

《 研究ノート 》

Curriculum development in peace-related learning within the Japanese higher education sector:

The structure and content of a new one year undergraduate course
in Peace Studies

James D. Short

To coincide with the commemoration of the 125th anniversary of the institution's foundation, in 2012 the Law Faculty of Toyo University introduced a number of new courses to its curriculum, including a course of Peace Studies taught in English which was delivered by the author. This paper represents a preparatory study into the nature and effectiveness of this course which will elucidate its structure and content, and the rationale behind its creation. It is hoped that this study will contribute towards the development of peace-related learning in other higher education contexts in Japan, especially with regard to the undergraduate level.

Introduction: Towards a new Peace Studies course in English

Prior to the 125th anniversary of the founding of the university, the governing body of Toyo University promulgated a strategic plan for the institution's educational activities and future development based upon three fundamental principles: philosophy education, globalisation, and career preparation. These principles were promulgated with the intention of consolidating the educational philosophy pursued by the university's founder, Dr. Enryo Inoue, orienting the university towards an ever-increasingly interconnected and globalised world, and preparing graduating students for a highly competitive and demanding job market. In accordance with this strategic plan and with par-

ticular regard to the second principle, the Law Faculty sought to broaden the choice of subjects offered in its curriculum through the inclusion of new courses which were not specifically related to the legal canon. These new courses included lectures and seminars in Sports Science, a seminar in German Language and Culture, and courses in International Relations, International Law and Peace Studies. To strengthen the globalising intention of this initiative, the decision was taken to deliver the latter three courses in English.

A central tenet of the curriculum taught across the Faculty since the early 2000s has been the promotion amongst students of what is described as a 'legal mind', this being the intellectual ability to absorb and understand the concepts and specific details of the subjects studied and then apply them to the realities of modern life in a just and moralistic manner. This approach has been applied to the Faculty's law courses in a concerted manner and has also to a lesser extent been applied to courses of foreign language, especially English. In relation to this, the inclusion of the new courses, especially those being taught in English, was held to be in keeping with the Faculty drive to develop the 'legal minds' of students, while simultaneously seeking to contribute towards the broader goal of globalisation being pursued across the university as a whole.

With regard to the Faculty's position towards the new courses being taught in English, due to the fact that hitherto no specific teaching precedents existed, there were similarly no blueprints stipulating specific required content or mode of delivery; it was generally understood that decisions about these matters would be left at the discretion of the instructor. In the case of Peace Studies, this situation proved to be both beneficial and problematic: beneficial in the sense that as the course instructor, the author found himself effectively at liberty to decide both the course textbook, the topics to be studied, the mode of delivery and method of evaluation; and problematic in the sense that since there was no model to follow, the majority of these decisions had to be taken in an *ad hoc* manner. During the months prior to the inception of the course, despite receiving considerable assistance from eminent colleagues both within and outside Japan,

the author came to the realisation that the circumstances surrounding the preparation for the course were far from ideal.

Following the decision taken in the Law Faculty professor's meeting in November 2011 to open a new Peace Studies course, the immediate priority was to create an overall structure for the course, which necessitated the selection of an appropriate textbook. Regarding the target audience, this would be Japanese students of Law and other faculties in the second to fourth year who were in all likelihood coming to the subject for the first time. Following a process of consultation, the decision was taken to select "Peace and Conflict Studies" 2nd edition by David P. Barash and Charles P. Webel.⁽¹⁾ It was held that this textbook would provide a broad framework of content which could be developed into an appropriate course syllabus. However, it transpired that adapting the content addressed in this textbook into a course of two fifteen-week semesters designed for Japanese undergraduate students proved to be a far from inconsequential task. As a consequence, the author faced a series of problematic choices regarding the specific topics and issues which could be deemed fundamental and therefore essential to the course and those which could potentially be omitted⁽²⁾.

The course syllabus was submitted to the university's educational affairs section in January 2012 in preparation for its inclusion in the package of other documentation submitted to all undergraduate students in April of that year. In terms of structure, the syllabus followed that of the selected textbook which divides the course into four parts under the following titles: 1) The Promise of Peace, The Problems of War; 2) The Reasons for Wars; 3) Building 'Negative Peace'; 4) Building 'Positive Peace'. It contained a breakdown of the topics to be addressed in each class on a week by week basis, and explanations of the teaching method and evaluation policy.

In the detailed description that follows, the author elucidates the framework of topics

(1) During the process of selection, the author received invaluable advice from the Vice-President of Academic Affairs at the National Peace Academy, New York, Mr. Tony Jenkins.

(2) Questions in relation to this issue remain and will be discussed in a subsequent paper.

outlined in the syllabus, and the specific concepts and other content delivered in the lectures during its first cycle which ran from April 2012 to January 2013. A detailed evaluation of the particular strengths and weaknesses of the syllabus and the course as a whole will be presented in a subsequent paper.

Course Content

Part 1 : The Promise of Peace, The Problems of War

Part 1 of the course introduced the fundamental concerns of the discipline and explained the key definitions and concepts that underlie discussions relating to these concerns. Succinctly stated, this refers to the variety of complex problems related to peace and war which exist in international human society, and specific frames of reference and modes of analysis that can potentially lead to practicable approaches and policies to create a more peaceful world. Over the course of six lectures, Part 1 addressed the following key questions: i) What is peace?, ii) What is war?, iii) Can war sometimes be justified? Furthermore, it examined the nature and consequences of cycles of terrorism and counter-terrorism, and issues relating to the manufacture, possession and possible use of nuclear weapons.

In order to address the key question 'What is peace?', the first lecture examined the variety of ways that peace can be defined. This includes positive connotations such as peace within individuals, peace between individuals, groups or nations, peace with other living creatures, and in a religious context peace with God. It also includes negative connotations such as the sterility and lifelessness of a desert, conditions of social or political oppression which lead to a climate of fear and silence, and sickness and aging which lead to physical degradation, coma and death. The discussion provided explanations of four key concepts in Peace Studies, those of Direct Violence, Structural Violence, Negative Peace and Positive Peace. It stressed that as an academic field of study, Peace Studies is a normative discipline whose ultimate goal is the realisation of a world which is free of both direct violence and structural violence.

The second lecture addressed a number of topics in order to answer the key question 'What is war?' Ostensibly a straightforward issue, on closer analysis it becomes clear that specific criteria are required to determine whether or not a particular conflict can be described as a 'war'. Proposed criteria were introduced, as was a working definition for forthcoming discussions relating to war: war is defined as 'the use of organised mass violence to achieve political goals'. Changes in the ways that wars have been fought throughout human history were examined, with particular reference to the weapons and tactics utilised by combatants from antiquity until the present day. The specific negative consequences of wars for both combatants and non-combatants were then examined, which drew attention to the following phenomena: in addition to causing widespread death and injury, wars frequently cause the destruction of living areas and infrastructure, the collapse of systems underlying societies such as food production and medical services, cause psychological trauma among survivors, and severely damage the natural environment. The discussion then addressed the complex moral issue of possible *positive* consequences that have come about as a result of wars, such as the ending of slavery in the United States following the American Civil War, and the ending of the Holocaust following the Second World War.

In order to address the key question 'Can war sometimes be justified?', the third lecture discussed various theories that have been put forward to justify organised mass violence. These include biological analyses which view humans as acting in a comparable fashion to other members of the animal kingdom and therefore view war as a manifestation of natural selection. Political justifications for war include widely held popular desires for liberty, self-determination, autonomy, equality and the rule of law, as evidenced by the motivations of combatants in conflicts such as the American War of Independence, the French Revolution, and post-Second World War anti-colonial struggles. Social justifications for war include revolts against intolerable social conditions such as slavery, widespread hunger, poverty, lack of education and economic opportunity. The discussion then addressed the issue of militarism, defined as 'seeking to

achieve political goals through war', and introduced commonly held views in relation to this issue from three positions on the political spectrum: the conservative view (right wing), the liberal view (centrist), and the progressive view (left wing).

The fourth lecture focused on an issue that has come to dominate much political and public discourse since the turn of the millennium, that of terrorism and counter-terrorism. After recounting a number of large scale terrorist attacks that have taken place in different parts of the world during the last twenty years, the discussion addressed the question of what exactly is understood by the terms *terrorism* and *terrorist*. A definition for the former term was offered thus: terrorism is defined as 'a violent attack on civilian non-combatants in order to achieve political goals'. The question of defining who or what constitutes a 'terrorist' was demonstrated to be more complex since a number of historical cases illustrate how one group or nation can view a particular individual as a 'terrorist' whilst that same individual can often simultaneously be viewed by a different group or nation as a hero or 'freedom fighter'. The cases of Nelson Mandela and Martin McGuinness reveal how political activists can become involved in terrorist activity at certain points in their career, but then at a later date abjure violence, join the political mainstream, and ultimately become accepted national leaders. The discussion then focused more closely on the actual perpetrators of terrorism, identifying two distinct types: i) terrorism from below, carried out by small groups (often pursuing religious motives) such as Al-Qaeda as in the 9/11 attacks in the United States; and ii) terrorism from above, carried out by national leaders against their own people such as Saddam Hussein against sectors of the population in Iraq. Ongoing cycles of terrorism and counter-terrorism, such as that taking place between Al-Qaeda and the US in its War on Terror following 9/11, were then contrasted with the application of an alternative non-violent approach to tackle such conflict: that of seeking a negotiated solution between the contending sides, as has been achieved to a significant extent in the cases of the Protestant Unionist and the Catholic Nationalist communities in Northern Ireland, and the black and white communities in South Africa.

The final lecture of Part 1 addressed the issue of the manufacture, possession and possible use of nuclear weapons. The discussion emphasised that notwithstanding the spectrum of serious problems of war and violence facing international society, it should be recognised that the dangers posed by nuclear weapons represent an existential threat to human survival since an all-out nuclear war has the potential to extinguish all life on Earth. An explanation was given of the likely immediate, middle-term and long-term effects of the use of nuclear weapons: a nuclear attack on a major world city would cause unprecedented urban destruction with many thousands (perhaps millions) of casualties, subsequently leading to potentially broader social collapse; furthermore, in the scenario of a nuclear war, possible environmental catastrophe could ensue in a 'nuclear winter'. This was followed by an approximation of the current sizes of the nuclear arsenals held by the nine nuclear powers (the US, Russia, the UK, France, China, India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea), and an explanation of the three delivery systems utilized to deliver missiles to their targets – strategic bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear submarines. The discussion then addressed the issue of nuclear deterrence which, during the Cold War, was largely founded on the threat of mutually assured destruction (MAD) should either the US or the USSR consider attacking the other with nuclear weapons. The latent weaknesses of this strategy were examined along with the conceivable ways that a nuclear war could start. The lecture concluded with a discussion of how the global nuclear threat could potentially be lessened through practicable scenarios for nuclear disarmament.

Part 2: The Reasons for Wars

Part 2 of the course focused on specific reasons why large scale violent conflicts occur in various contexts around the world. In order to address the key question 'Why do humans make war upon one another?', it examined violent conflict on four levels: the individual level, the group level, the national level and the decision-making level. Subsequently, it addressed four additional potential causes of war: conflicting political and

religious ideologies, serious social problems that exist within individual nations, imperialism, and the interrelationship between political power and the global military industry.

The first lecture of the cycle examined the issue of violent conflict on an individual level. Beginning with consideration of the preamble to the UNESCO constitution “*Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed*”⁽³⁾, the discussion introduced six theories that have been put forward to explain this phenomenon. The theories attribute human violence to the following causes: i) an innate tendency among humans to be aggressive in a similar fashion to other members of the animal kingdom; ii) the result of evolution since dominant, aggressive individuals enjoy enhanced reproductive success; iii) the result of conflicting psychological drives existing within individuals towards both life and death; iv) a manifestation of the innate depravity of all humanity (predominantly a religious view); v) the result of dissatisfaction and frustration with the circumstances of one’s own life leading to resentment and aggression; vi) the result of indoctrination by oppressive, militaristic regimes and/or strict, overbearing authority figures. It was stressed that evidence exists for many of these theories but that ultimately humans have responsibility for their own actions and can therefore choose their own behaviour. Consequently, as stated in the 1986 ‘Seville Statement on Violence’, humans are not biologically programmed for war: “*The same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace.*”⁽⁴⁾ The lecture concluded with a consideration of the attractions of war on a personal level in comparison to specific inhibitions that individuals may have against it. This included on the one side romantic, heroic images of battle and conquest as seen in many war films and military posters, the desire for achieving personal glory and the

(3) Preamble to the UNESCO Constitution, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15244&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

(4) The Seville Statement on Violence, p. 2, <http://www.unesco.org/cpp/uk/declarations/seville.pdf>

unique experience of pushing oneself to the limit in the company of battlefield comrades, as opposed to the fear of injury and death and an aversion to taking the lives of others.

The second lecture considered violent conflict on a group level, beginning with an examination of the ways that humans cooperate with each other in many facets of life. The discussion explained how throughout history humans have joined together to live in communities which, in a potentially hostile natural environment, have generally served to provide a safer, more productive and fulfilling existence for their members; this phenomenon can be encapsulated in the statement 'Humans are social animals'. Over time, this cooperative coexistence has led to the creation of particular common modes of behaviour, communication and social organisation, and also religious belief and artistic expression, which collectively can be termed 'group culture'. When groups come into contact with others, differences in 'group culture' become visible which can either lead to peaceful interaction between groups or alternatively to distrust and hostility in an 'Us versus Them' mentality. In the latter case, differences in skin colour, language and religious belief can intensify negative feelings towards members of other groups who, in extreme cases, are then viewed as less human than oneself and therefore of less intrinsic worth. This thinking has been a significant cause of violent conflict between groups of humans for centuries and was particularly prevalent in the conflicts of the twentieth century.

The discussion considered the issue of nationalism, defined as 'the desire of a group to become a significant nation within geographical boundaries', and an outline of its history was presented incorporating significant events such as the Peace of Westphalia (1648), the American War of Independence (1775–1783), the French Revolution (1789–1799), the unification of Germany (1871), and the pro-independence struggles of many African and Asian nations following the collapse of European colonial empires during the post-Second World War era (1945–1980). The lecture concluded with an examination of positive and negative aspects of nationalism: on the positive side,

nationalism can provide an inspiring and unifying vision for freedom and self-determination for great numbers of people, as in the case of India which achieved independence from Britain in 1947; on the negative side, extreme nationalism can lead to cultural intolerance, ethnic hatred, violence and war as in the cases of Nazi Germany and more recently in the Balkan Wars of the 1990s.

The third lecture considered the role of states in violent conflict. This began with an examination of the specific functions of state governments, which on a fundamental level can be summarised in the following way: state governments i) make laws, ii) collect taxes, and iii) conduct relations with other states. The concept of state sovereignty was examined: defined as 'the state's supreme authority over its citizens', state sovereignty provides that within a particular geographical area no power exists above that of the state since it represents the final arbiter in all legal and political affairs. Furthermore, the state also exercises a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence through its designated military organs, the armed forces and the police. As a consequence, states, and especially those with large militaries such as the US, Russia and China, represent extremely powerful actors in international society.

The international state system and its potential to solve global problems was then considered. The state system represents the existing political status quo in which individual states continuously seek to maintain and increase their power and position. Prior to 1990, this system was in a bipolar configuration dominated by the two superpowers, the US and USSR, which were supported by their less powerful state allies. Following the end of the Cold War, the system morphed into a multipolar model with a number of powerful states, including China, India, Brazil and the European Union, rising to prominence to compete with the formerly dominant US and (post-Soviet) Russia. The state system has witnessed numerous clashes between individual members over issues such as territory, resources and conflicting ideologies, and also violations of the sovereignty of weaker states by their more powerful counterparts. These latter have also been frequently involved in arms races against their rivals, which in turn have contributed to-

wards the outbreak of wars. As a consequence, the question can be posed that despite the enormous resources which powerful states possess, can they not be seen as actually *part of the problem* of violent conflict in the world? The lecture concluded with the contention that in order to address serious global problems such as war, poverty and environmental destruction, the inclusion of non-state actors such as NGOs and international organisations may be essential.

In order to assess the importance of decision makers in violent conflict, the fourth lecture focused on national leaders who have been deeply involved in war. The discussion sought to examine to what extent the personalities, motivations and actions of particular leaders affected both the initial likelihood of the outbreak of war, and subsequently its prosecution once the decision had been taken to initiate hostilities. To introduce the theme, brief biographies were presented of famous historical leaders who were involved in several wars such as Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan, Napoleon Bonaparte and Josef Stalin. Comparisons were drawn between so-called 'strong' and 'weak' wartime leaders, for example Winston Churchill versus Kaiser Wilhelm II, and consideration given to the question of whether it is conceivable that a particular war might have broken out irrespective of the individual who was leading the nation at the time.

Following the identification of two leaders who have been almost universally regarded as singularly evil, Idi Amin and Pol Pot, the discussion then focused on the pressures incumbent on leaders in times of national military crisis. This drew attention to situations where the decisions taken by a small number of predominantly men (senior political and military figures) had the potential to profoundly affect the lives of millions of their own and other countries' citizens. As seen in the case of the Cuban Missile Crisis where a single misstep on the part of US President Kennedy or USSR General Secretary Khrushchev could have led to a catastrophic nuclear war, the members of this small group, and particularly the decision maker at the top, had to attempt to identify the most appropriate strategy for the nation's armed forces and the broader

populace under conditions of extremely high professional and personal stress. In order to avoid such missteps in future crisis scenarios, the potential pitfalls facing national leaders were considered, such as miscommunication caused by language and/or cultural differences leading to misunderstandings of an enemy's intentions, and possible effective measures that could be taken to address them.

The final two lectures of Part 2 considered four other potential causes of war: conflicting political and religious ideologies, and serious internal problems (lecture 5), imperialism, and the global military industry (lecture 6).

To address the first of these issues, a definition of 'ideology' was provided thus: an ideology is 'an integrated network of ideas which explain and justify social and political actions'. It was emphasised that political and religious ideologies provide clear theoretical and practical blueprints for action towards the realisation of a commonly-desired future outcome which frequently offer little or no scope for compromise when they come into contact with differing or conflicting ideologies; consequently, clashes between adherents to different ideologies can often result in brutal and prolonged violence. With regard to clashes of political ideology, reference was made to the American War of Independence, the wars fought by post-revolutionary France, and the great conflagrations of the 20th century, most notably the Second World War which was fought between forces from widely differing democratic, communist and fascist nations. Clashes of religious ideology include conflicts which have plagued relations between Christians, Muslims and Jews for centuries, and also internecine violence that occurs within Christian communities between Protestants and Catholics, and within Muslim communities between the Sunni and the Shia.

Regarding serious internal problems within individual nations which may have the potential to cause war, the following problems were considered: large scale unemployment, poverty, homelessness, high levels of crime, alcoholism and suicide. The discussion emphasised that statistical research carried out into this question has yet to establish clear correlations between these problems and large-scale violent action on the part

of nations, but that such internal conditions may have the potential to create a climate of general social disquiet, a 'dangerous national restlessness', amongst a particular population which could engender a greater inclination towards relieving internal stress through engaging in violence against an external enemy. For example, in the case of Germany in the 1930s, it can be argued that the desire expressed by the Nazis for more living space, *lebensraum*, can be in part put down to a belief that growing population pressure was one of the factors seen to be limiting the development of the nation as a whole. Examining the issue of poverty in more detail, it was shown that evidence that indicates a link between poverty and war is rather contradictory since poverty can be seen as both a motivator *for* and *against* war depending on historical circumstance. In the cases of the revolutions in Cuba (1959) and Nicaragua (1979), a desire to alleviate poverty and inequality was central to the motivation of anti-government forces; conversely, the repeated military defeats and crippling socio-economic conditions endured by Russia during the First World War up until 1917 represented a significant motivation for its withdrawal from that conflict following the Bolshevik Revolution. In general, due to the fact that poor people would likely be more inclined to fight to alleviate hunger and destitution rather than assist in the facilitation of foreign conquest, violent conflicts that come about as a result of poverty and social distress are more likely to be civil wars – internal conflicts fought between pro- and anti-government forces, as opposed to wars of aggression fought against other nations.

To address the question of imperialism as a possible cause of war, firstly a definition of the concept was presented: imperialism is defined as 'the policy of extending one nation's power over other foreign peoples.' The discussion traced the historical development of imperialism and the activities of the principal imperialist powers (Spain, Portugal, Britain, France, Holland, Germany and the US) from the early modern era until the outbreak of the First World War which marked the start of its decline; this focused particularly on the most intense period of imperialist activity which took place during the 19th century. It was emphasised that for a significant time imperialist powers

regarded their activities as being inherently good, over and above the great economic and political benefits that could be gained from the possession of extensive overseas territories. However, on many occasions imperial conquest was revealed to have also led to large scale violent conflicts both between imperial powers, e.g. the Crimean War (1853–1856), and between the imperial power and the indigenous population, e.g. the Diponegro War (1825–1830). Following an explanation of the mechanisms through which imperial economies functioned, the philosophical foundations promulgated by imperialist powers to justify such activity were presented, which frequently centred on the concept of ‘the white man’s burden’ – a quasi-religious drive to ‘civilise’ and ‘Christianise’ the seemingly barbarous and uneducated peoples of the world. The discussion then addressed the concept of ‘neo-imperialism’, that of former imperial powers continuing to exert significant influence over former colonies in the modern era by means not of military dominance, but the economic activities of multinational corporations and the cultural activities of the Hollywood movie industry and the international news media.

The final issue addressed as a possible cause of war was the global military industry. The discussion described how the military industries of powerful states such as Britain, Germany, the US and Russia expanded rapidly during the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries both in terms of size and sophistication; these industries then provided the armaments utilized in the great wars of that period. However, as recognised by US President Eisenhower in a famous speech given in 1961, following the Second World War the military industries of the superpowers continued to grow significantly until he felt it could be argued that their actual existence had begun to represent a danger to world peace. Eisenhower identified a new phenomenon which he defined as ‘a military-industrial-complex’ which was seemingly forging ever closer links between military industries, the armed forces and government leaders. This phenomenon created a potentially dangerous situation in which participating in a war could be seen as being both politically and economically beneficial to the members of the military-industrial-complex;

consequently its existence could represent a *de facto* motivation in favour of war. The scale of the current military industries of the US, Russia, the UK and France were illustrated in order to show that this continues to be a significant issue since many thousands of people are employed in them. To conclude the lecture, an explanation was given of the various negative socio-economic effects that large scale military spending can have on states around the world. Such spending can have negative effects on: i) employment, since military industries generally create fewer jobs than their civilian counterparts; ii) productivity, since the best scientists and engineers are frequently appropriated by military industries; iii) public finances, since military spending often drives up inflation and produces large financial deficits; iv) worsening internal and external social conditions, since resources hitherto earmarked for health, education and international aid are re-directed towards the military.

Part 3: Building 'Negative Peace'

Part 3 of the course focused on specific actors and courses of action undertaken to lessen the severity of, bring a halt to, or ultimately prevent war. In terms of actors, this addressed the activities of national and international peace movements, international organisations such as the United Nations and African Union, and religious organisations. In terms of courses of action, this focused on strategies for conflict resolution including diplomatic negotiations between states, and the utilization of the precepts and mechanisms of international law.

The first lecture of the cycle examined the formation, nature and activities of peace movements in countries around the world. To introduce the topic, it was emphasised that looking back over more than 2000 years of human history, many of the so-called 'major events' that appear to stand out have been wars or other large scale conflicts, and that periods without conflict where regions enjoyed times of peace have failed to receive comparable emphasis. To some extent, this may suggest that in historical thinking

warmaking is regarded as being more significant than peacemaking; this phenomenon is conceivably linked to commonly held popular attitudes (as alluded to above in lecture 1 of Part 2) in which fighting is seen as exciting and peacemaking boring. In the history of peace movements, it has generally been the case that people who wished to oppose warlike policies pursued by their leaders have found it easier to articulate their opposition to war as opposed to their desire for peace. As a result, the majority of peace movements have been *antiwar* movements; in terms of definition, 'Peace Movements' are understood to be groups that are opposed to war and militarism. The discussion stated that with regard to political stance, peace movements are often located on the centre-left, 'progressive' side of the political spectrum, and in recent years (since the 1960s) antiwar groups have found common cause with groups campaigning for other progressive causes such as economic equality, human rights and protection of the environment. With regard to historical development, whilst specific 'peace thinking' has a long history which can be traced back to pre-history in Ancient Greece, through the early Christian period, the Middle Ages, the Enlightenment and into the modern era, the existence of clearly identifiable peace groups or movements represents a modern phenomenon which began to gain momentum in the 19th century. The conflicts of this era served to motivate people to form peace societies in parts of Europe and North America, and the subsequent great conflagrations of the 20th century accelerated this trend in many countries around the world.

The discussion then described how peace movements can commonly be divided into three types: i) movements to stop all wars, e.g. the Quakers and the Peace Pledge Union; ii) movements to stop particular aspects of war such as the use of nuclear weapons, e.g. the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; and iii) movements to stop particular wars such as the Vietnam War, e.g. American Writers and Artists Against the War in Vietnam. An additional feature of many peace movements is that they are liable to adjust or realign their objectives and activities in response to changing external circumstances; one manifestation of this being moves towards seeking cooperation and alliances

with other groups who are pursuing similar causes. This relative fluidity in terms of objective and action can lead to internal disagreement and in some cases factionalisation and division. Disagreement has occurred due to differences of opinion over a number of issues including: i) whether or not peace movements should cooperate with state governments; ii) the use of force – never justified or justified in extreme circumstances; iii) focusing on one specific issue or pursuing a broad social agenda; iv) strengthening central organisation or delegating authority to grassroots branches; v) civil disobedience – in acts of protest obeying the law or breaking it. The lecture concluded with an explanation of the criticisms that have been levelled at peace movements over the years, to the effect that, for example, their members have been called ‘apologists for violent dictators’ (prior to and during the Second World War), and that their protestations and campaigns amount to cowardly and even traitorous behaviour. These accusations, coupled with cumulative psychological and other stresses brought about by campaigning for many years against very powerful opposition with apparently little success, have on many occasions led to demoralisation amongst members of peace movements. However, during the last two centuries their campaigns have also contributed significantly towards a number of important humanitarian successes, such as ending slavery, securing women’s suffrage, reducing global stockpiles of nuclear weapons and ending apartheid in South Africa.

The second lecture considered the first of two specific strategies that are utilized to resolve or prevent violent conflict – diplomacy, meaning direct or indirect negotiations carried out by high level state representatives known as diplomats. To introduce this topic, it was emphasised that negotiation represents a completely natural activity in people’s everyday lives since humans constantly negotiate with one another on a simple level in a multitude of situations. Regarding high level negotiations carried out between political powers, history reveals that ways of making war have changed markedly over the centuries, but ways of negotiation largely have not: in negotiations with foreign

powers, in order to achieve the objectives stipulated by their leaders, diplomats principally have two tools at their disposal – threats and promises. When political leaders negotiate with each other directly this is known as a summit. During the 20th century several important summits took place which contributed towards bringing large scale conflicts to an end (Paris 1919, Yalta and Potsdam 1945), bringing longstanding enemies closer together (Beijing 1972), and reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons held by the Superpowers (Moscow 1972 and Washington 1987). Although diplomacy and summitry represent valuable means of facilitating conflict resolution and mutual understanding between potentially bitter adversaries, they also do not guarantee success and significant failures have also occurred, such as the US – USSR summit of 1961 in Vienna, which it can be argued in part led to the Cuban Missile Crisis of the following year.

The discussion next addressed the historical development of diplomacy and its manifestation in the modern era. Since antiquity, monarchs and leaders have sent ambassadors to the seats of power of other leaders in order to negotiate agreements on a variety of issues. To avoid misunderstandings and other potentially serious problems which could arise from them, this customary practice was formally codified into specific codes of conduct by Cardinal Richelieu, the principal minister of the French king Louis XIII during the first half of the 17th century; thereafter, French became the standard language of diplomacy and diplomats were drawn almost exclusively from the upper classes. The protocols established by Richelieu continue to underpin much modern diplomatic practice which, despite considerable preparatory work now being carried out via electronic means of communication, still continues to rely heavily on face-to-face discussions between senior officials. In general, diplomatic discussions take place away from the public eye and can, where required, also include meetings between lower level officials such as lawyers and doctors (Track II diplomacy), and/or the involvement of widely respected external figures who can act as mediators between contending sides. The lecture concluded with an explanation of some of the specific

negotiating techniques utilized by diplomats and mediators in high level discussions. This includes techniques intended to reduce hostility and distrust between the sides, create understanding of each other's specific motivations and constraints, with the intention of ultimately identifying a compromise position which can be acceptable to all. The principal requirement incumbent on all participants in what is often a protracted and painstaking process is to maintain the determination not to give up and withdraw, since it can nearly always be said that difficult and complicated negotiations are almost always preferable to the outbreak or perpetuation of war.

The third topic addressed in Part 3 was the nature, role and relative effectiveness of international cooperation in promoting peace; this broad theme was addressed over two lectures. The first of these focused on arguably the most important multinational organisation in international society since the Second World War, the United Nations (hereafter referred to as the UN). The discussion first traced the sequence of events which led to the creation of the UN in 1945. The desire to create a robust, multinational institution which could mediate between nations and thereby protect the international community from devastating war began to crystallize around specific proposals during the large peace conferences that were held around the turn of the 20th century. Following the deaths of millions of both servicemen and civilians in the First World War, the League of Nations was created in order to achieve this aim; however, due to intrinsic institutional weakness and insufficient support provided by its member states, the League was unable to fulfil its purpose. After the yet more devastating Second World War, the international community, led by the Allied powers of the US, USSR and Britain, agreed to create a stronger body dedicated to preserving world peace which came into existence at the San Francisco Conference of April to June 1945.

Following an explanation of the fundamental structure and principles of the UN⁽⁵⁾, the discussion next addressed the many criticisms that have been levelled against the organisation since its creation, many of which have considerable justification. These

include its failure to prevent major conflicts such as the Korean War and Vietnam War, and similarly the nuclear arms race and the genocides that took place in Cambodia and Rwanda; furthermore, the UN has been labelled indecisive, inefficient and overly bureaucratic. To balance these criticisms, it was emphasised that the UN is not a world government, has little financial or military resources of its own and can only address international problems that its members actually want it to address; in effect, if there is no international consensus in respect of a specific pressing issue, the UN is largely unable to act. Despite these significant weaknesses, the UN has contributed significantly towards world peace and development through the negotiation of peace treaties, carrying out peacekeeping missions, distributing relief to refugees and victims of national disasters, and improving levels of health and education for millions of people around the world.

In the second lecture focusing on international cooperation, the discussion described four other actors which have a major influence on international society: i) regional organisations, ii) intergovernmental organisations, iii) non-governmental organisations, and iv) multinational corporations. Regional organisations are groups of states located in a particular part of the globe which share geographical proximity, strategic political and economic interests, and wide-ranging cultural links; examples of which include the African Union, the Arab League and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). In addition to promoting economic development, frequently in cooperation with the UN these organisations are often involved in tackling violent conflicts that occur within their regions, such as in the cases of the African Union's involvement in the

(5) There are five major UN organs: Security Council, General Assembly, Economic and Social Council, International Court of Justice, and Secretariat; governments of all states may join the General Assembly. The Security Council was created to preserve world peace with enforcement power; it has five permanent members (US, Russia (USSR), UK, France and China) with veto power. In contrast to the League of Nations, the UN focuses not only on war and peace but has many other functions. A total of 40 UN agencies (including UNESCO, the World Bank and World Health Organisation) address a variety of economic, educational, health, scientific and social issues.

conflicts in Darfur and the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Arab League's efforts to negotiate a solution to the conflict between the Palestinians and Israel. Inter-governmental organisations are powerful groups of states which share close economic interests, such as the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC⁽⁶⁾), or wide-ranging economic and political interests encompassing the lives millions of people, such as the European Union. Non-governmental organisations (hereafter NGOs) come in a wide variety of shapes and sizes, and can have a domestic or an international focus. A number of international NGOs are involved in peace movements in many parts of the world including Amnesty International, Greenpeace and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. The category NGO also incorporates other large organisations which operate in a quite different capacity in international society such as the International Olympic Committee and Rotary International, and also major world religions which have great numbers of members throughout the world such as the Catholic Church. Multinational corporations (MNCs) are very large companies that employ thousands of workers in many countries; examples include the Apple, Pfizer, Gazprom and Toyota corporations. These companies have huge financial resources, which in many cases exceed the wealth of entire countries⁽⁷⁾, and are frequently able to exert considerable pressure on the political processes taking place within the countries in which they operate. The lecture concluded with a consideration of whether MNCs can be seen as being beneficial or detrimental to world peace. On the positive side, it can be argued that MNCs contribute towards economic development, provide employment to millions, and promote international exchange and technological development. On the negative side, it can be argued that MNCs cause conflicts due to strict competition over access to natural resources and markets, pay low wages to their workers in order

(6) Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) members: Algeria, Angola, Ecuador, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Venezuela.

(7) The two most valuable companies in the world according to 2012 data: 1. Apple Corporation, worth \$625 billion; 2. Exxon Mobil Corporation, worth \$422 billion.

to maximize profits and cause major damage to the natural environment.

The fourth lecture in the cycle considered the second specific strategy or mechanism utilized to resolve or prevent war, international law (hereafter IL). IL regulates relations between states in the international community and encapsulates a wide body of law. The majority of relations taking place between states are largely peaceful and in accordance with IL. The discussion identified the four sources of IL: i) classical writings, including the works of the philosophers Hugo Grotius and Jeremy Bentham; ii) customs, which incorporate traditionally accepted norms of behaviour such as respecting the freedom of foreign diplomats in one's own country, and protecting the resources of the Earth which benefit all people including the sea bed and ozone layer; iii) treaties, which incorporate peace agreements between formerly warring nations, and agreements over issues such as national boundaries, access to natural resources and protection of ecosystems; iv) rulings from international courts, such as the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court.

The discussion then identified the principal weakness of IL which is the fact that it has no enforcement mechanism. There is no such thing as an international police force which could theoretically enter any country and arrest people accused of breaking IL; therefore in reality state governments are at liberty to decide whether they will be bound by the stipulations of IL or whether they will ignore it. There have been a number of occasions when powerful states have ignored IL in order to pursue particular foreign policy strategies; these include the Chinese invasion of Tibet (1949), the Russian invasion of Afghanistan (1979) and the French nuclear tests carried out in Polynesia (1966–1996). A branch of IL, the Law of War, concerns the conduct of militaries during war and has criminalised particularly inhuman behaviour such as the conscription of child soldiers, the mistreatment or killing of prisoners of war and the causing of excessive destruction to the territory of an enemy. Three specific categories of crimes have been codified thus: i) crimes against peace; ii) crimes against humanity; and iii)

war crimes. Many of the stipulations of the Law of War came about as a result of the war crimes tribunals that took place in the aftermath of the Second World War in Nuremberg and Tokyo. The tribunals established the precedent that individuals or groups who are accused of committing these crimes during the course of a war may be liable for criminal prosecution after hostilities have ceased. The lecture concluded after the contention that IL has contributed significantly towards world peace and that the majority of international treaties are honoured by states throughout the world.

The final lecture in the cycle addressed ethical and religious perspectives relating to war and violent conflict. The discussion began by highlighting the clear dichotomy which exists between people's conduct during peacetime and their conduct in war: in peacetime it goes without saying that the killing or injuring of other humans is regarded as reprehensible behaviour, the perpetration of which will result in severe legal sanction; however, in war this same behaviour becomes not only legally permissible, but in many cases praised and even rewarded. This situation reveals the ambiguous relationship which exists between ethics, religion and war; many historical cases reveal how proponents of both pro-war and anti-war positions make use of ethical and religious precepts in order to justify their actions. Many of the world's major religions (e.g. Christianity, Islam and Buddhism) attach great value to the ideal and creation of peace, yet a number of religious leaders have been very warlike. From an ethical standpoint, the making of war upon other humans is viewed as morally wrong; however, in cases such as the Holocaust against the Jews, the taking up of arms against the Nazis was viewed in many countries as being morally justifiable in order to put a stop to a greater evil. In relation to war, there are two types of ethics – utilitarian and absolutist. Utilitarian ethics (as can be seen in the case of the Holocaust) regards war as terrible, but accepts that in certain cases the potential cost of *not fighting* could be even worse. Absolutist ethics regards the taking of human life to be wrong in every case, and therefore holds that war can never be justified.

Due to the fact that religious differences and intolerance between religions have been and continue to be the cause of many violent conflicts around the world, the discussion then examined the attitudes to war held by five of the major world religions: Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism and Christianity. This analysis illustrated how, with the exception of Buddhism, both the development of religious doctrine and external historical circumstances have caused the attitudes of these religions to war to change over time. In Judaism, the peace-oriented thinking of many Jews prevalent during the early-modern period changed radically towards a more militaristic stance following the Holocaust. In Islam, the imperative towards becoming a more pure and holy individual, the jihad against oneself, has for some Muslims (for example, members of Al-Qaeda) become ostensibly less important than an external jihad directed against unbelievers and enemies of Islam. In Christianity, the pacifism and nonviolence preached by Jesus during his ministry in the first century AD was followed by many years of religious war during the Crusades, and the forced conversion of so-called 'barbarous peoples' in large parts of the developing world.

The discussion then examined the issue of 'just war' and the specific criteria which can be utilized to ascertain whether a particular conflict has moral justification or not; these criteria are called *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. *Jus ad bellum* contains five principles and is applied in situations where a state is considering going to war. It holds that war can only be justified if: i) it represents the last resort – all other nonviolent measures have failed; ii) the decision to commence hostilities is taken by the correct authority, that is to say the legitimate government; iii) war is being fought for a just cause (not for the purpose of aggression, revenge or plunder) ; iv) there is a realistic chance of success; v) the goal of the war is to improve the current situation and ultimately restore peace. *Jus in bello* has two principles and applies to the conduct of militaries once hostilities have commenced. Ways of fighting can be morally acceptable if they adhere to the following: i) double effect – meaning that the negative effects of causing death and destruction to an enemy will eventually be outweighed by the posi-

tive effects of bringing about its defeat; and ii) discrimination – that non-military personnel, that is to say civilians, must never be the direct target of attack. On several occasions wars that began in accordance with the principles of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* unfortunately became increasingly barbaric as the conflict progressed, which ultimately caused the deaths of thousands of civilians. Particularly stark in this regard are the Allied bombing campaigns carried out against Germany and Japan during the Second World War and the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The lecture concluded with the contention that with regard to the use of nuclear weapons, it is widely agreed that there exists no moral justification for this since the consequences for any state attacked with them would be totally catastrophic.

Part 4: Building 'Positive Peace'

Going beyond strategies that can halt or prevent war, the final part of the course focused on courses of action which can serve to create a more peaceful and equitable world for all of its inhabitants. Over the course of four lectures it addressed the issues of human rights (split over two lectures), protection of the environment and economic equality.

In the first of the two lectures addressing the issue of human rights (hereafter referred to as HRs), the discussion began with a description of our contemporary world in which millions of its inhabitants are unable to enjoy rights which have been internationally recognised as essential for all people simply because they are human; examples of these rights include the right to health, education, freedom from attack and equality before the law. A very serious situation exists in many countries where, for example, women are regarded as inferior to men, children are forced to work and cannot attend school, and people are imprisoned, tortured and even killed because of their political or religious beliefs. It was emphasised that there is a close connection between the protection of HRs and the creation of positive peace. The discussion next examined

the history of HRs and illustrated how the concept of the *rights of individual humans* represents a relatively recent phenomenon. Throughout much of history, specific rights within society did not rest with individuals, but were distributed to members of populations in accordance with the will of the ruler; this included, for example, rights to the ownership of land and noble titles given by monarchs to their principal lords or ministers, and rights to live and farm in certain areas given by lords to their followers and servants. This situation changed as a result of the writings of philosophers such as John Locke and John Stuart Mill who espoused the view that humans have the fundamental right to the ownership of their own body and therefore the right to life; as a consequence, they held that it was morally wrong for humans to be wantonly killed. This thinking provided the intellectual foundation for campaigns supporting the protection of HRs which achieved significant progress following the Second World War when the international community became fully aware of the horrors committed by the Nazis. Foremost in this regard was the promulgation in 1948 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which built upon developments that had taken place during the 19th and early 20th centuries, including the passing of the Geneva Convention protecting prisoners of war in 1864 and the Convention outlawing slavery in 1926. The UDHR contains 30 articles setting out the civil, political, socio-economic and cultural rights which all humans should have. As with international law, the UDHR has no enforcement mechanism; however, it has strong moral authority and has therefore been the model for several subsequent international agreements including conventions against genocide and racial discrimination.

In the second lecture addressing human rights, the discussion firstly highlighted the condition of half of the entire human race whose HRs are in an almost universally inferior state in comparison to that of the other half: this is the situation faced by women. With regard to many aspects of life, including access to food, health care and education, the ownership of property and participation in the political process, in many parts

of the world women's position is found to be almost always beneath that of men. Historically, women have suffered in many ways and they unfortunately continue to do so in the modern world; examples of this include glass ceilings preventing advancement in work and education, arranged or forced marriages, the concealing of women within the home through purdah, and female genital mutilation. The next issue to be addressed was the situation of the 300 million people whose HRs are in the worst condition of all: the world's indigenous peoples. According to a variety of statistical indicators including levels of wealth, health, education and political participation, peoples such as the Aborigines of Australia, Native Americans and Canadians, the tribal peoples of India, and the Roma peoples of Europe are in the very poorest state.

The discussion then addressed the many controversial issues which exist with respect to HRs: this principally concerns serious disagreements over which of the 30 HRs set down in the UDHR represent the most important, and as a consequence what responsibilities state governments have or should have to protect them. The rights listed as numbers 1–21 in the UDHR focus on civil and political matters, including the right to protection from torture and arbitrary arrest, freedom of speech, assembly, religion and emigration. The rights listed as numbers 22–30 focus on socio-economic and cultural matters, including the right to work, to an education and to an adequate standard of living. In western countries and particularly the US, civil and political rights are seen as being more important; however, in poorer developing countries, socio-economic rights are viewed as being more important. This situation has given rise to a long-standing international controversy between rich and poor countries over what can be deemed appropriate policy to protect HRs. In respect of specific policy priority, this can be understood in terms of the pursuit of human freedom versus the pursuit of good living standards. Following this discussion, three hypothetical HRs were introduced which could potentially be added to the UDHR: the right to a clean environment, the right to security from nuclear destruction, and the right to peace. The lecture concluded with an explanation of specific strategies which governments can pursue in order to put

pressure on other governments in circumstances where the HRs of their people are being abused. These strategies include: i) diplomacy through diplomats or other representatives; ii) imposing cultural penalties, such as expelling an offending state from sporting events like the Olympics; iii) imposing economic penalties, such as halting trade, investment or economic aid; iv) applying legal pressure through international law; v) supporting internal or external HR campaigns led by NGOs or other actors.

The third lecture of Part 4 addressed the issue of how humans can protect the natural environment and live in harmony with other living things on Earth. Following an explanation of the contention that a healthy environment is regarded as being essential for the achievement of positive peace, the discussion described how concerns for environmental protection have developed relatively slowly during the course of human history. Since the 1960s this trend has accelerated with attention being directed towards specific environmental issues such as pollution, the destruction of rain forests and climate change; subsequently, this phenomenon has developed into a broader international awareness of the importance of 'green' issues which continues to the present day. Important milestones such as the creation in 1970 of the US Environmental Protection Agency with legal powers to prosecute polluters and the increasing political influence of green parties in European countries in the late 20th and early 21st centuries have supported the growth within the international community of an understanding that humans should act not merely as predators and consumers, but should be 'stewards of the Earth'.

The discussion next addressed the specific nature of the threats facing the natural environment. A number of natural phenomena were listed whose increasingly frequent occurrences in recent years could represent evidence of profound changes taking place within the global ecosystem: these include melting polar icecaps, severe storms, floods, droughts and forest fires. An explanation was given of three specific environmental problems which it can be argued can be attributed either directly or indirectly to the ac-

tivities of humans: pollution, global warming, and the loss of biodiversity. Regarding pollution, this relates to pollution of the air, soil and water caused by vehicle exhausts and factories, the use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, chemical spills (especially oil) and sewage. Rises in global temperatures have been attributed to the 'greenhouse effect' which has been linked to various human activities, especially rapid industrialisation and the growth of motorised transport; it is feared that this global warming could eventually lead to severe agricultural disruption and mass extinctions of plants and animals. In a similar fashion, it is predicted that the destruction of unique ecosystems such as rainforests and coral reefs for purposes such as farming, mining and tourism has the potential to lead to comparable negative consequences.

The lecture concluded with an explanation of means by which the international community can seek to address these serious environmental problems. In order to avert conceivably irreversible damage to the global ecosystem, concerted action is required by both governments and the wider public; in this regard, the following four principles can serve as philosophical foundations for such action: i) political borders are irrelevant to environmental problems; ii) environmental problems affect both rich and poor people; iii) the pursuit of short-term profit can cause long-term environmental damage; iv) the planet's natural processes must be respected. On a national level, it is held that governments should take steps to penalise polluting industries through the utilization of environmental impact assessment systems and provide financial incentives for companies that are conducting business in an environmentally friendly manner. On a personal level, individual people can be encouraged to boycott products made by polluting companies, draw attention to cases of severe environmental damage, and participate in 'green' campaigns led by NGOs such as Friends of the Earth and other groups who promote issues such as the efficient use of energy, the recycling of natural resources and the conservation of local ecosystems.

To introduce the final lecture of Part 4 addressing the issue of economic equality,

the discussion began by considering the simple but meaningful phrase “Peace is hard when you’re hungry.” This statement relates to the fact that it is probable that the majority of people around the world would wish to live in a peaceful environment, but if they live in conditions of extreme poverty then the challenges of daily life would likely mean that they would have little time or energy to contribute towards creating such an environment. Without the essentials of life like food, clean water, shelter and medical care it is clear that it would be difficult for anyone to feel peaceful; furthermore, it is a truism that poverty causes *peaceless* lives, and this also represents a condition which is morally wrong. Consequently, a further condition required for the achievement of positive peace is the provision of an acceptable standard of living for all of the world’s inhabitants. It was emphasised that ‘poverty’ does not represent an abstract concept, but describes the daily struggle for survival of real people in countries all around the world, and especially large numbers of people living in countries in the global ‘South’. The discussion then described the specific negative consequences of poverty: poverty leads to hunger, malnutrition, poor housing and sanitation, disease, poor health care and education, child labour and mental anguish.

Consideration was then given to the causes of poverty. Much academic and media attention has been paid to the question of why some nations and peoples are poor and why others are not; a number of theories have been offered regarding this, including the following: poor countries have a lack of natural resources, a lack of capital resources, large national debts, and widespread corruption. These theories may be appropriate with regard to certain countries; however, an additional cause exists which has repeatedly undermined attempts to reduce levels of poverty in many countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa – that is war. In general, war represents economic development that is taking place *in reverse*: when war breaks out, valuable infrastructure is often damaged or destroyed, the social fabric of communities breaks down, resources for health and education are directed towards fighting, hundreds or thousands of soldiers and civilians are killed, and levels of poverty rapidly increase. This phenomenon illus-

trates how tackling poverty in war-torn countries represents a complicated and very difficult challenge.

The discussion then considered an issue which has often been conflated with that of poverty, overpopulation. In many developing countries where there are high levels of poverty, the size of the overall population is also increasing; this suggests that in future levels of poverty within these countries may well get worse. With the current global population standing at more than 7 billion people, and this figure predicted to rise to almost 10 billion by 2050⁽⁸⁾, what kind of world will this become? It is likely that this massive population will continue to consume increasing amounts of goods and services, placing ever greater demands on the Earth's natural resources, thereby creating more pollution and potentially pushing the planet towards a major environmental disaster. An important strategy to tackle this worrying scenario is the introduction of measures to control population growth, especially in developing countries, and vital in this regard is the issue of women's rights. If women are empowered to decide how many children they will have in their families by means of improved education and access to contraception, it is predicted that birth rates will fall and that levels of poverty will also improve.

The lecture concluded by listing a number of policy strategies which can be implemented by governments around the world to tackle levels of poverty: i) agree an international 'bottom limit' for poverty; ii) provide debt relief for poor countries; iii) improve education for women worldwide; iv) make contraception freely available; v) promote 'eco-development', meaning development that protects the natural environment; vi) direct resources formerly used for the military towards improving the lives of poor people. The final topic drew attention to the case of Costa Rica which abolished its armed forces in 1948 and then directed the resources formerly allocated to the military towards health and education. The results of this national strategy have been sig-

(8) <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/6038>

nificant declines in both the fertility rate and infant mortality rate, and significant improvements in general levels of health and education throughout the country.

—James Daniel Short · 法学部准教授—