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Welcome to the Workshop!
Peace Action Plans

The first UNESCO Youth Peace Ambassador Training Workshop was held in Hiroshima, Japan 9-13 October 2010, with the cooperation of Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation and UNITAR. The workshop was a success with participants from all over the world attending and developing action plans for peace activities:

Ms. Mutiara Pasaribu (Indonesia) “Women’s peace network between Japan and Indonesia”
Mr. Taro Mochizuki (Japan) “Peace Café”
Ms. Pattana Sirion (Thailand) “Peace Café events”
Mr. Vatnak Oudom Samith, Mr. Sea Sengheng, Ms. Sodalin Rongsong, Ms.Kankanika Chao, Ms. Kouy Bunrong (Cambodia) “Youth Peace Fair”
Concordian International School (Ms. Sawarin Phummarin, Ms. Prima OngvisesMs. Panisa Sundravorakul, Mr. Ronnakorn Rottrattanadumrong, Mr. Sinthu Kosasih; Thailand) “Leading towards peace culture”
Eastern Star Bilingual School (ESBS; Ms. Payolin Razmountry, Ms. Daovilay Louanxay, Ms. Soudavanh Chunhlamany, Laos) “Peace Bridge”
Mr. Tsuyoshi Sotoya (Japan), Mr. Hyun Su, Chung (R.Korea) “Korea-Japan Movement”
Mr. Sang Hun Song (R.Korea) “Make a Peaceful World”
Shakhnoza Kabilova (Tajikistan) “Rego Youth for Peace Culture”
Ms. Ayana Saito (Japan) “International Student exchange for Peace”
Ms. Bolor-Erdene Ulaankhuukhen, Ms. Munkhtsetseg Dashdamba, Ms. Suvd-Erdene Otgonbayar (Mongolia) “Peace Club”
Mr. Phouvong Boutsady (Laos) “Towards solving alcoholism in Laos”
Mr. Bunsroeun Srun (Cambodia) “Conflict-free Angkor Wat temple’s surrounding area”
Mr. Henry Jiang (Japan) “2020 Vision Campaign Charity Concert”
Ms. Mara Duer (Argentina) “Unifying Peace Group”
Mr. Glenn Raynor (Canada) “Support for Stewards of Biodiversity on Gatakoe Island, Solomon Islands”

The second UNESCO Youth Peace Ambassador Training Workshop in Phnom Penh will include new persons as well as some of the existing youth peace ambassadors who will share their experiences in implementing their action plans since 2010. The national history in Cambodia, as well as in surrounding countries, who have experienced severe conflicts and atrocities is a background for the choice of country to host this event, as well as to support the initiatives of the Cambodian people in the quest for peace.

On 1st – 3rd April there will also be a Youth Peace Fair organized by the Cambodian UNESCO Youth Peace Ambassadors from the Hiroshima workshop, who have been actively working for peace. International trainees will present their own action plans on 1st April (and more Cambodian youth will also be there that day). International trainees are welcome to join in the Cambodian Peace Fair on the 2nd – 3rd April also.

1 http://www.unescobkk.org/rushsap/youth/youth-peace-ambassadors/
http://www.eubios.info/youth_peace_ambassadors
Participants

Young people from around the world who are motivated to work for Peace in their own institutions and communities. Two main groups of young people are invited – university students, and high school students. We will also consider youth applicants from other backgrounds also.

Participants will review cross cultural aspects of peace education, human security, post-conflict reconstruction; ethics of science and technology; and development of action plans. After the workshop the participants will have completed their own action plans for their follow-up activity (as individuals or groups), and will receive certificates from the organisers. The participants are expected to engage in activities in their own institutions and communities after the workshop to promote peace education through action, research and policy changes.

Expected Outcomes

- Add new members to the youth peace ambassador network of young people as a forum for the exchange of ideas and good practices for effecting social change for peace.
- Consultations in the design of peace curriculum.
- Expand the integration of security and peace activities into policy making, with special relevance to young persons.
- Each participant to develop their own activity plan for follow-up (as an individual or in a small group), and to make SMART goals for their activities in their community.

Secretariat:

For ongoing information and expressions of interest please email to

Ms. Anniken Grinvoll
Eubios Ethics Institute
Email at anniken@eubios.info

Or Telephone to Dr. Darryl Macer, UNESCO Bangkok +66-2-391-0577 x 141.

Stay in touch through the Facebook network of former Peace Ambassadors.
Monday 28 March 2011

Opening Session
Welcome words from UNESCO Phnom Penh
Ms. Anne Lemaistre, Director

Welcome words from Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace
Dr. Vannarith Chheang, Executive Director

Welcome words from the National Commission of the Kingdom of Cambodia to UNESCO
Mme Tan Theany, Secretary General

Introduction to the UNESCO Youth Peace Ambassadors’ Workshop
Prof. Darryl Macer, Regional Advisor, UNESCO
Email: d.macer@unesco.org

On 12 August 2010 the United Nations declared the International Year of Youth: Dialogue and Mutual Understanding, “Considering that it is necessary to disseminate among young people the ideals of peace, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, solidarity and dedication to the objectives of progress and development.”

How should communities go forward and build upon the progress made during the decade? How can we educate citizens in different institutions to promote a culture of peace and peace building? The youth peace ambassadors trained in this workshop will leave with draft action plans for follow-up, to work with others in a range of communities to transform policies and practices to those which best develop the culture of peace.

During the last decade, human security has become a central concern to many countries, with institutions and social actors searching for innovative ways and means of tackling the many non-military threats to peace and security. Today, in an increasingly globalized world, the evolution of threats involve ethnic confrontations, terrorism, forced displacement, extreme poverty, economic disparity, discrimination, environmental degradation, national disasters, and deadly infectious diseases which threaten the lives and security of millions. The world’s future depends upon a growing need for human security and a better understanding of all the risks and threats that affect populations and individuals. We will not enjoy security without peace, peace without security.

As part of a people-centered approach to development, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is committed to the various dimensions of human security “particularly addressing the needs of the most vulnerable populations at global, regional, national and local levels.” While there is no agreement among scientists and policy makers on a joint definition of human security, four conceptual pillars of human security have evolved in the scientific and political debate: a) ‘freedom from fear’, b) ‘freedom from want’, c) ‘freedom to live in dignity’ and d) ‘freedom from hazard impacts’.

The workshop will reflect on statements to consider a guiding declaration for youth activities in the peace program, as well as assisting persons to develop their action plans for individual follow-up.

In RUSHSAP we have also been working on efforts to develop peace in different groups, including among philosophers. Let us reflect on “A Proposal to Make a Declaration on Enduring Peace and Justice.”
Background
In order to strengthen local, regional and global awareness of the rich philosophical traditions of many regions of the world, UNESCO launched its programmes on inter-regional philosophical dialogues in 2004. Through a series of meetings and dialogues there was consensus that war and peace is a critical issue for dialogue.

In the most recent meeting of this dialogue series, the Joint UNESCO-UNITAR Asia- Arab Interregional Philosophical Dialogues on the Roles of Philosophy in War and Peace, held in Hiroshima, Japan on 25-27 July, 2008, the participants discussed themes pertaining to the philosophical analysis of War and Peace. These included the roles of philosophical dialogue in the practice of non-violence, analysis of the Culture of Peace, analysis of how to recognise and reconcile conflict, and peace education There was analysis of past and present wars, examination of so-called just, pre-emptive, and preventative war, the use of depleted uranium*, and how we can link traditions of philosophical reflection to policy making and implementation of policy.

The meeting recognised that 2008 is the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and that violence is counter to the protection of human rights, and to the survival of the biosphere, environment and all species on the planet. The participants made the following proposal, in mutual abhorrence against all forms of violence, noting that the distinctions between war and terrorism are difficult to define.

Recommendation to the International Philosophical Community
As a group of philosophers from many cultures, we urge all thinkers to recommit themselves to the goal of mutual understanding between people of different worldviews and traditions.

We realize the fragility of our contemporary global institutions to sustain the necessary social and environmental conditions that will protect and enhance the well-being and dignity of our peoples.

We also find that every religious and philosophical tradition in the world strives to promote a philosophy of life, peace and non-violence. We urge philosophers around the world to analyse, teach and research how ideas can be used to overcome the prevailing culture of violence and strengthen the culture of peace.

Given the growing gaps between the rich and poor in the world, and the uneven distribution of risks and benefits, we urge greater attention be paid to examining social and environmental justice, and nurturing traditions that promote a culture of peace. We also urge philosophers to find ways to promote the philosophy of love and justice as a necessary response to violence and hatred.

Recommendations to States
The freedom of thought and expression are enshrined as human rights, yet philosophers in many states continue to face repression and threats to their lives. The targets of this violence have included those who promote peace. We urge all states to enable thinkers to work in intellectual freedom, while they take responsibility for the growing ways in which ideas are shared with information technology.

We urge states to include human rights in the constitutional processes of their laws, promoting social responsibility and justice.

We urge states to support the teaching of philosophy at all levels to assist in the development of critical thinking among their citizens.

Mindful of the tragic loss of lives and resources that the history of war has caused as a consequence of the aggression of those who have dominated the economic, technological and political imbalances within our social and environmental systems;
We propose to the UNESCO, as a specialised organization that aims "to build the defences of peace in the minds of men" to rejuvenate its efforts for the construction of an enduring peace through the promotion of social and environmental justice and a culture of peace in our world today. We propose that UNESCO consider developing a “Declaration for the Construction of an Enduring Peace Through the Promotion of Social and Environmental Justice”. (Agreed in Hiroshima, Japan, 27 July, 2008).

The UNESCO Youth Peace Ambassadors (2010 group) will share some of their experiences in implementing their action plans since 2010. Throughout this workshop we would like youth peace ambassadors to share their experiences as individuals, as well as experiences from their institutions, and communities with each other.

Session 2: Peace and Human security

**Human Security, the Peace Index and Culture of Peace**

- Dr. Darryl Macer, Regional Adviser, UNESCO

**Human Security**

In 1997 the General Assembly declared that the year 2000 would be the ‘International Year for the Culture of Peace.’ The year 2000 was a focal point in the foundation of the UNs many initiatives aimed at attaining peace and human security with the start of the ‘International Decade for a culture of peace and non-violence for the children of the world.’ These initiatives by the UN aimed to raise awareness of the issues relating to peace and human security on a global level. The year 2000 also saw the adoption of the ‘Millennium Development Goals.’ These goals represent realistic targets the UN hopes to achieve in various areas relating to the development of developing countries. Currently in the Asia-Pacific region the results in the progress of these goals have been mixed. There have been successful campaigns: such as decreasing the number of people living on less than $1 a day, reducing child mortality rates and increasing the percentage of the population that have access to safe drinking water.

During the last decade, human security has become a central concern to many countries, with institutions and social actors searching for innovative ways and means of tackling the many non-military threats to peace and security.

Today, in an increasingly globalized world, the evolution of threats involve ethnic confrontations, terrorism, forced displacement, extreme poverty, economic disparity, environmental degradation, national disasters, and deadly infectious diseases which threaten the lives and security of millions. The world’s future depends upon a growing need for human security and a better understanding of all the risks and threats that affect populations and individuals. We will not enjoy security without peace, peace without security.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) focuses its activities in the fields of education, natural sciences, social and human sciences, culture, communication and information. As part of a people-centered approach to development, UNESCO is committed to the various dimensions of human security “particularly addressing the needs of the most vulnerable populations at global, regional, national and local levels.”
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While there is no agreement among scientists and policy makers on a joint definition of human security, four conceptual pillars of human security have evolved in the scientific and political debate: a) ‘freedom from fear’, b) ‘freedom from want’, c) ‘freedom to live in dignity’ and d) ‘freedom from hazard impacts’.

Within International law there are mechanisms to enforce human security but these are often obstructed by conflicting political objectives. A main tool in International law is the United Nations Charter. This charter is binding to all member states and overrides any other treaties, but it contains contradictions. A major barrier that the International community faces regarding human security is state sovereignty. Article 2.4 of the UN Charter states: “All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.” 4 This enshrined right for state sovereignty means that it is very difficult for the International community to intervene in the name of human security within another states borders. In order for the UN to act in the name of human security the decision must be made by the Security Council, with the permanent five members having the final say on the action to take place. Article 41 of the Charter outlines the Security Council’s responsibility to influence states through non-violent measures to act in a way conducive to peace. Article 42 of the Charter empowers the Security Council to use force to restore International peace and security if non-violent measures prove inadequate. By looking at these sections of the charter we can see that the Security Council has the legitimate power to carry out acts of intervention, but this is often obstructed by conflicting politics. The permanent five members of the Security Council each have the power to veto any proposal that they don’t wish to have enacted. This use of veto power can be detrimental to the goal of International peace and be motivated purely by state politics. In this new age with the definition of security changing, the power of the Security Council needs to be reviewed so that it can be capable of being an effective International body in the 21st century.

There are ways for the UN to take action if the Security Council finds itself unable to act due to a division of the permanent members, but these powers are rarely used. The UN General Assembly resolution 377A gives the General Assembly the responsibility to uphold international peace and security if the Security Council is unable to do so.5 Resolution 337A allows the General Assembly to deploy armed forces to achieve this. This resolution can be enacted by any seven members of the Security Council or a majority of the UN members. This could be a useful tool to uphold peace and human security because unlike the Security Council this action cannot be stopped by a single veto vote.

There are also other International legal avenues to uphold human security. The Geneva Conventions, Genocide convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are all legally enforceable and can be used to uphold human security. The International Criminal Court has the potential to be a valuable arena for human security issues but until it has the full support of the International community it will not be able to live up to its potential. Currently the International Criminal Court lack the support of influential states such as the US, China and Russia. If the ICC is to be a truly powerful body in the future it must gain the support and recognition of these influential states.

In the Social and Human Sciences sector of UNESCO, the culture of peace and human security initiatives aspire for freedom from need, fear and want. Social development and human
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rights, and the fight against discrimination dialogue and forum provide awareness on freedom to live in dignity. The ethics of sciences and technology, bioethics, and environmental ethics aspire for freedom from the negative impacts of technology, while harnessing the positive sides to address human need. These programme activities are implemented through research, advanced teaching, and policy makers-researchers-practices linkages.

The United Nations was founded in 1945 with the goal of bringing about a “world at peace,” thus peace is a vital term throughout the UN. Through the UN’s Culture of Peace program they strive to achieve a “set of values, attitudes, modes of behavior and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations.” The UN will not settle to define peace as simply ‘the absence of war’. A state of peace cannot be attained through the absence of violence alone. Peace must also include economic, social and environmental satisfaction. UNESCO promotes peace through a variety of programs in the fields of education, economic and social development, human rights, gender equality and the spread of knowledge through new media technologies.

Tolerance is another term that is relevant when talking about peace and human security. In order for peace and human security to exist in this turbulent world, cultures must learn to live with diversity and work together as a people. In the UN Millennium Declaration definition of tolerance it is stated “Differences within and between societies should be neither feared nor repressed, but cherished as a precious asset to humanity.” If universal peace and human security is to be attained these cultural differences must be acknowledged and embraced and used to the advantage of peace-building, not as a constraint. This issue relates directly to the issue of discrimination.

When counter-productive measures are taken against tolerance and diversity, discrimination happens. The UNHCHR Discrimination Convention (1960) defines discrimination as “Any distinction, exclusion or preference made on the basis of race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation.”

UNESCO’s ‘Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights’ outlines the UN’s stance on ethics and can be applied to the whole spectrum of the UN’s activities. In all instances the individual’s dignity and human rights must be fully respected and their welfare should take priority over the interest of science or society. The declaration also states that individuals and groups of “special vulnerability” be protected and have their integrity respected. As long as these conditions are met the individual must be provided with the adequate relevant information and be given the option for withdrawal at any point without any “disadvantage or prejudice.”

Ethics must be considered when undertaking any activity concerning peace and human security. In many instances practices to promote human security may have secondary effects that are
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damaging to a third party. To mount a successful campaign for peace and human security these ethical implications must be considered at all times.

**Global Peace Index**

The Global Peace Index (GPI), the first ever study to rank the nations of the world by their peacefulness and to identify potential drivers of peace. Now in its fourth year, the Index ranks 149 nations according to their ‘absence of violence’. The GPI is composed of qualitative and quantitative indicators from highly respected sources, which combine factors internal to a country and external to it.\(^\text{11}\) The attached file is the 2010 report, and lists all the countries, from New Zealand (ranked most peaceful; Japan, 3\(^{rd}\), Cambodia, 111\(^{th}\), Thailand, 124\(^{th}\), the Philippines, 130\(^{th}\)).

The major challenges facing humanity today are global – climate change, lack of fresh water, ever-decreasing bio-diversity and overpopulation. These challenges are now well documented and supported by thousands of scientists, academics and leading institutions. It is impossible to accurately portray the devastating effects that these problems will have on all nations, unless unified global action is taken.\(^\text{12}\) Peace is the essential prerequisite because without peace we will be unable to achieve the levels of cooperation, inclusiveness and social equity necessary to solve these problems, let alone empower the international institutions needed to regulate the challenges.

The notion of peace and its value are poorly understood. There are competing definitions of peace, and most research into peace is, in fact, the study of violent conflict. The presentation will discuss the 2010 Global Peace Index.

**Love and a good life**

What future do we want? The pursuit of a good life is a goal that all persons can hope for. A good life has many meanings, some of which will be developed in this paper. A good life should be understood in a holistic sense, and is clearly more than just a contented life, free of want and fear. At the international level this is what the United Nations was established to help provide. This is also the duty of all governments to provide to their citizens, and those with the abilities to provide to those in need.

A good life also implies that our moral choices will also be “good”, and that depends on every one of us responding to the circumstances into which we fall.

From the past years of research across many countries I will argue that “love” is a fruitful language for debate in ethics, despite its ambiguity. We can consider the four imperatives of love for ethics, as self-love, love of others, loving life and loving good (Macer, 1998). I have argued that love is not only a universally recognised goal of ethical action, but is also the foundation of normative principles of ethics. These fundamental principles of ethics may not have changed over time, but the emphasis placed on them has shifted. There was more importance placed on loving good – beneficence - a century ago but now there has been more precedence given to self-love. The self-love includes both pursuit of each individual to find their own given talents and skills, and place in the universe, and also self-rule, autonomy.

The importance of loving others, justice, and loving life - non-maleficence – are also central to our debates in bioethics. How can we ensure we all have a Secure Life. The universality of love cannot to be questioned, as we can see this in all major religions of the world as we try to consider global ethics, and also among philosophers. Confucius said that “to love a thing means
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\(^{12}\) (http://www.economicsandpeace.org/)
wanting it to live”. J.S. Mill also considered utilitarianism as the perfect expression of love (agape).

Ethics is a concept balancing benefits and risks of choices and decisions. The underlying heritage of ethics can be seen in all cultures, religions, and in ancient writings from around the world. We in fact cannot trace the origin of bioethics back to their beginning, as the relationships between human beings within their society, with nature and God, are formed at an earlier stage then our history would tell us.

Ethics is learning how to balance different benefits, risks and duties. In recent decades renewed impetus has been given to ethics through its application to consider the challenges of new technologies in life sciences and medicine. Bioethics includes ethical issues related to all branches of knowledge, including the environment, life sciences, and medicine and associated technologies. Concepts of bioethics can be seen in literature, art, music, culture, philosophy, and religion, throughout history.

There are at least three ways to view ethics:

1. Descriptive ethics is the way people view life, their moral interactions and responsibilities with others in their life.

2. Prescriptive ethics is to tell others what is ethically good or bad, or what principles are most important in making such decisions. It may also be to say something or someone has rights, and others have duties to them. It is related to policy making and law.

3. Interactive ethics is discussion and debate between people, groups within society, and communities, about descriptive and prescriptive ethics.

There was a long heritage of examining these issues found in all cultures, with a range of anthropocentric, biocentric, and ecocentric views. Asian and Pacific cultures are more bio-centric than many modern Western cultures. Bio-centric means to consider an ethical dilemma from the perspective of a living organism, for example, a dog, a tree, or a human being as a living organism. Eco-centric means to view an ethical issue from the perspective of an ecosystem, for example, a rainforest, wetland or a park in the city. One of the keys to Asian ways of thinking of the world is embedded in relationships between members of the living world.

A love of nature suggests not just a hierarchical domination of humankind over non-humans, but love between partners. The principle of stewardship is not limited to one region of the world or one religion. Stewardship can be balanced with support for the creativity of humanity to find new technology. Although some have said that industrialization was a force that led to the destruction of nature in Asia, historical studies suggest that despite the animism and Buddhist views of the oneness of nature, forests were converted into farmland over the past hundreds of years. In South Asia, however, we do find sacred groves where nature was preserved over human needs, and the trees and plants in these groves were not cut down and destroyed despite human need. Research into these areas of the philosophy of nature would be very opportune given our common environmental crisis. We can see our identity has become anthropocentric rather than ecocentric.

If we simply apply ethical principles to the question of technology we would see that we need to balance the different imperatives, as below:

The ethical principle of loving good, beneficence, supports the development of science and technology that might cure sick persons or feed hungry people. It is found in all religions and demands us to work for a culture of peace together with all others, helpfully and generously.

Respect for the ethical principle of self-love, autonomy, supports empowerment of people so they can make choices, live their lives, access technology according to their values. We respect families and communities.
The ethical principle of loving life, do no harm, warns us to avoid conflict. We must assess all options, current and new, to provide the best alternative for the local situation now. New options may do less harm to environment or to people’s health, and thus need to be considered if they will promote the future peace and solidarity of the world.

The ethical principle of loving others, justice, makes us consider the risks for future generations, and for all to share in the fruits of our endeavour and good fortune. There is an existing basis for developing ethics in all regions of the world to overcome conflict, and UNESCO will work with those in every culture to help achieve these goals.

The broad concepts of bioethics as taken by the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights in article 14 on social responsibility includes recognition of the right to food, water and minimum standards of living. These are some indication of a “good life”.

Member states of the United Nations have agreed to laudable goals. We need to work together to reach these goals, with intellectual creativity and mutual support. Within the structure of UNESCO, the Social and Human Sciences Sector (SHS) “has a mission to advance knowledge, standards and intellectual cooperation in order to facilitate social transformations conducive to the universal values of justice, freedom and human dignity.” This was an agreed goal by member countries. We need to provide more practical reality to expressions of love of others, if we will be judged to have lived a good life. The ultimate judge of our living a good life is not ourselves, but others, and those in the future for our generation.
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Regional security issues in Asia Pacific region: Calling for new leadership?
- Dr. Vannarith Chheang, Executive Director, CICP

Calling into question the concept of Peace
- Barbara Lonchambon, University Paris East Creteil, France
  (Currently Intern, RUSHSAP, UNESCO Bangkok)

Peace has been the object of many reflections for centuries. Many men facing war have always tried to think of a way to ensure a peaceful and stable situation for their society. Women have almost always been considered as mere victims or have been ignored by traditional thinking (Hunt and Posa, 2001).

Violence does not end with the beginning of peace for women as they face other threats in their private life. Gender-based violence (GBV) is the violence exercised against women, as women. The foundation of GBV is inscribed in socially built gendered relationships (Marques-Pereira and Stoffel, 2004), and is laid in social patterns since childhood among boys and girls.

As CFD, the Feminist Peace Organisation, explains in its mission statement, the absence of peace for women means facing, “personal, structural and cultural violence as well as gender-based discrimination”.

As a response to GBV, feminist movements have gradually emerged. Feminism is a demand for equality of the sexes and the representation of women in politics (Dorlin, 2008). Such activism has helped to consider gender issues in many fields, and to introduce a gender lens through which reanalysis of concepts can be made. War and peace are one of these social concepts that are being revisited.
It is noteworthy that feminism is a complex notion: in other terms, several “feminisms” exist. As Florence Montreynaud (2010) points out, being a feminist is, first of all, being able to think by oneself. For this reason, she states that there can be as many “feminisms” as women. Feminism can vary from one country to another, with many different trends within. As a French author, Montreynaud can only express her ideas on behalf of French feminism (as well as with a French perspective).

Gender issues and feminist points of view have enabled a revival of thinking about war and peace, seeking to consider women as potential actors.

But most of the reflections about gender and peace simply seek to modify particular current understandings of peace with a gender perspective. It could be more effective to redefine the whole concept of peace, rather than being solely based on gender perspectives, it needs to intrinsically include gender-based violence and discrimination.

The Concept of Peace

The Oxford English Dictionary defines peace as “freedom from civil unrest or disorder; public order and security” and the Larousse Dictionary describes “paix” as “state of nations which are not at war. State of a group, of people that are not quarrelling, in conflict”.

These definitions refer to a type of negative image of peace, that is, the absence of war. But it is now well-known that sustainable peace must be deep-rooted in society and not only signifies mere non-existence of conflict. For instance, the United Nations gives a definition of peace in their Declaration on a Culture of Peace (A/53/243): “Peace not only is the absence of conflict, but also requires a positive, dynamic participatory process where dialogue is encouraged and conflicts are solved in a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation”.

The concept of peace, in its general acceptance, is a long-term process involving many stakeholders and every layer of the society. A sustainable peace has consequently to modify the mind and the thinking of the persons who are involved. Dalai Lama Tenzin Gytso (1995) explains that “True peace with oneself and with the world around us can only be achieved through the development of mental peace”.

From this understanding, the concept of peace implies a number of considerations. In order not to hinder any peace process, the notion of peace should not be reduced to a simple idea of the absence of war. It is important to consider peace as an intricate idea which requires many things, and particular conditions and circumstances. It is only by taking this path that we can hope to build a concrete peace for all. The complexity of peace can be seen in by the following quotation:

“Peace requires harmony within a person, harmony between human beings, harmony between human beings and nature, and the harmony between human beings and the ultimate source of life. Peace does not happen spontaneously, we will have to build and maintain it.” (Chanroeu Pa, 2010)

Human being’s state of mind forms the basis of a concrete peace. This peace can be distinguished from other meanings of peace. Kanti Bajpai (2004) reminds us of three different types of peace. The first one is the hegemonic or deterrent peace, previously mentioned in this paper as “the absence of war”. The second one is a transactional peace and has to be understood as an economic interaction. The third one is “a social condition in which accommodation rather than force mediates change” (Kanti Bajpai, 2004). The latter refers to the integrative or perpetual peace discussed by Kant.
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Peace as a Masculine Concept

Generally peace as a masculine concept is something enforced by power. Power is considered as a means for pacification. Hobbes asserts that power organizes society in accordance with order. According to Foucault (1997), this discourse occurs via laws. This so-called “peace” is based on a social conformity or order due to the application of power. Although on the surface it appears harmonious and neutral, it is not. The weak and vulnerable, or those who have alternative ideas, cannot express dissent or propose a new vision for the construction of a truly peaceful society.

Indeed, we can raise serious questions about the consequences of such a so-called “peace” that is merely enforced by power emanating from a patriarchal organisation, or implicit violence or even at gunpoint.

The Security Council of the United Nations forms an example of a patriarchal organisation trying to enforce peace. Its composition is surprising as the United-States, France, the United Kingdom and Russia are part of the five most important arms-exporting countries. China is no exception: it keeps increasing its military spending as well as importing arms at one of the most significant rate in the world (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2006). These five countries have veto power over all Security Council decisions.

The Security Council of the United Nations is meant to maintain “international peace and security” (United Nations, 1945). Its function appears contradictory to its composition. We can legitimately wonder how this mission can be completed when its members are also major actors of the military-industrial system. The article 26 of the United Nations Charter (1945) states that the members of the Security Council should establish a “system for the regulation of armaments”. It is obvious that this statement is conflicting reality.

Likewise, the non permanent members of the Security Council include all of the most powerful countries in the world, in rotation. This has consequences on the decisions taken. The choice whether to intervene may be subject to political interests specific to certain members. Other countries may have decisions imposed upon them without really being consulted. This so-called “peace” might be therefore enforced on countries with no choice by members having internal political interests.

Apart from external considerations, Kant tried to seek for the internal conditions for peace. In his 1795 essay, Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch, Immanuel Kant describes an internal condition to ensure peace within a state. This condition is a Republican constitution establishing freedom for men and equality for citizens under a unique and common legislation (Marques-Pereira and Stoffel, 2004). Citizenship must be understood as a component of peace and any obstacle against the exercise of citizenship goes against peace. Therefore, if we consider that gender-based violence hinders women full exercise of citizenship, it also impedes the peace process.

In his article, Perpetual War: Is Peace Possible?, Ayoub Abu Dayyeh (2010) considers Rousseau’s book, Emile, as a theoretical basis to establish perpetual peace. But he does not specify the fact that Emile will get married to Sophie, which is a substantial idea. According to Rousseau, Sophie must not be educated because this could have harmful consequences. Sophie is only good at embroidery and should be limited to this activity. Nevertheless, this work is highlighted as a quest to find a way out of peace.

The author concludes his paper with this sentence: “Hitherto, we have not given peace a chance to express itself, so, we ask: Is peace possible? I leave the answer to this question for other researchers to pursue in the future analysis of history, since to date the answer appears negative”. One answer might be that Dayyeh’s concept of peace cannot be applied to reality because of its inaccuracy. Sophie is enslaved to the “opinion”, the same opinion that Emile’s
education fights against. According to Rousseau, Sophie is complementary to Emile and their education must be the antithesis (Wallon, 1968). Setting up a paper about peace on a text that explicitly excludes women from any education may not be the best way to promote peace. Highlighting the fact that Rousseau voluntarily excluded women from this education would have been necessary to apply a broader vision of peace.

According to the aforementioned definitions, people who suffer a lack of security, or are in conflict, cannot be at peace. Therefore, regions and communities where women suffer masculine oppression should not be characterized as peaceful. The concept of peace depends on the role of the person in the society. We could then conclude that before achieving peace, we would have to call into question its universality:

“Women suffer the burden of discrimination and violence in “peace” and in “war” and, for feminists, this situation alerts us to the poignant realization that the distinction between the two circumstances is, for girls and women, arbitrary. Perhaps, in some instances, there is a difference of degree, but not of kind, in the intensity of the violence. If what happens to us women worldwide is that we live in the midst of an undeclared war, it follows that, in talking about gender and peace building, we must also envision a different world for all of us. We all live in a world engendered by wars. Peace will be a different peace for each gender.” (D. Rodriguez and E. Natukunda-Togoba, 2005)

As Marie-Victoire Louis (1996) writes in her book, the universality of peace denies the specificity of masculine violence towards women and turned masculine values into hegemonic values. Thus, a unique peace does not exist. It is now recognized that feminism is not universal and should take into account every experience of different women. In the same way, peace should encompass the needs of everyone. As it is the case for feminism, peace must be thought of in the plural. The concept of peace should concern everybody but should be declined in a myriad of practical applications.

This idea echoes the principle that nothing can be really imposed from the outside of societies. Even though they borrow certain aspects (food, music), such changes never modify the core of these societies. Far from changing a society, those exchange concerns only playful aspects. A society will not change itself but will change the meaning of the elements it borrows (Sophia Mappa, 2005). That is why the concept of peace must be linked to the different realities existing in the world. One unified concept of peace will never achieve its goal.

To summarize, we can consider that “[....] male norms and male behaviour have been taken to represent the human norm” (Skelsbaek and Smith 2001).

That is why tensions arise when peace and masculine oppression are not considered antinomian. According to the reading I have done, the concept of peace was originally conceived by men, seemingly for men, in social organisations where women have no place. Byrne (1996) emphasizes this issue as the author wonders “how relevant notions of peace and security are if women remain socially, economically and politically marginalised in times of peace and still vulnerable to violence”. The concept of peace, which is used everyday, might indeed be understood as a masculine concept.

To reach this goal, “feminist peace policies are based on a comprehensive understanding of peace. They aim at creating a world in which women and men have equal opportunities to realise a good life” (CFD, the Feminist Peace Organisation).

The United Nations have theoretically answered to this question in a General Assembly Declaration (1993) “violence against women is an obstacle to the achievement of equality, development and peace”.

The link between gender-based violence and armed conflicts has not been given great attention. Nevertheless, the feminist gender perspective demonstrates that values and
behaviours behind private violence are the same as those that can lead to an armed conflict (AWID, 2008). Mary Caprioli demonstrated the link between gender inequality and interstate violence: “Just as domestic norms of peaceful conflict resolution and of gender inequality predict state behaviour internationally, so to should gender inequality help predict intrastate violence” (Caprioli, 2003).

Men use the same tools to guarantee privileges to their own sex in order to preserve its power. Gender-based violence is a mirror of military violence and should be, as such, given a primary status in peace thinking and building process. “No peace that sacrifices women’s rights is a peace we can afford to support” (Clinton, 2010) is then the ideal to strive for.

**An Alternative Peace**

Because women do not have to use coercive ways to empower themselves (e.g.: armed conflicts), their fight might not be seen as a real one in the masculine perspective. Feminist struggles are usually non violent ones. Women can be violent, but only when it comes to their individual need or desire (e.g. competition at work). Struggles that take place on behalf of feminism are most of the time non-violent. The “undeclared war” faced by women does not lead to a violent behaviour, releasing them from the masculine oppression.

On the other hand, feminism is not a synonym of pacifism. Many women claim the right to fight along with men as a consequence of gender equality. In many liberation wars, women link their own freedom to the freedom of their nation: in other terms, being equal to a man would mean being able to fight on his side. For instance, in Timor Leste, women’s empowerment became possible through resistance. On behalf of feminism, like many other women over the world, they fought alongside men, assuming in the meantime their traditional role, such as household tasks. Feminism should be considered as a non-violent struggle but cannot always be generalised as pacifist.

Albeit Florence Montreynaud (Gamblin and Vaillant, 2010) states that feminism falls within nonviolence, she concedes that her opinion does not reflect all the trends of feminism. She refers to Benoîte Groult who has said that feminism has never killed anybody whereas machism kills everyday. While the “macho world” uses extreme violence, the feminist revolution is non-violent and refers to justice, duty of equality and respect between human beings.

However, women still have to keep fighting for their rights to get the possibility to improve their condition. That is the reason why tensions may arise between peace and culture of peace. Culture of peace does include gender issues but intends to reach a peace that was not thought for women.

Social and psychological mechanisms of violence must be analyzed to understand the production process of violence in a “peaceful situation” (Marques-Pereira and S. Stoffel, 2004). Once those mechanisms understood, studies should be conducted to know how peace can be anchored in collective and individual consciousness, hindering violence that occurs at peace. Gender-based approaches must be added in analysis of conflict in order to offer “insight in power, control and competition” (Dijkema, 2001). The same author states that “gender considerations are critical to synthesise the analysis of the private and the public sphere by focusing on individuals and communities caught up in conflict”.

Intervening during the peace-building process to create a peace that suits everyone’s need is a very important issue for women. Peace-building is an instrument enabling women to put up peace according to their needs.

---

14 This statement may of course only apply to western feminism as written above and needs further research.
Barnes (2006) explains that all policies and academic research conducted in the United Nations in order to offer a new vision of peace-building do not take into account women’s needs. Therefore, gender equality in development and peace-building processes are not ensured. This issue is exemplified in the Brahimi Report (2000) where, as Barnes (2006) highlights, the word ‘gender’ features only eight times in the 74 pages. Women are still assimilated to the more vulnerable group in society. “It is indicative of the gender-blindness of the early days of the peacebuilding industry.” (Barnes, 2006)

Consequences of such theoretical analyses are numerous and can be witnessed and experienced everyday. The scandal regarding the sexual misconduct of peacekeeping forces or the masculine domination of peace negotiation, are just two examples among others.

In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) for instance, in order not to sacrifice peace, impunity for every crime is accepted, including numerous sexual crimes against women. Cyril Musila wrote in March 2010, that in DRC “sexual violence against women reached unimaginable proportions”. However, a step towards peace for women was made. A colonel of the Congolese Armed Forces was sentenced to twenty years in prison three weeks ago because of the rapes he committed along with his men on 62 women.

This may hopefully increase accountability for crimes against women and might form a positive and practical improvement. This evolution might also be seen through the culture of peace.

Let us consider the philosophy underlying the term culture of peace. In 1989, at the end of the Cold War, the United Nations attempted to use the culture of peace as a basis for its vision of peace. This was to replace the culture of fear or mutually assured destruction (MAD) that had kept a balance of power between the United States and Western allies, and the Soviet Union since the 1940s.

In the International Congress in Peace in the minds of men held in Côte d’Ivoire, the Congress recommended that UNESCO “help construct a new vision of peace by developing a peace culture based on the universal values of respect for life, liberty, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights and equality between men and women”. These values are more consistent with a feminist world view than the values that had predominated global politics until then. Interestingly however, the conference title was still using the term “in the minds of men”, which comes from the UNESCO charter of 1945. Only in 2010 did the UNESCO statements make this statement gender neutral and use the term “in the minds of people”.

The action areas include of the culture of peace are:

1. Fostering a culture of peace through education
2. Promoting sustainable economic and social development
3. Promoting respect for all human rights
4. Ensuring equality between women and men
5. Fostering democratic participation
6. Advancing understanding, tolerance and solidarity
7. Supporting participatory communication and the free flow of information
8. Promoting international peace and security

If we analyse the action areas of the culture of peace, we can also see a vision which is much more compatible with a gender neutral, or even, feminist vision for peace. Indeed, they can lead to an evolution towards a comprehensive understanding of peace.

On the same path, the Fourth World Conference on Women (1995) addressed themes such as gender, peace and conflict and lead to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Proposals following this declaration were also compiled in a document called Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and Peace for the Twenty-First Century.
In conclusion, it may have taken a long time but there are some hopeful signs that the view of women as only a vulnerable group that will be abused by men, and a masculine vision of power, is in the past. However, obviously with the abuses of women, including the prevailing power based models of politics and construction of social order, we have a lot of work to do. We need to transform policy making with this feminine vision of culture of peace.
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Philosophy on Civil Society Movement in Post-war Japan
Prof. Taro Mochizuki, Osaka University, Japan

Objectives
Introduce the historical background and context of the development of Civil Society Movements (CSMs) in Japan during the post-war period, and to contemplate the meaning of CSM in an era of globalization.

History: 1945-1960
Aug 6, 1945: Atomic bombing on Hiroshima city
Aug 9, 1945: Atomic bombing on Nagasaki city—resulted in the immediate death of 90,000-120,000 citizens in Hiroshima and 74,000 in Nagasaki.
1946-48: International Military Tribunal for the Far East (Tokyo War Crimes Trial) - 4,253 guilty; 1068 death penalty; 422 life-long imprisonment sentenced - Absence of the ex-Emperor Hirohito
‘The absence of the Emperor at the War Crimes Trial was a relief to most Japanese. At the same time, it was considered a denial of the very logic of the trial for war crimes. This ambiguity is the most important aspect of the Japanese reaction. It was universally understood throughout the war that all orders were given in the name of the Emperor. In the Imperial Instructions to the soldiers, the Emperor admonished: “Consider an order from your superior as an order from myself.” This instruction was so consistently used in military training that it became a truism that an order given by an immediate superior was understood as an order from the Emperor and was therefore above criticism.’ (Tsurumi 1984: 16)
1947: The New Constitution (“Peace Constitution”) implemented
1950-present: Korean War
1950: Sohyo 総評 (The General Council of Trade Unions) founded
1956: Zengakuren 全学連 (The All Japan Students’ Federation of Self-governing Associations) founded
1957: The word “citizen” (「市民」 Shi-min) appeared for the first time in Japanese vocabulary
April-May, 1960: Society for Criticizing Anpo / Anpo-related Problems Study Club / Anti-Anpo Japanese Young Generations’ Society established by the intellectuals
May, 1960: Ikutaro Shimiz, “Let’s Go to the Diet: Recommendation of Petition Drives” (Sekai 『世界』)
May, 1960: Koenaki-Koe-no-Kai, or the “Voiceless Voices” Society established by Tomi Kobayashi
June 15, 1960: Death of Michiko Kamba, 22-year-old female student of the University of Tokyo

The anti U.S.-Japan Security Treaty movement (Anpo安保) in 1960
1950: The General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (Sohyo 総評)
1956 December: Reunion of the All Japan Students’ Federation of Self-governing Associations (Zengakuren 全学連)
1957: The word ‘Citizen’ (市民) appeared for the first time in Japanese vocabulary.
1958 June: Preliminary negotiation to revise Japan-U.S. Security Treaty (Anpo)
1958 December: Setup of the Communist Students’ Federation (‘Bund’ 共産主義者同盟)
1959 March: Intellectuals’ petition drive against the revision of Japan-U.S. Security Treaty
May: 1st meeting of young writers’ anti-Anpo society ‘Japanese Young Generation’s Society’
June 4: Voiceless-voice Society (声なき声の会) set up by KOBAYASHI Tomi KOBAYASHI and her friends went out in the street to demonstrate;
June 15: Tokyo emeute. About 8,000 student activists assaulted the Diet. About 650 thousand students, laborers and citizens laid siege to the Diet. Miss KAMBA Michiko, 22-year-old (at that time) female student of Tokyo University was squeezed to death in the midst of the crush between student groups and riot police.16

Distinctive features of the Japanese CSM in the developmental stage
Distance from political parties Intellectuals’ initiative: Petition drives
Ordinary citizens’ initiative: Koenaki- Koe-no-Kai, or the “Voiceless-voices” Society

Distinctive features of the CSM
What are the criteria that distinguish CSM from other types of social movement? Spontaneity; individualism; easiness to join; political independency; indigenousness.

Spontaneous individualism easiness to join political independency indigenousness
“Voiceless Voice” Society’s Parade17 is an Article 9 Association, 九条の会 established in June 2004
In local communities, more than 6,000 grass-roots Art.9 Associations have been established in local communities and developing their activities since then.

Principles of the “Voiceless-voices” Society
1) To have meetings in order to exchange individual members’ opinion ☞ to respect plurality or multipolarity
2) To publish newsletters in order to link members and call out to citizens outside ☞ to make sustainable public linkage among citizens
3) Never to belong to any political party, to exist as an ombudsman society ☞ to observe political neutral, anti-authority standpoint
4) To continue discussion in members’ living place ☞ to be indigenous

15 See YouTube: http://jp.youtube.com/watch?v=1w4s_e5rpfQ
16 See YouTube: http://jp.youtube.com/watch?v=aVP2YKywBx8
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Session 4: Peace through Education

Peace through Policy, and Activity Plans
– Prof. Darryl Macer, UNESCO Bangkok

This presentation will discuss elements of making an action plan. It will also give some examples, such as the United for Peace in Asia and the Pacific: Strengthening and Expanding Regional Human Security and Peace Project of the Regional Unit for Social and Human Sciences in Asia and the Pacific (RUSHSAP) at the UNESCO Bangkok office. In the first phase we organized the Regional Training Workshop on Human Security and Peace in Asia and the Pacific for policy-makers and teachers, which took place on 12-16 March 2007 at Ruamrudee International School (RIS), Bangkok, Thailand. The selected participants from five sub-regions (Central Asia, East Asia, South-Asia, South-East Asia, and the Pacific) prepare the textbooks and teaching materials on Human Security and Peace which include some research topics and case studies in their own countries and neighboring countries in this region. The textbooks and teaching materials on Human Security and Peace were used at universities in their countries and received feedback from their colleagues and students.

In line with UNESCO’s strategy on the occasion of the end of the International year for Culture of Peace Decade, the Social and Human Sciences Sector UNESCO is planning to integrate Human Security and Peace activities into university curricula to ensure that reflections on human security and peaceful living among students of the region are sustained in the long term. The textbooks and training materials will be published and distributed in 2011 to celebrate the End of the Decade of the International Culture of Peace Year. The project aims to integrate Human Security and Peace activities into university curricula to ensure that reflections on human security and peaceful living among students of the region are sustained in the long term. Through this process we aim to:

- To embed the ideas of human security and peaceful living into formal, informal, and non-formal infrastructures relevant to youth of the region;
- To facilitate the networking of students and teachers across the region for the purposes of exchanging ideas on human security and peaceful living, building solidarity, and enhancing understanding;
- To expand existing activities into other schools and universities in the region; and
- To promote and publicize recommended exemplary human security and peace activities to policy makers.

A Regional Dialogue and Workshop on Peace and Human Security in Asia and the Pacific was held on 10-11 December 2009 in Kunming, People’s Republic of China, for teachers and policy makers from various universities in Asia and the Pacific region. In the 2010 a “Regional
Dialogue on Peace and Security in Asia and the Pacific” was convened within the framework of the International Culture of Peace Decade: 2010 the Rapprochement of Cultures, in Malaysia. The aim of the Conference on Peace and Human Security in Asia and the Pacific was to integrate Human Security and Peace activities into university curricula to ensure that reflections on human security and peaceful living among students of the region are sustained in the long term, beyond the end of the International Culture of Peace Decade (2001-2010). In addition this forum provided a space for Policy-Makers, Academics, teachers, students and persons who are involved in peace and security issues in Asia and the Pacific to share experiences and knowledge in order for them to further develop and strengthen their careers.

**Facing history, ourselves and the future: Education for peace-building in Cambodia**

- Tucker McGravy, Lecturer, Department of International Studies, Royal University of Phnom Penh, Cambodia/Regional Peacbuilding Advisor, CORD Asia; Center for Conflict Resolution, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford

The Different ‘Peaces’
Positive Peace: inclusive, equitable structures in society to promote harmony, respect for human rights, and proper stewardship of our natural resources
Negative Peace: absence of direct violence such as civil war or other conflict

Q: Where do you think Cambodia is today?

Conflict between Groups
Recent research finds that “around 70% of the Khmer ethnic group felt their Khmer identity was being threatened” (Sokeo & Miletic, 2007, p. 136) by the presence of minorities such as Vietnamese, Chinese, Thai, Lao, Khmer, and various other indigenous groups.

Q: Where might youth make a contribution here?

Conflict with Neighbors
The issue of Preah Vihear is a sensitive one, marked as it is by a conflictual history with Thailand. The ICJ’s ruling in 1962 has gone unheeded, and bi-lateral negotiations have not brought peace. Now we turn to the UN.

Q: What can youth do to help?

Conflict at Home / Schools
At home: 25% of Cambodian households experience domestic violence - in comparison to an Asian norm of 8%.
In school: 78% of teachers and 85% of students had experienced some form of violence in school.

Q: Is there anything that youth can do? The answer is “YES” – there is something that youth can do to be involved – promoting peace education. Both teachers and students are eager to be exposed to peace education. In a 2003 survey 100% of the students interviewed said they would like to learn more about peace and disarmament, and 93% of teachers questioned considered peace education a priority for schools.

Peace Education – the hope
DEFINITION: the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behaviour changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and
violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level.

**Peace Education Activity:**

**Skills / Attitude / Knowledge Strengthened:**

- Community survey on the understanding of peace and conflict
  - Critical thinking, peace, war, futures
- Having a debate on the use of nuclear arms in present day society
  - Nuclear issues, futures, political literacy
- Practice communication skills of active listening and empathy
  - Empathy, self-respect, assertiveness
- Learning to be peer mediators and solve classroom level conflict
  - Critical thinking, empathy, communication
- Analyzing television advertisements for images of violence and peace
  - Political literacy, vision, justice, violence

What’s been and being done

- WGWR (peace and disarmament)
- Empathy, perspective taking, problem solving, and non-violent communication.
- UNESCO (living values)
- Motivate students to involve them in thinking about themselves, others, the world, and values in ways which are relevant”
- ACT (inter-ethnic focus)
- How to build relationships with others
- World Vision
- Peace Road for children (focused on diversity, gender equality, empathy, healthy relationships, and peace-building)

**What can you do? Some ideas include:**

1. Conduct a research project to determine whether television violence undermines peace (p. 26, Lessons for Peace)
2. Develop a questionnaire to identify local peacemakers in your community (Unit 1, Book 2, HAP)
3. Practice your effective listening skills and then teach them to others (Unit 17, Books 2, HAP)
4. Learn how to effectively manage rumours and gossip (P&DC, Ch. 2, pg. 33)
5. Develop your skills as a mediator to solve conflict (P&DC, Ch. 4, p. 67)
6. Work with high school youth to develop a vision for a peaceful future (Sec. I, pp. 10-11, I Painted Peace)
7. Start your own Youth Peace Club (World Vision, Peace Road for Children)

**Peace Education Resources**

Visit my Dropbox folder for Youth Peace Ambassadors. It has resources, research, and other ideas for peace education: http://db.tt/pakcIBD

Peace Education Curricula:

- GTZ – Learning to Live Together
- Hague Appeal for Peace – Learning to Abolish War: Teaching Toward a Culture of Peace
- SC – I Painted Peace: Handbook on peace-building with and for children and young people

Cambodia Specific Curricula:
Conclusion

Peace education has an important role to play in building a positive peace in Cambodia. In peace education, we may look backward (retrospective), inward (introspective), and forward (prospective) to understand the ways and means we should use to build peace. There is a great role for youth to play in this process, as they are the future of the nation.

Case Studies of Peace Activities through the UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network in the Asia Pacific Region

- Associate Prof. Serafin A. Arviola Jr. Philippine Normal University, the Philippines
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Promotion of Peace and Dignity through Bioethics

- Ms. Anniken Celina Grinvoll, Managing Director, Eubios Ethics Institute

Email: anniken@eubios.info Web: www.eubios.info

Self-determination is important for all individuals to enhance their ability to make wise decisions, and to take responsibility for their actions. Can you imagine all the areas of your life where self-determination is important? Did you decide to come to this workshop today yourself? Did you decide what you will study? What clothes do you wear? What about the food you eat? We take it for granted to have basic freedom of choice in many areas of our life.

It is recognized as a right of all peoples in the first article common to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (which both entered into force in 1976) that: All peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.18

Let us examine how education is related to the concept of dignity. Dignity is human beings’ innate right to respect. We should receive ethical treatment from others, and also have the responsibility to treat others ethically. Dignity is a precondition of freedom. Human beings are said to be created in the image of God and for those who hold this view, dignity comes from this. Regardless of our religious views, however, we all want to be born with dignity, go through life and end life with dignity.

Sadly this does not happen to everyone. Some people are born under undignified circumstances, while some end their lives undignified.

Dignity of people is lacking when they lose their right to speak and right to have an opinion of what is happening in society. Press freedom is very important. Internet freedom is also critical for respect of people's freedom of inquiry and thought.

In many countries, websites are being shut down every week due to commentaries and criticism of the government. There are many ethical issues regarding the information technology, and our security is not usually enhanced by suppression of the right to information. Who can decide what is ethical or not? These are difficult issues, but dignity includes a right to expression, while also a right not to be libeled by false information.

Bioethics education is an agreed goal by all countries of the world. In the *Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (adopted by the UNESCO General Conference 2005)*

Article "23. (i) In order to promote the principles set out in this Declaration and to achieve a better understanding of the ethical implications of scientific and technological developments, in particular in young people, States should endeavour to foster bioethics education and training at all levels as well as to encourage information and knowledge dissemination programmes about bioethics. (ii) States should encourage the participation of international and regional intergovernmental organizations and international, regional and national non-governmental organizations in this endeavour".19

Also as stated in the Universal Declaration of Bioethics and Human Rights, respect for autonomy is associated with moral responsibility:

Article 5 Autonomy and individual responsibility

The autonomy of persons to make decisions, while taking responsibility for those decisions and respecting the autonomy of others, is to be respected. For persons who are not capable of exercising autonomy, special measures are to be taken to protect their rights and interests.20

The moral responsibility to ourselves, for deciding what is the best solution to our own needs, and happiness may be the first issue to consider, before the needs and wants of those around us.

Let us consider the example of end of life care. What may cause people to feel they live without dignity? For some people, at the end of their lives when they are no longer able to do basic things such as eating or going to the toilet, they feel loss of dignity. For others it is only not being able to do what they used to do. In the case of people becoming disabled or elderly, not being able to take care of themselves anymore due to sickness or age.

There are many discussions of death with dignity. In the case of euthanasia which is seen as termination of life on request, the moral and ethical questions which arise force us to look into our own hearts and souls, and to contemplate the mortality of ourselves and our loved ones. Self-determination can be achieved through bioethics education by developing their critical thinking capacity.

The Goals of bioethics education have been described in the Regional Action Plan for Bioethics Education (2005) as:21


“Research has shown that there are a number of goals of bioethics education including:

a) Knowledge
   Development of trans-disciplinary content knowledge
   Understanding the advanced biological concepts
   Being able to integrate the use of scientific knowledge, facts and ethical principles and argumentation in discussing cases involving moral dilemmas;
   Understanding the breadth of questions that are posed by advanced science and technology
   Knowledge of cultural values

b) Skills (capacity building in skill acquiring should be multi faceted or many sided, and the goals include)
   Balancing benefits and risks of Science and Technology
   Being able to undertake a risk/benefit analysis
   Develop critical thinking and decision making skills and reflective processes
   Develop creative thinking skills
   Develop foresight ability to evade possible risks of science and technology
   Skills for developing “informed choice”
   The required skills to detect bias in scientific method, interpretation and presentation of research results

c) Personal moral development
   Understanding better the diversity of views of different persons
   Increasing respect for all forms of life
   Elicit a sense of moral obligation and values including honesty and responsibility
   Being able to take different viewpoints to issues including both biocentric and ecocentric worldviews rather than only anthropocentric perspectives.
   Increasing respect for different people and culture, and their values
   Developing scientific attitudes, reflective processes, and an ability for holistic appraisal, while not ignoring the value for reductionist analysis.
   Knowledge about bias in the interpretation and presentation of research results, benefits and risks of technology and bioethical issues, and how to detect bias
   Exploration of morals/values (values clarification)
   Values analysis and value based utilization of our scarce natural resources”

We can always learn from history, past actions, wrongs and harms that still remain with us. Let us take an example of what is known as the “secret war”, and how Laos was used to stop communism from spreading. Though the war ended 40 years ago, Laos is still the most heavily bombed country in the world.

To this day UXO (unexploded ordnance) is still left in Laos. In many areas where agriculture was, and still is, the main source of income, the farmers are afraid to plough the fields because they are dangerous areas for farming. More than 50,000 people are recorded to have died from UXO when plowing the rice fields, since 1964. Children have died when curiously finding these small unknown ordnances and playing with them. In schools in these areas, children are given lectures about what these ordnances are, and what to do if you see one. These “bombies” as they

are called by the locals is a part of common lives in these areas of Laos, where more than 5 million tons of UXO is said to have been dropped on Laos.

Work is being done to clear areas of UXO every day by Mines Advisory Group (MAG) International. From 1996-2009 more than 1 million UXO were destroyed leaving 23,000 hectares of land ready to be cultivated again.

Last month I visited one of these areas in Laos myself, and that is why I have chosen to talk about this today. They have left the remains of war visibly in some areas to educate the children about war. Seeing the impact the so-called "secret war" still has on daily life among the people to this day, and how it makes people remain in poverty this long after, is very sad. Living in fear every day of coming across an UXO is not living in dignity.

"In the end the Lao people regard lack of food as a much greater threat than unexploded bombs," said David Hayter, the Lao country director of British-based Mines Advisory Group (MAG). "It's just that each UXO death is marked by a big bang, but deaths from lack of food or poor water are less noticeable."

Because farming is difficult, the local people have found other ways to make ends meet and increase their income. Collecting and reusing scrap metal from bombs has become the new source of income, dangerously risking their lives looking for the material.

"People have lived with this for two generations," said Gregory Cathcart, a MAG programme officer. "They don't view it as risky. It's simply a cash crop. The problem is the main scrap on the surface is gone, so they've to dig it up which is extremely dangerous."

Develop creative thinking skills is something we can see that the locals in this rural area of Laos obviously have done. The masses of bombs available have eventually led to the creative makings of goods for use in their houses. The origin of what these goods actually are, does not seem to matter to them at this point. For many other people around the world, knowing that you are cooking and eating your food from the remains of a bomb may not be that tasty.

What is the more ethical use of science and technology? Producing bombs for security? Or making spoons? Many spoons, pots, cooking equipment and other goods are being made from the recycled metal from UXO, and sold at markets. Citizens are using technology to produce consumer goods. This makes us reflect on the original use of the metal to make weapons. Wasn't this an abuse of technology?

Developing critical thinking and decision making skills and reflective processes when buying these goods at the market made of bomb scrap could be useful. By buying these goods you give these people income, but at the same time you also encourage people to go out and dig out bombs from the fields because they need the material to produce more goods. In this way you may contribute to more people losing their lives. I guess you could say that in this area this scrap metal is as valuable as gold to others.

The UXO which has contaminated the soil for long is a form of pollution. The convention on banning the use of cluster bombs was signed in 2008 by more than 100 countries all over the world. Let us hope that cluster bombs and other weapons of indiscriminate killing are not produced or used.

Only when we have realized the harms of war, can we start to talk about building peace. We not only need to educate children but it is important to promote self-determination of people at all ages in life. Children are our future, but also in the current time all people need to be encouraged to contribute to what is a prospering world of independence and freedom.

The maturation of citizens in society is important for shaping the direction of not only individual futures but also for the security and well being of the whole society, and our global

http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/dec/03/laos-cluster-bombs-uxo-deaths
community. Society needs to understand the universal diversity of the people and tolerate with love what we can. It is through Love of life we can create a better future.

**Peace and philosophy education**
- Prof. Heng Sreang, Department of Philosophy, Royal University of Phnom Penh, Cambodia

**Peace, Ethics and Values through History Education**
- Ms. Napat Chaipraditkul, Research Fellow, Eubios Ethics Institute
  Email: napat@eubios.info

**Introduction**

We hope that through education, we can teach good values to all persons to avoid abuses that happened in history. In the Action Plan for the Promotion of Philosophy Teaching in Asia and the Pacific adopted in 2009, called “Thinking for the Future”, a series of goals of philosophy education are set out. In the introduction of the plan it states:

“The participants recognized that historical reflections across all civilizations can make important contributions to the teaching of philosophy in any society. Given the importance of philosophy and the urgency of deliberations on the future of civilization, a detailed action plan with recommendations are offered below, to be available for countries to use as a point for further development of philosophy teaching in each community and inside each level of education”.

Let us consider how we can teach the goals of philosophy education, including those related to the search for wisdom, such as development of trans-disciplinary knowledge, Clarification of concepts, Enhancement of the ability to integrate knowledge, principles and argumentation in rational discussion, Understanding the power of questions, Broadening intellectual horizons, Knowledge of cultural values in different communities, Search for meanings and Living a better life, through selected examples of history education.

Another set of goals can include development of capacities for wise judgment and decision making skills, and for interpretation, construction and communication of knowledge, for example.

The third set of goals is development of a disposition to use knowledge and skills for good, and increasing respect for all forms of life, while respecting different points of view, people and culture, and their values. History education can work to achieve these goals, or work against these, and we should be cautious of the examples and interpretations we offer in teaching.

**Slavery**

There are many incidents and many maleficent practices through history. In history we can see a lot of examples of slavery. Slavery can be defined as a permanent status of being inferior to the superior for the means to exercise their power and earn their benefits. Thus, the League of Nations defines slavery as “Slavery means the status and condition of a person over whom any or all of the power attached to the right of ownership are exercised.”

There are many examples of slavery in history. For example, even around 1900, the Dutch were systemically capturing indigenous persons in places such as Indonesia, Malaysia, and Africa as slaves (Vink, 2003). This is a century later than the end of the major African slave trade to the Americas.

In the fourth article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights it states, “No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms”.

There are implications of slavery against persons coming from another nationality or races. There was a traumatizing suppression of previous Africans generations in the Americas in the slave trade. The African slaves were treated in an unfair and inhumane way. The Africans were taken from their homeland, then they were forced to be a supplementary workforce to overcome the scarcity of other slaves (Indians and indigenous labourers) in South America while the Spaniards and Portuguese took the precious findings and resources, such as Gold and silver to Europe after the process of excavating and mining. Economically, the production of valuable metal resources in Spanish America were subjugated to Spain (Mellafe, 1975).

Slavery was not only a way of controlling and humiliating others from different cultural groups (and those of different nationalities). We may think that the forms of slavery are only enforced on the “others.” However, slavery, is systematically practiced among those of the same nationality and culture as well. Occupying slaves for the nobles was considered acceptable in Siam. Serfdom and slavery were legal in the land. Every social class has social duties to serve the persons of higher social status, but ethical duties to serve everyone. Everyone has an obligation to other persons depending on their social standing and relations among the classes (Klein, 1993). For instance, parents may give their daughters or sons to noble men in advocacy of paying off the debt, presenting them as a gift, or even making them slaves.

We may consider that slavery is because of greed but the people who are subjected to slavery may vary due to several conditions. People could sell other persons as slaves by any means for their own benefits regardless of the slaves being the same nationality or a different one.

This paper will give examples of how ethics and values can be taught through history education. History education teaches us about the past, but through particular eyes. The same historical event through different sets of eyes can be described totally differently. These descriptions sometimes lead to conflicts between people and even between nations, for example, if they discuss different religious perspectives on the meaning of our life and responsibilities, or of course past wars and conflicts.

Throughout all periods in history there have been significant events which have changed not only the past but also affect the present and future. We have learnt from literature, folktales, and lore.

One of the main goals for philosophy education is to help learners be able to clarify basic concepts that are important for expressing our values. This helps to broaden our intellectual horizons and develop respect for reasons and historical evidence. As an outcome the person should have a disposition to be tolerant and reasonable, and have better understanding of the diversities of views of different people. Obviously, slavery is based on the erroneous view that we can use other people for our own purpose, with total disregard for their interests.

It teaches us to value others, as all persons are important parts of society. Slavery is one example of the condition of being superior or inferior to others. In reality, no one could be superior to other persons all the time, and yet we do not want to be inferior or be a slave under others. Yet we would never dream for us or our children to be a slave. Neither can we treat others as slaves, and the action plan sets an agreed goal for all persons to “Have empathy, compassion, tolerant, inclusive and reasonable for understanding of reality.

These historical examples were why we have International Treaties Against Slavery. However; one form of slavery still in present day is human trafficking. In Thailand, some young boys are abducted and forced to work in fishing trawler as slaves. They receive no payment and some are killed on the boats. At first these innocent young migrants come from the countryside to Bangkok in search of work and to fulfill their dreams of opportunity. They are then trapped as slaves by the bad people who recruit them. One story of a victim of forced laborer, was a man
who was promised to be employed for a job in Bangkok, instead, he was taken and forced to work on fishing trawlers in order to survive. In the end he fled back by swimming from the slavers boats (Amnatcharoenrit, 2009). Slavery is evil. For instance, Some children are kidnapped from their parents, then their hands and legs will be cut off and forced to work as a beggar on the streets of Bangkok or Krungh tep, the so-called the city of angels.

Nonetheless, we may say that prostitution is one of the first occupations in the world. Secondly, prostitution is common in many countries, for example, Thailand, with similar deceitful schemes to trap young women and men. This example of slavery shows us how lessons we may have learnt in the past influence our decision making and interpersonal relationships with others.

It shows that we must be compassionate and empathetic to others respecting their individuality. We should actually respect all forms of life, not just human beings. Slavery is a consequence of disrespect and greed, and lessens the social concepts of human dignity and challenges the values which shatter the fraternity and love among humanity.

Racism

Let us consider another example, that of racism. Are all people of equal value, and what's kind of value do you think of when we categorize people? Is it whether or not they have white skin or dark? For most of history they have been valued differently. This was especially true when Arab and European colonizations occurred, exploiting persons with dark skin as I have mentioned for slavery. How can there be peace when there are persons who were violated by prostitution, slavery, racial slurs and other kind of abuses. Those who faced such torments find it difficult to tolerate such maltreatment. They couldn’t find peace, and still there are those who had claimed that such harmful action is a way to achieving peace.

There was said by those in power to be some moral difference between so-called white and black people. Nowadays English people discuss the ethics of hunting foxes, but less than 200 years ago English hunted the aboriginal people in Tasmania, Australia, to extinction.

Through persons’ misconception some people are stereotyped as either despicable or of great virtue. History education and history educators may have mentioned racial slurs or discrimination towards one group as being inferior or even evil. Eventually, the students may understand in their point of view the culture or mindset of the instructor as well.

Teaching and understanding of history is not only to remember fictitious details but to learn to think and seek understanding of the mistakes of humanity as a whole. The teaching of history may vary due to the teacher and the students who may believe in the misinterpretation of teaching for certain purposes which inflicts hatred and never-ending problems that can lead to more violent crimes or even actual warfare. We have seen some examples of racial crimes against Indian students in some countries, as you may know.

Historical events which have shaped our present should make us reflect upon our future. What can we see through reading or studying of history, war, aggression, power struggles between hegemonic countries, or simply so-called glorious wars. Do we really think we have learnt our lessons? A person may learn to understand the conflicts, situations, and outcomes, through history textbooks that make us remember the years of all important battles. They may even sometimes blame and judge certain groups as the ones which started a war. Yet it almost always requires both sides to start a war, not just one. When we read history books God is on the side who wins, yet history books are written through the eyes of one history, but seldom through the eyes of both sides of past conflicts. God is not on the side of violence, but on the side of peace.

Human Rights
Human rights means to protect humanity and provide security. According to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights Article 3, “Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.” However, history has shown the dark side of humanity, for instance, wars and colonization.

For example, an institutionalized social system was created by the Aryans, which determines persons by their birth status, namely, the caste system in India. Some may consider this as a given way to live which Brahma has predestined each individuals' life. A socio-historical theory of how Varna exists after the coming of the Aryan. The caste system is from the Vedic time, with the division of classes into 4 main classes. The Brahman priest at their 1st position, were followed by Kshatriyas as 2nd class, Nobles. The commoners and traders (Vaishya) were the 3rd class. Lastly there was the 4th class, “Shudra”, labourers and skilled-craftmens. According to the Vedic texts it is also a skin colour based division called varna as well. The priest and Nobles are the white-skinned Aryans, and the traders and peasants are the Dravidians who have lost their status and prosperity by the coming and colonization of the Aryans (Avari, 2007).

Prejudice is originally from the 13th century French word rooted in the Latin praejudicium. There are many definitions of Prejudice. (Hall, 2005) First, prejudice is a preconception of a certain matter before having a prior information. Second prejudice is judgmental ideas or thoughts based on bias and unsympathical views. (Roeckelein, 2006) Third, prejudice is an act against so-called inferior or “uncivilized barbarians” as groups of people, and doubt of the unknown affects may shape our judgment. Therefore, we consider the rights to be given to others and rights to be taken from others. Who deserves the rights and who doesn’t? Such judgmental attitudes and mentality can cause ethno-centrism and racism towards so called “outgroups”. Historically, we can see a numbers of extermination that were conducted on those we considered as others.

Let us consider the example of the conflicts between Siam, Cambodia, and neighboring states in history. There are many conflicts in the history of Siam (or present-day Thailand) and Cambodia. In 1530, Siam was having a with Pegu (Myanmar), Bangnah, Prakanong, Chaopraya river were invaded when Cambodia attacked Siam (Smith,1869) Thus the conflicts such as Cambodian-Thai wars has occured many times in history, which is the causal reason for the Cambodian-Thai prejudice.

However, so far that I have found the history texts are unclear about a number of details depending on different versions. I will give an example of European Versions of wars and conflicts between these two nations. There are written texts regarding wars of Siam and neighboring countries, first, Sir John Bowring, a British Diplomat, in his mission report has mentioned of atrocity. He wrote:

“In 1583, King Naret (Naresuan) of Siam has conquered the Royal city of Lovek, ordered an execution of the Cambodian king, and washed his feet with his blood. Later on He captured Motama and Hongsawadi of Myanma (Pegu) by military force and appointed his vassals to rule there.”

Next, The Encyclopaedia Britannica online version says:

“In 1594, He had seiged and conquered The Royal Cambodian city of Lovek.”

And another version of Tony Jaques’ Dictionary of battles and sieges, writes:

“Chetta I, the king of Lovek has fled the city during the siege of Siamese troops under Naresuan in 1594.”

These are three different versions of history written in English. It is of course different in the French versions of history! Through the consideration of persons' misconception of peace some people are stereotyped as either despicable or of great virtue. Factions create wars against
another factions as a bridge to ongoing conflicts between nations nowadays, either our people are slaughtered or their people.

History education and history educators may have mentioned racial slurs or discrimination towards one group as being inferior or even evil. Eventually, the students may understand in their point of view the culture or mindset of the instructor as well. These examples of the records of wars make us question whether it is historically considered true or not. Accordingly, learning by students of past events already inflicts vengeance in the minds of people. This leads to another form of conflict caused by prejudice. Perhaps this is the reality that we are all facing? As history have shown, our ancestors’ make many decisions on wars instead of peace by many means and through political decisions. We can question whether we should try to create peace by wars. Is that what we are trying to pursue?

**Genocide**

Another kind of violence against humanity is Genocide. Genocide concentrates on the means to exterminate groups and individual existence (Smith, 2007). Genocide was a term introduced by Raphael Lemkin, the word “genocide” is composed by two Greek words, “genos” for racial groups and “caedere” is taking lives (Schabas, 2000).

There are several implications of historical events, which are associated with genocide. One of the most infamous is in WWII. The genocide of Jewish people by the Nazis is an infamous example, and it started through consideration of concepts of what is a good or bad person. Eradication of Jews from Europe by the Nazi was caused by more than racial hatred but also was related to political ideology. The war started with anti-semitic and fascist ideology.

Adolf Hitler is responsible for the Holocaust, which was a systematic campaign to eliminate Jewish persons. They were abducted and killed in Nazi concentration camps following the policies of anti-Semitism and racial hatred. World War II harmed Europe and the rest of the world, yet we may not have learnt all the lessons that history would teach us. The war has led to the acceptance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Cassin, 1969). The suffering from the loss of wars not only occurred in Europe as we may understand, but in Asia as well.

We also can see such examples in Asia. In the 1960s-1970s, the reign of the Khmer Rouge occurred in Cambodia. These were times of chaos and atrocities. The permanent leader of Khmer Rogue at the time was Pol Pot, who is as known as a gruesome and cruel leader. During Pol Pot's reign the primarily targets for killing were minority groups, political and ideological opposition in Cambodia, for example, Vietnamese and Sihanouks (Kissi, 2006). The years of massive tormenting and racial cleansing were systematically intransigent and practiced as if it was unknown to the world. The Pol pot government was trying to create a society with solely pure Cambodians. Which resulted in the death of millions (Congressional Report, 22 April 1998), yet justice was not brought upon the dictator himself. He was deceased on 15 April 1998 (Leonard, 2005). Pol pot is one of the dictators in Asia who have indulged themselves with racial cleansing and genocide.

Moreover, around the 1960s the massacre that occurred in Timor was started as political violence against non-communists known as “Partai Kommunis Indonesia or PKI” in Indonesia, under General Suharto. Soldiers had advanced to East Timor in order to terminate the non-Communist opposition; however, it became from a racial massacre instead of a political extermination of the PKI. The war resulted in approximately a million people violently dying including Timorese, Javanese, and other minorities by Indonesian troops (Gallately and Kierman 2003). Initially, the killing itself was means to eliminate the opposition regardless of the racial differences. Violence and massive killing in favor of discrimination is one of the common causes of War on genocide, yet it was not an only cause of such an act of atrocities.
Violence

A political killing spree in 6 October 1976 was committed by the Thai military to dispose of Thai students in Thammasart University and civilians who they considered as communists. Phra Kittiwuttho, a monk, He also comparing to the making of merit

“It was not sinful to kill communists said. “It is the duty of all Thai...It is like when we kill fish to make curry to place in alms bowl for a monk. There is certainty demerit in killing the fish, but when we place it in the alms bowl of a monk, we gain much greater merit” said Phra Kittiwuttho. (Bake and Phongpaichit, 2009).

In addition, more than 4,000 people were accused of being communist and yet around 2,000 individuals were imprisoned (Simons, 1976). It is considered as a great violence against the university students and Thai people. It was only a political movement (Ungpakorn, 2001). The days of the massacre is still remembered in Thai people’s mind until today.

These abuses against peace occurred in Asia, in recent times, while in the same country in history, the lessons that students were being taught about the evil things of European colonization. It seems therefore that the lessons of history did not make a better or more moral citizen.

The wars that I have mentioned before were caused in favour of maleficent, not for self love or protection. Accordingly, the hate is the means to harm other being. Thus, doing harm is not an act of love. It is understandable, occasionally, we may feel insecure or fear others. And that’s why some people detach themselves or even put an end to others existence which seems foreign to us. Yet it never leads to peace and human rights which we are searching for.

Stereotypes

Many historical texts and cultural norms and socio-environmental beliefs are related to stereotyping. Stereotyping is found in every culture and leads to many kinds of problem. “Stereotypes are qualities perceived to be associated with particular groups and categories of people” (Schneider 2004).

Obviously, there are a wide ranges of forms of stereotype. One of the controversial issues regarding stereotypes is racial stereotyping. The categorization of types of person into groups by physical features or colour of their skin. As you may know the stereotypic forms in media and beliefs, for instance, Asians are weak and imbecile, Africans are uncivilized, and Europeans are racists. Stereotypes are also based on genders as well. Basically, gender stereotypes are categorization of persons by physical structure focusing on gender and the roles given to them. For instance, some say women are unreliable and coy. One of the classical questions is whether we value all men and women? In many cultures, as we have known that men are more valued and highly regarded than women. In the case of Thailand, the preferred gender amongst the groups of Thai adults was explored by literature and interview research.

The result of 65 general public interviews found a greater proportion of people who prefer boys to girls. I have also interviewed medical doctors regarding preference of gender between boys and girls. One interesting comment was girls would be more preferable than boys if there was a talented women in the family, in this case girls would be preferable and valuable than boys. Girls are pressured to be talented in order to be beneficial for other causes instead of her own rights.

On the contrary, even though it seems that boys are more valued in the aspect of being wanted, and they receive more attention and affection than girls, boys are expected by the society to be strong, unemotional, and brave. However, in another study showing a group of male patients with cancer of one up to five years, most of them were unable to express their pain and
suffering, yet they kept their agony and hardly ever talked about it (Moynihan, 1998). On the other hand, girls can express their emotions. All in all boys are not considered emotional because of the generalization of how a boy should be. Accordingly, every person has their own dignity as individual human-beings. Stereotyping may not be an easy task to dissolve; however, we have to teach the value of approaching all others with tolerance and compassion.

**Autonomy**

Another concept is Autonomy. As you just learnt from the historical facts, wars on ideology are just an example of such acts against humanity. We may believe in any ideology or deity due to our choice and freedom. However, while we may say Autonomy is “the right of personal freedom in actions, choices, beliefs and preferences” (Macer, 2009). We may have understood autonomy is a kind of freedom that gives us a right to do whatever we wanted to do, we need to understand that freedom must be protected along with limitations of that genocide which was practiced as a development of racism.

Before we believe in any political ideology, or a deity, we must think of “Non-maleficence” which simply means no harms to others. Whether we consider a person of a group as outgroups or ingroups. However, this is a cause for dilemmas when we think of freedom and limitations of our action, whatever the reasons behind our actions. We must learn how to limit our over-excessive exercise of rights towards others. Therefore, we could build our own understanding of human rights and dignity. On the other hand, this may lead to these questions. Do we have rights to exercise our power over others, or do they over us?

**Peace**

History contains not only the series of wars, genocide, racism, and political aggression against people of the same nationality, or others. There are examples of peace in history as well. For instance, Prathad Sri Song Rak. This place was built by Ayutthaya and Viang Chan as a memorial of love, fraternity, and friendship between the two nations fighting against Burmese invasion. We can see that even this place was the means for peace, which is a consequence of wars against other nations for their own sovereignty. It ended with two nations friendship, on the other hand, which led to more hatred between Burma and Ayutthaya and Viang Chan alliance, and the people of each state despised each other.

During the colonization of India under British rule, the global icon of peace struggles, Mahatma Gandhi, emerged. He is well known for his political and spiritual movement, Satyagraha, which is a way of seeking the truth with Ahimsa or non-violence, and tolerance to others (Todd and Marty, 2004). Gandhi unchained India to give her freedom. India was subject to British rule for several hundred years. The non-violence movement was a contribution to Gandhi’s teaching of peace, truth and love and his people of India. The movement struggled its way to India’s sovereignty.

Another example of peace is the Waitangi Treaty of New Zealand. The Treaty has two languages Maori and English. It was a solution that ended the war between the British settlers and 17 Maori tribes. This is example of Peace agreement between Maori and newly arrived settlers in New Zealand.

These are some examples of creating peace. If you look closely, the peace between nations were resulted after wars. Is war considered a way of contributing to peace? Can peace be created after justified wars and atrocities? Is violence our basic instinct? We should not regard war as a way to creating peace.

**Conclusions**
Compassion should be in the heart of individuals, as if the portrait of you is in the eyes of others, likewise, the portrait of others reflects in your eyes. We need love and compassion for all forms of life.

In conclusion, it is clear in ethics that there are many reasons for putting an end to genocide, slavery, stereotyping and discrimination which is one possibility lead to racial hatred and for many reasons otherwise the problem that we are facing will return back to the beginning over and over again. We could begin with the micro unit of the society trying to love and understand your families, friends, then you may expand your circle of friends nationally and internationally with the regardless of genders and culture.

What values do we learn from history education? You may say that we have learnt the facts in history, or what we believed to be the facts. However, the values we have learnt, firstly, is awareness where racism, genocide and discrimination is happening now everywhere. Secondly, humanity is still in search of human rights and how we can develop our tolerance towards the unfamiliar. Third, respects to all the differences and of those who are vulnerable. Fourth, historical examples of maleficient and beneficient actions as an example of our present and future. Fifth, non-biased or neutral views of reality can be perceived and understood by teachers, students and learners in general.

History education teaches many things including moral and ethical analysis of the past event which develop the critical and analytical thinking of the past, present, and the future world. Therefore history is not simply history after all.
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G3. Peace and Peacekeeping

Chapter objectives
Peace is more than just the absence of war, and can be achieved by various means.
This chapter aims to:
1. Discuss causes & consequences of war and peace.
2. Illustrate gradients of power and peacefulness.
3. Demonstrate methods for establishing peace.
4. Compare future scenarios of war and peace.

G3.1. Peace and War

Peace is the presence of calm, human unity, personal safety, sufficiency, agreement, freedom, ecological health and human wellbeing. Peace is based on love. Peace is a central issue in bioethics, which can be interpreted as 'love of life', and among whose central principles are beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy and justice. Peace is in accordance with good human qualities, for example the cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance, the Ten Commandments, the Pillars of Islam and the central tenets of Buddhism. Peace is unity, a common bond of humanity for all different peoples, connected in tolerance and harmony despite a diversity of beliefs. Peace is tranquility, serenity, the presence of nature, good mood, healthy body and calm mind. Peace is 'good', the subject of ethics.

Peace is more than just the absence of war. Peace is the absence of any violence, hostility, threats, use of force, use of power against people's will, subterfuge, crime, civil strife, conflict, bad intentions, bad relations, disturbance or negativity. Peace results from the avoidance of sin, for example the seven deadly sins of anger, pride, lust, sloth, gluttony, covetousness and envy. Peace is never found in the presence of things considered evil and which cause harm, such as war.

Similarities between languages are an illustration of shared history, brotherhood and sisterhood. Peace is salām or salaam in Arabic, used in the greeting assalām alaikum (‘peace be with you’). Peace is shalom in Hebrew, as in shalom aleichem (‘peace be with you’). Peace is pāx in Latin, pace in Italian, paz in Spanish and Portuguese, paix in French and pes in Middle English. Peace is frieden in German, vrede in Dutch, and fred in Norwegian. Peace is in Russian, and in Greek.

Peace is สันติภาพ in the Thai language. Tranquility is shanti in India. Peace is written 平和 in Japanese, 和平 in Chinese, and 평화 in Korean.

Q1. Is peace a strong element and goal in your life?
What does peace mean to you? Where do you find peace?

---

This is a paper written by Morgan Pollard (Australia) from pp. 253-268 in Macer, DRJ. A Cross-Cultural Introduction to Bioethics (Eubios Ethics Institute, 2006).
Many people believe...

**WAR** is inherently and altogether outside of ethical boundaries, and cannot be rationalised or excused. Despite this abhorrence, *Homo sapiens* still retains some of its fighting instincts as a territorial carnivorous primate. Neanderthals (debatably a subspecies *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*) seem to have been more peaceful than us, and may have been driven to extinction by an extended form of genocide. African tribal wars, Roman Empire, Viking raids, the Crusades, Mongolian Empire, medieval battles with swords and pitchforks, forceful colonial takeover of Africa, North America, South America and Australia, the ‘Great’ War, the era of Japanese imperialism, Jewish Holocaust in Germany (6 million dead), Hiroshima and Nagasaki ‘experiments’ (over 70,000 immediate deaths from each), Rwandan genocide (800,000 dead)... Human history reads like the story of war.

**INDUSTRIALISED** production-line manufacture and international sale of armaments, especially since the World Wars, has become a very profitable large-scale business for many countries. To peace activists this industry is known as the global ‘military-industrial complex’. People within it prefer to call it the ‘Defense Industry’. Nations which are the largest producers and distributors of arms tend to be those which are wealthier and less internally conflict-ridden. Top manufacturers and exporters are the US (e.g. M16 machine gun, ICBM missiles), Russia (AK-47, RPG-7 grenade launcher), France, Germany (G3 rifle), UK, Belgium (MAG machine gun, FAL rifle), China, Israel (Uzi machine gun), Ukraine, Italy, Spain, Bulgaria, Brazil and South Africa. Major importers are often poor countries with deplorable economic disparity.

**VIOLENT** conflict and direct application of force are defining features of war. War is gory, not glory. High death tolls aren’t just remnants of the previous century. The recent Iraq war and its aftermath have been independently estimated to have caused at least 25,000 and perhaps over 100,000 civilian casualties, deliberately not counted by the ‘coalition of the willing’. These are not just numbers, but someone’s brothers and sisters.

**MASS** commercial distribution of weapons and the ensuing wars result largely from the massive economic incentives involved. Shifting international alliances and hyped-up threats in the mass-media ensure the maintenance of markets. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute aggregate, used as an indicator for the UNDP Human Development Report, estimates US$16.231 billion of official ‘legal’ conventional arms transfers globally in 2001, even after excluding the massive trade in hand-held small arms. Other reports have estimated much higher annual figures.

**ORGANISED** and disciplined in a stricter manner than other human institutions, the use of force permeates all levels and structures of the military. This is of course necessary to ensure that soldiers advance unflinchingly into a hail of danger. It also assuages feelings of guilt, both in the soldier who must ‘only follow orders’ to commit atrocities in the field, and in the officers who ‘didn’t do it’ themselves. Non-questioning compliance in many spheres of occupation means loss of individual thought and freedom of action, denying you the right to your own values and set of ethical principles, and ignoring moral responsibility.

**THIEVING** of land, resources and money have been the real underlying reason for war throughout history. Unfortunately, “we want to thieve from our neighbours” doesn’t sound like a very convincing excuse. Therefore ‘leaders’ of war use other excuses to justify their actions, often indoctrinating intolerance to different religions and cultures. Excuses relating to justice are also used for violence, and bear further consideration in this chapter. Of course, the other main reason is the acquisition of power, or the ability to manipulate land, resources, money and also people.
Other people believe...

**WAR IS** always a last resort, but can sometimes, in extreme situations, be justified as necessary to relieve a population from risk, oppression, suffering or exploitative leadership. ‘Just’ war is a subjective matter of ideology; witness ‘Holy’ wars, ‘Cold War’, Palestine, Vietnam, Cambodia, ‘war on drugs’, Afghanistan, Central America, Chechnya, the Balkans, East Timor, Western economic imperialism, World Trade Center, ‘war on terror’, Afghanistan again, Iraqi bombings, suicide bombings, fears of WMD (weapons of mass destruction), future wars...

**SOMETIMES** is a conditional word which limits when to do something, and whether it would perhaps be best not to. This introduces the ends versus means debate. Believers in ‘Right Action’ suggest that we are duty-bound to behave using good means even if the resulting ends are likely to be bad. On the other hand, believers in ‘Utilitarianism’ often say that duty is measured by consequences rather than right action, and means may be justified when there’s a high degree of predictability that the ends achieved will produce significantly greater good.

**JUSTIFIED** violence rests on assumptions about justice. The term justice, from the philosophy of ethics, may be interpreted in different ways. Social justice, or fairness and equal opportunity for all, is known as ‘distributive justice’. The use of force by police and the criminal justice system is an example of ‘retributive justice’ (although there’s debate as to whether prisons are mainly for retribution, prevention or rehabilitation). ‘Just War Theory’ tries to identify those conditions which justify the resort to war (**jus ad bellum**: ‘justice in going to war’), and permissible or just conduct during war (**jus in bello**: ‘justice in warfare’). Supposedly ‘Just War’ has been characterized by the following conditions:

- a) just cause, such as the protection of human rights,
- b) right intention, which should be the establishment of peace,
- c) appropriate proportionality, with just ends outweighing the means,
- d) the defensive rather than offensive position,
- e) use of force only as a last resort after diplomacy and economic measures,
- f) competent authority and leadership,
- g) high probability of success in the achievement of just ends,
- h) limitations on the use of excessive force,
- i) non-use of conscripted or child soldiers,
- j) non-use of internationally maligned tactics or weapons, and
- k) careful discrimination for the prevention of innocent casualties.

**BY FREEDOM** we mean the ability to pursue the diverse range of opportunities offered by modern life, requiring liberation from oppression by dictatorial governments. Freedom is the cry of people unbearably oppressed and disenfranchised, whose depths of pain and emotion may offer no other option but resistance. This is why one person’s ‘terrorist’ is another’s ‘freedom’ fighter. Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara was made a martyr in South America, to become a global cultural pop icon for freedom despite his advocating and using violent guerrilla warfare. Other fighters of oppression have won freedom, autonomy and democracy for their people and become respected statesmen, such as Nelson Mandela in South Africa, and Xanana Gusmao in the world’s most newly liberated country, East Timor. Justification for actions may depend on the socio-political nature of the situation. Perhaps some advice from two past US presidents to present and future leaders is relevant here. Franklin Roosevelt’s peace objectives from his ‘four freedoms’ speech (1941) were ‘freedom of speech’, ‘freedom of worship’, ‘freedom from economic want’ and ‘freedom from aggression’, and John F. Kennedy once warned oppressive governments that “Those who make peaceful revolutions impossible will make violent revolutions inevitable.”
Q2. Can war be rationalised or justified? Is there an ethical difference between wars based on greed and those based on grievance? Does the answer depend on whether the people advocating war have relative opportunity for wealth and wellbeing, justice from oppression and freedom from fear?

G3.2. Pacifism

Pacifism doesn’t believe violence can be justified. Violent means always provoke a violent backlash – ‘an eye for an eye leaves everybody blind’. Pacifism is the ethical philosophy of non-violence, or harmlessness. Pacifism has had a long tradition in many cultures, for example including Jainism, Taoism, the original teachings of Christ, Anabaptists, Quakers, Contractarianism, International Federalism, hippie culture, green politics, civil rights and peace movements.

Buddhism also seems to be one of the world’s most peaceful philosophies. It can be summarised by the ‘four noble truths’ of Gautama Siddhartha (Buddha): 1. life has omnipresent suffering; 2. suffering involves a chain of causes including desire and selfishness; 3. suffering can be reduced by removal of these causes; and 4. there is a path towards this end. This path is the ‘eightfold path’, namely: 1. ethically correct viewpoint (e.g. selfless, desireless, compassionate), 2. right resolutions, 3. right speech, 4. right action, 5. right livelihood, 6. right effort, 7. proper mindfulness, and 8. regular practice of concentration (meditation). Further, Buddha’s ‘middle way’ is a life which does not follow extremes of pleasure on the one hand, or extreme asceticism on the other. Such inner strength requires emotional intelligence such as the following abilities: self-awareness and management of one’s emotions, awareness of the emotions of others, empathy for the feelings of another, generation of motivation, positivity and optimism, impulse control, delay of gratification, and using both thought and feeling in decision-making. The principle of ‘Ahimsa’, proclaimed by followers of Vishnu, Mahavira and Buddha among others, is the philosophy of never harming any form of life.

Another exemplary pacifist is Mohandas (Mahatma) Gandhi, revered as one of the most humane and sane leaders of the twentieth century. He led the Indian people in a successful pacifist movement against colonialists of the British Raj, by the use of mass action which overwhelmed the country’s jails and political systems. These actions stand as a good example of how large numbers of people can demand change, without using any forms of violence.

The easily perceived drawback of pacifism is that a simple smile doesn’t block aggressive use of fist or gun. Consider many of the world’s famous pacifists, Jesus Christ, Mohandas Gandhi (1948), Luther King Jr. (1968) and John Lennon (1980). Assassination elevated them to become martyrs, rallies of sympathy and awareness of their cause to an effective level. Self-martyrdom has also been used to awareness, but can’t really be considered non-violent, selfless Buddhist monk’s protest of the Vietnam War powerfully illustrates.
**G3.3. Non-violent resistance**

There have been many other victories from nonviolent resistance. Poland’s ‘Solidarnosc’ trade union movement and led by Lech Walesa (1980) for improved workers rights, is as the initial impetus for the later downfall of the Communist regime in the country. In the ‘Yellow Revolution’ of the Philippines (1983), the assassination of Benigno ‘Ninoy’ Aquino Jr. (pictured on the 500-peso note) sparked an end to Filipino trepidation at the use of people power, bringing his widow Corazon Aquino to the presidency and ended the Marcos dictatorship. The ‘Singing Revolution’ (1988-1991) saw two million people stand hand in hand singing prohibited national songs for 600km across Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and led to the independence of Estonia from Soviet rule. Similarly, the Czechoslovakia Prague’s ‘Velvet Revolution’ (1989) saw the playwright activist Vaclav Havel become the first post-Communist A more recent success of non-violent revolution was the ‘Orange Revolution’ in Ukraine, which saw Viktor Yushchenko come to after being the victim of election fraud and attempted poisoning. similar forms of people-power, under the leadership of Aung San (pictured), can also eventually liberate the people of Myanmar Non-violent political revolution inspires confidence in the nature standing of the resulting government.

Non-violence then, doesn’t exclude these various other of resistance, such as diplomacy, politics, public protest, marches, appeal to world opinion, creative media activism (‘culture jamming’), civil disobedience, workers strikes, industrial action, and non-violent direct action. Direct action refers to protests outside the institutionalized framework not incorporating violence, aggression, threats, and sometimes property damage. Forms of violence undermine the moral authority of otherwise well-meant protest, and provoke a backlash of lost admiration and sympathy for the cause. It may be hard to practice a philosophy of non-violence in countries with conscription (forced entry into the military). ‘Conscientious objection’ is refusal by a peace-loving person to join institutions engaged in violence, and is commonly punishable by imprisonment.

The speeches of charismatic American civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. demonstrate a fine example of passion combined with compassion. His words ring out truths about justice and equality not just for the American negro, but for Hispanics, Arabs and Jews, for black or white or any minority group, and for all countries of the world.

“I have a dream, that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the colour of their skin, but by the content of their character. I have a dream today.”
Reverend Dr Martin Luther King Jr. (1963)

**Q3:** Why is violent protest not good strategy for the Peace and Justice Movements?
G3.4. Conflict Resolution & Preventive Diplomacy

Conflict Resolution and Preventive Diplomacy involve the early use of discussions and negotiations designed to put moral and political pressure on leaders to prevent the escalation or spread of armed conflict. More intractable than a simple ‘dispute’, a situation of ‘conflict’ possesses fundamental or institutionalized elements of disagreement which allow limited flexibility of the participants. The enterprise of conflict resolution includes various peaceful methods of dealing with such problems, including conflict analysis, enquiry, negotiation, mediation, facilitation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement, with the aim of getting both sides to find a middle-ground and collaborate towards a compromise or consensus decision.

Often opposing sides in a conflict can’t effectively communicate with one another. A mutually respected neutral third-party mediator or facilitator is then required for negotiation to take place; for example representatives from a neighbouring country or the United Nations, or a personality of international standing. Success or failure can depend on the belief systems of the mediator, so ideally several independent mediators should be employed by the process. These would include mediators friendly with each opposing party, for example from the same background or culture, who can then empathise with and accurately represent each side’s point of view and enable effective trust and communication. Facilitation goes further than mediation, analysing the wider social context to help facilitate understanding of broader causes, perspectives, value systems and relationships. Certain cultural values or human needs such as identity and security may not be subject to compromise. Compromise is the settlement of differences and is conditional on concessions from both sides. Preferable to grudging compromise is a consensus position, a mutually accepted win-win situation of constructive synthesis which comes closer to the truth than either of the previous positions. Further information can be found in the UN Secretariat’s 1991 ‘Handbook on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes Between States’. Successful diplomacy relies upon trust, good communication, and belief in a peaceful resolution. The statesperson who believes in these things is known colloquially as a ‘dove’. On the other hand, hard-line leaders and mistrustful strategists who believe in power, strength, deterrence and coercion in foreign relations are known as ‘hawks’. The outcome of hawkish behaviour from both sides is often the self-fulfilling prophecy of war – so peace-loving democratic people tend to vote for doves.

Legal initiatives for peace include the Hague Conventions, Nuremberg Code and Geneva Conventions, other multilateral agreements and conventions on disarmament and demilitarization (Table 1), and attempts to introduce international law such as the International Criminal Courts. Attempts by the United Nations and other international bodies to restrict the conduct of war have had only mixed success, the strengths and weaknesses of which are assessed in the chapter on Human Rights and Responsibilities.

In addition to diplomatic and legal methods across the table, there should also be coordinated practical strategies on the ground. ‘Peace building’ measures and the concept of ‘capacity building’ aim to meet people’s requirements for identity, self-satisfaction and quality of life. They involve the transfer to local people of knowledge, technology, and other economic and political tools and information, to enable self-sufficient development and prevent further expressions of hostility or continued dependency on aid. Peace building and preventive diplomacy are best implemented well before the outbreak of armed conflict. This would avoid not only the tragedy of open conflict, but also the difficulties and dangers of deploying post-conflict peace enforcement or peacekeeping operations, such as those attempted by the United Nations (Tables 2 and 3).
### Table 1: Examples of International Conventions Against Weapons Proliferation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nuclear Weapons:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I and SALT II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties (START I and START II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical and Biological Weapons:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outer Space:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Outer Space Treaty (prohibiting placement of nuclear weapons into orbit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Mines:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ballistic Missiles:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Missile Technology Control Regime (an organisation established by a group of like-minded countries in the absence of any appropriate multilateral convention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>International Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (now called the Hague Code of Conduct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Weapons:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little or nothing despite conventional weapons causing the overwhelming majority of casualties (because of economic ‘benefits’ and the right to national self-defence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Examples of Peace Enforcement Missions
(e.g. UN Charter Ch. VII Enforcement Provisions or UN Security Council Mandate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mission Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Unified Command in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>ONUC operation in the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Gulf War Coalition in response to invasion of Kuwait by Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>UNIKOM on the Iraq/Kuwait border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>UNPROFOR in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>UNITAF task force in Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UNOSOM II intervention in Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>NATO bombing of Serbia (without direct UN mandate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>US invasion of Afghanistan (debatable ‘peace enforcement’ categorisation, but triggered little UN objection due to sympathy with the US after September 11 attacks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Examples of United Nations Peacekeeping Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>UNTSO in Israel and Palestine (first UN peace deployment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>UNMOGIP observer group in Kashmir (India/Pakistan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>UNEF emergency force in the Sinai (Egypt/Israel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>UNGIL observation group in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>UNTEA for West Papuan transition into Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>UNYOM observation mission in Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>UNFICYP in Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>DOMREP observers in the Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>UNIPOM observation mission in India/Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>UNEF II emergency force in Suez Canal and Sinai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>UNDOF disengagement force in Golan Heights (Israel/Syria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>UNIFIL interim force for withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>UNGOMAP for the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>UNIIMOG for the Iran/Iraq war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>UNAVEM in Angola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>UNTAG in Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>ONUCA for Central America (Nicaragua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>MINURSO for referendum in Western Sahara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>ONUSAL observer mission in El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>UNAVEM II to monitor ceasefire and elections in Angola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>UNTAC transitional authority in Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>UNOSOM operation in Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>ONUMOZ in Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UNOMUR observer mission in Uganda/Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UNAMIR assistance mission in Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UNOMIG observer mission in Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>UNMIK interim administration in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>INTERFET in independent East Timor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>UNAMSIL in Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>MONUC in the Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>UNMEE in Ethiopia and Eritrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>UNMIL mission in Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UNOCI in Côte d’Ivoire (Ivory Coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MINUSTAH stabilisation mission in Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ONUB operation in Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UNMIS mission in the Sudan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. **Sun Tzu’s ‘The Art of War’ (4th Century BCE) is the definitive text on the traditional Chinese art of war (bing fa). One of its central principles is that “…to win one hundred victories in one hundred battles is not the acme of skill. To subdue the enemy without fighting is the supreme excellence.” Discuss.**
G3.5. The science of war and peace

International law and diplomacy will gain advantage from a more systematic approach. More systematic doesn’t necessarily mean more institutionalised, rather more scientific in its consideration of systems, processes and ethical principles. Conflict resolution and peacekeeping should be based on proper humanitarian measures of the degree of suffering and the number of lives at risk. What’s required is a sort of collective ‘epidemiology’ of war. This would be based in medical and bioethical principles, and involve scientific analysis of conditions leading to war and peace. For example, policies can be measured using methods from environmental science such as risk assessment, impact assessment, or cost-benefit analysis, but using casualties as the primary unit of measurement rather than dollars. War-prone states can be identified according to regional patterns, population pressure, economic disparity, social heterogeneity, polarity, election and power cycles, popular discontent, leadership style and contagion from neighbouring confrontations. Examples of empirical studies of war and peace can be found in books like Geller & Singer (1998) Nations at War – A Scientific Study of International Conflict or in academic journals like Conflict Management and Peace Science. Care must be taken not to enflame any situations, for example although Samuel Huntington’s (1997) Clash of Civilizations was a useful study of ideological differences as risk factors for inter-civilizational war, it also served to promote the concept of a divided world. Generalizations shouldn’t ignore the positive international effects of multiculturalism, trade, travel and human diversity. The study of war shouldn’t focus too heavily on cultural differences, but rather on fundamental causes such as the relations of power, territory, resources and economics.

Furthermore, looking at industrial warfare from an ecological perspective shows that it has become a lose-lose strategy for all concerned. Both sides of a conflict, regardless of who ‘wins’ the war, tend to suffer devastating environmental damage as well as catastrophic loss of life because of the scale of the industrialised methods employed. Even if a country wages war from the air on the other side of the world, the globalisation of terrorism has made it impossible to prevent reprisal attacks on home soil. Taxpayers fund the war, soldiers die for the war, civilian populations suffer the physical and psychological consequences, ecological and cultural heritage becomes irretrievably damaged, and future generations must live in fear of potential reprisals. It seems that the only winners from war are the multinational corporations which make weapons and bid for lucrative contracts to clean up the mess.

Subsequently, the emphasis of these industries should move towards conflict resolution, peacekeeping and the use of non-lethal force to maintain order on the streets in the protection of civilians and humanitarian workers. This would open up new industries and markets, for example in the development of non-lethal weapons designed to detect and prevent aggression without taking human life. Examples of non-lethal weaponry include rubber bullets, stun grenades, tear gas, catch-nets, sticky foam, calming & sleep agents, infrasound, high power microwaves, metal embrittlement agents, anti-traction lubricants and polymer adhesive glue. Peacekeeper casualties can be minimised with body armour and unmanned aerial spy vehicles. In the age of peacekeeping we will not succumb to the notion that war is about killing, and power will be able to be exerted without losing the ethic of saving life.

Q5. Discuss the concept of an ‘epidemiology of war’, or the process of measuring the impacts of war on human life.
**G3.6. An age of asymmetrical warfare**

The face of war is changing. We seem to be fast entering an age of ‘asymmetrical warfare’ requiring a so-called ‘revolution in military affairs’. This means that conflicts between nation states are reducing in number (modern democratic countries with good trade relations almost never wage war with one another), but are being replaced by the actions of small groups, such as opportunistic terrorist networks not aligned to any particular nation. Loose terrorist organisations such as Al-Qaeda are like the tentacles of an octopus – slippery to sever using conventional military means. This implies that traditional military hardware and concepts of deterrence are no longer applicable. Massive expenditures on large-scale industrial warfare no longer provide disincentives to attack. This waste of resources can best be exemplified by the Strategic Defense Initiatives (or ‘Star Wars’ anti-missile shields). These projects, which have broken defense spending records, measured in hundreds of billions of $US over decades, if anything are just likely to enflame new arms races (like the development of multiple nuclear ‘bomblets’), and are anyway totally ineffective in an era where weapons of mass destruction can be delivered in a suitcase completely under the radar screen.

The use of passenger planes as missiles on 11 September 2001 was horrendous and horrifying enough, but the anthrax attacks which soon followed almost had a more fearful element about them despite the very small number of victims in that case. They signify entry into a possible future world of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction used in warfare against civilian populations – innocent people held accountable for the misinformed policies of their leadership. The so-called ‘War on Terror’ is a tautological concept which may simply create an inflammation of terror if not undertaken with careful sensitivity and generosity to other cultures. The most useful definition of terrorism is ‘violence threatened or employed towards civilian targets for political purposes’. This definition thus does not include non-violent protest, strikes, civil disobedience and freedom fighting which targets only military forces. Unfortunately, this is not the definition typically used by the politicians and media of more wealthy countries. This seems to be because of difficulties in coming to terms with the hypocritical paradox of state-sponsored terror inherent to the functioning of ‘normal’ military establishments. But the definition is useful because it includes all threats of violence towards civilians (e.g. nuclear deterrence), not just threats posed by small groups of individuals or less well equipped fanatics without access to military high-technology. If the definition of terrorism were to include state terror, it would become a useful disincentive to state-sponsored military actions which ultimately provide the fuel (the direct motivation as well as indirectly some of the weapons used) for insane acts of ideological desperation.

Terrorism thrives on the fear of death, but although the frequency and severity of attacks seems likely to increase, terrorism is still only a minor risk factor compared to other causes of death. Not only would ‘War on Poverty’ save tremendously more lives per day with much less expenditure, it may even prove more effective at reducing terrorism than the ‘War on Terror’ itself! Reforming those global economic systems which allow such massive inequality and restlessness would reduce the desperation and grievances against Western economic imperialism which lead to hostility and terrorism. It is known that nations left behind by modern progress can turn into what are sometimes called ‘failed states’, ‘rogue states’, and ‘breeding grounds for terrorism’. Yet much more money is allocated towards military hardware purchased from corporations, than towards foreign aid for deprived people. Perhaps it would also be rather helpful if wealthy nations stopped making and selling everybody vast amounts of weapons, motivated by profit margins.
Wisdom comes from the stories of those who know the true face of war, be they civilian victims or returned soldiers. They know suffering and pain, and may find it hard to relate to ordinary society because of paradoxical ethical contrasts and post-traumatic stress disorders. They know that unleashing the “dogs of war” means unleashing ethical chaos on people. Many innocents suffer horribly or die (taking their first-hand wisdom of war with them), and new ranks of humans and their leaders (ignorant of the truth of war) always seem ready to fight again. War unlocks the darkest reaches of the disturbed mind (e.g. hate, anger, fear, numbness, sadness, madness). Those who survive in a war-zone can still function in these mental states. Mercenaries who thrive in a war-zone are the ones with a minimum of empathy. Those who lack empathy are known in psychology as sociopaths or psychopaths. It cannot be good to glorify such situations or encourage institutionalised training towards such ends.

Empathy should be taught and encouraged, rather than the emotional desensitisation of military practice and training where repeated exposure to violence decreases normal responses of shock and disgust. Violence is also made abstract by video-game training, and modern virtual reality technologies for easy killing at a distance by remote control remove any immediate awareness of tragic consequences. The psychology of violence is also promoted by common forms of media and entertainment. Conflict is considered the essential ingredient of drama, and violence is even central to comedy and cartoons. Nevertheless, a film can still incorporate successful drama whilst promoting ethical values if it illustrates the context and consequences of the violence it contains. News media would also be more informative if it provided better depth and balance towards solutions-based positivity instead of just parroting the loaded words of politicians (Table 8). Propaganda models have been proposed which imply that mass-media are involved in self-initiated censorship and omission of relevant facts, for the purposes of maintaining symbiotic partnership with government and big business. The language of our media is an important precedent for our actions as a culture. If sympathy is the ability to feel sorry for another person, then empathy is the further step of being able to imagine, perceive or identify with the emotions and experience of another. Sympathy and empathy are important pointers towards a culture of compassion.

### Table 8: Military Euphemisms

*(euphemism is language employed to be suggestive of a particular connotation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defense Industries</th>
<th>Development, manufacture and trade of offensive weapons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collateral Damage</td>
<td>Confounding term used to cover innocent civilian deaths and injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Intelligence</td>
<td>Covert information used in military and security strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrence</td>
<td>Use of the threat of violence to achieve strategic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Weapon</td>
<td>Common guns/missiles (causing more deaths overall than WMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War on Terror</td>
<td>Using terrorism to justify continued policies/industries of state terror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive War</td>
<td>Initiation of actual war due to suspicions of potential war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-emptive Strike</td>
<td>Early offensive or surprise attack before a threat has materialised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Enforcement</td>
<td>Intervention into an existing conflict (e.g. ‘authorised’ bombing raids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Arms</td>
<td>Machine-guns, hand-guns, etc. (statistically biggest-killing category)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Missiles</td>
<td>Bombs with autonomy, self-navigation, artificial intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly Fire</td>
<td>Shooting &amp; bombing mistakes killing personnel of same alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist</td>
<td>Sometimes used to disparage political activists or freedom fighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Fighter</td>
<td>Sometimes used as justification for acts of terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Bombing</td>
<td>‘Homicide bombing’ has better emphasis on consequences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G3.8. ☭ Future scenario #1: technological wars

It’s euphemistic that we call the military-industrial sector the ‘Defense’ Industry. Most of the products invented, manufactured and distributed by the defense industry are really for offence. Ballistic projectiles fired from a gun can do nothing but attack. It’s darkly ironic as well, because looking forwards in time it seems possible (and increasingly probable the further forward you look) that ‘defense’ technology will reach a threshold beyond which it risks driving to extinction its own creators whom it’s designed to defend. An article which stirred up much debate, ‘Why the Future Doesn’t Need Us’ (2000) by Bill Joy, founder of Sun Microsystems, warned that future developments and combinations in the fields of Genetics, Nanotechnology and Robotics (GNR technologies), along with easy internet access to such information by uncontrollable small groups, could place the continued existence of humans in jeopardy.

It’s not folly to say that some crazy and terrible things are currently being developed by scientists in secret government and military facilities around the world. There exist corporate and defense scientists, working on projects unseen by the general public, which remain unchecked by international regulation or ethical debate. Academic scientists believe in transparency, and open access to new discoveries for the benefit of humanity.

The rate of scientific and technological change is accelerating towards the unknown faster than ever before in history (for example computing power, information in journals, environmental risk etc). Many technologies and scientific disciplines of the world seem to be fast-moving towards what is known as technological ‘convergence’, or the progressive combination of new technologies into unpredictable new forms. In particular, biology and biological principles are being incorporated into technology (biomimetics refers to innovations in engineering from the mimic of natural designs). The many current examples include genetic engineering, nanotechnology (e.g. molecular electronics), artificial intelligence and artificial life (e.g. artificial neural networks, evolutionary algorithms), robotics (e.g. autonomous weapons, virtual warfare), computing (quantum and DNA computers), cybernetic systems (e.g. microchip implants), micro-electro-mechanical devices (MEMs, sensor networks) and biochemical weapons etc. The aim of much of this ‘bottom-up’ approach to engineering is to endow technologies with biological characteristics such as replication, heredity, learning, adaptation and self-organisation. The potential benefits, which may be magnificent, are rivalled in scale only by the potential dangers, which may be proportionately immense if weaponized into military technology. Typical responses to such warnings are disbelief and denial, but a cursory scan of scientific journals, or even just the news media as things progress, indicates definite grounds for great ethical concern.

For example, scepticism about the successful development of autonomous robots, artificial intelligence and artificial life has largely been based on the slow progress of previous attempts at the ‘top-down’ approach (trying to add together characteristics like problem-solving or pattern recognition, rather than allowing technology to create itself using evolutionary principles). Such doubts may become irrelevant as soon as key developments in molecular electronics and quantum computing progress to a certain point, creating new orders of magnitude in parallel processing power available for bottom-up self-evolution. Quantum computing has fundamentally different properties to ordinary digital bits and bytes, with quantum bits (or ‘qubits’) able to exponentially increase their processing power when in combination. Technological evolution is heuristically directed rather than selection among random mutations in biological evolution. This means that it’s incredibly fast and generally difficult to control, typically changing into complex systems with emergent properties beyond the expectations of their creators.
It may seem rather fantastic, but the existence of invisible, replicating, evolving artificial life-forms (molecular computers) with ‘swarm intelligence’ (wirelessly-networked communication) may not be confined to the realms of science fiction in the relatively near future. Basic structural components have already been discovered for molecular electronics (the creation of nanotechnology computers, with ‘nano’ meaning one billionth – the scale of atoms and molecules). They are made from organic chemistry (the same chemistry as life) with different mechanical and electrical properties, and include a structural base (e.g. nano-molecular layers, buckminsterfullerene), wires (e.g. carbon nanotubes, which are conductors of electricity when arranged in a line and semi-conductors when arranged in a helix), and other microscopic electrochemical analogues of circuits, gears, logic gates, diodes, resistors, switches and transistors. These trickier components can be extracted from mechanisms and structures already existing in other complex carbon-based ‘machines’ such as viruses (like the T4 bacteriophage pictured). The molecular arrangements of life and the DNA storage of information imply that the physics and chemistry can be made to work if only we could more efficiently manipulate the components. Current technical difficulties in the manipulation of atoms for construction at this scale, and the development of molecular assemblers (mechanisms for self-assembly and replication, with the potential associated risk of uncontrollable chain reactions), are currently being investigated with huge amounts of financial backing. The prophetic vision of Richard Feynman “There’s Plenty of Room at the Bottom” (1960) have become a major driving force behind the current generation of research into molecular systems. Eric Drexler, the technologist and philosopher who defined in detail the term nanotechnology in “Engines of Creation” (1986), has seen his original definitions diluted, perhaps due to his initial emphasis on warnings of potential ethical consequences from self-replicating molecular assemblers. Ethical concerns are derided and pushed into the background by massive economic incentives. In a frightening ethical twist, Drexler argued that development of “engines of destruction” is virtually impossible to prevent considering the current global context of independent groups and nation states with access to funding and information. While accepting the good intentions of people who want to prevent such developments altogether, he argues that rather a benign or benevolent nation must develop the technology first to investigate the appropriate global nanotechnology defences (“active shields”) before the risk of misuse or accident becomes too great. The scale of potential consequences of nanotechnology seems too great to ignore, even if the probability of such things seems quite unlikely.

So although the physical scale of future weapons of mass destruction may be microscopic, the scale of their potential impacts will possibly be greater than that posed by nuclear weapons. During the Cold War (1945-1990), the centrepiece of nuclear ‘game theory’ (war strategy) was known as MAD – the appropriately-named acronym for ‘Mutually Assured Destruction’. It’s quite possible that MAD may become ensured rather than deterred, due to unexpected anomalies in the game theory relating to the particular details of such future WMD. Nuclear weapons (e.g. atomic, hydrogen, neutron & gamma bombs, and ‘dirty nukes’), chemical weapons (e.g. mustard gas, VX nerve agent, sarin), biological weapons (e.g. anthrax, smallpox, botulinum toxin), cyber-warfare, autonomous weapons, robotic warfare and space weapons may be less devastating than the genetically engineered or nanotechnology weapons which may be beyond the horizon. A new paradigm and era of peace and friendship among peoples and nations is clearly needed, and soon. Otherwise, large portions of the Earth may be rendered similar to other planets of our solar system, and become inhabitable only by robotic technology.
G3.9. Future scenario #2: a path to peace

To borrow the rallying call of the increasingly well recognised annual World Social Forum, “Another World Is Possible”. What would be the distinguishing characteristics of another possible world? Our world is made up of a network of interlinked systems and subsystems, some of which are cooperatively beneficial to the whole system, and others which are not, but remain competitively successful because they tend to benefit themselves. We have seen that some beneficial systems (e.g. international law) are lacking in certain important characteristics (e.g. effective global policing and enforcement mechanisms), and that some harmful systems (e.g. runaway military industries) are driven by powerful motivating forces (e.g. economic incentives). Can you envisage from this another alternative to the status quo which would lead us away from continued cycles of war and terrorism, and away from potential global catastrophe?

It seems a difficult question to answer, especially if we accept that violence cannot be used even in the cause of peace (because it undermines a just cause and perpetuates further violence). Unfortunately, the ‘just say no’ campaign against military industries has very little chance of success against entrenched and powerful institutions of war and the necessity for national security. But as with other kinds of harmful addictions, the principle of harm minimisation (based on the assumption that wars are an inevitable consequence of a multi-state international system) using ‘soft power’, can help the industries of war to transform themselves step-by-step towards more beneficial roles in international affairs – namely peacekeeping, humanitarian response, and culturally-sensitive enforcement of international law and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

‘Soft power’ is the use of persuasion and co-option rather than coercion, diplomacy rather than force, and compromise rather than intolerance. The persuasive influence and legitimacy of soft power comes from promoting a higher moral ground with compelling value systems. Effective use of soft power tends to increase the influence of a country beyond its political or military capacity (e.g. the Netherlands and Scandinavian countries). ‘Hard power’ on the other hand is the use of force or coercion, for example military action, threat, deterrence and economic might, and is associated with ‘hard technology’. Hard power has the unintended result of promoting resentment which only leads to hatred and vengeance.

Thomas Kuhn in his Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962) showed that the progress of science is not gradual, but is based on a series of punctuated changes in knowledge (paradigm shifts), which alter the very model and language of the previous belief system. A paradigm is a theoretical framework which supports scientific beliefs and cultural behaviours. Fundamental changes in an established viewpoint do not come easily, with initial attempts at ridicule likely to come from the collective weight of tradition, inertia and professional careers invested in maintenance of the current paradigm. Institutional resistance will persist until the models and language of the previous belief system (security through the national operation of hard power) is updated to the alternative paradigm (security through international co-operation towards peace).

Q6. What non-violent ‘soft power’ techniques can be employed towards the emerging paradigm shift to a more peaceful world?
Moral or ethical influence alone will not remove the strong incentives which support and drive the actions of military industries, terrorism and the arms trade. Warfare and the military-industrial sector are perpetuated, among other things, by market forces. However, sustainable as well as destructive industries can obviously both generate jobs and income. Economic incentives for defence industries can still be maintained if military forces were to transfer their “business” focus, step-by-step over time, from existing skills and behaviours through the following phases:

**Step Zero – War Fighting:** The current paradigm has excessive tolerance to war, and acceptance of the arms trade, at the national level. These are increasingly seen as intolerable and unacceptable at the global and local levels.

**Step One – Peace Enforcement:** The UN category of peace enforcement still makes use of current military hardware and training, under enforcement provisions in Chapter VIII of the UN Charter or by mandate of the UN Security Council. The differences lie in the justification for their use, and careful discrimination to avoid unnecessary collateral damage. This is a policy of pre-emptive peace rather than pre-emptive war. National military actions already use ethical concepts of freedom and justice in an attempt to justify their actions, but many people believe this is often just empty rhetoric. Strengthening the role of international war lawyers (sometimes known as ‘Judge Advocate Generals’) would put more substance behind these claims. Professional standards of practice set criteria against which objectives and activities can be measured. The justification and conduct of war can be informed by internationally-monitored measurement scales, for example by indexes and indicators from concepts of Just War theory adapted to more culturally universal values. It’s still patriotic to support your country’s military operations undertaken towards global values rather than just for national interests.

**Step Two – Peacekeeping:** National military industries and the focus of training can then transfer towards the principles of peacekeeping. Peacekeepers try to establish security and adherence to negotiated agreements, ceasefires and military withdrawals in situations of recent conflict. People who like to see action can still be involved in military operations without the resort to desensitisation and dehumanisation. Pride and self-justification are perhaps at their greatest for soldiers wearing peacekeeper ‘blue helmets’. Peacekeepers are generally limited to self-defence and a non-coercive mandate. Other professions have corporate vision statements and ethical codes of conduct (e.g. the Hippocratic Oath in medicine is an ethic of beneficence and non-maleficence, or in older terminology ‘thou shalt not cause harm’), so why not also for military industries? Non-lethal weapons, protective equipment, virtual and cyber-weapons will be increasingly developed and deployed to minimize the potential harm caused by peacekeepers in proper balance with the benefits of their humanitarian operations. Even non-lethal force is inappropriate for peace-observer missions.

**Q7.** _What are the ethical issues related to non-lethal weapons? In extreme circumstances is it always better to maim (e.g. the horrible example of blinding lasers) than it is to kill (e.g. aerial bombing)? How does this relate to the concept of capital punishment?_
Step Three – Peace Building: As conflicts are reduced in number and intensity during the era of peacekeeping, the defence industry can move towards the age of peace-building. Peace building ensures that people’s cultural and psychological needs for a satisfactory life are met, as a preventative measure or prophylactic to war. There must thus be appropriate and culturally sensitive provision of a dispute resolution service well before armed conflict becomes imminent. Efforts will be directed towards prevention rather than cure, for example promotion of international economic systems which alleviate poverty, and political systems which deny the means for dictatorial oppression. Countries won’t need to waste their scarce resources on armaments once protective global systems are put into place (e.g. Costa Rica has already been brave enough to give up its military forces to boost social expenditures). Re-allocation of technologies from defence to other applications can be economically successful, for example the transfer of Japanese military know-how towards commercial electronic, mechanical and optical products after 1945 (the tragic lessons of Hiroshima and Nagasaki resulted in Japan’s ‘Self-Defence Force’ becoming a good model of constitutional non-aggression). Demilitarisation also includes keeping a watchful eye on dangerous technological developments with use of the precautionary principle and an ethical duty of care.

Step Four – Humanitarian Relief Operations: Generous activities (e.g. the international response to the December 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami) promote thanks and respect for the risks and efforts undertaken by good-hearted people. Generous economic expenditures save lives and inspire admiration for wealthier countries rather than resentment. Expressions of power on the other hand, like military bases in other people’s countries, are the cause of terror. Change the uniforms (and the values!) into those which are welcomed more warmly by the people. Compassionate value systems undermine attempts to justify terrorism. People want their countries to be loved for their tolerance, empathy and economic generosity. Institutions like the International Red Cross and Médicins Sans Frontières (‘Doctors Without Borders’) are great examples of self-sacrifice and love for humanity. National armies can only dream of such admiration until they follow their example and start to utilise their overwhelming resources with practical humanity and ethical vision.

It’s becoming more difficult to justify brute military force in the face of an increasingly well-informed world public. Ordinary people are generally quite compassionate, but seem to believe that they’re relatively powerless to do something about ethical issues. But with increasing knowledge and awareness, moderate wealth, the spread of democratic values, and new technologies such as the internet, we’ve never had so much individual power to effect change. It should be possible to reach a collective critical mass which will accelerate the paradigm shift already underway. We can overthrow the dominant paradigm and strongly establish an alternative world-view. We can change destructive self-fulfilling prophesies, subconsciously created by the selective perception of mainstream media and military institutions, to replace them with positive feedback loops which allow widespread expectations of a peaceful and sustainable world. The stakes are high, but the power of collective human activity is immense, and it would certainly be worth it for our species to survive and see the twenty-second century.
Write down your own personal follow-up and commitments here so you do not forget!