



# Briefing paper

---

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016

No.8

---

**Subject: The Leeds International Olof Palme Memorial Peace Lecture and the return from Manchester to Hiroshima of 1950's schoolchildren art**

## 1. Introduction

This report by the Chapter Secretary provides an overview of two recent and welcome developments that the Mayors for Peace member authorities Leeds City Council and Manchester City Council have been involved in supporting. The first is the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition of the Leeds International Olof Palme Peace Lecture, which this year was given by Caroline Lucas MP. The second is the return of art from Manchester to Hiroshima by schoolchildren in one of the first schools rebuilt in Hiroshima after the atomic bombing of the city, and the interesting story around it. Both are good examples of the types of events and role of the emerging UK and Ireland Mayors, Provosts and Leaders for Peace Chapter.

## 2. Creation and development of the Leeds International Olof Palme Peace Lecture

For a number of years, Leeds City Council, through its 'Peacelink' liaison group, has cooperated with the Politics and Applied Global Ethics Department of Leeds Beckett University; and in 2016 also with the UK and Ireland Mayors, Provosts and Leaders for Peace Chapter, to organise the annual Leeds International Olof Palme Memorial Peace Lecture.

The lecture was first established in 1987 by then MEP for Leeds, and subsequently Leeds councillor, Michael McGowan, in memory of the Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, a prominent leader of the 'Non Aligned Movement' at the United Nations, and active campaigner for the end of apartheid in South Africa, peace in the Middle East and the need for a nuclear weapons free world at the height of the Cold War. Olof Palme attended as a student activist an international conference in Leeds University in the 1950s. These lectures have been held to remember his work for promoting peace and security in the world.

Olof Palme first became prime minister of Sweden in 1969 and held the post over three terms up until his tragic death in 1986. During his time as Prime Minister he managed to carry out major constitutional reforms in Sweden. He was a widely recognised international political figure and he openly criticised and opposed apartheid in South Africa, the Franco Regime in Spain, the United States' role in the Vietnam War and the crushing of the Prague Spring by the Soviet Union. He was also active in campaigning against nuclear weapons proliferation and for the needs and living standards of the global South.

On 28th February, 1986, he was shot dead as he leaving a cinema in Stockholm accompanied by his wife Lisbeth. No one was ever found guilty of this crime.

Since 1999, Leeds City Council has been an active member of the Hiroshima-led Mayors for Peace. It was also one of the first cities in the UK to develop a city centre peace trail. Leeds Beckett University is one of a small number of UK universities with a Peace Studies section, which is within its Politics and Applied Global Ethics Department.

---

## THE UK & IRELAND CHAPTER OF MAYORS FOR PEACE

### 3. Previous Leeds Peace Lecturers

The lectures officially began early in 1987 and have taken place in Leeds Civic Hall on an annual basis.

There have been a long line of esteemed speakers for this lecture, including the following:

- The wife of Olof Palme, Lisbeth Palme
- The Mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Tadatoshi Akiba and Iccho Itoh
- Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, John Hume MP MEP
- Former International Development Minister, Clare Short M.P.
- Former Director of the West Yorkshire Playhouse, Jude Kelly
- Former Director of the Council of Europe's North – South Centre, Jos Lemmers
- Former leader of the European Parliament Socialist Group, Pauline Green
- Former MEP and Chair of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Ken Coates

In the past decade the following lectures have been presented:

- 2006: Professor Paul Rogers, Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford – “A War too Far? Iran, Iraq and the New American Century”
- 2007: International stage and screen actor Sir Patrick Stewart – “Why Promote Human Rights?”
- 2008: Chair of the Northern Ireland Peace Talks and US Senator George Mitchell – “Is World Peace Possible?”
- 2009: Bruce Kent, Vice President of CND – “The Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons - Possibilities & Practicalities”
- 2010: Former international war correspondent Victoria Brittain – “Lies, Truth and Whistleblowers in War Reporting”
- 2011: Professor Johan Galtung, Founder and Director of TRANSCEND - A Peace and Development Network for Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means – “World Interests - and what Wikileaks tells us about Diplomacy as an Institution”
- 2012: Professor Sir Richard Jolly, former Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations and Honorary Professor at Sussex University – “Security for People - the real alternative to crisis and war”
- 2013: Colin Archer, Secretary-General of the International Peace Bureau – “Military Spending in a time of Austerity”
- 2014: Professor Jenny Pearce, Professor of Latin American Politics at the University of Bradford – “1945-2045: Towards a Politics for a Future Peace”
- 2015: Professor Alistair Hay from the University of Leeds – “Chemical Weapons: Just History?”

In each case, the lectures have provided a serious consideration of various aspects of peace and conflict from the particular personal perspective of each speaker. Each lecture has been opened by the Lord Mayor of Leeds and chaired by a prominent individual – the Leader, Deputy Leader or Chief Executive of Leeds City Council; or a leading academic from Leeds Beckett University.

### 4. The 2016 Lecture – ‘War and Peace in the Modern World’ by Caroline Lucas MP

The 2016 Peace Lecture was given by the prominent Parliamentarian and Co-leader of the Green Party, Caroline Lucas MP, on the subject ‘War and Peace in the Modern World’. It was held in Leeds Civic Hall on the 27<sup>th</sup> October. An official welcome was given by the Lord Mayor of Leeds, Councillor Gerry Harper. An explanation of the reason behind the lecture series was also given by the lecture founder Michael McGowan and the lecture itself was chaired by Councillor Lucinda Yeadon, Deputy Leader of Leeds City Council and Executive Member for the Environment. Over 220 people attended the lecture.

Caroline Lucas was elected as a Green Party Member of the European Parliament for the South East England Region in 1999 and re-elected in 2004 and 2009. She was elected as leader of the Green Party in 2008 and was elected the MP for Brighton Pavilion in 2010, being re-elected in 2015. She was also named ‘Politician of the Year’ in 2007, 2009 and 2010 by readers of ‘The Observer’ Newspaper. In Parliament she is a leading member of the Environmental Audit Committee and the Chair of the Cross-Party Parliamentary CND group.

Caroline Lucas's talk concentrated on the two huge problems that humanity has created and now faces, which threaten our very existence on Earth – climate change and nuclear war. The talk considered that our politicians now have the power to destroy so much but asked the question do they have the intelligence and the initiative to save the world and its people? In the lecture Caroline Lucas focused on current and future global threats, alongside solutions that will help build a more secure stable world for all. She also talked about the threat posed by the ecological crisis in particular and set out what she thinks Britain's foreign policy ought to look like, including, of course, the issue of Brexit.

The full text of the lecture is attached as Appendix 1. Following the lecture, and as is usual with it, there was opportunity for questions and a detailed discussion with the audience.

This lecture series will continue in 2017, but the Chapter Secretariat would be interested in seeing if it could be part of a series of lectures including other members of the Mayors for Peace in the UK and Republic of Ireland. A number of other academic institutions are interested in assisting with the organisation of such events and anyone interested in hosting a local lecture should contact the Chapter Secretary using the contact details on the first page of this briefing.

Such lectures are an excellent opportunity to promote the work of participating organisations and the Mayors for Peace. Pictures from the history of the lecture are attached as Appendix 2.

## **5. Hibakuska art returns from Manchester to Hiroshima**

Over the past two years, Manchester City Council has been involved in a project to promote and then return pieces of art generated by schoolchildren survivors of the Hiroshima atomic bombing. This project has now successfully concluded with a recent ceremony in the school in Hiroshima which brought together some of the original artists, some six decades after they had made the paintings.

The paintings were donated back to Hiroshima by Manchester schoolteacher Mike Stevenson. The story behind them is quite fascinating.

The start of the story begins in 1945. Doctor Takuo Matsumoto was the Principal of a Methodist Girls' High School in Hiroshima, Japan, when the atomic bomb was dropped on August 6<sup>th</sup> 1945. He managed to rescue 12 of the 62 first year students who were in the Assembly Hall on site at the time of the explosion; 50 others died there and several of those rescued subsequently died. 300 of the school's students were killed, having been sent into the city with their teachers to assist in clearing away debris from the streets as part of key civic duties. Many simply disappeared and those who survived the initial impact all died in the immediate aftermath.

Dr. Matsumoto's wife was killed and his daughter was severely injured. The school buildings were destroyed, and Dr. Matsumoto's health was seriously damaged.

One of the students Sueko Kamatsuka (maiden name Yamane) describes what happened in her story called "Under The Assembly Hall". Having crawled towards the light through the rubble of the collapsed Assembly Hall, and managed to get out with some others, she writes:

*"In the confusion, my classmates and I started to head to the nearby Sentei Garden (Shukkeien) which was assigned as a refuge. That is when I heard another friend call out from under the rubble. Startled, I ran closer. Although no one was visible, I could tell from the amount of moaning that there were many people trapped under a collapsed wall. We tried to lift the wall, but with just a few girls' strength it wouldn't budge. We called to our classmates under the wall to encourage them; there was nothing else we could do. Time passed in frustration. We were at a loss as to what to do. That's when our school principal, Mr. Matsumoto, came by and told us to run away. "It's fortunate that you survived. The fire is approaching, so I want you to escape immediately to Mount Ushita. All right?" he said, almost shouting. We realized that the time had come to say goodbye to our friends. We kept looking back, each time apologizing in our hearts and folding our hands in prayer. I can still, to this day, hear my friends' cries for help."*

In spite of the horrors, the school started again in different buildings at the end of October 1945, although many of the 100 students and 5 teachers were maimed or seriously ill. It is thought that this was the first school in Hiroshima to resume teaching after the bombing.

After the war, specialists in art education met to discuss the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) programme for developing art education to promote peace. They laid great emphasis on the need to foster international co-operation and peace through the sharing of information, techniques, ideas and beliefs.

The exchanges of art works produced by children in different countries were seen as crucially important tools for promoting international harmony and co-operation. It is reasonable to assume that these exchanges were what enabled Dr Matsumoto to bring to the United States two sets of art works made by Japanese children. Mr Stevenson has subsequently called them "The Hiroshima Collection" and "The UNESCO Collection". The Hiroshima Collection comprised works by the pupils of the Methodist Girls High School in Hiroshima, now known as the Jogakuin High School.

Both collections were given to, and looked after by an eminent English art teacher, Prue Wallis-Myers, who later joined Her Majesty's Inspectorate. It is possible that Dr. Matsumoto and Miss Wallis-Myers met in America, since it is known that he was there in 1949 and that she taught there after winning a Fulbright scholarship in the 1950s. Both were committed Christians, and Dr. Matsumoto was visiting the institution in which he had trained as an educator. He also gave several interviews for radio and newspapers describing his experience of the bombing.

On her retirement, Prue Wallis-Myers entrusted the care and further use of the two collections of Japanese paintings to Mike Stevenson, as the person responsible for art education in the local authority area in which she lived in the years before her death.

In 2014, Mr Stevenson read on the 'BBC Manchester' website about a project Manchester City Council was undertaking to grow trees from ginkgo seeds donated from Hiroshima. The seeds come from an A-bombed tree located in the Shukkeien Gardens (noted above) close to the hypocentre of the atomic bomb. This tree sprouted again in spring 1946, giving hope to the survivors (hibakuska) of the bomb that they could rebuild their city and plants could grow.

Mr Stevenson got in touch with the Lord Mayor's Office and met up with the Mayors for Peace Chapter Secretary. Communication was then made by the Chapter Secretary with the Mayors for Peace office in Hiroshima, who got in touch with the school.

While these connections were being put in place, the paintings were shown in two special events – in the House of Lords in an event at which a hibakuska talked of their experiences to an invited audience; and for the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings at the Deiwa Japanese Cultural Centre in London.

In November 2015, Mr Stevenson exhibited the paintings to the Mayor of Hiroshima and colleagues visiting Manchester on a civic visit relating to the 'Project G' art and poetry project it had held with Manchester primary schools. They were then exhibited to Manchester councillors at a 'Full Council' meeting that was held in solidarity with the victims of the Paris terrorist attacks. The paintings have all been digitised by Manchester University and will be exhibited again in the city.

In July 2016, the paintings were formally sent to Japan and given to the Principal of the Jogakuin High School. In late October 2016, the paintings were seen by some of the School's Alumni Association where a number of the pupils who made the works finally got to see them again. For Mike Stevenson the paintings stand as a lasting tribute to the vision, imagination and expressive feelings of the young artists who made them, and to the people of that city and their contribution to peace. Pictures from this process are attached as Appendix 3. The paintings are also a testament to the positive role of the Mayors for Peace in bringing them back from New York and Manchester to Hiroshima.

**Text of 2016 Leeds International Olof Palme Peace Lecture by Caroline Lucas MP****“War and Peace in the Modern World: Building Peace Together – A Green Approach to International Security”****1. Introduction and the importance of Olof Palme**

Thank you for your invitation to speak here this evening.

It's a pleasure to be among so many friends and colleagues. And a really great privilege to be given this chance to reflect on the legacy of Olof Palme, here in Leeds with its strong track record and commitment to peace.

Olof worked tirelessly to highlight the common needs of people across the world.

His murder in 1986, at the age of 59, was a huge loss for us all. He had so much still to contribute to the cause of peace and justice in the world.

As we look back over the years since his death, and look at the challenges we face today, one aspect of Olof Palme and his work strikes me as particularly encouraging.

Palme was a political insider. He worked as, in effect, a special advisor for the Swedish Prime Minister Tage Erlander, and went on to become a Minister of Transport, and then of Education.

He was Prime Minister of Sweden for a total of ten years.

Yet his record is one of radical reform, and support for peace, social progress and the environment.

He proves that it is possible to stick to your principles and still get elected.

And, once there, to use that power and influence for good.

And, because I think we need some hope in dark times, this is the theme I would like to explore with you tonight.

**2. Mixed Progress**

In the years since Olof Palme's death, we have seen so much conflict, repression and exploitation.

Wars in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, in the former Soviet Union and in Africa.

Millions of lives wasted, millions more maimed, traumatised, forced to flee.

The seemingly endless cycle of terrorism and repression, one feeding off the other.

World leaders have not only created war, or fuelled it for their own reasons.

They have also blamed the victims.

They turn their backs on the refugees, or pander to the xenophobes who claim that those seeking asylum are some kind of threat to our way of life, rather than fellow humans who deserve our compassion and our help.

We've also had to witness the corruption and waste of the arms trade. Billions of pounds spent on unnecessary weapons, keeping whole nations in poverty and debt. So that even when those weapons remain unused, they still blight too many lives.

And yet, looking back over the years since 1989, **we can also point to progress.**

- Fewer children growing up in poverty.
- Progress on controlling major diseases.
- International action to protect the ozone layer.
- Democracy taking root in Latin America, and in Eastern Europe.
- The resolution of seemingly intractable conflicts – none more so than in Northern Ireland.
- We have the proxy war in Ukraine; but we have also seen a fragile form of peace endure in the former Yugoslavia.
- We've seen the disaster of the invasion of Iraq; yet we've also seen full-scale war averted between India and Pakistan.

### **3. Public Pressure**

For those of us who are committed to the path of peace, and who understand that peace can only come through addressing issues such as social justice and climate change, we must bear witness to what is wrong; **but also draw encouragement from what has been achieved.**

***The lesson is, I think, this: We can make a difference.***

We can help shape public opinion. We can influence the thinking of the elites.

We can, some of the time at least, provide the setting in which world leaders make the right choices.

There is the example of Harold Wilson. As Prime Minister during the Vietnam War, he was under huge pressure from the Americans to commit troops to that conflict, as Australia did. Yet Harold Wilson refused.

Maybe not for the right reasons.

It may have been political calculation, or pressure from Labour MPs and party members. But the result was the same.

And contrast that with Tony Blair's decision in Iraq.

More recently, public opinion helped persuade MPs to reject David Cameron's call for armed intervention in Syria.

That intervention did in the end come - albeit at a different target - but there was at least time for reflection. And we have at least established the principle that Parliament should vote on the decision to begin military action.

***We have seen this same mix of progress and regression on arms control:***

- Biological weapons were banned in 1972.
- Chemical weapons in 1993.
- Landmines in 1997.
- Cluster munitions in 2008.

In each case, politicians and their advisors doing the right thing: even if sometimes they were pushed into it.

But, nuclear disarmament –the greatest challenge of all – has so far proved near-impossible.

There are at least 16,000 nuclear weapons in existence today. And I want to pay tribute to ICAN, the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons and to highlight that, tonight, at the UN, there is a vote on whether non-nuclear states can embark on talks aimed at banning all nuclear

weapons. I don't know but can guess at how the UK will vote, yet it's an incredible step forward that this vote is even happening.

Those with nuclear weapons are intent on upgrading them – with the UK amongst the chief culprits. And non-nuclear states are encouraged to pursue their twisted ambitions.

***The same kind of pattern is there with the environment too.***

We look around us, and we see deepening threats to the sustainability of the planet on which we depend absolutely.

And so many decisions go the wrong way.

We know that fracking will make it far harder to reduce carbon emissions. Yet the government has given fracking the green light.

And although the government has no more idea than anyone else how to deal with radioactive waste, it is still pressing ahead with a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point.

Committing £100 billion of our money, which would be far better spent on reducing our energy needs and developing renewable alternatives.

But this year has also seen an important new agreement on phasing out the HFC group of chemicals that damage the ozone layer.

This builds on the historic Montreal Protocol – the international agreement to ban CFCs and other substances that were destroying the ozone layer that protects us all from harmful radiation.

An agreement that has already succeeded in eliminating 98% of those chemicals. So that now the hole in the ozone layer is finally beginning to heal.

An agreement that proves that international co-operation is not a pipe-dream. Countries can come together for the common good.

**4. Interlinked Threats**

The case I'd like to make tonight is that we need that co-operation now, more than ever, to tackle the three great crises of our time:

**a) Political Crisis**

The first is a political crisis. Our global political system is built on, and promotes, violent and militarised relationships. In 2015, governments spent \$1.7 trillion dollar on weapons and arms. And this was an increase from the year before. (SIPRI, 2016. <https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2016/world-military-spending-resumes-upward-course-says-sipri>)

\$1.7 trillion dollars is a simply unimaginable number.

To put it in some perspective, it is more than ten times the amount spent on international aid and development. And far, far more than was spent on peacekeeping or conflict resolution.

Between 1990 and 2010, the number of armed conflicts fell from 49 to 31. But by last year, this had once again increased to 50.

South Sudan, Kashmir, Syria, Palestine, Yemen, Democratic Republic of Congo. The list is a roll-call for the unknown numbers of dead.

(Uppsala Conflict Data Programme, 2016. <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP/> UNHCR, 2016. <http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/6/5763b65a4/global-forced-displacement-hits-record-high.html> and UNHCR, 2016. *Stateless People*. <http://www.unhcr.org/stateless-people.html>)

And there are now 65 million refugees worldwide<sup>3</sup>, and 10 million stateless people.

## **b) Economic Crisis**

The second crisis is economic. We have a broken economic system that perpetuates unjust and exploitative relationships.

As an English graduate, I am often reminded of a Jane Austen heroine. We see her seated in a charming drawing room, taking tea with the dashing hero. We are delighted with this admirable scene.

Yet at the same time, we know that the lifestyle, even down to the tea they are drinking or the sugar they are stirring into it, is based on exploitation – poverty wages, disenfranchisement, discrimination, and above all, on a slave economy.

We live in a world where exploitation is routine. Where unjust economic relationships are the norm.

Despite all the wealth that has been created in the past decades, around four billion people remain in poverty. Two billion remain hungry. This is more than ever before in history.

(J.Hickel, 2016. 'The true extent of global poverty and hunger: Questioning the good news narrative of the Millennium Development Goals', *Third World Quarterly*.)

(Global Justice Now, 2016.

<http://www.globaljustice.org.uk/news/2016/sep/12/10-biggest-corporations-make-more-money-most-countries-world-combined>)

The richest 1% now have more wealth than the rest of the world combined. No wonder democracy is under threat from extremists and demagogues.

In truth, our economic system is no longer under democratic control. Worldwide, 69 of the top 100 economic entities are corporations, not countries. With no accountability, no responsibility, how long do we have before the next financial crash?

## **c) Ecological Crisis**

Then there is the ecological crisis – a planet exploited beyond its natural limits.

To feed our lifestyles, we have stolen from the future; and from countries and people weaker than ourselves.

But we are not free from the consequences. The loss of habitats, the changes to our climate, the risks of disease, flooding, droughts and storms will affect us too.

Yet in the same week when we learned that the concentration of carbon in the atmosphere had passed the danger threshold of 400 parts per million, our government announced a new runway at Heathrow.

They have signed the Paris Agreement but are going 'all out for shale'. They set up a Green Investment Bank but will not let it borrow at the scale we need. They've stopped building onshore wind turbines but hand out £6bn<sup>7</sup> in subsidies to fossil fuel companies every year.

(Overseas Development Institute, 2015. *Empty promises: G20 subsidies to oil, gas and coal production*. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/publications/10058-empty-promises-g20-subsidies-oil-gas-and-coal-production>)

We know that climate change is a risk to peace and security.

The Ministry of Defence understands that the major strategic threats of the future are things like climate change.

They recognise that coastal flooding, climate-driven migration and rising food prices due to drought and water stress will be some of the most significant impacts of climate change over the next 30

years – and that these pose a significant security threat. Far greater than anything a nuclear weapon might help us with.

Yet if containing climate change is like a war, then it is one that we are losing, despite victory in some battles.

And in a vicious cycle, climate change adds further stress to a struggling global economy, undermines global cooperation, which in turn slows, or even halts, efforts to tackle the problem. And all the while the temperature rises.

## **5. Linked Crises**

So we face three closely-linked crises. And we cannot deal with each in isolation. Economic mismanagement is wrecking our climate. Climate change is creating droughts that destabilise whole nations, foster conflicts and create new flows of refugees. And that in turn creates political instability, and risks making our economic and environmental challenges all the more hard to tackle, by fomenting fear, xenophobia and isolationism.

### **a) Syria**

The current crisis in Syria provides a nightmarish example of this. The country's political system has been broken for years. Under Assad and his predecessors, we have seen decades of repression, ethnic and religious divisions, vast spending on defence, even direct support for terrorism, particularly in neighbouring Lebanon.

But Syria has also been a pawn in a larger geo-political game, which Britain has played, alongside France, the US and Russia. Where our approach to the country has been driven more by what we can extract from it strategically or economically, than by any genuine interest in the development of Syria, or the welfare of its people.

And where our own role in history – our broken promises to its people after the Great War, our collusion with its incorporation into the French Empire, even our occupation of Syria in the second world war – is a role we prefer to forget.

And if this were not enough, between 2006 and 2010, Syria suffered a severe drought. Herders in the northeast lost nearly 85% of their livestock, affecting 1.3 million people<sup>8</sup>. Nearly 75% of families that depend on agriculture suffered total crop failure.

(UN OCHA, 2010. Available at:

[http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/food/docs/SyriaMissionPreliminaryConclusions\\_07092010.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/food/docs/SyriaMissionPreliminaryConclusions_07092010.pdf)

W. Erian, et al, 2011. *Drought Vulnerability in the Arab Region*. Available at:

[http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/2011/en/bgdocs/Erian\\_Katlan\\_&\\_Babah\\_2010.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/2011/en/bgdocs/Erian_Katlan_&_Babah_2010.pdf)

Climate change is not directly responsible for the conflict in Syria – and we need to be very careful about drawing links in that way.

But it played a role – alongside corruption, poverty, unemployment, lack of political freedom, poor resource management, and those geopolitical tensions.

Ultimately, the crises in Syria must cause us to reflect on the kind of people we are. On the kind of world we want to build.

The world need not be this way. Poverty, war and inequality are not natural. But to create a different world, we must act in it differently.

## **6. Linked Solutions**

And just as the crises are linked, so too are the solutions.

Political reform would give us the chance to reshape economic and environmental policy. That in turn would allow us to tackle the causes of international tension at source. The more that people have jobs, security, and a stake in their society, the less fertile the ground for radicalism and extremism. And that holds good in Britain, just as much as in more unstable parts of the world.

Concerted action on climate would not only help the planet recover. It would reshape local economies to make them more sustainable, and resilient. Less in the control of unaccountable international corporations.

It would break the power of the big energy companies. And reduce the reliance of countries on the resources of their neighbours. Fewer wars for oil.

And economic reforms – based on fairness and accountability – would reduce tensions and provide a better background for the transition to low-carbon economy.

It is now clear to governments everywhere that the environmental risks of not acting on climate change are growing, while the political risks of acting are falling, because the cost of low carbon technology continues to fall dramatically.

And the bankers are starting to get it too.

In Bank of England Governor Mark Carney's speech last September, he warned of what he called the "tragedy of the horizon" – something climate policy makers have long understood – the danger that by the time it had become obvious that something should be done about the climate it would be too late to do it. Since then he's spoken again about climate change and the extent to which climate change represents a threat to financial stability.

And as I've argued, climate change is a stress multiplier. It is already clear from Syria that it can play a key part in creating failed states.

From rebuilding an economy for tomorrow, one that's innovative and means business.

A new global economy of sharing, participation and collaboration. To redistributing power, wealth and jobs, providing genuine security in a world liberated from the threats we face today.....

We know what we need to do. But how can we make this real?

## **7. Engagement**

Let me return to the example of Olof Palme. The political insider who made such a difference in social justice, the environment and in peace.

I am not suggesting that our political leaders are all quite of the calibre of Olof Palme. But he does remind us of the principle that we should look for the good in all our fellow humans.

After all, world leaders are still people. So too are those around them – the advisors and technocrats, the scientists and generals. They in turn have friends, and colleagues, and family, who are perhaps more open to different ways of seeing the world. And so we have the potential for influence.

We live in an inter-connected world. We are, it is said, just five connections away from every other human on the planet. It may be strange to think that this means we are five connections from the sailors on a Trident submarine, or the technicians at Menwith Hill, or the sales team at British Aerospace. But if we are, then this is an opportunity too good to miss.

When we sign a petition, or go on a demonstration, or write to a newspaper, or simply talk to our friends and family about the issues that matter, we have the chance to exercise that influence. To challenge preconceptions and even, perhaps, to shift perceptions a little.

But when it comes to world leaders, or the military and security apparatus, it feels very different. More like an armed stand-off. As if we are in our trenches, and they are in theirs. We trade arguments – perhaps even insults. We struggle to find common ground.

Many of you will share my memories of standing by the fence at Greenham Common. And all of us will have had that same experience. Being on one side of a barrier, and seeing the police, or the

army, or the neo-fascists or whoever on the other. The very setting creates division. We are tempted to see those on the other side as enemies.

Yet I am sure we have all had the impulse to reach out. To try and convince those on the other side to put aside their guns and batons and listen to a more hopeful message. To believe that the human race can be better than an endless future of war and repression. To throw flowers into the fences.

And if we are to be true to our principles, it must be we who step out of our trenches first.

## **8. Making it Happen**

A nice idea, you might say. But what would this mean in practical terms?

In part, that is the conversation I would like us to have as a movement in the weeks to come.

But I do have a few suggestions – particularly about peace and security.

First, that we are clear that greater engagement should not, and need not, mean the sacrifice a single one of our principles or our policies. This is not about junking what matters. It is about finding new ways to converse with others and explain our case.

The second is that we draw upon our strengths. Particularly, those who have already found ways to engage with those whose minds we need to change.

We have in our ranks so many people who have the experience and knowledge to help our political leaders chart a new course.

People like Paul Rogers, Professor of Peace Studies at Bradford University, who has a wide following in the world of international security for his thoughtful analysis. Or Rebecca Johnson, who combines her role as the Green Party's spokesperson on defence and security, and a vice-chair of CND, with advising governments on disarmament. Or Bob Overy, Michael McGowan, Sean Morris and all who follow in their footsteps.

It's not only that we have the right values and instincts. We also have the analysis and arguments too.

My third suggestion is that we should be ambitious.

Take the UK's National Security Strategy. It sounds impressive, doesn't it? National Security Strategy.

Unfortunately, it's rubbish. Ill-thought through. Badly-expressed. And most of all, it doesn't properly engage with the issues.

The respected British defence think-tank, the Royal United Services Institute, has said of climate change: "From a defence perspective, there is a danger that the military will be ill-equipped, under-resourced and under-prepared."

Yet climate change does not appear in any of the three National Security Objectives.

Nor is it listed in the threats facing the UK. Yet our admirals and generals are on record expressing their grave concerns about the threat from climate change. Even Tony Blair said it was one of the two most pressing threats to the United Kingdom.

Contrast this with the United States. There, the defence and security establishment has been thinking about climate change for many years now.

In 2008, the Central Intelligence Agency was ordered to carry out the first ever US National Intelligence Assessment on the national security implications of climate change.

And just last month President Obama issued a Presidential Memorandum insisting that climate change be included in national security policy.

(The White House, 2016. Climate Change and National Security. Available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2016/09/21/presidential-memorandum-climate-change-and-national-security>)

This came on the same day as a report from the US National Intelligence Council noting that climate change is “likely to pose wide-ranging national security challenges for the United States.”

(The Centre for Climate Change & Security. Available at: <https://climateandsecurity.org/2016/09/22/our-take-new-intelligence-and-presidential-memos-on-climate-change-and-security/>)

If even the United States can be more progressive than the UK on this, we know there is room to move.

Now if the British Government needs some help with the National Security Strategy, we are well-placed to help.

We could bring in the environmental and conservation groups. The aid and development groups, who see the impact of climate change. And the refugee groups, who understand the reality of the growing displacement of populations.

In fact, perhaps we should write our own National Security Strategy.

And think how different it would look:

- Tackling problems at source – giving people hope, a stake in their communities, more control over their lives by encouraging democracy and the rule of law.
- Finding ways to reduce tensions and resolve conflicts.
- Replacing economic exploitation with economic cooperation.
- Building up international institutions.
- Replacing wars of adventure with respect for international law.
- Curtailing the arms trade. Showing leadership in arms reduction negotiations.
- And giving a new impetus to nuclear non-proliferation by immediately suspending plans for a replacement for Trident.
- Investment in military equipment that can be used to support disaster relief and peace-keeping.
- A new approach to international trade talks. Globalisation should not be about handing power to multinational corporations. But it could be a force for good if it means agreeing international standards for the environment, workers’ rights and health and safety.
- A global policy of contraction and convergence in which rich countries’ use of finite energy resources contracts, while that of poorer countries expands. Ultimately, the goal being to converge on an equitable and sustainable per capita sharing of global energy, designed to keep well below 2 degrees Centigrade of warming – and ideally below 1.5 degrees too. Only in this way can poor countries improve living standards while the world as a whole avoids hitting resource and climate limits.
- And a new Lucas workers plan – and no I am not naming it after myself but referring to the plan developed 40 years ago by workers at the Lucas Aerospace Company in response to the corporate plan for the company’s future.

The Lucas corporate plan was to ensure a greater involvement in military markets and higher profit rates. It also meant the loss of jobs. The workers argued that concentrating on military goods and markets was neither the best use of resources, nor in itself desirable. And, by swapping the production of military goods for that of useful goods, they demonstrated no jobs needed to be cut.

Way ahead of their times, they looked specifically at energy and proposed that Lucas concentrate on renewable sources of energy generation, alongside developing more efficient methods of energy conservation from fuel sources.

Their proposals included the development and production of heat pumps to use in new housing schemes, using their experience in aerodynamics to develop wind turbines, and producing a

flexible power pack, which could easily adjust to people's situations allowing for small scale electricity generation using basic raw materials. Such instruments would be invaluable in under-developed countries where electricity provision is very poor, they argued.

These pioneers recognised that waging peace means waging war on poverty, inequality and environmental damage.

Marking their 40th anniversary with a massive transition to a new green industrial strategy, that helps tackle climate change, creates secure job and replaces the military economy, would be hugely fitting. Doing this as part of an alternative National Security Strategy is just one of the kinds of opportunities I believe lies within our reach.

To set out our principles and our policies in ways that mesh with the debates already going on within the security community. That channel our expertise. That open up new possibilities. That encourage the generals and the policy-makers to think again about what we have to say.

In short, to aim for the kind of influence that Olof Palme could wield when he was rubbing shoulders with other world leaders. Talking their language, but expressing our principles.

## **9. Policy Failures**

And how much that influence is needed. In recent years, the aura of competence and professionalism that once surrounded our defence and security policy has worn thin:

### **a) Iraq**

In 2003, the UK embarked upon its most disastrous foreign policy decision in my life-time. The war in Iraq. 100,000s of people killed and a country now in chaos. Out of that turmoil we have seen the growth of violence, fragility and instability in the wider region.

Far from protecting us – that war has made the world, and this country, a less safe place.

The expectation that we can coerce security into being – through strategic dominance over others – has not been borne out. After the War On Terror, the world has become less secure for most of its people.

### **b) Trident**

Then there is Trident. In July of this year, I stood in the Commons chamber as MPs debated, and then voted on, the renewal of the Trident nuclear weapons system. They may have won the vote; but we won the argument.

We will now spend up to £200bn on a weapons system that will be redundant before it is even delivered. Developments in underwater technology will likely uncloak our submarines within decades.

(BASIC, 2016. *Will Trident Still Work in the Future?* <http://www.basicint.org/publications/paul-ingram-executive-director/2016/will-trident-still-work-future>)

Nor is Trident much use against today's threats. But it does fuel the threat of nuclear proliferation.

### **c) Civil Liberties**

And we have seen successive governments respond in the most foolish and incompetent way to the threat of terrorism. More surveillance and intrusion showing contempt for the rule of law.

Stigmatising people – not just refugees, but British citizens, whether by race or religion.

And worse of all, being complicit with the nasty, right-wing campaigns on asylum, or religious freedom, or tolerance, that use hatred and racism to drive newspaper sales.

Politicians could show more courage in standing up to 'The Sun' and 'The Mail'. They could say that it is morally wrong, and against the best traditions of our country, to pick on a few young people arriving as refugees, or to criticise a newsreader for wearing a hijab.

Justine Greening is one politician who did challenge Kelvin Mackenzie's narrow-minded views. I salute her for that. But where were her colleagues?

This kind of silence creates a climate in which the forces of division in Britain become stronger. Together with the erosion of civil liberties, and the creeping withdrawal from our international commitments to human rights, it adds up to a victory for the extremists.

Because division and hatred is exactly what terrorists want. It is that which is their true oxygen. Terrorism can only win by provoking a reaction. This is no secret. And yet our leaders are marching into the trap that so-called 'IS' have laid for us.

#### **d) Brexit**

Perhaps the most glaring example of the sheer incompetence of our political elites – and the harm they are doing to the security of our country – is Brexit.

The decision to call the referendum was based solely on internal party political considerations. It was intended to marginalise UKIP.

Well, they got that wrong.

And they assumed they would win. Despite the evidence that people were sick of politicians and rearing to give them a kicking in the ballot-box.

Worst of all, they ignored the most powerful and engaging reasons for our membership of the European Union.

How it has helped avert war in Europe for sixty years. How it has fostered democracy and the rule of law across the whole continent. How it has provided its citizens with the freedom to travel, to study, to work. To experience the richness of the European inheritance.

During the referendum campaign, this message was difficult to get across. How many of us when we went to the ballot boxes were thinking about the courage, ambition and vision that helped create the European Union? And helped us emerge from the rubble and destruction of the 2nd world war into a nation that's been at peace with its neighbours ever since?

A miracle few would have dreamed possible when 25 tons of bombs were raining down on cities like Leeds.

The European Union isn't just the devil that we know. It is the foothills of something truly new, something not quite like anything that has existed on earth before.

It is an astonishing institution, unique in human history, imperfect, of course, because of the scale of its ambition, but truly remarkable none the less. It symbolises lighting a candle rather than cursing the darkness.

Yet we heard so little about this.

Instead, they tried to scare people about jobs and money.

Unfortunately, those scare stories were not all fiction. If Brexit goes ahead, we will indeed all pay a huge economic price.

But the greatest cost of all will be in Britain's retreat into a narrow, inward-looking isolation. Where weapons and money can go anywhere, but refugees are vilified, and compassion chased out of town.

And I worry too about the harm done to the development of a Europe committed to peace and progress.

We only have to recall the chaos after the result was announced. Seeing Cameron, Gove and Johnson standing embarrassed amid the wreckage was like watching a gang of schoolboys whose latest wheeze has burned down the sports hall. That same sense of children who are suddenly faced with the grown-up reality of their actions.

They are not super-heroes or statesmen. Just ordinary people, wrapped up in a protective camouflage of status and privilege. Who have become increasingly detached from reality. Who need our help.

## **10. Conclusions**

So the thought I would like to leave you with this evening is this.

Humanity faces new and dangerous challenges. Our leaders do not have the answers. And I think they know it.

This gives us more of a chance to influence their thinking for the better than we've had for many years. To help set the terms of the debate.

To challenge the outdated models of security.

To put new emphasis on promoting security and peace through economic and ecological justice.

How do we best exploit this enhanced influence? I don't have the answer. But I think we, collectively, do have the answer. That's the conversation I'd like to continue after tonight.

Thank you.

Pictures from the Leeds International Olof Palme Peace Lecture 1986 – 2016



**Olof Palme, 1927 - 1986**



**Lisbeth Palme with Michael McGowan MEP, 1987**



**Michael McGowan with Nobel Peace Laureate John Hume MP MEP**



**Sir Patrick Stewart giving the 2007 Peace Lecture**



**Senator George Mitchell giving the 2008 Peace Lecture**



**Caroline Lucas giving the 2016 Peace Lecture, with the Lord Mayor and Deputy Leader of Leeds City Council behind her**

Hiroshima paintings return to Jogakuin High School almost seventy years on



Hiroshima A-bomb dome painting



The Lord Mayor of Manchester with Mike Stevenson



The current Principal of Jogakuin High School with the A-bomb painting



Some of the Jogakuin High School teachers with Ms Kuranaga and the paintings



Principal Hoshino with Ms Kyoko Kuranaga and her original 1950s painting