

Presentation to the PNND Assembly
Senator Alena Gajdůšková
Vice-President of the Senate of the Czech Republic
11 October 2009

Non Proliferation Treaty and new topics in the debate of Parliamentarians

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me at first a short remark about my personal experience. My life took place until 1989 behind the Iron Curtain. We were taught to “fight for the peace”. And the term “fighting” was meant seriously. This impuls was an ideological one. The fighting soon became the primary perspective and peace was a rather abstract principle. We obviously also should become horrified by an abstract imagination of war. This was an element of ideological manipulation – using also petrified idiomatic combinations like “imperialistic war”.

And yet there was something true in the idea of peace. Parts of the political activities even of our totalitarian state of the past were directed towards developing countries – with some success. And within the country, the dissidents took up the ideas of peace and human rights. A new way of thinking spread over the country starting from the small groups thus enabling us to develop democracy and to integrate into the structures of the free world. With this experience, citizens of the Czech Republic are seeking peace in a less ideological framework and are able to contribute actively to reduce wars and the weapons used – including the nuclear ones.

The new millennium, European integration, the start of a new American administration as positive developments and on the negative side a new quality in the international threats, this all puts us in a situation where we have to continue with an old task – coming nearer to a world without nuclear weapons – with new means and responding to new conditions. The United Nations discussed this question in the last few weeks and President Obama underlined his wish to contribute to developments in this direction. Barack Obama spoke this year in April in Prague about the commitment of the United States to support the idea of peace and security without nuclear arms. He named the large volume of nuclear arms as a heritage of Cold War. Statements of others, about the impossibility to reduce the nuclear weaponry, were in the speech of the American president clearly rejected.

Our strategy has to take into account several characteristics of the recent situation:

- technology in the production of nuclear weapons is not very innovative at this time. The principles are known, and development of nuclear weaponry is not able to be controlled via budgeting. Nuclear armament is no longer an arms race between the technologically developed superpowers alone.
- therefore, the problem of possible spread of fissile material (where only a part of technology is used, and production and access are much easier) has to be treated with special intensity. The idea of a fuel bank for power plants belongs in this field.
- this situation results in the impossible position of reaching equilibrium in nuclear armaments – however paradoxical this may sound and however other historical facts are known from the nineteen seventies. The threats are now asymmetrical, and new powers who have acquired nuclear weapons (or are following a strategy like this over the near future) have their own ideologies of reasoning, which are in general not compatible with the democratic world.
- apodictic positions with rather ideological fundamentals are a serious hindrance for a flexible debate about new strategic possibilities given by political and technological developments. In my country the debate about the so called "radar shield" might be an example. Some politicians forced this project as a demonstration of certain links to certain political streams in the USA. Additionally, a debilitating influence upon the development of European defence structures was intended. I disagree with both intentions. Now, this project was changed and the missile defense will be developed with flexible strategic missile placement. The administration of president Obama did not simply change the attitudes. The change responds to the strategical development and is a result of a serious debate.
- political instability in some states, totalitarian principles of government, are dangerous aspects of global development. They support both international terrorism as an aggressive ways of communication among and with the new (would-be or real) nuclear powers.
- in some cases, we can observe a grey area, where the nuclear threat crosses over into developments in international terrorism. Frequently, terrorist activities do not have a basis in official state structures. Our strategy should reflect this situation. We know that not every state is able to monitor and control its own territory completely. International control mechanisms should be installed.
- addressing problems of underdevelopment, enforcing human rights wherever possible and strengthening international networking lower the risk of conflicts.

- for these reasons, a parallel debate about (1) developing sustainable and generally recognised international law, (2) using so called 'soft' power and (3) alternative military strategies is needed. Only such a broad perspective can bring us to a generally accepted agreement in a situation where not all participating states are organised according to the same principles.
- facing recent problems, we have to reflect on all mechanisms in order to win over partners or to enforce international rules – in the whole spectrum of alternatives available.
- the Parliamentarians – a powerful group, yet without executive power – can steer or guide the international community in an innovative way. We are not restricted by feedback in administratively defined policies. “Yes, we can” – we can also start developing ideas presented by the new US President.
- by no means the last idea should be remembering the financial resources spent during the last 70 years in development and production of nuclear weapons. A huge number of problems which are causing today's international difficulties – such as armed conflicts, enforced migration or suppression of democracy and freedom - could have been solved constructively by using such extensive financial means.

The clock of history cannot be turned back. However, we have to treat our inherited situation properly. Therefore we need to prepare the review conference in 2010 carefully. Numerous impulse ideas have been presented during the last number of months. The UK Foreign Secretary David Miliband proposed a debate about more research in order to develop new methods in controlling nuclear armaments. We need this debate and this research. Committees, the General Assembly, the Security Council and especially the UN Secretary General, Ban Ki Moon, have a special focus on nuclear disarmament, especially during the last few months. The first step should be a general agreement on 'no first-use' policy. And, obviously, the former Cold War superpowers have a special role – on the one hand to be the first to move, on the other hand to start developing control mechanisms and ways of mutual understanding as an example for the whole international community. They have our support.

We should develop also the prospect of common decision making in the European Union (where the slow implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy is an obstacle). All other integration structures – we prefer those which are value based – can contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament and to non-proliferation by integrating smaller impulse ideas and developing common strategies on a regional level – thus giving an example to the global debates and facilitating the global result.

A study of the University Heidelberg clearly shows that the global number of war conflicts steadily increases – from 2007 to 2008 there came 3 wars and 4 comparable conflicts more. The total figure is 9 wars and 30 serious conflicts and the total number of conflicts is about 350. We should see these figures on the background of the year 1945 when the number of conflicts approached 100 – do we really take our responsibility?

We have to coordinate our activities all over the world, we have to strengthen the civic society and develop within this civic society an empathy towards the suffering of others.

Barack Obama clearly formulated in Prague the first step: The world without nuclear weapons and herewith connected danger of nuclear conflicts. I know that is by no means an easily reached target, but – “yes we can” - to quote President Obama once more. „The future of the world is based on solidarity and peace” said the Pope Benedict XVI last week in Prague. We have to force the global perspective without wars and suffering.