

Nonviolence and Justice – the basis for common security

Lecture given at the conference of Church and Peace,
11 June 2016, by Christine Schweitzer

1. Comprehensive “Securitisisation”

A lot of people are talking about security these days. Politicians, the media, and even family and friends.

We each see different threats looming, depending on where we’re looking and the context in which we happen to be living and thinking. And maybe we’re being told what threat(s) we should be afraid of. Nothing works better at motivating citizens to support a new policy, such as going to war or restricting civil and human rights at home, than first instilling fear into them and then promoting the new policy as the means of combatting the supposed threat.

According to NATO and the defence ministers of Western countries, there are several significant threats to our security, threats which ultimately require a military response. The armed forces must therefore be given tax revenues, arms manufacturing must flourish, and people have to serve in the armed forces – may it be as volunteers or as conscripts. The list of threats has not changed significantly since the early 1990s, although terrorism has been given a higher ranking since 2001 and “cyber warfare” has been added to the list in recent years. In a NATO document agreed at a summit in Lisbon in 2010 ¹, the following threats are mentioned: threats within Europe (i.e. from Russia, though not mentioned by name; this threat may be highlighted even more strongly at the NATO summit in Warsaw this year); nuclear proliferation; terrorism; conflicts outside NATO territory ²; cyber-attacks, threats to trade routes and energy supply ³. New technological developments (lasers, electronic warfare) and deterioration of the “security environment” through threats to health, climate change, water shortages, and growing demand for energy are also listed by NATO as security risks.

National strategies, such as that embodied in the German Government 2006 White papers (the new White Papers will be published this summer), name similar risks, though sometimes in a different order or with a different emphasis. The German Government 2006 White Papers already included a section on “the threat to security from migration”, a subject which is bound to be given more attention this year along with the tensions with Russia.

Since the start of the crisis in Ukraine, Central European defence ministers have been naming Russia as the foremost and biggest threat that they face. They fear (or pretend they fear) that Russia may seek to recreate the old Soviet Union or establish a “Greater Russia” by reclaiming all the territories in which Russians live. This point of view is also mentioned in the so-called Ischinger Report to the OSCE in 2015.⁴ Russia, on the other hand, feels threatened by the USA and NATO - possibly even more so than by Islamist terrorism.

So far I have talked about states. What about citizens? Let’s put aside for the moment universal fears of social exclusion, loss of love, domestic violence, illness, and death, etc. ⁵:

¹ “Strategic Concept For the Defense and Security of The Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation”, adopted by heads of state and government in Lisbon

² “Instability or conflict beyond NATO borders can directly threaten Alliance security, including by fostering extremism, terrorism, and trans-national illegal activities such as trafficking in arms, narcotics and people”, according to the Lisbon document.

³ “Some NATO countries will become more dependent on foreign energy suppliers and in some cases, on foreign energy supply and distribution networks for their energy needs. As a larger share of world consumption is transported across the globe, energy supplies are increasingly exposed to disruption”, according to the document.

⁴ ‘Back to Diplomacy’. Final Report and Recommendations of the Panel of Eminent Persons on European Security as a Common Project, November 2015

⁵ According to psychologist David Grossman, most people fear illness and death less than other phenomena in their social environment: “We want desperately to be liked, loved and in control of our lives; and intentional, overt human hostility and aggression - more than anything else in life - assaults our self-image, our sense of control, our sense of the world as a meaningful and comprehensible place, and, ultimately, our mental and physical health. (...) It is not fear of death and injury from disease or accident but rather acts of personal predation and domination by our fellow human beings that strike terror and loathing in our hearts.” (Grossman, Dave, 1996: *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. New York, Back Bay Books, p. 76). Quoted by Georg Adelmann (2016), *Angst und Bedrohung - eine psychologische Perspektive*, in: BSV (Hrsg.), *Bevor Angst die Seele auffrisst*, HuD Nr. 50, Juni 2016.

In many, perhaps most, countries around the world, natural disasters, the police, the military, or raids by armed bandits, are likely to be at the top of the list of threats which people fear. Along with terrorism. And along with state terrorism in the form of American drones which, in some parts of the world, turn every gathering of people, including wedding celebrations, into a dangerous situation.

In Germany, if one googles “surveys of what people are afraid of”, one comes across surveys which are concerned above all with issues of internal security, especially crime and refugees. In Germany, for quite a few years now, the fear of being a victim of crime has become increasingly prevalent and now stands at just over 50%. Women, those aged over 60, and East Germans are more fearful than average. 41% of men and as many as 60% of women feel unsafe. 5% of men and 12% of women feel seriously threatened. 69% believe that crime rates are increasing. ⁶

Nearly half the citizens of Germany are seriously worried by the refugee situation in the country. Only 7% are not at all worried by the developments. 70% believe that dealing with the wave of refugees is one of the greatest challenges facing Germany. 71% are convinced that terrorist groups pose a serious threat to the country. “The feeling of being personally at risk has increased enormously. Only a few months ago almost half of all citizens did not think they were personally at risk of being attacked by terrorists. Now only 27% still feel this way,” according to WirtschaftsWoche. ⁷

External factors are also mentioned in surveys: “Given the large number of conflicts around the world, German citizens watch global developments with growing concern. 62% of Germans now perceive the international political situation as threatening or very threatening (58% last September). This is the result of a recent survey conducted by the Berlin-based polling organisation infratest dimap for 'ARD-DeutschlandTREND'. Various developments around the world contribute to the Germans feeling threatened,” according to the infratest dimap pollsters. One of these developments is the advance of the terrorist militia “Islamic State” (IS) in Syria and Iraq. ⁸

What are we to conclude from this? Because they have such fears some people vote for populist and extreme right-wing parties. Other people are afraid of precisely this and other related trends, even to the extent of fearing, as is often mentioned in discussion, a repeat of what happened in the 1920s and 1930s.

When we talk to environmental organisations, people in the peace movement, and academics in these fields, we’re reminded about other threat scenarios: The lifestyle which so many people in industrialised countries now enjoy is seriously under threat - essential resources will be exhausted within the next 30-40 years. Then there is climate change, the possibility of a nuclear disaster, the continuing danger of nuclear war, etc.

Here’s another thought on the subject of terror - such a dominant topic these days, especially here in France: Most of us are horrified by terrorist attacks only when they happen virtually on our doorstep and when the perceived proximity is reinforced by media reports. Psychologists can explain this, no doubt. If it wasn’t for the media reports, people would be nowhere near so upset. Everyone who travels by train has personal experience of the fact that each year nearly 1,000 people take their own life by throwing themselves in front of a train. But the media keep quiet about this, so long as the person who has committed suicide doesn’t happen to be a well-known personality such as the national goalkeeper from Hanover, Robert Enke. ⁹ So no-one feels any empathy for such people. One might point out that when people commit suicide in this way they don’t normally endanger other passengers. This is true, but what do statistics tell us about the dangers to which we are exposed? From a statistical point of view, the risk of losing one’s life as a result of a terrorist attack is far smaller than that of dying in a car accident (in 2015, 3,175 people died ¹⁰ and 67,732 were seriously injured ¹¹), or becoming ill with cancer (around 500,000 new diagnoses per year in Germany and around 224,000 deaths from cancer each year ¹²). These are both risks which we’ve learnt to live with. I’m not quoting these figures in order to set them against the number of deaths from terrorist attacks. I just want to use them to illustrate how we react to various risks in such very different ways.

⁶ <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/allensbach-umfrage-zeigt-angst-um-innere-sicherheit-steigt-14073805-p3.html>

⁷ <http://www.wiwo.de/politik/deutschland/allensbach-umfrage-die-deutschen-sorgen-sich-um-ihre-sicherheit/12737298.html>

⁸ <http://www.bundeswehr-journal.de/2014/deutsche-fuerchten-anschlaege-durch-terrormiliz/#more-4126>

⁹ <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/panorama/suizid-auf-den-gleisen-es-passiert-drei-mal-am-tag-1.133473>

¹⁰ <http://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/161724/umfrage/verkehrstote-in-deutschland-monatszahlen/>

¹¹ <https://www.destatis.de/DE/ZahlenFakten/Wirtschaftsbereiche/TransportVerkehr/Verkehrsunfaelle/Verkehrsunfaelle.htm>

¹² <http://www.krebshilfe.de/wir-informieren/ueber-krebs/krebszahlen.html>

2. Various concepts of security

The nature of the threats (and no doubt more could be added to the above list) is so broad that it seems that nothing short of a global revolution is required. The dangers seem so huge. And the scale of injustice worldwide seems to be at least equal to the resistance to it and the attempts to overcome it. How can we overcome these dangers? How can we create global justice? Each of the threats which we've named, from the build-up of armaments and the exploitation of natural resources to climate change, would require many comprehensive measures to deal with it. Such a task is beyond the scope of this lecture. So I would like instead to address the overriding issues:

What these threats and changes all have in common is that they are - or are likely to be - a source of conflict and violence so long as they are not addressed in new ways which are different from what is being done at present. Let me mention just two examples:

- Climate change gives rise to conflict within states over water supply and fertile land and is one of the main causes of migration. This in turn leads to the "repulsion of refugees" (through the construction of border fences and the deployment of police and armed forces), which we can already see happening, and to the growth of right-wing extremism.
- The impending shortage of natural resources is a cause of war of the first order: many of the geostrategic implications of today's conflicts, from Afghanistan and Iraq to the Democratic Republic of Congo, are an indication of this. And even though oil may be cheap at the moment, there will be none left in a couple of decades.

To summarise in one sentence: Conflict is unavoidable - the question is: How do we approach it? Do we resort to violence and fight against everyone who threatens us and our interests, so that we get what we want? Or do we find other ways of relating to each other? I would like now to present several alternative concepts of security.

2.1 Common Security

The term "common security" was coined back in 1982 by a commission, chaired by the Swedish prime minister, Olof Palme, which did a lot to deescalate the East-West conflict and promote the CSCE process. Between 1980 and 1982, at the height of the Cold War, the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security, made up of nineteen leading politicians and experts from East and West, North and South, including the former German minister and disarmament expert, Egon Bahr, carried out a thorough analysis of the potentially fatal consequences of military alliances with doctrines of nuclear deterrence. They summarised their conclusions in an alternative concept, "common security", which went beyond the UN's principle of "collective security":

"Nowadays security cannot be achieved unilaterally. We live in a world in which economic, political, cultural, and above all military structures are increasingly interdependent. The security of one's own nation cannot be bought at the expense of other nations."¹³

In the nuclear age of mutually assured destruction, it is no longer possible to achieve security against a potential adversary; security can only be established as common security in cooperation with the adversary.

During the 1980s many people in Europe, including political parties outside the social democratic consensus, took up the concept of common security as an alternative to the policy of nuclear deterrence involving the threat of nuclear holocaust. And the concept found its way into the CSCE process.

But the era of disarmament and arms control treaties, which were partly a (delayed) success of the peace movement in the 1980s, was soon followed by a new phase. NATO stopped heeding Russian interests and concerns, expanded further and further towards Russia's borders, and failed to take up proposals regarding pan-European understanding, such as Russia's 2009 proposal to draft a pan-European security treaty.¹⁴

The idea of common security in Europe is still relevant today, in two respects. On the one hand, it has gained new meaning in relation to the relationship between the West and Russia, where the West, in

¹³ Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival, 1982; Egon Bahr/Dieter S. Lutz (Hg.), *Gemeinsame Sicherheit*, 3 Bände, Baden-Baden, 1986 and 1987. Quoted in: Dieter Deiseroth, *Das Friedensgebot des Grundgesetzes und der UN-Charta - ... und die Bundeswehr?* (Manuskript)

¹⁴ Proposal for a European security treaty (http://www.sicherheitspolitik-dss.de/autoren/lemcke/proj1_eu.htm and Sabine Jaberg, 'Der Westen blockierte eine Friedens- und Sicherheitsordnung in Europa', *Friedensforum* 4/2016

political terms, now includes central European states. The current sabre-rattling on both sides of the Russian border is extremely dangerous, especially since lines of communication established during the Cold War are no longer functioning.

On the other hand, it is also possible to extend the concept (common security) to one of global common security. The adage, that ultimately security can only be gained through mutual cooperation, not in opposition to one another, applies to North-South and South-South as well as East-West relations.

2.2 Human Security

The concept of common security is concerned with security between states. This is not the case with the concept of “human security”.

The 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) introduced the concept of human security into international political discourse.¹⁵ The report contrasts the Cold War concept of security - defined in terms of territorial security, the protection of national interests in the international political context, or global security from the nuclear threat - with the security needs of “ordinary people”. Human security means “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want”, i.e. protection from illness, hunger, unemployment, crime, social unrest, political oppression, and threats to the environment. Besides this broad definition of human security, there is also a narrow definition limited to security in relation to war and violence.

The key aspect of the concept of human security, in both the broad and the narrow sense, is that it is concerned with the protection of persons against abuse by the state and therefore gives priority to human rights over state interests and ultimately over state sovereignty.

How can human security be established by nonviolent means? The UNDP recommended a development policy oriented towards meeting the needs of people (rather than the needs of states) as the best way to achieve human security. Focussing more on the narrow definition of human security, Slim and Eguren¹⁶ describe five measures to protect human security from violation by state structures:

- Denunciation (forcing the authorities to meet their obligations by making failings public)
- Persuasion
- Mobilising influential people
- Substitution (alternative provision of services)
- Supporting local structures.

2.3 Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

The responsibility to protect, which in recent years was the subject of discussion almost more often than human security, is another concept which is primarily concerned with the world as made up of states, but it already passed its peak of popularity after the war in Libya in 2011 (see below). It was formulated in 2001 by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS).¹⁷ In spite of misgivings on the part of those who saw it as a blueprint for worldwide military intervention, the “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2005 and subsequently by the Security Council in the following year. The global summit stated that “every state has the responsibility to protect its population from four kinds of crime: genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity”.

If a state fails to meet this obligation, then the international community has the right and the duty to intervene: to prevent, to respond, and to rebuild. The UN conceived of three pillars:

1. Pillar 1: The responsibility of every state to protect its citizens from R2P-type crimes.
2. Pillar 2: International assistance with achieving this task.
3. Pillar 3: Intervention, if necessary against the wishes of the state concerned.

The international military intervention in Libya in 2011 was the first military intervention to be justified according to R2P. The consequences are well-known: the Gaddafi regime was violently overthrown; and the country was plunged into civil war and is today one of the countries which suffers most from the presence of Islamic State (so-called). Other examples used to make the case for waging war are equally

¹⁵ <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/>

¹⁶ Slim, Hugo and Eguren, Enrique (2004) Humanitarian Protection. A Guidance Booklet. Pilot Version, ALNAP, <http://www.odi.org.uk/rights/Publications/protectionbooklet3.pdf> -

¹⁷ 'The Responsibility to Protect.' Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001

dubious: the allies defeated Germany in the Second World War, but during the war they took no action against the German concentration camps, although they knew what was going on; in Rwanda the relatively small contingent of UN troops withdrew initially; in Kosovo NATO bombed troops and installations from the air, whilst paramilitaries continued to expel people without hindrance. In some ways the situation doesn't seem to be much different in the battle against IS, which has been driven out of some places only to become more active elsewhere, including in regions outside Syria and Iraq.

2.4 Peace logic instead of security logic

Peace researcher Hanne-Margret Birckenbach has coined the term “peace logic”. She created it to describe thinking which is distinguished from conventional thinking amongst politicians which is only concerned with “security”, however questionable this may be as a useful concept.¹⁸ Current “security logic”, in the name of “securitisation”, is creating a huge structure of violence which gobbles up resources which are urgently needed for other things. Conflicts and problems are seen as something which we need to defend ourselves against using whatever resources are required. Might is right and those who are strongest can disregard everyone else in the pursuit of their own interests.

A peace logic approach, on the other hand, tackles problems from the point of view of trying to prevent violence and aims at transforming conflict. Its tools are those of nonviolence and dialogue. Instead of “might is right” there is the search for policies which are broadly acceptable to all concerned. And, last not least, a mistake does not immediately lead to escalation, but makes it possible to begin again and to do things differently and better next time (failure-friendliness and responsiveness).

Hanne-Margret Birckenbach writes: “Policy making can only escape from the militarisation trap, if peace becomes the key concept once again. In the case of conflicts which have already escalated into direct violence, peace means:

1. Critiquing violence and the conditions which are conducive to violence.
2. Believing that problems can be solved and that there are alternatives to violence.
3. Facilitating and practising problem solving and alternatives to violence.

The more we think according to peace logic, the sooner we will be able to see what can actually be done to reduce violence, intervene constructively in conflict, and strengthen the forces for peace, however weak they may be.”¹⁹

The difference between government actions which follow security policy and those which follow the peace logic alternative is no longer to be found in a rejection of civilian instruments - at least not at the UN or in Germany. The catchphrase in government circles is “a comprehensive approach”: “21. The lessons learned from NATO operations, in particular in Afghanistan and the Western Balkans, make it clear that a comprehensive political, civilian and military approach is necessary for effective crisis management. The Alliance will engage actively with other international actors before, during and after crises to encourage collaborative analysis, planning and conduct of activities on the ground, in order to maximise coherence and effectiveness of the overall international effort.”²⁰

The German Government White Papers for 2006 uses similar arguments: “The term ‘civilian crisis prevention’ is not to be understood as something separate from military crisis prevention, but rather includes this.”²¹ „Making peace both with and without weapons” is the principle underlying the state’s efforts at what in Germany is called civilian crisis prevention.

In contrast with a point of view in accordance with nonviolence and peace logic, we have here an expression of the widely held belief that in violent situations we have to use violence to protect ourselves and others. We urgently need a paradigm shift towards a recognition that in many situations nonviolence can be very effective, indeed more effective and more sustainable than violence.

¹⁸ See, for example: Dossier Nr. 75 von Wissenschaft & Frieden (2014), *Friedenslogik statt Sicherheitslogik, (peace logic vs. security logic)*. Theoretische Grundlagen und friedenspolitische Realisierung. By Ulrich Frey, Christiane Lammers, Hanne-Margret Birckenbach, Sabine Jabert, Christine Schweitzer, and Andreas Buro, in: *Wissenschaft & Frieden* 14/2

¹⁹ Birckenbach, Hanne-Margret (2013) *Friedenslogik statt Sicherheitslogik*. Lecture at the 11th Munich International Peace Conference, 1 February 2013

²⁰ “Strategic Concept For the Defense and Security of The Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation”, adopted by heads of state and government in Lisbon

²¹ Weissbuch 2006, p. 28 (caption)

Difficult Dilemmas

Even in peace movement circles people ask whether military intervention might be desirable or, looking back, might have been unavoidable in particular crises or conflicts. People now ask this question in relation to IS. A few years ago, it was 9/11. Before that, it was Kosovo, Bosnia, and Croatia. And before that, it was Iraqi rocket attacks on Israel in 1991. And before that ... The basic question has always been: "Isn't this a situation in which only violence will work?" This same question was already asked at the time of the First World War, during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939)²², during the Second World War, during the Vietnam War, and during the liberation struggles in the global South (especially the wars in Nicaragua and El Salvador). These were all situations which made many pacifists unsure of themselves and even caused some to consciously turn away from their convictions and others to attempt to square supporting - or at least not objecting to - the particular war with their pacifist convictions.²³

Here, though, are three points to ponder and discuss:

1. People often justify military intervention as the only option by pointing to cases when there was no intervention. The two best examples of this are Rwanda in 1994 and Srebrenica in 1995. Those who use this argument need to produce evidence that such intervention would have been successful. In the case of Libya it simply contributed to a deterioration of the situation, as already pointed out.
2. The Second World War is the next example which is often raised. But this wasn't a case of humanitarian intervention. Rather it was simply a war between nations which was fortunately won by the right side, though at the cost of huge losses. And some crimes were committed in the process which even at the time would have been outlawed as war crimes by the Geneva Convention. If no one could ever win a war, people would have stopped fighting wars long ago. The question therefore has to be: Is war necessary or are there alternatives?
3. "Humanitarian intervention" is first and foremost a concept used to justify military intervention whilst masking the geostrategic interests of the intervening power. It is an effective argument which can guarantee the support of the electorate because people get really upset and horrified by the suffering caused by war in other places. But it has been shown time and time again that ruling elites don't care about the victims so long as they are the "right" people. Just one example, described by Michael Lüders: Between 1991 and 2003 approximately one million people, including 500,000 children, died as a result of sanctions against Iraq. When asked about this on a US news programme Secretary of State Albright answered that half-a-million children was "a price worth paying".²⁴

3. The effectiveness of nonviolent action

3.1 Nonviolent action

Nonviolent action is "the kind of (political) action in conflict situations which arises out of a nonviolent attitude and which involves a conscious renunciation of violence which would cause death or injury."²⁵ It is not the person who is an opponent who comes under attack, but rather the role which they play in an unjust system. The distinction between the person and their role helps to deconstruct enemy images and opens up new possibilities for action. The goal of nonviolent action is not to conquer or destroy one's opponents, but to work towards a change of will on their part.

The creation of justice requires nonviolent action. It is used all around the world, e.g. when people rise up against oppression, against their land being bought up by multinational corporations, against mining and the exploitation of resources, against travel agencies, etc., etc. Admittedly not all these movements are entirely nonviolent (in India, for example), but they always find themselves in an asymmetric conflict against heavily armed security forces. And I think they deserve our solidarity, which doesn't necessarily mean that we have to condone every strategy and method which they might use.

²² See Xabier Aguirre Aranburu, „Was würde ich machen, wäre ich heute in Spanien?“, in: Graswurzelrevolution Nr. 208/209, p. 56-62

²³ As one example amongst many, let me quote here a declaration of the executive committee of Pax Christi Germany, issued on 9 August 1995, which states, amongst other things: "For the sake of maintaining the credibility of our work for peace, we consider any future military intervention to be justified, if - as in the case of Srebrenica and Zepa - people have no protection against violent aggressors." (Quoted in Friedensforum 4/95, Hrsg. Netzwerk Friedenskooperative Bonn, p. 23 f)

²⁴ Quote taken from: Lüders, Michael (2015): Wer den Wind sät. Was westliche Politik im Orient anrichtet. München: C.H. Beck

²⁵ http://www.friedenspaedagogik.de/themen/zivilcourage/grundlagen/konflikte_gewaltfrei_loesen

3.2 Successful nonviolent resistance

The cases in which nonviolent resistance turned to violence are well-known. This happened, amongst other places, in Kosovo in 1997, when the Kosovo Liberation Army suppressed nonviolent resistance in a short space of time, and in Syria in 2011/12, when the rebels allowed deserting soldiers who had formed the Free Syrian Army to “protect” the protesters.

The reasons for a swing from civil to violent resistance generally include: a lack of any noticeable change or success as a result of nonviolent resistance; a failure on the part of the leadership of the resistance to control impatient young men in particular; the belief - which persists in spite of the choice of a nonviolent strategy to begin with - that violence is more effective; and, no doubt, patriarchal ways of thinking as regards shame and honour.

With hindsight the switch to violence often turns out to have been a mistake, because nonviolent uprisings actually have a much better chance of success than violent revolt: According to Karatnycky & Ackerman (2005), 67 authoritarian regimes were brought down between 1972 and 2002, more than 70% as a result of nonviolent uprisings.²⁶ Chenoweth and Stephan²⁷ studied 323 “resistance campaigns” (their term), both violent and nonviolent, between 1900 and 2006, 105 of which were non-violent. The study showed that, compared with violent campaigns, nonviolent campaigns were more than twice as likely (53%) to be successful. In other words, only one in four of the nonviolent campaigns failed altogether, whereas barely more than one in four (26%) of the violent campaigns was successful (2011:11).

3.3 Civilian conflict resolution

In general terms, the tasks of crisis prevention and civilian conflict resolution are to prevent war and, where conflict has nevertheless escalated into violence, to bring it to an end, restore security, and effectively and permanently remove the causes and consequences of the violence.

The basic principles of nonviolent civilian conflict management include the following:

- Violence is rarely productive, because it leads to a hardening of positions and a continuation of the conflict in the future. When a person is forced to give in, they don't forget it. They learn that “only violence works”. Innocent people suffer. People are likely to be more strongly traumatised.
- It is important to distinguish between positions and interests.
- Galtung's triangle: all three sides must be dealt with, if a conflict is to be successfully transformed.
- A peace logic approach, as outlined above.

Civilian conflict resolution can be applied just as well at home as at the international level. There are many civilian conflict management projects going on around us, from neighbourhood mediation to mediation programmes in schools, and interfaith dialogue.

3.4 Nonviolent intervention: Meeting the responsibility to protect and creating human security without violence.

At the international level, civilian conflict management means developing nonviolent intervention to such an extent that it becomes an alternative to military intervention. This is a “recurrent vision”, to use the terminology of the researchers and activists Yeshua Moser-Puangsuwan and Tom Weber.²⁸ This vision has been the starting point for a great many peace team projects, civilian peace service organisations (including the German Ziviler Friedensdienst/Civil Peace Service), and for at least a dozen short-term projects (e.g. peace marches such as those that were undertaken in Bosnia in the 1990s).

In the field of peacebuilding and prevention many different tools and working methods are employed by national and international organisations. We heard about two examples during Maria Biedrawa's lecture. Alongside the activities of a large number of national and international organisations, we should include peace service organisations such as the German Ziviler Friedensdienst/Civil Peace Service, which provides all-round support for German partner organisations engaged in conflict prevention and

²⁶ Karatnycky, Adrian / Ackermann, Peter (2005) *How Freedom is Won. From Civic Resistance to Durable Democracy*, Freedom House

²⁷ Chenoweth, Erica und Stephan, Maria J. (2011): *Why Civil Resistance Works. The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Colombia University Press and

Chenoweth, Erica and Stephan, Maria J. (2014) *Drop Your Weapons. When and Why Civil Resistance Works*

²⁸ Moser-Puangsuwan, Yeshua and Weber, Thomas (Eds.) (2000) *Nonviolent Intervention Across Borders. A Recurrent Vision*. Honolulu: Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace

management, undertakes reconciliation work, runs “dealing with the past” projects, and provides training and other forms of capacity building.

At this point I would like to give special attention to a particular form of nonviolent intervention: civilian peacekeeping. There is no reason why we should let the advocates of military intervention monopolise the terms “human security” and “responsibility to protect”. What is a new and controversial idea for states is actually not at all a new idea. Inspired by Gandhi’s idea of a “shanti sena”, a peace army, social movements have been intervening in violent conflicts in other countries for decades. Their goal has been to prevent war and violence, and to promote dialogue and reconciliation, or at least to protect civilians, refugees, or human rights defenders by their presence. Civilian peacekeepers do not carry weapons to protect themselves. What they can actually do in a violent environment is sometimes hard to understand for many people because most people are used to thinking that violence is the only means of protection in extreme cases. It is true that unarmed civilians have no means of exerting force: they can’t kill attackers or stop them with bullets. But they are nevertheless able to successfully protect civilians and human rights activists, as is evident from the work of Non-violent Peace Force and Peace Brigades International. Unarmed peacekeepers have their own source of power: the trust and respect which they gain as internationals and the fact that “the world is watching”.²⁹

3.5 Social defence - Defence of a way of life rather than territory

Social defence is a form of nonviolent resistance which has been developed for particular situations, especially for defence against a military attack on one’s own country by another country or a coup d’état. The term “social defence” was coined around the end of the 50s by a group of peace researchers (Stephen King-Hall, Gene Sharp, Adam Roberts, April Carter, and Theodor Ebert, amongst others), who were looking for an alternative, non-military form of defence against the supposed threat (which they didn’t question at the time) from the Warsaw Pact. The threat analyses, on which they based their work, changed only gradually to include coups d’état and later the possibility of intervention by former allies.

After the end of the Cold War the concept was largely forgotten, but we can see from what is happening now that this was a mistake.

Between 2002 and 2006 the US-American organisation Collaborative for Development Action collected 13 case studies in which districts or even whole regions successfully kept themselves out of a violent conflict which was going on around them. “Opting Out of War” is the resulting book which, out of the study of these individual cases, derives a number of general factors which are common to all or most of the case studies.

In the first place, both the quantity and the nature of these cases is remarkable. Many people probably know of the peace communities in Columbia. Some may also know that there are similar peace zones in Mindanao (in the Philippines). But how many people know that during the genocide in Rwanda the Muslims not only succeeded in staying out of the conflict themselves, but also saved the lives of their Tutsi neighbours in many cases? And how many people know that the Jaghori people in Afghanistan successfully defended their own way of life, which included girls going to school, during the advance of the Taliban? The 13 case studies are of conflicts in Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Columbia, Fiji, India, Kosovo, Mozambique, Nigeria, the Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and Sri Lanka.

4. Conclusion

War and violence seem to be effective. Unfortunately, the belief in the power of violence is prevalent in most societies, even though nowadays most wars are brought to an end by negotiation rather than the victory of one side over the other. But, as has already been pointed out above: If war were as ineffective as some pacifists claim, it would hardly have survived as an institution for so many thousands of years.

However, things look different when we examine the longer term consequences. As long ago as the 1930s Bart de Ligt coined the phrase: “The more violence you use, the less revolution you get”.³⁰ The same applies to wars which are waged either for supposedly humanitarian reasons or to protect one’s own privileges. They often simply replace one evil with another. We’re already seeing this. The wars which are being conducted by the USA and Europe are not only blatantly unjust; they provoke further violence - “Every drone attack breeds a terrorist,” has become a popular saying. And the response to this violence is still more war - a spiral of death.

²⁹ On civilian peacekeeping, see e.g. Ellen Furnari (ed.) *Wielding Nonviolence in the Midst of Violence*, Norderstedt: BoD 2016.

³⁰ 1936 in “The Conquest of Violence”.

The basic problem from a pacifist point of view is that military forces are available and that war is commonly a viable option. Nonviolent alternatives, on the other hand, are not available and therefore appear to be utopian. That is why we must continue to develop and build up social defence as an alternative to military defence and nonviolent intervention as an alternative to military intervention in conflict at every level of escalation.

One fundamental problem is the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate uses of lethal violence. Only when the killing of human beings is outlawed altogether, not just in the private sphere but also in politics; only when there are no longer any institutions in which people are taught to kill and in which killing is used (i.e. armed forces), will it be possible to overcome violence.

In the meantime, we must accept that there is no such thing as absolute security, and no amount of state resources can create it. To accept insecurity can be a way to struggle for one's own freedom. Many human rights activists and other activists throughout the world, who are daily threatened by death squads or police and military, speak about the importance of overcoming fear and the freedom which they have discovered when they have accepted the risks. Ultimately, security is only possible when it is enjoyed by everyone, not just one's own group. Security requires justice. Nonviolence is the way to create justice.

Christine Schweitzer
c/o Bund für Soziale Verteidigung
Schwarzer Weg 8, 32423 Minden, Germany
Schweitzer@soziale-verteidigung.de
www.soziale-verteidigung.de

Translation: Gordon Matthews