

# Providing for long term security for Ireland

## through Non-Offensive Defence, Civilian Based Defence and an innovative policy of neutrality

by Rob Fairmichael,  
Coordinator, INNATE

*Written for Consultative Forum on International Security, June 2023*

-

### Introduction

'Common sense' about security contributed to the evolution of the two World Wars (the Second being a direct result of the First) and the current war in Ukraine. Building up armed strength can be seen by 'others' as preparation for belligerence of one kind or another so it is far more strategic to have security which does not threaten or be seen to threaten others ('non-offensive defence' which also requires less armed forces). And clear non-belligerence is a strong part of providing real defence. There is the question of how we can 'break into' history to prevent cycles of violence.

Neutrality and non-alignment, while taking stands for justice and against militarisation, have been features of Irish state policy from Eamon de Valera's involvement with the League of Nations through the espousal of non-alignment and disarmament by Fianna Fáil Minister for External Affairs Frank Aiken in the 1950s and 1960s, and through to work for the banning of landmines and cluster munitions more recently. This broad policy has served the state and people well.

Ireland's important role in military peacekeeping operations backed by the UN, and any wider work for peace, is threatened by changes in government policy as it would no longer be seen as an 'honest broker' even if NATO membership would not prohibit peacekeeping. But the Irish role could be much more significant in contributing to peace internationally with some imagination, application and without the vast expense which is entailed in buying in to EU and NATO military approaches.

There are innovative methodologies which can be part of non-offensive defence which are ignored. Nonviolent civilian defence could be a very significant part of making Ireland more secure without contributing to military escalation.

Irish contributions to peacemaking worldwide have not been, and are not, just a contribution to world peace, something in accord with the rather ignored Article 29 of Bunreacht na hÉireann, but are also part of Irish 'reputation capital' or 'social capital' which is an important contribution to Irish wellbeing and to Irish security in a wide sense – including military security.

It is also to be noted that this paper is predicated primarily on pragmatism and practicalities rather than morality or particular beliefs although these can be relevant. [\*1]

## **The geopolitical situation currently as it affects Ireland**

There is the mistaken impression that to be 'a good European' a country like Ireland needs to be involved in common EU military structures. Nothing could be further from the truth. [\*2]

There is much loose and unsubstantiated talk about Russia as a threat to Ireland. Russia is obviously a threat to Ukraine and has been supporting military incursion there since 2014. But Russia is only a regional power. The prospect of Russia being a threat to Irish security in terms of invasion or military action is frankly laughable; they cannot even militarily subdue their smaller neighbour, Ukraine.

The USA is the only global superpower with some 800 military bases worldwide (this is a rough estimate) including many 'right on top' of other regional powers (e.g. Iran). If we analyse who has been involved in aggressive wars killing millions and millions of people since World War II, it is the USA which comes out on a reprehensible top. A quick internet search will give some details. It also certainly cannot be said that this has been in pursuit of 'democracy' – if 'democracy' had been allowed to proceed then North and South Vietnam would have been united in 1953 and there would have been no Vietnam war, no mass bombing and killing in Cambodia (and therefore no Pol Pot there), and Allende would not have been overthrown in democratic Chile in 1973 in a CIA-backed coup. The USA has blood on its hands - it is not just Russia in its onslaught in Ukraine. But there were no Western actions and sanctions against the USA and Britain's war on Iraq (2003) for example, or its onslaught in Afghanistan, which led to mass deaths and destabilisation, instead a lot of cheerleading. There is also culpability by Ireland in allowing rendition flights to go through Shannon.

The use of Shannon airport by the USA's military, totally inappropriate for a neutral country, is probably the greatest threat to Irish international 'military security' since it is the main facility in Ireland which makes the country a potential target – either for militant Islamist who take a military view of jihad, or in a war situation where 'the West' and the USA are involved.

There is no realistic prospect of Ireland being invaded. The country is also, in the modern era, of less strategic significance, e.g. the British closed their RAF-run radar base at Bishopsdown in Co Down in 1992 when it was technologically obsolete; the job could be done from elsewhere using fixed, aerial and satellite facilities.

That is not to say there are no risks for Ireland. Shannon airport, as already mentioned, potentially makes Ireland a target. The greatest risk by far, however, is a general conflagration and war in which there would be no one in Europe, possibly in the world, not at risk. Ireland's foremost interest should therefore be in avoiding the risks of such a war. The same arguments apply to worries about undersea communication cables being disrupted; this is only likely to happen in extreme crisis and war because the repercussions for the perpetrator would be so serious.

It is also important to have a concept of 'human security' far beyond any thought of military security. [\*3] Covid-19 is a case in point where the world was unprepared. Global heating and its effects is another, including the inevitable political instability which will follow along with mass migrations. Any concept of international security which is only understood in military terms is woefully inadequate and not preparing for the realities of life as the 21<sup>st</sup> century thunders on.

But insofar as Ireland engages in military defence it should be 'non-offensive defence'. [\*4] Some analysis points out that there can be contradictions between 'non-offensive defence' and 'civilian-based defence' but there is no perceived contradiction within the scope of this paper. Like many such terms it is open to different interpretations but NATO as a sometimes aggressive military alliance with nuclear weapons does not, and cannot fit the bill of being 'non-offensive'. And in the same way, as an EU army becomes more of a reality it too will be used for offensive purposes at

times. An emphasis on military security contradicts and undermines human security because it diverts resources away from human development and promotes and supports war and armed conflict.

NATO is a military alliance which includes nuclear weapons, these WMDs/Weapons of Mass Destruction can be considered illegal in international law [\*5]; it does not even have a 'non first use' policy. The EU is an emerging military force which can also be seen increasingly as the 'European wing' of NATO. The idea that NATO is simply a defensive alliance is nonsense, and nonsense when we consider what its primary power, the USA, has got up to in military escapades.

Military developments are a major contributor to global heating, and, highly ironically, exempt from national figures on greenhouse gas emissions. Further militarisation by Ireland is thus contributing to global warming which is against everyone's interests; while most affecting the poorer countries of the world, Ireland may yet be affected in the form of stronger storms and even becoming colder if the Gulf Stream continues to get weaker or stops. [\*6] The military are also a major contributor to other forms of pollution, e.g. 'forever chemicals' (PFAs). [\*7] None of this is in the interests of Ireland or anywhere in the world.

Irish government attempts to promote involvement in the arms trade is also misplaced. It is a sad reflection on a country which suffered so much violence in the Troubles in the North that people should even think of making armaments and equipment for armed forces that will be used to kill, maim and repress, aside from the waste of money involved. Investment in armaments also gives a poor return in relation to the number of jobs created [\*8] and is has a negative effect on Ireland's name internationally.

### **Ireland's 'self-interested' and 'altruistic' interests in relation to international security**

It can be argued that the two different approaches to what are Ireland's interests are actually the same. But it is important to analyse them both to prevent false narratives about what is 'necessary'.

It is not in Ireland's self-interest to have either the financial burden of involvement with NATO or with EU military developments. These necessitate major increases in military spending and it is totally unclear what additional 'security' Ireland receives for this. It can be argued that it actually increases Irish insecurity because Ireland is seen to be a fellow traveller of NATO and of a 'fortress Europe' policy; "Ironically, it is Ireland's neutral status which has provided so much of its soft power, but that point seems to have been missed in the move to capitalise on the global access it has provided." [\*9]

Increased integration with NATO and EU military structures does nothing to increase Irish security because Ireland is not threatened with invasion or takeover by a foreign power. It is therefore jumping in to swim with the 'big boys' when there is no need and likely to bring Ireland into conflict with others where there is also no need.

There is of course the 'altruistic' argument that Ireland should contribute to European security, and some accuse Ireland of 'freeloading' in this regard. [\*10] But if you think in conventional military terms, what is Ireland going to add to NATO and EU military developments? Ireland is a small country and any additional military capability being added would be of little actual significance. But it would be adding Irish backing for a 'might is right' approach.

The fact that Finland and Sweden are both becoming NATO members is certainly not an argument for Ireland to join. If anything it is an argument that neutrality is even more important, in avoiding

jumping on a military bandwagon, and being prepared to work for peace without taking the side of the strongest.

Europe needs a non-aligned and neutral country such as Ireland can be to both 'speak truth to power' and to look dispassionately at how peace can be brought about. Once engaged in the NATO and EU military structures this becomes impossible for several reasons not least because it might be considered 'disloyal'. But Irish loyalty should be to truth, justice and peace internationally. We just have to look at the role that British PM Boris Johnson and USA President Joe Biden played in short-circuiting negotiations which were going on a couple of weeks into the Russia-Ukraine war (involving the ex-prime minister of Israel, Naftali Bennett who gave them at that time a 50% chance of success). [\*11] With the message that Western powers would not back a ceasefire, the talks were doomed - and resultantly so were hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian and Russian soldiers. At this point the Ukraine-Russia war really did become a proxy war. [\*12]

### **The opportunity cost of joining in with NATO and EU military developments**

The headline or slogan has been used of "No Swiss role for Ireland". [\*13] By this was meant that Irish neutrality should not just be for inward protection from invasion but also acting as a force for peace and an example of what a state striving for international wellbeing could be like in being an active peacemaker. Critics are right in stating [\*14] that Irish neutrality as it stands is unsustainable; it has, in any case, been cut back to the bone through participation in NATO's totally inappropriately named 'Partnership for Peace' and membership of PESCO. However these critics are right but for the wrong reason: Irish neutrality needs to be vastly strengthened.

A motto of the Irish Citizen Army was that "We serve neither King nor Kaiser" but the direction Ireland is currently going in is to serve the contemporary manifestations of both – NATO and EU military developments. This is a betrayal of an important part of Irish heritage.

The more Ireland gets involved with NATO and EU military structures the less opportunity there will be for it to be involved in working for peace internationally. Even its military peacekeeping will be – is – threatened not just because of the lack of impartiality displayed by NATO and EU military involvements but also for practical reasons that commitment to the latter will use up much of the available military resources.

But it is also a betrayal of peace and 20<sup>th</sup> century Irish history.

Removing the current 'triple lock' on the deployment of Irish troops abroad is not an answer to any desire for peace but a recipe for Irish participation in big power politics and military action, which would be disastrous. Of course the current situation of the veto by 'great powers' on UN Security Council actions is unfortunate and in urgent need to reform. The answer here is reform of the United Nations and bypassing the UN Security Council through developing mechanisms of the General Assembly. [\*15]

### **Nonviolent civilian defence as an important possibility for the future**

While this paper argues that any invasion or seizure of power is very unlikely in Ireland, there is no reason why there cannot be a nonviolent civilian-based defence policy in place, whether or not a conventional military defence exist, or the latter could be gradually stood down. A short definition of civilian-based defence is a "Form of national defense based on nonviolence as a functional substitute for military force" [\*16]

'Nonviolent civilian defence' or 'civilian-based defence' is the term or terms used here as best known for the concepts involved but the term 'social defence' (defence of a society, its people,

institutions and values) is also relevant. One key distinction is that nonviolent civilian defence is geared to oppose foreign intervention and control while social defence is also designed to oppose internal coups d'états and authoritarian control. It is not possible to give a comprehensive outline of what a nonviolent civilian defence policy might look like for Ireland in a paper of this length – it requires rather more detailed work - but rather to indicate some aspects of it. [\*17] Nonviolent resistance is a more general term than civilian defence and the former can be defined as “Reactive application of the principles of nonviolence and civilian-based defense to situations such as invasions and internal coups d'états. Means would include non-cooperation, strikes, demonstrations, etc. intended to hamper the attainment of genuine control by the usurpers.” [\*18]

Details of a nonviolent civilian defence policy would have to be carefully planned but features should include: a) Civilian preparedness b) State preparedness c) International publicity to make the policy known.

Civilian preparedness can take a number of different forms. While mass education in terms of what possibilities for action exist is desirable, it is probably unlikely that most civilians will attempt to become acquainted with these outside of a crisis situation. There therefore needs to be cadres of people who are prepared on a local level though being educated on nonviolent resistance and ready to organise at the drop of a hat. Decentralisation of control is also desirable so the system of resistance is not dependent on a central entity which, if removed from play, creates a vacuum.

However communication is key. While the internet and social media might be pivotal initially, these can be taken down by an occupying power. So old fashioned radio, including on a local basis, would be essential as a back up system. Other local communication systems should be in place including mouth to mouth networks. Examination could also be given to communicating, by any means possible, with the public of an occupying country.

As mentioned above in relation to nonviolent resistance, popular action could include methodologies such as strikes (or various kinds including general strikes), demonstrations which could be ‘flash mobs’ dispersing before invading forces came on the scene, propaganda of various forms including posters, leaflets and graffiti, and, where direct public disobedience is impossible then hidden disobedience and noncooperation.

There are no limits to the possibilities of nonviolent resistance. Gene Sharp in his classic study of nonviolent methods [\*19] details 198 nonviolent tactics, with historical examples; this could equally be 1,980 or 19,800 examples. Our imagination is the only limit.

The state apparatus is obviously important and in the event of a seizure of power, a government in internal or external exercise should be in place. The state role is most important in the initial period coming up to, and immediately after, seizure of power; if that power is taken away then the power it exercises may be mainly symbolic.

However a key part of the state’s role would be to deny any invader facilities that it would seek. As stated elsewhere, Ireland is not of the strategic importance it once was due to technological change. However there should be plans in place to scuttle/destroy any facilities which it is thought an invader might want to use; this includes airports, seaports and possibly some communication facilities (though with alternative Irish-controlled communication systems in place). This could be a role for the Irish Army in rendering facilities unusable but preparations would have to be in place well before any invasion.

Communicating Ireland’s nonviolent civilian defence policy internationally would be part of deterrence. If a potential invader, in a military crisis situation in Europe, realised that not only would the facilities it would seek to use be destroyed when they arrive but also that the population

were prepared to resist without violence, they might think twice about coming, and think more seriously about it than if there was a conventional military defence.

Economic defence and in particular food sovereignty should also be a part of any plan. Obviously Ireland is a country heavily involved in worldwide trade. How the economic sector could and should respond would be a matter for detailed planning. While Ireland currently imports considerable food products from abroad; there is no reason (except where green issues necessitate) that this should change. But there should be a policy in place to guarantee the availability of, and access to, food for everyone in the event of major shocks preventing international trade for a short or longer period. This is not just a matter for a wartime type situation but contingency planning to meet any eventuality that may occur disrupting normal food chains.

There is a misapprehension that nonviolent action only works in liberal societies. This is clearly disproved by Chenoweth and Stefan in their study of the effectiveness of nonviolent resistance where it is shown that success is not in any way dependent on a 'liberal' regime. [\*20] There is thus nothing to say nonviolent civilian defence would be less effective against a brutal and non-democratic enemy.

This is also evident from resistance to Nazi occupation during the Second World war; Capt Basil Liddell Hart has written about how Nazi German generals (whose interrogation he was involved with following the defeat of Germany in 1945) did not know how to respond to nonviolent resistance [\*21]. Armies know how to deal with violence, and will feel justified in taking even more violent counter measures but are at a loss with how to respond to nonviolent resistance [\*22]

Ireland, as a society with a high popular identification with the state and culture (not necessarily with the government), even with an increasingly diverse population, is well placed to have a policy of nonviolent civilian defence since unity and 'pulling together' is a key aspect of it. Being an island country on the edge of the continent also makes such a policy even more feasible, indeed ideal.

We can also learn from practical examples of civilian resistance, e.g. from Czechoslovak resistance to the Warsaw Pact invasion of 1968 to 'bring the government to heel; "(1) remaining nonviolent is crucial: (2) resistance organised by the people is stronger than resistance directed by the government: (3) fraternisation is a powerful technique: (4) resilient communication systems providing accurate information are notal: (5) maintaining unity of the resistance is vital: (6) leaders need to understand the dynamics of nonviolent resistance." [\*23]

### **Possible developments in Irish peacemaking and peacebuilding**

Some detail is given in this section to counter the notion that neutrality is, or should be, simplistic and an opt out. What is detailed here is an opt in which would build enormous social capital for Ireland and thus contribute to Irish security. There is an enormous range of options which can be utilised for peacemaking and peacebuilding.

Mohandas Gandhi said that "We are constantly being astonished these days at the amazing discoveries in the field of violence. But I maintain that far more undreamt of and seemingly impossible discoveries will be made in the field of nonviolence." This statement may seem quixotic but it is surely not when we consider the amount of money which goes into armies and armaments compared to the amount devoted to disarmament and developments in nonviolence – virtually nothing from states while the amount spent on armies and armaments is going through the roof, including very significant increases planned in Irish military spending [\*24]; global spending of arms and the military is now well over \$2 trillion a year. [\*25]

As well as military peacekeeping, which Ireland has been heavily involved in for many decades, and probably needs no coverage for an Irish audience, unarmed civilian interventions are also

possible in many different ways. Monitoring and accompaniment are just two related approaches which can be of use in very varied situations [\*26]

Mass action to interpose between rival violent or would-be-violent factions or armies is not impossible, nor is mass civilian action from outside a state to protest at unjust military actions.

Building up international peace institutions is also a role where Ireland could play a significant role. Reform of the UN will not be easy but it is important to keep trying, and to try to unblock logjams. There are numerous UN agencies which can be used and developed for a peace agenda however. [\*27]

Long term conciliation in fractured societies and between countries where there is significant tension is another whole area of work. This is something which Quakers have been involved with including through Quaker House in Belfast. [\*28] This is long term investment in peace by increasing communication, directly and indirectly (shuttle diplomacy). With a modicum of trust and understanding built up, if a crisis blows up then the different sides are far better equipped to deal with it because channels of communication are open and likely to be utilised. Numerous Irish politicians, past and present, have been beneficiaries of Quaker House Belfast and other (e.g. Corrymeela) work to foster communication in relation to Northern Ireland so it seems strange that work to support this internationally is not on the government agenda.

But shorter term mediation should also be a core aspect of work for peace. Ireland should have been, and should currently be, involved in trying to mediate between Russia and Ukraine. The immediate criticism here is that this would be to condone Russian aggression. Let us be quite clear; mediation does not and should not accept abuse of human rights, or further the abuse of human rights.

And as for the criticism that such mediation would simply be impossible because the two sides are too far apart, this is a very shallow understanding of a mediation process. It can also be stated quite clearly that the 'positions' and 'interests' of both sides need to be taken into account [\*29]; the positions taken by different sides may show total incompatibility, but the interests behind those positions may give much more scope for leeway. Let us take the example of Ukraine where Ukraine has spoken out against negotiation while part of the country is still occupied.

NATO pushed eastwards in terms of membership after the fall of Russian and Eastern European communism in 1989, despite a promise not to do so. The USA threatened nuclear war in 1962 during the 'Cuban missile crisis' when it was deemed worthy of risking nuclear annihilation to get USSR missiles removed from Cuba. However in expecting that Ukraine could and should join NATO, 'the West' is expecting of Russia precisely what was – and remains - totally unacceptable to the USA. This is extremely naive and unreasonable and Russia has its own security concerns having been invaded by Napoleon, the Allies after the First World war, and by Nazi Germany.

The Minsk Agreements in relation to relative autonomy for the Russian speaking, eastern part of Ukraine were not implemented, and the 'the Maidan revolution' overthrew a democratically elected, if corrupt, government (corruption is an ongoing concern and has not applied just to that regime). So is it no wonder that Russia has been anxious, apart from any desire by Vladimir Putin to promote a narrow, nationalistic and militaristic 'Greater Russia' policy. The genuine anxiety does not for a second justify Russian actions.

Let us say there were negotiations. Ukrainian military neutrality while having guarantees from the west could be part of it and this is quite reasonable. Autonomy for Russian speaking areas in the east of Ukraine could be another easy point of agreement. As for Russia's commitment that the parts it has sought to annex will always be part of Russia, a way around could be found if the people of these parts were guaranteed Russian citizenship if they wanted it (in the same way that people in Northern Ireland can have British, Irish, or both citizenships) and Russia could withdraw

while saving face. And allowing an opponent to 'save face' may seem a cruel course of action when there is a conviction that the other is in the wrong, but it may be essential to bring a conflict to an end.

When examined in terms of interests there is surely room for manoeuvre which are invisible if stated positions are taken at face value. Obviously any negotiation between Ukraine and Russia will take its own course but this analysis is provided to point to some of the possibilities which exist, and are already well known (just as many of the features of the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland in 1998 were known well in advance, all parties have to get through different stages to support them).

There are a considerable number of organisations working in the fields of early conflict intervention and prevention [\*30] and many lessons could be learnt from these about possible effective interventions. State financial or other logistical support to these organisations might also be possible but only if it was seen that it would not compromise their integrity and independence.

Building participative and inclusive democracies is part of promoting peace, though only partly since democracies such as the USA and the UK have been to the forefront of warmaking in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and into the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. However, particularly in ethnically or linguistically divided societies, fair and democratic decision making can greatly assist the avoidance of violent conflict. In this regard the inclusive voting and decision making mechanisms promoted by the de Borda Institute should have a role to play in avoiding majoritarian decision making – the idea that a majority in a society, however defined, can do whatever it likes is definitely a threat to peace and stability. [\*31] Encouraging a change in global thinking on democracy and majorities is a task worth undertaking.

Work on gender and peace is another whole area of possibilities. While it is a fallacy to say that women are 'natural' peacemakers and peacebuilders – they can also be cheerleaders for male violence or perpetrators themselves – women in many conflicted societies play an important role in pushing for peace and opposing violence [\*32] Support to women such as was provided by the Women Peacemakers Program (WPP) in the Netherlands could be invaluable in many situations. [\*33]

However it is important also not to let men off the hook for their violence, and the vast majority of violence of all kinds is committed by men. There are many examples of programmes helping men to examine their roles in life, equality, and use of violence. [\*34] While this is a huge task if it is undertaken or supported in societies in conflict or risk of conflict then it could be transformational in the long term.

Finally we come on to nonviolence training. Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan's book "Why civil resistance works" clearly points to the effectiveness of nonviolent action compared to violent action. [\*35] An additional important point in their empirical analysis is that nonviolent campaigns are less likely to lead to repression if there is a change of regime. Supporting the capacity of people to struggle for human rights and justice without violence is an enormous task but one which needs invested in. [\*36] This is a huge area but the provision of training has to be geared to the situation and needs of people on the ground.

Truly Irish peacemaking could be a force for good in the world. It is very sad that it is not so. While it may be a bit stereotypical, Ireland was once considered a 'land of saints and scholars'. It is not too fanciful to imagine it becoming a 'land of peace and peacemakers' given previous Irish involvement in peacemaking but it requires political will and a radical reappraisal of the unfortunate direction Irish security policy has been drifting towards.



## Conclusion

It is not in Ireland's strategic security interests to pursue involvement with NATO and a developing EU army. Instead, both for narrow security interests and for a wider concern for peace in Europe and the world, Ireland should be dynamically developing its neutrality, non-alignment and peacemaking capacity. With a modicum of imagination, the possibilities are literally endless. A small country can make a big difference standing up for peace as opposed to being a small cog in a wider military machine which does little to de-escalate conflict and much to encourage it. It takes real courage to stand out from the crowd and pursue a different path but this is surely what Ireland should do, acting for the good of humanity as a whole and for human security worldwide.

-

## Footnotes/References

[\*1] Regarding Christian teaching and understanding of war and nonviolence, see e.g. *Choosing peace – The Catholic Church returns to Gospel Nonviolence*, ed. Marie Dennis, Orbis Books, 2018; *New Testament Basis of Peacemaking* by Richard McSorley, Herald Press, 1979; various works by Walter Wink including *The Third Way – Reclaiming Jesus' nonviolent alternative*, IFOR Patterns in Reconciliation No.4.

[\*2] Slowly, slowly, EU military developments and NATO expansion have taken place, backed in regard to Ireland by a mixture of political, military, media and establishment figures. However the direction has been clear for a long time, see e.g. *The European Community: A Superpower in the Making* by Johan Galtung, George Allen and Unwin, 1973, and *Do you want to die for NATO?* by Patrick Comerford, Mercier Press, 1984.

Also, a variety of pamphlets by Afri [www.afri.ie](http://www.afri.ie) PANA/Peace And Neutrality Alliance [www.pana.ie](http://www.pana.ie) and Shannonwatch [www.shannonwatch.org](http://www.shannonwatch.org) have analysed developments.

[\*3] A recording of StoP/Swords to Ploughshares Ireland online seminar on *Human and Ecological Security: An Alternative to War & Militarism*, November 2022, is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bpck1QYLk6M> with Diana Francis, John Maguire and John Lannon.

Books by Diana Francis are also relevant here, particularly *Rethinking War and Peace*, Pluto Press, 2004; "Maybe one of the reasons we do not radically review the realities of war is that those realities are unbearable to contemplate and almost impossible to imagine." (page 46)

[\*4] Bjørn Møller. *Dictionary of Alternative Defence*, page 81, 1995, Lynne Rienner Publishers/Adamantine Press. A *Glossary of Civil Resistance* appears online at <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#inbox/FMfcgzGsmqxIDBKmfRTPNPdHNhRrWDWV> 'Non-provocative defence' is a similar term to 'non-offensive defence'.

[\*5] Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, 2021, which made all aspects of nuclear weapons illegal in international law. It is ironic that in 1957 a senior British Labour Party member, and oft-time minister, Aneurin Bevan should state that unilateral nuclear disarmament would send a British Foreign Secretary "naked into the conference chamber" when nakedness ('Protest disrobing' in Gene Sharp's typology) is actually a very strong nonviolent tactic when utilised voluntarily.

Also in Britain, an Alternative Defence Commission in the early 1980s produced two reports; *Defence without the bomb*, Taylor and Francis, 1983, and *The Politics of Alternative Defence – A role for a non-nuclear Britain*, Paladin, 1987.

[\*6] <https://ceobs.org/the-militarys-contribution-to-climate-change/>

[\*7] For one example from the USA see <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/jun/06/military-bases-contaminating-water-supply-pfas> and another <https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2022/06/30/its-scary-as-hell-pfas-exposure-a-widespread-problem-for-troops-families-nationwide/>

[\*8] For a simple run down on *8 Myths about the arms trade and defence* go to <https://stopfuellingwar.org/en/understanding-peace-and-security/internal-resources/myths-and->

[answers/](#) More detailed coverage appears in such books as *Indefensible – Seven myths that sustain the global arms trade*, Paul Holden at al, Zed Books, 2016, and *The Shadow World – Inside the global arms trade* by Andrew Feinstein, Penguin Books, 2011.

[\*9] See section by Angela Hegarty at page 36 in *Fanning the Flames: How the European Union is fuelling a new arms race*, produced by TNI and ENAAT, 2022, available online at <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/fanning-the-flames>

[\*10] There are many examples of this including columnist Charlemagne in the *Economist*, 21<sup>st</sup> January 2023.

[\*11] There are different takes on this whole episode but see e.g. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-60679175> <https://www.businessinsider.com/israel-bennett-walks-back-claim-west-blocked-ukraine-russia-peace-deal-2023-2?op=1&r=US&IR=T> and <https://jacobin.com/2023/02/ukraine-russia-war-naftali-bennett-negotiations-peace>

[\*12] All this is highly ironic given the hopes that existed following the fall of communism in Russia and eastern Europe; well known British peace activist Michael Randle wrote a book in 1991 entitled *People Power: the Building of a New European Home*, Hawthorn Press. However such hopes were to be cruelly dashed and ‘the West’ did not help Russia to navigate the perilous straits which it entered.

[\*13] *Dawn* magazine No. 43, issue on *The future of Irish neutrality*, 1978; a further *Dawn* pamphlet on neutrality appeared in 1982 (No.81).

[\*14] See e.g. Stephen Collins’ article *Notion that our neutrality is widely respected abroad is an Irish self-delusion* in *The Irish Times*, 26<sup>th</sup> May 2023.

<https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/2023/05/26/stephen-collins-notion-that-our-neutrality-is-widely-respected-abroad-is-an-irish-self-delusion/>

[\*15] See e.g. the pamphlet *Transforming the United Nations Conference*, from a conference in 2000 organised by the Peace and Neutrality Alliance, the Irish Committee for UNICEF and the Irish United Nations Association; the pamphlet was published by PANA, Irish UNA and Irish CND.

[\*16] Bjørn Møller, *ibid.*, page 79.

[\*17] *An alternative defence for Ireland – Some considerations and a model of defence without arms for the Irish people* by Rob Fairmichael, *Dawn* magazine 95-96, 1983, is a short 8 page look at this topic, with some aspects now dated. It is available at

<https://innatenonviolence.org/wp/pamphlets/>

[\*18] Bjørn Møller, *ibid.*, page 248.

[\*19] *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, in 3 volumes, Porter Sargent, 1973 – he includes a significant number of Irish examples. However the book by Gene Sharp most relevant to this area of concern is probably *Making Europe Unconquerable – The Potential of Civilian-based Deterrence and Defence*, Taylor and Francis, 1985.

A short listing of some examples of nonviolence and nonviolent action in Ireland can be found in INNATE’s *Nonviolence – The Irish Experience: Quiz* which can be found at

<https://innatenonviolence.org/wp/resources/>

There are many different aspects or approaches to nonviolence; Iain Atack in *Nonviolence in Political Theory*, Edinburgh University Press, 2012, states “Transformative nonviolence....suggests that the ultimate aim of nonviolent political action needs to be new forms of social and political organisation that do not depend upon institutionalised violence as a method of domination, control and security and that liberate, rather than suppress, the popular power central to its effectiveness as a mechanism of political change.” (page 96)

[\*20] See chart on page 74 of *Why Civil Resistance Works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict* by Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan, Columbia University Press, 2011. There is also some video available online which can be found through a word search.

[\*21] Chapter by B H Liddell Hart on *Lessons from resistance movements – Guerrilla and non-violent in Civilian Resistance as a National Defence – Non-violent action against aggression*, ed. Adam Roberts, Penguin Books, 1967 and 1969.

[\*22] A graphic illustration of this can be found in a photo from Prague in 1968 on the cover of the *Dawn* broadsheet *An alternative defence for Ireland*, see footnote [\*12] above.

[\*23] *Social Defence* by Jørgen Johansen and Brian Martin, Irene Publishing, 2019, page 56.

[\*24] There is a planned increase of 50% in the Irish military budget by 2028.  
<https://www.irishtimes.com/ireland/2022/09/27/defence-spending-military-radar-and-training-aircraft-to-be-acquired/>

[\*25] Global military spending increased beyond \$2 trillion in 2021  
<https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2022/world-military-expenditure-passes-2-trillion-first-time> and further increased in 2022 to \$2240 billion <https://www.sipri.org/publications/2023/sipri-fact-sheets/trends-world-military-expenditure-2022> U.S. military spending (U.S.\$877 billion) continues to be 10 times that of Russia even in the context of Russia's war in Ukraine. Further information in infographic form can be found at <https://demilitarize.org/resources/gdams-2023-infographics/>

[\*26] For a short photo feature on this see  
<https://www.flickr.com/photos/innateireland/albums/72157629555375796>

[\*27] See for example the chapter on *International peace institutions* by Kevin Clements in *No alternative? Nonviolent responses to repressive regimes*, ed. John Lampen, Williams Sessions, 2000.

[\*28] For the work of Quaker House in Belfast see Chapter 5, *Quaker House Belfast*, by Anne Bennett, in *Coming from the Silence – Quaker Peacebuilding Initiatives in Northern Ireland 1969 – 2007*, ed. Ann Le Mare and Felicity McCartney. There were different editions from William Sessions, 2009, and Quaker Service, 2011.

Other books on Quaker conciliation work include *Dining with diplomats, praying with gunmen – Experiences of international conciliation for a new generation of peacemakers* by Anne Bennett, Quaker Books, London, 2020 and in terms of older work *Quaker experiences in international conciliation* by C H Mike Yarrow, Yale University Press, 1978.

*Being in the middle by being at the edge – Quaker experiences of non-official political mediation* by Sue and Steve Williams (formerly working at Quaker House Belfast among many other places), Quaker Peace and Service/Sessions of York, 1993, is another very useful study of this area.

[\*29] This is succinctly outlined in *Getting to Yes – How to negotiate to agreement without giving in* by Roger Fisher and William Ury, Hutchinson 1982 and Arrow edition 1987.

[\*30] See e.g. Peace Brigades International/PBI <https://www.peacebrigades.org/> International Alert <https://www.international-alert.org/> and Conciliation Resources <https://www.c-r.org/>

[\*31] See [www.deborda.org](http://www.deborda.org)

[\*32] e.g. Women organising for an end to the civil war in Liberia, 2003; see the film *Pray the devil back to hell*, information readily available online.

[\*33] This was through training and support of different kinds; WPP became defunct in 2017 <https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2017/after-20-years-women-peacemakers-program-closes-its-doors> and unfortunately the numerous resources it produced do not seem to be currently available online.

[\*34] One such project is Padare in Zimbabwe which is a men's organisation working for a gender just society – and gender justice is an important part of building peace. <http://www.padare.org.zw/> AVP/Alternatives to Violence Project <https://avp.international/> is mainly about nonviolence at a personal level but this can be important for men (or women) in dealing with their own violence and aggression.

[\*35] Chenoweth and Stephan, *ibid.*

[\*36] See e.g. *Handbook for Nonviolent Campaigns*, various authors, published by War Resisters' International (WRI), 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2014. See printed edition and/or visit *Empowering Nonviolence* section of their website at <https://wri-irg.org/en/pubs/NonviolenceHandbook>



INNATE's websites are at <https://innatenonviolence.org> and <https://www.flickr.com/photos/innateireland>

Its email address is [innate@ntlworld.com](mailto:innate@ntlworld.com)