

Lesson One: International disagreements, nuclear negotiations, and gender

Subjects: Citizenship, PSHE, English, Government & Politics

OVERVIEW

Students explore their own assumptions of 'strength' and 'security' by putting themselves in the shoes of world leaders. They play a card game to understand the difficulties of nuclear deal negotiations, and then take part in a modified version of the game to see the differences in nuclear treaty negotiations.

MATERIALS

Pens / Powerpoint / Tug o' War cards / Worksheets

ROOM LAYOUT

For group work.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- All students will **experience** two different ways to approach international conflict and change: mediated negotiation, and multilateral co-operation.
- Most students will **understand** the role of vested interests and gendered ideas in conflict, strength, and security.
- Some students will **decide** on the best ways to negotiate for change, and defend their opinion, with a **consideration** of gender.

Note: This lesson has been designed to be delivered independently of other lessons in the pack, however for a gentler or more thorough learning experience, it can be adapted to fit in with other, or longer, schemes of work.

STARTER (5 minutes) Thinking Thumbs: Strong or not strong?

The class are shown a series of photos (refer to PowerPoint), and have to judge whether they consider whatever is depicted in the image to be either 'strong' (thumbs/hands up) or 'not strong' (thumbs/hands down). In each instance the teacher asks a student from each side why they decided to vote a certain way.

If you are putting together your own slides, you could consider: a weightlifter / a male soldier / a male political leader / a mother / a female soldier / a female politician / a female protester / a girl / a boy / a homeless person / a business person.

For a deeper inquiry, ask the class to think about their responses to the activity with regards to gender. In small groups, students discuss any biases they might not have realised they hold, to do with gender, age, profession, appearance etc. You may find our supporting material (p.13), which explores gender and militarism, helpful.

ACTIVITY 1: Tug o' War (15 minutes)

Before (5 mins)

- Brief the students (PowerPoint with videos) about current tensions between two nuclear armed countries (we suggest the 2018/9 talks between North Korea and the USA), giving the 'bare bones' of the situation.
- In THREEs, students decide who will play the opposing parties (1 student on each side), and who will act as a neutral mediator.
- Provide students with their trading cards (p.15-16). The cards detail what each party can 'offer', 'ask' for, or 'threaten' and each card has either a positive or negative value. A briefing card for each country outlines how many points each 'party' starts with (a reflection of their power). Tell negotiators they need to maintain their strength, whilst reducing the threat posed by their enemy.
- Give the mediator their own separate worksheet (p.17), which they can use to keep a record of how the negotiations progress. Their job is to understand each 'deal' and try to get the parties to compromise.

During (5 mins only – the game might be frustrating, this is the point!)

- Without seeing the other's cards, each party chooses one 'ask' or one 'offer' card. They slide these cards face-down to the mediator.
- The mediator turns the cards over and: 1) reads aloud what each party wants; 2) asks parties why they asked/offered what they did; 3) asks parties how they feel about this prospective 'deal'.
- The parties can accept or reject the deal 'as it stands', and have the opportunity to say what they would like to see in the next deal. Whether accepted or rejected, another round of proposals follows.
- If the parties accept the deal, the mediator notes down on their worksheet what just occurred, including any change in power scores. The cards remain face-up on the table.
- If the parties reject the deal, the cards are returned to the parties' hands, and the mediator records that this deal has failed. The mediator tells the parties why they think the deal failed (e.g. one party asked for too much, or didn't offer anything in return).

- The parties choose a new set of cards (or the same, if they were returned to their hands) to slide over to the mediator in the next negotiation. Note: there are blank cards on which the parties can write their own 'offer' or 'ask'. The mediator can decide on the points ascribed to these custom cards.
- If either party plays a 'threaten' card, the game must restart and any cards on the table are returned to the parties' hands. This is because a direct threat can de-rail diplomatic efforts, and reduce trust between parties. Alternatively, you may wish to allow the negotiations to continue, so that students must respond to the threat.

After (5 mins)

- Ask groups how their negotiations went; did the class have difficulties, and why?
- Discuss whether they felt they needed to appear strong and powerful, and if they found it difficult to make any concessions because of this.
- Emphasise that this negotiation process is a zero-sum game, where one party's gain requires another party's loss. Ask how the students feel about this? Is there an alternative?

DISCUSSION (15 mins)

Our PowerPoint presentation will help with this section: [see: bit.ly/CNDCriticalMass]

- Present what happened in Trump/Kim talks of 2018 (Singapore Summit) and 2019 (Hanoi Summit and Trump's visit to the Korean de-militarised zone). To what extent were these negotiations successful?
- Refer to conflict escalation slides, and as a class apply this understanding to the US/NK talks. How would students have navigated these conflicts differently?
- Noting that almost all negotiators in these conflicts were men, ask the class to discuss in pairs for 1 minute whether there is a link between gender and conflict. Would the outcome have been different if women were in the room? Field responses.
- Play video in which Theresa May states she would fire the UK's nuclear weapons. Underline that although our ideas of strength and conflict might be gendered, they are not necessarily exclusive to everyone of one gender i.e. masculine ideas of strength can be communicated through the actions of women leaders too. Link: <http://bit.ly/UKPMTheresa>
- Extension: For a deeper inquiry, also play video showing New Zealand Prime Minister's emotive reaction to the Christchurch massacre (note: discussion of shooting and weapons). Do these leaders show the same strength, or different strengths? Link: <http://bit.ly/NZPMJacinda> (0.29-1.42)
- *Extension:* Students asked where else these ideas might play out? Teacher writes these on the board. Responses might be: at home, in the workplace, in the street, with other men, in sport... The responses can be left on the board.

ACTIVITY 2 (10 mins): **Tug for Peace (the TPNW): the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW)**

Before

- The teacher is now a mediator, and the class splits into small groups of two or three, for which they are given blank 'suggestion cards' or slips of plain paper.
- Teacher thinks of a question applicable to a school setting e.g. 'What can we do to ensure everyone feels safe at school?' Students will produce an agreement to try and reach a solution.

During

- Three groups hand the teacher a 'suggestion' card, which they have written themselves.
- Teacher reads them aloud and asks the groups why they made this suggestion. Might other groups disagree?
- The class votes on whether each suggestions is added to a group agreement. This is decided by a majority vote. Teacher can write on board or stick the cards to the board with tack. The teacher reads these agreements out loud and can suggest ways that the discussion can move forward.
- New groups now hand in suggestion cards that can add to, or edit, the agreement. The process is repeated until every group has given in at least one suggestion card.
- The class votes as a whole on whether to accept the agreement, remaining in the roles of their delegation groups.

PLENARY (10 mins)

- The class learns about the TPNW (refer to PowerPoint), noting that the Tug for Peace occurred in a similar process to the TPNW negotiations. See our supporting information on the TPNW (p.14).
- Note the role of women, and other marginalised groups, in establishing the treaty – Ask:
 - Why might some people say that this is significant?
 - Is the 'regular' process of negotiation being changed by listening to those affected?
- Note the differences in approach between the Tug for Peace and the Tug o' War – Consider how the Tug for Peace used power co-operatively whilst the Tug o' War used power competitively, and ask which was most effective at creating a change?
- Ask how might some people critique this way of change making? Responses might include:
 - Reaching a consensus could mean that no one is fully satisfied.
 - In a majority vote, some voices can be overlooked.

- Some parties can be excluded from an agreement, such as 'rogue states', meaning that although the rule is changed for most, the exceptions to the rule are unchanged.

DIFFERENTIATION

Simplify

- Provide students with fewer cards to choose from in the Tug o' War activity.
- Provide students with a list of possible suggestions to choose from in the Tug for Peace activity.

Stretch

- Provide groups with more, or only, 'custom' cards in the Tug o' War activity.
- Base the Tug for Peace activity around nuclear weapons e.g. ask 'what are the dangers of nuclear weapons and how can we reduce them?' In this example students can act as delegations (i.e. groups of two or three representing a civil society group or country, such as CND or North Korea). They could do their own research on these beforehand.
- In the Tug for Peace activity, you might wish to give a group VETO powers, allowing them to block any suggestion, or the agreement as a whole. This could be because they are particularly powerful, or require special consideration.
- Move the Thinking Thumbs STARTER activity to follow the DISCUSSION for a deeper inquiry of gender and 'strength'.

EXTENSION (Homework or subsequent lesson ideas)

- Students could produce a poster on the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which could later be put on display.
- Students could research another conflict with a 'gender' lens, for example, the International Women's Strike, which occurs on the 8th March in over 50 countries, looking at the difference between the people seeking change, and the people who have the power to make decisions. See: <https://womensmarchglobal.org/>
- For a historical comparison, our teaching pack 'Dial M for Missile' offers several lesson plans around the Cuban Missile Crisis, which bring to life another famous nuclear negotiation. Available via our website.

ENRICHMENT

- Students contact their MP to see if they support the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW). Contact them to either thank them or challenge them based on the student's point of view. You can find more information at: <https://cnduk.org/nuclear-ban-communities/>

Timeline

16 July 1945	World's first successful nuclear weapons test carried out by the USA in New Mexico.
6 and 9 August 1945	USA drops two nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan, close to the end of the Second World War.
August 1945	Following the end of the World War, Korea is divided in two, with the Soviet Union occupying the North and the USA occupying the South (until 1948-9).
May to September 1948	Two separate governments are formed in the North and South. North Korea then becomes an independent country, known in full as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), following the South's independence in May 1948.
1950-1953	The Korean War between the North (supported by the USSR and China) and the South (supported by the USA and backed by the UN): <ul style="list-style-type: none">– The DPRK's army invades South Korea on 25th June 1950. Other foreign powers get involved as the conflict escalates.– The conflict ends without a peace treaty on 27th July 1953, and with a 4km-wide Demilitarised Zone (DMZ) on the border between the two states.– The US military presence in the South is reinforced and the North's system is maintained.
March-June 1993	North Korea threatens to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty.
31 August 1998	North Korea launches a long-range Taepodong-1 ballistic missile over Japan, surprising the world.
29 January 2002	US President George W. Bush lists North Korea as one of the 'axis of evil' (together with Iran and Iraq) during his State of the Union address. The USA eventually takes North Korea off the list in 2008. However in the 2017 National Security Strategy, the USA refers to North Korea as a 'rogue state'.
10 January 2003	North Korea announces its withdrawal from the NPT.
October 2006	North Korea conducts first nuclear test, underground (it was detected as a small earthquake before the announcement came!)
17 December 2011	Kim Jong-Un becomes the third Supreme Leader of North Korea
20 January 2017	Donald Trump becomes President of the United States of America.
July 2017	North Korea's first successful intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) test, says that a North Korean missile could reach USA mainland.
August 2017	Trump tells reporters: 'North Korea best not make any more threats to the United States.... They will be met with fire and fury like the world has never seen.'
September 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– North Korea conducts a nuclear test of 250 kilotons (16 times the power of the Hiroshima bomb)– Trump tells United Nations: 'The United States has great strength and patience, but if it is forced to defend itself or its allies, we will have no choice but to totally destroy North Korea. Rocket Man is on a suicide mission for himself and for his regime'.– Kim declares Trump will 'pay dearly for his speech'.
12 June 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Having been invited for a meeting in March, Trump meets Kim at the 'Singapore Summit'.– Both sides commit to 'denuclearise' the Korean peninsula, but the agreement appears vague.– Trump stops 'provocative' military drills with South Korea.
27 and 28 February 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Trump and Kim eventually meet a second time for the 'Hanoi Summit' in Vietnam.– Talks fail after two days. The USA says that North Korea wanted all economic sanctions lifted, Trump reassures reporters that he trusts Kim.
30 June 2019	Trump meets Kim at the de-militarised zone (DMZ) and steps over the border into North Korea, making him the first sitting US President to set foot on North Korean soil.

The gendered impact of nuclear weapons

How are nuclear weapons gendered?

Nuclear weapons are indiscriminate in their character i.e. the effects of a nuclear explosion do not distinguish between military targets and a civilian population. This does not mean, however, that the effects of the use of nuclear weapons are the same for everyone. In this sense nuclear weapons can be 'gendered', from the language and ideas of nuclear weapons themselves, to the direct effects of a nuclear explosion on the population. Nuclear weapons affect women and men differently.

Gendered pattern of harm

Any use of nuclear weapons would have long-term (and direct catastrophic) effects on people and the environment. But women in particular face unique and sex-specific risks due to their biology and child-bearing capacities. For example, as was seen following the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the Chernobyl disaster in 1986, women affected by radiation were twice as likely to develop cancer, experience stillbirth or give birth to children with genetic disorders, so consequences were passed on for many generations afterwards.

From this, radiation-affected women have faced ostracism from their communities, especially when the impacts of radiation have not been fully understood. Women can/would also be differently affected by political instability following a nuclear explosion, such as a greater risk of sexual violence, or inequalities in access to resources such as food and water.

Even in peacetime, testing nuclear weapons has irradiated communities, often on lands inhabited by indigenous and minority populations. Between 1945 and 1980 over 60 locations across the globe were subject to nuclear tests, which harmed colonised populations in particular through the effects of radiation. An estimated 2.4 million people died as a result. Underwater and atmospheric nuclear test explosions were banned by the UN in 1963.

Peace activism

Historically, women have played a leading role in peace movements and anti-nuclear campaigns, such as Greenham Common Peace Camp* against placement of nuclear weapons in the UK (or a Committee of Soldiers' Mothers in the USSR in the 80s). One might think, then, that there is a natural link between women and peace, but this correlation is more to do with society and gender roles than biology. It is nonetheless an important correlation.

**This is the subject of Lesson 2 in Critical Mass.*

Women and war

Although men experience direct forms of violence in war, women and young girls face increased physical, social and economic insecurity during warfare that leads to sexual violence and rise in gender inequality (child marriages, FGM, endurance of patriarchal norms).

Outside of armed conflicts, issues concerning state security, including the control and management of weapons of mass destruction, are overwhelmingly decided on by men. Data collected by Article 36 between 2010 and 2014 showed that women comprise only 25% of participants at international arms control meetings, with almost half of state delegations comprised fully of men.**

** Source: <http://www.article36.org/updates/bwc-participation>

Language and values

The underrepresentation of women in nuclear policy decision-making does not only mean that a significant proportion of the population is not heard and their voices not taken into account. Feminists have argued that the language used to discuss nuclear weapons is deeply gendered. For example, 'masculine' characteristics such as dominance, power, and physical strength are valued over more 'feminine' ones such as soft power, diplomacy, or cooperation. When one's focus is skewed towards one view of power, alternatives can be overlooked.

The cost of maintaining a nuclear arsenal takes a significant amount of public resources. As women are more dependent on the welfare state than men, the way the government directs its revenue is a gender issue. For example, the 2016 UK Government's decision to replace Trident is estimated to cost £205 billion. Yet public spending available for single parents (90% of which are women), has decreased and pay for public sector employees (three-quarters of which are women), has been frozen, which widens the poverty gap between men and women.***

*** Source: LSE blogs (<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/gendered-impacts-of-austerity-cuts/>)

The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons

'One of the most unique aspects of the TPNW is that it is the only gender-sensitive nuclear weapons agreement in existence' – Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF)

'Together we have brought democracy to disarmament and are reshaping international law' – Beatrice Fihn, Director of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN)

On 7th July 2017, following months of negotiations with more than 135 nations as well as members of civil society, the United Nations voted to adopt the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) with an overwhelming majority of 122 states. The treaty, sometimes referred to as the nuclear ban treaty, is a legally-binding agreement that prohibits nations from using, manufacturing, and stockpiling nuclear weapons on their territory and makes any international assistance in those activities illegal. The treaty's adoption fills a gap in international law towards an all-inclusive ban of nuclear weapons, and it is the first document to recognise the humanitarian harm resulting from their use. The treaty becomes legally binding once signed and ratified by at least 50 UN member states, and is expected to enter into force in 2020.

Following decades of global campaigning and advocacy, and working closely with groups representing peace, disarmament, and women's and minorities' rights, the treaty acknowledges the disproportionate effect of nuclear weapons on women and girls, as well as on the indigenous populations across the globe. The nuclear ban treaty also addresses the importance of gender equality and says that women's full participation in denuclearisation is a vital step towards peace and security. It obliges nations to support the victims of nuclear weapons' use and testing, and including provisions for environmental recovery. The TPNW marks a significant step towards justice for indigenous inhabitants of colonised lands who were exposed to nuclear testing between 1945 and 1980.

Although the nine states that possess nuclear weapons boycotted the negotiation talks and did not participate in the UN vote – including the US and the UK – the treaty has been officially signed by over 70 governments, which means that it is due to become international law soon.

As of September 2019, the treaty has been ratified by 26 states. To check on the progress of the 'global nuclear ban', see: <http://www.icanw.org/status-of-the-treaty-on-the-prohibition-of-nuclear-weapons/>

Following the agreement, the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2017.

USA. 50 POWER SCORE. UN Security Council, 6,500 nuclear weapons, military alliance with many countries.

<p>ASK North Korea to end all nuclear weapons tests.</p> <p>US +5</p>	<p>ASK North Korea to get rid of all of its nuclear weapons</p> <p>US +10</p>	<p>ASK North Korea to stop threatening the USA with its nuclear weapons</p> <p>US +2</p>	<p>ASK North Korea to release US prisoners</p> <p>US +1</p>
<p>ASK North Korea to sign a peace deal (a pledge to become less aggressive towards South Korea and remove nuclear weapons in the future)</p> <p>US +2</p>			
<p>OFFER Allow North Korea to trade with the USA's allies. (lift economic sanctions)</p> <p>US -5</p>	<p>OFFER Suspend USA's own nuclear weapons production and testing.</p> <p>US -10</p>	<p>OFFER Invite North Korean leader on a state visit, including a banquet.</p> <p>US -2</p>	<p>OFFER Remove North Korea from USA's list of terrorist states.</p> <p>US -5 This happened in 2008 (though is now described as rogue state)</p>
<p>OFFER Completely get rid of USA's nuclear weapons.</p> <p>US -20</p>	<p>OFFER Dismantle a quarter of USA's nuclear weapons.</p> <p>US -10</p>		<p>THREATEN Impose even harsher economic sanctions.</p> <p>US +5</p>

NORTH KOREA: 20 POWER SCORE. Around 30 nuclear weapons, recent nuclear tests and threats.

<p>ASK For the US military to be removed from South Korea</p> <p>NK +5</p>	<p>ASK US to get rid of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •a quarter of its weapons (NK +5) or •half of its nuclear weapons (NK +10) or •all of them (NK +20) 	<p>ASK For 'sanction relief' (being able to trade with other countries, or receive aid from them.)</p> <p>NK +3</p>	<p>ASK For a 'peace treaty' to formally end the Korean War</p> <p>NK +3</p>
<p>ASK For the President to apologise for calling NK a 'band of criminals' at the United Nations</p> <p>NK +1</p>			
<p>OFFER To establish a US embassy in Pyongyang</p> <p>NK -1</p>	<p>OFFER Declare the location of all nuclear sites (previously kept secret)</p> <p>NK -5</p>	<p>OFFER To get rid of all North Korea's nuclear weapons.</p> <p>NK -15</p>	<p>OFFER To slow down nuclear weapons production</p> <p>NK -5</p>
<p>OFFER To improve relations with South Korea e.g. sending a joint Korean team to the 2018 Winter Olympics</p> <p>NK -2</p>	<p>OFFER Promise not to test a nuclear capable missile (again).</p> <p>NK -5</p>		<p>THREATEN To fire a nuclear missile at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Guam, a US military base (NK +1), or •South Korea (NK +3), or •USA mainland (NK +5)

Mediator's table

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	NORTH KOREA	Deal accepted? (Y/N)	If rejected, how could deal be improved?	Power Points running total
Asked/Offered:	Asked/Offered:			USA
e.g. Other to get rid of nuclear weapons	e.g. Move the army away from the border	e.g. N	e.g. US could start by asking for less	e.g. +/- 0 = 50
				North Korea
				e.g. +/- 0 = 20