaty, invented to replace the Constitution and rejected by the Irish last spring. All other Member States are likely to ratify the Treaty in their national parliaments. Referendums are dangerous for the political elite - so they should not be held.

There are many articles in the Lisbon Treaty that consolidate the militarisation of the EU.

- There shall be a common foreign and security policy (CSDP). It shall provide the Union with civilian and military capacity. This capacity may be used in missions outside the Union for peace-keeping, conflict prevention and for strengthening international security. UN mandate is not necessary.

This could be called the "global dominance article".

It could also be called the "laying hands on natural resources article".

The Treaty includes the progressive framing of a common Union defence policy. This will lead to a common defence, when the European Council, acting unanimously, so decides.

In respect of this article we have to remember that the UK and France both possess nuclear weapons. A common defence would give the EU a nuclear capacity.

In September 2007 (der Spiegel 38/2007) the French president Nicolas Sarkozy touched the subject visiting Germany. His offer was that the French nuclear shield also would cover the neighbours. He asked the Germans to consider whether they also politically would take part in the French nuclear weapons. The German Chancellor Angela Merkel politely said "no thanks" at that

I think we, from all our different nations and cultures, could begin to think about would be one way forward on nuclear disarmament. I need hardly tell you that while my government, the UK, and the other nuclear weapon states, talk about the dangers of nuclear weapons proliferation, they themselves do very little to satisfy their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to disarm in 'good faith'. Indeed through NATO expansion they are themselves proliferating nuclear weapons. And by retaining nuclear weapons, saying they need them for defence, they provoke other nations to do the same – for example India, Pakistan and Israel.

However, hundreds of states across the world have rejected these arguments and set up nuclear weapon free zones. Listen to the wise words of the Mexican diplomat, Robles, who was the peace activist behind the Tlatelolco Treaty in Central and South America, the first Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in the world:

*"The military denuclearisation of Latin America will constitute a measure which will spare the peoples from the squandering of limited resources on nuclear armaments and will protect them against nuclear attacks on their territories, and will also constitute a significant contribution towards preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and a powerful factor for general and complete disarmament"*

Indeed nearly the whole of the southern hemisphere is covered by nuclear weapon free zones. Why should we in Europe not follow their lead?

Recently Parliamentarians and members of IPPNW and IALANA+, in Europe published a significant article, in the journal, No 3 2008, of the Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament on the establishment of a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Central Europe.\*

They said about such a zone,

" It would enhance efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation and terrorism....

And

..it could generate political momentum to remove the remaining US nuclear weapons deployed in Europe and ensure that such weapons are not deployed in new NATO states such as Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary. "

They added: “As most of the world’s populations obviously reject nuclear weapons, why do not the governments of nuclear weapon states still stick with them, with all the associated expense and security risks? “

Why indeed.

Let us show that civil society supports them, we can urge the item to be place on the agenda of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations.. The latter, the OSCE, is recognised under Chapter VIII of the UN as a Regional Security Organisation.

It is our representatives who sit and deliberate there. The United Nations Charter opens with the ringing statement, ‘We the peoples....not we the Foreign Ministers.

For our part, those of us in the nuclear weapon states, we will continue tirelessly to oppose our countires dangerous and destabilisng policies. We will urge our governments to support sustainable security for all people ev-erywhere.

**Let us move forward, let us take positive steps, together dear friends as a peace alliance not a military alliance, because we so urgently need welfare not warfare.**

The article was signed by Parliamentarians, members of IPPNW (International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War) and IALANA (International Association of lawyers Against Nuclear arms) from Austria, Switzerland and Sweden.

The suggested countries for a nuclear weapon free zone were:

The Scandinavian states: Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden

The Baltic states:

Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania

Belarus, Ukraine, Slovakia, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Albania, Romaina, Bulgaria

Austria, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Andorra, Greece, Portugal, San Marino, and Spain.

## **Ulla Klötzer, Women for Peace and Women Against Nuclear Power**

When you talk about security in Europe you have to talk from the European Union perspective since the Union - mostly in a negative way – has changed all aspects of security in Europe: military security, social security and environmental security. The four freedoms of the EU - free movement of goods, labour, capital and services – have benefited big business and have become a tool to play off workers and social welfare models against each other. What counts is to keep production costs low and concentrate business into the hands of few.

This is why it was so important to get the Nordic countries into the Union. Our social welfare model, our strong civil society, with strong engagement in peace and environmental issues, was a threat to big capital. Socially secure and socially engaged people have the courage to fight things they do not accept or like. Like wars on resources.

As members of the EU we now experience how the rapid concentration of big business and political power has lead to social dismantling, periodical labour contracts, lay-offs and workers being dismissed. In such a situation people become humble and silent and they are less and less interested in peace and environmental issues.

The security policy of the EU is originating from the late 40ies/early 50ies from the most famous EU founding father, Robert Schumann. His idea was to prevent futher wars in Europe by placing the Franco-German coal and steel production under a common High Authority. The Coal and Steel Union was born. Ever since then politicians supporting the European integration like to call the EU “a peace project”.

But already at an early stage in the integration process it became clear that a strong economic co-operation, and lately a strong monetary union, need to be protected by a strong army. Thus the peace project turned into a ”militarisation of Europe” project.

According to the SIPRI yearbook of 2007 the figures for the worldwide exports of weapons have increased by 50 % in the last 4 years.

The by far biggest exporters are the 27 NATO states and Russia. Please note

and human rights, which include equal rights for women and men.

Urgently at the top of the agenda we need development aid, projects of co-development by means of evenly balanced partnerships, international fair trade, world-wide cooperation to agree on reliable environmental policies to safeguard the future of our planet and generations to come. Decent humanitarian immigration policies that take into account the dramatic realities that drive civil populations to leave their homes and flee must replace egoism, repressive measures, detention and expulsion. Well functioning reception routines, education, asylum and help to return to one's native country for those whose option this is, respect for human rights, reliable partnerships on social, economic and political issues with the countries of origin, both civil population and institutions, all these can help us find lasting solutions to problems which will reach grim proportions if at a wider international level, solidarity and responsibility do not win the day.

This is true also of pollution, global warming, access to drinking water, sufficient food, the global struggle against disease, access to clean, renewable energy, that does not jeopardize nor pollute our natural world, either in the short or the long term. This is in the interest of everyone ; it is in the interest of women.

Thank you for your attention.

## **Cynthia Cockburn, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF)**

I'd like to make my contribution to this panel on the basis of the research I've done over a period of 13 years among women's organizations working for peace and opposing militarization and war, in a lot of countries.

I'd like to point to four different ways in which I've seen activist women contributing to peace, security and demilitarization in Europe. They are: forming alliances to stop hostilities; making an input to peace agreements; maintaining a street presence against militarization; and tackling gendered violence. So I have about two minutes for each of them!

First, sometimes women contribute to bringing hostilities to an end by specifically reaching out to each other and forming an alliance, as women, better still as feminists, across ethnic lines of animosity and violence in their countries. I saw a great example of this in Northern Ireland, ten years ago when the armed conflict between the British, Republican insurgents and Unionist paramilitaries was still causing a lot of deaths and disruption of everyday life. In the capital city of Belfast the territory was sharply divided into the enemy territories, and a lot of the men were armed. Life for women had become very basic, just keeping your family fed, supporting men who were in prison, keeping your kids out of trouble.

Then in the nineties there was an upsurge in Belfast of community organizing - non-violent. Community associations, including women's centres, sprang up in a lot of Protestant and Catholic neighbourhoods in Belfast. They were helped by grants from the Belfast city council. Now - one year, the council (which was totally Protestant dominated) announced it was cutting the funding for a particular women's centre - in the Falls Road, a militantly Republican and Catholic area. All women, on whatever side, were very upset by this unfairness. And something completely unexpected happened. The women of Shankill Rd Centre, in a deeply Protestant and Unionist area of the city, called a press conference, WITH the women of Falls Rd centre. The stood there beside them and said, "we're telling the council: you fund one of us, you fund us all - or else!!"

After that they decided to form what they called a Women's Support Network. Eventually twelve or thirteen different associations signed up to it, some from one camp, some from the other. Over the years the Network did amazing work. First they learned the difficult skills you need to talk without alienating each other by sectarian reactions. They supported each other in projects against domestic violence, getting women job training, and so on.

My second example of feminism's contribution to peace and security in Europe is in the context of the process of drafting and signing peace agreements. As it happens, Northern Ireland's a good example of this too. The Northern Ireland peace agreement was actually rather special. It was unique in fact. Because instead of just talking about ceasefire between the armed groups it embodied a plan for a fair and equal society. Yes, equality at last for Catholics. But also fair deals on several other dimensions, including between women and men. That was because there was a very participative peace process. Civil society groups were given a chance to say what they wanted for a future Northern Ireland. And the Women's Support Network was among them. Men had always expected women to keep their mouths shut about politics. Politics wasn't for women. But in the Network, the women had worked to educate each other in political issues and how to get a foot into the peace process.

At the other end of Europe, in Cyprus, the political leaders of the Greek Cypriot south and the Turkish Cypriot north have just (again!) started negotiations for peace. In these talks, unlike Northern Ireland, they've only ever addressed ethnic relations.

There's a women's organization in Cyprus called Hands Across the Divide – it's Turkish and Greek Cypriot women who've worked together through very difficult times, as women, as feminists, for peace. A couple of years ago, they sat down together and imagined a future Cyprus – what would women want? They said to the politicians, you talk about creating a Cyprus in which relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots is going to be equal, communicative and non-violent.

Well, since historic social change is on the agenda, why can't we, at the same time, also have relations between men and women in Cyprus that are equal, communicative and non-violent. It'd be the first time in thousands of years of

be significant advances and a systematic alignment with those countries who have made the best progress. Instead, we are witnessing negative rivalry between social models, the dumping of wages and deterioration of the working environment, the worsening of conditions for retirement, privatisation and the lowering of standards in public services, in education, health care, transport and social security. Two recently proposed directives from the European Commission are particularly outrageous and will have serious consequences, particularly for women:

- a) the possibility of increasing hours of work to 65 per week, and
- b) the right to keep migrants in an «irregular» situation in detention up till 18 months. Even here we are convinced that women, families, have the most to lose, should these measures be introduced.

*The increase of military armament budgets* and research in progress to produce new weapons, including nuclear spearheads, the growing involvement in wars without decisive outcome, the increased dependency on NATO which clearly wishes to dominate security policies and the defence of the EU and to replace the UN and OSCE, all this is unacceptable. We must struggle to accomplish nuclear disarmament, the end to foreign bases, the peaceful solving of conflicts, respect for UN resolutions and human rights, particularly in the Near East. Severe criticism of NATO and its aggressive policies were put forward in yesterday's debates, and looking ahead to the great rally in Strasbourg and Kehl April 4th 2009 on the occasion of the NATO summit meeting to celebrate its 60th anniversary, we need women to mobilise energetically. We know that planning together with international contacts for the event is to take place in Kassel in January, in Paris in February, in Brussels in March.

*Europe must establish entirely different relationships, based on new criteria*, with the countries of the Global South and especially with the whole Mediterranean area, primarily to contribute towards promoting relations based on trust in peace, an end to war as a means of solving conflicts. The target of realising progressive, universal and controlled disarmament, of relinquishing nuclear arms in coordinated steps, should be launched, abandoning also military bases and put an end to foreign occupation. Compromise with dictatorships and the survival of relations inherited from earlier domination must cease and be replaced by support for those working to develop democracy, social justice

means of implementating them, against voluntary termination of pregnancy, the freedom to decide whether to marry or not, to get a divorce or freely to choose forms of cohabitation. Sexual aggression, rape, sexual exploitation are intolerable realities. Normative and repressive discrimination is exercised towards those wish to live their sexual orientation or gender identity openly. Women are victims most of all within patriarchal and traditionalist systems of thought that are opposed to the emancipation and education of a critical spirit through education and culture, to the freedom of expression and of thought, freedom of religious belief or non-belief.

In armed conflicts, civilians are the first victims. It is children and women who pay the heaviest price of the horror of war. Amongst migrating populations fleeing from extreme poverty, from fighting, hunger, epidemics and all kinds of disasters, whether natural or caused by human activity, it is the women and children who most suffer the consequences, likewise of the obstacles set up to prevent freedom of movement and the right to asylum.

*On all these issues, Europe should be setting an example, but fails to do so.*

The European treaties, the Charter of basic human rights, including texts of implementation, should include total equality between women and men focusing on the practical application in every day life. This should be reflected in decisions in all economic, social and political areas. A gender-focused perspective should exist in the implementation of all international tools of action such as treaties, conventions, charters, legal decisions, resolutions... Help and support must be available to all female victims of different kinds of discrimination and violence, in the home, in the work place, in the streets and during armed conflicts. To receive and to protect women migrating for economic reasons or wanting to seek asylum and protection in the face of threats to their security, their families or even their survival, this is a responsibility incumbent on society.

*In order to achieve the social, democratic, peaceful, solidaric Europe that we all wish for, we cannot be content with the contents of the proposed Constitutional Treaty rejected in 2005, nor with the Lisbon Treaty still being considered, in spite of the people's No in Ireland. Where social economic rights, human rights, those of women and of children are concerned, there must*

history. Now they have Resolution 1325 to help them lodge these ideas in the current peace process. I really hope they succeed.

My third example is women maintaining a feminist street presence against militarization and war. This is something typical of a network I belong to, and perhaps some of you do too: Women in Black against War. This began in Israel in 1988, spread next to Italy, then Spain, soon to Serbia and it now exists in a whole lot of countries worldwide. It has a very simple formula for action – the silent vigil, usually for an hour, in some public place. It's women only, wearing black, and holding messages on banners and placards to make a political point.

We have a Women in Black group in London. Our aim is to inform the public and challenge our own government on its militarism. So for instance before the Iraq war we held vigils to try and keep Britain out of it. Now we campaign for pulling the troops out.

We call for interventions by the UK government to help end the Israeli occupation and bring a just peace to Palestinians.

We protest against Britain's part in the international arms trade. And just now we're struggling to get the government to reverse its decision to upgrade the UK's nuclear weapons and submarines.

We give out around 500 leaflets in an hour. Although the vigil itself is silent, the leafleters engage in discussion with passers-by.

We get people to sign petitions to the government. The thing is, it's unusual to see women standing in public, as women.

We make use of that.

We think our silence and non-violence makes a powerful impression.

We're just one of scores of such vigils all over Europe.

Finally, my fourth example. What feminist antiwar organizations see from their close encounter with war is that patriarchal gender relations have something to do with it. Gender as we live it is a relation of power and inequality, in which masculinity is constructed as violent, and women all too often play their supportive part. Gender as we live it is one of the factors that perpetuate war.

So - to win sustainable peace we have to transform gender relations. We

have to end patriarchal rule, the prevalence of masculine values and male authority, in the institutions of society, the corporations, the militaries, the churches and mosques – as also in the family, in the community and the street. That itself would be a major contribution to peace. This means that we should see the feminist organizations all over Europe that oppose and try to end violence against women, rape, abuse of children, violent media and computer games, and so on, as a resource for peace and security in the long term.

That's all from me. The message is (and it's a message I hear loud and clear from women's organizations) is that there are several causes of war. One is capitalism and its relentless economic predation – that's often a primary cause. Another is nationalism – I mean nationalist, ethnic and religious rivalry and hatred. That often sparks war. *The thing is, patriarchy as a system of power is absolutely intertwined with those other two.* They are inseparable. Where capitalism and nationalism – and militarism – are shaping things, you can be sure patriarchy is too. Patriarchal gender relations are right in there, a root cause of war, disposing our societies to violence, making war thinkable.

That's why feminism is a key resource for peace and security.

## **Raoul Alonzo, Le Mouvement de la Paix**

For a democratic Europe, a Europe of peace, solidarity and justice for all, of equal rights between women and men, working in cooperation with others to achieve sustainable development that includes the countries of the global South.

Good morning, my name is Raoul Alonzo and my contribution is in the name of The Mouvement de la Paix, the Peace Movement in France, of which I am a board member in charge of issues concerned with Europe. I wish to express my regrets that Arielle Denis who is co-president of this organisation could not be with us as she is at this moment taking part in the anti-war assembly at the ESF.

We would like this contribution to be seen in the perspective of promoting and constructing a Culture of Peace in the world, based on the eight major themes put forward by the UN and UNESCO for the decade 2000-2010.

*Equality between women and men* is one of these themes and I will start there. This theme is in harmony with the values vital to the commitment of pacifists, ecologists and those striving to abolish all forms of discrimination, injustice, social and cultural inequalities, to prevent war and make possible the emancipation of human kind.

In today's Europe we need to concentrate all our efforts to come closer to this equality we seek to achieve, efforts required of our national institutions and those of the European Union, and, indeed, of individual men. I am one of these, and so I approach this subject humbly, but without complacency. What is right for Europe is also right for the world at large. Every positive step forward in one particular country can, however, be of help it can spread to others.

Our societies, even if in unequal measure, are still imbued with sexism, macho attitudes, patriarchal patterns at work and in the family. Domestic violence is a constant concern. Sexual harassment, wage and other forms of discrimination in the work place are experienced by millions of women. Obstacles are raised against the recognition of contraceptive rights and effective

will be a paper tiger and nothing else.

In Operation 1325 we act in different ways in order to implement 1325 in real life. We act with demands towards government and parliament, EU and UN. I. e. we now have written to all foreign ministers and Solana and calling for them not to adopt EU Security Strategy as it is without any mention of women's role in the peace process and SC resolution 1325, which all Member States are bound to.

We educate people's high school teachers in resolution 1325 and individual women in human rights and conflict resolution. So far some hundreds. We work directly with women in conflict areas such as Sudan and Middle East.

This year it is eight years since resolution 1325 was adopted by SC. Eight countries have now adopted an action plan. Women's absence is still obvious. There are very few women working with peace in the UN and in Security Council there are still only men. In both the UN police forces and military forces women are only a fraction and no real effort to get the member states to increase police or military women has been made. Today women are between 3-5%. The goal for the UN to reach equal gender participation in all professional positions is very far away.

The declared will in the international society to involve women's and men's social and economic development in security policy, does not mean that this is full-filled. Nothing is said about women's right to live without violence even if every fifth woman has been sexually abused in her lifetime. Focus is on war, armed conflicts, nuclear weapons, terrorists, organised crime and poverty. The analysis lack a gender perspective and, as I mentioned before, in the European Security Strategy "women" does not exist and resolution 1325 is not at all mentioned, even if all European countries are bound by the Security Council's adoption of resolution 1325.

It seems as if neither Solana nor any other leader in the European Union has listened carefully the old roman statesman Cicero when he stated: "There are two ways of solving conflicts - through negotiations or through violence. The first one is aimed for human beings - the other one for wild beasts."

Will they ever learn? When will they ever learn?

It is high time that we women "mind our own business" and take our seats in the whole peace process and let our perspective influence security policy.

Thank you

## Maj Britt Theorin, Operation 1325

### Women, peace and security

"Both now and before we had to stand your eternal war. And with patience we forgave and understood what men did. You never listened to our critics - you were not our ideal. And still we understood your trick. We hear that you have done something very stupid in a very vital issue and ask you - and we smile even if our heart is worried and heavy: "How did you manage with your peace-agreement? Have you decided about the communiqué which should be carved in stone?" The man answered quite calm: "Mind your own business. Leave me alone" and I remained silent.

Those words of Lysistrata in the play of Aristofanes 411 years before Christ could have been said by women all over the world today. Mind your own business. Leave me alone. Women are not even today allowed to give their opinion on security.

Security has long been high on the political agenda and the leaders of the world are talking of security and freedom as high ideals for all human beings. But whose security are they talking about? The agenda is set by men and it deals with men's perspective of security, which means military security and security for the state, not human security. Security policy lacks a gender perspective. In the Security Strategy for EU, to be adopted in December, the word "women" does not even exist. A gender perspective is necessary in order to see the differences in the need of security between women and men.

The gender related violence increases in war. Rape and sexual violence are used as a war strategy. Not long ago several countries included rape in their written war strategies Rape as a war strategy - preferably in front of the enemy - is used in order to break down the family and create social instability. It strengthens one mans virility on behalf of the other mans humiliation. In that confrontation the woman who is raped has no value. She is just an object.

The gender related violence depends on the subordinating of women. Violence is a very important measure to keep the power and privileges men enjoy. Maud Eduards professor at Stockholm's University has studied men's violence against women in war. In her opinion the conceptions: state, nation, security and war are strongly sex coded. Nowhere in the official life are women and men's sex roles and missions more separated than in war and interna-

tional crises management. The man is the strong and brave hero-like soldier and the woman the weak one who had to be defended. Women symbolize non-power and weakness.

Why not listen to women and their experiences? I am convinced that security policy should look totally different if that happened. The security concept must involve both women and men's security. Equality is a precondition to secure women. And a society can never reach equality as long as gender values are built on a norm, which value the male values higher. That is why the traditional socially constructed sex roles must change.

The fact is that women are not invited to the peace table anywhere. No Bosnian women took part in the peace negotiations ending the war in Bosnia even if the whole world knew about the systematic rapes women had faced. In Tadjikistan's peace negotiations one of twenty-six delegates was a woman, even if the war had created 25.000 widows. And I can go on with Sierra Leone, Arusha, Afganistan, Iraq and all other conflicts in the world. Women are raped and sexually abused and forced into slavery. And they are refused any partaking in peacenegotiations, in conflict prevention work, in mediation, in every peace process.

This was also reflected in the values I met when my report in the European Union Parliament about women and peace should be decided on during the spring 2000. A male chairman protested against the report and said: "We can write some words about it in our defence report" and continued: "Women shall not deal with this. Don't you understand that we men are fighting war for you". My report was adopted by the EP in the fall some weeks before the Security Council in UN adopted resolution 1325 with the same conclusions.

My report demanded women's full participation in all peace work - not only after conflicts but also preventive. Gender perspective should be an obvious part of both planning and practical dealing in conflict situations and in all peacebuilding work. Women must have at least 40% of all positions in reconciliation, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and conflict prevention. All personal - civil and military - dealing with international security and development must be educated in gender-analysis of conflict situations.

To secure women's rights to influence diplomatic work women had to be educated in negotiations and reconciliation and a register should be created of women, qualified for peace and security related positions. More women should be recruited to diplomatic service and more women to international

diplomatic positions in peace commissions, special envoys etc. Much more women must take part in international meeting dealing with peace and security and formal peace negotiations.

My report is still in the drawer of the European Commission. But SC resolution 1325 exist now 8 years later. And it has to leave the nice words and become reality. That's why we - six women's peace organisations - started Operation 1325.

We demanded the Swedish government to work with nine areas in the action program in order to implement 1325. They were:

- 1) develop a clear policy of peaceful conflict handling instead of military actions
- 2) develop a plan in order to step by step reserve as much resources to prevent military conflict as for military actions
- 3) give full support to UN as the peace organisation of the world and forcefully stand up for human rights
- 4) introduce education in conflict handling in all level of education and in teachers education
- 5) specific support for training of women in conflict areas and international peace missions
- 6) create an active register of qualified women for different peace missions
- 7) involve at least 40% women in all peace work as educator, conflict solver, mediator, peace keeper, observer and peace negotiator
- 8) support and encourage women's organisations in their work to implement UN resolution 1325
- 9) develop strategies in order to involve gender perspective in all prevention, conflict handling and peace-building work.

It took nearly six years until Sweden adopted a first action program on how the resolution should be implemented. We had quite some critics against it. It will end in December and a new action program will be formulated. What has to be done to improve the Swedish action plan? How is Operation 1325 working in order to implement 1325 in everyday work?

Our nine points are still valid and not fulfilled. They have to be implemented. First of all an action program must define the goal and then describe how the goal will be reached; i. e. how many women in the different peace processes do we want? 30%?, 40%? When shall it be fulfilled? The action plan must every year be checked and if necessary revised. Otherwise the SC resolution