

# DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

## Chapter 1 : the essence and value of democracy | Download eBook pdf, epub, tuebl, mobi

*Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index. Search the history of over billion web pages on the Internet.*

We see the fatigue overcoming the Western nations. We see that this song of hate has not benefited humanity. Let it be the privilege of India to turn a new leaf and set a lesson to the world. My Task In the past, non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil-doer. I am endeavoring to show to my countrymen that violent non-co-operation only multiplies evil and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Nonviolence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil. I claim to be practical idealist. The religion of nonviolence is not meant merely for the rishis and saints. It is meant for the common people as well. Nonviolence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit lies dormant in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law-to the strength of the spirit. I have therefore ventured to place before India the ancient law of self-sacrifice. For satyagraha and its off-shoots, non-co-operation and civil resistance, are nothing but new names for the law of suffering. The rishis, who discovered the law of non-violence in the midst of violence, were greater geniuses than Newton. They were themselves greater warriors than Wellington. Having themselves known the use of arms, they realized their uselessness and taught a weary world that its salvation lay not through violence but through nonviolence. Well, it is my ambition to provide an instance, and it is my dream that my country may win its freedom through non-violence. My marriage to nonviolence is such an absolute thing that I would rather commit suicide than be deflected from my position. I have not mentioned truth in this connection, simply because truth cannot be expressed excepting by nonviolence. Science of nonviolence alone can lead one to pure democracy. England, France and America have to make their choice. That is the challenge of the two dictators. Russia is out of the picture just now. Russia has a dictator who dreams of peace and thinks he will wade to it through a sea of blood. No one can say what Russian dictatorship will mean to the world. That does not make for individual freedom. Individual freedom can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterated ahimsa. I want Swaraj in the winning of which even women and children would contribute an equal share with physically the strongest. That can be under ahimsa only. It is the most harmless and yet equally effective way of dealing with the political and economic wrongs of the downtrodden portion of humanity. I have known from early youth that nonviolence is not a cloistered virtue to be practised by the individual for his peace and final salvation, but it is a rule of conduct for society if it is to live consistently with human dignity and make progress towards the attainment of peace for which it has been yearning for ages past. Nonviolence A believer in nonviolence is pledged not to resort to violence or physical force either directly or indirectly in defence of anything, but he is not precluded from helping men or institutions that are themselves not based on non-violence. If the reverse were the case, I would, for instance, be precluded from helping India to attain Swaraj because the future Parliament of India under Swaraj, I know for certain, will be having some military and police forces, or to take a domestic illustration, I may not help a son to secure justice, because forsooth he is not a believer in nonviolence. And there are not wanting men, who do believe that complete non-violence means complete cessation of all activity. Not such, however, is my doctrine of nonviolence. But I would be untrue to my faith, if I refused to assist in a just cause any men or measures that did not entirely coincide with the principle of non-violence. I would be promoting violence, if finding the Mussalmans to be in the right, I did not assist them by means strictly nonviolent against those who had treacherously plotted the destruction of the dignity of Islam. Even when both parties believe in violence there is often such a thing as justice on one side or the other. A robbed man has justice on his side, even though he may be accounted as a triumph of non-violence, if the injured party could be persuaded to regain his property by methods of satyagraha, i. I reason with them. I put before them the better way and leave them to make the choice. I do not want to repeat it in so far as the broad facts contradict the highest laws of life. But positively

## DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

refuse to judge man from the scanty material furnished to us by history. De mortuis nil nisi bonum. Kamal Pasha and De Valera too I cannot judge. But for me as a believer I nonviolence out and out they cannot be my guides in life in so far as their faith in war is concerned. I believe in Krishna perhaps more than the writer. But my Krishna is the Lord of the Universe, the creator, preserver and destroyer of us all. He may destroy because He creates. But I must not be drawn into a philosophical or religious argument with my friends. I have not the qualification for teaching my philosophy of life. I have barely qualifications for practising the philosophy I believe. I am but a poor struggling soul yearning to be wholly good-wholly truthful and wholly nonviolent in thought, word and deed, but ever failing to reach the ideal which I know to be true. I admit, and assure my revolutionary friends, that it is a painful climb, but the pain of it is a positive pleasure for me. Each step upward makes me feel stronger and fit for the next. But all that pain and pleasure are for me. The revolutionaries are at liberty to reject the whole of my philosophy. To them I merely present my own experiences as a co-worker I the same cause even as I have successfully presented them to the Ali Brothers and many other friends. I cannot look at this butchery going on in the world with indifference. I have an unchangeable faith that it is beneath the dignity of men to resort to mutual slaughter. I have no doubt that there is a way out. I have known from early youth that nonviolence is not a cloistered virtue to be practised by the individual for peace and final salvation, but it is a rule of conduct for society if it is to live consistently with human dignity and make progress towards the attainment of peace for which it has been yearning for ages past. I was a very industrious reformer. I was a good draftsman, as I always had a close grip of facts which in its turn was the necessary result of my meticulous regard for truth. But I found that reason failed to produce an impression when the critical moment arrived in South Africa. My people were excited; even a worm will and does sometimes turn-and there was talk of wreaking vengeance. I had then to choose between allying myself to violence or finding out some other method of meeting the crisis and stopping the rot and it came to me that we should refuse to obey legislation that was degrading and let them put us in jail if they liked. Thus came into being the moral equivalent of war. I was then a loyalist, because, I implicitly believed that the sum total of the activities of the British empire was good for India and for humanity. Arriving in England soon after the outbreak of the war I plunged into it and later when I was forced to go to India as a result of the pleurisy that I had developed, I led a recruiting campaign at the risk of my life, and to the horror of some of my friends. The disillusionment came in after the passage of the Black Rowlatt Act and the refusal of the Government to give the simple elementary redress of proved wrongs that we had asked for. And so, in , I became a rebel. Since then the conviction to the people are not secured by reason alone but have to be purchased with their suffering. Suffering is the law of human beings; war is the law of the jungle. But suffering is infinitely more powerful than the law of the jungle for converting the opponent and opening his ears, which are otherwise shut, to the voice of reason. Nobody has probably drawn up more petitions or espoused more forlorn causes than I and I have come to this fundamental conclusion that if you want something really important to be done you must not merely satisfy the reason, you must move the heart also. The appeal of reason is more to the head but the penetration of the heart comes from suffering. It opens up the inner understanding in man. Suffering is the badge of the human race, not the sword. Nonviolence in the very nature of things is of no assistance I the defence of ill-gotten gains and immoral acts. Individuals and nations who would practise nonviolence must be prepared to sacrifice nations to the last man their all except honour. Nonviolence is a power which can be wielded equally by all-children, young men and women or grown up people, provided they have a living faith in the God of Love and have therefore equal love for all mankind. When non-violence is accepted as the law of life it must pervade the whole being and not be applied to isolated acts. It is a profound error to suppose that whilst the law is good enough for individuals it is not for masses of mankind. Perfect nonviolence is impossible so long as we exist physically, for we would want some space at least to occupy. It is uttermost selflessness. If man desired to realize himself i. Truth, he could do so only by completely detached from the body i. That is the way of ahimsa. Ahimsa does not simply mean non-killing. Himsa means causing pain to or killing any life out of anger, or from a selfish purpose. Or with the intention of injuring it. Refraining from so

## DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

doing is ahimsa. But what is inevitable, is not only declared the inevitable violence involved in killing for sacrifice as permissible but even regarded it as meritorious. It is no easy thing to walk on the sharp sword-edge of ahimsa in this world which is full of himsa. Wealth does not help; anger is the enemy of ahimsa; and pride is a monster that swallows it up. In this strait and narrow observance of this religion of ahimsa one has often to know so-called himsa as the truest form of ahimsa. All destruction therefore involved in the process of eating, drinking etc.

*Gene Sharp published his seminal trilogy, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, in *The methods, theories and advice that he espoused over thirty-five years ago have continually received praise.**

Tripartite Dialogue As mentioned above, political crisis in Burma today is not just a conflict between totalitarianism and democracy. It involves a protracted civil war that has consumed many lives and much of the resources of the country for five decades. The root of civil war in Burma is the conflict over power arrangement between the central government, which so far has been controlled by one ethnic group called Myanmar or Burman, and all the non-Myanmar or non-Burman ethnic groups in the Union. In other words, it is, as mentioned, a problem of constitution, or more specifically, the rights of self-determination for non-Burman nationalities who joined the Union as equal partners in . Indeed, most nationalities in Burma are now fighting against the military monopolized central government for self-determination and autonomous status of their respective National States within the Union. In order to avoid further bloodshed and violence during the political transition, the second level of dialogue must start almost simultaneously with the first level of dialogue. Dialogue at the second level shall be concerned not only with power transformation and sharing but also with solving the entire political crisis in Burma. It should end the five long decades of civil war by laying down the foundation of a genuine Federal Union. Without ending the civil war, there is no means of establishing a democratic system. Thus, the participation of all ethnic nationalities in the political transition is the most important element in the entire process of democratisation and restructuring of the Union into a federal system. Alternatively, it could be said that the tripartite dialogue will serve not only as a platform for power transformation but also as a means to end the civil war, which has consumed so many lives and national resources over the last five decades. Thus, dialogue at that level must be a three ways negotiation, or a tri-partite dialogue, which shall include three forces, namely the forces composed of the non-Myanmar nationalities, the democratic forces led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, and the military junta. In regards to this, the UNLD had adopted a policy of national convention at the conference held in Rangoon, on June 29 to July 2, We believe that in order to establish a stable, peaceful and prosperous nation, the process of rebuilding the Union must be based on a democratic process which includes the following basic principles: 1. A peaceful resolution of the crisis in the Union, 2. The resolution of political problems through political dialogue, 3. Respect for the will of the people, 4. The recognition and protection of the rights of all citizens of the Union, 5. The recognition and protection of the identity, language, religion, and cultural rights of all nationalities, 6. The recognition and protection of the rights of the constituent states of the Union through a federal arrangement. It is clear from the onset that negotiations will undoubtedly require to compromise on many issues in order to achieve a peaceful settlement. The leaders of both democratic forces and ethnic nationalities should, therefore, mentally prepare for difficult and painful compromises at tripartite negotiation, in order to solve the political crisis in Burma in a sustainable manner. At Tripartite Dialogue, at least three challenges can be foreseen: Can such undemocratic demand be accepted? Can the NLD compromise their hard won victory in order to form a Transitional Authority, in which they need to include military and ethnic nationalities? The establishment of Federal Union is the ultimate goal, especially for ethnic nationalities. How could agreement be reached on this particular issue? Is there any compromise possible with such opposing views? In addition to the challenges that will be faced at the dialogue table, there are a number of obstacles, partly because of the misconception of dialogue itself. Instead it will complicate a situation. Since they first came to power in , General Ne Win and his successors have never believed in a peaceful political settlement. Their strategy has always been one of violent suppression, for they only believe in power that comes from the barrel of a rifle. The most effective tactics they employ are those of violent confrontations, including civil war and urban killings. And they want their opponents to play along accordingly, as they are masters of violence. In fact, violent confrontation is the name of their game which they want to deploy at any cost. On the other end, they

refuse to engage dialogue because they know and think that they are going to lose if they do. It is obvious that the Generals are going to use every brutal means that they can in order to keep their power intact. Holding on to power at any cost is their ultimate goal, and ethnic Myanmar domination through Tatmadaw is their dream; violent suppression is the strategy they employ to achieve their goal, torture and killing are the tactics they use, deception is the method they apply, and avoiding dialogue is their escape. Surely, the junta is buying time and weapons to keep their power. However, democratic forces and ethnic leaders should know that therein lay their strengths and weaknesses. Thus, it is essential to study their strength and weaknesses, and analyze why they refuse to engage dialogue. What is needed to do, therefore, is to create a situationâ€”through coordinated local, national and international effortsâ€”whereby the junta will have to come to the negotiating table, to see dialogue not as a danger but as a way to resolve the conflict in Burma that has plunged the country into crisis. Based on this simple theory that the political power of governments may in fact be very fragile, Mahatma Gandhi challenged British colonial power, saying that: You have great military resources. Your naval power is matchless. If we wanted to fight with you on your own ground, we should be unable to do so, but if the above submissions be not accepted to you, we cease to play the part of the ruled. You, if you like, cut us to pieces. If you act contrary to our will, we shall not help you; and without our help, we know that you cannot move one step forward. In political terms non-violent action is based on a very simple postulate: Subjects may disobey laws they reject. Workers may halt work, which may paralyze the economy. The bureaucracy may refuse to carry out instructions. Soldiers and police may become lax in inflicting repression; they may even mutiny. And he concludes, by saying that: Therefore, its power has disintegrated. Since , non-violent actions have applied in various means and ways and it will continue to do so. The important factor, however, is that the tactics of non-violent actions need to be able to translate into a grand strategy, which will bring the final victory for the movement. During the uprising, the movement employed the best tactic of non-violent actions but did not have a grand strategy. The movement, therefore, needs to learn lessons from both its successes and failures. Armed Resistance Movement A. M that all the non-Myanmar ethnic nationalities in Burma engage in, in essence, different from waging offensive war. The difference is that in offensive war, military strategy is deployed in order to win the war by force. The similarity, however, is that ethnic nationalities in Burma engage in civil war only because they are unable to resolve the conflict through peaceful means. None of non-Myanmar ethnic nationalities in Burma believe that the armed struggle or A. It is only for self-defence. However, as Sun Tzu suggested, the long term goal of A. A stable and peaceful democratic Union of Burma will ensure regional stability and world peace; it will no longer be a country that produces all kind of narcotic drugs, HIV-AIDS disease, refugees, migrant workers, etc. M, may sometimes be a necessary evil. This indicates the fact that international pressure is view as a very important strategic and tactical factor. We welcome and appreciate the concern of the international community over the crisis in our country. We specifically appreciate the leading role played by the United Nations, and the efforts of the Government of Thailand to bring about national reconciliation. From the very beginning, the movement has adopted at least three international pressure tracks, to put strong pressures on the military junta to get it to the dialogue table. They are, One, lobbying the UN, governments, regional blocs, neighboring countries such as China, India, Japan, to bring about diplomatic pressure for dialogue; Two, undertaking international campaigns, calling for sanctions, exposing and condemning human rights abuses by the regime, exposing forced labor practices, highlighting the plight of political prisoners, and so on; and Three, calling for international mediation.. However, the exact role of third party intervention or involvement still needs to be clarified, that is what kind of third party involvement will be needed: Conclusion In this paper, I have explored: What is the ultimate goal of democracy movement in Burma? What is the grand strategy that the movement has adopted to achieve its goal? And what are tactics that the movement has applied? I have argued that the strategy and tactics may change in accordance with the changing political situation has demanded, but the changing strategy and tactics shall not affect the ultimate goal. The central argument in this paper is that the fundamental issues of political crisis in Burma is not only ideological confrontation between democracy and totalitarianism, but a

## DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

constitutional problem rooted in the question of self-determination for non-Myanmar non-Burman ethnic nationalities who joined the Union as equal partners in at Panglong. The ultimate goal of democracy movement in Burma, therefore, is not just changing the government in Rangoon but to establish a genuine democratic federal union, where various ethnic nationalities from different backgrounds ethnically, culturally, religiously, linguistically, and historically, etc. As such, non-violent actions and international pressures become the most important tactics in this movement, which put the pressures on the military junta to bring it to a dialogue table. As a matter of fact, the armed resistance that all the non-Myanmar ethnic nationalities in Burma engage in is a defensive war. Moreover, they carry arms and waged an armed struggle only because they are unable to resolve the conflict through peaceful means. None of non-Myanmar ethnic nationalities in Burma believe that the armed struggle or armed resistance is the end game. Strategically speaking, armed resistance or struggle constitutes only a tactical means, a part and parcel of the pressures that should be put on the military junta in order to bring them to a negotiating table. Since the military junta is refusing to engage in dialogue, it is essential to employ several tactics at once, to make sure that the strategy works properly.

## Chapter 3 : A Nonviolent Strategy to End War

*As Hamburg details, the prevention of war is built on key pillars including democratic governance, economic development, and nonviolent problem solving in dangerous situations. International cooperation and strong leadership at every level are essential.*

It can hear complaints by individuals, including legal persons such as political parties. Until recently a separate body, the Commission, determined the admissibility of applications and sought to bring about a settlement in cases declared admissible, but this body was abolished in as part of an institutional reform. A Chamber may choose to relinquish jurisdiction to a seventeen-member Grand Chamber where important issues of interpretation are involved. Final judgments of the Court are binding on the respondent States, and may require States to award the applicants just satisfaction. The measures were found to be prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society for the pursuit of legitimate aims. Three of the seven judges dissented, finding the measures disproportionate. On the request of the applicants, the case was referred to a Grand Chamber of the Court. On February 13, , the 17 judges of the Grand Chamber upheld the previous judgment, with no dissent, though with two concurring opinions. While the Court chose to deal with it as an Article 11 case, the case is also of clear interest to those concerned with the right to freedom of religion or belief in conjunction with the right to freedom of expression. Finally, because of a specific legal maneuver carried out by the Turkish Constitutional Court, the case raises certain concerns over due process. The Court had previously examined three of these cases and had found violations of Article 11 in all three. Its leader, Necmettin Erbakan, had been a fixture of Turkish politics for nearly twice that long. At the time of its dissolution, Refah was the largest party in parliament, having gained a plurality. Before its dissolution, it had ruled for nearly a year in a coalition government with the center-right True Path party, with Erbakan as prime minister. Leaving aside certain symbolic measures and ill-fated initiatives that galvanized sectors of public opinion against it, the party had not realized any radical Islamist agenda while in power. On the contrary, it had had to preside over an extension of military-industrial cooperation with Israel and a pruning of religious education. It had left office peacefully when it lost parliamentary support, apparently as a result of pressure from the Turkish military leadership. The Court found that these controversial statements and acts, taken as a whole, pointed to a theocratic vision incompatible with democracy, which Refah would be able to realize through its political influence, as fundamentalists had done elsewhere. Necessary in a democratic society? With regard to Turkey, the Court stated that: The Court unfortunately did not take the opportunity afforded by the Refah case to reexamine the problematic assumption that the Turkish understanding of secularism is fully in harmony with respect for human rights. The fact that a political programme is considered incompatible with the current principles and structures of a State does not make it incompatible with the rules of democracy. It is of the essence of democracy to allow diverse political programmes to be proposed and debated, even those that call into question the way a State is currently organized, provided that they do not harm democracy itself. As compared to previous cases, Refah thus appears to have narrowed somewhat the range of permissible policies promoted by political parties that enjoy protection under the ECHR, and a minority of judges in both Chambers appeared uncomfortable with this development. A State could not be required to wait until a party had seized power and begun to implement a policy before intervening. Application of the law to the facts in Refah The Court held that in this case: The Court grouped the evidence under three main headings, finding that Refah had a sought to establish a plurality of legal systems, b sought to introduce sharia, and c suggested the use of jihad and political violence. Principles such as pluralism in the political sphere or the constant evolution of public freedoms have no place in it. These assumptions are couched in problematic language that reflects stereotypes of Muslims, disregarding the diversity of Muslim thought by equating it with the views of a fundamentalist minority. Some of the statements made by party members were highly provocative and could only be understood as threats of violence against secularists. By taking this line of argument, the Court would

have avoided interpreting ambiguous religious symbolic expressions and taking a stand on Turkish secularism. Before examining whether the actions of the Turkish Constitutional Court were necessary in a democratic society, the Court also addressed the issue of whether these actions were prescribed by law. One week before its judgment in the Refah case, the Turkish Constitutional Court closed the loophole by declaring the relevant portion of Turkish legislation unconstitutional. The law regulating political parties imposed a specific and rather peculiar procedure for determining whether the party was such a center. However, activities against the principle of secularism no longer constituted a criminal offense after the repeal, in , of the applicable Article of the Criminal Code. Since party members could not be convicted of activities against secularism, State Counsel could not order their exclusion, and hence should not be able to institute proceedings for the dissolution of a party as a center of such activities. During the proceedings against Refah, the Turkish Constitutional Court ruled the relevant paragraph of the law on political parties unconstitutional, null, and void. On the face of things, this violates the principle of legality, as Refah representatives could not have foreseen the legal consequences of their actions: Due process would seem a particularly sensitive issue given the broader political context: The issue, however, was examined by the Grand Chamber, which considered that the applicants were not estopped from raising the issue again. The Court found that, given such a discrepancy between statutory law and the Constitution, the Constitutional Court was clearly required to disregard the unconstitutional provisions of the relevant legislation and exercise its constitutional authority directly. The Court further found that the applicants, being experienced politicians who had taken part in relevant parliamentary discussions and who were in two cases lawyers by profession, were reasonably able to foresee this outcome. It might be argued, however, that a constitutional provision giving a court the sole authority to dissolve political parties does not in itself require that it actually exercise this authority--i. If so, procedural obstacles to their dissolution do not necessarily constitute a violation of the constitution. It is surely acceptable, and not unusual in some countries, for constitutional provisions to be rendered dormant even though they remain on the books. Might the applicants reasonably have assumed this to be the case with regard to their situation? A supporting argument for construing the constitutional provisions as dormant in this case, however, is that the relevant statutory legal changes and their effects tend to strengthen democracy and human rights. Restricting the state prosecutor from requiring political parties to exclude members strengthens the internal autonomy of parties against government interference. Again, however, preventing the judiciary from dissolving parties on grounds of acts against secularism rather than acts against democracy as such, which is arguably not quite the same category may be a sound policy for strengthening the freedoms of belief and of expression. Being closer to the issues at hand, it is argued, national authorities are in a better position than international judges to decide on the appropriateness of derogations from or limitations to rights in a given situation. Critics have argued that the expansion of this doctrine has led to excessive deference to States, based on opaque arguments, to the detriment of individual rights when these are most at risk. However, the Court appears implicitly to give the national authorities a rather wide margin of appreciation. In effect, it defers to their particular understanding of secularism, to their understanding of Refah as a theocratic threat to democracy, and to their constitutional argument on due process. However, numerous factors argue instead for a closer independent scrutiny. These factors include the behind-the-scenes role of the Turkish military and the intensely emotional polarization of Turkish public opinion on the appropriate role of religion, from which the judiciary can hardly be expected to be detached. As compared with some other recent cases, the Court has also set out a stricter test as to the substantive policies that political parties of any persuasion may legitimately espouse. It remains to be seen whether Refah therefore heralds a more restrictive line toward political parties in general. He is currently based in Ljubljana, Slovenia. Turkey, judgment, July 31, , p. This article focuses on derogation from rights under Article 15 of the ECHR in times of declared national emergency rather than on the inherent limitations of rights as in the Refah case, but the argument could easily be extended.

# DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

## Chapter 4 : The Violence of Climate Change | Georgetown University Press

*Nonviolent Leadership: the Essence of Democracy. Public Á. Hosted by The Lovett School. Interested. clock. Monday, April 9, at PM - PM EDT.*

Burrowes There is a long history of anti-war and peace activism. Much of this activism has focused on ending a particular war. Some of this activism has been directed at ending a particular aspect of war, such as the use of a type of weapon. There is an important reason why those of us in the last category have not, so far, succeeded. In essence, this is because, whatever their merits, the analyses and strategies we have been using have been inadequate. This is, of course, only a friendly criticism of our efforts, including my own. I am also not suggesting that the task will be easy, even with a sound analysis and comprehensive strategy. But it will be far more likely. Moreover, given that I like to succeed when I work for positive change in this world, I pay a great deal of attention to strategy. In fact, I have written extensively on this subject after researching the ideas of the greatest strategic theorists and strategists in history. If you are really keen, you can read about this in *The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense*: One of the outcomes I would like to achieve through these websites is to involve interested peace and anti-war activists from around the world in finalizing the development of a comprehensive nonviolent strategy to end war and to then work with them to implement it. Consequently, I have been developing this nonviolent strategy to end war and I invite you to check it out and to suggest improvements. You can see it on the Nonviolent Campaign Strategy website. If you are interested in being involved in what will be a long and difficult campaign, I would love to hear from you. Ending war is not impossible. But it is going to take a phenomenal amount of intelligent strategic effort, courage and time. Whether we have that time is the only variable beyond our control. Robert has a lifetime commitment to understanding and ending human violence. He has done extensive research since in an effort to understand why human beings are violent and has been a nonviolent activist since

## Chapter 5 : From Protest to Challenge, Volume 6

*The Philosophy of Nonviolence. and World Revolution Through World Law. Glen T. Martin (February ) The philosophy of nonviolence that has been developed through much of the twentieth century has made an indispensable contribution to all theories of legitimate revolutionary social change.*

X Peacebuilding and human rights - an agenda for democratic transformation 17 March Gabriela Monica Lucuta looks at the trends which have shaped international peacebuilding efforts. DFID National dialogue and public participation must be encouraged in seeking solutions When peacebuilding was defined in the s the relationship between democratisation, peacebuilding, and political governance was not well defined. In the s, a new process of conflict resolution emerged as a non-violent protest against lack of democratic governance and the application of human rights in specific regions of Europe. A third wave of democratisation began in Europe as a consequence and in response to an emerging process which included better governance, democratisation, and peacebuilding. As a consequence, the relationship between these two subfields improved post-conflict governance, including the concepts and policies associated with international post-war political reconstruction. Peacebuilding should not be limited to post-conflict societies. This articles looks at the various trends which have shaped peacebuilding through the years. Peacebuilding trends According to Charles T. Call and Susan E. Cook there are three trends in peacebuilding. It distinguishes between peacekeeping and peacemaking, presenting a better view of what peacebuilding, peacemaking, and peacekeeping is all about. It is also a plan of action which includes research, development, and policy advocacy in relation to all aspects including peacekeeping, peacemaking, conflict prevention, peacebuilding, and reconciliation. The third trend of the peacebuilding literature uses a broad term when referring to peacekeeping, peacemaking, and conflict prevention. It is highly prescriptive, empirically weak and theoretically uneven in the past. Moving beyond Peace Agreements In the 21st century the concept of peacebuilding has moved beyond peace agreements. Peacebuilding and peacemaking in our times are peace processes employed as starting points, not the end of wars like in the past. Both peacebuilding and the democratisation literature argue that peace and security are preconditions for democratisation. The emphasis is now on justice and the rule of law as part of political analysis. The human rights aspect have been neglected in comparative analysis and policy circles in the past. They will continue to be highly recognised in the analysis of post-conflict governance. Achieving sustainable peace is in itself a process of transformation, be it in the political, social, civil or economic sector. As a point of convergence between peace and democratisation one can recognise that peace implementation is the focus now, along with participation and building civil societies. In post-conflict governance both peace and democratisation are equally accepted at local-level events. For example, in Kosovo, East Timor, and Afghanistan local participation must take priority in order to build institutions and obtain civil rights guarantees as part of the human rights agenda, before a new government is established. Democratisation theory addresses the question of centralisation versus decentralisation in transitions. If this question is avoided or misapplied it can undermine peace processes in post-conflict societies. Both peace and democracy depend on ending warfare and preventing renewed warfare. Peace implementation requires empowering a central authority like the central government of a war-torn society to exercise control over all legitimate means of violence. Decentralisation on the other hand is necessary to remove the excessive and abusive power concentration of a central government while granting power and voice to local and often marginalised citizens. Decentralisation undermines democratisation if the local authority is more authoritarian than the central authority, for example rebel or terrorist groups like Hamas or the Taliban. Most peacebuilders are concerned with the role taken by international actors because we live in a global community where each action taken towards or against peace has a great impact on all. In our time, ideas about state sovereignty and international intervention radically differ from a century ago when international involvement in matters of internal governance violated international legal norms of the day. Today international intervention is essential while

international cooperation brings an emerging contribution to peacebuilding, market liberalisation, and democracy. The growing universality of human rights and the liberal democratic model has dramatically changed the field of international law since the Cold War with implications for societies in transition today. The solution for peacebuilding can be found by answering the question which implies an increased concern in relation to intervention versus non-intervention. The latter is still used as an excuse in many political circles in our times. The main question is not whether but to what extent the international community will intervene in the peace process in a given society. The United Nations Security Council. International organisations such as the UN play a key role in the history of peacebuilding image credit: Dan McKay In order to have a sustainable peace democratic institutions must be part of the creation of a new governance model. It provides a forum for rational discussion of political problems and settlement of conflicting social interests between hostile parties. A well designed structure for reforming governance must ensure that a negotiated governance agreement between parties exists. Such agreement should address the disputes that led to conflict in the first place. Negotiated agreements are essential tools employed to secure basic democratic governance. This new governance structure must encourage a more cooperative power-sharing model of governance which includes genuine checks and balances on the abuse of power. There are certain features which must be included in order to maintain a governance structure that is responsible and accountable for every action taken. Democratic nations must use incentives like technical and financial aid in order to encourage compliance and enforce peace settlements. National dialogue and public participation must be encouraged in seeking solutions and shaping both the mandate and policy framework for the future governance of the state. Transformation of the root causes of conflict is a very important element of democracy and peacebuilding. In order for structural transformation to occur the root causes of conflict must be well understood within the socio-political and cultural landscape of a nation. They can destabilise the efforts of securing a lasting democracy if they are neglected in the early years. The terms must be consolidated between a new government and the international community. One of the benchmarks could be the expectation that the new national government will abide by the constitution negotiated as part of the transition. As Ashraf Ghani argues: And this must be framed in a context of a series of achievable benchmarks. Sudan Envoy Background factors in peacebuilding Peacebuilding is a consequence of a democratic activity. The ethical implications are inherent in the process of peacebuilding in divided societies. Second, an interest in individual human rights and the influence of rights discourse within the foreign policy communities of Western governments, international and regional IGOs. It is imperative to note that all rights-based declarations represent intervention against the traditional principles of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-intervention. Finally, an increased attention to peacebuilding since the end of the Cold War and the strengthening of the Western hegemony of the international system shows a trend towards democratisation. Liberal democracy and free markets reflect collectively the value of market democracy. They are considered the guiding principles of governance. Market democracy fosters domestic and international peace, stability, and prosperity at the same time. It is morally and politically important to foster market democracy as a legitimate and significant foreign policy objective. The democratic transformation requires a change in thinking at each level of society in post-conflict nations. There must be a shift from intervention to deescalate conflict towards conflict resolution and reconciliation. This article has looked at the concepts of peacebuilding, peacebuilding trends, and policy instruments used in the past. We discussed intervention versus non-intervention, the risks and the advantages of non-violent intervention via peacebuilding. The current methodologies for peacebuilding include assistance to rebuild civil societies, promoting a culture for the protection of human rights, reconstructing law enforcement systems and facilitating ethnic reconciliation in unstable political and social environments. It has also looked at ways of creating new structures of governance, enforcing democracy, and introducing market liberalisation as the main elements of sustainable peace in post-conflict societies. What is missing at this time is a proper conceptual framework or an intervention model that could be used to prevent violence from re-occurring in post-conflict nations. Conflict prevention is a radical idea as part of another Canadian initiative, to be discussed in the near

**DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT**

future.

# DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

## Chapter 6 : Democracy - Peace - Development (TRANSCEND University Press)

*David A. Hamburg--doctor, teacher, hostage negotiator, presidential advisor, and more--has seen a lot in his 77 years and has a message for the 21st century: An ounce of prevention is worth many pounds of cure when it comes to deadly international conflict.*

While acknowledging the legitimacy of these perspectives, Kevin J. Global warming is largely caused by the carbon emissions of the affluent, emissions that harm the poor first and worst. Climate change is violence because it divides human beings from one another and from the earth. He holds a PhD from Emory University. Reviews "An engaging work. In its essence, this book is a call to resist. He is thoughtful and constrained, presenting clear connections and lessons for the reader. The book is an excellent resource for scholars and particularly for climate activists facing the discouragement common in their work. Making a Life on a Tough New Planet "Essential reading for the climate justice movement, this book is for anyone wondering how the ideas and tactics of iconic figures of previous movements can shape action in the weird world of climate change. There is something for everyone here: However you are working to address climate change, this book is food for the journey. Toward a Witness of Resistance Part 1: Climate Change and Nonviolence 1. The Wicked Problem of Climate Change 2. Nonviolent Resistance Part II: Five Witnesses of Nonviolent Resistance 3. Jane Addams and the Scales of Democracy 5. Dorothy Day and the Faith to Love 6. Martin Luther King Jr. What Can We Do?

# DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

## Chapter 7 : Gandhi's Views On Nonviolence - Nonviolence

*the essence and value of democracy Download the essence and value of democracy or read online books in PDF, EPUB, Tuebl, and Mobi Format. Click Download or Read Online button to get the essence and value of democracy book now.*

Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. At least 1, people have been injured. Israeli soldiers are currently firing live ammunition into the crowd of tens of thousands of Palestinian protesters, who have gathered in Gaza near the heavily fortified border with Israel. The Israeli military has also been dropping tear gas from drones over Gaza. This comes as senior members of the Trump administration have gathered in Jerusalem for the opening of the U. Move your embassies to Jerusalem, because it advances peace. You base peace on the foundations of truth. Two controversial pastors have been chosen by the Trump administration to lead prayers at the U. Sharif, welcome back to Democracy Now! Embassy is about to be opened, symbolically, in Jerusalem. I was at the biggest protest site, which is just east of Gaza City. There are thousands of people converging on the site—men, women and children. There are people gathering, mostly young men and boys, up near the border, where there is barbed wire, three sets of barbed wire. And you can see, just a couple of hundred yards away, Israeli soldiers, you know, under these canopies, on mounds of sand, sometimes in jeeps, and they are picking people off with—snipers are literally picking people off. Most of the people are being shot in the lower extremities, in their legs. I saw one person shot in the throat. The latest numbers—they keep going up—somewhere between 28 and 30 killed, including a paramedic and a disabled person. That brings the total, since this movement began, this kind of somewhat unprecedented movement in Gaza, since March 30th, to 74 people killed and over 9, injured. There are no bullets being fired by Palestinians on Israeli soldiers. Not a single Israeli soldier has been injured. And yet these killings continue. People insist that this is peaceful. There are no military uniforms allowed. There are no weapons allowed. Despite the fact that there are very heavily armed groups in Gaza, this was a decision that was made by a group of—by the committees that are running this movement. They burn tires, large tires, which send huge plumes of black smoke into the air, to try and block the view of the snipers. They also send these kites and balloons, which have either a burning rag or an improvised Molotov cocktail dangling off the end, and they try and guide it over, over the border. Some people go and place the Palestinian flag on the barbed wire. Some people do go and cut the wire and try and cross, saying that they are implementing the right of return themselves. And so this is a way of pushing their bodies up against their confinement. And this is also happening, all of this, in a buffer zone. We have to remember that Israel imposed a buffer zone a couple of hundred meters from the border in Gaza. And so, over the years, farmers and people living on that side of the Gaza Strip have been regularly shot at by Israeli troops from the other side. And so, even reclaiming this space in Gaza itself is, in itself, an achievement. And they have seen injuries with fist-sized holes in the exit wounds. And most of this is being—people are being shot in the legs. They were talking about nearly 10, people injured, many of them by live ammunition, many being hit in the legs. You know, it kind of reminds me of the first intifada. Israelis would break the arms of Palestinians who were throwing stones. We were in Shifa Hospital. If you just walk there, I mean, there was a wailing of pain in the orthopedic wards and young men and boys walking around on crutches, many of them lying in beds, their legs bandaged up with rods and pins protruding out. Tear gas comes in three different ways. And this is a new method that Israel experimented with just a couple of weeks before these protests started. It was first used in Gaza in March. And this also fits a trend of Israel kind of experimenting its tools of occupation on the bodies of Palestinians. And those tools are usually exported elsewhere. But a really chaotic situation here. The embassy is opening in Jerusalem, Sharif. Do you know about any protests there? This has been a siege for 11 years. It has affected everything—the economic situation, humanitarian situation, the right to travel. And, you know, everyone knew that this was unsustainable. People were talking about it. So you have Jerusalem, which is at the very core of the Palestinian

cause, with Trump moving the embassy to Jerusalem, the U. Embassy, and recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and that is a huge insult to Palestinians. But many of them do away with the right of return, and treat Palestinian refugees as a humanitarian situation. And it also comes in a context of a divided leadership, Palestinian leadership, with Fatah and Hamas really nowhere near reconciliation, that was supposed to happen a few months ago. And finally, Gaza has seen itself, historically, as responsible for the national cause. Yasser Arafat is from Gaza. Gaza gave birth to the first intifada. It gave birth to Fatah. It gave birth to Hamas. It gave birth to Islamic Jihad. It isâ€”all of this came out of Gaza, and it sees itself as part ofâ€”you know, responsible for the Palestinian cause. I wanted to ask you about the significance of the opening of the embassy in Jerusalem. An anti-gay, pro-Trump pastor from Dallas, Pastor Robert Jeffress, was chosen by the Trump administration to lead the prayer at the opening of the U. Where is Pastor Jeffress? What a good guy! I love this guy! It is a religion that promotes pedophilia, sex with children. It has always been considered a cult by the mainstream of Christianity. Hindus and Buddhists, Islamâ€”cults? That is not true. It is a heresy from the pit of hell. And Mormons do say they are Christians. They believe in Jesus Christ. Homosexuality is a perversion. They are engaged in the most detestable, unclean, abominable acts you can imagine. Whenever you counterfeit something, you cheapen the value of the real thing. Jews, he believes, are going to hell. This is the man who will be doing the opening prayer today at the U. Embassy in Jerusalem, Sharif. Well, what can you say? I mean, you know, Jerusalem, it goes to, like I said, the very core of the Palestinian issue. And this is being doneâ€”I mean, speaking with people here in Gaza, you know, and not justâ€”well, I mean, the fact that the decision was made in this way, but also the arrogance in the way that it is being done, will not be, I thinkâ€”you know, pass easily here. Palestinians who live in Jerusalem have a separate kind of identity card. If they travel abroad for a length of time, they can lose that residency, and then it will go to a Jewish person, a settler. And then, you know, this, the move of the embassy, is just another kind of slap in the face. So, you know, what can you say whenâ€”and also you get this kind of pastor here? So this killing continues. And, you know, Gaza is much more than Hamas. All of them are taking part and making these decisions of how to move forward and how to run this movement. There are no party flags allowed. Only the Palestinian flag. So, this is really more of a broad-based, grassroots movement. We just have this report from AP. The latest number of people dead since March 30th is, we believe, around 100. They say the drones set tires ablaze in two locations early Monday, releasing large clouds of black smoke.

*rights and democracy without recourse to violence. While nonviolent techniques have been widely used by single-interest groups such as trade unions and anti-nuclear, indigenous or environmentalist movements, this chapter refers.*

Rule by the Consent of the Ruled This book links democracy, peace and development, and that begs the first question: What is the essence of these three ideas? What is that without which those precious concepts do not apply, loaded as they are with hopes of a life in dignity for all? One essential aspect of democracy is obviously rule by rules making rulers accountable to the consent of the ruled. The "ruled" would be the demos, the whole people in the political sense of citizens of a state; possibly different from the ethnos, people in the national sense of carriers of national culture. The level of legitimacy of the rule depends on level of consent. In a democracy the ruled bestow legitimacy on the ruled in return for their accountability. A direct way to express consent is for the ruled to do so in a plebiscite. An indirect way is for representatives in an assembly to do so in a vote. And a very indirect way is to open a window every four years, for hours, for people to choose representatives to that assembly in an election, free and fair, FAFE, leaving the decision-making between elections to them. All three make rulers arithmetically accountable to the ruled. Rulers without the consent of the ruled are no longer legitimate rulers and should be replaced by new rulers for a new cycle of accountability. A genius social invention, that one. Democracy is a feedback loop between rulers and ruled, with signals of consent or dissent, meaning acceptance or rejection. A democracy is as good as its feedback loops. Hence, there are degrees, levels, of democracy. Autocracy is only one way, with no loop, no built-in feedback, from the ruled to the rulers. As mentioned, legitimacy is exchanged for accountability. Legitimacy is based on moral consent of the ruled, not fear of the force of the stick, or dependency on the lure of the carrot. But the essence of democracy transcends signals of consent in feedback loops. The genius stroke was to extend this general point about consent and legitimacy downwards. Of course systems function better if people want to do what they have to do, but that easily translates into a reality where rulers do what they want to do and the ruled what they have to do. Democracy stands for the revolutionary idea that what the ruled want sets limits to what the rulers do, not the other way round--in principle. In other words, accountability is not only upwards, the citizens being accountable to the guardians of law and order, or sideways, with people establishing networks of all kinds based on mutual rights and obligations where they basically do what they want to do. The point about democracy is to add accountability downwards, with the rulers accountable to the ruled; even if only one day in four years. A meager diet, but better than no accountability at all: In a globalizing world decisions increasingly affect people in other countries. They should be included in the feedback loops. But the global system of human beings is no democracy. A decision to invade and occupy abroad may be democratic within, and at the same time maxi-autocratic without, with no feedback loops that include the victims. The same may apply to economic decisions, for instance by speculators, affecting millions. Of course, there may be feedbacks from other states in the state-system. But with veto power--and votes being advisory, not compelling--that system is generally not democratic either. Democratic deficits are found not only at the supra-state, but also at the sub-state levels. But democracy is advancing, also into the basic systems known as family, school and work in complex processes that are quite recent and quite revolutionary. The wife may also beat downwards, so may the elder siblings. To introduce husband and parental rule by consent, with husbands and parents being accountable downwards, to wife and children, is as revolutionary as at the general social level. The idea of romantic love, in principle a relation of reciprocity, may have paved the way, like the idea of children as lovable pettable? Take a school, or a university, with administration-teachers-professors-students. The administration gets compliance from the teachers by paying them, and the teachers until recently got compliance from the pupils by beating them. However, increasingly the professors are made accountable to the students, and the level of consent is expressed through the

## DOWNLOAD PDF 6 DEMOCRACY AND PREVENTION: THE ESSENCE OF NONVIOLENT

sometimes publicly available instrument of evaluation. But administrations, like feudal lords, resist accountability to professors and students. The accountability cycle is blocked. Not viable in the longer run. Democracy knows no holy cows. A classical company also has a three tier structure, board-management-workers. Accountability is upwards only: Democratization would add consent by management, and by workers, expressed through evaluation of the board by the management and of the management and the board, by the workers. Voting might be an instrument. And customers would be given more of a say than with money only, through buying or not, and some idea boxes in some shops. Customers might actually have ideas. They might even suggest new products, not only wait for whatever the management proposes and the board is willing to accept if the returns are both high and quick enough for "risk capital". The best might actually be a meeting of all four, board, management, workers and customers, maybe also with suppliers, the community and spokes-persons for environmental concerns; for a multilateral dialogue after bilateral explorations. The same applies to families and schools. There is actually a loophole in democratic theory and practice: Take the standard democratic state with the executive government accountable to the legislature parliament , and the legislature accountable to the people. They meet bilaterally, ministers with representatives in the national assembly, representatives with voters in the campaign. But never the three shall meet, bringing up issues in triads that may lead to new insights and solutions. As also in the micro-space of families, in schools with at least parents, teachers and administration meeting PTA , and at work places that bring together workers, managers and the CEO. The break-through to multilateralism will be a major step forward.

### Chapter 9 : No More Killing Fields: Preventing Deadly Conflict - David A. Hamburg - Google Books

*Those two research areas come together in Democracy Prevention: The Politics of the U.S-Egyptian alliance. In this brief volume, Brownlee traces Egyptian-U.S. relations from the period of the Camp David Accords through the revolution that ousted Hosni Mubarak in*