Proposal for an

EU Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation

Turning 50, the EU can reinvent itself as a force for peace

By Francesco Marelli

Thesis submitted by Francesco Marelli (marelli.francesco@gmail.com) to the

European University Center for Peace Studies **(EPU)**
Stadtschlaining, Austria

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for an MA Degree in Peace and Conflict Studies

- Our time is merely a race between extinction and education -

H. G. Wells, English writer, 1866-1946

Table of Contents

Abstract

A historical chance awaits the European Union (EU), the project of European integration which has turned 50 recently. Warfare, in all its forms and shapes, is growing more and more unpopular worldwide. Additionally, the United States, especially under the George W. Bush Jr. administration, has severely undermined the likeliness that states worldwide will ever accept a unipolar global leadership system again. Increasingly growing numbers of countries are experimenting with alternative ways of governance and economy to escape from the negative externalities of, for example, current economic realities, such as strong pollution and severe poverty at the bottom.

The missing pillar for the promotion of the ability to deal creatively and non-violently with conflict in the EU is a Commissariat promoting Peace and Conflict Transformation. This Commissariat is the indicated agent to spread therapies and, by virtue of this, it could make the EU the true peacemaker it claims to be. Currently, it is often described as a project for peace, but not only is it unclear what the EU means by peace, it also does not act according to any rich definition of peace. Both the *European Security Strategy* and *Treaty Establishing a Treaty for Europe* are two quintessential EU documents showing the course the Union will be pursuing and, despite the latter not having been implemented yet, sadly, upon close examination both are full of contradictions, lack of insight, and absence of a visionary and exciting projection for the future. Both documents, guiding the life of some 500 million of the world's materially richest people and therefore vital on the platform of international relations, transpire a worldview that is dominated by millennia-old defense and military-dominated security thinking.

Little points in the direction that the EU will pledge to reduce direct violence, nor does it show much understanding of the nature of, contribution to, and possibility of reducing structural, cultural and environmental violence in the EU and outside its borders. For these reasons, this new Commissariat could propose alternatives and thereby legitimize a position that stands for nonviolence, empathy and cooperation. Additionally, it can spurn constructive, creative and concrete solutions to engage in the challenges the EU and the world face.

Terms Used

Negative Peace
A state of absence of violent conflict. However, the situation is fragile and might relapse into violence because the root causes that escalate the conflict (towards violence) have not been properly addressed and/ or because not all interested parties have been invited to genuine participation in order to discuss and solve the conflict.

Positive Peace
A state of peace where there is not merely silence of weapons, but where justice is practiced throughout the given society and potentials of individuals and society are achieved. Basic needs of the population are met; there is development, security, freedom of thought and expression; people are able to shape their lives freely; reliable and trusted institutions are in place; there is a general sense of equality and respect, in sentiment and in practice; mutual understanding of rights, interests and duties.

Direct Violence
This is used to indicate when, for example, one actor harms another by, for example, shooting or beating. It may also be violence of a psychological nature, and possibly in addition to physical. It can be connected with violence in thoughts, words and/ or deeds. Other examples of direct violence are warfare and beating of children or spouses. Although these forms of violence are the most widely recognized and attracting most media attention, they form merely the tip of the iceberg.

Structural Violence
Here the actor is a whole system and all the people involved in it. The system operates in such a way that it creates a gap between the possible realization of social potentials and the actual realization. This system is composed of embedded social and political mechanisms as well as hierarchies that impose conditions which place people at high risk of negative consequences such as unemployment, malnutrition, mental illness, suicide, crime, disease, and ill health. An example to connect structural violence to direct violence: it is direct violence when a man hits his wife. However, if many or all men hit and oppress women in a given community or society, it is also a systematic phenomenon built into the system, in this case the patriarchal system, hereby making it also structural, as well as cultural violence.

Cultural Violence
The explicit or implicit conviction that one's own culture or civilization is superior to others and is better. People in different cultures should, for their own sake, accept our standards or even see them being forced upon them. Other examples of cultural violence are sexism and racism. Most importantly, it is culture that is mostly, whether tacitly or not, supports environmental, structural and direct violence.

Environmental Violence
The explicit or implicit view that creation around us is exclusively there to satisfy our material needs and that nature has no or little value in itself. Examples are the conversion of nature's worth into goods, extermination of species and pollution.

DIAGNOSIS

<u>Introduction: Diagnosis, Prognosis, Therapy</u>

Why a Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation?
A Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation for the European Union (EU) is vital in order to move the EU and, hopefully, the world towards a high degree of peace in all its forms: direct*, structural*, cultural* and environmental*, as it can formulate a recipe to uplift the EU, in combination and consultation with non-EU actors, humanity from its apparent self-destructive nature, and the time to act is now.

In essence, it would enable all EU inhabitants with tools for their private, economic and political life to counter the logic of violence occurring in most circumstances. For now, peace is often spurned and derided upon, which means that when tried as means of solving a conflict, and it does not work, people tend to relapse into violence. If many, on the other hand, would manage to establish durable and widespread cultures of peace, when getting frustrated with a conflict and apply violence to meet certain needs, people will realize to have stepped outside of their "nature", and will relapse into peaceful and constructive means.

Additionally, on the macro-level, the EU "should develop a fundamentally new defence and peace-promoting security doctrine which is adapted to the non-threatening new Europe and eliminates any possibility of others viewing the EU as aggressive or purely determined to look after its own interests around the world."[1]

What is peace?
    In a world ridden which seems ridden with violence, and its most visible exponent being direct violence in the form of warfare and terrorism, what cure is the EU offering to heal it? It claims to export its peacefulness to the rest of the world, as will be shown in the coming analysis of two of the most important EU documents. In the words of Gandhi, it sees itself as "the change you want to see in the world". Nonetheless, other than going to war less than the US does, tacitly supporting most of its foreign policy and half-heartedly trying to put more emphasis on diplomacy to resolve conflicts, one cannot but still regard the self attributed emblem of soft power as a hollow statement. The EU does certainly not walk its talk. What does it need to do then? More importantly, what is the broad definition of peace it adopts and is it the same it should adopt for the sake of a better world?

    The 2003 report entitled *Reflecting on Peace Practice Project*, involving over two hundred (inter)national and local peace agencies worldwide, tried to pool the experience of these organizations together to reflect on, assess, and learn more about the practice of peace.[2] Their main definition of peace highlights two quintessential matters, also known as negative peace* and positive peace* respectively

> *"Stopping Violence and Destructive Conflict.* When agencies work to end war, their programs are aimed at ending cycles of violence which become a cause for continued war, getting warring sides to negotiate and fighters to disarm, mobilizing the public against continued war, etc.
> *Building Just and Sustainable Peace.* When agencies focus on supporting social change, their programs are focused on addressing political, economic, and social grievances that may be driving conflict.

---

[1] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 38
[2] Anderson & Olson, 2003, p. 5

Such changes are seen as foundations for sustainable peace."[3]

The report adds that, "Amazingly, there is broad agreement that these are the two big goals of peace work."[4] It seems then that the concept of peace, when elaborated upon by its professionals is, in its basic assumptions, roughly similar worldwide. This is a hopeful basis for constructing peace on a global scale. What does peace really look like on a practical level? I would like to add one additional definition of peace which is more specific and which, more than the previous one, serves as the fundament of this thesis. It was coined by Jan Øberg in February 2007. This definition, based on the idea of positive peace and his 35 years of experience as both researcher and peace worker, states that

> "No human person can mature and develop as human being without experiencing conflict, for instance inner moral dilemmas and quarrels with parents, siblings and friends. … The only realistic way to handle conflicts is to accept and embrace them, become clever at handling them – in short, stop conflict avoidance and reduce conflict illiteracy, i.e. intensify across the board education and professionalization when it comes to learning how to "quarrel well." This means that, grosso modo, peace can be learnt and has extremely little to do with good versus evil human beings as some will have us believe …. Peace is compatible with conflict but not with violence. Thus we need a global, multicultural and multi-dimensional approach to violence prevention, not conflict prevention. This is best achieved by education and dialogue and deep respect for the idea of unity in diversity – many peaces weaved together like a patchwork - in contrast to the violence-prone idea of one peace imposed in uniformity."[5]

Keeping these definitions of peace in mind, it is important to note that the remainder of the Introduction, as well as the subsequent chapters, will be structured according to an analysis technique from medicine. It was first brought to Peace and Conflict Studies by one of its main thinkers, Johan Galtung, and consists of examining a certain issue according to the exact same criteria as Western medical science does, namely by applying its three cornerstones of diagnosis, prognosis and therapy. Diagnosis means trying to understand what the exact problem is one is dealing with. Prognosis is aimed at predicting what effect the problem will have if no attempt is made at solving it. Lastly, therapy is meant to provide a solution or set of solutions to address the problem. Despite this subdivision, some chapters will contain a certain overlap in these elements.

Despite this method, grounded in a few hundred years of experience in many First World countries, doctors still occasionally fail in curing this or that patient. Peacemaking, as can be seen in the world today, is often still failing. However, considering the growing rate of success stories and the fact that Peace Studies has been around for only some 50 years, it deserves at least the same amount of praise, criticism, encouragement and innovation that keep Western medicine going.

The current situation
When examining the situation on the ground we have seen, since the 20th century, despite the rosy words on peace just mentioned, the unfolding of novel methods of the strategic exercise of violence such as terrorism with suicide bombers, non-state actors using war-like tactics and attacks on civilians. At its beginning, the 21st century confirms a persistence of this phenomenon and an enormous and ever growing gap between rich and poor as, in the year 2000, only 1% of the world's adults owned 40% of the global assets.[6] Also, despite all pledges by states such as those enshrined in the Millennium Development Goals, undernourishment still affects some 852 million people a year.[7] The UN with its Millennium Development Goals (MDG), the Food and Agricultural

---

[3] Idem, p. 12
[4] Idem, p. 5* = *see List of Terms Used for a definition of the highlighted terms*
[5] Øberg, *What is Peace?*, 2007
[6] *The World Distribution of Household Wealth,* 2006, p. 1
[7] *The State of Food Security around the World 2004*, 2004, p. 8

Organization (FAO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the World Health Organization (WHO), just to mention some, mostly have the knowledge to resolve the problems they have been designed to combat, but solutions are impeded by a lack of cooperation from individual states as well as the global community at large.[8] The structural violence they are designed to tackle is, so far, not really improving. Are there other reasons to help explain the foundering of initiatives to tackle the big issues facing our planet?

The UN was set up after WWII to serve as a platform to tackle global issues in concordance and cooperation with the vast majority of the world's states. If the UN is not working that well, maybe its guiding principles and ideas are out of touch with reality. Perhaps, some or most of its members are not sincerely interested in dealing with worldly issues, but want to preserve a certain status quo. One can think of the current US administration in connection to this last argument, which blatantly breaks promises to its own citizens as well as UN rules and international conventions for the benefit of its own political agenda. This is not a breathtaking statement to make, as most of history has known one or more superpowers in various eras imposing their will upon others. However, this is not to say that citizens worldwide and within the US itself should continue to accept this fact, for it is hard to argue that such a world order can bring genuine and lasting peace for all states, including the US itself. What will happen if the world continues this way?

Near future forecast
An increasing number of scholars agrees that the US Empire will collapse in the near future and, some argue, together with the US republic itself. In other words, its policies, and especially on the global arena, such as its massive and omnipresent military apparatus and its strict capitalist economic policies (protected by aggressive military intervention), will sooner or later have to change if the US wants to preserve its republic from sinking alongside the Empire.[9] Britain took the gamble some sixty years ago and, by letting go of its empire, managed to preserve itself as a state.

It seems than that the EU will, by the time of the vanishing US Empire, likely alongside China and India, take over the reins of the global community. Whilst it might seem frightening to have China and India in leadership positions in the eyes of the average European, and maybe US citizens alike, there are some strong reasons to urge for calm. First and foremost, there is the Panchsheel of "Chindia", as both countries are affectionately called together. This is an accord which consists of Five Pillars for maintaining peace between these world's largest countries and contains five clauses, namely mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence, as signed in 1954 by Jawaharlal Nehru and Zhou Enlai.[10] On top of this, in a survey conducted among 100 Chinese elite in 2005, except for a strong divide on whether or not China should try to contain India's ambitions, the general picture that emerged from their worldview was positive: both countries are strongly dissatisfied by the current unipolar world model, but 65% of Chinese elite oppose a Sino-Indian anti-US coalition and 54% believe it is better for China to form a multilateral alliance with only 18% desiring the said Sino-Indian anti-US coalition; 40% believes that avoiding confrontation with India on regional conflicts is possible; 50% does not currently perceive India having colonial ambitions; 90% of the Chinese sample considers American attitude in dealing with world affairs arrogant and aggressive.[11] As was to be expected from the profound Chinese culture, the concept of balance forms the key. Additionally, China

"is attempting to reduce geopolitical tensions with as many nations as possible, so that it can

---

[8] Friesen, 2006, p.30
[9] Boyle, 2002; Rockwell, Galtung, 2004; Fisk, Korten, Nader, Baroud, Baker, Fuller, Chomsky, 2006; Whitney, Johnson, 2007
[10] Shuqing, 2004
[11] *Chindia: the 21st century challenge,* p. 38-42, 56

devote all its resources and energies to the problems of modernization and reform, diversify its economic relationships, and preserve its strategic independence."[12]

It then seems that "for both Beijing and New Delhi, the priority is a safe and fast development and towards this end a stable, supportive and peaceful environment is a crucial requirement."[13]

The Five Pillars, above analysis and both countries' far less aggressive expansionist behavior throughout history than the former colonialist powers in the EU make Chindia a potentially magnificent fountain of stability in the world, possibly better than the EU. It can then be said that the EU has nothing to fear from the two Asian giants, were it not that it is itself producing disturbing contradictory signs, which will compromise it and annoy Chindia in the longer run. These contradictions need to be addressed and form the heart of this thesis.

Without doubt, the European Union is the farthest integrated regional organization in the world today. In what will be a landmark achievement, it will most probably adopt some form of Treaty, Constitution, or Charter within the next two years. Importantly, as we seem to be moving toward a world of regions, other regional organizations are carefully observing the EU "experiment" and it is therefore vital that it evolves well. However, when reading the current draft version of the *Treaty Establishing a Constitution for the EU* (29 October 2004) one cannot help frowning. On a hot topic such as international terrorism, mentioned in the document as the primary threat to the EU, one looks in vain for any consideration of the possibility that poverty, alienation or a feeling of powerlessness could be reasons behind terror directed at Western targets.[14] Is not the question "why" equally or more important as "who"? Does punishing perpetrators really remove a structure of inequality and oppression, whether visible or not so? Also, according to the same text, the Union's primary objective is "to promote peace, its values and the well-being of its peoples."[15] Despite these beautiful words, Øberg, in his study on whether the EU truly promotes peace, asserts that

> "The [Øberg's] study also shows that the EU as a peace project is not nearly so intellectually consistent or visionary as the UN Charter. It may actually be said that the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe can be seen as a serious step backwards in relation to the standards and values of the UN Charter … It is not possible to find concrete targets for a general reduction of violence in Europe, or the world, nor for measured, principled and professional conflict management with the emphasis on civilian methods or general disarmament."[16]

Sadly, above statement's apparent sad and hard tone is justified. Most of the Treaty indeed contains short-sighted, traditional and simplistic analysis, resulting in a projected world-view which is equally short-sighted, traditional and simplistic.[17] This will become clear from the examples provided throughout this thesis. Also, if adopted, the current text of the Treaty will not steer EU efforts in the coming decades towards increasing peace internally or worldwide, it will merely exasperate a situation that is already barely within control.

In addition to the above, it increasingly seems as if the EU is running out of steam, leaving EU citizens with quite some confusion and disenchantment. Above all, there is no concrete and/ or widely supported common project, no deep driving force. The EU just goes ahead engulfing new states, broadening intra-state cooperation and taking other seemingly mechanical decisions. As

---

[12] Harding, 1994, p. 388
[13] *Chindia: the 21ˢᵗ century challenge,* p. 53
[14] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 17-20
[15] *Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe*, 2004, p. 17
[16] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 3-4
[17] Idem, p. 4

Joschka Fischer, former German Foreign Minister, stated "This process of European integration ... is now being called into question by many people; it is viewed as a bureaucratic affair run by a faceless, soulless Eurocracy in Brussels - at best boring, at worst dangerous."[18] Luxembourg Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker once reflected it as follows "We decide on something, leave it lying around, and wait and see what happens. If no one kicks up a fuss, because most people don't know what has been decided, we continue step by step until there is no turning back."[19] This is not pretty, nor democratic, nor desirable. It is time to give the EU a more human face, and this can be done through this new Commissariat.

What could be changed?
Fortunately, the global situation for embarking upon a therapy is optimal. In January 2001, no EU Member State felt threatened by the others, nor did it see a military threat from anybody else.[20] After 9/11 this still holds truth, as confirmed by the *European Security Strategy* which states that "Large-scale aggression against any Member State is now improbable."[21] Combining this with the growing unpopularity of war worldwide, exacerbated by the wave of US-led interventionism since 9/11, the EU can offer a hard alternative by being a true "soft" force.

Taking up the idea of a sincere and dedicated force for good, what vehicle can form the cure the EU can use to heal itself and this 'infected' world? Which needle with which substance to use? The needle is the one labeled "Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation", and the liquid it injects is a mix of creative, constructive and concrete solutions to achieve more positive peace. To use Confucius' famous quote "Don't curse the darkness, light a candle" this Commissariat, by advising on a vast array of issues, will not form merely a platform to "curse the darkness", but, more importantly, it will "light a candle". It will answer questions such as: What can be done in exchange for the money allocated to the war system? How to provide education teaching dialogue, nonviolence and respect for diversity? What is the best way to mediate professionally in conflicts between international actors? Where do root causes of domestic abuse, police brutality and tension between immigrants and host nations lie? The EU can hereby illustrate that it can be done at fraction of the EU's current military spending and that this will cause even less need for military spending, because wars arise partly as a result of ignorance of each other, inequality, hopelessness and injustice.[22]

Embarking upon this journey, it is vital and useful to keep in mind some recommendations made by certain individuals in the last few centuries, as a compass to which to orient the efforts of the Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation.

---

[18] Mahony, 2007
[19] Idem
[20] Hårleman & Øberg, 2001
[21] *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 4
[22] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 43

DIAGNOSIS

<u>Introduction: Lessons from our Ancestors</u>

It would seem there are sufficient reasons for the establishment of a Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation at EU level. The understanding is that it must be done at a hasty pace, as the deteriorating international situation cannot afford therapies to be stalled indefinitely. This initiative could then, whilst perhaps being an attractive alternative to current affairs, already be considered to have arrived too late and/ or too radical to be implemented.

Too late? It is very late, but not too late. Only future history will be able to unveil how grave the costs of these times have already weighed upon our and future generations in terms of economic disparity, wars, epidemics, social injustice, depletion and pollution of nature, human lives lost or crippled. However, it is still worth a try as just sitting down as lame ducks could mean the end of humankind as the weaponry to "settle" conflicts is increasingly hazardous. It is not too far-fetched to imagine that it is only a question of time before a few reckless people, a true brand of modern political conduct, will get hold of a nuclear, chemical or biological arm and deal the final blow. Neither is it impossible to conceive states using them against other states or armed groups. Although some argue the current world stockpile of nuclear warheads worldwide is not enough to end all human life, it offers little comfort, for if the prospect of a billion or two people killed "is not enough to arouse our concern, what will?"[23] With it, the EU, the world's most renowned peace project, will most likely come to a miserable end as well.

Can the EU then, as a self-proclaimed beacon of peace in the world, give itself a very different and more appealing face by instituting the proposed Commissariat? Most people will argue the idea being too radical and that the proposal will therefore never be considered seriously. Whilst the latter could be true, it is not necessarily true that this proposal be a radical one. If proposing something radical really means to be forwarding a very different reality than the current one, then it can undeniably and rightly criticized for being radical. However, when looking at fundamental norms and values of life worldwide and, more specifically, European ones, it is difficult to detect any sign of radicalism in the ideas creating this Commissariat at all. Let us delve into this a little.

Arguably, the cornerstones of morality in societies, no matter what the circumstances or places in time have been, generally speaking, philosophers, clerics, writers and poets. The crème de la crème of these four categories, but others as well, through quotes which immortalized them for posterity, have presented us with many messages of hope and important maxims to pursue in life which are roughly similar to the ones which permeate trough this written effort. Please skim the few selected hereafter, as you will be reacquainted to them further on, as a testimony of the dedication of the Commissariat to uphold the most noble of ideas raised in the foregoing centuries. Many ideas do not reflect the current image of the world, but this does not mean one cannot actively work towards finding them anew.

An eye for an eye makes the world blind   **- M.K. Gandhi -**

So long ... as nations expend all their energies on their vain and violent designs ... The human race will likely remain in this state until ... it has worked itself out of this chaotic state of national relations."
                                                                - I. Kant -

We should take care not to make the intellect our god; it has, of course, powerful muscles, but no personality.

---

[23] Fischer, 1984, p. 13

                                                   - A. Einstein -

Don't curse the darkness, light a candle   **- Confucius -**

Every man is responsible for the good he didn't do
                                           - J. Voltaire -

An enemy is a friend waiting to be made   **- D. Tutu -**

The release of atomic energy has not created a new problem. It has merely made more urgent the necessity of solving an existing one   **- A. Einstein -**

Divide and rule, a sound motto. Unite and lead, a better one
                                        - J.W. von Goethe -

Washing one's hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral   **- P. Freire -**

A lot of people are waiting for Martin Luther King Jr. or Mahatma Gandhi to come back, but they are gone. We are it   **- M.W. Edelman -**

He who is not angry when there is just cause for anger is immoral. Why? Because anger looks to the good of justice. And if you can live amid injustice without anger, you are immoral as well as unjust.
                                        - Aquinas -

To complement these quotes, the reader is kindly asked to consider one more aspect for the time being. Gandhi gave us a priceless gift, *satyagraha*, the (spiritual) pursuit of love and truth. For Gandhi, as Galtung puts it, *satya* was an essence bridging the concepts of God, Love and Truth, uniting the spiritual, the emotional and the cognitive, as opposed to fitting them into separate compartments as the West does, "banning the first two from research and science."[24] The worldview that comes out of this is then definitively more balanced and compassionate. It is therefore at this point that a start will be made integrating the mentioned quotes in the text, by citing the thought of Albert Einstein, who said that "We should take care not to make the intellect our god; it has, of course, powerful muscles, but no personality." It might be important to affix another element to this contemplation; that the intellect has no heart either, and that it should be guided by both the heart as well as the personality in order to achieve its full potential.

Also, and to give a practical example, it is clear that the most basic of needs, which are more or less tangibly enshrined in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), are largely ignored at a global level. This is sad, as what gives meaning to our lives is how we combine needs, rights and responsibilities in our actions. If MDGs do not count for anything, how will it ever be possible for each and every world citizen to flourish? The current stress on rights only, be they those of prisoners of war, children, women or other categories, bears limited fruits, as the separation from needs they grow out of and the responsibilities we all have to foster those rights and needs. Until all realize that unity in diversity, the oneness of humankind, just as with the example of Galtung's elaboration on *satyagraha*, is the way forward, we will not sustainably come together.

Adding to this, reading back the quotations page, many signs of hope can be grasped. For example, the importance of respect, dialogue, cooperation, nonviolence, education, peace by peaceful means (UN Charter) and creative solutions seem important. These lessons, scattered throughout time, are not scattered in meaning. They mean peace in one way or another. Also, they complement each other in the meaning of peace, and as such they can be combined, learnt, and, when combined with culture, expressed in multifarious interpretations of positive peace.

---

[24] Galtung, Speech at *The Satyagraha Centenary: New Delhi, 29-30 January 2007*, 2007

Finally, before moving on, it is helpful for the reader to keep two things in the back of the mind, reflecting the definition of peace as formulated by Øberg. First of all, a state of peace is not some kind of utopia, but a situation in which people are at relative ease when conflicts at any levels emerge, for they are sufficiently trained to handle them. Secondly, conflict is often suppressed, but in a world which is increasingly interconnected and where all meet increasingly diverse peoples, it is vital to be able to deal with any form of conflict, from the personal all the way up to the global level. The simple reason for this is that (unnecessary) conflicts surface and escalate sooner when the actor(s) involved in them have language barriers and cultural differences.

The next chapter seeks to deconstruct the logic of war humans have built up over the centuries and explain how what fundaments the logic of peace is built of and how it can come about.

DIAGNOSIS

Introduction: War for History and Peace for Future?

War as the Red Thread of History
The present world community can be said to be rather unsocial. States form closed units of power that see each other as competitors in every field, and they more or less implicitly manipulate their own citizens to believe other human beings "do not constitute a part of their humanity" and, to make matters worse, "international diplomacy is the external projection of this sovereign power, and international law, in its practical forms, ratifies these unsocial conditions."[25]

Whilst the above vision might seem a bit harsh, there is some truth to it. More importantly, what seems to be at the basis of it is a sense of mistrust, historical antagonism and power play, as the modern state system is, in essence, the fruit of an evolution of past monarchic, tribal and feudal systems. Nations and states worldwide have, throughout time, tried infinite ways of governance. If there is one thing that has not changed in the aspect of these systems, it is that they have often and persistently clinched to the use of (armed) force to defend and protect the systems' interests. In this context, it is interesting to note that archaeologists and anthropologists found traces of this behavior, termed militarism, in some 95 percent of the cultures of which there was and/or is any record, and was examined by them.[26]

It can be assumed that the prime responsibility of any government is to ensure the safety of its people. Following this, the armed forces continue to be the primary, as well as ultimate, tool of security. This because, one the one hand, having them means deterring others from committing violence and, on the other hand, deploying them to contain violence, by using violence, both reflect an understanding of peace in the traditional understanding of the word, now known as negative peace. Unfortunately, because of this long-standing tradition, most governments and their citizens have accepted state sanctioned violence as both natural and necessary. It is exactly here that the logic of war, as well as the tolerance of it for the sake of the national agenda, is born. War is then seen as the ultimate expression to safeguard the well-being and dignity of a nation. Also, it is seen as the uniting force in history, and the noblest way for individuals to display dedication and love to the nation is to sacrifice their life for it. With that said, it is clear why it is so hard for many states to simply give up their sovereignty over matters such as their national bank or the military, to any sort of regional or global authority.

For the establishment of positive peace, the situation is not a healthy one. The aforementioned concepts must become archaic for peace to be the guiding spirit of governance worldwide. Since the worldview we could work towards is some sort of network of rather peaceful societies, it is important for the reader to understand where this other logic comes from and what consequences it will have if it is to ever replace the logic of war. From the perspective a Peace and Conflict Studies scholar, it is rather worrying to see that virtually all states, religions and ideologies, mostly when co-opted by certain groups, as for example within state administrations, have tolerated and continue to tolerate the loss of life to fulfill their agenda.

As hinted at previously, war or some other form of armed violence has often been the means to settle conflicting interests. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant recognized more than 200 years ago the futility of this conduct:

---

[25]   Murphy, 1999, p. 130
[26]   Angier, 2003

> "So long … as nations expend all their energies on their vain and violent designs, thus continuously plodding efforts to shape internally their way of thinking … no progress of this sort [morality] is to be expected, because the formation of citizens requires a long process … All good that is not grafted onto a morally-good character is nothing but illusion and glistering misery. The human race will likely remain in this state until … it has worked itself out of this chaotic state of national relations." [27]

Freud once said that "the first man that started using ugly words instead of physical violence invented civilization". One might wonder if it is not improper for people to insult, or even to be rude. Following the logic of peace however, there is virtually no amount of verbal or physical provocation that justifies a response, let alone inflicting that very same verbal or physical violence.

Peace is then about handling conflicts that inevitably arise when many different players seek to satisfy their needs, develop and secure/protect themselves, with the least possible violence. What we must prevent is not conflicts, because, without them, life would be an Orwellian '1984' society in which everyone acts compulsively and thinks the same thoughts. As mentioned in the introduction, when people will learn conflicts are a part of life and will have the proper mental toolbox to deal with them, it will mark a vital difference in our lives.

Current US Foreign Policy
Former President of the USA Dwight D. Eisenhower, during his farewell speech in 1960 to leave office to John F. Kennedy, delivered a speech in which the following phrases contained a number of very important warnings to the American people

> "Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose." …
> "Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties." …
> "Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry." …
> "We have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. We must not fail to comprehend its grave implications … we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the militaryindustrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations. This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. … we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications." [28]

The first phrase seems to indicate the need for diplomacy, as well as a peaceful and nonviolent discourse, such as the one described in previous chapters.

The second phrase reiterates what is mentioned in the first one, but adds to that the specific notion that it is not grandiose and expensive (military) action that solves escalating conflicts. Whilst he does not carry the line of thought further, by saying this he most likely means that massive war engagement and 24 hour full media coverage are not always bound to bring home victory, one cannot be that far off his underlying thought.

The third phrase is very interesting as the EU is, for many aspects, certainly not as militarized as the US. However, as can be seen from the chapter dealing with the *Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe*, the text explicitly provides both the justification and structure within which re-armament can take place. This means the EU is capable and, in some

---

[27] Kant, 1992, p. 36
[28] Eisenhower, *Farewell Radio and Television Address to the American People*, 1961

aspects, willing to militarize increasingly.

The fourth passage reveals yet another difference between the US and EU Member States, a big discrepancy in military spending in general, and the size of the domestic arms industries. Most importantly, it utters an explicit warning of the risks of having a big military complex.

The situation Eisenhower wholeheartedly warned against has come to pass in the US. This affirmation should by now be rather obvious to informed citizens worldwide. Moreover, if you combine his admonition with the following passage from the *US Department of Defense Planning Guide* for 1994-1999, the picture looks increasingly grim

> "We [the U.S.] must account sufficiently for the interests of the advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order . . . we must maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role."[29]

In spite of the fact that the wording of this particular phrase was changed after the document leaked to the media, the image that transpires from this and other US foreign policy documents is mostly this and it is consistent. Basically, it seems to say capitalism and military interventionism as conducted by the US are not to be touched. Clearly, during the first Bush Jr. administration, this view had not changed, as Paul Wolfowitz, then in the Department of Defense, wrote that it is US policy "to prevent any nation, or combination of nations, from ever having the kind of power that could challenge us [the US] in any way militarily."[30] As can be widely seen today, the second Bush Jr. administration clings on to this belief, and probably more staunchly so than ever before. To correct such a course visionary US leaders that reject a foreign policy of military intervention are needed, such as Ron Paul, Mike Gravel or Dennis Kucinich. We will see what the near future brings.

Another example worth noting is the *Project for the New American Century* (PNAC), which defines itself a neoconservative NGO supporting greater American militarization, challenging hostile governments, advancing democratic and economic freedom. It additionally claims, through its welcome note on the website by chairman William Kristol, that "American leadership is good both for America and for the world; and that such leadership requires military strength, diplomatic energy and commitment to moral principle."[31] In 2000, it issued a report entitled *Rebuilding America's Defenses*. It was drawn up at the request of some of George W. Bush's administration closest allies, namely Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Jeb Bush and Lewis Libby, and declared that as the US now faces no global rival "America's grand strategy should aim to preserve and extend this advantageous position as far into the future as possible", and, further on, going more into detail on the Gulf region, it states that

> "The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein."[32]

After these slightly Machiavellian passages, an interesting last example comes from an article comparing Joseph Goebbels' (chief of propaganda of Nazi Germany) speeches with George W. Bush ones [33] and, though the article does not comment on the differences and similarities, there

---

[29] Tyler, 1992

[30] Karlin, 2007

[31] Kristol, 2007

[32] Foster, 2003

[33] *Propaganda: Did Goebbels write The Bush Administration speeches*

is really no need for it, as the similarity of the employed rhetoric is striking

> "Americans are asking, "Why do they hate us?" They hate what they see right here in this chamber: a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms: our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. … Americans are asking, "How will we fight and win this war?" We will direct every resource at our command -- every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence and every necessary weapon of war -- to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network."[34]
> *George W. Bush, 20 September, 2001*

> "They hate our people because it is decent, brave, industrious, hardworking and intelligent. They hate our views, our social policies, and our accomplishments. They hate us as a Reich and as a community. They have forced us into a struggle for life and death. We will defend ourselves accordingly. All is clear between us and our enemies."[35]
> *Joseph Goebbels, 31 December, 1939*

No More Trial and Error
Another important aspect as to why the time has come to change attitudes is because in an era where technology is increasingly making our life easier and more comfortable, it hides potential disaster as well. Whilst most human undertakings in history have followed the trial and error principle, the fault margin in a technological age finds itself incredibly reduced. Let us first see a very specific example, before moving to a set of more general ones.

The following lines emerge in the autobiography of Albert Speer, the main civil architect and later Minister of War and Armaments for Hitler's regime. The reason it can be considered relevant to this essay is that in order to grasp humankind's bright side one most have an equal, or arguably even larger, understanding of its darker sides. In order then to better appreciate and build towards a more peaceful world, what better manner than examining the thoughts of the closest associate of one of the most notorious minds in recent history? In his closing statement at the Neurenberg trials, during his very last chance to defend himself before judgment would be cast upon him, he said the following:

> "Hitler's dictatorship was the first dictatorship in an industrial state in this age of modern technology, a dictatorship which employed to perfection the instruments of technology to dominate its own people … By means of … radio and public-address systems, eighty million persons could be made subject to the will of one individual … offices and squads received their evil commands in this direct manner. … Thus the type of uncritical receiver of orders is created."[36]

While technological advances have made huge population surges possible, and filled the world with many marvels such as cars, trains and computers, there are thus great risks, even of repetition of tragedies such as WW II. "Uncritical receivers", are referred to as the military staff, but it can be argued that the majority of citizens also often falls under this label as, to again take the example of Nazi Germany, without the (tacit) cooperation of many citizens, and the fact that most people were unaware of the full extent of atrocities committed by their government, there would have probably been no WW II as they could have made Hitler lose his power-base. Importantly, this reality holds worldwide relevance and truth, because it is a phenomenon that can and will happen again when structures and cultures supporting them are left unaltered.

In fact, a grave tragedy is unfolding right now and has been for some years, in dealing with

---

[34] *President tries to give Americans some answers*, 2001
[35] *Goebbels New Year address to Germany*, 1939
[36] Speer, 1970, p. 520

the current genocide in Darfur, after the international community solemnly pledged, some 13 years ago, never to allow another "Rwanda". On 25 March 2007, on the 50th anniversary of the EU, leaders of EU Member States received a tour in Berlin involving many sites and symbols of Nazism in an effort to be reminded that such evil things should never occur again but, as *The Independent* wrote, "They ought to be reminded, too, that evil times never go away. Evil changes its address and its rhetoric but - somewhere - evil times are always with us."[37] In a not so celebratory tone as the one used at in the EU documents of the Berlin festivities, the article continues

> "So happy birthday to us. But putting on celebratory smiles and congratulating ourselves necessitates averting the eyes from the spreading shame of Darfur… So far, we have used it to bleat about the ineffectiveness of the United Nations, and we have used the UN to get ourselves off the hook."[38]

Albert Einstein, probably the world's most unrecognized peace philosophers, recognized the needs to address underlying reasons, as he said, "The release of atomic energy has not created a new problem. It has merely made more urgent the necessity of solving an existing one." Indeed, problems cannot be solved at the level of awareness that created them and, though he was worried of the potential use of nuclear energy, he understood the blame was not his entirely. There are many more challenges though, some of them technological as well. Nuclear strikes are one of them, and considered by the EU in the *European Security Strategy* as

> "The most frightening scenario … terrorist groups acquire weapons of mass destruction. In this event, a small group would be able to inflict damage on a scale previously possible only for States and armies."[39]

Other challenges include demographical collapse, industrial pollution, nuclear war between countries, widespread and persistent power blackouts, disasters in nanotechnology etc.[40] In this list not even the potential all-natural catastrophes are included, such as big volcanic eruptions, hits by asteroids or comets, nearby supernova explosions, and, last but not least, annihilation by extraterrestrials.[41] Whilst the last argument might appeal positively to the reader's sense of humor, most of the other scenarios are not as unlikely as one might believe. Would it not be a shame if the human race came to an end after such a short amount of time spent on this planet?

If there will be some future generations at all, it would be great if they could look at us with a certain pride and respect. Additionally, if we want to do ourselves a favor that will still positively mark our own existence, peace has to somehow become the red thread of future history instead of war, and solutions for all challenges that threaten our existence should be seriously, but not frantically, dealt with. Secondly, and taking into account what has been said about Speer and Hitler, every person, young and old, should be educated in how to deal with conflict. This, in order to defuse the proneness to violence, which on its turn will help defusing the logic of war, as they share the same root.

When our offspring in a few generations from now will tell jokes about the armed endeavors embarked upon by us up to and including the 21st century, this will be a major victory for both current and future generations. It will mean they have been able to pluck the fruits from the seeds planted some decades earlier, which are the ones we live in now. It is then in these decades where the critical decisions need to be taken.

---

[37] Stoppard, 2007
[38] Idem
[39] *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 4
[40] Leslie, 1996, p. 3-6
[41] Leslie, 1996, p. 6

The next two chapters look at the pillars on which the EU as a force for peace could be based upon in order to take the bold step of moving towards a less violent world.

PROGNOSIS

<u>Possible Pillars of EU Action: Peace</u>

Two Peace Concepts: Security and Peace
As mentioned, for the purpose of this paper, the concept of positive peace is the guiding spirit. Whilst a definition has already been given, it is opportune to elaborate a bit further on this concept. Peace is a concept with vastly diverse meanings for many persons and, above all, it seems abused by current international political elites for their own, often more violent than peaceful, designs. What then, is the peace we could be looking for? Also, to understand it more clearly, it has to be contrasted with another form of peace.

Broadly speaking, one can identify two dominant peace logics. One is military-based security, whilst the other logic embraces conflict transformation and reduction of violence as tools for peace. They are often termed security or war discourse on the one side, and peace discourse on the other. When reading through them the reader is kindly asked to keep in mind that these represent models, as well as two opposite poles. This means that the truth cannot be entirely grasped in them, and that it always lies somewhere in between. However, as Galtung jokingly puts it, we would need about 10% security and 90% peace. No need to say the current situation on the ground represents quite the opposite.

Security Discourse versus Peace Discourse
The simplest model is one presented by Galtung, and in order to lay down more clearly the fundamental differences, it is presented as a table. Thereafter, Øberg's and Jacobsen's models will be examined to gradually expand on the concept.

Galtung[42]

Security discourse	Peace discourse
Central issue: an evil actor lurking and lurching for opportunity to escalate conflict violently	*Central issue*: a bad conflict
Violence: the evil actor is always ready to commit violence, because it hates the good	*Violence:* because of this bad conflict violence is committed, which is why it must be solved
Solution: the good actor must deter or crush the evil actor to create security for the good actor	*Solution*: the conflict should be solved non-violently, to be able to create peace for all actors involved

Now the fundamental divergences have been laid down, let us proceed into the more specific as presented by Øberg, who highlights concrete points on the EU in his distinction.

Øberg[43]
The security discourse is the traditional national security as we know it from the individual EU Member States and, it should be added, the vast majority of states worldwide. It is the state's duty to safeguard its citizens from any form of outside threat and, following this line of thought, if the state is strong and safe, its citizens can feel safe as well. This logic is currently crystallized in a defense policy, wider security policy and foreign policy. The method used to constitute the defense

---

[42] Johan Galtung, "Peaceful Conflict Transformation". Lecture, European Peace University, December 2006
[43] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006

policy is generally military power. Security policy is broader, about positioning oneself in the larger system to increase one's own relative security. One can think of issues such as aid to developing countries, involvement in UN operations and naturally imports and exports, including those of military equipment, etc. Foreign policy overlaps with both but traditionally focuses first and foremost on bilateral or multilateral relations with other countries, including the EU. For the security discourse, it is the military means, either what is employed for prestige or to threaten or what is actually used, that constitutes the primary instrument in real situations when a particularly threatening situation develops. At the core is the nation-state; the task of the state is to defend itself and its people in a threatening world.

According to the peace discourse, a more peaceful state of affairs can be created when security, defense and development work together with lower levels of violence. In order to be able to achieve this, the lower levels of violence must embrace underlying conflicts in a different way. The idea here is that, by having the greatest possible conflict knowledge, one can find other ways of solving the problems than by threats and the use of violence. It is then imperative to find a meta-concept and a *trans*-national perspective which both go 'beneath' the nation-state and integrate the individual, and 'above' it to include the global issues. Hence the question as to whether the EU is essentially good for itself and its own, or also a good for the world as a whole.

Jacobsen[44]

In the security/war discourse, the other actor or group is wrong and/or acts illegally. The problem lies with this actor or group, the acts committed against me/us. We are right and correct, because we do what is necessary, that is to defend ourselves. The other side is a threat and needs to be demonized, dehumanized and stereotyped in order to create powerful enemy images. The power is held by leaders, and it is to be seen as power over and against others. There is only one truth, and it is our truth. We are right and they are wrong. The actors are elites, almost fully comprised of men and using violence. Direct violence is the main focus. Change comes about in a single moment/date/event, in which the other is defeated. The process of change is war/violence/struggle to kill/defeat the other and, when victory is really impossible, a negotiated settlement can be concluded. Security means my/our security, security from threat against/from the other. Relationships are based on fear, insecurity and deterrence. Leadership is central, top-down. Time view presents a clear division between past, present and future. The past is often glorified and romanticized, the present is a legitimate and just struggle against evil and the future is projected as conflict solution through victory. The outcome of the conflict is victory oriented. Finally, peace is defined as victory and the absence of direct violence.

By contrast, the peace discourse sees unmet needs and structures denying people their rights, opportunities or access. The impact of conflict, violence and war is visible in negative relationships and untransformed contradictions. The other is wrong, but we are also seeing our responsibilities and must understand our own contradictions in the conflict. There is thus another party, with its needs, interests and goals that is part of our conflict. Power comes from all of us, belongs to the people, and is power with/to/for. Many truths exist; we have to understand each other's truth through dialogue. Actors are many, it is important to see how they contribute to the conflict and how they might transcend it. Direct violence, structural violence and cultural violence are all vital aspects. Change is a process, combining the transformation of deep structures and cultures of violence. Processes to come towards a result focus on nonviolence, conflict transformation, peace building, empowerment and the struggle to overcome the three forms of violence. Common security is achieved by addressing root causes of all conflicts, and fostered by relationships based on trust, respect, coexistence and cooperation. Leadership is as horizontal as

---

[44] Kai Fritjhof Brand-Jacobsen, "Peacebuilding: from the Local to the Global level". Lecture, European Peace University, March 2007

possible. Past, present and future are closely connected: the past is a history of conflicts and relationships, both positive and negative aspects are mentioned, the present affects all the actors and the challenge is to transform the conflict and, finally, the future can be characterized by negative or positive conflict transformation. The outcome of the conflict is solution-oriented. Peace means meeting the needs of all parties, achieving direct, structural and cultural peace through empathy, creativity and nonviolence.

Finally, Øberg makes a very important distinction on the use of violence[45] in both discourses, which paves the road to the next chapter.

In the security discourse, violence is relative. The fundamental point is the difference between good/just/productive violence, as for example the "just war" theory is based upon, and bad/unjust/counter-productive violence. In this approach there is a need for *alternative violence*.
The peace discourse, by contrast, rests on the assumption that violence is bad in principle, although it allows for exercising a certain degree of violence in rare, specific cases as a necessary evil, as was indicated earlier by the "90%-10%" comment by Galtung. Following this discourse, peace leads towards the reduction of violence and can best be brought about by increased knowledge and understanding of conflicts and conflict-resolution mechanisms. *Alternatives to violence* must therefore be found following this approach.

As a future great power or superpower, it is important that the EU chooses which kind of philosophy of peace it will pursue. Is it able and willing to contribute to more violence, about the same amount of it, or consistently less in tomorrow's world? This is the question that must be analyzed before deciding whether or not the EU is a peace project and, if not, what can be done to turn that round.

Also, the EU has to choose whether it pursues it goals condoning or encouraging violence, thereby quelling or "managing" conflict, or it is willing to try to diminish violence as much as possible, and pushing for non-violence, thereby attempting at solving or "transforming" the conflict.

---

[45] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 14

PROGNOSIS

Possible Pillars of EU Action: Nonviolence

Two Ways of Addressing Conflict: Violence and Nonviolence
Since the logic of the peace discourse forms the red thread of this work, it follows that non-violent, rather than violent, handling of conflict would be the chosen path. That is what is known as conflict transformation, because you address the root causes of the conflict and thereby not only solve the conflict but bring the relationship of the parties to a new level. Violence has been as normal as the presence of moon and sun in our lives for thousands of years, whether in the form of warfare or in the intimate family sphere through verbal and physical abuses. It must therefore be the most effective way of getting one's point through. It could be the case, were it not that forcefully shoving one's truth down somebody's throat is not the same as persuasively winning that same person over to a certain position, nor is it as enriching as discovering new truths together. The latter two require exploring interests and needs hidden behind the other actor's position. Violence, both direct and indirect, in words and/ or deeds creates resentment, anger, frustration and, what is worse, a chance that this person or group of persons subject to that treatment will repeat it (to their loved ones) later in life.

As violence in all its forms is no secret to humanity, there is probably no need to introduce it. Nonviolence, being generally known as a sort of spineless, hippie tactic for protesters invented by Gandhi, most likely then merits a brief elaboration.

Introduction to Nonviolence
The central part of a nonviolent philosophy is that the use of violence is morally wrong and, on top of that, often inefficient and unproductive. In other words, the aims do not justify the means. Its most widely known understanding is the principled rejection to kill human beings. However, most nonviolent philosophies have a more far-reaching view on the matter, as they regard all sorts of physical and psychological harm against human beings as violations of the norm. Also, some of these philosophies additionally comprise not only human beings, but other living creatures as well. Some even include the entire global ecosystem as well as material objects.

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi used the concept *ahimsa* in his philosophy. It is found in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, one of the main religious Hindu texts and is normally translated as "nonviolence" or "non-harm".[46] In the Gandhian philosophy however, its scope is broadened not to only entail physical actions. Ahimsa should be a principle guiding humans in their thoughts, word and deeds. Gandhi was certainly no utopian. He was well aware of the violent tendencies humans expose and therefore understood the impossibility to completely fulfill such a norm but, despite this conviction, he maintained that this does not take away the possibility to make every effort to reduce any injury on other living creatures to an absolute minimum.[47]

Gandhi has been incorrectly criticized for promoting passivity, for he actually argued that passivity itself could be violence. On this matter, he once stated that "every act of injury to a living creature and endorsement of such an act by refraining from non-violent effort, whenever possible, to prevent it, is a breach of ahimsa."[48] As educational scholar Paolo Freire said, "Washing one's hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral". This is something often overlooked in western cultures, where acts of commission count much more than acts of omission. The latter are, however, at least as important

---

[46] Johansen, 2005, p. 4
[47] Idem, p.4
[48] Næss, 1974, p. 48

as the former. Another illustrious person sharing these opinions is medieval theologian and philosopher St. Thomas Aquinas, who held that "He who is not angry when there is just cause for anger is immoral. Why? Because anger looks to the good of justice. And if you can live amid injustice without anger, you are immoral as well as unjust." Lastly, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. viewed nonviolence as "active non-violent resistance against evil", and deemed it should be "aggressive spiritually, mentally, and emotionally".[49] These attitudes so widen the concept as to make it immoral to not prevent injurious acts, for instance suppression, manipulation, exploitation, and Gandhi termed this more "active" form of *ahimsa* as *satyagraha*.[50]

Clearly, in most of today's societies, it is an awkward concept to apply. One merely has to think of a justice system rewarding people who acted in defense of persons in need, or a system which punishes all within 500 meters from a crime scene who did not intervene. Nonetheless, it is food for thought, for yet another very prominent historical figure, French philosopher François-Marie Arouet, better known as Voltaire, claimed that "Every man is responsible for the good he didn't do."

Comparing Violence and Nonviolence
Weighed against to the focus on violent conflicts, peaceful ones have always been a minor sideline, despite the fact that the practice of nonviolence has developed tremendously over the last hundred years.[51]

The most influential use in recent decades has been in the long list of successful political revolutions. Successful up to a certain degree however, for these revolutions mostly have the same problematic consequence: they have been more successful at removing a regime than replacing it with a better one.[52] This side of the nonviolent revolutions is not anything unique to them. That changes of societies only occur "at the surface" by changing the people at the top level and that not any profound social changes occur was also the conclusion of Gandhi when he evaluated the liberation of India. What would he have to say about the hanging of Saddam Hussein? Would he have deemed it as helpful for the cause of a more peaceful Iraq?

Gandhi's firm belief was that the failure to obtain social change was a consequence of too much focus on non-cooperation and too little on constructive work and that, for this very reason, for a country to change into a nonviolent society, it is necessary to start building the new society long before the takeover and, in addition to changing the political structures, it is essential to change the social structures as well.[53] Again, what would Gandhi comment about building a non-violent Iraqi society before the 2003 invasion? He probably would have argued in favor, being opposed to the invasion in the first place.

For many pacifists life itself has an inviolable or sacred value and hence it will always be wrong to hurt other living beings. Some restrict this to humans, whilst for others all forms of life have an ultimate value. It is relatively easy to acknowledge for a person to have made a wrong judgment. However, if acting violently based on wrong assumptions it is seldom possible to reverse one's actions.[54] Surely, it is directly proportional, if not exponential, as the committed violence takes a more extreme form. For example, when one is killed, this cannot be reversed. On top of this, the pain and anguish of family and friends is something that can never fully heal. Galtung often says that the loss of a life seriously hurts at least ten others. It makes sense when thinking of it, for most

---

[49] King, 1958
[50] *Peace Studies Terms*, 2005, p. 69-70
[51] Johansen, 2005
[52] Idem,
[53] Idem
[54] Idem

of us have parents, grandparents, and an inner circle of best friends which even make the number ten a very modest estimate. Their whole life would be scarred by any serious accidents involving the person(s) they cherish.

Consequently, this implies both of the above admonitions, every single one of us has a number of roles/identities in their lives and in most cases it is only one or few of them someone has a conflict with. To illustrate this, imagine you are an investment banker, man, husband, football player, friend, son, liberal democrats voter, Christian, ex-soldier and Spanish. Maybe it is only your role as a husband I disapprove of. I could be a friend of you and your wife, sharing her position that you treat her badly. However, I might not have problems with any other role of yours. If I decide I am fed up with how you treat your wife, and she keeps begging me to "do something about it", I might one day snap and get a hold on a weapon of some sort and kill you.

By doing so, I will take away your life, your role as a husband and all your other roles at once. You will not be able to work as investment banker, nor any other work; you will not be a man anymore, but a dead man; you will not be a husband anymore; you will not be able to play football anymore; you will lose all of your friendships; your mother and father will lose a son; the liberal democrats will lose a voter; being a Christian, you might be in Hell, the Purgatory or in Heaven and, finally, Spain will lose a citizen. Besides all of this, your colleagues at work will mourn you; your wife might mourn you; your football buddies will mourn you; your friends will mourn you; your parents will mourn you; etc. Additionally, somewhere along your life, you might have inspired a child to pursue a certain goal in his or her life by a simple phrase of yours. This could be considered a role as well. The point to be grasped here is that violence is not specific enough to separate the different roles: violence, in all of its forms, is blind.[55] Most non-violent means, on the contrary, are much more specific.[56] Imagine the Members of European Parliament, becoming severely annoyed by their precarious power in EU decision-making would, desperate for solutions, simply sit down on the floor and remain silent during an entire meeting. What if this meeting was with, say, the President of the European Commission? Besides the media fuss it would unleash, one can rest assured that the President of the European Commission, if she is also a woman, mother, socialist, volleyball player and jazz singer, would not be (severely) impaired or touched in these latter roles.

An additional argument that favors nonviolence over violence is that the latter is much more likely to inspire equally violent to far more violent retaliation. This counter violence will then be the first twist in a negative spiral which can escalate out of control. For many of those who opt for nonviolence out of pragmatism it is exactly the fear of the consequences of violent means to form a strong deterrent. It seems then that violent means results in violent ends, and that nonviolence thus allows for less chance of (a severe) retaliation.

Both Gandhi and King agree that those using nonviolence are able to fight problems rather than persons.[57] Additionally, this allows one of the most profound and troublesome transitions in relationships to take place. Nonviolence, much more than violence, creates a possibility of mutual understanding or even deep friendship after the transformation of the conflict. In the famous words of the man who, together with Nelson Mandela, is viewed as the conscience of Africa, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, "An enemy is a friend waiting to be made". On the other hand, violence hits humans but it usually does not weaken or soften ideologies, decisions, and policies. Most of the time, it actually exacerbates them. In relation to the War on Terror, the *New York Times* reported in September 2006 that

---

[55] Idem
[56] Johansen, 2005
[57] Johansen, 2005; King, 1958

> "The intelligence estimate, completed in April, … represents a consensus view of the 16 disparate spy services inside government. Titled "Trends in Global Terrorism: Implications for the United States," it asserts that Islamic radicalism, rather than being in retreat, has metastasized and spread across the globe." [58]

On that same occasion, the *Washington Post* wrote

> "The war in Iraq has become a primary recruitment vehicle for violent Islamic extremists, motivating a new generation of potential terrorists around the world whose numbers may be increasing faster than the United States and its allies can reduce the threat, U.S. intelligence analysts have concluded." [59]

Lastly, the UN, in November 2006, following its Secretary General's initiative on the Alliance of Civilizations, released a report in which the key finding is that "terrorism and extremism are fostered by power politics, where cultural constructs are used as vehicles."[60] There is no need to spend additional words emphasizing the connection between the US and UN documents respectively. On top of this, anyone familiar with the concepts of nonviolence could have predicted this development of (international) terrorism, as well as state terrorism.

In its justification of violence, the security/war logic places much emphasis on the roles of individuals in (political) conflicts. The peace discourse however, looks primarily at the structures that are in place or created by these individuals, and the culture that supports and/or tolerates them, which are much stronger factors. As Galtung puts it, "cultural violence makes direct and structural violence look, even feel, right, or at least not wrong."[61] To illustrate this matter, suffice to take an example where as soon as individuals in central positions are replaced the system survives and continues more or less unaltered. If we take Italy, it is clear that its 61 governments in its 62 years as a republic,[62] as well as its widespread mafia, are phenomena which, whilst upheld and invigorated by some, mostly rely on the (tacit) consent and/or ignorance of the majority, through structures and a culture supporting the whole.

That violence creates new problems is an experience many have had. New conflicts, often unrelated and possibly exaggerated from the original focus of the first conflict, pop up as a result of the use of violence. They remove their centre of attention and withdraw resources they could otherwise have used on their main goals, which could have been the reduction of violence and the understanding of the root causes of the first escalated conflict. At the macro-level, it seems new conflicts are created or exasperated by international political actors as well to shift away the attention to the inability to solve a prior one. By doing this, the leader creates more and more turmoil unless he or she is stopped or, in line with earlier findings, if the system permitting it is redressed.

The last factor worth mentioning, and probably least known, is a sense of humor. Violence does not always inspire or is not always inspired by cruel wit. In nonviolence it is very important however, for it allows to defuse tensions accumulated in oneself, or even in a specific moment in a delicate mediation process. It is a method for stress relief and triggers positive thoughts, which is why, if used smartly, it can be a very powerful tool indeed. Johansen, Galtung and Gandhi are all favorable to the use of humor in conflict situation. Gandhi once said "If I did not have my sense of humor I would have committed suicide long ago."

---

[58] Mazzetti, 2006, p. 1

[59] DeYoung, 2006

[60] *An Inclusive World in which the West, Islam and the Rest have a stake*, p. 40

[61] Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means,* 1996, p. 196

[62] Willan, 2007

Some Final Thoughts on Nonviolence

Is nonviolence more successful than violence? Whilst it is difficult to measure in objective ways, it seems to be increasingly the case. One matter however, stands out. Looking at the following list, the number of non-violent revolutions over the last decades has increased dramatically: India 1947; Malawi 1959-1961; Iran 1979; Poland 1980; Bolivia 1982; Philippines 1986; Czechoslovakia, Hungary, DDR and Bulgaria 1989; Soviet Union 1991; South Africa 1993; Indonesia 1998; Zambia 1999; Serbia 2000; Zambia, Philippines 2001; Madagascar 2002; Georgia 2003; Ukraine 2004; Kyrgystan, Lebanon 2005.[63], Thailand 2007. Despite this list however, nonviolence, as violence, does not guarantee success. As many found, Gandhi included, an "anti-something" movement is not the same as a "pro-something" one. Once the desired change is met, the individual or group struggling for the change has to be able to put in place a better reality. On this aspect, nonviolent movements have much to learn. However, since they are a relatively new phenomenon it is no wonder they have to learn much and catch up with millennia of predominantly violent methods of conflict resolution.

To conclude, it seems the peace logic and the nonviolent approach form a good pair. Their principles of almost total rejection of violence; encouragement of tolerance; dialogue; alternatives to violence; inclusion; satisfaction of basic needs for all; possibility of action reversal; focus on a bad conflict instead of evil actor(s) etc. coincide rather well. The security discourse and the violent approach suddenly appear rusty and old-fashioned. This does not mean persons clinging to them are intrinsically evil. It merely signifies that their positions are rooted in history and the evolution of violence in all its forms. Positions are difficult to get out of, but once reminded of basic needs of the body and soul, people often are able to alter their positions. Now that nonviolence is catching up in expertise, the security discourse will likely eventually lose support to its counterpart. Whilst is might appear difficult to incorporate non-violence into our daily lives, our institutions and cultures, as US activist for children rights Marian Wright Edelman states, "A lot of people are waiting for Martin Luther King Jr. or Mahatma Gandhi to come back, but they are gone. We are it." Nobody will do things for us, we have to do them ourselves.

The following chapter presents an analysis of what will happen if the current state of affairs in the international political arena is maintained, mostly envisioned through two of the most important EU documents, the *European Security Strategy* and the *Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe*.

---

[63] Jørgen Johansen, "Nonviolence: From Philosophy to a Practical Tool". Lecture, European Peace University, October 2006

PROGNOSIS

<u>Current and Currently Future EU Principles:</u>
<u>EU Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe and European Security Strategy</u>

What will most likely happen to the European Union and its surrounding world if the current course remains largely unchanged?

This chapter is by no means exhaustive in examining the EU. It aims at portraying the likely EU future in view of its current claims of maintaining and exporting peace, and thereby (indirectly) the world's peace. Two documents are quintessential in this analysis, the already mentioned *Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe* and the *European Security Strategy* (ESS). Whilst the Treaty has not yet been implemented, statements of various EU and Member State politicians seem to indicate that some sort of document outlining at least the EU's basic beliefs and rules will be put forward very by 2008-2009.

A Little Game
Before truly kicking off, it might interest the reader to see a little experiment initiated by Øberg[64], and which I expanded upon, on the choice of words within the Treaty. Measuring almost 500 pages, more analysis is possible on this text than on the *European Security Strategy*, which totals a mere 14 pages. Basically, the purpose of this small test was to screen the language of the document for certain words which are often used for the peace discourse on the one hand, and the security/war discourse on the other. It could already indicate in which direction the Treaty, and thereby the EU, is going in the future if the course remains unaltered. In other words, it will shed some preliminary light on the prognosis. Øberg screened the text in Danish. I added English, Italian and Dutch to it. As Øberg conducted his test in Danish, but mentioned the English equivalents of the search terms in his writings, you will find them here in English as well.

Peace discourse

Danish
Peace, peaceful 8; conflict prevention, prevent conflict(s) 5; disarmament 1; confidence-building, arms control, reconciliation, détente, arms reduction, nonviolence 0; nuclear weapon(s), atomic weapon(s) 0   **TOTAL = 14**

English
Peace, peaceful 18; conflict prevention, prevent conflict(s) 4; disarmament 1; confidence-building, arms control, reconciliation 3; détente, arms reduction, nonviolence 0; nuclear weapon(s), atomic weapon(s) 0   **TOTAL = 26**

Dutch
Vrede, vreedzaam, vreedzame 17; conflictpreventie 3; ontwapening 0; preventie / voorkomen van conflicten 0; wapencontrole, détente, wapenreductie, wapenvermindering, geweldloos(heid) 0; verzoening 1; atoomwapen(s), kernwapen(s) 0   **TOTAL = 21**

Italian
Pace, pacifico/a, pacifiche 14; prevenzione dei conflitti 3; disarmo 1; controllo delle armi,

---

[64] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p.21

riconciliazione, riduzione delle armi, nonviolenza 1; arma/i nucleare/i, arma/i atomica/che 0
TOTAL = 19

Security discourse

Danish
Defence, defence policy 64; (internal) security (policy) 81; military, combat forces 21; terrorism, terrorist(s) 10 **TOTAL = 166**

English
Defence, defence policy 71; (internal) security (policy) 156; military, combat forces 25; terrorism, terrorist(s) 11 **TOTAL = 263**

Dutch
Defensie, defensiebeleid 38; veiligheids(beleid), binnenlandse veiligheid 117; militair, gevechtseenheid 8; terrorist(en), terrorisme 6 **TOTAL = 169**

Italian
Difesa, politica di difesa 62; sicurezza, sicurezza interna 174; militare/i, forze militari, forze di combattimento 27; terrorismo, terroristico/i, terrorista 11 **TOTAL = 274**

When we compare the averages of the former category for all four languages (20) to that of the latter (218), the difference results more than tenfold in favor of the security discourse. Surely we have three languages here with Germanic roots, which might influence terminology and therefore the outcome. Besides, the world is currently used to and molded around the security discourse, making its words more dominant in everyday language as well as in political language. Lastly, there are certainly some other drawbacks to such a brief and superficial analysis of a vast text. Fact remains that the divergence is remarkable. Surely then, if the EU wishes to stay its course in following the internationally prevailing security discourse, the Treaty seems to encourage exactly that.

EU Vision of its Future
It is a 2006 study by Jan Øberg which sparked my interest in the question of whether the EU is a true force for peace or not. Indeed, it is also the same text which provided the abovementioned short terminology analysis of the Treaty. What struck me most in the study was one of the initial remarks of the author, which held that

> "The EU is often described as a project for peace, but without making clear what is meant by the word 'peace'. Indeed, the current version of the Constitution [Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe], which says nothing about disarmament, human security or dialogue, nor challenges the existence of nuclear weapons, puts Member States under a direct obligation to re-arm in the future … The study also shows that the EU as a peace project is not nearly so intellectually consistent or visionary as the UN Charter. It may actually be said that the Constitution can be seen as a serious step backwards in relation to the standards and values of the UN Charter."[65]

To what extent were and are these remarks justified? Can the text really said to be a serious step backwards in comparison to the UN Charter? Clearly, for a document generated some fifty years after the Charter, it would be worrisome if it were true. The more so, when considering that the UN, despite its quite decent framework and scope, still has difficulty achieving its goals.

---

[65] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 3

Unfortunately, Øberg's commentary is fully justified, as there are no concrete targets for a comprehensive reduction of violence within Europe or the world, nor for professional civilian conflict transformation practices or general disarmament. Øberg adds that "the drafters, people in EU's leadership, seem to be ignorant of Europe's own colonial and warlike past as seen through the eyes of others."[66] This unawareness of the importance of the subject of conflict transformation, which is often wrongly labeled conflict prevention, again emerges in a 2002 report entitled *Putting conflict prevention into practice: Priorities for the Spanish and Danish EU Presidencies 2002*. It states that a great deal remains to be done in order to realize the EU's capacity to help prevent and effectively respond to violent conflicts,

> "as many of the commitments of the EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts (June 2001) and Commission Communication on Conflict Prevention (April 2001) still need to be fully implemented … conflict prevention has still not been mainstreamed into EU development policy…"[67]

Key Challenges to Europe
The Treaty text does contain a certain degree of good diagnosis, showing awareness problems related to war, refugee streams and starvation, but "it all falls apart in the following section, on key threats to Europe", which appears to be "almost a carbon copy of those outlined by the Bush administration: proliferation of WMDs is seen as the greatest threat; terrorism; regional conflicts; failed states and organized crime."[68] However, what is equally preoccupant is that no interconnections are made, no priorities are set, no timescale is given nor are strategies for handling these conflicts really set out.

To me, two points of comment stand out in Øberg's critique on this list on the one hand, and Galtung on the other hand. Let us take Øberg first. Concerning terrorism, he states that prior to 9/11 terrorism had caused some 400 fatalities with most of them concentrated in South America.[69] This is much less than any other transnational issue such as environmental deterioration, malnutrition, or even obesity or smoking. As for proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the essential clauses of the Non-Proliferation Treaty are that states that possessing nuclear weapons should reduce and gradually abolish them (Article 6) and that those not possessing such weapons should not buy them (Article 2) but may be assisted in obtaining nuclear energy for peaceful purposes (Article 5).[70] However, all nuclear countries have shunted their own disarmament and abolition obligations, most recently at the NPT conference in May 2005,[71] and, even more recently, in the global political reality of the past few years, in which hypocrisy and double standards on nuclear issues thrive uncontested.

Galtung, in addressing the issue of failed states, and referring to the fact that under current policies such states are often obliged to drop subsidies and buy foreign machinery and materials, writes that "external assistance can never be a substitute, only a complement in a state already trained in providing basic needs for its own people."[72] One here has to assume that all states can assure basic needs for their citizens but, surprisingly, even in richer countries, this is not always the case. Concerning organized crime Galtung reiterates the claim often made but seldom acted upon that, for example, drugs "depend on supply, and on demand. The demand is in Europe and in the USA, mainly the latter and is probably related to … normlessness and fragmentation of social

---

[66] Idem, p. 17
[67] Saferworld, 2002, p. I
[68] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 17
[69] Idem, p. 17
[70] Non-Proliferation Treaty, 2005
[71] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 17
[72] Galtung, *Solana's (and EU's?) Foreign Policy: A Non-Starter*, 2004

structure."[73] He then continues asserting that

> "yet the "war on drugs" is in drug-producing countries, with success at the end of the Taliban regime, now flourishing more than ever. Where is the certification of progress in reducing demand in the EU and in the USA? Who certifies whom? Where is the Plan EU and Plan USA to complement Plan Colombia [US legislation aimed at curbing drug smuggling by supporting various drug war activities in Colombia]? And then, don't underestimate the sympathy for commissariatized crime that hits the rich and the rich countries as one more form of guerrilla."[74]

Going back to the same list but in light of the other document, the *European Security Strategy* by ex-NATO Secretary-General and current EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) Javier Solana who, without advancing any proof or intentions such as what was mentioned by Øberg or Galtung, asserts that those same threats are growing and will continue to grow over time and that it is therefore vital that the EU should be "ready to act before a crisis occurs."[75] Galtung has the following to say about Solana's ways of dealing with politics, stating that he

> "… was against Spanish membership in NATO to win Spanish elections, then worked for that membership, and finally became NATO's Secretary General (Aznar was at least consistently pro-USA). So from Solana little is to be expected. His analysis is autistic. He locates all the problems on the outside in his "Europe faces three key threats": international terrorism, particularly with weapons of mass destruction, failed states, and organized crime."[76]

In the same ESS, besides Solana's assessment of threats, the Balkans is cited as an area in which, in collaboration its international partners, the EU has created stability and that the region "is no longer threatened by the outbreak of major conflict." and that "The credibility of our foreign policy depends on the consolidation of our achievements there."[77] It also says that the EU has progressed in the direction of Common Foreign and Security Policy and effective crisis management and, remarkably, that "We have instruments in place that can be used effectively, as we have demonstrated in the Balkans and beyond."[78]

Wilfried Graf, by contrast, states that not a single one of the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, with the exception of Slovenia, have been resolved, and adds that new scenarios of violent conflict are possible in the area within the coming few years.[79] *Le Monde Diplomatique*, in a March 2007 article titled "Kosovo, still ready to explode", strongly reinforces the critique on the EU management of the situation, arguing that corruption, non-integration, frustration and unemployment are among the factors that could trigger a re-explosion of violence.[80] Finally, Øberg writes that it could certainly be objected that to anyone "who has followed EU policies in the former Yugoslavia may wonder why Solana's paper is so lacking in either self-criticism or humility or both."[81] Also, in a more recent article, he writes that Solana, in 1999, was the highest civil decision-maker responsible for destroying Serbia and Kosovo, "a gross violation of international law, done without UN backing and leading to unspeakable suffering…"[82]

It seems sad and hypocritical that individuals and their organizations, in this case NATO,

---

[73] Idem
[74] Idem
[75] *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 7
[76] Galtung, *Solana's (and EU's?) Foreign Policy: A Non-Starter,* 2004
[77] *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 8
[78] Idem, p. 11
[79] Graf, 2006, p. 1
[80] Dérens, 2007, p. 1
[81] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 18
[82] Øberg, *EU at 50 - What has it got to do with peace?,* 2007

directly responsible for bombing countries and thereafter claiming to have stabilized them and brought peace are not scrutinized and held accountable for their actions. Nonetheless, the document states that what the EU needs to do in future is more of the same, which must mean that military action is still the preferred tool. This is confirmed by Graf, who mentions the Helsinki 1999 and Brussels 2000 meetings which concretely defined the defense and intervention capabilities, and which led to both a projected EU force of around 60.000 soldiers and the build-up of a civilian deployment force, but with the civilian dimension still clearly subordinate.[83] It seems that nothing is about to change and that the EU, or single EU Member States, could again embark into a military adventure in the near future, causing more damage and suffering than it will ever understand, if one is to believe the self-complacent tone of EU documents such as the ESS. Clearly, it seems Solana, and the EU, would clearly need to reconsider their ideas and political action, if they want to genuinely come across as respectively persons and institutions of their word and true peacemakers.

The *European Security Strategy* states that the EU needs 160 billion Euro per year in order to "sustain several operations simultaneously" to assist the UN when asked to do so.[84] However, the document subsequently states that the EU should react before situations deteriorate, which is something the UN Charter does not authorize.[85] Graf is of the same opinion when he mentions that, with the erection of defense and intervention forces, the EU is working itself into a chaotic state of national armies, NATO and EU forces without clear task divisions and without a mandate from the UN.[86] Again, we see a relapse into a view of "settling" violent conflicts that is light-years behind the UN Charter, which advocates peace by peaceful means. The EU even contradicts itself on this point, by stating in the ESS that

> "We are committed to upholding and developing International Law. The fundamental framework for international relations is the United Nations Charter … Strengthening the United Nations, equipping it to fulfill its responsibilities and to act effectively, is a European priority."

The Treaty also miserably fails in this respect, as it "does not contain any norm or provision that the EU should primarily endeavor to resolve conflicts by peaceful means, nor that the EU should work for the abolition of war as a social institution."[87] Whereas virtually all other aims, such as the market economy, trade, defense, rights and institutions, are dealt with in detail in the Treaty, there is no addressing of the issue of peace, though stated as the Union's prime aim. This is worrisome, as it indicates the EU will continue behaving the way it does, which is not as peaceful as it portrays itself. As Gandhi said, "An eye for an eye makes the world blind", so the countries comprising the EU, especially the former colonial powers, really need to change some of their patterns of behavior if they do not want to continue make others blind and, somewhere along the line, become blind themselves.

According to Solana, the establishment of an EU defense agency is the right way ahead in the first place. However, again, in the *European Security Strategy* document, the EU contradicts itself. This time, it takes place on the very same page. On page 12, it states that

> "To transform our militaries into more flexible, mobile forces, and to enable them to address the new threats, more resources for defence and more effective use of resources are necessary."

And, after the subsequent phrase, it reads

> "In almost every major intervention, military efficiency has been followed by civilian chaos.

---

[83] Graf, 2006, p. 1-2
[84] *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 12
[85] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 19
[86] Graf, 2006, p. 2
[87] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 21

We need greater capacity to bring all necessary civilian resources to bear in crisis and post crisis situations."[88]

First of all, why allocate more money to the military, as it is increasingly becoming clear that military and the way it operates does not appreciate nor allow for genuine conflict settlement? Secondly, and in relation to the former, how can one add to it that military *should* be used, for what else can "enable them to address new threats" and giving them "more resources" mean? Both remarks are in stark contrast to the second passage stating that "military efficiency has been followed by civilian chaos" and that civilian resources need more attention. Why then, again, according to the first passage, should increasing emphasis be placed on the military? Also, one might ask if military is really efficient if it has, in the words of the EU, created "civilian chaos." Is the goal of military generally not to quell violent conflict by addressing military personnel and facilities of the adversary country or countries with minimum harm to civilians? What were the Geneva Conventions all about? Finally, one could say that these two passages seem to indicate that the EU follows US lead unconditionally in the belief that military intervention is necessary and should always take place before civilian efforts which, as the Iraq invasion clearly shows, is a nonsensical approach.

EU Cooperation

Emphasis is repeatedly placed on the EU's close relationship with NATO, but not with other organizations. It is axiomatic that the EU should cooperate with as many countries as possible but again the transatlantic partnership takes precedence, as it is the only one being mentioned. "Our aim should be an effective and balanced partnership with the USA", because "Acting together, we can be a formidable force for good in the world". Both Galtung and Øberg deem the *European Security Strategy* as failing in its analysis.[89] It begins by making some good points, but goes on to reach increasingly for the military tool kit.

All areas of foreign, security and defense policy come within the scope of the EU top leadership's decision-making, not just some or most of them. Graf states that the Member States are already obliged to act loyally and in solidarity to the CFSP, which basically means that the interests of the big countries in the Union take priority, so that the Member States must "refrain themselves from any act which could harm the interests of the Union or its functionality as coherent force in international relations."[90] In the words of Øberg, "the Union is in practice attempting to run countries' security policy."[91] The only exception, being in a way beyond or "above" the EU's powers, is where its Member States are variously bound by NATO commitments (Article 41). It should also be pointed out that every Member State is required to support the CFSP "actively and unreservedly".

To conclude, it can be said that the EU, with respect to the dimensions referred to above, falls virtually completely into the traditional, national approach to security with the emphasis on military resources. At present then, as was briefly mentioned earlier on in this essay, it is highly improbable that the EU understands, will understand, or is willing and able to contribute to a reduction of the four types of violence, direct, structural, cultural and environmental, in the world. In the current situation, it mostly depends on whether individual Member States assume greater shared responsibility for the world than the EU does[92] or on external forces, such as an increasingly vocal and supported international environmental shift or (perceived) political and economical pressure from Chindia.

---

[88] *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 12

[89] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 19 / Galtung, *Solana's (and EU's ?) Foreign Policy: A Non-Starter,* 2004

[90] Graf, 2006, p. 1

[91] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 24

[92] Idem, p. 37

The next two chapters will look at what can be done to redress and influence these, as well as other, shortfalls of the EU's practice. The first of these chapters will focus on what the US initiative for a Department of Peace looks like, what can be drawn from it. The second is focused around a list of suggested tasks and responsibilities of the Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation.

THERAPY

Possible EU Future Principles and Actions:
Origin and Functions of the US Department for Peace and Nonviolence

As the idea of a Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation, known there as Department for Peace and Nonviolence, first emerged in the USA, the first part of the chapter will be dedicated to those efforts and to the current situation of the Department.

Once Upon a Time in the West
To the colonizers, the end of the 18th century was filled with exciting years on the North American continent, as the new nation of the United States of America was about to be formed. Besides the immense suffering of and injustice inflicted upon the various First Nations, another small matter often slips out of the narratives of those times.

It is the year 1792 and two gentlemen, Benjamin Banneker, a noted African American scientist, surveyor and editor, and Dr. Benjamin Rush, a physician and university professor, proposed a Department of Peace to George Washington and Thomas Jefferson in an essay.[93] The document they presented, titled "A Plan of a Peace-Office for the United States", kicks off as follows

> "Among the defects which have been pointed out in the Federal Treaty by its antifederal enemies, it is much to be lamented that no person has taken notice of its total silence upon the subject of an office of the utmost importance to the welfare of the United States, that is, an office for promoting and preserving perpetual peace in our country. It is to be hoped that no objection will be made to the establishment of such an office, while we are engaged in a war with the Indians, for as the War-Office of the United States was established in time of peace, it is equally reasonable that a Peace-Office should be established in the time of war."[94]

Further down, it states

> "To inspire a veneration for human life, and an horror at the shedding of blood, let all those laws be repealed which authorize juries, judges, sheriffs, or hangmen to assume the resentments of individuals and to commit murder in cold blood in any case whatever. Until this reformation in our code of penal jurisprudence takes place, it will be in vain to attempt to introduce universal and perpetual peace in our country.
> To subdue that passion for war, which education, added to human depravity, have made universal, a familiarity with the instruments of death, as well as all military shows, should be carefully avoided. For which reason, militia laws should every where be repealed, and military dresses and military titles should be laid aside: reviews tend to lessen the horrors of a battle by connecting them with the charms of order; militia laws generate idleness and vice, and thereby produce the wars they are said to prevent; military dresses fascinate the minds of young men, and lead them from serious and useful professions; were there no *uniforms*, there would probably be no armies; lastly, military titles feed vanity, and keep up ideas in the mind which lessen a sense of the folly and miseries of war."[95]

From a perspective of Peace Studies, the understanding of the deeper implications of a culture/discourse of war seems profound in this fragment of the essay. Some of the more practical recommendations are rather interesting and, as most of the current peace discourse, fully absent

---

[93] Vance, 2006; Helfrich, 2004
[94] Helfrich, 2004
[95] Idem

from the main discourses in politics most societies around the globe know. Towards the end of the essay, the criticism hardens to virtually outright cynicism. Undoubtedly, this stems from Rush's firsthand experience with war as a doctor, witnessing less rosier sides of large-scale violence than most powerful war advocates do, often themselves far away from the violence

> "In order more deeply to affect the minds of the citizens of the United States with the blessings of peace, by contrasting them with the evils of war, let the following inscriptions be painted upon the sign which is placed over the door of the War Office:
> 1. An office for butchering the human species.
> 2. A Widow and Orphan making office.
> 3. A broken bone making office.
> 4. A Wooden leg making office.
> 5. An office for the creating of public and private vices.
> 6. An office for creating a public debt.
> 7. An office for creating speculators, stock Jobbers, and Bankrupts.
> 8. An office for creating famine.
> 9. An office for creating pestilential diseases.
> 10. An office for creating poverty, and the destruction of liberty, and national happiness.
> …
> In the lobby of this office let there be painted representations of all the common military instruments of death, also human skulls, broken bones, unburied and putrefying dead bodies, hospitals crowded with sick and wounded Soldiers, villages on fire, mothers in besieged towns eating the flesh of their children, ships sinking in the ocean, rivers dyed with blood, and extensive plains without a tree or fence, or any object, but the ruins of deserted farm houses."[96]

The USA currently has no Office for Peace. Regrettably, the efforts of the two men have thus far gone in vain. As of recent, the greatest period of activity around the issue has been between 1955 and 1968, when 85 bills were presented in the House of Representatives and Senate, several proposals were made calling for a Department of Peace, a Secretary of Peace, or, more modestly, a "Peace Division in the State Department"[97] The latest in a long series of efforts, as of March 2007, is the introduction by Congressman Dennis Kucinich of Ohio and 51 co-sponsors of Congress Bill HR 808,[98] to call for the establishment of a cabinet level US Department of Peace.

Under this Bill the Department would be based on three basic assumptions:[99]

1 Internationally, the Department would provide the President with specific options for non-violent resolution of conflict and peacemaking strategies for post-war stabilization.

2 Domestically, the Department would have jurisdiction to address national and local issues including drug and gang violence, school bullying, prison reform and domestic abuse. All such issues would be coordinated under one umbrella to increase efficiency and effectiveness, as is now with.

3 The Department of Peace would establish a Peace Academy, patterned after the military academies, where students would learn peaceful conflict resolution skills and, after graduation, would serve in peace-related postings here at home or abroad.

As Marianne Perez, active for the organization *Americans for a Department of Peace*, one of the main organizations supporting the Department of Peace initiative in the US, argues in her work on establishing a culture of peace, the present US governmental system "has a strong bias towards the Department of Defense which effectively militarizes all aspects of society" and, she adds,

---

[96] Helfrich, 2004
[97] Perez, 2006, p. 7
[98] *H.R. 808: To establish a Department of Peace and Conflict Transformation*, 2007
[99] Idem

"This is especially evident in the overwhelming presence of violence in the media with little or no analysis or contextualization… There are, however, in all strata of society groups working towards a culture of peace, but, for various reasons their voice is not heard in the mainstream media."[100]

As already mentioned in previous chapters, military influence is less in the EU. Nonetheless, the influence seems to be growing, so the EU and its citizens must be careful. The point Perez raises about the media, can, unfortunately, be wholly extrapolated to the current reality in EU Member States.

The US initiative for a Department of Peace is not the only one. At present, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, India, Italy, Japan, Nepal, Uganda and the United Kingdom[101] all have their separate initiatives and are, as the US initiative, organized under the umbrella organization of the Global Alliance for Ministries and Departments of Peace. In London, on 18 and 19 October 2005, this organization was launched at the First People's Summit for Departments of Peace to support national-level campaigns to establish Peace Ministries and Departments throughout the world.[102] So far however, none of the efforts has been successful.

We are shaped by our cultures, but we also create them. Cultures change with time, which means through the heads, hearts and hands of our ancestors. This means that our behavior should not be dictated by that culture and, as much as we might be inspired or disgusted by it, it is our responsibility to alter the elements we want to. The proposed Commissariat is a vehicle to facilitate such advancement.

The next chapter will elaborate upon what the Commissariat could address, by stating its objectives and goal. It will show that the process of moving towards more peace is a process which involves many efforts which all mutually reinforce and complement each others efforts.

---

[100] Perez, 2006, p. 5
[101] *National Campaigns*, 2006
[102] *Introduction to the Global Alliance for Ministries and Departments of Peace*, 2006, p. 3

THERAPY

Possible EU Future Principles and Actions:
Mission and Examples of Changes through the Commissariat

What Path the EU can Create
In the words of Chalmers Johnson, one of the most prolific writers on the upcoming demise of the US empire,

> "History tells us there's no more unstable, critical configuration than the combination of domestic democracy and foreign empire. You can be one or the other. You can be a democratic country, as we have claimed in the past to be, based on our Constitution. Or you can be an empire. But you can't be both. The classic example is the Roman republic, on which our country was, in many respects, modeled. They decided, largely through the influence of militarism, to retain their empire. Having decided to retain it, they then lost their democracy due to military intervention in politics after the assassination of Julius Caesar and the coming to power of military dictators. They were termed Roman emperors, but they were essentially military dictators."[103]

Unfortunately, the EU states in its *ESS* that "The transatlantic relationship is irreplaceable."[104] It is in the interest of us all that, in contrast to current complacent attitudes towards the US, somewhere in the near future, this can still turn into a healthy relationship of constructive criticism and dialogue on equal footing. A Roman Empire-like downfall in not very desirable, neither for the US itself nor for the rest of the world. More specifically, it is clear that an EU Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation should try to formulate policy advice that would never ever allow passages and acts such as those presented in the last three pages; neither should it push the EU towards aspiring deterrence of other world regions and/or their domination. In the long run, it simply creates widespread international fear and mistrust, as is currently the case between the USA and most other countries. The EU, as Øberg phrases it, should behave more independently by developing a niche for itself, "which will be regarded by the world outside the EU as far more attractive and compatible with the professional conflict management policies and skills needed in the future."[105] This is certainly a vision that is both strong and sustainable for a constructive future of international relations for, as German philosopher von Goethe nicely termed it, "Divide and rule, [is] a sound motto. Unite and lead, a better one." Global governance, and especially the key states shaping its bulk, should move past neo-imperialist politics towards a new order that is more human, constructive, equitable and sustainable.

As a last remark, it should also be taken with the experience gained since the end of the Cold War that it is simply impracticable to first destroy countries' economies, political systems and physical appearance, and then expect to rebuild them within a mere few years and to, all of a sudden, find happy, secure and reconciled people.[106] As the famous scholar Jean-Paul Lederach points out, sustainable peace requires attitudinal changes, crafting of new relationships, a novel social structure as well as the development of a culture of peace and, by that, our entire manner in which we approach conflicts can change.[107] Currently, there is an incomplete vision in the mainstream, but also in the highest echelons of politics, religion and business, of what peace work entails. Lederach attributes the gaps in this vision to the legacy of

---

[103] Karlin, 2007
[104] *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 13
[105] Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 41
[106] Idem, p. 38
[107] Graf; Kramer; Nicolescou, 2006, p. 7-8

"traditional approaches of conflict resolution through military, diplomatic, legal means, which long predate the systemic contexts of modern warfare, capitalism, secularism and the modern nation state system. This legacy, hammered into the deep psyche of most societies over a period of millennia, has left us with the notion that once an agreement is signed, however it may have been settled, it is final and the problem is resolved. The result is an overemphasis on elite negotiation and interdependence between elites, while neglecting the elites' need for interdependence with the people they aim to lead and govern. It also results in an over-emphasis of a peace or ceasefire agreement, while the complex processes necessary for peace and the transformation of conflict are neglected. The final result is a superficial peace without roots or chances for development."[108]

Certainly, the EU Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation will be challenged to overcome what Lederach states. However, as shown throughout the previous chapters, conflict is not about intrastate or interstate war only, as direct violence on a large scale is only the tip of the iceberg. There are many more structural and cultural issues to address.

Specifically, the Commissariat will spread knowledge on how to wage conflict non-violently; facilitate empathy and understanding; protect Human Rights and Human Security; create spaces for dialogue; envision a better future and transform causes and consequences of conflict.

Structure of the Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation
Although the US initiative for a Department of Peace and Conflict Transformation is an interesting example for the EU to emulate, it is hard to say whether the establishment of a Commissariat at a similar structural level, such as an EU Commissariat, is the only way forward. However, more importantly, I cannot abstain from shortly commenting on the possible structure of such an institution, for if a doctor gives his patients a great diagnosis, an accurate prognosis, but does not do anything as far as therapy goes, that doctor is a criminal. So, even though this thesis is not about the structure and shape of an EU-level institution or Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation, at least a couple of recommendations such a body could make are included, so as to give the reader a clear picture of what could be coming from such an institution.

To lift a tip of the veil of structure the Commissariat could, for example, be a network of NGOs, university departments, journalists and concerned citizens with some EU Member State representatives, meeting every month and reporting to the European Commission and Parliament. Alternatively, one could envisage an intergovernmental panel of EU Member State representatives from the respective Foreign Affairs, Development, Peacebuilding and/or Conflict Prevention Ministries or Departments meeting coming up with joint strategy documents and incorporating them into the national legislation. Another option would be establishing a fully fledged Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation operating just as any other Commissariat. Many more options can be envisaged but, as this thesis is not about this aspect, all readers with an interest in the topic are invited to take this research a step further and come up with concrete proposals for a structure. I will certainly do so myself in the near future.

Proposed objective and goals of the Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation

Main objective:
To stimulate peace as a primary organizational principle in the private and public sphere both within the EU and, as much as possible, outside of it.

Primary goals:

---

[108] Idem

- Provide the EU institutions and Member States with specific options for non-violent resolution of interstate and intrastate conflict, as well as and peacemaking strategies for post-war stabilization and reconstruction worldwide.
- Provide the EU with policy formulations to address EU and Member State level as well as local issues including drug and gang violence, school bullying, prison reform and domestic abuse.

Secondary goals:
- *To direct EU policy towards non-violent resolution of conflict and to seek peace by peaceful means in all conflict areas*; by, for example, studying and promoting multifaceted, widespread and inclusive approaches, and by cooperating in that fashion with UN, OSCE and regional organizations around the world, as when EU security and peace policies will consistently move in the civilian direction, the EU will most probably soon become more attractive in the eyes of other parts of the world;
- *To promote non-military means of peacemaking and peacebuilding*; by, for example, instilling mechanisms of early warning, diagnosis, prediction and handling need to be put in place and be enabled to monitor worldwide;
- *To stimulate transarmament and disarmament*; by, for example, formulating policies to enable Member States to avoid being targeted or involved in any form of war, by concentrating on purely self-defensive mechanisms and, to that end partially, dismantle all nuclear bombs within the EU and scale down and shut down most arms production;
- *To develop new approaches to non-violent intervention*; by, for example, utilize constructive dialogue, mediation and the peaceful resolution of conflict at home and abroad;
- *To encourage the development of bottom-up and non-elite peace initiatives;* by, for example, from local communities, faith groups, NGOs, and by formation of civilian nonviolent peace forces which retain good qualities of armies such as good organization, brotherhood, courage, willingness to sacrifice but replace killing and conflict suppression by non-violence and assistance in conflict transformation;
- *To facilitate the development of peace and reconciliation summits*; by, for example, mass processes to promote non-violent communication and mutually-beneficial solutions;
- *To act as a resource*; by, for example, the creation and the gathering of best practices documents, lessons learned, and peace impact assessments;
- *To professionalize post-war reconstruction and demobilization in war-torn societies*; by, for example, providing for the training of all military and civilian personnel who administer the situation;
- *To ensure understanding the fundamentals of peace and nonviolence among students of all* ages; by, for example, funding the development of peace curriculum materials for use at all educational levels which ensure all students are able to largely understand and cope with fundamental causes of violence such as fear, hatred, intolerance, desperation and hopelessness;
- *To enable EU citizens young in age and/ or spirit to serve in peace-related postings within the EU or abroad*; by, for example, providing for the establishment of a Peace Academy, patterned after the military academies, where students (including all EU diplomats) would learn peaceful conflict resolution skills and, after graduation, would, and helping for a limited period in tasks as diverse as: presence alongside the affected populations; support for humanitarian operations; support to local peace constituencies; observation, monitoring and reporting on human rights conditions; reconciliation work; facilitation of inter-religious dialogue;
- *To provide for as fair and broad-minded as possible media*; by, for example, training all journalists in peace journalism, since media in general and journalists in particular are a key factor in cultivating a culture of peace. They can be involved in assisting in the design of non-violent policies; study further the role media can have in de-escalation of conflicts and

improve media with regards to how to be aware and better promote peace; and,

- *To provide ideas for the environmental questions*; by, for example, investing in the EU and abroad of it as much as possible in (the development of) alternative energy such as solar, wind, water.

Additional…

The reader most certainly has some additions to make to the aforepresented proposals. On top of this, it is impossible to predict what the fruits will be from the synergy of countless professionals dedicated to peace. There are indeed many more things that can be done and it is important that the whole of civil society, meaning you, me and all other citizens worldwide, are critical but also constructive in our scrutiny of our government in particular and world affairs in general. Also, and in relation to the point just made, when and if some of the measures mentioned in this chapter will have been implemented, it is extremely important that they be carefully analyzed. This because, unfortunately, no matter how well one can plan in advance, unforeseen developments often take place when changing a certain status quo. Blindly implementing the successive stages in whatever plan can be counterproductive, especially if circumstances have changed beyond the reach of one's original plans. Herein lays one of the greater dangers of (modern) politics, the inability of leaders to admit failures or of being wrong about a certain matter, which leads to an even worse situation in order to cover up the initial flaw, hereby creating a downward spiral with extremely hazardous outcomes. This means that whoever wishes to initiate these plans should be idealistic, driven, but not stubborn and blind to reality. Reculturing global political culture might just be another merit of the Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation.

The 21st century, more than any other century, is one in dire need of reculturing. As the English writer Wells said, "Our time is merely a race between education and extinction". It seems that if humanity wants to avoid anthropogenic extinction, which seems to have become more and more challenging, there is a need to severely improve conflict transformation skills and decrease lethality of all our complex relationships worldwide. This process should follow the logic of countering our tendency towards violence and warfare, starting from the individual all the way up to the global. This reculturing needs to incorporate elements from direct, structural, cultural and environmental peace. The proposed Commissariat can speed up and broaden this process within the EU and it is expected to have ripple effects throughout the world.

The window of opportunity is ever narrowing, so it is the world is to progress towards a better peace culture, there is no time to waste. If a proper set of initiatives is set up, it can save much often unnecessary grief to us and others alike. On top of this, the inability to constructively deal with and re-channel the strong energy caging negative emotions arising from conflicts leaves us with untapped strength for transformation beyond our wildest dreams.

.

Bibliography

Books

Fischer, Dietrich. Nonmilitary Aspects of Security: A Systems Approach. A report to the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), Brookfield, Vermouth: Dartmouth, 1993

Fischer, Dietrich. Preventing War in the Nuclear Age. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Lanham, 1984

Galtung, Johan. Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization. London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1996

Harding, H. China's Co-operative Behavior, in W.T. Robinson and D. Sambough, ed.: *Chinese foreign policy, Theory and Practice,* Clarendon Paperbacks, 1994

Johansen, Jørgen. "Nonviolence: More than the absence of violence", in J. Galtung and C. Webel, ed.: *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies,* Routledge Taylor and Francis Group,\. London, 2007

Kant, Immanuel. Perpetual Peace and Other Essays on politics, history and morals. Trans. Ted Humphrey. Fourth printing, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 1992

Lederach, John-Paul. Justpeace, People Building Peace 35 Inspiring Stories from Around the World, European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Trasformation, Utrecht: European Center for Conflict Prevention. 1999

Lederach, John-Paul. The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005

Leslie, John. The end of the world: The science and ethics of human extinction. New York: Routeledge, 1996

Murphy, Cornelius F. Jr. Theories of World Governance: A Study in the History of Ideas. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999

Næss, Aerne. Gandhi and group conflict: an exploration of Satyagraha: theoretical background. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1974

Speer, Albert. Inside the Third Reich: Memoirs by Albert Speer. Trans. Richard and Clara Winston. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970

Unpublished work

Ariyaratne, Vinya. "The Sarvodaya approach to peace in Sri Lanka". Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement of Sri Lanka. *Unpublished paper.* 2006.

Galtung, Johan. "The Coming 100 Years of Peacemaking". *Unpublished paper.* 1993

Graf, Wilfried; Kramer, Gudrun; Nicolescou, Augustin. "The Art of Conflict Transformation

through Dialogue". The Institute for Integrative Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding. *Unpublished paper.* 2006

Internet articles and documents

Anderson, Mary B.; Olson, Lara. "Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners" <u>The Collaborative for Development Action, Inc.</u> 2003.
<<u>www.usaid.gov/our_**work**/cross-cutting_programs/private_voluntary_cooperation/ conf_anderson_doughty_olson.pdf</u>>

Angier, Natalie. "Is War our Biological Destiny?". <u>New York Times</u>. Nov. 11, 2003.
<u>http://www.thirdside.org/faq_nat_05.cfm</u>

Baker, Carolyn. "Propagating Economic Collapse: The Cloning of Enron". <u>Information Clearing House</u>. Jan. 30, 2006.
<<u>http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11716.htm</u>>

Baroud, Ramzy. "Imminent Decline of Empire?" <u>Global Policy Forum.</u> Apr. 12, 2006.
<<u>http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/challenges/general/2006/0412decline.htm</u>>

Boyle, Francis A. "The American Empire: A Banana Republic?". <u>Crimes Against Humanity.</u> Jan. 25, 2002.
<<u>http://www.ratical.org/ratville/CAH/fab012502.html</u>>

Chomsky, Noam. "New World Relationships". <u>The Noam Chomsky Website</u>. Mar. 10, 2006.
<<u>http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20060310.htm</u>>

Danesh, Roshan; Danesh, Hossain B. "Has Conflict Resolution Grown Up?: Toward a Developmental Model of Decision Making and Conflict Resolution". <u>Education For Peace International</u>. 2002.
<<u>www.efpinternational.org/publications/Has_Conflict_Resolution_Grown_Up.pdf</u>>

Davies, B. James et. al. "The World Distribution of Household Wealth". <u>World Institute for Development Economics Research of the United Nations University</u>. Dec. 5, 2006
<<u>http://www.wider.unu.edu/research/2006-2007/2006-2007-1/wider-wdhw-launch-5-12-2006/wider-wdhw-press-release-5-12-2006.pdf</u>>

Dérens, Jean-Arnault. "Kosovo, still ready to explode". <u>Le Monde Diplomatique</u>. March 2007.
<<u>http://mondediplo.com/2007/03/12kosovo</u>>

DeYoung, Karen. "Spy Agencies Say Iraq War Hurting U.S. Terror Fight". <u>The Washington Post</u>. Sep. 24, 2006.
<<u>http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/23/AR2006092301130.html</u>>

Eisenhower, Dwight D. "Farewell Radio and Television Address to the American People". <u>Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Center</u>. Jan. 17, 1961.
<<u>http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/speeches/farewell_address.html</u>>

Fisk, Robert. "The Roman Empire Is Falling - So It Turns To Iran and Syria". <u>Global Policy Forum.</u> Dec. 7, 2006.
<<u>http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/history/2006/1207romanempire.htm</u>>

Foster, John Bellamy. "The New Age of Imperialism". Monthly Review. Jul.-Aug. 2003.
<http://www.monthlyreview.org/0703jbf.htm>

Friesen, Eric R. "The Need for a Global Democracy: Obstacles and Reworking Structure".
European University Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. 2006
<http://www.aspr.ac.at/epu/Friesen.pdf>

Fuller, Graham. "Graham Fuller and Superpower Fatigue?". Global Policy Forum. Summer 2006.
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/challenges/general/2006/summersuperpowerfatigue.htm>

Galtung, Johan. "Learning from Gandhi: Toward a nonviolent world order". Peacemaking South
Korea. Mar. 6, 2007.
<http://www.peacemaking.co.kr/english/news/view.php?papercode=ENGLISH&newsno=817&pub
no=263>

Galtung, Johan. "On the Coming Decline and Fall of the US Empire". The Transnational
Foundation for Peace and Future Research. Jan. 28, 2004.
<http://www.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2004/Galtung_USempireFall.html>

Galtung, Johan. "Solana's (and the EU's?) Foreign Policy: A Non-Starter". The Transnational
Foundation for Peace and Future Research. Jul. 23, 2004.
<http://www.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2004/Galtung_Solana.html>

Graf, Wilfried. "Supermacht oder Friedensordnung? Die EU zwischen Militarisierung und
Friedenspolitik" Institute for Integrative Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding. 2006.
<http://www.iicp.at/communications/publications/articles/Graf_Supermacht%20oder%20Friedensor
dnung.pdf>

Helfrich, Joel T. "Peace as an American Doctrine: An Indispensable Civic Ideal". Apr. 20, 2004.
<http://www.thepeacealliance.org/content/view/61/156/**>**

Johnson, Chalmers. "737 U.S. Military = Global Empire". Information Clearing House. Feb. 19,
2007.
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article17123.htm>

Johnson, Chalmers. "Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic". Information Clearing
House. Feb. 27, 2007.
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article17210.htm>

Karlin, Mark. "Is the American Empire on the Brink of Collapse?". AlterNet. Mar. 24, 2007.
<http://www.alternet.org/story/49603/>

King, Martin Luther Jr. "Principles of creative nonviolence". Pace e bene Nonviolence Service.
1958.
<http://www.paceebene.org/pace/principles-of-creative-nonviolence/martin-luther-king-jr-s-princ>

Kristol, William. "Project for the new American Century". Project for the New American Century.
2007.
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/>

Luyendijk, Joris. "Agreement on terms". Le Monde Diplomatique. Mar. 2007
<http://mondediplo.com/2007/03/17agreement>

Mahony, Honor. "Europe at 50". <u>EUObserver</u>. 30 Mar., 2007.
<<http://euobserver.com/9/23536>>

Mazzetti, Mark. "Spy Agencies Say Iraq War Worsens Terrorism Threat". <u>The New York Times</u>.
Sep.24, 2006.
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/24/world/middleeast/24terror.html?ex=1316750400&en=da252be85d1b39fa&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>>

Miller, Christopher E. King, Mary E., Ed. "A Glossary of Concepts and Terms in Peace and Conflict Studies". <u>University for Peace</u>, 2005.
<<www.africa.upeace.org/documents/GlossaryV2.pdf>>

Nader, Ralph. "Bush At Tipping Point: A Lawless and Incompetent Leadership". <u>End of Empire: Moving towards a better world</u>. Mar. 18, 2006.
<<http://www.endofempire.org/soc_movement.php?page=18>>

Øberg, Jan. "Does the EU Promote Peace? Analysis, critiques and alternatives." <u>The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research</u>. 2006.
<<www.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2006/Oberg_EU_Promote_Peace.pdf>>

Øberg, Jan. "What is peace? My summary of 35 years of thinking and practising". <u>The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research.</u> Feb. 13, 2007
<<http://www.transnational.org/Resources_Treasures/2007/Øberg_PeaceSummarized.html>>

Øberg, Jan; Hårleman, Christian. "Peaceful Europe – Something different". <u>The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research</u>. Jan. 17, 2001
<<http://www.transnational.org/SAJT/pressinf/2001/pf112_PeacefulEurope.html>>

Perez, Marianne. "Moving Mainstream Media towards a Culture of Peace". <u>European University Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies</u>. 2006.
<<http://www.aspr.ac.at/epu/Perez.pdf>>

Ramonet, Ignacio. "Secrets and lies". <u>Le Monde Diplomatique</u>. March 2007.
<<http://mondediplo.com/2007/03/01ciaflights>>

Robinson, Mary. "WMDs in slow motion". <u>The Guardian</u>. Jul. 11, 2006.
<<http://www.guardian.co.uk/armstrade/story/0,,1817576,00.html>>

Rockwell, Paul. "The Role of Boycotts in the Fight for Peace". <u>Common Dreams News Centre</u>. Nov. 18, 2004.
<<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1118-24.htm>>

Stoppard, Tom. "Tom Stoppard: The EU was formed in the shadow of Nazism. But, 50 years on, it should remember evil is still with us". <u>The Independent</u>. Mar. 24, 2007.
<<http://comment.independent.co.uk/commentators/article2387856.ece>>

Shuqing, Liu. "Speech by Mr. Liu Shuqing, Chairman, India-China Eminent Person's Group at the seminar of 50 Years of Panchsheel: Towards a New International Order Base on Genuine Multilateralism" <u>Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India</u>. Nov. 18, 2004.
<<http://www.chinaembassy.org.in/eng/zyjh/t174131.htm>>

Tyler, Patrick E. "U.S. Strategy Plan Calls for Insuring No Rivals Develop a One-Superpower World". <u>The New York Times</u>. Mar. 8, 1992.

 <http://work.colum.edu/~amiller/wolfowitz1992.htm>

Vance, Laurence M. "Benjamin Rush's Peace Office". LewRockwell.Com. Apr. 19, 2006. <http://www.lewrockwell.com/vance/vance76.html>

Whitney, Mike. "The Second Great Depression". Information Clearing House. Feb. 21, 2007. **<**http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article17145.htm**>**

Willan, Philip. "Brittle Italy". Sunday Herald International. Feb. 24, 2007. <http://www.sundayherald.com/international/shinternational/display.var.1217827.0.0.php>

"A heavyweight champ, at five foot two". The Economist. Nov. 23, 2006. <http://www.economist.com/business/displaystory.cfm?story_id=8313925>

"A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy". European Union. Dec. 12, 2003. <http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/76255.pdf>

"An Inclusive World in which the West, Islam and the Rest have a stake". Strategic Foresight Group. 2007. <http://www.strategicforesight.com/AnInclusiveWorld.pdf>

"Chindia: The 21st Century Challenge". Heartland, Eurasia Review of World Politics. Mar. 2005. <http://www.heartland.it/_lib/_docs/2005_03_chindia_the_21st_century_challenge.pdf>

"Goebbels New Year address to Germany". Calvin College. Dec. 31, 1939. <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb21.htm>

"H.R. 808: To establish a Department of Peace and Conflict Transformation". GovTrack. Feb. 5, 2007 <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=h110-808>

"Introduction to the Global Alliance for Ministries and Departments of Peace". Global Alliance for Ministries and Departments of Peace. Sep. 2006 <http://www.mfp-dop.org/documents/DocumentPackage.pdf>

"National Campaigns". Global Alliance for Ministries and Departments of Peace. 2006. <http://www.mfp-dop.org/modules.php?name=Content&pa=showpage&pid=14>

"Non-Proliferation Treaty". Department for Disarmament Affairs, United Nations. 2005 http://www.un.org/events/npt2005/npttreaty.html

"President tries to give Americans some answers". The Indianapolis Star. Sep. 21, 2001 <http://www.indystar.com/library/factfiles/crime/national/2001/sept11/transcripts/0921bush.html>

"Propaganda: Did Goebbels write The Bush Administration speeches?". Information Clearing House. *No date.* <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article4433.htm>

"Putting conflict prevention into practice: Priorities for the Spanish and Danish EU Presidencies in 2002". *Intermon Oxfam, International Alert, Saferworld*. 2002. <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/images/pubdocs/Presidency2002.pdf>

"The State of Food Security around the World 2004". *Food and Agriculture* Organization 2004

<http://www.fao.org/documents/show_cdr.asp?url_file=/docrep/007/y5650e/y5650e02.htm>

"Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe". European Union. Dec. 16, 2004.
<http://europa.eu/scadplus/constitution/index_en.htm>

Lecture notes

Brand-Jacobsen, Kai Fritjhof. "Peacebuilding: from the Local to the Global level". Lecture, European University Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. Mar. 2007

Galtung, Johan. "Peaceful Conflict Transformation". Lecture, European University Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. Dec. 2006

Johansen, Jørgen. "Nonviolence: From Philosophy to a Practical Tool". Lecture, European University Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. Oct. 2006