

SECURE SCOTLAND SEMINAR

**RAPPORTUERS:
CHARLOTTE-ANN STODDART AND LAURA RUTHERFORD**

16th April 2019 – 18th April 2019
Allanton Peace Sanctuary
Auldgirth, Dumfries, Scotland

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	Page 2
2. Methodology	Page 5
3. Tuesday	Page 10
4. Wednesday	Page 20
5. Thursday	Page 30

Executive Summary

The present report details the discussions held throughout the Secure Scotland Seminar at Allanton Peace Sanctuary on 16th April 2019 – 18th April 2019. The purpose of the Secure Scotland Seminar was to envision how Scotland can challenge the narrative of dependency on militarism and aspire to a Scotland that can safeguard all its people, and develop responsible international relations based in peace, justice, and respect, contributing to international peace and security. The aims of the Secure Scotland Seminar were threefold:

1. Identify cross-party legislation to increase security in Scotland;
2. Take practical actions to improve the well-being of the majority;
3. Reclaim, name and highlight real security needs of Scotland.

Secure Scotland evolved from discussions held by Gari Donn, Janet Fenton, David McKenzie and Malcolm Spaven on the concept of security and the dominant narrative which encapsulates it. Secure Scotland aims to reconceptualise the concept of security, challenging the existing state-centric model, favoured by the political elite, where armies and weaponry are utilised to combat ‘perceived’ security threats. The discussions referenced the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, and some texts included in the Scottish Greens policy document on the role of gender and global co-operation, and the idea of creating positive frameworks based on social justice.

It is evident that the international community prescribes to this dominant narrative of security. To illustrate, the international community ‘spent more than \$1.7 trillion on arms and armies’ in 2017 (United Nations, 2019). The United Kingdom is no exception, choosing to privilege national security over human security. Their security strategy revolves around control and dominance and is an outworking of their colonial history. It is indisputably clear that this militaristic paradigm is damaging to individuals and societies, as it fails to understand what

makes individuals feel secure in their daily lives; the concept of security must be defined within the ecological context in which individuals live: security must be seen as a common right, security must be seen as a freedom and security must be seen as a shared responsibility. By reconceptualising security, societies can build positive peace, creating an environment where there is, amongst others, equitable distribution of resources and well-functioning governments.

The Secure Scotland Seminar was a Creative Search Gathering, following three steps and identifying a plan; looking at our ideal future, assessing where we are right now, identifying the constraints between these and finally naming actions that can move us forward.

Following three days of discussions, the participants collectively agreed that a gender-sensitive view of security reform applied and the following five themes are useful when challenging the existing militaristic paradigm which engulfs the international community today :

1. Climate and the environment;
2. Inequality;
3. Education;
4. Militarism;
5. Scotland's contribution to the international community.

The participants acknowledged the political strength of Secure Scotland, which requires attention and engagement from a multitude of individuals, organisations and politicians. Participants acknowledged the difficulty in implementing an attitudinal change, decoupling militarism from security. The participants agreed that the aim of Secure Scotland is to shift prevailing discussions on 'security' away from a toxic militarism and patriarchal dominance that leads to environmental degradation, and instead address the real threats experienced here in Scotland – naming them and providing impetus for change. Changing the message will

require a flexible, innovative and creative approach. The group believe that it is the human right of all individuals living in Scotland to feel confident and secure, and to strive globally to promote environmental and social justice, in alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, with particular emphasis on 1, 2, 5 and 16.

The present report will contain an account of the methodology and some biographical details of those involved as well as detailing the discussions held throughout the Secure Scotland Seminar.

Methodology

1. Participants

We brought participants together for a residential event at the Allanton World Peace Centre from Tuesday 16th April afternoon until Thursday 18th April afternoon. We invited individuals chosen to comprise, as far as possible, a group which was reasonably representative of different demographic groups: we aimed to include new Scots, young people, women's groups, faith groups, elected representatives and/or their staff, trade union officials and members, people who are active and informed within healthcare, social enterprise, violence reduction efforts, arts and culture, education and media.

(f) facilitators

(p) planning group members participated in the process, and some (Janet and David) added some support with the facilitation since one of the team we had originally planned had to withdraw at a late stage.

The UN House interns Charlotte-Ann and Laura also acted as rapporteurs for all the plenary and some break-out sessions.

Gari Donn (p)

Malcolm Spaven (p) aviation consultant, author

Laura Rutherford (UN House Scotland intern, Int. relation graduate, political analyst)

Charlotte-Ann Stoddart (UN House Scotland intern, IHL graduate)

Celia McKeon (f) Rethinking Security

Philip Austin (f) NFPB

David Mackenzie (p)

Janet Fenton (p)

Clare Philips - social work trainer WILPF/SCND

Tony Fitzpatrick – local authority, STUC, SCND

Emma Harper – MSP, former health care

Ishbel McGeorge – Scottish Parliamentary staff

Isobel Lindsay – former sociology lecturer, Constitutional Convention, magazine contributor

John Page - civil service, Transition Arran Island

Meg Beresford – former gen sec CND, manager Wiston Lodge

Caroline Uchima – Allanton executive director (p for event)

Jessica Wheeler – Forest School organiser/community gardener

John Wheeler – Lauriston Hall Housing Co-op, Hatricks Street Theatre Co.

Glenda Thornton – Allanton Schools/Teachers/education programme (p for event)

Sandy Watson – Scottish Enterprise, National Collective

Douglas Robertson - Photographer, Soundhouse Events director

Pete Ritchie – ED Nourish Scotland (food justice) & proprietor at Whitmuir Organic (farm/shop/gallery)

Mike Danson - Professor of Enterprise Policy, Heriot-Watt University, Jimmy Reid Foundation

Duncan Saunderson - engineer, Community Council member

Mike Blackshaw – entrepreneur, Edinburgh YESHUB Manager

David Mumford – Episcopal Church of Scotland, FoR UK and FoR International

Additional individuals were prevented attending the seminar but are interested in following progress and potentially being involved in future work, include:

Catherine Eschle, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Government, University of Strathclyde, political scientist, feminist and academic

Fintan Hurley, research scientist, (i) work and health and (ii) environment and health, author (March 2019) United Nations Environment Programme GEO-6 report

Jim Sutherland, award winning Scottish film composer, musician and producer (Outlaw King, Brave), SAC Creative Scotland Award for artists of distinction and originality

Dr Claire Duncanson, Social and Political Science University of Edinburgh. Research fields include Intersectional Security, International Relations theory and Gender Politics

Karine Polwart, Award winning Scottish singer, author and playwright and former philosophy teacher

Pat Kane, Scottish writer, musician, activist and consultant.

2. Seminar Process

We worked organically, utilising the expressed interests and ideas of the participants to develop and identify shared concerns and then utilising the strengths and expertise evident in the room to progress emergent themes:

Tuesday – Our Ideal Future, safe and secure

Wednesday morning – Where We Are, right now

Wednesday afternoon – The Constraints – what we have to change

Thursday morning – Planning for Action

Tuesday's workshops were a mix of games, talks videos and slide presentations and lots of discussion to gather impressions (on post-its and verbally or dramatically) of what would be a desirable secure future.

Rethinking Security and a future Scotland (Celia and Janet) Starting with buzz groups, responses to images and phrases videos. The concept of security was explored outside of militarism, nuclear weapons and the use of force, and focused instead on activities that were already in place or desirable for Scotland. The presentation on Allanton – Living In Balance (Caroline) and the hospitality reflected their sustainable approach to food, caring for their house and land and modelled a secure environment, as well as starting discussions about education.

Building Peace Together (led by Philip) gave participants an opportunity to consider different ways of sharing ideas and procedures that do not require consensus on the way forward.

On Wednesday we began to identify clusters of ideas, and share some practical examples of what already exists, and what could constitute a Secure Scotland. Practicalities were explored with pragmatic ideas as well as more general ideals. We worked through informed discussions on:

- parliamentary or council processes and examples of cross party collaboration
- provision of basic income and how this might impact on security
- education to develop Forest School and formal education in UN processes
- food security for Scottish children, their parents and food producers

On Thursday there was time to think about going forward with what we had discovered together. All of these ideas would depend on a change in discourse and approach to the term security. We agreed that it was important not to distract people already involved in campaigns on the topics we identified, or to create a ‘new campaign’, but rather to provide a resource or network to help share a change in thinking that would benefit them all, We defined this as:

To shift prevailing discussions on ‘security’ away from a toxic militarism and patriarchal dominance that lead to environmental degradation, and instead to address the real threats experienced here in Scotland – naming them and providing impetus for change.

It was also considered important to celebrate and highlight existing initiatives and situations that constitute what does give Scotland security.

All of the sessions were recorded by rapporteurs, and ideas were clustered through the use of a sticky wall and post-its by the whole group. Participants regrouped to consider these clusters. Time was also given to allow walking and talking informally outside, using the Allanton

labyrinth and the Peace Pole Henge as well as the house to allow reflection and building of friendship. Some photographs were taken. The full report of the ideas generated and outcomes suggested is available from UN house.

Some outcomes that will be followed up include:

- Parliamentary questions on education for healthcare professionals on nuclear health risk asked by MSP Emma Harper will be followed up with ICAN partners
- A survey on UN process through a model UN, will be submitted to a sample of headteachers
- Approaching local folk club(s) to offer music events based on the theme of Secure Scotland possibly with speakers, possibly fund or awareness raising
- Connection established with campaigns on militarism in schools and universities
- A 'Secure Scotland' stall at Allanton Festival
- A logo and a banner, and a basic leaflet to be created, explaining the concept which can be taken to events and gatherings
- Creation of a register of interested parties and a list of existing initiatives that support the aim

The Secure Scotland Seminar was jointly funded by the Schiehallion Group, the Rethinking Security Network, Scottish CND, Peace Education Scotland and individual donations. The secretariat was provided by UN House and the project is supported by Words and Actions.

Agenda for Tuesday

OUR IDEAL FUTURE

1. Welcome, Introductions, Purpose and Expectations

1.1. Introductions

The assembled group introduced themselves informally.

1.2. Purpose and Expectations

Following the introductions, Malcolm Spaven began by explaining the origins and purpose of Secure Scotland, which aims to reframe the concept of security. Having already re-framed the Green Party's security policy, and from currently reframing Green Party policy, he acknowledged that peace and security has traditionally been portrayed negatively, with governments choosing to accumulate weapons to achieve security. Even within the Green Party – a party which has always believed in widening the concept of security to incorporate social justice – he has struggled to challenge this dominant narrative, as Green Party members continue to focus on the traditional conception of security. It is arguable that this traditional conception of security is more favourable as it is concrete, involving measures such as utilising Trident etc., whereas the concept of social justice is nebulous. However, the founders of this seminar believe that the concept of security must be reconceptualised, away from the traditionalist assumption that we are always under threat, and leading to a widening of the concept of security, building a positive framework to take forward.

2. Reframing Security

To challenge existing assumptions on security, Celia McKeon began by placing participants into small groups to discuss what the words peace and security mean to them. The participants answers were varied, relaying different images such as breathing, nature, barbed wire, fences

etc. It is clear from their answers that the concept of peace has positive associations, as opposed to the concept of security.

Subsequently, Celia McKeon delved into a discussion on the differences and similarities between peace and security. She began by highlighting the differences between peace and security on photo-sharing websites. For security, the images are centred upon armed forces, men and weaponry whereas for peace, the images are centred upon doves and flowers, devoid of human relationships. The polarisation between these images reflect this dominant narrative of security, which is projected by the political elite onto the public. Before it can be challenged, it is important to engage and understand this dominant narrative of security.

To understand the dominant narrative of security, it is important to recognise the hallmarks of the United Kingdom's current approach. The United Kingdom prescribes to the dominant narrative of security, starting from the position that national security is supreme and is privileged over international security. It aims to define national interest in a meaningful way, detached from the security needs of local communities, but fails to define the term 'security'; this allows flexibility within their agenda. Furthermore, it focuses on short-term outlooks as opposed to long-term outlooks, negating the importance of long-term drivers which create insecurity within communities. It is evident the United Kingdom's current approach revolves around control and dominance and is an outworking of their colonial endeavours, where they exerted power over others to secure prosperity for themselves. To illustrate, there are two examples of the United Kingdom's current approach in practice. Firstly, this approach is demonstrated in the United Kingdom's accumulation of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons are justified as essential for national security, yet they are the ultimately a symbol of power, utilised as a tool to hedge threats from North Korea and Russia and to retain the United Kingdom's seat at the United Nations Security Council. Secondly, this approach is demonstrated in the United Kingdom's approach to arms exports in Saudi Arabia. The rationale underpinning the United

Kingdom's arms exports to Saudi Arabia lies in ensuring job security for British citizens, irrespective of the livelihood and security of those living in Yemen. As the United Kingdom has a benign influence in the region, and as the crisis can be solved through military intervention by regional powers, the United Kingdom is not concerned about what is happening on the ground. These two examples highlight how the dominant narrative of security frames the actions and policies which the United Kingdom government operates in practice.

It is difficult to articulate how the dominant narrative of security can be changed, offering a credible alternative to the status quo. However, if the dominant narrative of security is not challenged, it will be difficult to make any progress. Therefore, to change the dominant narrative of security, the concept of security has to be defined within the ecological context in which individuals live: security must be seen as a common right; – it cannot be achieved for only one group of individuals – security must be seen as a freedom; – the United Nations sees security as freedom from fear, want and to live in dignity – and, security must be seen as a shared responsibility – it is the responsibility of individuals at all levels, not just for governments.

Rethinking Security believes there are three strands to re-conceptualising security. Firstly, there has to be investment into building the conditions for human security. The United Nations has identified that there are seven different dimensions to individual security, ranging from access to food, housing, income and political participation. Secondly, the systemic causes of insecurity must be addressed, ranging from climate change, economic inequality, militarisation and political and social marginalisation; each of these dimensions are critical when constructing society. Thirdly, there has to be reinvestment in the equitable relationships which can address the systemic causes of insecurity. These relationships must be based on justice and mutuality as opposed to domination and power. There is no one-size fits all approach to security: security is not a means to an end; it is the end.

2.1. Discussion

Following the presentation, participants were invited to discuss their opinions on security. The participants questioned if other states national security strategies were similar to the United Kingdom's, and, if Scotland were to become independent, what its national security strategy would look like. In response, Celia McKeon explained that Rethinking Security had conducted research into the national security strategies of different states, finding that there are a number of states who concentrate on the concept of human security, a concept which is absent from any of the United Kingdom's policies. Furthermore, continental European states concentrate more on international cooperation, unlike the United Kingdom. There are different approaches to democratising security, but to do so, radical ideas are required from the beginning.

The discussion addressed how to democratise security, resolving the genuine conflict of interest between states and societies by developing institutions and structures which promote non-violence. It is essentially about shifting power, which, in reality, is difficult to do as so many individuals benefit from living within the status quo; the security of the rich will diminish in return for increased equality. The current militaristic paradigm, focusing on the macro and the political, is damaging when reframing security. The paradigm in which individuals live, culturally and institutionally, are where this dominant narrative is embedded and is the starting point for reframing security. To illustrate, Extinction Rebellion is an example of individuals beginning to challenge this dominant narrative, pushing their own agenda and questions into the public sphere.

The participants believed the United Kingdom's approach to security was preferential to the government as it enables them to maintain their position on the United Nations Security Council. It was argued this preference is not aligned with Scotland's national interests. Economic security is more important to individuals living within Scotland, yet financial

support continues to be peddled into the current militaristic paradigm. Defence spending does not provide employment security. Reframing security requires a question: what makes people in Scotland secure?

2.2. Videos

Two videos were shown during the discussions. The first video presented showed Scotland's First Minister Nicola Sturgeon following her official meeting with the United Nations' Special Rapporteur on poverty. His report on the United Kingdom's Government identified its policies were misogynistic and shameful. The First Minister insisted that Scotland should have no part in that. This highlighted the importance of women's security. The second video demonstrated how Scottish women can contribute to the United Nation's Commission on the Status of Women. Both videos are important in the context of reframing security within Scotland. The participants discussed how Scotland as a non- member can still have an influence at United Nations, drawing on their experiences with nuclear weapons. The participants agreed there needs to be a transitional approach, starting local (transitionnetwork.org).

2.3. Group Exercises

Leading on from these discussions and videos, the participants worked in groups to answer the following question: what is your vision of how security could be approached differently? It was generally held that, to reframe security, there has to be an understanding of what makes individuals feel insecure in their daily lives, their personal and community sense of security. In approaching security differently, work can be done in the following areas:

- Communication, utilising alternative ideas, language e.g. changing the terminology from security to secure etc.;
- Climate change;
- Conflict resolution;

- Education;
- Prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons
- Equality;
- Food/energy security and production;
- Human flourishing;
- International;
- Local democracy within communities;
- Parliamentary engagement;
- Policing;
- Poverty especially child poverty;
- Societal breakdown.

All these areas can be approached from both the bottom-up and the top-down.

3. Allanton – Living in Balance

The Secure Scotland seminar was hosted at Allanton Peace Sanctuary in Auldgirth, Dumfries. After a simple meal of seasonal food that was mostly grown at Allanton, all produced sustainably and with care and attention, Caroline Uchima, Director, led this section of the seminar to provide an insight into life at Allanton and the projects they are working on.

Allanton Peace Sanctuary's origins can be traced back to Japan, where the Peace Prayer was shared in direct response to the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. It was hoped peace sanctuaries would cultivate a culture of peace, and increase the number of people sharing the affirmation of the statement 'may peace prevail on earth'; for peace to be achieved, every human being

must feel secure. The Peace Pole Project aims to cultivate a culture of peace, whereby everyone can plant a peace pole, inscribed with the statement 'may peace prevail on earth'. Currently, there are 250,000 peace poles worldwide, with every country having at least one peace pole. The World Peace Flag ceremony takes place annually at the Peace Pole Henge at Allanton, merging the ancient spirituality of the Celts with the present, cultivating a culture of peace.

Another project ran by Allanton Peace Sanctuary is Education for Peace, which introduces the concept of peace to children who visit and those within mainstream education. The aim of Education for Peace is to enable children to create and recognise peace within themselves, developing their resilience and self-confidence. When these children are secure, this peace can be shared with their families, friends, schools, communities, countries and all human beings. It teaches children that their actions have consequences and an impact on others. Education for Peace involves eight lesson plans on topics such as global citizenship, learning for sustainability etc., with teachers receiving training either face-to-face or online. It can be embedded within the Curriculum for Excellence and is currently being promoted to Education Scotland and schools

4. Building Peace Together

This session is led by Philip Austin, who began by personally reflecting on security. Firstly, he began by discussing his experiences in Bolton as a member of the Interfaith Council, which aims to improve local understanding of different cultures and faiths. Several years ago, the English Defence League began obtaining momentum throughout England, planning demonstrations with violent intentions. The English Defence League planned to have a demonstration in Bolton town centre, leaving the Muslim population feeling threatened. Several meetings were conducted to prepare for this demonstration, and to defuse tensions between all parties involved, but all measures put into practice adhered to the dominant

narrative of security. The English Defence League were to be escorted by police and metal barriers were utilised to separate them from other protesting groups such as Unite Against Fascism; it led to police officers becoming violent. It is clear from this example there was no space for dialogue between the competing factions, with the question remaining: how should these events be policed?

Secondly, Philip Austin continued by discussing Bolton's response to the shootings in Christchurch, New Zealand. Vigils were held and attended by individuals of all faiths including Conservatives, Unite Against Fascism etc. The police were also in attendance to show their support. These two experiences highlighted two contrasting responses to events by the individuals living in Bolton. He also reflected on the aftermath of the Manchester Arena bombings, where he was invited to speak at local events. To build peace, there has to be an interweaving of relationships between individuals living within communities; there has to be a relationship between accountability and security. Currently, Bolton is facing an increase in economic insecurity, yet the local authority has responded by implementing Public Space Protection Orders for those aggressively begging. The local authority is failing to tackle real insecurity.

Subsequently, Philip Austin introduced Building Peace Together, a resource published by the Quaker Council of European Affairs. This resource discusses peacebuilding and is available for all individuals, having been translated into different languages. The concept of security is a condition of peacebuilding. Yet, the dominant narrative is no longer the sole focus of security. The question of whose security is being promoted and protected influences the definition and design of any security strategy. Conflict drivers include: demographic stress, inequality and unmet economic, political and social expectations and frustrations, influx, new technologies, organised crime and international terrorism, political and social institutions, questions of history and identity and stress on natural resources.

Peacebuilding is a process for all individuals, and every stakeholder to a conflict can be turned into an actor, to build cohesion and to foster reconciliation, leading to sustainable peace. The principles of peacebuilding include: inclusiveness, ownership or appropriateness (legitimacy of engagement), awareness of economic and socio-political factors which manifest in conflict-affected areas, power relations, pursuing accountable governance (mutual accountability), building drivers for peace and engaging populations. All these principles are vital for building sustainable peace; the individuals who are affected by conflict are the best equipped to resolve it. Peacebuilding tools include: agriculture and the environment, arts and culture, business, the economy and trade, communication and the media, democracy and politics, diplomacy, dialogue, healthcare, infrastructure and planning, justice, and mediation and negotiation. Philip Austin shared the view of Johan Galtung, the main founder of the Peace Research Institute Oslo, who discussed the differences between building negative and positive peace. The former refers to the absence of conflict, whereas the latter creates the optimum environment, creating a community where there is acceptance of the rights of others, equitable distribution of resources, good relationship with neighbours, high levels of human capital, free flow of information, low levels of corruption and a well-functioning government. These are the pillars of positive peace.

It is helpful to remember the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions: promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

4.1. Discussion

The participants initiated discussions on peacebuilding and security with regards to migration, – individuals only feel insecure when there is an influx – social media, – anonymity must be

eliminated – and, transparency – this is an opportunity for social media. This was followed with an exploration of processes for managing conflict, especially extreme oppression, where conflicts are contained but not resolved as the conflict fosters oppression which is beneficial to the elite.

This section is concluded with a video entitled ‘The Work of Humankind Has Just Begun’ by Vincent Harding.

Throughout this session, ideas for what could be meant by Secure Scotland were noted by participants on post-it stickers and added to boards round the room; these included broad themes, pragmatic suggestions, visions and personal goals. After the session, the facilitation team collected these. On larger sheets, the ideas expressed were written as single word, or short phrases, and the first exercise on Wednesday involved adding these to fifteen foot long ‘sticky wall’ with the whole group discussing and re-ordering them into themes for the next stage of our work.

Wednesday

WHERE DO WE START, AND WHAT ARE THE CONSTRAINTS ON MOVING FORWARD?

1. Introduction

Work on Wednesday aimed to follow up our vision of an ideal future by identifying where we are starting from, and beginning to explore the constraints and the points of entry to make changes.

Three significant participants were unable to attend the entire seminar, but we appreciated that they each agreed to join for part of Wednesday's work; they were Emma Harper MSP, who offered ideas about how Secure Scotland could engage with parliamentarians at Holyrood; Pete Richie, Executive Director of Nourish who offered an input on what food sovereignty and food security could mean for security in Scotland; and Mike Danson who was able to add a perspective on how a basic income for all Scots could increase our security.

We started with the exercise of sorting of the words and phrases generated by Tuesday's work onto the sticky wall, and the groups explored themes, discussing their collective vision for Secure Scotland, where and how the dominant narrative could be changed.

Discussions, ideas and aspirations in many aspects of how people experience security or the lack of it emerged, including education, where kindness and positivity can help to provide inner security, and conflict resolution skills, co-operative approaches to competing interest and an acceptance of non-violence as a principle could be integral. Equality of opportunity could also address economic social and other forms of insecurity and could provide the eradication of child poverty and oppression of women and girls. Practical suggestions included free access to phones, increasing the bee population, violence reduction measures in policing, basic income for all, and fairer distribution of resources. The group also discussed existing practices in Scotland, for example, the non-charging of tuition fees for university students and every baby

being given the basic resources in a box were recognised as increasing security, and the group thought that it was important to recognise that these measures make us safer than government spending on arms trading. These ideas do not emanate from the United Kingdom's policy and contribute to how Scotland sees itself in the global community.

Changing the idea of security to the things we experience or desire in order to feel secure requires reclaiming the language and challenging the idea of what we need to be safe. The participants were agreed that the current security doctrine, along with climate change, present an urgent threat to Scotland's security in any real sense and that we can and must take steps to bring that to people's attention and change that.

2. Collective Vision (Potential steps for the future)

Communication requires a narrative shift away from security referring solely to militarism. There must be an articulation of ideas, languages and values wherever possible, using security language at all levels (local, national and international) and in the media. There has to be a discussion on the root causes of insecurity, peacebuilding and peacemaking. The consensus was that the term secure is more fitting than the term security and will be catchier in the media. There needs to be a discussion within communities as to what worries them, incorporating the concept that individuals want to be secure.

In respect of current defence policies, the participants seek a clear articulation of alternatives to military intervention.

The group discussed the importance of agriculture, climate change and environmental justice, increased efforts to save bees and the micro-generation of energy (a focus on the significance of the environment to security). Climate change is urgent and change is essential and possible. To change the dominant narrative, there has to be emphasis that security and militarism do not mean the same thing.

2.1. Group Exercise

The participants were divided into groups to discuss the following categories, derived from their collective vision for Secure Scotland: education, environment, equality, international community and the military.

For education, the participants believed that once Secure Scotland's core statement had been disseminated, its implications could be embedded within the Curriculum for Excellence and through civil society and tertiary education. Conflict resolution practices and other safeguarding measures could be introduced throughout Scotland. Faith communities can look at what reconciliation looks like within their faith and share this collectively.

For the environment, the participants discussed climate justice and the need for changes in practice over agriculture, energy production, land ownership and sustainability. Climate justice is urgent.

Any vision of security will recognise injustices, both past and present and will take practical steps to uphold equality at all levels.

Participants noted the importance of Scotland in the international community, and for Scotland to be known for international justice and peace. Secure Scotland desires that the citizens of Scotland feel secure and confident to strive globally to promote social and environmental justice. Communication has to involve actions and words.

Some of the participants stressed a possibility for civil emergency response within the military, and others supported the promotion of preventative violence reduction models within policing. Resources could be used for making individuals feel secure.

The participants suggested some ideas as examples of Secure Scotland: expanded access to technology and communications for all, thus merging the individual and the global – free phones and IT access for all; a survey on what security means with wide demographic inclusion

of different voices; basic income to increase equality; more grassroots funding opportunities to empower individuals and communities to make smart choices for their relevant security; a tax instead of individual car insurance policies; shifting funding away from the military to improve education; transforming military forces into civilian organisations; community living, where tasks and resources are shared; and reform of land ownership laws.

Emma Harper MSP joined the seminar to focus on parliamentary possibilities and discussed how Scotland has already begun to reframe security e.g. baby box initiative. Emma Harper is very active in cross-party work and is working on the Livestock Members' Bill, ownership of sustainable farming and the policing/prison system, incorporating support services for prisoners. She uses the example of drug addiction, and the need to recognise this as a mental illness as opposed to a crime, changing the language from an abuser to a misuser. She is active in cross-party groups but the media are more interested in adversarial activity at Parliament. Individuals and parliament could be made aware of Secure Scotland, through taking a cross-party approach to legislation within the health inequality cross-party working group.

Participants considered other parliamentary possibilities included the Curriculum for Excellence and militarisation within schools, and militarisation and climate change/natural disasters, using military resources, both funding and personnel to address natural disasters etc.. This will question what the military is for. Other discussion points included education on the impact of nuclear weapons, especially in respect of health and wellbeing (Emma Harper MSP has e-mailed health boards regarding the impact of radiation and has engaged in parliamentary questions regarding this topic, local authority disaster preparedness, training emergency and medical professionals), the use of cross-party groups to draft legislation on Secure Scotland, how to politically package Secure Scotland nationally and globally, commissioning surveys to assess what makes individuals feel secure, decoupling security and violence, cybersecurity (what makes individuals in Scotland feel insecure, what is their biggest threat?), the democratic

deficit and housing (private renters, tackling rent prices) (Good Food Nation Bill). Participants discussed choice, when schools host military career fairs or events. The covenant between hospitals and the military restricts children's ability to think of safety and security in new ways. Secure Scotland is a strong political opportunity. The dominant narrative shows security being catastrophised; this can be changed by decoupling security and violence.

3. Entry Points for Change

To address entry points, groups worked on the five themes, using three questions:

1. What capacities already exist?;
2. What are the obstacles to fuller realisation of this vision for change?; and,
3. What opportunities are there for further progress?

There are extensive resources in Holyrood and in existing international voluntary organisations to achieve Secure Scotland's aims, but the United Kingdom's cultures and values are dominant; the media has entrenched these norms (there are economic and social anxieties and resource pressure in policy). The participants stressed the importance of social media in engaging the Scottish public. The participants also discussed the impact of the Scottish independence movement on political engagement and as a challenge to United Kingdom's norms. Scotland is a cultural entity with a strong global identity, long history in international relations and enjoys a supportive diaspora. Scotland has a tried and tested capacity to cultivate change through arts and media. Opposition to nuclear weapons, commitment to education and social justice and reducing disadvantages provide political opportunities in Scotland to change this discourse here.

The participants believed the public are beginning to understand climate change. Efforts to address economic inequalities within Scotland, through policies such as the baby box initiative and free tuition fees show a readiness for a change in discourse. The participants were critical of agricultural and land ownership policies, as the public continue to live in growth model

economies where embedded capitalism continues to oppress minorities, especially women. Land ownership and vested interests, agriculture and associated practices, decline in the insect population and public reluctance to take action all require challenge. Education is both an obstacle and an opportunity.

Education initiatives within Scotland, such as Peace Education Scotland, positively campaigns for peace and runs residential courses for 18-30, incorporating modules on the environment, morality etc.. Pax Christie organises materials for primary and secondary schools as do Society of Friends (Quakers) and United Nations Association organises model United Nations events for schools and more senior students. Headteachers may be promoting our agenda or acting as gatekeepers, maintaining the status quo in education. The participants emphasised the importance of collaborative and positive opportunities at education conferences. The message from Allanton, ‘may peace prevail on earth’, should be included in the curriculum and encouraged by headteachers. New legislation at Holyrood promises reductions on domestic violence against children and violence in schools and is supported through the Positive Parenting Programme, Society of Friend and the Alternatives to Violence programme in prisons. Religious prejudice, financial constraints, lack of awareness, lack of adequate resources and the media (promote violence on local and national levels) provide challenges. There must be separation of education and military and separation of security and violence; efforts are ongoing through the Scottish Quaker Parliamentary engagement, Veterans for Peace and Forces Watch as well as Scotland Against Militarism in Education.

There are huge challenges in reframing security within Scotland. These include agricultural practices, economic growth model, forestry monoculture, job insecurity, lack of resources, lack of vested interest, land ownership, media, militarisation of education, systematic oppression of women and minorities and poverty. The participants believed that there has to be involvement from organisations who are already committed to projects, education and campaigns that can

each help to demonstrate and articulate Secure Scotland but most of all, there has to be an attitudinal change, where an adversarial working group is convened to delve into what security means to the public.

Legislative processes can be based on change, challenging dominant understandings of security, and questioning what security means for Scotland. One project will be mapping existing services which can readily be promoted.

After dinner and an opportunity to explore how Allanton has developed its grounds and garden as a model of sustainable practice, participants and facilitators reconvened to hear from and question Mike Danson and Pete Ritchie in our final session of the day.

Mike Danson outlined Citizen's basic income; this involves periodic cash payments (as opposed to a voucher) at regular intervals (not a one off grant or annual payment; it puts money into the hands of people, it does not restrict where they spend it). It is distributed on an individual basis, irrespective of age and continues throughout life. It is unconditional and universal, removing the barriers which are attached to other benefits e.g. providing proof of applying for jobs. It will empower individuals, tackling issues such as domestic violence, insecure employment and poverty, promote career breaks, set up small businesses, volunteer or work part-time whilst feeling secure and stable. Citizen's basic income was developed in Scotland by Quaker Annie Miller and endorsed globally. A pilot project increased divorce rates by empowering women to leave their abusive marriages. It does not eradicate the need for other benefits such as disability allowance. It is also beneficial to those who suffer from mental or physical illness. It is clear the current labour market is damaging to mental and physical illness. It is also beneficial to those who are self-employed. Individuals who are self-employed are living in poverty but are viewed by the Department of Work and Pensions as entrepreneurs. However, they do not receive any holiday pay or sick pay. Citizen's basic income will benefit these individuals, improving productivity (Reasoning includes security, stability for career-

breaks, part-time employment, retraining, setting up businesses and volunteering, step towards labour market, suitable for those in rehabilitation and veterans, allowing them to be healthier mentally and physically etc.).

Research on citizen's basic income, funded by civil partners and universities focused on citizen's basic income aspects and a report has been launched within the Scottish parliament.

Criticisms towards citizen's basic income include affordability conflict with the United Kingdom's neoliberal market and opposition from the United Kingdom's Department of Work and Pensions make this policy difficult to implement.

The participants also discussed the following: economic growth, if citizen's basic income creates problems, how gross domestic profit creates problems and land ownership. Some participants discussed how the government conceptualise and present as a universal benefit. The government does not restrict this benefit to any individual. The participants also discussed collective bargaining.

Subsequently, Pete Ritchie raised three issues to be discussed: global food security, household food security and food security in respect of Scotland.

The major difficulty globally in respect of food security is the conceptualisation that there will be food shortages due to climate change and population increases. However, food production has matched population growth (Scotland's last period of food insecurity was in 1690), and there is capacity to grow infinite amounts of food. Since World War II, there has been discussion of how industries can convince individuals to consume their product; food availability is not the problem, it is income availability (John Boyd Orr). The biggest problem is how industries can persuade individuals to consume their products and the biggest technical problem is the availability of income, not the availability of food. In addition, another problem is the production and distribution of food in respect of climate change and the potentiality of a nuclear war, threatening to damage farmland, especially in South Asia where there is dense

populations and highly fertile land etc.. The food system is a contributor to climate change, deforestation and cognitive dissonance in respect of animal welfare. Food production systems subscribe to the paradigm where we constantly need to produce more. Farmers are continuing to accumulate greater resources, but their yields are not increasing.

On household food insecurity, Pete Ritchie noted that 8% of Scottish households worry about food security. This figure increases to 23% in lone-parent households (figures are from the health service). Household food insecurity can impact mental health and physical wellbeing, especially amongst children, who worry about their parents running out of food. A potential solution is to raise individual's income and tackle the poverty premium, in turn reducing reliance on food banks etc.. Recent surveys have shown if individuals earn £8.50 per hourly, there is increased reliance on foodbanks. For individuals earning £10.00 per hour, there is less reliance on foodbanks; the difference between security and insecurity is small, those who live in poverty have poorer diets. Low-income families wish to feed their families food which is more sustainable but to do so, their income has to be significantly higher and prices need to remain at the same level. Raising incomes alone will not solve this problem and there are calls to repackage the household food system in its entirety. To tackle the poverty premium, there must be aggressive fuel tariffs, examination of income distribution (raise income to eat sustainably).

Thirdly, Pete addressed food security and Scotland in respect of farming policies etc. (farming at 900FT). Scotland produces more food than it consumes and is unproductive unless receiving help from others. Farmers cannot pay their employees the living wage. The common agriculture policy within the European Union is beginning to be reformed, but what approach must be employed in Scotland in respect of farming and food; should farmers be paid to participate in environmental schemes, should policies focus on producing Scottish food for Scottish people? Should farmers be paid to participate in environmental schemes? How should resources be

spent? Non-local production, food into supermarkets? Scotland is unproductive unless imported as it is still not an exporter.

The participants discussed citizen's basic income, its relationship with existing social security payments and work ethic.

Participants questioned the way forward. His response involved changing the mindset on agriculture and the environment, the duty of care for exports and imports and welfare standard and interventions within the market to guarantee fruit/vegetables are cheaper than processed foods. There is also a need to change the narrative in respect of climate change and food production.

The participants discussed subsidies, land ownership, education for children, the relationship between citizens and government, cost production and the price of commodities, the decrease in energy costs for producing food, spaces for producing food and how these are impacted by climate change, food distribution and the relationship between ammonia and cattle; how ammonia can be converted and improving animal welfare conditions. An extended duty of care to all standards including animal welfare and labour welfare would be desirable and intervention in the market to ensure fruit and vegetables are as good as highly processed food. Furthermore, there must be global governance (the European Common Food Policy/Good Food Nation policy). The government should be organising systems which work for a wide-range of individuals. The current system is non-innovative and gendered.

Thursday

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? PLANNING FOR ACTION

1. Introduction

In groups, we considered two themes: what has changed about your perspective on security? What have you learned? and what practical actions are needed to help change the narrative on security?

2. What has changed about your perspective on security? What have you learned?

There was discussion on how the Secure Scotland seminar demonstrated the need for a change in narrative around security. Participants acknowledged the significant promise for potential future change given the difficulties in creating the right conditions to shift security-related discussions towards a more humanitarian perspective

Participants also suggested that in any discussion of shifting policy towards a humanitarian security definition, there ought to be recognition that there are a number of Scottish government policies aligning with this on an ideological level already in existence (for example, free tuition fees at university). The key, building on these, would be to emphasise the discursive shift, that these policies are directly security-related, in order to ensure continued transition towards a Secure Scotland.

Participants generally agreed that the seminar showed how it can be relatively easy to make the case for the provision of social services being directly security-related, but that the difficulty comes in decoupling militarism from the umbrella of security.

Many appreciated that the Secure Scotland seminar provided the opportunity to discuss the breadth of a definition of security.

Some participants highlighted the importance of the seminar in developing the phrase Secure Scotland, as this offers a useful gateway into these discussions without directly using the word security, which they claimed had been negatively appropriated to mean only military-related

security. They suggested that this seminar represented the introduction of a new narrative and showed the importance of diversity in redefining security.

3. What practical actions do you think are needed to help change the narrative about security?

The goal for this exercise was to think about the aim that was set out for this event and for Secure Scotland more generally, in line with the aim:

‘To shift prevailing discussions on security away from toxic militarism, environmental degradations and patriarchal dominance and instead to discuss real threats experienced here in Scotland, naming them and providing impetus for change’.

Suggestions were made for practical actions that could be taken to help shift the narrative, both within the context of the individual/groups they are involved with, and different arenas such as politics, media, culture and activism.

The responses are grouped roughly according to category:

1. Engage with expertise: higher education networks and academic researchers engaged in the area currently defined as security-related when security narratives link to the distribution of wealth and power.
2. Communication: conversations to change the narrative on security. Speaking to people is important in order to break barriers. It is important to consistently challenge, as they arise, instances of the prevailing narrative, using humour, questions, satire, and memes. Practice will develop confidence and expertise in communicating and sharing ideas about Secure Scotland with individuals, families and friends. Use social and new media including podcasts, blogs, and alternative/independent media to disseminate information and engage in debates. Develop a cohesive brand, publicity and digital strategy for Secure Scotland.
3. Working together: collaborate and advocate to amplify the message. Engage Police Scotland to educate and support all vulnerable individuals to internet fraud and telephone fraud.

4. Education: requires generational change through legislation and through existing programmes such as the Peace Education Networks, and by articulating a strategy for peace, resilience and nonviolent conflict resolution in all levels of education.

5. Narrative changes: highlight the need for accurate plain speech on security among peace and environmental organisations. Challenge what secure means in all engagements with others. Research and share data on the negative impact of militarism in Scotland and the world. Encourage peace organisations to challenge defence spending in comparison with socially useful activity. Join groups and use relationships with key people to build the Secure Scotland narrative at the international, national, local and community levels.

6. Specific events: a concert for Secure Scotland and an international arts convention/collective to interpret and display our concept of security, extending links with cultural arts organisations, including poetry and music, in order to promote Secure Scotland themes.

3. Evaluation and Closing Reflections

Participants were invited to offer feedback informally on the day, using a simple positive/negative/ ideas flip chart, or in writing by e-mail after the event on the day.

3.1. Positives

1. Learning experience
2. Helping to make sense of the debate and context
3. Sharing and openness
4. Networking
5. Opening opportunities
6. Introduction to Allanton
7. Facilitation: excellent at summarising and distilling the information
8. Sticky wall

3.2. Negatives

1. Lack of diversity, although recognised that this is a beginning and future efforts will try harder for inclusiveness

3.3. Other Comments

How does Secure Scotland get incorporated into a policy framework for Scotland in the future?

Could there be a Secure Scotland table at Allanton festival in June? What would we want to have on the table? What will people who come to the festival be asking about Secure Scotland?

The table at Allanton festival in June has been agreed.
