

Final Draft - 26.7.05



**The NGO Committee on
Spirituality, Values and Global
Concerns - CSVGC**

Panel Report

27 Demilitarized States in the World : Utopia or Reality for the Right to Development with Peace and Security?

During the UN Human Rights Commission

April 14th 2005

Palais des Nations – United Nations, Geneva



Geneva – Switzerland – May 2005



The NGO Committee on Spirituality, Values and Global Concerns



Panel title:

27 Demilitarized States in the World :
Utopia or Reality for the Right to Development with Peace and Security?

At the panel, launch of the
***“Appeal to the UN:
A Call for Spiritual Empowerment”***

Introduction

by **Rudolf Schneider**, Chair, NGO Committee on Spirituality, Values and Global Concern (CSVGC)

Presentation

by **Elly Pradervand**, board of the NGO CSVGC, Women’s World Summit Foundation (WWSF)

Panellists included:

- **Christophe Barbey**, Association for Demilitarization (APRED) author of a book on the 27 countries with no army
- **Conchita Poncini**, International University Women
- **Michel Monod**, Fellowship of Reconciliation - Swiss Group for No Army

Chair:

Astrid Stuckelberger, Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues

Countries with no Army:

Andorra, Costa-Rica, Cook Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Iceland, Kiribati, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia, Monaco, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Panama, Samoa, San-Marino, St.-Kitts and Nevis, St.-Lucia, St.-Vincent and the Grenadines, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Vatican

Introduction to the panel

Astrid Stuckelberger

Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues, CSVGC

Today, military forces are taking the stage and encouraging its development in the name of security and peace. It is often done at the detriment of investing in development, health and anti-poverty programmes and denying the right to development by imposing the right to security. The expenditure on the military forces and armament has been increasing at the cost of allocating funds to development, it is often stated by leaders in the world that the richest nations and people are getting richer and the poorer are getting poorer... We also have more and more evidence on the privatization of the military and armed forces actions.

According to a report lead by a group of UN-appointed military experts, 'The relationship Between Disarmament and Development in the Current International Context' and presented at the 59th Session of the UN General Assembly in 2004, „After declining in the post-Cold War era of the early 1990s, global military spending is on the rise again - threatening to break the one trillion dollars barrier this year. By contrast, rich nations spend 50-60 billion dollars on development aid each year.“ The world richest nations are increasing their spending on military and war which we all know destroys and impoverishes the very center of people's life and of the functioning of a nation instead of bringing hope and safe homes to people in the world....

Two facts are often forgotten:

- 1) the "Société des Nations" in Geneva and the United Nations were created after the two first World Wars in order to ensure peace and diminish the race for nuclear armament, conscious of the fear of global nuclear self-destruction;
- 2) while some 27 nations in this world either have never had any army or are demilitarized states, others bluntly display their 'weapon power' as a sign of 'superpower' gaining respect by fear, a typical feature of men-led power pattern.

The Committee on Spirituality, Values and Global Concern CSVGC, has grabbed the opportunity to address for the first time the value of demilitarized states. One objective is to identify the options to peace and security, and see how States and civil society could set a new and 'higher way' to think and live together while ensuring the right to development with the right to peace... We welcome our panelists and thank them warmly for accepting to join us for this first panel.

Introduction to the Appeal

Rudolf Schneider

Chair CSVGC, Institute for Planetary Synthesis

A warm welcome to our panelists and to all of you in the audience. We thank you for your participation in our group discussion on non-militarised States in a time when more and more weapons are spread over the planet.

The CSVGC members agreed to begin every meeting organised by the Committee with a minute of silence, in order to develop an atmosphere of alignment and mutual respect.

Minute of Silence

In the last two months, the Council of our Committee worked out an **Appeal to the United Nations, a Call for Spiritual Empowerment**. Elly Pradervand from WWSF, will read some passages from the Appeal.

Elly Pradervand

CSVGC Treasurer, Women's World Summit Foundation

The Appeal has as its objective to empower the United Nations Secretary General and all Member States to

- recommit to the universal values contained in the UN Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights signed for the establishment of world peace and security, human rights and international justice;
- ensure the implementation of the founding principles and values in their governing policies and actions, thereby demonstrating greater spiritual will and political commitment to serve

the needs of people and establish decent human rights regulation mechanisms nationally and internationally;

- publicly acknowledge and systematically take into account the human and spiritual dimensions throughout national and global development strategies as essential preconditions to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and sustainable world peace.

APPEAL TO THE UNITED NATIONS A CALL FOR SPIRITUAL EMPOWERMENT

Launched for the first time on the occasion of the United Nations 60th Anniversary 2005

We, the undersigned, civil society organisations

- **remind** all United Nations Member States that in signing the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they have recognised the right of the Peoples of the world to peace and have renounced war as a means of international politics. Despite this, military actions and budgets are increasing to unprecedented levels,
- **accept** that all human beings have an identity beyond the material dimension. We believe that peace will not be reached without the acknowledgement and respect of our human and spiritual identities and values, which form the ultimate basis for universal human rights,
- **urge** all governments and world leaders to accept their collective and individual duties and responsibilities and, together with their citizens, commit to sharing their resources,
- **request** that these values be more consciously and concretely integrated into the United Nations system as we are **concerned** about the insufficiency of political will to implement the universal values and spiritual principles contained in the United Nations Charter.

Considering those facts, we **call** on the

Secretary General of the United Nations and all Member States

- **to recommit** to the universal values contained in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights signed for the establishment of world peace and security, human rights and international justice,
- **to ensure** the implementation of the founding principles and values in their governing policies and actions, thereby demonstrating greater spiritual will and political commitment to serve the needs of people and establish decent human rights regulation mechanisms nationally and internationally,
- **to publicly acknowledge** and systematically take into account the ethical and spiritual dimensions throughout national and global development strategies as essential preconditions to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and sustainable world peace,
- **to effectively transfer** military expenditures to true human development.
- **to propose** that the World Health Organization (WHO) adds the spiritual dimension to its definition of health as follows: "*Health is a state of complete physical, mental, **spiritual** and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity*".

We, commit ourselves to upholding the values contained in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and include the UN Secretary General and Member States in our daily prayers and meditations: May they be graced with the courage, wisdom, strength and discernment needed for the accomplishment of their respective mandates.

We invite all to join us in our commitment for the common good and a better Humanity.

Please photocopy and send signatures to WWSF via Fax: + 41 22 738 82 48 or E-mail: wwsf@wwsf.ch
The Appeal with signatures will be transmitted to the UN Secretary General for the UN Millennium Summit (September 2005 New York)

Convenors: NGO Committee on Spirituality, Values and Global Concerns CSVGC
c/o WWSF 11 Avenue de la Paix, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland Tel.: +41 22 738 82 48

Signatures of endorsing civil society organisations with UN ECOSOC/DPI & CONGO status

*Signatures of endorsing civil society organisations without UN consultative status

Anglican Consultative Council New York*/ Women's World Summit Foundation WWSF Geneva*/ Institute for Planetary Synthesis IPS Geneva*/ International Association of Gerontology IAG Geneva */ Pan Pacific and South East Asia Women's Association International* / Tribal Link Foundation */ International Association of Educators for World Peace */ International Federation of Social Workers IFSW */ All India Women's Conference, New Delhi */ Lasalle - Institute, CH / World Organisation for Women */ Association of World Citizens* / Interfaith International CH */ Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation*/ International Association of Educators for World Peace *

*Centre for the World Religions, Inc. Germany / *International Charity Foundation "Creation", Ukraine

Christophe Barbey

Association for Non-militarisation and Demilitarization (APRED) Author of a book on the 27 countries with no army

Ladies and gentlemen,

Thank you for coming to this panel.

Thank you as well, Astrid Stuckelberger, for chairing it, and I here express a deep gratitude to Elly Pradervand for all the preparation work and for making it possible today.

For soon sixteen years now, I have been studying “countries without armies”. In 2001, with Jürgen Störk, who is present here today, and with Dietrich Fisher, co-Director of Transcend : a peace and development network and rector of the European Peace University in Stadtschlaining (Austria), we founded APRED, the association for non-militarization and demilitarization. The same year, we published our first report on countries without armies, which is available, so far in French only, at the desk.

First and before we move deeper into the matter, I would like to recall the right to safety of each and every one, which is enshrined in all human right texts. We do consider it as being a right to peace ! It applies to countries without armies as well, and in the second part, we will see how they organize their security, or more likewise, their peace policies.

Before we move on to the definition of selection criteria for countries without armies, and though the call for this panel talks about “demilitarized” countries, I would like to make a distinction:

Demilitarization is a process, the one that brings, if it is total, non-militarization, the permanent state of a nation or territory living without armed forces. Amongst the 27 countries without armies, only seven underwent an effective demilitarization process. All the others were born without armies. The reasons for their demilitarization processes are of special interest here. The first one to undergo such a process was Monaco, in the early 17th century, and for ballistic reason. Once the shooting range of canons made it possible to reach within the fortified town from the neighboring mountain, the Prince realized that it was totally impossible to defend his territory and he stopped spending on defense. How many countries could realize nowadays that they are in a similar situation and that the money in the budgets they spend on defense could find a better use for development and education ? Similarly, in 1868, The Prince of Liechtenstein sent his last fifty soldiers home. They were too much of a burden on the state budget ! More interesting about Liechtenstein is the fact that not having an army has proved the country's neutrality, and therefore saved the country, at the end of WWI from being dismantled as a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

So who are these countries without armies and how do we identify them ? APRED, though clearly intending to promote peaceful and non-armed solutions to all conflicts is at first a scientific institution. Therefore, we had to establish a clear definition of what is and what is not a country without an army. To do so, we developed three criteria :

- 1) “Constitutional provisions”. They are not for themselves sufficient, as the “terrain reality” might be different from what the constitution says, but these provisions are a very good indication on what goes on in the country. Some interesting examples: some countries do ban the army: Panama banned it totally, Liechtenstein and Costa-Rica banned “permanent” armies, while Kiribati allows only the police as armed forces, and all the others simply do not mention military matters.
- 2) “Facts”, with the sometimes difficult distinction between police forces and armies. But mainly, an army needs heavy weaponry, while a police force does not. This criteria is quite certain if the data is available, but there are exceptions. We do admit that non-militarized countries can, and do have border patrol, anti-riot squads and intelligence services. Border patrol teams sometimes do have heavy weapons, specially on coast guard vessels, so in order to be sure that they are not “militarized” we do need a third criteria, which is institutional.
- 3) Are they civilian forces or are they an institution of their own? As an example, an army has it's own budget, it's own ministry and therefore less control through civil society. So we consider that if the defense forces are not heavily armed and that they are civilian forces, usually administratively accountable to the Department of the Interior or Justice and related to the police, the non-militarized criteria is still valid.

Need be, we can explore further, the role and mission the different forces have, but so far the above three criteria have been sufficient to make a clear distinction, and establish a reliable list of the countries without armies in the world.

Before we move on to peace and safety matters, let me give you a brief portrait of who these countries are.

- 1) Some are very old. Andorra has been living without an army and without any major incidents for more than 700 years. But most of them (21) are a result of the decolonization process.
- 2) Indeed, most of them are small and their population is low, but 27 countries still stands for one country out of eight in the world, or 14% of the countries of the world.
- 3) Amongst them some are well developed, some are amongst the less developed states, but most of them are emerging countries, regularly developing, and with advantages of their own, tourism, economic services, labor force, etc.
- 4) This does often compensate for the fact that they are remote, as most of them (20) are islands or archipelagoes.
- 5) Geographically, most of them are in four regions, Europe (6), the Caribbean Islands (6), Central America (2), Indian Ocean (2), and indeed the Pacific Ocean (11). There is none in Africa nor in Continental Asia.
- 6) But one of the most interesting of our findings, while looking at the characteristics of these countries, is the fact that with one major exception (Vatican state) and in one situation where it is highly questionable (Maldives islands), they are all democratic, and considering that most of them are still developing countries, this is a very interesting future to be able to show that not having an army is a god democratic factor !
- 7) And finally this list would not be complete without a clear praise of what Costa-Rica has been doing. Since it's demilitarization in 1948, Costa-Rica has been the only country in Central-America to avoid dictators and civil war. It is now both the seat of the United Nations University of peace and of the Interamerican Human Right's Court. It is Oscar Arias it's former president and Nobel Prize receiver that started the Esquipulas process that finally brought peace to the region. In 1995 Panama, it's southern neighbor, followed Costa-Rica's brilliant example and suppressed it's own army.

Safety matters !

These countries, viewing their size, can seem vulnerable, and they had a few problems. So their security issues have been in various circles, a matter of concern.

But first let me say, that most of them handle freely their security issues and their international relations, most of them are not in anyway protectorates. However, some are. Monaco, depending on France, is most likely the one with the less freedom regarding these matters, but things are changing. The Marshall Islands, Palau and the Federated States of Micronesia are bound to the US, and their situation is not very enviable. Niue and the Cook Islands are in free association with New-Zealand.

This being said, all the others rely and strengthen the collective security system. Except for Niue, Cook, and the Vatican city, all are members of the UN. Though not a security organization, half of them are members of the Commonwealth, and this organization issues every ten years or so a report on the safety of small states. Similarly, the UN has a forum for small island developing states that meet every decade. Then there are the regional security organizations, OSCE in Europe, OECS in the Caribbean region and the Pacific forum in the Pacific. All the countries without armies are members in their regions. But because of these regional organizations, so far and for what we know, these countries have never met to establish in common a "non-militarized countries" security and peace organization, and more over non-militarized peace policies. Various possibilities could emerge of such an organization and to our opinion their situation is now strong enough, and visible enough, to envision such a process. (As an example, and strangely none of these countries have a seat at the disarmament conference. Surely, they should have one !).

Furthermore such an organization could study more thoroughly what are the advantages of being army less and what peace policies these countries could put together to enhance their own well-being but also the good and future of all humanity !

I would like to conclude with an appeal for support for our work. Our next step will be the publishing, this summer, and in English, of a new report on non-militarization and the countries without armies. This report, updated and bigger, will include a chapter on the peace policies of these countries. We are both looking for intellectual support, written contributions and research on any related topics and for financial support for research, editing and publishing. For more information, or to get in touch with us, please visit our website: www.demilitarisation.org

Thank you for your attention.

Conchita Poncini

**International Federation of University Women
Former Chair, Committee on the Status of Women**

Convenor of the Working Group on Women's Employment and Economic Development

The peace movement in recent history can be traced back to the women who, in the 1820s and 1830s in the U.S. and in England notably, formed women's peace societies. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, women active in the movement for women's suffrage and in other movements for social change were simultaneously active in working to promote peace. In 1905 the first Nobel Peace Prize was received by a woman, Bertha von Suttner of Austria, who took an anti-war stance and promoted non-violence and international sisterhood. Many women's groups like the International Federation of University Women (IFUW), were created also with peace as its primary goal. In the history of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), it recounts: "These intelligent and sensitive women first came together in World War I from neutral countries and countries whose men were slaughtering each other in the battlefield, yet the women warmly embraced as sisters. The symbolism of the moment must never be lost, for the surmounting of artificial barriers in the spirit of reconciliation is the most essential message and the most needed attribute for our time."

Today, more than ever, when war and conflict situations are on the rise, the women's peace movement has raised major issues on war around the world. There is no denying that the movement to wage peace has been able to accomplish significant inroads in impacting public opinion. The UN Security Council Resolution 1325 of bringing a gender perspective into peace negotiations is an evident outcome of this. The big question remains, however, on how much women can realistically achieve peace for as long as they do not participate in governmental and intergovernmental bodies as well as non-state bodies that make decisions about war and peace, military spending and policy.

In economic and development terms, the manufacture of arms, whether for mass destruction or individual self-defence, is purported to energize the economy, boost employment and sustainable development.

In terms of security and peace, these arms are supposedly meant to protect the human race notably the vulnerable and to bring order and reconciliation.

In terms of collective rights and empowerment, these are theoretically tools for self-determination and democracy; to bring order and freedom to exercise civil and political rights, together with economic, social and economic rights...

In terms of individual human rights to development, it is to redress the injustices and inequalities.

QUESTIONS:

Have all these been achieved through the production of arms and their use?

Economically yes it has – but for a few, the mass has not benefited over the short or even medium or long term because the whole infrastructure of the targeted country has been destroyed and there is no longer the urgency.

Peace and security are relative terms, for in reality, there are more victims than saved populations who are mostly civilians, notably women and children.

Rights to self-determination and democracy are also relative – depending on who takes over the regime.

Collective rights are also questions of political will and sound management, which are being questioned at this Commission on Human Rights. Have injustices, social inequities and gender and other inequalities been actually redressed?

I would argue that military rule and the manufacture of arms are a hierarchical power model, that are not the solutions to economic progress, peace and development. I suggest that the solution needs a paradigm shift based on gender equality and the use of the feminine energy of both women and men.

While admittedly not all but in many instances, women in principle get into business to fill a personal need or opportunity rather than pure ambition for personal empowerment, women want decision-making power to enable them to move or transform situations not for the sake of earning more.

Women leaders want to be at the centre of things rather than at the top, which women perceive as a lonely and disconnected position.

I argue that women leadership and feminine energy are the best models for sound management. They demand the same skills of organization for pacing and balancing conflicting claims, negotiating, conciliating, handling disturbances, and imparting information. Women are generally cautious strategic risk takers, in view of their primary role as family custodians and caregivers required of them by their reproductive role.

Women have less difficulty in admitting they need help and thus surround themselves with good people. Women connect good business with community well being.

Women are trained by their family responsibilities to be team and consensus builders.

Social entrepreneurship is a state of mind. Women have an intuition and instinctive desire for survival as care givers. By the same token, women are good in principle in budgeting and financial management of the household.

The feminine energy model would breed a new form of empowerment that tends towards creating a nourishing environment for personal growth built on openness, learning through continuing education, compassion and understanding.

FEMALE MANAGEMENT STYLE

Women and men manage quite differently: male energy generally composed of men leaders are generally "transactional". They set their role as a series of transactions: "What do I get back for what I give, e.g. the sale of arms.

Feminine energy is transformational – it alters people's self interest into organizational goals that, unlike master sergeants in military settings that command this energy,

- encourages participation
- shares power and information
- enhances people's self-worth
- gets others excited about their work.

Women involve people in decision-making. They work better with people who do not want to be ordered around. The backside of this is that asking for ideas is more time-consuming than making unilateral decisions.

CONCLUSION

Demilitarization means empowerment through confidence building in acting with one's own authority without resorting to the use of weapons and arms.

The judgement of empowered persons is sufficiently respected by their leadership, based on respect for human rights. Leadership is utilized to give an opportunity for negotiations, not to berate or humiliate which is the principle of military action.

Finally, I want to give a word of caution. Because women are still in a time of transition in their equal role with men, it is critical to remember that to lead in the new paradigm, men and women must understand how this new approach will look to those still locked in the old hierarchy of pyramidal power structures and clichés epitomized by the military and armed forces.

Michel Monod
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Swiss Group for No Army
Michel Monod membre du Groupe Suisse Sans Armée

QUELLE EST L'UTILITE D'UNE ARMEE ?

En 1985 le Groupe Suisse Sans Armée a lancé une initiative pour l'abolition de l'armée. La question de l'utilité de l'armée a été posée. Le vote est intervenu en novembre 1989 après la chute du mur de Berlin. Le résultat a été étonnant : 33% des votants ont refusé l'armée. Ce n'était pas la majorité mais une forte minorité ne voit plus l'utilité de l'armée en Suisse. La même question pourrait être posée dans beaucoup de pays qui ont encore une armée avec d'encore plus surprenantes réponses. En fait la population n'a rien à gagner de l'armée. C'est une source de peine, de dépenses inutiles et de temps de service sans aucune assurance de sécurité.

L'armée est seulement utile aux gouvernements pour rester en place quand il y a un risque de soulèvement et pour s'affirmer en face des critiques de gouvernements étrangers . Ils disent que l'armée est nécessaire pour défendre le pays et non pas pour attaquer d'autres pays. Mais souvent l'attaque est considérée comme la meilleure défense. Il n'y a pas d'autre utilité pour l'armée que de faire la guerre. La guerre est désastreuse pour la population. Elle provoque des destructions matérielles, des pertes de vies humaines : 80% des victimes de guerre sont des civils. La guerre crée des ressentiments contre les ennemis et un désir de vengeance.

L'armée est supposée prévenir les guerres. En fait elle promeut la guerre par son existence même. Quand un problème sérieux surgit entre 2 pays pourquoi ne pas utiliser les moyens militaires à disposition ? Clausewitz disait : la guerre est la poursuite de la politique par d'autres moyens. L'armée permet aux politiciens d'aller de l'avant dans la domination de leur propre peuple et dans l'exploitation des autres peuples, de poursuivre des politiques impérialistes et capitalistes. Il n'ont pas besoin de se préoccuper d'apaiser des conflits en comprenant les autres cultures, en manifestant leur solidarité avec des population démunies, en entretenant des relations commerciales équitables, en partageant des ressources matérielles, intellectuelles et financières. Ils s'appuient sur l'armée pour maintenir leur position. Quand un conflit éclate, l'armée reste la solution. Evidemment personne ne veut utiliser l'armée. Elle n'est là que pour menacer. Mais à force de menacer on finit par l'utiliser.

Prenons quelques exemples. Le pays le plus riche du monde a une immense armée. Le gouvernement ne se préoccupe pas d'appliquer les traités juridiques et commerciaux internationaux. Son but c'est l'intérêt du pays par l'exploitation et la domination dans le monde entier. Quand une difficulté surgit, l'armée est utilisée pour annihiler les ennemis de la nation. En Afrique il y a des pays très pauvres. Les gouvernements ne se préoccupent pas de nourrir la population et d'éduquer le peuple. Leur premier souci est de s'enrichir eux-mêmes aussi vite que possible tant qu'ils sont au pouvoir. Pour cela ils s'assurent de la protection cde l'armée contre la population. Si un rival apparaît et rassemble des opposants, la guerre civile éclate. Q'en est-il des pays de classe moyenne sur le plan des richesses. Les gouvernements ont aussi des armées à disposition. Ils affirment que c'est pour établir un équilibre des forces en vue de maintenir la compétition. Cet équilibre est instable et l'histoire a prouvé maintes fois que cet équilibre peut être rompu entraînant parfois le monde entier dans la guerre.

L'abolition des armées obligerait les gouvernements à rechercher surtout la coopération entre pays, à respecter les engagements pris envers l'étranger et à respecter la population du pays. Les gouvernements ne renonceront pas d'eux-mêmes et la population devra imposer cette abolition car elle souffre en premier lieu et désire vivre en paix.

WHAT IS THE USE OF AN ARMY ?

In 1985 in Switzerland the Group Swiss without an Army has launched an initiative for the abolition of the Swiss army. The question of the utility of an army has been raised. The vote intervened in November 1989 after the destruction of the Berlin Wall. The score was surprising: 33% of the Swiss voters refused the Army. It was not the majority but a strong

minority did not see anymore the use of an army in Switzerland. The same question could be raised in many countries that still have an army with more astonishing answers. In fact the populations have nothing to gain from an army. It is a burden of pain, money and time of service with no assurance of security.

The army is only useful for governments to stay in power when they are at risk to be overthrown and to affirm themselves in front of foreign governments who may criticize them. They say the army is necessary to defend the country and not to attack other countries. Very often attack is considered the best defence. There is no other use of the army than to make wars. War is disastrous for the population. It leads to destructions, lost of lives: 80 % of the death casualties at war are civilians. It creates resentment against enemies, desire of avenge.

Army is also supposed to prevent wars. In fact it promotes war by its very existence. When a serious problem arises between countries, why not using military means if they are at disposal?. Clausewitz said: war is the continuation of the politic with other means. The army enables politicians to go ahead with domination of their own people and exploitation of the others, with imperialist and capitalist policies. They do not need to bother with solving conflicts by understanding other cultures, solidarity with deprived countries, equitable commercial relations, share of material, intellectual and financial resources. They rely on the army to confirm their position. At one point conflict arises and war becomes the solution. Sure none intends to use the army, it is only a threat. But threatening leads often to an action.

Let us take some examples. The richest country in the world has a huge army. The government does not bother with implementing jurisdictional or commercial international treaties. Its aims are the interest of the country by exploitation and domination all over the world. When a difficulty arises, the army is used to annihilate enemies of the Nation.

In Africa there are very poor countries. Governments do not bother with feeding the population and educating people. Their first concern is to get as much money as possible in the time they are in power. To achieve this aim they rely on the army for their own protection against the population. If a rival appears and assemble opponents, then a civil war breaks out.

What about middle class countries? Governments have armies at their disposal. They say it is not to use them but only to establish a balance of power in order to maintain the competition. This balance is an instable equilibrium and is has been proved several times in history to be broken.

The abolition of the army would force governments to rely more on cooperation between countries, respect of agreements to the outside and respect of the population in the inside. They will not renounce by themselves and the population has to impose this abolition because they suffer in the first line and want to live in peace.

Some Key moments debating with the participants

➤ **Filomina Steady, WWSF member and from Sierra Leone: In the case of a civil war, who should disarm first ?**

Reply by Christophe Barbey: Most of the demilitarized countries disbanded their armies, during or just after military conflict. The matter is not as much on who shall disarm, but to see it is done, and well done.

Reply by Michel Monod: The word “rebel” is used by governments in developing countries to indicate their opponents. In front of a government imposing itself with the help of the army, their opponents have often no other choice than to take to weapons to make themselves heard. They call themselves freedom fighters.

Remarks by Rudolf Schneider: Today there are about 200 million people directly or indirectly involved or employed in the global military machinery which includes weapon development, military personnel, several so called intelligence services and civil industries working for the military-industrial complex. My first question is: where are the enemies? Secondly, is it not correct to say that the same military machinery has to develop the so-called enemies and terrorists through ruthless international policies, to justify the annual investment of tax money of nearly 1 Trillion in a murderous business where most of the victims are the tax payers? In other words, the good people of our world work for their own destruction because they are not informed or correctly informed about hidden power and profit-oriented manipulations.

Remarks by Astrid Stuckelberger: we could mention here an interesting project we launched with the working group on peace of the Committee on the Status of Women called the “Mapping Peace” project. This project consists in mapping peace instead of mapping war, which is a typical pattern of man-led military strategy, a very efficient strategy indeed. So using the same methodology but for building a better peace strategies. By building a world map pointing out which regions and zones are in peace, which one are in peace negotiation and which ones are at risk of “peace deterioration”, you can better analyse, identify actions and intervene – and women have certainly a different image of what needs to be done for peace! The idea is based on epidemiology methodology, where you do surveillance of health/disease in the world, well here we propose to make the surveillance of peace deterioration... With better methodology, we will have better impact and hope for change of paradigm! And with women on board, we will have different thinking and action!

Many institutions and people have addressed and studied peace, but here the originality is that a ‘Map’ is the tool and instrument to find new solutions. Women, as Conchita Poncini has mentioned very clearly, have different ways of thinking, acting and solving problems. We would like to give peace a chance with a new feminine way of addressing peace... we invite all of you in joining us with the Mapping Peace project and developing it.

➤ **Prof. Akira Maeda, Tokyo Zokei University, Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights**

In Japan, the article 9 of our constitution mentions that Japan has no Army and does not allow military engagement outside the country. It has a Self defence force since 1954. Despite the article 9, Japan has engaged in the Iraqi war.

1. Also to mention, Japan has developed **?????? non defended zone** as stipulated in article 59 of the first protocole of the Geneva Convention. The peace movement **has** initiated a vast movement called the ‘Non Defended Zone Campaign” which develops, especially around cities, safe but non defended zones such as in Osaka, **a** type of Human Rights city model. This model could be set around all cities and countries in the world, knowing the family is the first peace zone, then the neighbourhood, the city or village, the nation, **etc.**

About 200 million people are involved in military service and arms production around the world. Peace is proactive. The concept of war is outmoded. Soldiers learn to kill and the police learns to protect, this is the difference between soldiers and police forces. The human factor should be at the top of all decision-making to guarantee the development of right human relations.

Reply by Christophe Barbey: I am well aware of the existence of article 9, in the Japanese constitution. I’d like to remind here the right to safety of every one and the promotion of peace as the only popular support to peaceful solutions will be a lasting support for non-militarized solutions. As long as there is no popular support, there is a risk as is the case with Japan authorities that do not closely follow the provisions of their own constitution.

Regarding article 59, non-defended zones in the Geneva Convention, I must thank you for bringing this up. APRED has been working for a while on peace zones (for example, all South America has declared itself a peace zone in 2002), and we were not aware of this possibility in humanitarian law. It is also very interesting to see that it is the people themselves who demand to be excluded from armed conflict zones. This could be used a lot more "in popular strategy".

➤ **Carlotta : Question. Labor in arms industry ?**

Reply by Michel Monod : The same amount of money spent by governments to produce weapons or buy them could be used to employ workers in civilian industry. A study has shown that the arms industry does not give as much income as civilian industry.

➤ **Participant from Tibet :**

The question about Tibet was raised. Tibet has never had any army as it is based on spiritual life. Despite the threat of China, the Dalai Lama has never wished an army knowing it would be invaded and destroyed.

Since the Dalai Lama keeps on advocating peace and non violence without military force and has even set a five point plan for total demilitarization

Reply by Christophe Barbey: There again, I am aware of the will of the Government of Tibet in exile to make Tibet a non-militarized zone.

Astrid Stuckelberger: it is worth underlining that despite the drama of Tibet's invasion, it has never been so alive and known in the world as today and spreading messages and models of peace and non-violence. The influence of Tibet is ever growing today internationally ...

➤ **Participant from Finland : The Aland Islands have been demilitarized since 1856, what is your definition of peace ?**

Reply by Christophe Barbey: There are shelves filled with books on the definition of peace. I use mainly "Peace is a lasting solution with at least no further damage, or better some reconciliation, prevention and reconstruction".

There is as well, some analysis on the cause of conflict : Some basic needs unsatisfied, no political ways to address or solve this lack, and the presence of weapons. In individual conflicts, attitudes are solved with empathy, negative behaviour with non-violence, and contradictions with creativity !

There are three types of violence, direct, structural (social structure that promote war for example) and cultural (justification of violence, or violent culture). Let us mention here the Sevilla Declaration (UNESCO, 1986) that stated that violence and war are not more in human nature (or biology) than peace and respect, it's a matter of choice !

- Elly Pradervand shared about a presentation she recently attended during the 49th Commission on the Status of Women (UN New York March 2005) entitled " War on Trial " which is a mock NGO Tribunal taking war to court for its violation of Human Rights, illegitimacy and non-compliance with UN Declarations and commitments.

Christophe Barbey : I do not think there is a model of a country without an army, each and every country has its own ways and reasons. The more they are grounded in the people the better ! This is one of the reasons why APRED upholds a "human right to peace". We are certain that non-militarization is a good incentive and a concrete possibility for development. We all need to learn from them and look forward to their development!

Astrid Stuckelberger: In the name of our committee, we would like to thank all speakers and participants to this panel and for the promising discussion and proposals that we will follow up on.

Thank you again.

Proposals

- The creation of a Ministry for Peace instead of a ministry of defence
- Enhance women models for demilitarization, women as negotiators, as the first educators of men
- Encourage and further develop the "Non Defended Zone Campaign" started in Japan
- Peace development index with the Mapping Peace Project
- Change the name and definitions of army versus police as to avoid the confusion
- Organize this panel every year during the Human Rights commission and invite Representatives from the non-militarized States
- Quality labelling of peaceful and non-violent institutions and industries

Participants included:

François de Vargas – Penal Reform International (PRI)

Akira Maeda – Professor of Tokyo Zokei University, Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights

Koichi Yoshida – Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights

Ana Gregiao – National Association of Criminal Defence Lawyers

Leila Lönnroth – UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR)

Jörgen Störk – Association for Demilitarization (APRED)

Sahdia Jahangir – National Association of Criminal Defence Lawyers

Chayanit Poonyanat – NGO FORUM – ASIA

Via de Waal – Institute for Planetary Synthesis

Maria Lazarte – International Conference Volunteers (ICV)

ONG Bun-Tieng for Laure Dolci-Kanaan – Commission on Human Rights (NGO Liaison)

Mariane Aguilar - Socialist International Women

Sofie Sandström – Permanent Mission of Finland

Carlotta Segne – Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation (LGWPF)

Leila Seigel – International Council of Jewish Women (ICJW)

Ngawang C. Drakmargyapon – Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organisation (UNPO)

Laure Maitrejean – Women’s World Summit Foundation (WWSF)

Linda Ros - Women’s World Summit Foundation (WWSF)

Filomina Steady - Women’s World Summit Foundation (WWSF)

And many more persons not listed ...

Annex 1 Countries without a Standing Army

Countries without Army

Identification criteria's:

1. Constitutional provisions regarding the absence or existence of armed forces.
2. Absence of heavy armament.
3. Civil status for paramilitary forces (customs, intelligence, domestic security).

Andorra
Costa-Rica
Cook Islands
Dominica
Grenada
Haiti
Iceland
Kiribati
Liechtenstein
Maldives
Marshall Islands
Mauritius
Micronesia
Monaco
Nauru
Niue
Palau
Panama
Samoa
San – Marino
Solomon Islands
S'-Kitts and Nevis
S'-Lucia
S'-Vincent and the Grenadines
Tuvalu
Vanuatu
Vatican

Some comments:

- One country out of 8 in the world is without a national army (27/194, 14%) !
- Despite the fact that they are small, there is rich one's and poor one's, old one's and new one's.
- 20 countries are islands or archipelagoes, 4 do not have access to the sea.
- 7 have demilitarized : 5 following serious problems because of the army, 1 for economic reasons, 1 for ballistic reasons. All others have been created without an army.
- Only 7 among them have - at different extents - "protectors". All others manage security and international relations independently.
- Except for 3, Niue, Cook Islands and the Vatican, all of them are UN members.
- Except for the Maldives (where the question is open) and for Vatican, all of them are democratic.
- According to the Human Development Index (UNDP), the situation of women seems better in them.
- The education budget and literacy rate are also comparatively better.
- The history of the countries without armies is full of teachings about non-military conflict resolutions.
- There is also many "territories" without armies or demilitarized by treaty, the Moon, The Antarctica, the sea bottom, the Aland Islands (in Finland), the Spitzberg, many small islands, etc.
- The existence of countries without armies, therefore less aggressive towards their populations (their own and other's) foresees the possibility and establishment of **fully non-violent states and political institutions.**

To find out more: Read « *Les non-militarisation et les Pays sans armée : une réalité* », Christophe Barbey and APRED, 2001 ; or visit www.demilitarisation.org or contact **APRED** at info@demilitarisation.org.



**The NGO Committee on
Spirituality, Values and Global
Concerns**



Cordially invites you to attend the panel discussion on

27 Demilitarized States in the World :

Utopia or Reality for the Right to Development with Peace and Security?

Room XXII

Thursday, April 14th 2005

13h00 to 15h00

United Nations Geneva, Palais des Nations

- *Sandwiches will be served* -

*The panel will launch also be the occasion to launch the
"Appeal to the UN: A Call for Spiritual Empowerment"*

Introduction

by **Rudolf Schneider**, Chair, NGO Committee on Spirituality, Values and Global Concern
(CSVGC)

Presentation

by **Elly Pradervand**, board of the NGO CSVGC, Women's World Summit Foundation
(WWSF)

Panellists will include:

- **Christophe Barbey**, Association for Demilitarization (APRED) author of a book on the 27 countries with no army
- **Conchita Poncini**, International University Women
- **Michel Monod**, Fellowship of Reconciliation - Swiss Group for No Army

Chair: **Astrid Stuckelberger**, Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues

Countries with no Army:

**Andorra, Costa-Rica, Cook Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti,
Iceland, Kiribati, Liechtenstein, Maldives,
Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia, Monaco, Nauru, Niue,
Palau, Panama, Samoa, San-Marino,
St.-Kitts and Nevis, St.-Lucia, St.-Vincent and the Grenadines,
Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Vatican**

The NGO Committee on
Spirituality, Values and Global Concerns
at the United Nations Geneva



Contact and further information:

e-mail: secretariat@csvgc-geneva.org

or wwsf@wwsf.ch

Main websites

<http://www.ngocongo.org>

<http://www.ngocongo.org/ngosubs/spiritgen.htm>

<http://www.csvgc-geneva.org>