


We seek
a world free of war and
the threat of war

We seek
a society with equity
and justice for all

We seek
a community where
every person's
potential may
be fulfilled

We seek
an earth restored

© FCNL

 Friends Committee on
National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002-5795

If war is not the answer,
Peaceful what is?
Prevention
of **Deadly**
Conflict

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON

NATIONAL LEGISLATION



The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) is a non-partisan public interest lobby founded in 1943 by members of the Religious Society of Friends. FCNL seeks to bring the concerns, experiences and testimonies of Friends (called Quakers) to bear on policy decisions in the nation's capital. FCNL speaks for itself and others of like mind, and people of many religious backgrounds participate in this work. FCNL does not claim to speak on behalf of the entire Religious Society of Friends. FCNL's staff and volunteers work with a nationwide network of thousands of people to advocate social and economic justice, peace, and good government.

The FCNL Education Fund is a 501(c)3 organization that exists in parallel with FCNL to support the research, analysis and education for which FCNL is known and respected. Thousands of individuals and organizations rely on FCNL Education Fund's resource materials, such as this booklet, for background information on policy issues and legislative details.

Published by the FCNL Education Fund, 3rd Edition, July 2004. Also available in Spanish language edition. Individual copies of this booklet are free. For bulk orders, please inquire.

Authors: Bridget Moix, Dan Smith, and Anna Staab

Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second St., NE
Washington, DC 20002
800-630-1330 Email: fcnl@fcnl.org
www.fcnl.org

Printed on recycled paper
(100% post consumer waste, processed chlorine free) with vegetable based inks

Printed with electrical power generated 100% at wind farms.



Introduction

Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, U.S. policy has been dominated by the "Global War on Terror," an endless, boundless war against an undefined enemy. That war, begun in Afghanistan in October 2001, continues today with U.S. military operations in dozens of countries around the world. In the fall of 2002, the Bush Administration enshrined in U.S. policy a unilateral right to take military action against "emerging threats before they are fully formed."¹ Months later, in March 2003, against widespread global protest and without United Nations Security Council authorization, the U.S. put its new policy of "preemptive" war into practice by invading and occupying Iraq. Over the next year

BUSH'S "PREEMPTIVE" WAR DOCTRINE

Article 51 of the UN Charter reserves to states the right of self-defense against military attack. Preemptive war may be justified under the Charter if the military threat is so imminent, substantive (combining capability and intention), and substantial that an attack is virtually certain. However, the Bush Doctrine, as presented in the September 2002 National Security Strategy and implemented in the March 2003 invasion of Iraq, upends the concept of self-defense. All this Administration needs is a U.S. unilateral determination that at some **undefined** future time, using means that **might** be acquired or developed, another country **possibly** could constitute a challenge to U.S. national interests. Because these conditions do not meet the prerequisites for preemptive self-defense under international law, the word "preemptive" will be placed in quotation marks throughout this booklet.

¹The National Security Strategy is a document published by every administration, sometimes annually, and required by Congress. It outlines the basic policy framework for U.S. security policy under the authoring administration. The 2002 National Security Strategy has received considerable criticism in the U.S. and abroad for its emphasis on U.S. global military dominance and declaration of a unilateral right to take "preemptive" action against emerging threats. The document text and analysis from FCNL is available at http://www.fcnl.org/issues/mil/sup/national_security-strategy.htm

of U.S. military occupation, Iraq descended into further violence and became the White House's "central front of the war on terror." The rising costs of war in blood and treasure, fractured relations with allies, and a growing realization that military actions in Iraq may have fueled the very threats U.S. leaders proposed to thwart, have demonstrated that "preemptive" war is a poor substitute for the long-standing U.S. principles of international cooperation and the rule of law.

Debate over the war on Iraq will continue for months if not years. Many who originally supported the war and occupation have since criticized the handling of it or the lack of evidence to back up the Bush Administration's case for war. Some say the war on Iraq was a dangerous diversion from the broader "war on terror" that the U.S. should be pursuing. Whatever their opinion on the invasion of Iraq, most U.S. policymakers remain committed to fighting terrorism with overwhelming force and pursuing U.S. military dominance as the path to national and global security. However, a clear lesson from the U.S. experience in Iraq should be that military force and unilateralism are tragically ineffective responses to the current threats facing the U.S. and global community.

But, if war is not the answer, what is?

A More Effective Path to Lasting Security

The post-September 11 attention given by the Administration and many in Congress to finding earlier responses to emerging threats is an important and necessary step in U.S. policy. For too long, the world has responded too late to escalating conflicts, genocide, gross human rights abuses, failing states, the threat of terrorism,

² In December 1997, the Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Violent Conflict published a hallmark report that helped create the language and theoretical framework of peaceful prevention. The report described preventive activity with the terms *operational* (late-term preventive actions that address the proximate causes of conflict as it is unfolding; examples include mediation, arms embargoes, and peacekeeping operations) and *structural* (early preventive actions that address the underlying structural causes of conflict; examples include preventive development programs, arms control and disarmament, interreligious or interethnic peacebuilding, and democratic institution building). Following its 1998 report, the commission published a series of other studies on prevention, all available at <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/index.htm>

and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Since the early 1990s, the international community has been facing up to and striving to overcome this "culture of reaction" by moving toward a "culture of prevention." Unfortunately, the continuing emphases on U.S. military and economic dominance and the use of force as the main instruments of U.S. foreign policy diverge drastically from the international community's deepened understanding of how to effectively reduce conflict and prevent war.

A growing body of research and experience is contributing to a global movement for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict. The publishing of the report of the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict in 1997,² followed a few years later by the release of the UN Secretary General's *Report on the Prevention of Armed Conflict*³ in 2001 and the report *Responsibility to Protect*, authored by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty,⁴ marked important steps in the world community's effort to better understand, predict, and prevent the outbreak of violent conflict.

In his 2001 report, Secretary General Kofi Annan called for the development of new capacities within national governments, multilateral regional organizations, civil society, and the UN to undertake genuinely preventive actions in all stages of conflict—from latent tensions to hot wars to post-conflict peacebuilding.

³ In June 2001, at the request of the UN Security Council, the Secretary General published a *Report on the Prevention of Armed Conflict*. The report outlines actions, roles, and recommendations for the international community in the prevention of armed conflict. The report was well-received by UN Member states, and the theme of conflict prevention was anticipated to be a major topic in the opening speeches of the 56th General Assembly. However, the attacks of September 11, 2001, coming just before the UN session opening, eclipsed other topics and became the central focus. Work to implement the recommendations of the report at the UN level, among regional organizations, at the country level, and among civil society groups has continued. The report is available at http://www.fcni.org/pdfs/SecGen_report.pdf

⁴ The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty was established by the Canadian government to lead an international consultation process on the issue of international intervention in interstate conflict or humanitarian crises. Rather than focusing on the international community's right to intervene, the report emphasized the responsibility of every state to protect its people and prevent violent conflict. The report is available at <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/iciss-ciise/menu-en.asp>

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

The study and practice of preventing the outbreak, escalation, and re-emergence of violent conflict is still quite new. Scholars, practitioners, and policymakers have struggled to find appropriate language to succinctly name this new field. Most in the international community have settled on the term *conflict prevention*, often noting that it is not necessarily conflict per se that they seek to prevent but *violent, deadly, or armed conflict*. Questions about the distinctions between violent, deadly, and armed conflict have also raised problems in trying to discuss what is already a broad and complex issue. FCNL chooses to describe its work in this area as *the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict*, in order to clarify that we are seeking just and peaceful methods for addressing, resolving, and transforming conflicts before the outbreak (or renewal) of violence. This includes addressing both the immediate or proximate causes of conflict, as well as the structural or systemic causes. In some cases we do use the term *conflict prevention*, particularly when referring to work by groups or agencies that employ this term.

4

Such actions include developing early warning systems and enhanced preventive diplomacy capacities, strengthening international law and good governance, reducing the proliferation of weapons and protecting human rights, supporting sustainable development and the fair distribution of resources, ending poverty, tackling HIV/AIDS and other public health crises, reducing ethnic tensions, building strong institutions of global civil society, and ensuring basic human security for all the world's people. The Secretary General is expected to issue a follow-up report building on these steps in 2004 or 2005.

Many in the international community are already making progress toward developing and implementing policies of peaceful prevention. The European Union, African Union, and other multilateral organizations are working to develop new mechanisms for regional conflict prevention. Sweden created a national policy for the prevention of violent conflict and is working to implement it.

The UN Development Program, World Bank, and national development agencies including the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) are integrating conflict prevention into their program work in countries worldwide. Civil society organizations across the globe working in humanitarian assistance, development, and peacebuilding have formed the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, and are planning a conference to be held at the UN in 2005 that will draw attention to the role of civil society in conflict prevention.

A new agenda for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict originally grew out of the recognized failure of the international community in the post-Cold War world to adequately prevent mass humanitarian crises, including the Rwandan genocide and mass slaughter in Srebrenica, Bosnia. The international community, including the U.S., was growing tired of reacting too little, too late to humanitarian crises, ethnic conflicts, and state failures that might have been prevented. A paradigm shift away from 11th hour responses to a model of early prevention was needed. In the summer of 2001, the UN Security Council, with the Bush Administration representing the U.S., passed a resolution pledging to “enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in addressing conflict at all stages, from prevention to settlement to post-conflict peacebuilding.” Secretary General Kofi Annan urged the global community “to make prevention the cornerstone of collective security in the twenty-first century.”⁵ In July 2003, the UN General Assembly adopted a landmark resolution in which member states, including the U.S., committed to working towards the prevention of armed conflict, and laid out the roles of states, UN agencies, civil society, and the private sector in preventing armed conflict.⁶

The attacks of September 11, 2001, and ongoing threats of terrorism have highlighted the importance of implementing a security agenda that can better predict emerging threats, prevent their outbreak into violence, defuse current disputes, and address the

5

⁵ See UN Security Council Resolution 1366, available at <http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/2001/sc2001.htm>

⁶ See UN General Assembly Resolution A/Res/57/337, available at <http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/r57.htm>

root causes of violent conflict. Rather than applying the lessons of peaceful prevention that the international community has been gathering, however, the U.S. has reverted to the outdated tools of unilateralism and overwhelming military force—instruments which promise to fuel the threats of weapons of mass destruction and terrorist attacks. Military action may stamp out some elements of a threat, but it cannot remove the roots of conflict and may instead deepen their reach.

A New Security Strategy

A more effective, less costly path to national and global security is available.

6 Some years ago, the New York City fire department made a fundamental paradigm shift away from fire emergency response toward fire prevention. The department changed the way it approached its job and turned more energy and resources into public education, early detection systems, better building codes, and addressing some of the most persistent causes of fire. They saved lives and, over a few short years, found they were fighting fewer and less devastating fires.

Fire fighters, as well as health professionals, have learned that prevention pays. A similar shift in approach to conflict could save lives and reduce the occasion of war. The U.S. can help lead this shift, if it is prepared to make significant changes in its policies and practices for dealing with conflict and violence.

The threats of weapons of mass destruction, terrorist networks, oppressive regimes, ethnic conflict, failed states, and devastating poverty and disease can be diminished through policies and programs designed to peacefully prevent the outbreak of violence and address the root causes of conflict. As U.S. Senator Joseph Biden (DE) proposed in late July 2003, “Instead of a preemption doctrine, what we need is a prevention doctrine which defuses problems long before they explode in our face.” Such a U.S. policy framework would build on the efforts already underway within some U.S. government agencies, at the UN, among European allies, in regional organizations, and among civil society

groups to develop stronger capacities for early warning, early response, and addressing root causes. It would replace the policy of “preemptive” war with one of war prevention.

IF WAR IS NOT THE ANSWER, WHAT IS?

Conflict Resolution & International Grassroots Networking Great Lakes Region, Central Africa, 1995–present

“The exceptionally creative thing about an AVP workshop is that a new community is forged during the intense, intimate time that people spend together; laughing, playing, thinking, no matter whether the participant be an old Buddhist farmer, a young Baptist university professor, a middle-aged atheist biker...or a politically radical ex-felon. Or a Hutu or a Tutsi.”

—Elaine Klaasen, “Alternatives to Violence
Project Goes to Africa,” July 2002

7 After the devastation of Rwanda’s 1994 genocide, communities of Quakers in Uganda began searching for ways to promote conflict resolution and reconciliation in the societies of their region. Ugandan Friends reached out to the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP), a conflict resolution program designed by Quakers and NY prison inmates in the mid-70s. AVP’s workshops are designed to be highly adaptable, and had already been conducted in diverse communities across the globe by the mid-90s. Since 1995, AVP facilitators have conducted hundreds of workshops in Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda, and have trained more than 100 local facilitators who continue grassroots resolution and reconciliation work. In 2002, President Paul Kagame of Rwanda announced a plan to process genocide suspects through a renewed version of the traditional, community-based gacaca court system. Rwandan Quakers met with the secretary general of the gacaca commission in the summer of 2002, and are in the process of conducting AVP workshops with thousands of genocide suspects, as well as the judges who will be deciding their cases. A growing number of Quaker organizations known as the Quaker Prevention Network brings together Quaker groups and individuals, including Rwandan Friends, who are working to break long cycles of violence and prevent future conflicts around the world.

To effectively address current and future threats to peace and security, the U.S. needs a new security strategy for the *peaceful prevention of deadly conflict*. Such a strategy would reduce reliance on military responses to global problems, strengthen international cooperation and the rule of law, and invest in tackling the root causes of conflict and violence. A comprehensive strategy for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict would include five pillars:

- I. International Cooperation and the Rule of Law**
- II. Preventive Diplomacy and Peace Operations**
- III. Arms Control and Disarmament**
- IV. Human Rights and Good Governance**
- V. Sustainable Development and Human Security**

Some recommendations for U.S. policy in each of the five areas follow.

8

I. International Cooperation and the Rule of Law

Goal: Strengthen international law and multilateral cooperation to address global threats to peace and security.

- Revoke the policy of “preemptive” war (see page 1 for definition);
- Prevent terrorist attacks and rein in terrorist networks through strengthened rule of law and international cooperation in policing, restricting finances, and information-sharing;
- Support and strengthen the United Nations and other international institutions working for the peaceful prevention and settlement of conflicts;
- Work with the UN Security Council to address emerging conflicts and threats to peace and security before they reach crisis levels;
- Ratify the Rome Statute and support the International Criminal Court in bringing human rights abusers and perpetrators of crimes against humanity to justice, and
- Fulfill U.S. commitments under international treaties and work cooperatively for the strengthening of international law on arms control, human rights, the environment, and trade.

II. Preventive Diplomacy and Peace Operations

Goal: Enhance the international community’s capacity to prevent the escalation of conflict, effectively respond to emerging crises, and rebuild societies shattered by war and conflict.

- Invest in research and training for national, regional, and international early warning systems and early response mechanisms;
- Support the use of preventive diplomacy, including the use of mediation, arbitration, and confidence-building measures to de-escalate tensions and resolve conflicts;
- Support the creation of new international, national, and regional capacities for preventing and responding to conflict, including a stand-by corps of conflict resolution and prevention experts, as well as an international civilian police corps;
- Support and fund more effective civilian post-conflict reconstruction initiatives, including reconciliation and restorative justice programs;
- Contribute annually to the UN’s Trust Fund for Preventive Action;
- Support educational, cultural, scientific, commercial, and other exchanges among nations and peoples in order to facilitate intercultural dialogue and replace unjustified fears with mutual understanding and trust.

III. Arms Control and Disarmament

Goal: Reduce the spread of weapons of all kinds—nuclear, chemical, biological, as well as conventional weapons, small arms, and light weapons.

- Renounce the first use of nuclear weapons, prohibit the development of new nuclear weapons, and stop the push for new nuclear testing in the U.S.;
- Increase funding for the Nunn-Lugar program and other cooperative threat-reduction efforts;
- Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and fulfill U.S. obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty;
- Strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention through enhanced monitoring and inspections;
- Work to create zones free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East and other regions;
- Support multilateral efforts, including the UN small arms process, to limit the spread of weapons;

9

- Enhance U.S. and international arms export controls, end U.S. military assistance to repressive regimes, and work internationally to end weapons flows to regions of conflict and abusive regimes.

IV. Human Rights and Good Governance

Goal: Strengthen human rights and promote good governance as foundations for stable, secure societies.

- Support the deployment of international human rights monitors in situations of conflict and emerging crises;
- Uphold U.S. commitments under international humanitarian law, including the Geneva Conventions, and strengthen the protection of civilians in situations of conflict;
- End mass detentions and abusive interrogation techniques in the name of combating terrorism;
- Ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child and work to end the use of child soldiers;
- Ratify the Convention to End Discrimination Against Women and support an increased role for women in conflict management and peacebuilding, economic life, and the political arena;
- Support programs to strengthen civil society and promote human rights awareness, democracy, transparency, accountability, and peacebuilding, particularly in pre- and post-conflict situations.

V. Sustainable Development and Human Security

Goal: Address root causes of violent conflict by meeting basic human needs and promoting more equitable use of world resources.

- Increase funding for programs that integrate conflict prevention and peacebuilding within traditional development assistance, including USAID's Office for Conflict Management and Mitigation;
- Increase U.S. development assistance to the world's poorest countries and work to ensure transparency and accountability in aid distribution;
- Actively work to implement the UN Millennium Development Goals, including halving global poverty by 2015, promoting environmental sustainability, and creating a global partnership for development to address issues of aid, trade, and debt;

- Provide generous and effective U.S. funding—bilaterally and through the UN—for the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis in Africa and other highly infected regions;
- Reduce U.S. dependence on oil by lowering consumption, developing renewable sources of energy, and promoting alternative modes of transportation;
- Work with the international community to make clean water accessible and affordable for all.

IF WAR IS NOT THE ANSWER, WHAT IS?

UN Peace Operations & Inter-ethnic Community Building Macedonia 1991–1999

“Conflict, including ethnic conflict, is not unavoidable but can indeed be prevented. This requires, however, that the necessary efforts be made.”

—Max van der Stoep, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, High Commissioner on National Minorities, 1994

When Macedonia declared its independence from the former Yugoslavia in September 1991, the new republic faced steep challenges in its efforts to establish autonomy and legitimacy. In addition, the internal pressure of inter-ethnic tension and the external pressure of war in neighboring Balkan states provided clear warning signs of potential armed conflict. Although in the past the UN had only deployed peacekeeping missions to maintain cease-fires in post-conflict situations, in December of 1992 the UN Security Council voted to send peacekeeping troops to monitor the Serbian-Macedonian border in an effort to prevent conflict from erupting. International nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) such as Catholic Relief Services and Search for Common Ground worked with local groups on inter-cultural communication and sensitivity training. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) provided clear channels for communication and transparency between the Macedonian government and other government parties. Despite continued tensions, sustained and multi-faceted efforts helped prevent the spread of regional conflict in Macedonia for close to a decade. Unfortunately, in 1999 the UN peacekeeping mission was not renewed, and tensions reignited.

1. What is the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict?

The peaceful prevention of deadly conflict is a paradigm for addressing conflict issues, as well as a set of policies for building national and global security in the 21st century. It is an alternative to the policy of “preemptive” war and military dominance. It begins from the premise that war is not inevitable and that preventing the outbreak of violent conflict is less costly and can be more effective than responding, often through military force, once crises have already erupted. It seeks to understand the causes of conflict, both proximate and root, and to address them before disputes become violent. It seeks to address both immediate conflict issues and longer-term structural issues of injustice. The UN, parts of the U.S. government, regional organizations, individual countries, and civil society organizations are actively working to implement programs and policies for peaceful prevention.

12 2. How did the concept of peaceful prevention develop?

The international community, along with peace and conflict scholars, began to develop the concept of peaceful prevention of deadly conflict in the early 1990s. The failures of the global community to effectively prevent the genocide in Rwanda, mass killings in Srebrenica, Bosnia, and humanitarian crises in Somalia and elsewhere pushed many to search for a new approach to managing conflict in the post-Cold War world. The publishing of the report of the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict in 1997, followed three years later by the release of the UN Secretary General’s *Report on the Prevention of Armed Conflict* and the report *Responsibility to Protect* by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, marked important steps in the development of peaceful prevention. However, the efforts at the international level have largely focused on preventing violent conflicts within states (civil wars and state collapse), rather than wars between states (such as the U.S. attacks against Afghanistan and Iraq). Many see the importance of extending the international community’s approach to preventing deadly conflict to include both.

3. What are the benefits of peaceful prevention?

As health professionals and firefighters have already learned, early prevention is more effective and more efficient than late response. Preventing conflict from erupting into violence saves lives in the short-term and enhances security in the long-term. It is also less expensive than responding to crises after they have erupted and rebuilding shattered communities. Peaceful prevention frees up resources that can be used to meet basic human needs. Its benefits extend beyond any single state’s borders. One country’s armed conflict can result in economic destabilization and undermine human security for an entire region. At the same time, successful prevention of violent conflict in a country can contribute to the stability and resilience of the surrounding region. Communities and societies with the capacity to peacefully manage conflict can often better address other issues such as economic development, human rights, and political stability.

4. Are there cases where violent conflict has been prevented?

Yes. Throughout the 20th century there have been many cases of escalating tension and violence in which concerned governments, nongovernmental organizations, religious organizations and social movements have worked steadfastly to confront repression and injustice and to prevent the outbreak of deadly conflict. In 1978, when longstanding tension between Argentina and Chile over a strip of water known as the Beagle Channel threatened to disintegrate into full-blown war, Pope John Paul II sent his personal envoy to act as mediator between the two countries. Six years of continued peace efforts, facilitated by papal officers, held off war long enough for the military regimes of both countries to lose much of their authority, and a final treaty was signed in 1984. In India in 1991, social and religious tensions in the shantytowns of Ahmedabad were erupting into violence with increased frequency. Saint Xavier’s Social Service Society launched a program of peace initiatives such as street plays, festivals and community meetings that served to counter propaganda and diffuse confrontations. When conflict in the former Yugoslavia threatened to spill over into Macedonia, the United Nations deployed peacekeepers to help prevent the spread of violence. The presence of international peacekeepers helped contain the conflict. (For more stories on suc-

successful prevention see the Oxford Research Group's 2001 report *War Prevention Works: 50 Stories of People Resolving Conflict*. This book is available through the publisher at 51 Plantation Road, Oxford OX2 6JE, England, email: org@oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk

5. **Who is working toward the peaceful prevention of violent conflict?**

The UN Security Council, General Assembly, and UN agencies, as well as the European Union, the African Union, the World Bank, national governments like Sweden, development programs like the UK Department for International Development (DfID) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and many civil society groups working around the world have taken steps to establish policies and programs for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict. Many peace and conflict scholars continue to make essential contributions to the field. The Secretary General's *Report on the Prevention of Armed Conflict* includes 29 recommendations for making progress on prevention in the UN, among Member states, in regional organizations, and with civil society groups. The General Assembly of the United Nations has also affirmed the principles and policy directives of conflict prevention in Resolution 57/337, passed in July 2003. Efforts to implement these recommendations are underway, including planning by the Global Partnership for Prevention of Armed Conflict for an international conference on the role of civil society in conflict prevention, to be held at the UN in 2005. A follow-up report from the Secretary General is also expected, and the UN high level panel appointed to address global issues of peace and security will also likely include prevention on its agenda.

6. **What is the U.S. doing to help prevent deadly conflict?**

The U.S. has contributed to the global dialogue on peaceful prevention. In the Security Council, the U.S. joined in adopting Resolution 1366 (2001), which expresses the determination of the Council "to pursue the prevention of armed conflict as an integral part of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security." At a national level, the U.S. has also taken small but important steps. In September 2002, a new Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation

was created in USAID. It is working to integrate prevention into its development programs and spread a culture of prevention through USAID. In March 2004, members of the House of Representatives introduced the "SMART Security Platform," a piece of legislation that affirms multilateral institutions, arms control and disarmament, and the prevention of deadly conflict as the most effective policies for achieving security. Other members in the House and Senate are developing legislation to promote more effective peace operations and to enhance U.S. capacity for civilian post-conflict relief and stabilization efforts—efforts which, at their best, could help prevent the reemergence or outbreak of violence in countries recovering from war or on the brink of state failure.

Policymakers on all sides clearly recognize the need to address the threats of terrorism, weapons proliferation, and global conflict before they explode into deadly violence. Unfortunately, the U.S. has not actively embraced an agenda for peaceful prevention that addresses the root causes of violence. In fact, policies of "preemptive" war, U.S. military dominance, unilateral exceptionalism, and an endless, boundless "Global War on Terror" undermine the potential for peaceful prevention. The U.S. has already waged two wars, is undermining human rights at home and abroad, and may be fueling a new era of global weapons proliferation and terrorist attacks.

7. **How does the doctrine of "preemptive" war relate to peaceful prevention?**

The doctrine of "preemptive" war and global military dominance, outlined in the 2002 National Security Strategy, diverges dramatically from the global trends toward peaceful prevention. It turns the concept of preventing the outbreak of violence and addressing root causes of conflict on its head by using aggression and war as the preferred tools of so-called prevention. By doing so, the U.S. is threatening to create a new era of entrenched global violence and to destroy the very pillars of peaceful prevention, such as international law and multilateral institutions like the UN.

8. What about brutal dictators and terrorists?

How does peaceful prevention deal with such threats?

Preventing war does not mean ignoring or acquiescing to the very real threats posed by brutal regimes and terrorism. However, military force has proved an ill-suited tool for ending the threat of terrorism or replacing brutal regimes with healthy, peaceful societies. Instead, the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict requires the creation of global norms, laws, institutions, and prevention capacities that weaken, isolate and withdraw power from dictators and terrorist networks. The International Criminal Court is a major advance in this regard. It is designed to handle cases of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes when national governments are incapable or unwilling to do so. More importantly perhaps, working preventively means understanding how threats develop and what motivates those engaged in acts of violence and terror. What policies and practices have contributed to the development of a conflict in the past? Has the U.S. aided oppressive regimes in the name of short-term national interests, only to find later that U.S. and global security have been undermined by such policies? What are the conditions that allow or even encourage oppressive regimes or terrorist networks to develop? How can those conditions be altered to ensure more participatory governance and remove the power base of extreme factions? Societies in which democratic processes are strong, civil society is well-established, and civic engagement is high have mechanisms that can curtail fanaticism and authoritarianism. If a dictatorship takes hold, these indigenous democratic institutions can serve as a powerful and sometimes decisive counter-force in a population's struggle to peacefully bring about regime change.

9. How can U.S. policy be improved to better prevent violent conflict?

The U.S. needs a new national security strategy for the peaceful prevention of violent conflict. Such a strategy would invest in developing and utilizing nonmilitary tools to address global problems, including: 1.) international cooperation and the rule of law; 2.) preventive diplomacy and peace operations; 3.) arms control and disarmament; 4.) human rights and good governance; and 5.) sustainable development and human security. (See page 7 for more detailed policy recommendations.)

10. What can I do to contribute to the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict?

You can educate yourself, your community, and your members of Congress on the paradigm and the policies of peaceful prevention. Plan an event and invite an FCNL staff person to speak, or create a study group with others in your community. Communicate with your members of Congress about peaceful prevention and use FCNL and other materials to educate them on the issue. Urge them to support and vote for policies that can reduce threats to peace and security, prevent armed hostilities, and address the root causes of violent conflict.

IF WAR IS NOT THE ANSWER, WHAT IS?

**Global Civil Society & International Weapons Inspections
Iraq, 2002-2003**

“Never before in the history of the world has there been a global, visible, public, viable, open dialogue and conversation about the very legitimacy of war...This is a miracle. This is what ‘waging peace’ looks like.”

—Dr. Robert Muller, former Assistant Secretary-General of the UN,
March 18, 2003

In September 2002, President Bush went before the UN General Assembly and announced the intention of his Administration to bring about regime change in Iraq, by force if necessary, with or without the support of the UN Security Council. Many people believed that the Administration’s push to war would go unchallenged, and that a U.S. military invasion of Iraq was imminent. Instead, U.S. citizens, members of global civil society, and ordinary people around the world mounted what would become the largest international peace movement in history in an attempt to prevent war with Iraq. In answer to pressure at home and abroad, the Bush Administration went to the United Nations with its concerns over Saddam Hussein’s regime. For seven months the Security Council held sway as it served as arbiter and initiated intensive international weapons inspections in Iraq. Even as the U.S. military prepared to invade Iraq in March 2003, many long-time peace advocates believed they had witnessed a turning point in global opinion and action with regard to armed conflict. Following the invasion and occupation, after more than a year searching for weapons in Iraq, no evidence was found to back up the prewar intelligence claims of the U.S.

Further Reading and Resources



Reports & UN Resolutions

Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy

The World Bank Group Policy Research Report

Full report available for download or purchase at

<http://econ.worldbank.org/prr/CivilWarPRR/>

FCNL Analysis of the September 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States of America, April 2003

Full text of September 2002 National Security Strategy and FCNL analysis available at

http://www.fcnl.org/issues/mil/sup/national_security-strategy.htm

Preventing Deadly Conflict: Final Report

Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict

The final report of the Carnegie Commission, along with other publications, is available at <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/frpub.htm>

Preventing War and Disaster: A Growing Global Challenge

UN Sec. General Kofi Annan’s 1999 Annual Report on the Work of the Organization

Available on the United Nations web site at

<http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/Report99/toc.htm>

Prevention of Armed Conflict: Report of the Secretary General

United Nations, June 7, 2001

This report is available on the FCNL

web site at http://www.fcnl.org/pdfs/SecGen_report.pdf

Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations

August 21, 2000, Lakhdar Brahimi, chairman of the panel on United Nations Peace Operations

Available on the UN web site at

http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/

The Responsibility to Protect

Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty

Available at <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/iciss-ciise/menu-en.asp>

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000)

October 31, 2000: The Security Council calls on all Member states to increase representation of women within local, national and global institutions and increase attention to gender issues within peacemaking processes. Resolution available at the UN web site:
<http://daccess-ods.un.org/TMP/5451769.html>

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1366 (2001)

August 30, 2001: The Security Council establishes the prevention of armed conflict as an “integral part of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.” Resolution available at the UN web site:
<http://daccess-ods.un.org/TMP/6580126.html>

United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/337 (2003)

July 18, 2003: The UN General Assembly calls for “a comprehensive and coherent strategy comprising short-term operational and long-term structural measures for the prevention of armed conflict,” while affirming the principles and directives of the Secretary General’s report. Resolution available at the UN web site:
<http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/r57.htm>

20 Websites

American Friends Service Committee
<http://afsc.org/>

Carnegie Commission on Prevention of Deadly Conflict
<http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/index.htm>

Center for International Conflict Resolution, Columbia University
<http://www.sipa.columbia.edu/cicr/>

Center for Strategic & International Studies, Preventive Diplomacy
http://www.csis.org/prevdip/cp_index.htm

Council on Foreign Relations
<http://www.cfr.org/>

Eastern Mennonite University, Conflict Transformation Program
<http://www.emu.edu/ctp/>

European Center for Conflict Prevention (ECCP)
<http://www.conflict-prevention.net/>

Friends Committee on National Legislation
<http://www.fcnl.org/>

Global Action to Prevent War
<http://www.globalactionpw.org/>

Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict
<http://www.conflictprevention-dialogue.org>

International Crisis Group
<http://www.intl-crisis-group.org/>

Quaker United Nations Office
<http://www.afsc.org/quno.htm>

Search for Common Ground
<http://www.sfcg.org/>

United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Conflict Prevention & Recovery
<http://www.undp.org/erd/>

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Conflict Prevention
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/confprev/>

United States Institute of Peace
<http://www.usip.org/>

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Conflict Prevention Project
<http://wwics.si.edu/>

Books

Cases and Strategies for Preventive Action
Center for Preventive Action, Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations and the Twentieth Century Fund, Edited by Barnett R. Rubin, the Century Foundation Press, 1998.
Copies available through the publisher, 1-800-552-5450

Conflict Prevention: Path to Peace of Grand Illusion?
Edited by David Carment and Albrecht Schnabel,
United Nations University Press, 2003.
Copies available through the publisher, 2 United Nations Plaza,
Room DC2-1462-70, New York, NY 10017; (212) 963-6387

Preventing Violent Conflicts: A Strategy for Preventive Diplomacy

By Michael S. Lund, United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996.
Copies available through the publisher, 1550 M St., NW,
Washington D.C. 20005

Preventive Negotiation: Avoiding Conflict Escalation

Edited by William Zartman, Carnegie Commission on Preventing
Deadly Conflict, 2001.
Copies available through the Conflict Prevention Project, Woodrow
Wilson Center, One Woodrow Wilson Plaza, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave.,
N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004-3027; (202) 691-4187

War Prevention Works: 50 Stories of People Resolving Conflicts

By Dylan Matthews, published by Oxford Research Group,
September 2001
This book contains 50 short accounts from all over the world of what
ordinary people are doing to prevent and resolve conflicts peacefully.
Copies are available from the publisher at 51 Plantation Road, Oxford
OX2 6JE, United Kingdom, or on the web at
www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk

Ghosts of Rwanda

FRONTLINE co-production with the BBC and Silverbridge Productions
Limited, written and directed by Greg Barker.
Through interviews with Rwandans, U.S. and UN officials, peacekeepers,
diplomats, journalists and international aid workers, this documentary
revisits the harrowing days of the 1994 Rwandan genocide, in which
more than 800,000 civilians were killed over 100 days, and the failure
of the international community to take effective preventive action. On
the 10th anniversary of the genocide, the interviewees still struggle to
understand how such a tragedy was allowed to happen, and how future
genocides could be prevented. For more information, see the PBS website
at <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/ghosts/>. Copies of the
documentary are available through PBS Video at
1-877-PBS-SHOP, or visit <http://www.shoppbs.org>.

Videos

22

Bringing Down a Dictator

A co-production for PBS by York Zimmerman Inc. and WETA,
Washington, D.C., written and produced by Steve York.
This documentary tells the story of Otpor, the student group whose
non-violent organizing in Serbia mobilized the population and helped
bring down Slobodan Milosevic. For more information, see
<http://www.pbs.org/weta/dictator/film/>. Copies of the documentary are
available through Films for the Humanities at 1-800-257-5126, or visit
<http://www.films.com>

A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict

A co-production for PBS by York Zimmerman Inc. and WETA,
Washington, D.C., written and produced by Steve York.
This three hour documentary tells the stories of six successful nonviolent
movements, from South Africa to Denmark, Chile to Poland, whose
participants took on some of the most brutal and repressive regimes of
the 20th century and were able to resist or dismantle these regimes
through nonviolent action. For more information, see the PBS web site
at <http://www.pbs.org/weta/forcemorepowerful/>. Copies of the documen-
tary are available through Films For the Humanities at 1-800-257-5126,
or visit <http://www.films.com>

23

Web site: Visit us at www.fcnl.org for current information about important legislative issues, information on Congress, status of bills, tips on how to effectively engage you member of Congress, and much more.

Washington Newsletter: This monthly report provides news and analysis for a selection of domestic and international issues with a primary focus on peace, disarmament, international cooperation, and social and economic justice. It is sent free upon request and automatically to current donors.

Indian Report: This quarterly publication supports FCNL's Native American advocacy program. It is sent to all *Washington Newsletter* recipients as well as to tribal leaders and others with a particular interest in FCNL's Native American program.

Email Lists: FCNL maintains email lists for sending out updates on legislative and policy matters, particularly those needing constituent calls and letters to members of Congress or the Administration. To join an email list, go to www.fcnl.org and click on "FCNL's email alerts."

fcnl-news: weekly Legislative Action Messages and periodic InfoLine messages.

fcnl-prevent war: updates and action messages on peaceful prevention of deadly conflict and other foreign policy issues.

Nuclear Calendar: weekly updates of events concerning nuclear weapons, disarmament, and non-proliferation.

fcnl-library-friends: background information, updates, and action messages about civil liberties issues affecting libraries and bookstores.

fcnl-nalu: periodic alerts on Native American issues.

FCNL's many educational resources are made possible through the generous contributions of individuals, foundations, and groups from around the country. Donations to FCNL [a 501(c)(4) organization] are not tax-deductible and go toward public interest lobbying. Gifts to the FCNL Education Fund [a 501(c)(3) organization] are tax-deductible and support non-partisan research and education. You can use the tear-off coupon on this booklet to mail your check to FCNL at 245 Second Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002. You can also donate securely on-line via Visa or Mastercard (www.fcnl.org, then click on the "Support FCNL Financially" button on the navigation bar) OR you may call FCNL to make a credit card contribution (800-630-1330).

FCNL Needs Your Support!

Please note that our mailing list is never traded, rented, or sold.

Use this form to:

- Join with 12,000 supporters who receive the monthly *FCNL Washington Newsletter* and other periodic publications.
- Begin your involvement with FCNL by making a contribution.

Name

Address

City, State, Zip

Daytime phone

Evening phone

Email

My gift of \$ _____ is enclosed

OR

Credit card donations can be made securely online at **www.fcnl.org** or by calling **1-800-630-1330, ext. 141**

This gift is for:

- FCNL—lobbying, **NOT** tax deductible
- FCNL Education Fund—policy, research, publications, and training, **IS** tax deductible.
- Please send me the *FCNL Washington Newsletter* (11 issues/year), although I can't contribute at this time.

Questions? Call 1-800-630-1330

**Please mail your contribution
along with this form to:**

Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second St., NE Washington, DC 20002