

# PEACE NEWS NEW ZEALAND

PEACE NEWS NEW ZEALAND, P.O. BOX 9563, COURTENAY PLACE, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND.

---

## PEACE NEWS NEW ZEALAND: AN INTRODUCTION.

P.N.N.Z. is an independent peace news publication. This issue is being circulated for comment. If the response to this issue is encouraging P.N.N.Z. will be published each month starting in December 1980.

We hope this monthly material will be of interest to:

- Parliamentarians,
- Media persons,
- The Labour movement,
- The Churches,
- Peace Activists,
- and other thoughtful people.

P.N.N.Z. is accountable to an Editorial Board which includes the following:

- *Dr. George Armstrong*, Peace Squadron, Auckland.
- *Des Brough*, Senior Lecturer, Wellington Teachers College,
- *David Buller*, (Editor) Peace Activist, Wellington.
- *John Le Strange*, Researcher, Federation of Labour.
- *Dr Rod Alley*, Political Scientist, Victoria University.
- *Caril Cowan*, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament,
- *Dr Viola Palmer*, Peace Action Group, Tauranga,
- *Richard Northey*, Auckland City Councillor.
- *Katie Boanas*, Peace Educator, Christchurch Peace Collective.
- *Dr Jules Older*, Medical School, Otago.

There are some obvious gaps. It is hoped that further names can be announced at the National Peace Workshop, (August 8-10, Wellington.)

Funding of P.N.N.Z. is by subscription and donation. All donations will be welcomed. If a contribution is accepted it does not imply that the Editorial Board agrees with the ideas or policies of the donor/s.

It is hoped that a range of publications and community groups will find P.N.N.Z. a useful vehicle for a wider communication of news and comment related to issues of peace and justice in N.Z. and overseas. Every effort will be made to present issues of global and local concern accurately.

This issue is an indicator of some of the content to be presented monthly. We have a group of people in N.Z. and overseas who will monitor publications, countries and regions, subject areas such as:

- Multi Nationals (NZ and overseas)
- Peace media
- Defence Institutes
- Weapons; Research, Development, Transfers.
- Salt negotiations
- Non violent action
- Human Rights
- Local Justice Issues
- Land Rights
- NZ media
- United Nations
- Racism
- Nuclear Waste Disposal
- Military Bases
- Military Pacts, Alliances, Exercises
- the work of churches for peace
- the Labour Movement and peace

We look forward to increased graphic content in later issues.

Future issues will contain a larger percentage of monitors reports than does this issue. Reports mentioned in P.N.N.Z. will often be available in full at the price of photocopying and posting the material, Monitors reports will usually carry source identification although some of our sources will not be able to be named because of personal risk.

## PEACE

### AN ADDRESS GIVEN BY THE REV. JOHN CURNOW' EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR THE N.Z. CATHOLIC COMMISSION FOR EVANGELIZATION' JUSTICE AND DEVELOPMENT ON JULY 28th, 1980.

Throughout history peace has been one of mankind's dreams. But this has been an elusive dream. People have gone to war, the strong have wielded power for their own ends, strife has brought suffering and death to our history.

Over the centuries we have seen force as the usual way to gain advantage over others. Theories were worked out to justify war. Even the Church was compromised on the side of violence. Today, however, the Church teaches that modern war, nuclear war, would be a horrible crime against God and man.

Indeed, Christians should be among the first to work for peace. The Christian Church teaches that all people make up one human family, that Christ blessed peacemakers and promised the gift of peace. This teaching is one that Christians should cherish and work for. Peace is not just one compartment among many for a Christian. Peace must not be seen in a narrow political or sectarian way. Peace is a compelling moral challenge.

Today, the reality of war is such that all people of goodwill must begin to see the work of peace as a compelling imperative.

We have seen a glimpse of the destruction that nuclear arms can bring and we know the terrible consequences of such a war.

It is true that a modern nuclear war could destroy most living things. Warmakers have in their power almost unlimited destruction. One hydrogen bomb is equivalent to 24 million tons of T.N.T. — that is 12 times the explosive power of World War 2 in one bomb.

In the "Press" on July 10th, 1980, it was stated that the combined destructive capacity of the world's nuclear arms amounts to around 13 thousand million tons of T.N.T., the equivalent of one million Hiroshima bombs, or about 3 tons of explosive for every man, woman and child on earth.

In a nuclear war ordinary people, young and old, are the targets. One bomb can kill millions of people, depending on where it is dropped. Nobody knows about the long term results of nuclear pollution. The threat of nuclear war surely is an insane option. Yet military leaders say that the present balance of terror is a deterrent and a realistic military option. These same people now plan for first strike capacity — preparing to destroy the world in order to save it.

This is an option that we must firmly reject. We must oppose it and plan a campaign against this sort of war. When we come to work for peace, there are certain things we must understand.

1. The first major obstacle to peace in the world is injustice. Millions of people live in desperate poverty. The powers spend \$450 billion a year on weapons of destruction. "The arms race is not making people safer, only poorer", says the Brandt Report. Hunger and the violence of injustice assists their preparation for war. The present so-called "world order" is in fact systematized inequality. The enormous self-interest of the powerful promotes this waste on war while people die. Do we need so much power to contain the poor? Peace comes as a fruit of justice.
2. The second problem we face is that almost total blindness exists about the possibilities of nuclear war. It seems that people do not want to know about this. Maybe we have become used to the threat of war and think it will not happen. Around us there is a vast apathy and fatalism. For example, action for peace is not in the mainstream of Church activity. Churches have still to get their teaching on peace out of the statements and into the life and ministry of Christians.

We have been socialised into accepting inequality, racism and centralised power as normal. We have been kept in the dark about the arms race and the threat to use nuclear arms. Our ignorance comes partly from those who use the language of deception.

So, what are we going to do?

First of all we must believe we can do something. After all people did finally stop the war in Vietnam. It took 10 years of intense activity, but it did succeed. Ordinary people want no part of war.

Let us begin by raising awareness in all the ways that we can. Get information moving as well as we know how. We must work towards reducing defence spending and make disarmament a goal of our campaign.

We must move away from alliances with militarism and break with the culture of war. Could these be political issues in an election year?

Sooner or later we will have to examine and confront the whole value system and power structure that imposes violence and inequality on people, a system that accepts war and terror as a means of retaining advantage. Such a campaign will require great faith and courage. We may have to change life styles, challenge concepts of national interest, question male-dominated values and contest certain accepted ways of acting. It is certain that we will have to reject a concept of power that sees people in the abstract and manipulates them for its own ends.

Aggression on the global scale today could destroy us all. We must declare "No more war, war never again" (Paul VI), and dedicate ourselves to the goal with renewed commitment.

## PEOPLE

It was with considerable sadness that PNNZ learned of the death of Father John Healion, at Turangi on July 29th.

Toby Truell, general secretary of Corso said "John Healion was a leading figure in Corso throughout the 1970s. He became Chairman in July 1976, at a time of great turbulence in the organization. The annual appeal had been at its lowest ever, and there had been three Directors within three years."

He helped to clarify Corso's change of direction from support for the poor to working with the poor."

He was completely committed to justice, and the fight against poverty and oppression."

Father Brendan Keegan, who succeed Father Healion as the Chaplain of the Wellington Young Christian Workers said "As a result of his work, a lot of young people have become involved in social issues throughout the country."

### Visitors:

Pat Dodson — first Aboriginal to be ordained a Catholic priest in Australia. Presently researching land rights etc. at a Melbourne University. He has wide experience of the plight and problems of Aboriginal people, in all parts of Australia including reserves, urban situations, and in land struggles involving multi-national mining operations etc.

### Itinerary:

Christchurch, 8-15 August — local contact person Fr John Curnow, Catholic Commission. Phone 64-002.

Wellington, 15-23 August, local contact person Toby Truell, National Corso Office, Phone 859-585.

Auckland, 22-29 August, local contact person, Rev. Michael Elliot, Ecumenical Secretariat on Development. Phone 774-433

## EUROSTRATEGIC WEAPONS

The spotlight has recently fallen on so-called Eurostrategic weapons. Defining these weapons is extremely difficult. By and large, Eurostrategic weapons could be defined as nuclear weapons located in or targeted on Europe and having a range longer than that of the existing short-range tactical nuclear weapons, but shorter than that of the intercontinental strategic nuclear weapons. A heterogeneous array of missiles and aircraft are contained under the rubric 'Eurostrategic weapons'. Often referred to as 'grey area systems' these weapons are not covered by any of the current international arms control negotiations.

The current debate on Eurostrategic weapons is focused on the newest generation of US and Soviet medium and intermediate range nuclear weapon delivery systems. The Soviet SS-20 missile, which can carry three independently targetable nuclear warheads to ranges of up to 4,000km, substantially increases the Soviet Union's nuclear potential in Europe. This missile has been deployed and is still under production, as is the other controversial Soviet Eurostrategic weapon, the Tu-22M Backfire bomber. It should be noted that under certain conditions, the Backfire bomber is capable of carrying out intercontinental missions. This bomber was therefore a contentious issue during the SALT II negotiations, but was finally excluded from the treaty limitations. However, the USSR pledged not to produce more than 30 Backfires a year and not to upgrade the Backfire so as to carry out intercontinental missions.

Two new US Eurostrategic systems, under development, are planned to be deployed in a number of NATO countries. These will be ground-launched cruise missiles and the Pershing II ballistic missile (replacing the Pershing I of shorter range). In December 1979, NATO decided to base 464 ground-launched US cruise missiles and 108 US Pershing II missiles in Western Europe. The reason given for this decision was that the Soviet SS-20 missiles and Backfire bombers posed a new threat to NATO. Both types of NATO missile will be capable of penetrating a significant distance into the Soviet Union and will possess exceptional accuracies. Furthermore, the flight-times of Pershing II missiles from their bases in FR Germany to targets in the Soviet Union will be extremely short — only a few minutes — affording virtually no warning of attack. The cruise missiles, although considerably slower, will be able to fly zig-zag flight paths at 'tree-top' altitudes to avoid air defences. Although the protocol to the SALT II treaty prohibits the deployment of ground and sea-launched cruise missiles with a range exceeding 600 kilometres, it does not prohibit their development. In any event, the protocol is due to expire at the end of 1981, that is, before these missiles will be ready to be deployed.

These new Eurostrategic weapons, on both sides, must be seen as increasing the risk of nuclear war in Europe, which would amount, in fact, to the destruction of Europe. This risk could be reduced if both sides exercised restraint and if negotiations were to be initiated as quickly as possible to limit and eventually remove the threat posed by these weapons.

### Major Eurostrategic nuclear weapons

State	Weapon designation	Year first deployed	Max. range (km)	No. deployed in 1979	State	Weapon designation	Year first deployed	Max. range (km)*	Nuclear weapons per aircraft	No. deployed in 1979
<i>Missiles</i>					<i>Aircraft</i>					
USSR	SS-4	1959	2 000	390	USSR	Tu-16 Badger	1955	6 500	2	318
	SS-5	1961	3 700	80		Tu-22M	1974	9 000	4	50
	SS-12	1969	~ 600	72	Backfire					
	SS-20	1977	4 000	~120 <sup>b</sup>	USA	FB-111A	1969	10 000	6	66
	SS-N-5	1964 <sup>c</sup>	~1 200	18		F-111E/F	1967	4 900	2	156
USA	Pershing IA	1962	~ 750	108 <sup>e</sup>	UK	Vulcan B2	1960	6 500	2	48
	Pershing IA	1962	~ 750	72 <sup>d</sup>						
	Pershing II	(1983)	~1 600	0	France	Mirage IVA	1964	3 000	1	33
	GLCM	(1983)	2 500	0						
UK	Polaris A-3	1967	4 600	64						
France	S-2	1971	3 000	18						
	M-20	1977	5 000	64						

- \* On board Golf-2 submarines in the Baltic.
- <sup>b</sup> The figure is for launchers. Probably only 80 of these are targeted on Western Europe.
- <sup>c</sup> US missiles deployed in Western Europe.
- <sup>d</sup> Deployed in FR Germany under dual US-West German command.
- <sup>e</sup> The maximum combat radius, i.e. the distance an aircraft can cover in order to reach its target area, fulfil its mission and return to its base, is considerably lower—less than half the maximum range.

### NEW TYPES OF STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS

More ominous than any other weapon development is the continuing emergence of weapons with distinct nuclear war-fighting capabilities.

Among such weapons being developed in the USA is the MX missile system (ICBM) and a related mobile basing scheme to reduce vulnerability. The MX will carry 10 warheads, the maximum allowed by the SALT II treaty. Each warhead will have substantially greater accuracy and explosive yield than warheads on current US Minuteman III ICBMs. Furthermore, a laser or radar system may be introduced to guide the warhead onto its target, giving it hitherto unattained accuracy. The first MX is expected to become operational in 1986, and the full force of 200 MX missiles by 1989. From then on, the MX will significantly increase the capability of the USA to threaten the Soviet fixed ICBM force.

While current submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) do not possess the necessary combination of accuracy and explosive yield to pose a real threat to hardened targets such as missile silos, the USA is developing a new type of SLBM, the Trident II, which will probably have a definite capability against hardened targets. This new missile will eventually be deployed on new Trident submarines. A variety of sophisticated guidance mechanisms are under consideration for use on Trident II; thus Trident II may be more accurate than any strategic missile in operation today.

The USA is not alone in developing new generations of strategic nuclear weapons. The USSR has in operation and under continued production a series of multiple-warhead ICBMs capable of destroying a high percentage of US fixed ICBMs. The new Soviet ICBMs — the SS-17, SS-18 and SS-19 missiles are ostensibly a response to the US deployment, in the early 1970s, of multiplewarhead ICBMs — the Minuteman III force. In turn, the US MX is heralded as a response to the new Soviet ICBMs, and the USSR is likely to react to the deployment of the MX. Thus, the strategic nuclear arms race continues.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 1980

## EAST AND WEST PAY HOMAGE TO FATHER OF MILITARY THEORISTS

THE 200th anniversary of the birth of Carl von Clausewitz on June 1 was commemorated throughout the world — in East and West. The Prussian major-general did not become famous through battles won but through his classical work, 'On War'. This work does not deal with war as such but with war as the ultimate instrument of politics.

Clausewitz breaks down war ("conflict of major interests which is resolved in blood") into three component parts, in order of priority.

1. The political objective
2. The aim of the war itself
3. The military means

But he says that politics is the major factor in all three parts: even the armed forces are a political instrument above all — an instrument used by politics to secure peace.

He is the only classical military man recognised, used and quoted time and again in East and West. Accordingly, the anniversary of his birth will be commemorated by both power blocs — a most unusual situation in our divided world.

It is one of the many paradoxical traits of German history that the politically minded Clausewitz was not discovered by the German military brass.

It was instead, Friedrich Engels, the founder of militant world communism, who deserves credit for this.

In a letter which the "general" and military expert of the first communist movement wrote to Karl Marx, Engels termed Clausewitz a "star of the first order".

The consequences could not be foreseen at the time. Many decades later, Lenin also became interested in Clausewitz and studied his *On War* in 1915 while in exile in Switzerland.

He wrote down excerpts and made notes in the margin of the book — notes which have meanwhile become part of the dogma of Leninism.

"For politics is nothing in itself. It is only the administrator of all these interests vis-a-vis other states. The fact that they have taken a wrong direction, that they serve ambition, private goals and the vanity of those in government is of no interest here.

"For it is never the art of warfare that must be regarded as preceptor; and we can in this context see politics only as representative of society as a whole."

Of middle-class background, Clausewitz entered the Prussian Army in 1792 and was admitted to the War College in Berlin in 1801.

He studied under Gerhard von Scharnhorst and became an aide to Prince August. He served with both the Russian and the Prussian armies in the Napoleonic wars.

In 1818 he was made a general and administrative head of the War College. In his 12 years at the War College he wrote, among other works, his famous *On War*.

Wilhelm von Schramm  
(Kieler Nachrichten, 29 May 1980)

Wilhelm von Schramm, is generally recognised as one of Germany's foremost Clausewitz scholars.

The German Tribune, 8 June 1980. (edited)

### APRIL 20th 1980, LETTER FROM LORD PHILIP NOEL-BAKER, PUBLISHED IN "THE GUARDIAN" (WEEKLY)

IN JANUARY the veteran US Ambassador to Moscow, Mr George Kennan, the "father" of the policy of "containing" Russia warned his nation of the danger of their "war hysteria" over Iran and Afghanistan. He used significant words:

"Thought and discourse in Washington are more militarised today than at any time since 1945."

The present frenzied arms race is militarising thought in many countries. The British Government's Defence White paper, which you report today, forecasts the expansion of armaments for decades to come, and discusses new weapons for the nineties: a reversion to poison gases and germs, both banned by treaty long ago; and the arming of women.

But the continued expansion of armaments is not a policy; it is a drift, a paralysis of thought and reason; an acceptance of the unacceptable.

After the first World War a great Foreign Secretary, Lord Grey of Falloden, wrote of the arms race before 1914: "The moral is obvious: it is that great armaments lead inevitably to war... The nations must disarm or perish."

The Government rely on nuclear deterrence to prevent the present arms race from ending in a nuclear war. But our two greatest authorities, the late Lord Mountbatten, and Lord (Solly) Zuckerman both reject reliance on deterrence. Even the White Paper itself appeared to be preparing opinion for the breakdown of deterrence — that is, for war.

And what war? On Radio 4 on March 16 the Minister for Civil Defence said: "In the war we can expect to have, there would be 15 million survivors, if it happened today; 30 million if all the Civil Defence precautions were carried out. At best, 25 million Britons would be killed."

To rely on deterrence to avert such an unimaginable catastrophe is suicidal.

The only path to safety is the policy decided on by the Special Session of the UN General Assembly in 1978: General World Disarmament, conventional and nuclear, and the reallocation of the resources so released to the ending of world poverty and the promotion of social justice everywhere.

The World Disarmament Campaign has been organised to mobilise opinion in support of that policy, which was adopted unanimously by 149 governments in 1978. The campaign was launched at a Convention in the Central Hall, Westminster, on Saturday, April 12. The Convention proved to be the most memorable of its kind for many years.

If the campaign succeeds, Britain would become the leader of the nations for the salvation of mankind.

Philip Noel-Baker  
House of Lords

THE BEGINNING...