

A People's Charter on Peace for Life

INTRODUCTION

A People's Charter on Peace has been a felt need among peace movements and peace workers for a long time. This is in recognition of two factors: one, there is a new geopolitical context at the beginning of the twenty-first century; two, most declarations on peace are from inter-state or state related institutions. The need was for a peace charter from a people's perspective.

The international conference (sponsored by WCC, CCA and NCC Philippines) in September 2002 clearly underlined the fact of a new geopolitical context. This was the conference which founded the organization *Peace for Life*. The conference was one of the first to attempt to define the new context as that of an emerging global empire and more specifically the U.S. Empire. It was felt necessary to rediscover the true meaning of peace in the new context and to affirm a new commitment to peacemaking. For this it was felt that a Charter on peace would be extremely valuable and useful. While many declarations and statements on peace are available there were few models for a peace charter.

The idea of a charter was discussed at a meeting of *Peace for Life* in December 2005 in Hong Kong and some suggestions were formulated. In October 2006, a Workshop was held in Hwacheon, Korea. Presentations were made at the workshop on a peace charter from various perspectives. At the end of the workshop, an outline for a charter was adopted.

In July 2007, a three-person drafting group met in Hong Kong and worked on the first draft of a peace charter. This was further revised and presented at the International Workshop in Hwacheon at the end of October 2007. On the basis of discussions and suggestions at the Workshop, several changes were made.

The **People's Charter on Peace for Life** was adopted at the Workshop.

Two terms need some explanation in the Introduction itself. It may be asked whether it is not presumptuous to call it a People's Charter. There is no claim here to any representative character that it is on behalf of people. The reference is to the character of the document as distinct from that of the governments or interstate bodies. There is of course some claim to the perspective of the people as gained by a large number of persons active in peace movements for a long time.

The term 'peace for life' also may be explained. This is comparatively a new concept underlining the interlocking of life and peace. Peace is for fullness of life. Life in its fullness demands a life of dignity and for that peace is essential. Fullness of life means peace, justice and freedom. The right to life and right to life are intertwined.

A word about Hwacheon, Korea where we outlined and finalized the Peace Charter. It is the smallest county of the Republic of Korea and is close to the Demilitarized Zone. Some of the bloodiest sites of the Korean War are here. Thousands and thousands of soldiers perished here. In few places is the South Korean desire for peace as well as the sometimes surreal manifestation of inter-Korean hostility on better display than in Hwacheon.

The people in the Hwacheon province and their leaders have decided to establish a Bell Park on peace, an art park for peace and an eco 'paradise' and make Hwacheon a place of pilgrimage for peace and life.

The Mayor and people of Hwacheon are delighted that the Peace Charter was drafted in Hwacheon. They extended all support to the two workshops. The groundbreaking ceremony of the Bell Park was held at the time of the Workshop in 2007. They have plans to inscribe a summary of the Charter prominently in the Bell Park. The Charter thus may be also called the **Hwacheon Peace Charter**.

PEOPLE'S CHARTER ON PEACE FOR LIFE

1. Preamble

Recognizing the yearning and right of people to live in peace with dignity;

Realizing that a new global situation has arisen with new challenges and threats to peace, where the total life of all living beings is at stake;

United by the need to rediscover the true meaning of peace today as peace with justice and peace for life;

Conscious of the need to be self-critical about accommodation and compromise with the forces of domination and exploitation;

Underscoring the need for a new commitment as well as to mobilize people in order to make and build peace;

This Charter is adopted as an affirmation of the ardent desire and aspirations of the people for peace.

2. Objectives

This Charter is adopted with the following objectives:

- To articulate the people's vision of peace for life;
- To clarify and redefine the context and concept of peace for life;
- To affirm the fundamentals of peace;
- To serve as a reference point as well as a guide to action for groups and movements for peace; and,
- To provide a model on which instruments for peace efforts can be built in specific situations.

Section I **A NEW CONTEXT**

Peace is the condition for the fullness of life, just as justice is the precondition for peace. Peace ensures the harmonious living of all humankind and creation. In essence, peace is the defense of human dignity and the integrity of the cosmic order of living beings.

From the most violent and war-ridden century in history, the world emerged into the 21st century only to witness the inauguration of an endless and borderless imperial war. A new international order of a global empire with its political, militaristic and ideological/religious dimensions is emerging. Led by the USA, this coalition of the uniting and other major powers and international financial and trade organizations is waging a permanent war.

Under this situation, intolerance, xenophobia, racism and discrimination are being reinforced often in violent and even genocidal fashion. Their practitioners justify them on the grounds of religious, national, cultural, ideological, racial, and ethnic affiliations.

The War on Terror, unleashed by the United States of America and its allies, has disastrous consequences for the whole world. This war poses present and future threats to peace. The War on Terror is limitless, borderless, endless and ever changing in its aims, targets, and enemies, thus potentially an instrument for total control of the world.¹

This is part of the broader geopolitical reality that takes its roots in the twentieth century and emerges more aggressively at the beginning of this century—the Global Empire.² It is intertwined with the militarization of globalization and the attempt to build a new military and economic order threatening all living beings, their future and self-determination, cultures and economies, as well as the ecosystem.

All these have created a world of systemic and structural violence unparalleled in history. The threats to peace and security are no longer solely of a military nature, however. In the recent period, there has been deterioration both at the national and international levels of the various dimensions of security. The scope of destruction and devastation wrought by the combination of these threats is unprecedented in the history of humanity.

Section II **UNDERSTANDING PEACE FOR LIFE**

1. The Right to Peace

The peoples of our planet have a sacred and inviolable right to life, the precondition of which is peace. Citizens of each country can therefore demand of their governments to ensure that their national and international objectives are directed toward attaining peace for life.³

The human right of every woman, man, youth, and child to peace and life lies at the very heart of the realization of all human rights. War and violence result in the systematic and sweeping denial of civil and political rights as well as economic, social, and cultural rights. People have a right to live convivially in harmony with all living beings.

The right to life is denied through various forms of violence such as political killings, forcible displacement, and destruction of habitat.

Peace is a prerequisite for the exercise of all human rights and duties. It is not, however, the peace of silence, whereby men and women remain passive either by choice or by constraint.⁴ It is the peace of freedom, of happiness, equality, and solidarity in which all citizens count, live together, and share. Peace is not an abstract idea but one that is rooted firmly in cultural, political, social, and economic contexts.

The right to peace functions mainly to promote and protect the right to life through peaceful settlement of disputes, by the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, by total disarmament, and through the enforcement of international laws and standards of human rights.

2. Redefinition of War

“By a combination of creative strategies and advanced technologies we are redefining war on our own terms,” the U.S. has officially claimed.⁵

This is an ominous declaration as the Empire redefines not only war strategies but also aims and doctrines of war. War aim has been redefined to mean “regime change” in and occupation of the adversary state.⁶ The redefinition of war places nuclear weapons as essential for military purposes.⁷ Preemption is redefined as “preventive war” with the empire claiming an exclusive right to it, even in defiance of international law and multilateral consensus.⁸

Therefore, the redefinition of war has grave implications for peace. The “creative strategies and advanced technologies” are well reflected in the new doctrines of war. More alarming is that the redefinition is “on our own terms”, i.e., the terms of the Empire. Hence, it is a definition of imperial wars.

These doctrines have to be challenged from the perspective of people grounded in people’s sovereignty and integrity of life of all living beings. Peace has to be redefined on the terms of the people even as rulers and aggressors of the world redefine war on their own terms. The new terms of war—the terminology as well as the conditions they impose—have to be rejected.

Peace can be recovered, reclaimed, and regained only by unmasking the powers, their religion, systems, and institutions that perpetuate war and injustice.

3. Exposing the New Image of War

New images of war are deliberately and assiduously created with a view to sowing fears about so-called new “enemies of freedom” and “non-traditional threats to security” while thwarting efforts and opportunities for peace.

The two World Wars in the twentieth century led people all over the world to develop an abhorrence of war. After the Second World War, wars in many forms, regional and civil, were fought in many parts of the world, often sparked by imperial aggression. Social movements and cultural resistance against war strengthened through various forms of social and political thoughts as well as art and literature denouncing war.

As the 20th century came to a close a new image of war emerged or rather was contrived, if not fully displacing the old one, competing and challenging it. A new lexicon of military terms appeared. War became “surgical”, “precise”, “frictionless”, “post-modern” and even “abstract”. The killing of hundreds of thousands of civilians, through preemptive strikes as well as cruel economic sanctions, was called “collateral damage”.

At the turn of the 21st century another perhaps more profound and disastrous change came. War is projected as inevitable. Its doctrinaires justify war as the means to peace and it is through war that freedom is ensured. Thus, the Empire’s army is praised as the greatest force for freedom. Wars waged by the Empire’s forces will build democracy and free market in many countries. Weapons of war are called instruments of peace. The producers of weapons of mass destruction are hailed as the new peacemakers.⁹ The new images of war are glorified by the powers that be through media manipulation with the aim of globalizing a culture of war.

These images of war have to be exposed and challenged for what they are—myths and lies. One of the casualties of the culture of war is the colonization of our imagination. People need to resist subjugation and reclaim their imagination. They have to dream anew of new possibilities. People need to exercise their imagination and envision a new world—a world without war or violence.

4. A Holistic Understanding of Peace

Simplistically equating peace with the mere absence of war has to be rejected. The peace that is usually projected is the peace that is maintained by “peace through strength”¹⁰ posture that has led to the arms race, the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, and the ultimate threat of mutually-assured destruction.¹¹ It is precisely through this machination that big powers are able to bully small nations and create disequilibrium and disharmony throughout the world. This actually creates conditions for war even as the imperial wars for profit threaten peace no end.

More aggravating, many nations of the world erroneously believe that security alliance with the USA will guarantee peace. To the contrary, “peace” that is tied to the threat and intention to kill vast numbers of human beings is hardly a stable or justifiable peace worthy of the name. Peace is fundamentally about sharing universal values such as respect for life, liberty, justice, solidarity, tolerance, and equality. A holistic understanding of peace involves the recognition that humanity cannot exist independently of the biosphere, which sustains all life.

Peace is the condition for the fullness of life. Human beings can become truly humane only in conditions of peace. Creativity, spirituality, individual and collective achievements attain glory and grandeur only in the salubrious climate of peace.

The notion that war is inevitable is totally unacceptable, either. If war is inevitable then peace becomes dispensable; peace has no space. The commitment to regain and expand the space for peace by struggling for a just and inclusive world community has to be reaffirmed.

The understanding of peace has to be broadened to lead to Great Peace.¹² Toward this, the rich resources on peace from Asian traditions and religions need to be tapped.

Peace and justice are indivisible. Justice is the condition for peace, just as peace cannot be built on injustice. Peace requires a radically new international order based on justice for all and within nations, and the respect for the humanity and dignity of every person. Peace is the effect of righteousness. Recent history teaches us that without justice for all everywhere there will not be peace anywhere. Peace is for life with its fullness of humanity and dignity.

Section III **THREATS TO PEACE**

1. Threats to Peace from the Global Empire

The Bush administration's war on terrorism, invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, expanded military budget, new military doctrines and the ideology of the National Security Strategy 2002, have thrust the USA into the light of day as an empire.¹³ Its ideology claims a mandate for the pursuit of permanent military security.

The Pentagon is moving at breakneck speed to re-deploy U.S. forces and equipment around the world in ways that will permit Washington to play "GloboCop".¹⁴ The vast network of U.S. bases on every continent except Antarctica actually constitutes a new form of empire.¹⁵ These military bases are today's version of the imperial colonies of the world. The USA has military relationships with the vast majority of the nations of the world ranging from alliances to access to facilities.

The Empire claims "global freedom of action". It is geared toward intervening militarily in any part of the world where—dictated by its security doctrines and global strategic interests—it perceives a threat, whether present, future, or potential.¹⁶ This constitutes today the most visible threat to peace.

The Empire's use of religion has to be challenged while exposing the nexus between the neo-conservatives and the Religious Right in the USA.¹⁷ Cultural imperialism of the USA is undermining cultures of many nations.¹⁸

Since war has been redefined to suit imperialist objectives, the struggle for peace has become today a struggle against imperialism in general and resistance against the U.S. Empire in particular.

2. The War on Terror, an Imperial War

The War on Terror is an imperialist war.¹⁹ On the pretext of attacking terrorists, their organizations and the states that allegedly support them, the Bush administration has actually been building the new American Empire.²⁰ It has changed the nature of war: It has become a war of conquest and a war of exploitation and control of resources in the countries occupied. It is claimed to be continuous and permanent. In the name of the War on Terror, the USA claims its right to intervene in the world militarily anywhere and anytime.

The terminology of war assumes that terrorism has to be combated solely through military means. War on terrorism is based on a dangerous logic—that "modern terrorism" is primarily a military threat and warrants a military solution.²¹ The disconnect between countering terrorism and pursuing the War on Terror for imperialist objectives has to be exposed.²²

The special nature of the War on Terror poses an unending threat to peace. It represents the transition from conventional wars to imperial wars in the 21st century. Planning for imperial wars is different from planning for conventional wars. The maximum amount of force is used as quickly and preemptively as possible for psychological impact and to demonstrate that the empire cannot be challenged with impunity. Even after imperial wars end, imperial garrisons are left in place indefinitely in the name of order and stability.²³

3. Patriarchy and War

The links between patriarchy and war need to be emphasized. The very structure of the military is patriarchal. To galvanize to full potential the struggle against militarism we must question its gender-based approach. Since the very beginning of war, women have been considered spoils of war and, as victims, are today subsumed under the euphemistic phrase “collateral damage”.

The War on Terror intertwined with neo-liberal globalization has intensified exploitation and oppression of women, commodifying them, trafficking them, thus systematically violating their dignity.

The main casualties of war are women and children. The economic consequences of war are exacerbated by patriarchy. Militarization reinforces the sexual commodification of women. It also perpetuates sexual violence against women. Military occupation further degrades women.

4. The Misuse of Religion

Religion has been used to create and exacerbate conflicts often leading to violence. Religious beliefs and symbols are exploited to justify wars. Religion often appears to be against peace. This results from misuse and distortion of religion. The steady rise and growing influence of fundamentalism in all religions is a matter of serious concern. This actually promotes imperialist attitudes and its masculinity further reinforces patriarchy.

5. The Threat of Terrorism

Terrorism is a form of political action. It cannot be treated apart from its specific historical, social and economic context or considered as a generic phenomenon. It is a strategy rooted in political discontent and in the service of many different beliefs and doctrines that help legitimate and sustain violence.²⁴

Sometimes it is easier to understand a terrorist act than to define terrorism or terrorist. An attack on innocent people is a terrorist act. Such terrorist acts are carried out by some states and non-state actors as well as state agencies, and some organizations and sections of organizations. Attacks that mainly target civilians are terrorist acts, whoever perpetrates them.²⁵

However, terrorism does not help the cause of freedom or justice. It cannot be part of the struggle for freedom or liberation. In fact, terrorism can endanger freedom and justice and counter productively encourage reactionary forces. Terrorist acts are a threat to peace.

Military means have a limited role in countering terrorism and often generate more terrorism or as such constitute a terrorist act.²⁶ Only the resolution of the basic political, economic and social problems that cause the discontent that, in turn, gives birth to terrorism or is capitalized on by terrorists, can deal with terrorism.²⁷

6. The Military Corporate Complex

The military corporate complex²⁸ has emerged as one of the biggest threats to peace. It thrives under war and promotes war. It is encouraged by major powers and international financial and trade organizations. Globalization and the war on terror have caused quantum leap in military expenditure and arms trade across the world, distorting priorities, especially of developing countries and reducing allocation for welfare activities.

7. The New Nuclear Arms Race, a Threat to Peace

Nuclear arms have always been one of the biggest threats to peace. The continued existence of nuclear weapons as well as their threat or use, by accident, miscalculation or design, threatens the survival of all humanity and life on earth.

The stockpiling of nuclear arms and their spread especially in the recent period in the Asian region has to be decried and opposed. There is a close link between the new nuclear doctrines of the USA and the new stage of proliferation. The new nuclear doctrine of the USA places new emphasis on the utility of nuclear weapons in U.S. military strategy. It considers new uses of nuclear weapons and claims that nuclear weapons may be used in any war including preventive wars.²⁹ When the mightiest military machine in the world claims that nuclear weapons are indispensable, the message it sends to nations is clear and dangerous.

The national defense missiles of the USA marks a new and even more disastrous stage³⁰ in a nuclear arms race and the weaponization of space with the U.S. claiming monopoly of control over space. Thus, the campaign against nuclear weapons and weaponization of space must be a major component of peace activity.

8. The Threat from New Weapons Systems

A particular cause for alarm is the emergence of new weapons systems resulting from new technologies, the merging of conventional and non-conventional weapons, and the extension of the arms race to space.³¹ Cyber strategy changes the nature of warfare. New technologies of remote control, electronic warfare, and laser weapon are alarming developments.³²

Section IV **HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE**

1. Violation of Human Rights

The violation of human rights is one of the roots of war—and is a major victim of war itself. These violations, exacerbated by neo-liberal globalization, have resulted in the denial of economic, social and cultural rights as well as political and civil rights on a scale larger than before. The artificial distinction between these two sets of rights should be rejected. We affirm the universality and indivisibility of human rights and call to strengthen mechanisms to implement and enforce human rights treaties and to afford redress to victims for the violation of rights.

Although the right to life is fundamental, it is constantly denied by attacks of various forms on the human person particularly extra-judicial killings, forced disappearances, and torture. The War on Terror in a qualitatively new way causes a denial of human rights. In many countries where wars of intervention and occupation are waged—or where antiterrorist operations are staged—people are denied their collective rights to self-determination and national sovereignty.

The defense, protection and promotion of human rights and support to struggles for human rights are important areas of peace activity.

2. Internal Conflicts, Civil Wars

Ethnic, religious and racial intolerance and narrow nationalism are among the principal causes of armed conflict today. In many countries, internal conflicts, civil wars, sectarian strife, as well as class conflicts take place leading to killings, destruction, ethnic cleansing, and other forms of large-scale violence. It must be emphasized that various factors contribute to these internal conflicts: Among these are the unjust distribution of political power and economic wealth, feuds over land and resources, ethnic and religious divisions, and intervention by outside forces. Civil wars take place between the establishment and organized groups of those who are denied political and economic rights. Unjustly, many of the wars that are waged against social, economic, and political inequities are redefined as non-traditional acts of terrorism. Under the guise of War on Terror, national liberation movements have been demonized and labeled terrorist. Seeking political solutions and resolving internal conflicts are extremely important for peace actions.

3. Counter-insurgency, Low Intensity War

As part of the War on Terror and under other pretexts, counter-insurgency and low intensity wars are carried out against sections of people in many parts of the world particularly in neo-colonial countries. Counter-terrorism is implemented most often through brutal military actions backed by so-called anti-terrorism laws.

Counterinsurgency and low intensity wars, which were developed as Cold War anti-communist strategies, are now increasingly subsumed under the War on Terror. They result in widespread violations of human rights, such as extra-judicial executions and forced disappearances, and the displacement of large numbers of people, their future, and economies.

This is an issue, which should receive high priority in planning peace activities.

4. Neo-liberal Globalization, a Threat to Peace

Economic injustice is at the root of war and war results in further economic injustice and exploitation. Economic injustice violates dignity and degrades the human person. Financial capital, integral to neo-liberal globalization, has undermined economies of many countries, especially destroying the livelihood of farmers and those with small business and trade. Neo-liberal globalization has produced more injustice, inequality and poverty. It has marginalized broad sections of the world's population, further widening the gap between the rich and the poor, between centers of global capitalism and peripheral countries. The concern is not only about globalization and the plunder and other unjust consequences it creates but also the fact that justice is alien to globalization. Justice has no scope or space in globalization. Globalization sets the paradigm of development only on growth that emphasizes profit maximization. This has directly led to the increase and intensification of poverty endangering peace.³³ Justice and people's participation, two essential components of development, have no place in globalization. In place of participation, intense competition is encouraged, destroying possibilities of cooperation and solidarity among the people. Exploitation and destruction of environment under globalization are threats to peace.

Under neo-liberal globalization, increased poverty and unemployment is triggering a surge in global migration, its feminization and informalization a major source of human insecurity. In their countries of destination, the human rights of migrant workers including the diaspora migrant communities remain largely unprotected and are often threatened with job discrimination, low pay, racism and xenophobia. Increasingly, women and children are victims of human trafficking and smuggling, with no possibilities of justice and protection.

Globalization and militarism should be seen as two sides of the same coin. On one side, globalization promotes the conditions that lead to unrest, inequality, conflict and ultimately war. On the other, globalization fuels the means to wage war by protecting and promoting the war industries needed to produce sophisticated weaponry and that, in turn, are utilized to destroy national economies and people's lives. Weaponry is used—or its use threatened—to promote the interests of transnational corporations.³⁴ Globalization and imperial security go together.³⁵ Global capitalism, enforced militarily if needed, is integral to building the empire.

Neo-liberal globalization has to be vigorously combated. Struggles for economic justice and for peace have to be fought together.

5. Threats from Denial of Right to Self-Determination

Indigenous and unrepresented people are suffering from the suppression of their right to self-determination, ethnic and cultural genocide, the violation of their cultural, linguistic and religious freedoms, and the militarization and nuclearization of their lives, lands and waters.

Many of today's violent and persistent conflicts are between states and unrepresented peoples and are characterized by an extreme power imbalance. As a result, unrepresented peoples by themselves are unable to engage states in negotiations for peaceful resolution of conflicts. Moreover, these conflicts tend to continue for decades leading to gross sufferings and cultural annihilation. To counteract the power imbalance, which drives these conflicts, it is necessary for the international governmental and non-governmental community to support actively people's right to self-determination, to prioritize attention to these conflicts, and to promote their peaceful resolution.

The denial of the right to self-determination has led to several long-term conflicts most of which remain unresolved. It is important to comprehend that what generates conflict is not the legitimate claim of the right to self-determination but rather the denial of this inviolable right. Thus, it is imperative that the internationally-recognized right to self-determination be actively promoted as a basis of conflict prevention and conflict resolution.

The efforts of colonized or neo-colonized peoples toward the exercise of their right to self-determination have to be endorsed by all those who believe in peace. Specifically, the demand for the establishment of a permanent forum for indigenous peoples within the United Nations and the full implementation of the rights under the "Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples"³⁶ deserve active support.

Section V TRUE SECURITY

1. Protection of Environment as Peace Policy

The primacy of ecological peace has to be underlined. The ecological consequences of war and militarization are extremely serious.

Imperiling the environment, conflict impairs economic growth, sustainable development and livelihoods. Armed conflict accelerates the loss of infrastructure and degradation of resources and reduces society's capacity for self-reliance.

The world's dominant consumers are overwhelmingly concentrated among the rich, but the environmental damage from the world's consumption falls most severely on the poor.

It is important to end the military destruction of the environment and especially the militarization of indigenous lands. Peace being peace of and among all living beings, environmental destruction is a threat to peace.

2. Toward True Security

In the imperial agenda, security is the substitute for peace. The meaning of security itself has been restricted and no longer contains economic, social and cultural rights. Security has left the universe of the people, and has nothing to do anymore with the security of the people. The doctrine of national security has narrowed down its definition to the security of the state, if not military security alone. Now it is not even the security of the state but the security of the occupier or the military. The notion of security today revolves around imperial security.

Other terms used in connection with this notion of security are “stabilization” and “pacification”. Both generally involve the use of force. These notions have to be exposed for what they are—creating more insecurity and violence.

A holistic understanding of security with focus on people's security has to be affirmed. Security fundamentally as people's security has to be reclaimed and rediscovered. Security is fundamentally the condition in which people live in dignity enjoying all human rights—civil, political, economic, social and cultural—made possible only with the security of life.

To understand the significance of people's security, the plight and situation of groups and realities of the people who are marginalized and oppressed at local and national levels must be recognized. Such oppression is made more intensive by the collusion of local and national forces of domination with global forces politically and economically.³⁷ People's security for the marginalized is a priority for peace.

National security and imperial security doctrines are threats to people's security. Neoliberal globalization, which is predatory in nature, is a threat to people's security especially in its denial of social and economic rights.

It is time to redefine security in terms of human and ecological dimensions instead of national sovereignty and national borders alone. Redirecting funding from armaments to human security and sustainable development will establish new priorities leading to the construction of a new social order that ensures the equal participation of marginalized groups,³⁸ including women and indigenous people, restricts the use of military force and moves toward true collective international security.

Global warming and climate change are fast becoming the biggest threat to the survival of humanity on earth. Urgent action on this issue is essential for peace.

3. From a Culture of War to a Culture of Peace

A Culture of WAR is characterized by:	A Culture of PEACE is characterized by:
• Enemy images	• Understanding and tolerance
• Armies and armaments	• Disarmament, general & complete
• Authoritarian governance	• Democratic participation
• Secrecy and propaganda	• Free flow of information, knowledge
• Violence (structural and physical)	• Respect for human dignity
• Law of the jungle	• Nature of garden
• Male domination	• Equality between men and women
• Education for war	• Education for a culture of peace
• Exploitation of the weak and of the environment	• Sustainable economic and social development
• Destruction of the order of life	• Convivial life of all living beings
• Aggression and arrogance	• Affirmation and humility

Since war begins in the minds of human beings, it is in those very minds that the defense of peace must be constructed.

The transition from a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace is a process of individual, collective and institutional transformation, developing within particular historical socio-cultural and economic contexts. A culture of peace aims at transforming values, attitudes and behavior based on violence to those which promote peace and nonviolence. It aims at empowering people at all levels with skills of dialogue, mediation, and peace building.

Section VI **PEACE MAKING**

1. Victims, Vulnerable Sections

The fundamental vision of peace emerges out of the perspectives and experiences of victims. It is that vision that needs to be pursued.

Concern for peace has to be reflected in awareness about and concern for victims of wars, militarism and neo-liberal capitalist development. Their human rights are grossly violated. Large numbers of refugees and internally-displaced persons result from militarism and militarized globalization. Women, children, and old people are particularly vulnerable. Among the most vulnerable as a result of armed conflicts and militarization are the indigenous people.

Working for the rights of the victims should receive priority attention in peace activity. But it needs underlining that the victims are the protagonists and thus should be empowered.

2. Taking Initiatives in Peacemaking

There are valuable strategies and methods of conflict resolution and peacemaking in different cultural traditions. They have to be explored and developed for innovative action in peacemaking. It is time for people to assert their right and commitment to peacemaking, to wrest peacemaking away from the exclusive control of politicians, national security doctrinaires and military establishments. Peace initiatives are often taken as a last resort with negotiations restricted to war protagonists and imposed on those most affected, particularly women and children. When peace agreements are negotiated, those who have suffered most must have a seat at the table. Civil society should also convene peace initiatives before crisis gets out of control and more lives are lost. This can help to turn early warning from a slogan to a reality.

Armed conflicts are often “resolved” by external actors with little or no reference to either the just demands of those who assert their right to resistance and self-determination, or the rights of those who must live with the situation. As a result, either there is no satisfactory, multilateral solution or the solution reached is ephemeral. If efforts to prevent, resolve or transform armed conflicts are to be lasting and effective, they must be based on the active participation of local civil society groups committed to building peace. Strengthening such local capacities is vital to the monitoring and maintenance of peace.

There is a strong need to promote the specialized training of civilian men and women in the strategy and techniques of conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation, etc., and to facilitate their deployment in conflict areas in order to carry out peace-building tasks. But such skills should be grounded on the principles of true peace and justice.

3. The United Nations

The United Nations remains the best inter-state mechanism to build the conditions for peace and provide human security for all. Its achievements in peacemaking and peace-building and humanitarian efforts should not be underestimated.

However, its weaknesses and failures—a by-product of big power dynamics and not necessarily of the international organization as a whole—should be considered and addressed. The manipulation of the organization by the Empire is a matter of serious concern. Many countries, including some of the most powerful, use the UN as a fig leaf and a smokescreen to blur unwanted focus on them, to defuse political pressure, or to dilute or evade their own responsibilities. States often make commitments, which they do not honor.

We believe that urgently needed are:

- The reform³⁹ and democratization of the United Nations, including democratic strengthening of the General Assembly;
- The reform of the United Nations Security Council to make its composition more representative of the international community and its decision-making process more transparent;
- The promotion of regional institutions to advance peace through adherence to international law; and
- The meaningful and effective participation of non-governmental organizations in the processes and programs of the United Nations.

4. A New Peace Movement

Considering the new context and fresh challenges, the new nature of warfare and the need to rediscover peace, there is a strong need for a new peace movement. There are already initiatives in many parts of the world, reviving some of the old movements to face challenges today and also creating new ones. These initiatives have to be supported while forming new groups and movements where necessary, locally, nationally, and regionally. There is a need to affirm international solidarity and actively support each other's struggles and issues. Information and experiences have to be regularly exchanged. It is necessary to build a broad platform of people's movements for peace.

5. Role of Women in Peacemaking

UN Security Council resolution 1235 mandates the protection of, and respect for, the human rights of women and girls and calls for the increased representation of women in decision-making for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts and in peace processes.⁴⁰

There is need for specific initiatives aimed at understanding the interrelationship between gender equality and peace-building, strengthening women's capacity to participate in peace-building initiatives and equal participation of women in conflict resolution in decision-making levels.

The perspective of women in distinguishing between force and power, emphasizing the pro-people use of power, is valuable in peacemaking.

6. Mobilization of Public Opinion

Public opinion has to be regularly mobilized in support of peace agenda, nationally and internationally. This has to be done through organized campaigns and other effective ways of communication and advocacy.

An important method for clarifying issues and marshaling support of the wider public is public tribunals on situations/issues of militarism and conflicts. They can be a significant means to create greater awareness of causes and consequences of armed conflict, military actions (by states), and internal security laws and regimes.

A people's tribunal relies on the preparedness of victims to testify about their plight as well as the participation of credible personalities (nationally and internationally) to adjudge the evidence and testimony within a people's security and holistic justice framework. The publication of the findings of such tribunals will contribute not only to an understanding of the problems but also their solutions.

Another method will be public hearings. These hearings also will help bring out the issues in a particular situation, including the sufferings of the victims.

7. Inter-faith Cooperation

In building a platform for peace as broad as possible, inter-faith cooperation is important. In doing this convergence among religions for peace can be explored, identified and highlighted. The positive affirmations from religious envisioning peace through concepts like *Shalom*, *Salam*, *Shanti* and *Pyungghwa*. The wisdom and insights from traditions, religions and philosophies can be translated into a language that will motivate and activate the broadest sections of the people.

8. Signs of Hope

In the midst of a seemingly desperate situation, many signs of hope are visible. They are in the struggles of resistance against foreign occupation, struggles of farmers and workers against corporatization, struggles of local communities to protect their ways of life, actions of solidarity with victims of war and globalization, and in the prophetic witness of many committed to peace and justice. They have to be affirmed and supported.

EPILOGUE

The People's Charter goes beyond inter-state agreements. It has spiritual, cultural, philosophical and ethical foundations, which have national legal and international juridical implications.

The Charter is addressed to the peace movements of the people, peace-making organizations as well as nation states and international organizations.

The Charter is not a fixed and rigid system, but is an open declaration in the process of convergence of diverse experiences on all levels of locality, nation states, and world community. Therefore, it is an open document to be enriched further and encouraged and adopted by all involved in peacemaking in the present global context.

Hwacheon, October 2007

NOTES

Through the Notes an attempt is made to give explanations to some of the terms, expressions and ideas in the Charter. In several instances we give also supporting citations.

-
- 1 The response from the United States to the highly complex set of issues raised by the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 was a declaration of permanent war. With not even a moment's thought about the root causes of terrorism or possible considerations of the political, economic and social aspects, it was decided that the non-traditional threat would be dealt with solely by traditional military means.

George W. Bush, President of the USA addressing a joint session of the U.S. Congress, soon after the terrorist attacks, said. "Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated... Every nation in every region now has a decision to make. Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists."

- 2 "The USA is by circumstance and design an emergent global empire, the first in the history of the world. Prior empires had frontiers and boundaries, although occupying large expanses of territory and exercised control from a distant centre that due to available technologies of communications and transportation were further away in time than is any part of the global empire from Washington." (Richard Falk, 'Will the Empire be Fascist?', The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research, 24 March 2003).

-
- 3 On February 15, 2003, over 30 million people demonstrated in 600 cities against the planned USA-UK led war against Iraq and to defend the right to peace. The War was in defiance of the United Nations openly flouting the UN Charter.
- The moral and legal rule established by the UN is itself a 'peace' system. The international order is founded on the opening paragraphs set in the 1945 Charter:
- "To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small...
- "To promote social progress and better standard of life in larger freedom,
- "And for these ends,
- "To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors..."
- 4 "Active peace is a prerequisite to the exercise of all human rights and duties. It is not the peace of silence of men and women who by choice or constraint remain silent. It is the peace of freedom and therefore of just laws, of happiness, equality and solidarity in which all citizens count, live together and share." (UNESCO 1997)
- 5 Standing by some of the mightiest toys in his military arsenal, U.S. President George W. Bush on April 16 boasted that the U.S. is "redefining war" by toppling tyrants at will.
- "Since September 11, 2001 we have been engaged in a global war against terror. That war continues and we are winning", said Bush to the tumultuous cheers of aircraft workers at a Boeing Co., plant in St. Louis, Mo.
- Excited, jubilant he talked about the aerospace plant's F18 Super Hornet Jets—the most advanced strike fighters in the U.S. Navy's arsenal and said, "Boeing workers and their jets are a main reason why we are successful in making the world a more peaceful place."
- "By a combination of creative strategies and advanced technology we are redefining war on our own terms." (*Toronto Star*, 17 April 2003)
- 6 On September 20, 2001, nine days after the terrorist attacks, the Bush administration released the 2001 *Quadrennial Defense Review*. As Carl Cornetta explains, "The critical difference is that the new QDR puts a definitive emphasis on war-fighting and war-fighting capabilities. Beyond seeking decisive victory, it aims for the decisive defeat of the adversaries. This it defines ambitiously in terms of 'changing the regime of an adversary state' and 'occupying foreign territory until U.S. strategic objectives are met.'" ("The Pentagon, New Budget, New Strategy and New War", *Project on Defense Alternatives*, 25 June 2002)
- 7 The classified *Nuclear Posture Review* of the USA, details of which appeared in the media in March 2002 revealing the Pentagon's ambitious nuclear battle plans, redefines the role of nuclear weapons as fundamental to U.S. defense policy, places new emphasis on the utility of nuclear weapons in U.S. military doctrine and strategy and changes the very nature of deterrence.
- 8 *The National Security Strategy of the USA 2002*, argues that while the U.S. will seek allies in the battle against terrorism, "We will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively." The doctrine of preemptive strikes and unilateral action and the scorn for the United Nations and its Charter represents a fundamental threat to the very global order that the U.S. did very much to bring about in 1946.
- 9 "When President Bush announced the air strikes against Afghanistan, he said 'We are a peaceful nation.' America's favorite Ambassador who also holds the portfolio of British Prime Minister echoed him: 'We are a peaceful people.' So now we know pigs are horses, girls are boys. War is peace." (Arundhathi Roy, *In These Times Magazine*, 21 November 2001)
- 10 Peace through strength is the doctrine that military strength is the primary or necessary component of peace. The doctrine is a major justification cited for large militaries, also served as the primary motivation behind the Cold War doctrine of *mutually assured destruction*. The doctrine has undoubtedly led to the growth of militarism.

-
- 11 Mutual Assured Destruction is a doctrine of military strategy in which a full-scale use of nuclear weapons by two opposing sides would effectively result in the destruction of both the attacker and the defender.
“A strategic situation in which both sides possess the ability to inflict unacceptable damage upon the opponent at any time during the course of a strategic nuclear exchange even after absorbing a surprise first strike.” (U.S. Military Dictionary)
- 12 “Great peace has they which love thy law and nothing shall offend them.” (Psalms 119:165)
“Lord, lead us out of private-mindedness and give us public souls to work for Thy kingdom by daily creating that atmosphere of a happy temper and generous heart which alone can bring the Great Peace.” (Bishop Hacket, 17th century)
- 13 “The military victory in Iraq seems to have confirmed a new world order. Not since Rome has one nation loomed so large above the others. Indeed, the word ‘empire’ has come out of the closet.” (Joseph Nye, *The Washington Post*, 25 May 2003)
- 14 “What word but ‘empire’ describes the awesome thing that America is becoming? It is the only nation that polices the world through five global commands, maintains more than a million men and women at arms in four continents and deploys carrier battle ships on watch in every ocean.” (Michael Ignatieff, “The Empire, the Burden”, *New York Times Magazine*, 5 January 2003)
- 15 “The empire is built on increasing and expanding military relationships of various kinds with a very large number of countries as well as the stationing of hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops around the world. ...Establishing a more impressive footprint has now become part of the justification for a major enlargement of our empire—and announced repositioning of our bases and forces abroad—in the wake of the conquest of Iraq. They (the planners) have identified what they call the ‘arc of instability’ which is said to run from the Andean region of South America through North Africa and then sweeps across the Middle East to the Philippines and Indonesia. This is of course more or less identical with what used to be called the Third World—and perhaps no less crucially covers the world’s key oil reserves.” (Chalmers Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy and the End of the Republic*, New York, Verso 2003)
- 16 *The National Defense Strategy of the USA* March 2005 lists as strategic objective “to secure strategic access and retain global freedom of action.” It is linked to the idea that the USA is entitled to global sovereignty. The notion of global sovereignty means that the USA will lay down international laws. Only the USA can use force anywhere in the world. This is one of the pillars of the new grand strategy which is exemplified above all else by the concept of an exclusive right to preventive military intervention all over the world.
- 17 “The religious right in its conventional theological form teaches that the United States is a Christian nation destined to lead the world. Or in its Pentecostal form the religious right teaches the central role of the United States within universal apocalyptic history: for these folks the end of the world is near. These are indeed universal visions, which require a notion of this country as empire.” (L. Edward Knudson, ‘The Temptation to Empire’, *Public Theology*, 27 March 2003)
“What distinguishes it from many other empires in history is its strong sense of righteousness. This sense of moral righteousness is fed by the major influence of the Christian Right on present U.S. policy. This has a very worrying political aspect in the way in which Christian millennialism has been taken up by so many evangelical Christians with its apocalyptic overtones and its very clear political agenda in relation to the Middle East. We argue that not only is the political reading of current history in the light of apocalyptic texts not only illegitimate but these texts need to be read in a different way altogether, as a critique of imperialism, rather than as a justification for a particular form of it.” (“Countering Terrorism, Power, Violence and Democracy”, a Report by a Working Group of the Church of England House of Bishops, September 2005)

18 “Globalization has economic, social and political consequences but it has also brought into focus the power of culture.

“The United States dominates the global traffic in information and ideas. American music, American movies, American television and American software are so dominant, so sought-after and so visible that they are now available literally everywhere on the Earth. They influence the tastes, lives and aspirations of virtually every nation.

“Americans should not shy away from doing that which is so clearly in their economic, political and security interests and so clearly in the interests of the world at large. The U.S. should not hesitate to promote its values. Americans should not deny the fact that of all the nation in the history of the world, theirs is the most just, most tolerant, the most willing to constantly reassess itself and the best model for the future.

“For the United States, the central objective of an information age foreign policy must be to win the battle of the world’s information flows, dominating the airwaves as Great Britain once ruled the waves of the sea.” (David Rothkopf, “In Praise of Cultural Imperialism?” *Foreign Policy*, September 1997)

19 “To proclaim a war in general, even if one means only terrorist cells and forces not directly sponsored by states, is ambitious indeed, for we need to distinguish among types of terrorists. ...A determined project of ridding the world of all rogues and terrorists would be a dream that would be seen abroad as a demonstration of rabid imperialism.” (Stanley Hoffman, “On the War”, *The New York Review of Books*, 1 November 2001)

20 “The War on Terror will now turn to regimes that sponsor terror and threaten America or our friends with weapons of mass destruction. States like these—North Korea, Iran and Iraq—and their terrorist allies constitute an axis of evil arming to threaten the peace of the world.” (President Bush)

21 “War on terrorism is a dangerous logic. It implies that modern terrorism is to be understood primarily as a military threat and must be opposed by military means.” (Report by the Working Group of the Church of England’s House of Bishops)

22 “To declare war on terrorists or even more illiterately on terrorism is at once to accord terrorists a status and dignity that they seek and they do not have. But to use or misuse the term ‘war’ is not simply a matter of legality or pedantic semantics. To declare that one is at war is immediately to create a war psychosis that may be totally counterproductive for the objective being sought. It raises an immediate expectation and demand for spectacular military action against some easily identifiable adversary.” (Michael Howard, “What is in a Name? How to Fight Terrorism?”, *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2002)

23 “The United States has no rival. We are militarily dominant around the world. ...Our role is not combating a rival, but maintaining our imperial position and maintaining imperial order. ...Planning for imperial wars is different from planning for conventional wars. ...The maximum amount of force can and should be used as quickly as possible for psychological impact. To demonstrate that the empire cannot be challenged with impunity. ...Imperial wars end but imperial garrisons must be left in place for decades to ensure order and stability.” (Stephen Peter Rose, Director, Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University, quoted by Rainer Rilling, “American Empire as Will and Idea”, Rosa-Luxemburg Stifting, Policy Paper 2/2003)

-
- 24 “Terrorism is a form of political action. It cannot be taken out of specific historical context or treated as a generic phenomenon. It is a strategy rooted in political discontent and in the service of many different beliefs and doctrines that help legitimize and sustain violence. Ideologies associated with nationalism, revolution, religion and defense of the status quo have all inspired terrorism. We have to look at the opportunities, resources, intentions and perceptions of the actors for whom terrorism is useful to intimidate opponents, communicate goals, advertise the cause, recruit followers and mobilize public support.” (The International Summit on ‘Democracy, Terrorism and Security’, Madrid, March 2005)
- 25 “In particular those who advocate a new convention on terrorism fail to understand how deeply unhappy people are about the hypocrisy of those who use state power unlawfully and cause massive loss of human life—and then expect all countries to line up to a definition of terrorism that fails to acknowledge the right to resist occupation.” (Claire Short, “Depression and Discontent Preval at the UN”, *Independent*, 15 September 2005)
- 26 “Since September 2001 many states have adopted new counter-terrorism measures that are in breach of their international obligations. In some countries, the post-September climate of insecurity has been exploited to justify long-standing human rights violations carried out in the name of national security.” (Declaration of the International Commission of Jurists on “Upholding Human Rights and Rule of Law in Combating Terrorism”, International Commission of Jurists, Geneva, September 2004)
- 27 “We should all be clear that there is no trade-off between effective action against terrorism and the protection of human rights. On the contrary, I believe that, in the long term, we shall find that human rights, along with democracy and social justice, are one of the best prophylactics against terrorism.” (UN Secretary General Kofi Annan on 18 January 2002)
- 28 “The conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence in economic, political and even spiritual is felt in every city, every statehouse, and every office of the Federal government. ...We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence whether sought or unsought by the military industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will prevail.” (President Eisenhower’s farewell address to the nation, 17 January 1961)
“Globalization and transnationalization of defense/military corporations have replaced the military industrial complex of the Cold War economy with a military corporate complex of the new global economy. This is based on the dominance of the corporate interests over those of the state.” (Steven Staples, “The Relationship Between Globalization and Militarism”, *Social Justice Magazine*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 2000) The state has lost even the little say it had in the era of military industrial complex.
- 29 “The Bush administration has put nuclear weapons—and its various uses—at the centre of U.S. military and foreign policy. The message of the administration’s Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) in December 2001 was unmistakable. *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* editorialized: ‘Not since the resurgence of the Cold War in Ronald Reagan’s first term has U.S. defense strategy placed such an emphasis on nuclear weapons.’ The NPR reiterated the U.S. commitment to first-strike nuclear war-fighting. For the first time, seven nations were specifically named as primary nuclear targets: Russia, China, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya and North Korea. Consistent with calls by senior administration figures who spoke of their ‘bias in favor of things that might be usable,’ the NPR urged funding for the development of new and more usable nuclear weapons. This included a new ‘bunker buster’. Seventy times more powerful than the Hiroshima atom bomb, the bunker buster was designed to destroy enemy command bunkers and WMD (weapons of mass destruction) installations buried hundreds of feet beneath the surface.” (Joseph Gerson, ‘Empire and the Bomb’, University of Michigan Press, 2007)

-
- 30 “The U.S. missile defense programme is:
1. Based ostensibly an overstated and incomplete assessment of a ballistic missile threat
 2. Intended primarily to gain strategic advantage rather than provide physical defense
 3. Damaging to prospects for international arms control, disarmament and global security
 4. Unlikely to provide a reliable defense against missile attack
 5. Wasteful of resources that for reasons both of morality and global security could be better spent elsewhere
 6. Likely to involve directly, or lead to, the weaponization of space
 7. Likely to increase the missile threat while damaging real opportunities to reduce it”
(Missile Defense Working Group, Quaker Peace and Social Witness, UK, May 2004)
- 31 “The Pentagon is planning a new generation of weapons, including huge hypersonic drones and bombs dropped from space, that will allow the U.S. to strike its enemies at lightning speed from its own territory. Over the next 25 years, the new technology would free the U.S. from dependence on forward bases and the cooperation of regional allies. ...The new weapons are being developed under programme codenamed Falcon (Force Application and Launch from the Continental U.S.).
(Julian Borger, “U.S. missiles to have global reach”, *The Guardian*, 1 July 2003)
- 32 “No heat, no recoil, no sound, no gunpowder, no flash—just 120,000 rounds per minute of pulverizing force. The next generation of weapon system has arrived, the DREAD centrifuge powered weapon system. The weapon itself is called DREAD or Multiple Projectile Delivery System (MPDS) and it may just be the most revolutionary military weapon system concept that DefenseReview.com has ever come across.” (David Crane, Editor, DefenseReview.com)
- 33 “Globalization emerges out of earlier forms of global social change associated with western imperialism and the internationalization of capital. The merging of industry, technology and bureaucracy into a machinery for waging war contributed directly to the militarization of society.”
(Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, “The Imperial Peace, Democracy, Force and Globalization”, *European Journal of International Relation*, Vol. 5(4), 1999)
- 34 “Globalization and militarism should be seen as two sides of the same coin. On one side, globalization promotes the conditions that lead to unrest, inequality, conflict and ultimately war. On the other side, globalization fuels the means to wage war by protecting and promoting the military industries needed to produce sophisticated weaponry. This weaponry is used—or its use threatened—to protect the investments of transnational corporations and their shareholders.”
(Steven Staples, “The Relationship Between Globalization and Militarism”, *Social Justice Magazine*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 2000)
- 35 “For globalism to work, America can’t be afraid to act like the almighty superpower it is. ...The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist. McDonald’s cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the designer of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley’s technologies is called the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.”
(Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, New York 1999)
- 36 The text recognizes the wide range of basic human rights and fundamental freedom of indigenous people. Among these are the right to unrestricted self-determination, an invaluable collective right to the ownership, control and use of lands, territories and other natural resources, their rights in terms of developing their own political, religious, cultural and educational institutions along with the protection of their cultural and intellectual property.
With an overwhelming majority—140 votes in favor, only 4 negative votes cast (Canada, Australia, New Zealand and USA) and 11 abstentions—the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People on September 13, 2007.

37 The second front in the War on Terror was officially opened by President Bush in the Philippines soon after the invasion of Afghanistan, to support the Philippine military in its war against 'terrorism' in Mindanao.

"The beleaguered Philippine island of Mindanao is crawling with communists and Islamic fundamentalist guerillas, and the links between Al Qaeda and the local insurgents have made the island a battlefield in President Bush's war on terrorism. ...But to farmers in Mindanao, home to more than two thirds of the Philippines' corn production, subsidized American imports loom as large as any other threat. Since the Philippines joined the WTO eight years ago, American corn growers have received an astonishing \$34.5 billion in taxpayer support. ...This helps explain how America is able to export—the less polite word in the patois of trade would be dump—corn at only two-thirds its cost of production. The resentment is intense. ...Farmers' despair... fuels the Marxist New People's Army insurgency.

"By rigging the global trade game against farmers in developing nations, Europe, the United States and Japan are essentially kicking aside the development ladder for some of the world's most desperate people. This is morally depraved. By our actions, we are harvesting poverty around the world." (Editorial, "Harvesting Poverty; The Rigged Trade Game", *The New York Times*, 20 July 2003)

38 "From the perspective of faith, the security of all shall be judged by the 'shalom security' of the poorest, the weakest, the excluded, the subjugated, the *minjung*. ...The plumb line of people's security is abundant life for 'the least of these' in a globalized world economy afflicted by extreme poverty, disease, injustice, environmental degradation and militarized hegemony." (Ecumenical Consultation on "Justice, Peace and People's Security in North East Asia", February 2001)

39 "The UN needs reform. On that everyone agrees. But there is sharp disagreement on what kind of reform is needed and for what purpose. Again and again over the years, the UN has been reformed—on average once every eight years. But the pace has now been quickened and reform projects seem almost a constant part of the landscape....

"But after the fireworks, the same problems regularly persist—because the shortcomings of the UN are primarily rooted in the dysfunctional global order and the conflict-prone state system, not in the UN's institutional arrangements. Few reformers are willing to admit that the UN's complex and inefficient machinery results from deep political disagreements among its members and between other contending forces in the global system. Yet the United States, military superpower and transnational corporate headquarters, clearly wants a weak UN with an impossibly small budget and scarcely any voice in economic matters. Many other nations, to the contrary, want a stronger UN and more effective multilateral policymaking.

"The Millennium+5 reforms, proposed by the Secretary General Kofi Annan in March 2005, were neither ambitious nor far-reaching. Designed to please (or at least not to displease) the superpower, they substantially ignored the most urgent issues—the UN's financial woes, the unilateralism of the superpower, the absence of real disarmament, and the shaky and unjust global economic order. For a time, it seemed that these modest if flawed reforms might nevertheless be adopted. But as the Summit approached, negotiations faltered, due largely to last-minute, far-reaching demands from Washington. In the end, the world leaders approved an embarrassingly weak document, filled mostly with empty platitudes. It remains to be seen how the UN will weather this contentious and divisive reform process, and what avenues remain open a stronger and more effective multilateral system." (Global Policy Reform)

40 The Security Council resolution 1325 has great implications on:

- Protection of women in conflict situations.
- Participation of women and civil society in peace process.

It also calls for:

- Participation of women in decision making and peace process.
- Inclusion of gendered perspectives and training in peacemaking.
- Protection of women and girls in conflict zones and refugee camps.
- Gender monitoring in the UN system—reporting and programmatic implementation.