Nonkilling Political Leadership

By Oseremen Irene

8 • 2013

Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

Contents # 8

Oseremen Irene is a Peace and Conflict Specialist, Geographer, Trainer, Researcher, Administrator and Practical Peacebuilding Practitioner. He is President of the Centre for Peace and Rehabilitation of Displaced Persons, President of the Peace Service Academy of Nigeria, and member of the Board of Directors, Global Alliance for Ministries & Infrastructure for Peace—committed to global campaigns for the creation of Ministries of Peace. Oseremen earned his B.Sc (Hons) and MA degrees in Geography and Peace and Conflict Studies respectively from the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, before proceeding to Durban University of Technology, South Africa for his doctoral degree in Peace Studies.

Nonkilling Political Leadership

Oseremen Irene
Creighton University

Summary

Is a nonkilling society possible? This is the question posed by Glenn D. Paige in the book Nonkilling Global Political Science. Paige describes a nonkilling society as that which neither kills nor showcases threats to kill, and that such society must be devoid of weapons or technologies for killing and as well be freed from justification for killing including conditions that depends on the application of lethal force. Since political leadership is one of the most important aspects of the society, a transformed political leadership with nonkilling features is critical to the attainment of nonkilling society.

Introduction

According to Maisiri (2009), political leadership is about adherence to the principles of accountability, engagement, transparency, delivery of public goods and responsibility. If these key principles in political governance are absent, leadership would be devoid of the value of legitimacy which anchors the strategic purpose of sovereign authority. As such political leadership within the context of nonkilling theory is one that is devoid of lethality-prone behavioral and structural or systemic variables. Paige (2009: 95) submitted that the concept of nonkilling re-defines the idea of political leadership:

from that of lethal commander to facilitator of nonkilling societal problem-solving; seek early identification of and withdraw support from leaders aspirants with aggressive, violence-prone personalities; remove expectations of willingness to kill and power to order others to kill from leadership role responsibilities; do not provide leaders with professional killer organizations pledge to obedience and armed with increasingly lethal weapons; withdraw religious, business, labor, scientific, and artistic support for killing-prone organizations and commit to nonkilling alternatives; elevate need-responsive conflict resolution to be a primary task expectation of political leaders and citizens; affirm commitment to the value of nonkilling as a core component of national pride and identity; refuse definition of any group as subhuman or otherwise so evil to justify extermination; seek common dialogue among groups for mutual well-being; change socioeconomic and other structural conditions that predisposes individuals and groups directly or vicariously to sleek satisfaction by violence; shift the economy of killing to serve life-affirming human needs; and support creation of nonkilling cultures through arts and sciences.

Data on global violence have shown a declining trend in mass killing (Human Security Report, 2008). Consistent with this, the 2010 Human Security Report tracking trends in political violence revealed that high intensity wars that kill at least 1,000 people a year has gone down by about 78% since 1998. The 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s figures are similar to the figure of between 1950 and 1959. The 2009/2010 edition of the Human Security Report also shows a remarkable drop in the number of armed conflicts. This trend of relatively more peacefulness provides grounds for confidence on the journey towards a nonkilling era. However, the need to further entrench the nonkilling theories and practices into the frameworks of political leadership has become more pressing in the light of the fact that state(s) can easily commit more mass killing than can readily be achieved by other violent groups. Consequently, there is a need to re-think in the conceptualization of political leadership from that of lethality command to nonlethality.

The act of killing perceived political enemies, rivals and those committed to the struggle against social injustice by some political leaders, has become a disturbing development especially in African politics and electoral processes. Systemic or structural driven lethality following structural violence can better be han-

dled by tracing the problem to the root causes of social imbalances or disequilibrium in the society and direct energy to transforming such challenges. Government policies that fan such disequilibrium need to be overhauled, and nonkilling political science and peace science are critical in this project.

Paige explains that while governmental and nongovernmental institutions directly or indirectly contribute to actions that promote killing, it is still practicable to re-direct such set-up to support nonviolent life sustaining ideas to problem-solving and the objectives of the society. He however cautioned that it must be in the direction of our institutions, if indeed we truly yearn for true civil societies, and ultimately survive, as working towards killing-free societies will also result in tackling issues of poverty, environmental degradation, social inequalities, injustice as well as other human insecurity conditions that really undermine the dignity and life of man effectively.

Paige (1977) stressed further that there are some variables capable of purposive, nonkilling transformative interventions such as violence prone concepts of leadership; personality prerequisites, role powers, organizational supports, task expectations, value saliencies; technological capabilities and economic, social, and cultural reinforcements for killing. The identification of lethality prone behavioral and systemic variable, planning and taking actions to bring about their transformation through social nonviolent activisms, trainings and orientations programs, research, and advocacy, can present practical steps towards the realization of nonkilling political leadership and killing-free society in general.

The lives of nonviolent and nonkilling political leaders, such as Mohandas Gandhi and N. Radhakrishan of India, Gene Sharp and Martin Luther King Jr. of the United States, Ronald Mallone of the United Kingdom, Adolfo Pérez Esquivel of Argentina, Aung San Suu Kyi of Burma, Maha Ghosananda of Cambodia, Ham Suk Hon of Korea, Dom Helder Câmara of Brazil, Sulak Sivaraksa of Thailand, A.T. Ariyaratne of Sri Lanka, Ken Saro-Wiwa of Nigeria, Lanza del Vasto and General Jacques de Bollardière of France, Aldo Capitini of Italy, Guillermo Gaviria of Colombia, Albert J. Luthuli and Desmond Tutu of South Africa, Máiread Maguire of Northern Ireland, the Dalai Lama of Tibet, among others known and yet to be known heroes and heroines of nonviolence, speak volumes of the possibility of nonkilling political leadership and that a peaceful, nonviolent and nonkilling global society is a possibility.

Conditions for Nonkilling Political Leadership

There are certain conditions that are conducive for the evolement and consolidation of nonkilling political leadership. They include:

The abolition of death penalty

Death penalty is the act of killing through judicial proceeding for retribution of certain crimes. However, death penalties undermine human dignity. Indeed, in its very nature, death penalty is a cruel and unusual punishment that violates the sanctity of life and also debases the moral code of any society that imposes it. Horak (1999) explained that the cruelty of death penalty goes beyond execution, but it includes the cruelty inherent in the whole process of the trial to the offender, his family and the law enforcement agents. It is devoid of any conclusive evidence of deterrence value and any miscarriage of justice in the course of its implementation is irreparable and cannot be reversed. Victim of state execution seizes to have human rights, which by implication, means a denial of their humanity and dignity. The cruelty of the entire process leading to state execution transverses through the lengthy period of the appeal and the clemency procedure as well as the painful wait on death row. From the perspective of the law enforcement agents, Kahn (1987) posited that "the burden of having the power of life and death over another person rest heavily on prosecutors, defense counsel and judges."

A report released by the Amnesty International shows that 139 countries have so far abolished death penalties either in law or in practice. The report classified all the countries that have outlawed death penalty into three categories viz: Those countries that outlawed death penalty for major crimes; those that outlawed death penalty for ordinary crimes; and those that have a *de facto* ban on the death penalty. For instance, Philippines abolished death penalty for all crimes in 2006, Georgia and Maldova expunged it from their constitutions and Chile, Argentina, as well as Uzbekistan joined this league of countries that have outlawed death penalty in 2008. Much recently, the abolishment of death penalty by Gabon in 2010 raised the number of African countries that have abolished death penalty to 16.

While the increase in the number of countries that have abolished death penalty is a hearty warming news, it is important

to note that the existence of laws in support of death penalty which largely represent threat to kill and the actual execution of such threat pose great danger to the 'sanctity of life', as there is no single justification to take a human life. Given that legitimate political activities by political leaders are often conducted within the ambience of the law, there is therefore the unwavering need to shape the law in support of nonkilling, if nonkilling political leadership must be realized within the 21st century. The global society needs to be urgently socialized from retributive justice that attracts death to a restorative justice that celebrates the sanctity of life. Activism to influence the nations' legislators to take urgent steps to repeal death penalty from constitutions and penal codes could be good starting point in this effort. Educating the legislators through the use of various media that fits such purpose including publication in legislative magazines on the significance and need to abolish death penalties could be another important step.

Nonkilling political leadership will remain an illusion as long as legislation in support of killings still remains for certain kinds of crime. Thus the first and basic step towards the attainment of nonkilling political leadership is the transformation of the legislations against death penalty. Global campaign in favor of the removal of death penalties from laws of countries who still uphold death penalties legislation is necessary to build up pressure globally in order to ensure all countries of the world are free from laws supporting death penalties. The Centre for Global Nonviolence and cabinet level Ministries of Peace can play key roles in this direction as well as helping to initiate and/or sustaining any existing movements as well as lobbying for the removal of death penalties from local, state and national legislations of all nations in the world.

Conscientious Objection

Despite the fact that international institutions such as the United Nations and/or the Council of Europe recognize and promote conscientious objection as fundamental human rights (Decker and Freser, 2004), many countries are yet to make legal provisions for it. Out of about one hundred countries with conscription, only about thirty do have legal provision for it, and twenty-five out of the thirty countries are in Europe. With the exception of Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, Russia, and Finland, most countries in Europe that have conscription had fulfilled to a larger extent the international guidelines on conscientious objection

legislation. In countries such as Israel and Democratic Republic of Congo, severe punishment still exists for conscientious objection.

Sean MacBride (the erstwhile assistant Secretary General of the United Nations) in his 1974 Nobel Lecture asserted that "to the right enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, one more might, with relevance, be added; it is the right to refuse to kill". There is the urgent need for the United Nations to enshrine this right in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Further, nonviolent activisms or rather peaceful social movements by networks of civil society organizations can play key roles in influencing governments to respect conscientious objection. Besides, such movement can also mount pressure on the United Nations to work towards the enshrinement of the right to refuse to kill in the universal declaration of human rights. These are essential for the realization of the promotion of nonkilling political leadership system in the global community.

Re-thinking Security and the need for Demilitarization

Today, due to changes in conflict dynamics described by Rupensinghe (1995), Rasmussen (1997), Laderack (1997) and IDEA (1998) as a shift of violence from inter-state to intra-state, there is a paradigm shift in the conceptualization of security. This has orchestrated the need to redefine security away from the traditional view of border or territorial protection from external attack to the more contemporary concept of human security which centers on meeting the needs of the people within the borders as a priority. This new insight construes security in the light of environment, health, and economic matters as well as factors such as diseases, famine and drought which are necessarily not defined by national boundaries. This new perspective is crucial to the understanding of enemy from human to factors of human insecurity, hence helping to define common enemies that all human must collectively confront. In a nutshell, given the contemporary turn of events, the term security encompasses transnational and international issues that include the provision of basic needs, poverty reduction, disease control as well as environmental management.

Therefore to break the cycle of k, adequate understanding and prompt effort to address the structural and cultural forces driving people into violence becomes a matter of necessity. Fresh understanding of security reflects the idea that struc-

tural and cultural violence are as much threats as direct violence (Galtung, 1990; Mitchell, 1990; Laderach, 1997). The correction of the structural and cultural disequilibrium or inequality couple with the provision of the peoples' basic needs will unequivocally promote security and build peace. Furthermore, the orientation of the people to nonkilling concept together with the existence of nonkilling political leadership both of which are capable of influencing the people in no small measure remain a potent weapon for sustenance of peace.

Table 1. Defense Budget Estimates

Rank	Country	Spending ($ b.)	World Share (%)	% of GDP, 2008
-	World Total	1321.19	100	-
1	United States	904.0	41.5	4.3
2	China	84.9	5.8	2.0
3	France	65.7	4.5	2.3
4	United Kingdom	65.3	4.5	2.5
5	Russia	58.6	4.0	3.5
6	Germany	46.8	3.2	1.3
7	Japan	46.3	3.2	0.9
8	Italy	40.6	2.8	1.7
9	Saudi Arabia	38.2	2.6	8.2
10	India	32.7	2.1	2.6

Source: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Experience has even shown that the use of military in intrastate lethality has the tendency to aggravate such violence with its sequelae such as poverty and human rights abuse. The maintenance of military outfit has been one of the major activities gulping many nations several billions of dollars, which further worsens the limited resource base available for fighting global factors of human insecurity. The breakdown of investment of 10 countries with the highest defense budget in 2008 presented in the table below, readily buttress this view. As obvious from the table, the total world spending on defense amounted to $1.321 trillion USD in 2008.

The third world countries especially the African nations appear to be worst hit by this huge investment in military weapons. The submission by William (1998:26) that an enormous quantity of military weapons have been purchased around the world under the guise of self-determination and freedom with such expenditures impeding economic development, readily established this fact. It is no exaggeration that these nations had been denying their

people basic economic rights under the guise of military readiness to protect the right to self-determination and freedom. This experience is very pathetic especially in Africa where over 300 million people are living below one dollar per day and where average life expectancy is not more than 48 as well as over a third of all children are suffering from malnutrition (Oxfam, 2002).

Table 2. Arms Exports

#	Supplier	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
1	USA	7220	5694	5091	5596	6750	6600	7394	7658	6090	6795
2	Russia	3985	6011	5773	5202	6260	5321	6156	5243	6026	4469
3	Germany	1603	821	892	1697	1067	1875	2510	3002	2499	2473
4	France	1055	1270	1308	1288	2194	1633	1577	2342	1831	1851
5	UK	1484	1257	915	617	1180	915	808	987	1027	1024
6	Spain	46	7	120	156	56	108	757	565	603	925
7	China	272	496	515	632	282	306	599	412	544	870
8	Israel	354	360	414	358	612	315	282	379	271	760
9	NL	280	203	243	342	208	583	1221	1322	554	608
10	Italy	189	217	400	312	214	743	525	706	424	588
11	Sweden	46	830	185	515	305	537	417	367	457	353
12	Switz.	176	193	157	174	250	267	306	324	467	270
13	Ukraine	288	661	244	430	202	281	557	799	269	214
14	Canada	110	129	170	255	268	235	231	343	236	177
15	S. Korea	8	165	N/A	104	29	48	94	228	80	163

NB: The trend indicator values in the table below are in millions of US dollars at 1990s prices. Source: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Unfortunately as reflected on the table below, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, who incidentally drives the UN decision-making power, are the highest dealers in arms. The implication of this is that, any rational move at reducing military interventions and curtailing the production as well as the procurement of weapons of mass destruction and promoting peaceful resolution of conflicts should start with establishment of a UN General Assembly and a UN World Parliamentary Assembly that will be saddled with the responsibility of UN decision-making as against the current structure whereby these primary arms dealers and biggest military spenders are key stakeholders in UN decision making process.

In addition, there is a need to realize and appreciate in the cycle of governance that a nonkilling approach that incorporates nonmilitary means or civilian peace force is effective in the resolution of any security threat. The Africa Union symposium while addressing the issue of the best means to provide peace and security at the regional level recognized the need to create a 'security community' that goes beyond international boundaries in which the resolution of conflicts by something else other than

peaceful means is unthinkable (Inter-Africa Group, 2002: 2). A regional security community is a network of governments, civil society, private and public sectors as well as the ordinary citizens. The development of common security may involve the formation of co-operative research and monitoring centers, situated in one country but staffed by regional professionals who form part of lose networks of conflict management groupings that spread across national boundaries. However, the basic requirements for achieving a common security include (Inter-Africa Group, 2002: 3):

- Developing early warning mechanisms that enhance capability to identify, analyze, and act upon evolving conflict situations.
- Integrating the civil societies towards the common goal of building a common security community that is jointly owned by all.
- Enhancing best practices that are essential for legal and political governance within and across regional boundaries.

Equally essential for the promotion of nonkilling within the global society is demilitarization. The shifting paradigm of the conceptualization of security from boundary related to human security in contemporary time provides the basic foundation for demilitarization. The possibility of nonmilitary statehood has been largely demonstrated by countries without armies. Barbey (2001) in Paige (2002) listed examples of these countries viz: Costa Rica, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Kiribati, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Mauritius, Nauru Panama, Saint Kitts and Nervis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Vatican. Others are, Andorra, Cook Islands, Iceland, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Monaco, Niue, and Palau. Political leaderships in the aforementioned countries have demonstrated the possibility of conducting the business of governance without the military. The use of military in political leadership does not only advance the science of killing, but also promotes the use of force in dealing with disputes which of course is not appropriate. The use of force or violence to achieve 'peace' has the tendency to corrupt the victor, as such, make positive peace unattainable. The military often affects human rights negatively and this usually breeds more violence that in many cases resulting in loss of lives. Political leadership involving the use of military as defense or security has a way of promoting killing, both direct and

structural killing. The structural killing often manifest in the negative impact military investment has on other sectors of the economy, human security, and development.

Except various civil society organizations and individuals rise against this infamous development, the trend may continue. The time has come for the masses to nonviolently stampede the ugly trend while still operating within Gene Sharp conceptualization of power from pluralistic dimension. There is a need for virile public education and widespread campaign against amassing weapons of destruction and fat defense budget through newspaper articles, radio jingles, academic conferences, workshops and seminars. The use of hand bills, bill boards, and community mobilization approach to disseminate information on the need for nonkilling political leadership system and the need to stop wasteful spending on military weapons, will also be very helpful.

Nonlethal weapons

Nonlethal weapons are those technologies as well as systems intended for accomplishing missions without using direct lethal force against people and materials or damaging property and the environment (Alexander, 1995). Examples of nonlethal weapons include: pepper spray, special demobilization devices like sticky foams, nonlethal landmines—valuable in capturing target person(s) in large nets, nonlethal barrier systems such as directed-energy microwave, anti-materiel agents like entanglements, flash/bang devices, stun weapons, and nonpenetrating projectiles like rubber bullets, among others.

The possibility of the utility of nonlethal weapons to advance the course of nonlethality and yet bring frictional situations under control, nonetheless was brought to fore by the success recorded in their application to support United Nations Forces withdrawal from Somalia in 1995. It is however important to note that nonlethal weapons systems are not designed to cause fatal injury (Alexander, 1995). They are usually nonexplosives and by their designed or composition could inflict transient pain but should not cause irreparable damage to the target person(s) or groups. Their relevance in specialized combat is due to their nonexplosive quality as well as their ability not to cause irreparable damage on their targets. In view of their effectiveness and the possibility of increasing their availability, it has therefore become imperative to discard the use of lethal weapons and respect the sanctity of life in the present dispensation. New

wave of law enforcement and conflict management must be adapted within the confine of the suitability of nonlethal weapons application as a direct replacement of the existing lethal weapons.

As nonlethal capabilities advance from novelty to norm, however, many potential pitfalls and barriers to their efficient and effective development would have to be identified and overcome. If nonlethal capabilities are to achieve their full potential, policymakers will need to take a variety of steps as a matter of urgency to deal with these problems (Alexander, 1995). First, it will be necessary for policymakers to evaluate nonlethal weapon system application concepts, doctrinal, tactics, training, and logic support, alongside the gains and limitations of nonlethal weapons with a view to exploring the opportunities such weapons provide especially their capabilities and applications in effecting corrective measures within the context of nonkilling. Beyond that, existing international agreement posing constraints to the furtherance of nonlethal weapons needs to be adjusted. There is also the need to re-evaluate such agreements and present a case for policymakers to assess in timely manner the cost benefit effect of the use of nonlethal weapons and the cost of negotiating adjustment for such agreements.

While the use of nonlethal weapons and force appears critical to the promotion of nonkilling political leadership, peacekeeping operations, and the activities of Civilian Peace Forces in the global society, further researches are necessary to develop and advance its applications in order to ensure that it truly conforms to nonkilling in all its ramifications.

Yet significant is the need global campaign against the production and sales of arms and ammunition. This is in view of the fact that proliferation of small arms and ammunition over the years played key roles in fanning armed conflict between governments and rebels or insurgent groups as well as between and among various government and nongovernment groups or organizations that have pitch tent against one another at one point or the other in the past. Such campaigns and sensitization to curb arms sales will go a long way in debunking the fallacious claim of gains inherent in arm trade.

Disarmament and Nonproliferation

It has become more necessary for global policy makers and members of the civil society to increase their effort not only towards the bringing into force the comprehensive Nuclear-

Test-Ban Treaty but also towards concluding negotiations on Fissile Material cut-off Treaty as well as intensifying advocacy for treaty in support of overall elimination of nuclear materials in the world. Nuclear weapons according to Evans and Kawaguchi (2010) are inherently indiscriminate in those they killed and maimed and their impacts often last for decades. They stated further that they are the only weapons invented so far, that have the capacity to totally destroy life on the earth planet.

At present, there are at least 23,000 nuclear warheads with a combined blast capacity equal to 150,000 Hiroshima bombs. Literature reveals that of this 150,000 the US and Russia possesses over 22,000 while France, UK, China, India, Pakistan and Israel owned the remaining 1,000. Sadly enough, nearly half of these warheads are still operationally deployed, and the US and Russia still keep 2,000 weapons on dangerously high alert, ready to be launched in the event of perceived attack within a decision window of 4-8 minutes (Evans and Kawaguchi, 2010). The existence or possession of nuclear weapons by certain states naturally stimulates other states to want to acquire their own nuclear weapons with resultant proliferation of nuclear weapons. There is therefore no guarantee that one day they will not be used either by sheer accident, miscalculation or design. This development is posing great danger to human life especially considering that the cold war years command systems were consistently strained by false alarms. With more nuclear-armed states now, and more system vulnerabilities, the near miracle of no nuclear exchange cannot continue in perpetuity (Evans and Kawaguchi, 2010: 2). Beyond this, the amassment of nuclear weapons even under the guise of deterrence is unhealthy to the efforts towards the institutionalization of peace in the world.

To this end, it has become imperative for the global citizen to reject the aforesaid development as the concept of nonkilling takes root in our minds and the society at large. If nuclear energy must be contemplated, it must completely be for peaceful uses, and by this it becomes crucial to increase global awareness on the significant of the three S's—safeguards, security and safety. Nonetheless, there is the growing apprehension that even at that, it may "present some additional security risks, especially if it will be associated with the construction of new national facilities for enrichment at the front end of the cycle and reprocessing at the back end; it could mean a great deal

more fissile material becoming potentially available for destructive purposes" (Evans and Kawaguchi, 2010).

In essence, there is the need for a change of orientation from the present strategic thinking of the use of nuclear weapons for productive purposes to a total nonkeeping and nonutility of nuclear weapon in the global society. As a follow up, there is equally the need to develop and build formidable support for comprehensive and all encompassing nuclear weapon conventions in order to legally underpin the transition to a world free from nuclear weapons.

It has become even more crucial to build a global network of civil society organizations committed to the building and implementation of treaty to ban nuclear weapons. This is indispensable to the realization of a nonkilling political leadership system in the world. The establishment of monitoring and advocacy centre(s) designed to serve as focal points and clearing house for various institutions and organizations on what is to be done, how is to be done, and what has been done so far as regards the issue of disarmament and nonproliferation nuclear weapons has thus become a matter of urgency. Lastly, such structure should be designed to conduct research and other general and specific advocacy supports to further consolidate efforts towards the attainment of nuclear weapon-free society that will enhance the development and sustenance of nonkilling political leadership system and nonkilling global society in general.

Nonkilling Education

The Hawaii based nonkilling leadership academy has set the background for a formal nonkilling studies or educational programs. The establishment of such academy in other countries of the world will not only be relevant to the promotion of nonkilling political leadership system but also in the realization of killing-free societies in the world. Furthermore, nonkilling political leadership studies that are problem-solving oriented can be enhanced by the introduction of curricula in nonkilling political leadership into the General Studies Program of higher educations institutions. Such programs can also be structured for high schools and primary school children. Just like violence was learnt from the environment, violence as well as the lack of value and respect for the sanctity of human life can also be unlearned. Early exposure to nonkilling educational programs especially during the formative stages in life is no doubt vital to achieving the desired result.

Nonkilling Political Leadership

In addition, the promotion of nonkilling political leadership study for the benefit of current political leaders or prospective political leaders are also essential for the realization of nonkilling political leadership. One organization that could be of great help in this direction is UNESCO through the provision of platform that facilitates nonkilling political leadership training such as workshops, seminars, retreats, etc., for these group of people. Paige (1993) advocated that for current leaders, small informal seminars like that of Aspen Institute will be suitable and the creation of short, interesting and useful learning programs (that may take the format of audio visual presentation and lasting for an hour as the case may be) for each leader and their advisers, especially the key ones. It will be worthwhile also to extend such educational programs and trainings to the followers. Renowned Universities and other international organizations such as EU, AU, etc, could also lend support in respect of this noble course of educating current and prospective political leaders in nonkilling political leadership. The establishment of Nonkilling Democratic Political Leadership Institute or Institute for Nonkilling Political Leadership Studies by the United Nations University and other relevant educational institutions will also be potent instrument in the furtherance of nonkilling political leadership agenda.

However, in order to ensure a wider reach and sustain the gains accruable from the nonkilling political leadership program, there is a need for formal investigations or researches on techniques appropriate for the promotion of such learning in nonformal educational way while also publishing books and other literature works on nonkilling political leadership studies. As good as this may sound, it may forever remain a dream without the support of funders and international organizations in terms of releasing grants and sponsorship for this bid. In fact, the role of nonkilling literature, research and academic publications as well as nonkilling leadership academy in nonkilling learning and nonkilling political leadership studies and practice cannot be over-emphasized. The media is equally important in promoting nonkilling education and mass orientation of people on the concept of nonkilling. Media advocacy support is therefore vital in the journey towards nonkilling political leadership system and a killing free society in general. The use of media, online trainings approach and distance learning as well as travelling seminar groups constituted by nonkilling leadership fellow also remain crucial to the promotion of nonkilling political leadership studies.

Nonkilling Student Movements

The creation of nonkilling student movements especially in higher institutions has the possibility of introducing a significant dimension to the call for nonkilling political leadership system in the global society. The movements will primarily focus on initiating and advancing nonviolent campaigns for nonkilling political leadership system and killing-free societies. This nonkilling perspective can be popularized through series of workshops, trainings, seminars, symposia, etc which expectedly will result in the promotion of the concept of nonkilling political leadership system and nonkilling in general. This surely will further help to orientate and develop nonkilling mindset in students who are the cream of future political leaders of any society. The role played by student organizations in many liberation campaigns in different parts of the world, especially at forging paradigm shifts in many social issues and ideologies in the global societies cannot be ignored. In the United States for instance, a group of African-American students, initiated the civil rights movement that eventually thrusts into leadership the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.", Paige (2002), hence the indispensability of nonkilling student movements in the drive towards entrenchment of nonkilling political leadership.

Nonkilling Political Parties

Nonkilling political parties are imperative to the attainment of nonkilling political leadership. Such political parties must be designed within the framework of need-responsive processes for the welfare of every member of the society, and shall indeed be structured to give voice to the collective interests of all, as well as advancing nonkilling conditions of social welfare, equal participation, justice and freedom. As submitted by Paige (2002), nonkilling political parties are logical institutions to help bring about nonkilling social transformation. Such political parties need to emerge creatively in concept, name, organisation, and activities that are within the context of specific socio-cultural conditions (Paige, 2002). A practical way to move from theory to practice is to initiate advocacy for the formation of such political parties that enshrine the principles of nonkilling and the education of electorates and politicians alike on the whole idea of nonkilling political party.

Institutionalization of peace

The Institutionalization of peace is of immense importance to the promotion of nonkilling political leadership and killing-free society. Stated differently, the elimination of direct, structural and cultural triggers for killing or killing-enhancing factors from multiple sites of the societies including socio-economic structures, the interaction between man and its environment, as well as social institutions at formal and informal levels, all of which facilitate peaceful co-existence have become necessary in the present dispensation.

More importantly, the proliferation of cabinet level Ministries of Peace and other peace infrastructures across many nations will further enhance the promotion of a culture of peace and nonviolence which is vital to the entrenchment of the concept of nonkilling within governmental framework and the society at large. The presence of such cabinet level of peace structures has the tendency to increase government commitment to the promotion of peace and nonviolence in the society. It is the responsibility of such peace structure to tackle conflicts from their root causes and also help to diminish the military option of conflict management which often results in destruction of life and property. This corroborates Suter (1984: 40) assertion that the proposal for Ministry of Peace did not emerge from vacuum but for the pressing need to find alternatives to arms race and to design new whole order for peace. According to him, such structure has immense potentials to play key role in the injection of peace perspective and institutionalization of peace in government which are consistent with professionalization of peace process while ensuring that the peacemakers voices are heard within the decision making cycle of governance. This is sine qua non for the attainment of nonkilling political leadership.

Perhaps, it is important to state at this juncture that the Global Alliance has been playing key roles in supporting national campaigns in different countries of the world for the creation of Ministry and Departments of Peace. While such efforts have been yielding result, there is nonetheless the need for an increased support from a cross section of civil society organizations, individuals, business organizations, and political gladiators to further consolidate the call for the establishment of Ministries of Peace in governments all over the world. This no doubt, will

foster efforts at institutionalizing peace as well as the entrenchment of the concept of nonkilling in governments worldwide.

The overall function of the Ministry of Peace is to build a culture of peace and nonviolence which are basic to the promotion of nonkilling in the society. However, this will involve a number of specific tasks such as the promotion of: peace education, restorative justice, equality, peacemaking, civilian peacekeeping or peace support operations, nonviolent conflict resolution, disarmament, respectful relationship and friendship, foreign and national peace policies, as well as healing the wounds of violence. Since the eradication of underdevelopment and the institutionalized poverty within a social system are regarded as signs of peace (Elias and Turpin, 1994), the Ministry of Peace therefore has as part of its mandate, the tackling of these challenges and other structural and cultural violence in the societies.

Other peace infrastructures such as the National Peace Council in Ghana, the District Peace Councils in Kenya, and a host of others, remain relevant in this effort to institutionalise peace and promote a culture of peace and nonkilling. For instance, the National Peace Council was instrumental to the 2008 political transition in Ghana which occurred peacefully. Prior to its creation, the frequency and intensity of violence especially between 1980 and 2002 during which about 23 armed conflicts were recorded was high. The armed conflict that erupted in 2006 claimed the life of the then King of Dagbon and many of his elders. The post election violence experienced in Kenya in 2007 also led to the creation of district committees by the National Accord and Reconciliation Act 2008. Wachira (2008) observed that during those periods of violence in Kenya, districts with peace committee reported less violence. It could also be recalled that the initiative of district committees later adopted by the government in 2008, was earlier initiated in the local communities by the Wajir Peace and Development Committee and the success recorded by the group led to the spread of the model to other parts of Kenya. This further strengthens the importance of these infrastructures for peace in conflict resolution and peace-building and by extension the cultivation of the concept of nonkilling. One can therefore appreciate the Paul Van Tongeren led global campaigns for the creation of peace infrastructures in different countries of the world. It is important to increase the network of such campaign to allow more grassroots organisations and

many other civil society organisations to connect and play key roles in advancing such advocacy.

Human Right to Peace

The Santiago de Compostela 2010 Declaration of human rights to peace added another dimension to the world campaign for human rights of individuals, groups and people to peace. The need to: protect victims from uncontrolled weapons of mass destruction and from conventional weapons, genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and sexual violence and ensure redress for the victims; strengthen the exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and linguistic rights; enhance social justice, equity and gender equality as well as elimination of extreme poverty; enable solidarity, peace and friendly relations among all nations, races, ethnicities or religions; are some of the information contained in the Santiago declaration document. The Santiago congress, in which the Center for Global Nonkilling actively participated, also endorsed a statute of the International Observatory on the Human Rights to Peace. This campaign together with other efforts to institutionalize peace is relevant to the attainment of nonkilling political leadership system and killing-free societies.

Peace as a human right is significant in the prevention of wars and in addressing the root causes of violence as well as in the monitoring of those who foment armed conflict, including bringing to justice the perpetrators of armed conflict. The progress report of Santiago declaration, considered peace "as the absence of organized violence, the effective protection of human rights, gender equality and social justice, economic well being and free expression of different cultural values, without discrimination".

While the ongoing efforts in support for human rights to peace by civil society organizations is commendable, there is however the need to further enlarge the campaign network to include other existing international, national, and local initiatives as well as mobilize more conscious individuals to support the movement that encourages humans to push for peace as a human right through a more solid legal framework. This ultimately will mount more pressure on the United Nations to pass the human right to peace as a fundamental human right. The passing of the human right to peace by UN will help to prohibit the glorification of war,

promote right to disarmament among others which are necessary for the attainment of nonkilling political leadership system.

Spirituality

Spirituality is vital to the institutionalization of peace. The importance of spirituality towards the attainment of nonkilling political leadership and a nonkilling culture in our society cannot be over-emphasized. Indeed, the search for a killing free society and killing free political leadership in the absence of spirituality may amount to an exercise in futility. According to Paige (1997) the development of nonkilling societies, is rooted in the spiritual heritage of humankind.

The term spirituality can be defined as "a continuing search for meaning and purpose in life; an appreciation for the depth of life, the expanse of the universe, and the natural force which operates' a belief system" (Myer, 1990). This search for meaning and a sense of purpose in life is a key component of the manifestation of spirituality (Bhugra and Osbourne, 2004; Cobb and Frey, 2001). To Legere (1984) it is experiential but beyond this it offers cultural and personal meaning to life. It is a part of a belief system which gives personal identity. Doyle (1992) as cited in Aldridge (2000) viewed spirituality as searching for existential meaning. Furthermore, Tracy (2005) declared that value and purpose rather than finances or social status are the only effective nourishment for the soul, and that the meaning that emerged from one's link with the transcendence is the desire of the soul.

Another manifestation of spirituality is its impact on individuals with resultant increasing commitment "to the actualization of positive potential in all aspects of life" (Elkins, et al., 1988: 11). Spiritual development often refines one's spirit being and awakens one's insight to one's potentials while at the same time activating one's energy towards the actualization of one's potentials. All these are critical to peaceable life in the sense that they facilitate the internalization of values for the sanctity of life and the obedience to the God's commandment that 'thou shall not kill'.

Spirituality is also manifested in the realization of one's interconnectedness with other living beings. The real experience of this feeling can only be activated through spirituality, and it enables spiritually inclined human to value others and regards all as one, thus further helping to build a culture of harmonious relationship and killing-free society. Rogers (1990), viewed human as energy fields which constitutes a key component of

the environmental fields, and experiences an incessant, mutual systematic process of change. A sense of interconnectedness may also be showcased through dedication to selfless love and action (Elkins et al., 1988), and love and forgiveness toward others (Hungelmann et al., 1985; Stoll, 1989).

Elkins identified selfless concern for the welfare of others as another manifestation of spirituality describing it as being touched by the pain and suffering of others, and having a strong sense of social justice. Banks, Poehler and Russell (1984: 17) reported that a "sense of selflessness and a feeling for others; a willingness to do more for others than for yourself" is also a very significant part of the spiritual dimension. Carson (1989) in his own writing simply associated spiritual development as service. Some other writers linked spirituality with love, caring, wisdom, imagination, forgiveness, and compassion, as well as other qualities which constitute the act of care for others (Dossey, 1989; Krieger, 1981; Reed, 1992; Rew, 1989; Stuart et al., 1989). These traits to my mind are sine-qua-non to development of nonkilling political leadership system and entrenchment of peaceful interrelationship in the society.

Spirituality is also translated as a sense of connectedness with a transcendent or supreme being. Donnelly and Sutterley (1989) posited that to be spiritual means to stay "connected—to one's inner self, and to other persons as well as to a transcendent being or energy". This sense of connections is helpful in valuing one's life, the lives of others and God in such a way that destruction of such valuable lives becomes unthinkable for a spiritually-inclined political leader as well as members of the society at large from where successive political leaders are drawn.

Spirituality is critical to faith tradition. Religion is a formative part of our identity, and since it is part of personal identity, then spirituality must be the essence of the development of our personal and collective identity (Tatum, 1997) and of course transcends the concept of identity. Spiritual values like tolerance, reconciliation, socio-respect, harmony, love, peace, and respect for the sanctity of life, are critical to a culture of nonkilling and in laying a viable background for nonkilling political leadership in our society. In fact, spiritual self-respect is inter-link with substantial respect for others, and the ultimate desire to share peace and freedom as well as shun the act of killing.

The abstinence of political leadership from the misuse of religion for power striving goals and in influencing their visions

and policies, is critical to the attainment of nonkilling political leadership and nonkilling society. While it is true that religious sentiments have been used perversely to meet certain selfish and self-centered goals of many political leaders and members of the political class, it is suffice to say that political leadership entangled in power craving national politics, with a twisted vision of dictating the rest of the world, further spiced up by religious fundamentalists, are largely implicated in the threats of terrorism that confronts the world today. According to Paige (1997: 100) "religions have been engaged to incite and bless unspeakable slaughter. But within each faith the main message has been to respect life and not to kill…The test need not rest only upon selected scriptural passages, but needs to be seen in light of teaching as a whole, and the lives of the faithful in each tradition who have found inspiration in nonkilling commitment". If the common values of 'respect for the sanctity of life' contained in all religions holy books are rightly shared and practiced, the global views would no doubt be consensual and unanimous in text and fervor of nonkilling.

While it is true that the world cannot survive properly without a new global ethic, religions however is basic and essential to the realization of such ethic, and in the entrenchment, enhancement and consolidation of a culture of nonkilling within the sphere of political leadership and the society at large. Hans Küngs' thesis that there cannot be world peace without religious peace is right. Religious peace is important bedrock to a culture of peace and nonviolence, which in turn is the building block of a culture of nonkilling. As such, to transform the armed conflicts and various killings including political killings the world is currently faced with, there is the need to unravel the conceptions of peace within the context of our diverse religious and cultural traditions that support nonkilling.

It is even common knowledge that every religion professes peace and 'not to kill' in all societies. It is also known that the basic values of tolerance, respect for the sanctity of life, peace, love, among others, are components of all religious books, and are meant to lay the basic foundation for a peaceful and prosperous society. As a matter of fact, the commonality of basic values of life and living as observed with all religions when internalized would naturally makes men to share common views on issues confronting them and their environment.

While religious Organizations, religion leaders and interfaith Organizations have immense roles to play in efforts geared at promoting the concept of nonkilling through the lens of spirituality, the onus to advance such concept in the context of spirituality, should nonetheless be limited to aforesaid groups, rather, there is the timely need for researchers and academics in the field of peace science, political science, among others, including social activists, private individuals, agencies and research institutions, government and all a sundry to compliment the roles of spiritual leaders, in order to consolidate the effort towards the promotion of the religious or spiritual commonalities of nonkilling in the global society. Despite the substantive differentials that exist among various religions of the world, as Appleby says, "One can trace a moral trajectory challenging adherents to greater acts of compassion, forgiveness, and reconciliation" (Appleby, 2000). Emphasis on spiritual virtues such as love, tolerance, sanctity of life, peace, respect, etc. common to all religious teachings as well as emphasizing what bind us together as a people rather than the uniqueness of individual religious organizations is unequivocally essential in moving towards a nonkilling social system.

Academic publications, Books, Media publicity, social networks sites (e.g face-book, twitter), seminars and workshops among others, are important tools for the promotion of religious commonalities relevant to the attainment of nonkilling political leadership system and a nonkilling global society at large.

Conclusion

While nonkilling political leadership system is a possibility, the input of all segments of the society is necessary for its realization. From the foregoing, the attainment of nonkilling political leadership system largely depends on the afore-discussed conditions which among others include the institutionalization of peace through the establishment of Ministries and Departments of Peace by governments all over the world as well as the creation of peace infrastructures and development in spirituality. Consequently, empirical research, publication and production of books as well as nonviolent campaigns are germane to moving from theory to practice and the overall realization of nonkilling political leadership system and a world that works for us all.

References

Alexander, Lexi R. Issues in Science and Technology. National Academy of Sciences Journal, 12(2) 1995.

Appleby, R. Scott (2000), op. cit., p. 35.

Decker, D. Christopher and Lucia Fresa: "The Status of Conscientious Objection Under Article 4 of The European Convention On Human Rights, 33 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 379 (2000)". New York University School of Law, Issues - Volume 33. 2001.

Diamond, L. and McDonald, J., Multi-track diplomacy: a system approach to peace, Kumarian press, West Hartford, Conn. 1996.

Elias Robert and Turpin Jennifer: "Thinking About Peace", (eds.) Rethinking Peace (Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994.)

Galtung, Johan, Cultural Violence, Journal of peace research, 27 no. 3 (1990): 291-305

Horak, J. 1999. Reintroduction of death penalty in South Africa: Fighting crime or winning votes? SAPR/PL 414.

Harris, Geoff. 'Ministries of Peacebuilding in Sub-Saharan Africa: Rationale, Functions and Establishment'. African Security Review, volume 20 no. 1 (2011).

InterAfrica Group/Justice Africa, The Africa Union and Peace and security, Issues paper for the African Union symposium: challenges for the Africa Union. 2002

International Peace Research Association (IPRA), International Institute of Peace Studies and Global Philosophy, IPRA Newsletter, 2001.

Jankowski, P. J. (2002). Postmodern spirituality: Implications for promoting change. Counseling and Values, 46, 69-79.

Kahn, C. 1987. How did we get our lopsided law on the imposition of the death penalty for common law crimes? And what should we do about it? SACJ, 146.

Küng, Hans, 1990.

Laderach, John. Building Peace. Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies, United States Institutes of Peace press, Washington DC. 1997.

Legere, T. E. A spirituality for today. Studies in formative spirituality (Vol. 5). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University, 1984.

Maisiri, Trevor, A New Political Leadership Discharged. (African Reform Institute, 2009).

Mitchell, Christopher. Necessitous man and conflict resolution: more basic questions about basic human needs theory. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 1990.

Myers, J. E. Wellness through the lifespan. Guidepost, 1990. p. 11.

Oxfam 2002, Africa at the crossroads: time to deliver, *Oxfam Briefing Paper* 19,

Oxfam, Oxford.

Paige, Glenn D. To Nonviolent Political Science. From Season to Violence. Centre for Global Nonviolence, Honololu Hawaii. 1993.

Paige, Glenn D. Nonkilling Global Political Science. Centre for Global Nonviolence, Honololu, Hawaii. 2002.

Rasmussen, J. Lewis. "Peacemaking in the Twenty-First century: New Rules, New Roles, New Actors". Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

Rupesinghe, Kumar. Violence and its transformation. Stockholm International Research Institute. 1995

Suter, Keith. The Australian Campaign for a Ministry for Peace, United Nations Association of Australia. UNAA peace program 1984. UNAA publications.

Suter, Keith. National Ministries of Peacebuilding, in G. Harris (ed.), Achieving Security in sub-Saharan Africa: Cost Effective Alternatives to the Military, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2004.

Wachira, George, Red State, Blue State: Citizens in Action: Making Peace in the Post-election Crisis in Kenya - 2008. Nairobi Peace Initiative-Africa, 2010.

William, F. Felice "Militarism and Human Rights: A trade off?" International Affairs, volume 74 No. 1, 1998.

Guidelines for Contributions

Following the Center for Global Nonkilling's mission of "promoting change toward the measurable goal of a killing-free world", the *Global Nonkilling Working Papers* are dedicated to theory and research incorporating original scientific works that tackle issues related to the construction of nonkilling societies, where killing, threats to kill and conditions conductive to killing are absent. The series have a multidisciplinary perspective, open both to theoretical and empirical works on topics such as:

- Nonkilling and neuro-bioscience
- Nonkilling and gender relations
- Nonkilling and education
- Nonkilling and economics
- Nonkilling and the environment
- Nonkilling and the media
- Nonkilling, science, and technology
- Nonkilling in spiritual and philosophical traditions
- Nonkilling and the arts
- Nonkilling and sports
- Nonkilling and the professions
- Role of the military and police in nonkilling social transformation
- Nonkilling futures
- Nonkilling and leadership

A wider list of possible research topics can be found in the two following publications: *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (2002; 2009) by Glenn D. Paige and *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm* (2009), edited by Joám Evans Pim, both available for free download.

The series are published on an occasional basis as texts are delivered by authors and reviewed by the Nonkilling Research Committees. Every issue will be distributed both on print and on-line, and will be available for free download through the Center's website. Authors will remain as sole holders of the legal copyright for their texts, but a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 will be applied through the series to guarantee wide distribution and fair educational use.

Authors must submit a title, a 100 word summary and a 80 word biographical sketch, prior to acceptance of the complete proposal. After approval, authors will have four months to complete the final text, with an extension between 10,000 and 20,000 words. The Chicago Manual of Style should be used for reference.

For additional information contact Editor Joám Evans Pim at jevans@nonkilling.org

Published Issues

1. **Are Humans Inherently Killers?** A Critique by Robert Sussman and Joshua Marshack Followed by a Response by Richard Wrangham (2010).
2. **Examining Domestic Violence as a State Crime: Nonkilling Implications**. By Laura L. Finley (2010).
3. **Nonkilling Political Science: A Critical Evaluation**. By Balwant Bhaneja, Joám Evans Pim, Piki Ish-Shalom, Chaiwat Satha-Anand and Yoon-Jae Chung (2010).
4. **Socioeconomic Democracy: A Nonkilling, Life-Affirming and Enhancing Psycho-Politico-Socio-Economic System**. By Robley E. George (2010).
5. **The Mark of Cain A Depth Psychology Commentary on the Nonkilling Paradigm**. By Ramon Lopez-Reyes, Lt.Col. (2013).
6. **Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society**. By Maorong Jiang (2013).
7. **Political Art and Craft: The Story of Nonkilling Global Political Science**. By Clayton K. Edwards (2013).
8. **Nonkilling Political Leadership**. By Oseremen Irene (2013).
9. **Ethnicity and Nation Building in Contemporary Africa: A Perspective for Nonkilling**. By Emmy Irobi (2013).