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They Ought to Know!

“I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, as only one who has seen its brutality, its futility and stupidity…. War settles nothing.”

--- General & US President Dwight D. Eisenhower

"WAR is a racket. It always has been. It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives."

—Major General Smedley Butler, USMC (ret.)
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“The sum of my teachings comes down to this: Live in harmony with yourself and be at peace with all of humanity.”
Confucius (551-479 BCE)

“Better than a thousand hollow words is one word that brings peace.”
Buddha (563 BC-483 BC)

“Shall I not inform you of a better act than fasting, alms, and prayers? Making peace between one another: enmity and malice tear up heavenly rewards by the roots”
Prophet Muhammad

“...and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war anymore.”
Isaiah 2:4

“Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.”
(Jesus) Matthew 5:9

“The well-being of mankind, its peace and security, are unattainable unless and until its unity is firmly established.”
Bahá’u’lláh

“From War to Peace is not from the strenuous to the easy existence; it is from the futile to the effective, from the stagnant to the active, from the destructive to the creative way of life...The world will be regenerated by the people who rise above these passive ways and heroically seek, by whatever hardship, by whatever toil, the methods by which people can agree.”
Mary Parker Follett (1918)

“Whether humanity will consciously follow the law of love, I do not know. But that need not disturb me. The law will work just as the law of gravitation works, whether we accept it or not.”
Mohandas Gandhi

“In this postmodern world, cultural conflicts are becoming more dangerous than at any time in history. A new model of coexistence is needed, based on man’s transcending himself.”
Václav Havel, 1995

“We are each of us angels with only one wing, and we can only fly by embracing one another.”
Luciano De Crescenzo

Occasionally, in the course of human events, a transformative goal moves through three stages: from impossible dream, to imperative demand, to inevitable destiny. Global, enduring, and sustainable peace is one such ineffable goal. At
this fragile historical moment, the yearning for peace is emerging worldwide as a resounding imperative. Will we have the courage and determination to transform that imperative yearning into inevitable destiny?

In 2010, the world watched transfixed as peaceful protest expanded into the “Arab Spring.” Everywhere in the global village, we felt the zeitgeist of peace. Long-stifled hopes in the Middle East began to erupt. Subsequently, the “Occupy Movement” sparked wildfires in cities around the world. At the time, many felt that both phenomena signalled the next stage of social existence: the inevitability of global, enduring, and sustainable peace. Even through the haze of retaliatory bombs in the streets of Egypt and Syria and pepper spray on American campuses, we began to glimpse peace shedding the tattered garb of an ideal vision and donning the substantial cloak of an inexorable reality.

As we entered the second decade of the 21st century, the world seemed thrust into paradoxically momentous, dangerous, yet hopeful times. In the Middle East, ordinary citizens poured into the streets to protest the oppression by dictators clinging desperately to power wielded far too long. These toxic leaders, too long ensconced as heads of state, had brought their countries to the brink of economic catastrophe and their people to existential despair.

Rejecting the bitter fruits of war, with countless dead, financial resources wasted, and jobs in short supply, new protesters in “Occupy Movements” across the globe added their voices for still larger changes. Their multihued agendas agreed on the basic need for greater equality, limned by global, enduring, and sustainable peace. We felt we were witnessing nothing less than a seismic shift. Unfortunately, with the surge of terrorist activities, particularly in the Middle East, protestors’ yearnings for justice, equality, and peace have been overshadowed.

Now, just a few years after the Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement, the world is once again plunged into the abyss of war, this time provoked by suicide bombers, beheaders, and multihued terrorists. In many countries, a troika of fear, dread, and hatred is gathering strength. Yet, the longing for peace and the courage to protest injustice refuse to die. Even as this document is being updated,
young protestors throng the streets of Hong Kong, insisting on freedom and the right to select their own leaders.

We have a fateful choice to make in this second decade of the 21st century: climb to the peak of noble human destiny or remain trapped below in the swamp of human discord, death, and destruction. The choice is clear, but the time is short.

Not since the Vietnam War have the thirst for peace and the temerity to dissent coalesced in spontaneous protest movements. But, time is running out. It is not clear if there is still time to act before that brief window of opportunity and hope closes, not to re-open – if history predicts cycles -- for another half century or more, perhaps until this generation dies off in disgrace. Shall we act with courage and resolve, or, through cowardice and doubt, let even the slimmest chance for global, enduring, and sustainable peace elude our grasp?

Inspired by the courage of the peace-and-justice seekers who have taken to the streets worldwide in the last half decade, I humbly propose an initiative (some might call it a “manifesto”) for their approval.


This framework focuses on peace as the engine for reenergizing the world economies and developing new leadership strategies, new directions, new goals, new enterprises, new products, new knowledge, including new technology and science, new services, new jobs, and new thinking. It is a plan to use the goal of global, enduring, and sustainable peace to jump-start the world economy and set it off in a new, expansive, more life-affirming direction. So, I invite all readers of this document to join with me in brainstorming about a bold strategy in the ongoing, most serious economic crisis the world has faced in modern times.

Leadership for What, If Not for the Noblest Enterprise: Peace?

The world-wide financial crisis that recently brought us to the brink of disaster has also shaken our confidence in leaders. Leaders have failed us egregiously. We need to step back and rethink leadership. What is the purpose of leadership? As
we move forward, what constitutes visionary, principled, and courageous leadership? What are all the leadership development programs and research initiatives designed to do? What exactly are they accomplishing?

The overarching purpose of leadership has always been the identification of noble enterprises and the invitation to supporters to engage, with the leader, in those noble missions that serve the society while creating meaning in their own lives. Each era presents new challenges, and leaders, in league with their constituents, must decide which challenges to tackle. History judges each generation by the challenges it chooses to address and what it does about them. How shall we be judged?

In this post-2008 economic era, we must ask ourselves, “Which challenge should we address?” We must also raise the most fundamental and practical question of all: “Leadership for what, if not for the noblest mission: peace?” For without peace, we wantonly squander both the human and material resources we desperately need to place the world economy on a sound footing and restore meaning to peoples’ lives.

So today, I would like to challenge the world-wide community to brainstorm about a Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace. Peace, as conceptualized here, must be broadly defined to mean far more than the absence of war. Peace must stand on a foundation of justice, equality, sustainability, and all the other societal and human needs required for the world’s citizenry to live productively, harmoniously, and happily. We must realize Ubuntu in action.⁵

I propose this Strategy not simply as the most principled, but also as the most pragmatic, blueprint for rebuilding the global economy after the near-death experience of 2008 and restoring hope throughout the world.

This admittedly immodest proposal must involve every sector⁶ of every nation assuming its unique role in this Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace. The Strategy must begin in every nation simultaneously. No nation must be left out or allowed to back out. No sector of society must be permitted to shirk its responsibility. As Luciano De Crescenzo...
has warned, “We are each of us angels with only one wing, and we can only fly by embracing one another.”

This enormous task will take every one of us, in every sector of every society, working relentlessly, to achieve this noble goal. It is not a mission for the weak or the faint-hearted. It will take more effort than we can begin to imagine! And **time is not our friend.**

**A New Era Needs New Leadership: A New Connective Era, For Now and the Future:**

We have entered a new historical moment, the Connective Era, where everyone and everything are inevitably connected, like it or not. We live and work cheek by jowl with people often very different from ourselves.⁷

Consequently, two distinctly contradictory tensions – interdependence and diversity – frame the Connective Era. Living with the powerful forces of diversity and interdependence is inescapable, even desirable, but it is not necessarily easy, primarily because these forces pull us in opposite directions.

Interdependence drives us toward collaborative action, encouraging us to recognize our common human needs and longings, as well as our mutual interests, even when those areas of mutuality may be decidedly slim. Diversity, by contrast, drives us toward independent, solo action that underscores our uniqueness, our differences, and our conflicting agendas.

Because of these contradictory tensions, we find ourselves in a **new world, where inclusion is critical and connection inevitable. Without peace and without leaders who can integrate these opposing forces, we shall continue to dissipate our lives and our resources through escalating conflicts.**

In this new era, to achieve an international goal of global, enduring, and sustainable peace, we need a new type of leader who knows how to integrate these opposing forces. We must develop leaders who can see the mutuality in seemingly conflicting agendas, perspectives, values, and cultures. We must seek leaders who understand the need to connect diverse groups, people, and nations,
many unlike themselves, leaders who can recognize the oneness of humanity. I call these individuals “connective leaders.”

_The Bitterness of Compromise; the Sweetness of Integration_

Connective leaders do not seek compromise. They understand, as Mary Parker Follett did so long ago, that compromise weakens us, leaves us in a state of instability. Compromise demands that we give up a part of what we wanted, something we deem dear and important. Compromise creates a numbing sense of loss, leaving us in a dark state of grief and weakness. (Worse yet, that piece we have relinquished will re-emerge, again and again, in other negotiations, until it is satisfied, unless it is addressed through integration.) When leaders urge us to compromise, we are always coming to the table with the bitter taste of loss still on our tongue.

Connective leaders, by contrast, seek integration, starting from even the smallest area of common choice, need, and agreement. They help us to join and build upon our mutual and stable concern, moving into ever widening circles of mutuality and strength. Through this process, we begin to taste the sweetness of optimism. We begin to see each other through different eyes. We break the shackles of “us vs. them.” In so doing, we all become “us.”

The times demand “connective leaders,” who act from their commitment to goals that benefit the group or society, goals that transcend their own power and profit. Connective leaders lead with transparency and ethical concern. They understand that the sparks of innovation ignite from rubbing the flint of unique differences against the stone of interdependence. Integrating -- not compromising -- diversity and interdependence is a central challenge of this era. It is a challenge we should welcome if we seriously seek a long-term, global economic recovery. Connective leaders are perfectly suited to this challenge.

We need these connective leaders who can transcend their own egos and help their constituents do the same. These are leaders who can reach out to other leaders, joining their agendas and combining their constituents’ power and
resources to attain a more difficult, more stable, more encompassing, more noble goal.

To achieve global, enduring, and sustainable peace in an increasingly diverse and interdependent world, we need leaders who can enter the international policy dialogue with fresh eyes, open minds, and hearts determined to bring humankind together in all its magnificent glory. Leaders who can transcend not only their own egos, but the narrow identities of their constituents, will open new doors to peace.
Civil Society Must Create the Groundswell for Peace

Current leaders have not stepped up to the challenge. Sadly, statesmen, diplomats, and politicians around the world remain trapped in outmoded, confrontational, zero-sum strategies for dealing with one another across national boundaries and ideological chasms. They perform equally ineffectively across their domestic divides. They have failed to bring peace.

Military leaders, unprepared to deal with the changing face of warfare, have been stymied, as well. Unfortunately, the dangers of the military-industrial complex remain more potent than ever a half century after U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower so eloquently warned the world in his farewell address.¹⁰

Even our religious leaders have not spoken forcefully enough as the carnage of war and violence engulfs the world. When they have acted, their voices are drowned out by more bellicose forces or ignored by media that thrive on conflict.

It is now civil society’s responsibility to lead the way. The “Occupy” protesters need every ordinary citizens, every one of us – government workers, politicians, business people, factory and office workers, unionists, teachers, students, plumbers, doctors, nurses, gardeners, lawyers, engineers, telephone repairpersons, military personnel, religious authorities, retired people – to do our part.

I am mindful that many others before us - and many even as we speak -- have labored long and hard in the vineyard of peace. The Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict documents the struggle of myriad non-governmental (NGO) peace groups worldwide.¹¹ Peace movements have a long and many-splendored, if cyclical, history in countries around the world. Their on-going efforts attest to the difficulty, as well as the enduring importance, of the task, as Mary Parker Follett warned us a century ago. Despite their best and continuing efforts – and these peace groups are incredibly resilient – peace remains stubbornly elusive. The need for peace is relentless; it voraciously expands.

So, we must build on the labor of those individuals and groups who have and are still working for peace. We must add our voices, our strengths, and our resources
to their magnificent struggle. But we must also invite these pioneers to join with us in re-visioning a *Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace* that requires every sector of society, in a global transcendent effort, to think and act anew.

I call this effort “transcendent” because a global strategy for peace demands that we each reach deep within ourselves to transcend our individual egos, our ethnic and cultural identities, our organizational allegiances, and even our national pride. Only then can we achieve a truly human identity and a global mission, one that treats every citizen of every country as equal and equally valuable.

This does not mean we have to move in lockstep or even work on the same part of the puzzle at the same time. Yet, we do need a *Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace* that moves us all toward the same overarching goal. There must be a clear, inclusive picture to which we all commit ourselves. I emphasize the term “leadership,” because, without leadership, no strategy can succeed.

The strategy must be one that can be brought to fruition by many groups, each doing its special part. If we are successful in crafting a global strategy, even as one group lags, it will be buoyed and reinvigorated by the momentum of the rest. And with strong, connective leadership, we can accomplish this critical task.

**The Issue is Ripe; The Time is Now**

Leadership scholar Ronald Heifetz (1994) argues that it is not possible to “move” an issue until it is ripe.\(^\text{12}\) By that, he means enough people must be aware of the issue, feel it deeply, and have both the incentive and the resolve to solve it.

I do believe the issue of “global, enduring, and sustainable peace” is ripe. It is time – more than time – to confront this noble enterprise. Worldwide, ordinary people in their most fundamental roles – as mothers, fathers, wives, husbands, and children -- are sick of war. They thirst for another, more humane, more civilized, more equitable, and democratic way to live. It is time to put our people and our resources to work for the good of humanity everywhere, not just in our own
neighborhood, our own company, our own religious community, nor even simply in our own country. That is what the protests are symbolizing.

Before you insist that what has failed in the past is bound to fail again, let us first remember Heifetz’s insight: *The issue must be ripe.* And the yearning for peace is ripe right now! The historical moment is right! And new technology, particularly social media, makes this strategy possible now, not before. There is no time to lose.

**The Current Focus Is on War**

Currently, the world economy is driven, in large part, by a focus on war and defense. At the present time, the defense industry is the second largest industry worldwide (2.7% of World GDP), with an estimated annual expenditure of over US$1.5 trillion on the military, including services and hardware. (And this does not count illegal trade in small arms.)

During the 2008 financial meltdown, the defense industry saw a serious decline in total arms sales, with more than a 50% cut, from US$32.9 billion to US$14.3 billion. Estimates running through 2014 predict further declines. The industry is forecast to decelerate at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 4.7% for 2009-14. Let’s keep our eye on that predicted decline.

**The Message is Clear: Self-destruct or Change the Focus from War to Peace**

Nonetheless, the message is clear: We are on the path of self-destruction worldwide. Wars and local conflicts are killing off the next generation in a senseless and obscene way, provoking endless clashes. In our drive for growth and power, we are wantonly destroying the natural environment that we need for life and breath. In the process, we are misspending our material resources in ways that leave whatever remnant is left of the next and future generations bereft of the basic necessities for sustainable human life.

We need to shift our focus from war and defense to global, enduring, and sustainable peace that would recharge the engines of production and innovation.
worldwide. Redirecting our attention and energies to peace would also vastly improve our quality of life, as well as the condition of the planet.

Continuing to invest in war and defense is throwing badly-needed resources after already enormous sunk costs. This is a costly and senseless strategy. Moreover, the prediction for the near term tells us this is not an engine that can invigorate the world economy.

Without peace, we exhaust our valuable and limited human and material resources so desperately needed to confront the teeming unmet needs of humankind: that is, poverty, health, famine, shelter, education, scientific and technological discovery, innovative business development, the environment, infrastructure, and economic stability around the globe.

So, I ask you to consider with me a 180° turn to a global investment in peace, in peace entrepreneurship, scientific and technological innovations for peace, peace research and development, production for peace, and more constructive relationships to ensure a global, enduring, and sustainable peace. With diminishing returns from investments in war, why not consider peace as the galvanizing force to reignite the engines of production around the world? In the 1960’s, President John Kennedy’s challenge to a race to the moon created unprecedented economic growth and technical innovation. A challenge to create global peace could have a similar energizing effect throughout the world.

Peter Drucker, the father of modern management, often spoke of abandoning bad ideas quickly and completely. It is time to abandon our obsession with war, conflict, and competition and start investing in peace entrepreneurship, peace collaboration, peace productivity, peace innovation, peace R&D, sustainability, and our own human fulfillment through peace.
Two Cases for Peace: The Principled Case and the Pragmatic Case

To cut the Gordian knot of war, we need a strong scissor, with two sharp blades. One blade applies the *principled* (or moral) force for peace; the other blade, the *pragmatic* force for peace. Both blades must work together to sunder the stubborn knot of war.

**The Principled (Moral) Case for Peace**

At this very moment, approximately 41 wars are being waged worldwide, with others threatening to erupt at any moment. The destruction inflicted by most of these wars falls below our angle of vision. The media, weary of reporting the monotony of endless, horrific war, turn instead to the trivia of dog shows and beauty pageants.

From a moral perspective, the loss of life to violence of all kinds, from war to neighborhood gangs, is beyond measure. Reliable statistics are difficult to find; however, *The World Health Survey Programme* reports that in the near half-century, from 1955 to 2002, in 13 countries alone, “an estimated 5.4 million violent war deaths” were reported.\(^\text{18}\) The estimates since 2002 are too variable to report with any confidence.

Warriors, by definition, kill when it is necessary to defend their own people and property against threatened violence and destruction. Wars without this fundamental purpose, including wars for power, resources, or revenge, diminish and distort warriors. We don’t even notice as we transform young military warriors, who patriotically seek to defend their nations, into senseless killers, many of whom are then killed themselves. Those who survive frequently return shattered by the trauma of their new identity as killers. Society welcomes them home, but then ignores their misery reflected dimly in increasing divorce and suicide rates.

In these world-wide wars, we consistently kill off the next generation of our opponents, as well as our own offspring. How unnatural is this sickening and senseless act of the parental generation? Freud most likely would interpret this
as a pitiful defensive strategy by an older, fading generation, clinging to its political, financial, and sexual power.

**The Pragmatic Case for Peace**

*Capital Resources*

The costs of war are also closely guarded. No amount of web surfing can reveal a substantiated total cost of wars in the 20th and 21st centuries. According to the Congressional Research Service, from 9/11 to February, 2012, the Iraq War reportedly has cost US taxpayers $806 billion, while the conflict in Afghanistan has drained $499 billion and growing from the American treasury. Expenditures by our coalition partners are not part of these calculations.

This profligate misuse of resources affects every area in which we need to invest to ensure a productive and prosperous future. We do not need economists to tell us what is readily apparent: The long-term effects will be staggering. Worldwide, the cost of war is virtually impossible to estimate. But let us be clear: We are wasting our economic and natural resources at a great rate. And we continue to do this even in the face of the 2008 near-death economic spiral from which the entire world is still struggling to recover.

**The Pragmatic Peace Bonus**

There is also a serious pragmatic case to be made for peace: By harnessing our efforts toward a common worldwide goal – *global, enduring, and sustainable peace* – we can stimulate peace entrepreneurship, galvanize innovation and industry, promote a green economy, put people to work, generate new knowledge, new products, and processes, and find new sources of energy to replenish dwindling oil supplies, while advancing science and developing new technologies for growth and sustainability. In the process, we shall revitalize our global economy and create a profound sense of meaning in our lives.

*********************************************************

**A Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace**
The framework I am suggesting, which admittedly is a work in progress, requires us all to change our economic and political perspectives 180°. Let me also state at the outset, these strategies are not all of my own invention. In fact, they come from many people, and some, if not all, as I have discovered, have been attempted in the past. But this is the time to start anew! The issues have never been riper!

A Plan for Every Sector of Society

In this call to action, I shall try to identify several, but not all, major sectors of society and what each can do to launch this Strategy, although ultimately we need to address the contributions of every sector.\textsuperscript{20} So, let us begin this proposal with what governments need to do.

\textit{Government:}

\textit{A Department of Peace}

First and foremost, I propose that

- every government should establish a \textit{Department or Ministry of Peace}, following Costa Rica’s 2009 example, funded by a \textit{substantial budget taken from the Department of Defense};\textsuperscript{21}

- currently, thirty-two countries have campaigns to introduce a Department or Ministry of Peace, and \textit{all deliberate haste should be made to convert these campaigns, bills, and petitions into law worldwide}. In every country, citizens must press their national representatives to support, or introduce if necessary, similar legislation;\textsuperscript{22}

- \textit{Departments of Peace}, once established, \textit{should be linked to any other existing government agencies devoted to resolving conflicts and building peace};\textsuperscript{23}

- \textit{Departments of Peace, worldwide, should take as their top priority the elimination of nuclear weapons, with safeguards to ensure that all nations comply};
• A Joint Council on Defending the Peace, composed of senior personnel from the Department of Peace and the Department of Defense, and reporting to the Vice President of the country, should be established as a permanent link between these two cabinet-level departments;

• The Joint Council would function as a blood vessel connecting the two departments and bringing vitality to both. Including senior Department of Defense personnel would enable their formative and influential perspective on the military’s role in keeping the peace. It would also build on the expertise already contained in existing structures.

• A primary purpose of the Joint Council would be to explain each department to the other and also to serve a coordinating function. The oversight of this permanent Joint Council should be a top priority for the Vice President and provide the Joint Council with considerable clout and a clear communication link to the President.

• The Joint Council also would act as an "innovation lab" for joint projects for the Department of Peace and DOD, focusing upon the joint responsibility of the DOP and the DOD to “keep the peace.”

• Departments of Peace should let contracts for peace entrepreneurship, peace innovation, peace R&D, peace development, sustainability for peace, and peace education programs, as well as for the design and creation of peace-promoting and conflict-resolving institutions.

A Department of Peace may sound new and radical; however, it is quite the opposite. In fact, more than 200 years ago, Dr. Benjamin Rush, a member of the American Continental Congress and a signer of the American Declaration of Independence, published an essay entitled, “A plan of a Peace-Office for the United States.” Rush proposed an Office of Peace that would “inspire a veneration for human life and a horror at the shedding of human blood (and) ...subdue that passion for war.”
Anti-War-Profiteering Legislation

One major reason war often seems like a positive decision is the belief that there are profits to be made from war. (We have already noted the immense world-wide defense industry.) In cases, where military materiel is actually for the “defense of country,” should this not be conceived as a “patriotic duty,” created for one’s country as close to cost as possible? To discourage exorbitant profits in the defense industry, I propose that

- all governments should pass **War Profiteering Prevention Legislation**. In those countries that already have such proposals on their legislative agendas, citizens should urge their legislators to act with dispatch. In those that do not, citizens should propose and insist upon such legislation.

**The Peace Dividend**

Some economists argue that business has much to gain from peace, despite the traditional belief that war ignites the engines of industry. They suggest that there is a long-term “peace benefit,” as wartime budgets and other resources can be redirected to everything the society needs -- from housing to health, from education to environment.\(^27\)

The Peace Dividend discussion is far too complex for our purposes here, but it needs to happen. It involves, at a minimum, an analysis of which countries actually reduced their military spending in post-war periods, and how those resources were redeployed, as well as other important issues.\(^28\) Yet, this discussion is imperative. So, I propose that governments sponsor

- an Analysis of the **Peace Dividend** to determine how to derive the benefits suggested by proponents.
Rethinking the Military

It is time to rethink the military, its mission, and its composition. This step must be taken to follow the example of countries, like Costa Rica and others.

I propose that

- every government should reduce its military to a limited, militia-like organization used primarily for 1) defending its borders and handling other 2) national emergencies, including natural disasters;

- every government, within the same time frame, should eliminate all military bases on foreign soil, since, in a world without war there will be no further need for them;

- the military should focus the bulk of its resources on R&D, for which it has demonstrated unrivalled capacity, training, and creativity. One magnificent example of the military’s R&D brilliance: DARPA created the internet and thereby changed how the world communicates. Similar enormous R&D challenges remain, from climate change, to alternative fuels, new modes of travel, renewed infrastructure, and space exploration, to name a few. Let us release the military to express its own genius for peaceful innovation;

- every government should contribute to a significant International Peace-Keeper Force that would be responsible for intervening at the very outbreak of hostilities wherever they might arise in the world. This worldwide military peace-keeping force would have the backing of the entire international community, and thus act in the interest of keeping peace for the whole world. Having an international peace-keeping force would eliminate suspicions of imperialism or hegemony that inevitably arise when individual nations, or even a limited coalition of nations, intervene militarily in external conflicts;

We recognize there may be times when countries feel they need to act in their national self-defense. But we urge that, when a nation’s own survival is threatened, that country call upon the International Peace-Keeping
Force to intervene. And, if this *Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace* is adopted by every country, or even a majority of countries worldwide, the need to act in self-defense will diminish.

In those countries, including the US, where military service is voluntary, it is inevitably inequitable. Usually volunteers come primarily from those groups with the most limited economic and educational opportunities. There are, of course, exceptions, including many individuals from distinguished military families.

Aside from the inequity of a volunteer military, there is another serious problem: In nations where military service is on a volunteer basis, the total citizenry cannot feel the true social and psychological burdens that servicemen and women and their families bear. War remains hidden within that social class. The rest of us go on about our business as usual.

If every family were in danger of shouldering the burden of war, we would all be far more aware that peace was imperative. That is what happened during the Vietnam War, and the universally-distributed responsibility contributed heavily to ending that disastrous situation.

I, therefore, propose that

- **military service must be universal and determined by lottery, in order to distribute the burden more equitably.** These universally-drafted men and women would serve both in the International Peace-Keeping Force, as well as in their own national military.

Declarations of war are made by politicians, who then ordinarily proceed to send other people’s children into harm’s way in military action. To erect a road block to this easy path to war, I propose that

- **legislators who vote for war** must agree that they and their grown children and grandchildren will be the first to serve in the military and volunteer for the most hazardous assignments.
When those whose decisions put us on the road to war are forced to feel first-hand the anxiety and pain of battle, they undoubtedly will be far more likely to search for peaceful resolutions.

**Rethinking Political Campaigns and Political Term Limits**

Political campaigns that extend over months, even years, as they do in the US, expend vast sums of money desperately required for other human needs. Some countries manage to limit their political campaigns to weeks. In the UK, for example, 44 days is seen as an unduly long time for a national election. In Ireland, from the time candidates declare, it is four weeks until the election. Thus, I propose that

- **political campaigns shall be shortened to no more than six weeks** to conserve both time and money;

- these time-limited **political campaigns should be funded solely with public monies**, so that corporate and other private interests cannot develop a hold on individual elected officials;

- **elected political representatives should be limited to one six-year term at the local and another six-year term at the national level** in order to reduce the influence of entrenched interests and tendencies toward corruption. If elected officials do not have to consider their re-election, they can vote freely, without indebtedness to any group;

- **legislation should be introduced to make the lobbying of political candidates, as well as elected and appointed public officials, an illegal activity.**

**Public Education Funding**

As the world becomes increasingly complex and interconnected, largely through advanced technology, a more educated citizenry will be needed to
enable society to function productively. The burden of student loans is a barrier to educating current and future generations.

In 2011, the College Board reported that US students were “borrowing twice what they did a decade ago after adjusting for inflation.” Current estimates list total US outstanding student loan debt between $902 billion and $1 trillion. “The Federal Reserve Bank of New York reports $902 billion, while the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau reports $41 trillion. Roughly $864 billion is outstanding federal student loan debt, while the remaining $150 billion is in private student loans...not made or backed by the federal government.” The figures on per capita student debt are devastating, too voluminous and too depressing, in fact, to report here. This overwhelming personal debt for college graduates and graduate school degree holders stands in the way of their moving productively into the labor market.

Yet, according to the President’s 2013 federal discretionary budget request sent to Congress in February, 2013, 57% of the budget will be allocated to the Military (Department of Defense, war, and nuclear weapons programs), compared to 6% for education, all levels combined.

Given the earlier plan for reducing each country’s military defense force, replaced by a strengthened international peace-keeping force, I propose the following recommendation, drawing on proposed reductions for defense:

- The Federal Government should forgive all existing federal student loans and repay all existing private loans to banks and other lenders.
- The Federal Government should extend public education funding to cover k-16, that is, to include a 4-year baccalaureate degree from public colleges and universities. Any students who prefer private colleges will be responsible for any additional costs of private college and university tuition that exceed the amount allotted for public college/university funding.
• The Federal Government should offer no-interest loans, scholarships, and work-study programs for graduate level education beyond the baccalaureate.

**Criminal Justice System Reform:**

The criminal justice system is in need of serious reform, a subject far beyond the scope of this *Peace Plan*. Suffice it to say, that the escalating incarceration problem, largely fed by the underlying drug problem, is out of control, with more than two million inmates, by current count. A disproportionate number of minorities and poverty-level individuals have been incarcerated in the US system. (See Business, Private Prison Industry, below). Two major studies of released prisoners indicate that the recidivism and reconviction rates within three years remain close to two-thirds of the released populations. This suggests that

• Educational programs designed to teach prisoners marketable skills for their post-prison lives are sorely needed.

• Psychological counseling programs in prisons need to address the dysfunctional personality issues and decision making processes exhibited by prisoners.

**Business:**

Business, in particular, with its prodigious resources, has a special, vital role to play; however, business cannot do it singlehandedly. I call the overall business component “*Peace Entrepreneurship.*” Before I get to Peace Entrepreneurship, please allow me a detour to set the stage:

**Defense Industry**

We have already considered the immense profits the defense industry earns during wartime. I am hardly the first to call attention to the size of defense industry profits in the US, nor is this the place to consider them in great detail.34
Nor is the American defense industry a singular example. Defense industry companies around the globe are making astronomical profits.

To discourage the unnecessarily extensive defense industry, I propose two actions, which will require a business/government partnership:

First,

- **Worldwide legislation requiring the defense industry, prompted by expectable patriotism, to operate as non-profit businesses; and**

Second,

- Government-provided **conversion funds** to create incentives for defense industries to switch to for-profit Peace Entrepreneurship that includes production of products, processes, services, research, development, and technology focused on peace, reduction of poverty, improvements to health, housing, education, a green economy, economic growth and stability, sustainability, climate change, and other issues that contribute to the positive, productive, and peaceful condition of society.

For example, Swedish TV, in December, 2010, profiled an Egyptian business owner discussing how he converted his land mine manufacturing factory to the production of land mine detectors. He spoke with pride about his increased profits, but he spoke with even greater satisfaction and humility based on his awareness that he now was doing something to help humanity.

Clearly, this individual’s motivation, as well as his sense of material and human worth, had expanded when he converted his business to a peace-building activity. That is Peace Entrepreneurship in practice.

That intriguing example made me think more deeply about the motivation of captains of the defense industry. Are these business leaders really committed to making war materials for the sake of war -- or for the sake of profits? Clearly the individual on TV was happier and richer in his peace-building business.
I suspect that when there is limited profit to be made in war manufacturing and more to be made in peace- and sustainability-related businesses, the current and future captains of the defense industry will seriously reconsider what kind of businesses they want to build.

Third,

- Government agencies, such as the CIA, various offices within the Department of Homeland Security, as well as the Military, should track down and eliminate illicit trade in small arms and light weapons (SA/LW), as the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) and other groups have attempted to do. According to the FAS,

  “SA/LW account for an estimated 60-90% of the 100,000+ conflict deaths each year (Small Arms Survey 2005) and tens of thousands of additional deaths outside of war zones. They are also the weapons of choice for many terrorists.”  

Tracking down and eliminating illicit trade in SA/LW is a complex matter, because SA/LW also serve legitimate law enforcement, military, sporting, and recreational purposes. Thus, as the FAS suggests, unlike weapons of mass destruction, their manufacture cannot be banned outright. Nonetheless, it is the illicit diversion and improper use of SA/LW that need to be controlled.

**Private Prison Industry**

The US imprisons 2.3 million people, “more people, both per capita and in absolute terms than any other nation in the world, including Russia, China, and Iran.”

According to the ACLU, “The number of inmates in private prisons increased by roughly 1600 percent between 1990 and 2009. In 2010, the two largest private prison companies alone took in nearly $3 billion in revenue, and their top executives each received annual compensation packages worth well over $3 million.”

- Worldwide legislation should be promulgated converting the private prison industry from for-profit to non-profit status;
• Redirect government funding from previous for-profit prison industry programs to rehabilitation industry (drug treatment and other life counseling programs, etc.) to help reduce prison population.

Business has immense resources and resourcefulness to contribute to peace. Innovation, R&D, and entrepreneurship, all focused on peace, can present the business sector with enormous, energizing opportunities. As noted earlier, this redirection of the business sector’s focus would act much the same as President John F. Kennedy’s challenge to land a human on the moon in 10 years. That challenge galvanized American society, particularly business and the military, to engage in an outburst of new products, new science and technology, and new conceptual frameworks for still further developments.

With that in mind, I propose a two-pronged strategy:

First,

• **Department of Peace Contracts for Peace Entrepreneurship.** This includes not only former defense contractors, but social entrepreneurs and other businesspeople who want to “do good, while doing well.” All the activities mentioned in the previous point (i.e., production of products, processes, services, research, development, and technology focused on peace, a green economy, economic growth and stability, sustainability, climate change, and other issues that contribute to the positive, productive condition of society) could receive Department of Peace contracts. 38

  **Two New Statutory Forms of Corporations: L3C’s and B Corporations**

As part of an enhanced business strategy, we need to consider innovations in the types of business structures we can create. We need to move beyond the narrow set of for-profits and non-profits.

Two new statutory forms of corporations are particularly worth our notice: **L3C’s (low-profit, limited liability companies) and their for-profit cousins, Benefit**
Corporations, which already exist in the United Kingdom. They are new arrivals on the corporate scene in some American states, since 2008.\textsuperscript{39}

These innovative corporate structures offer new business opportunities for entrepreneurs and investors, as well as for foundations, to promote socially-beneficial, peaceful research efforts, products, and services. Related, but different, L3C’s and B Corporations are designed to “use the power of business to solve social and environmental problems” and generally to benefit society.

L3C’s are for-profit, limited liability companies that allow program related investments (PRI’s) by private foundations and other investors. Although the L3C may earn a profit and distribute that profit to its members, \textit{profit making is not meant to be the primary aim of the corporation}. The state legislation authorizing L3C’s stipulates that the primary exempt purpose must meet the requirements of Internal Revenue Code §170(c) (2) (B) (e.g., religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational). Thus, profit making, while allowed, is a \textit{secondary} purpose of an L3C. Although L3C’s can be created as “stand alone” entities that wish to brand themselves as “charitable” organizations, they can also be created by public charities that wish to create a for-profit arm.

\textbf{Benefit Corporations} are a second new statutory corporate form, available in certain states within the United States, as well as elsewhere. \textbf{Benefit Corporations are for-profit entities that benefit society, as well as shareholders. “B Corporations must create a positive impact on society and the environment; consider how decisions affect workers, community, and the environment; and publicly report their social and environmental performance according to third party standards.”}\textsuperscript{40}

While an L3C is required to have a specific and primary §170(c) (2) (B) exempt purpose, Benefit Corporations are designed to offer a “general public benefit." The law defines a “general public benefit” as “a material, positive impact on society and the environment, as measured by a third party standard, through activities that promote a combination of specific public benefits.”\textsuperscript{41} The Benefit Corporation may “include one of the following specific public purposes in its organization documents:
1) Provide individuals or communities with beneficial products or services;
2) Promote economic opportunity for individuals or communities beyond the creation of jobs in the normal course of business;
3) Preserve the environment;
4) Improve human health;
5) Promote the arts, sciences, or advancement of knowledge;
6) Increase the flow of capital to entities with a public benefit purpose; or
7) The accomplishment of any other particular benefit for society or the environment."

A third, and sometimes confusing, entity is the B corporation, which is designated yearly by B Labs. A B corporation is “merely a certification of a company that can be incorporated as an LLC or a C corporation, while a Benefit Corporation is not automatically certified as a B corporation.” And while the L3C must assign profit-making secondary priority, the Benefit Corporation is allowed to give equal weight and attention to profit and societal benefit.

Social Entrepreneurship, of which Benefit Corporations and L3C’s are some new examples, is an important aspect of peace. Social entrepreneurship can be encouraged through contracts from the Department of Peace. (Elaborate this section.)

**Unions:**

Unions, too, have a significant leadership role to play in this global strategy for enduring peace. Unions have strong negotiating and mediating skills, which can be put to good use in our search for peace. They have a deep history in mediation which should be focused on the larger issue of global peace.

Here, I propose that

- unions join in partnerships with mediation groups to develop peacemaking programs, for educational, business, and military institutions, as well as for other types of organizations.

By so doing, unions can move to the next level of development, where they can lead the way for profitable and less conflict-ridden work environments.
The Media:

The media’s role during wartime has often been courageous, complex, and controversial. During the Vietnam War, iconic media images of children, their clothes ignited by napalm, stirred outrage around the world. On June 11, 1963, photographer Malcolm Browne famously snapped an image of Thich Quang Duc, a seventy-three-year-old Buddhist monk, who set himself on fire at a busy Saigon intersection, as bystanders watched in sickening horror. Protests against the Vietnam War erupted, and the rest is history.

More recently, a 26-year-old Tunisian fruit vendor, Mohamed Bouazizi, set himself ablaze in direct view of the governor’s office to protest the humiliation he had endured when local authorities confiscated his fruit, attacked him, and refused him a vendor’s license. When news of Bouazizi’s protest spread -- this time, through social media -- it sparked a revolution that ultimately unseated Tunisian President Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali, who had held a tight grip on power for 23 years.

In recent military conflicts, the media initially complained that they were not allowed to witness actual combat. This eventually led to the policy of embedding journalists and news photographers in military units to permit them to see first-hand war’s harsh realities.

For a complex set of corporate, military, and other reasons, the public still does not get to see the worst of war. And with good reason: In the past, when that has occurred, the public has been stirred from its lethargy and moved to action, as we saw in the Vietnam example.

When any country is engaged in war, I propose that

- news media take photos and file stories that depict not the glory, but the goriness, of war so that the general public, worldwide, can see and judge for itself whether it chooses to support the carnage.

In that role, the media could perform a valuable service for peace. And if they choose not to do so, or are prevented by editors or corporate bosses, then “Ireporters,” using
social media, can step in and send viral images that will increase the outrage and the call for peace.

- **All TV channels should sponsor a weekly Peace Magazine**, in which various peace issues can be discussed by scholars, peace activists, legislators, and the general citizenry.

- **The film industry should make documentaries on the horrors of war**, as well as the beauty and productivity of peace.

- **The video game industry should make peace video games and apps** for mobile devices.

**Educational Institutions:**

Educational institutions transmit and promote the culture of a country. Some educational institutions are already working assiduously to inculcate a culture of peace, including peace-making attitudes, values, and skills in their students.

Still, much more needs to be done. From elementary school to post-graduate institutions, every level must play its part.

Consequently, I propose that

- **elementary and secondary schools build broad-based Bullying Prevention Programs and Mediation and Negotiation Skills Development Programs.** These programs should focus not simply on the process of bullying, which allows us to remain emotionally distant, but on the persona of bullies as “uncool cowards.”

- **elementary and secondary schools should create counseling programs for bullies and victims of bullies, along with their families;**

- **elementary and secondary schools should develop training programs for teachers and other school personnel to teach the most effective methods of dealing with bullies and their victims.**
Bullying Prevention Programs and Mediation and Negotiation Skills Development Programs should be as fundamental to the curriculum as reading, writing, and arithmetic.

As the bullying epidemic spreads among school-aged children, often with deadly results, it has become increasingly clear that we must reach children, their teachers, and their parents at the earliest possible stage. In that way, we can build awareness and skills to prevent this deadly form of interaction. Bullying experts insist that preventing bullying on the playground will serve to diminish bullying in the executive suite later in life (Blumen, 2011).46

- elementary and secondary schools should develop peace and justice curricula;

- elementary and secondary peace and justice academies should be established in every school district, with “social justice laboratories” designed to enlighten children about the serious consequences of inequality and lack of justice.47

At the university level, I propose that

- universities and post-graduate institutions inaugurate full-scale Peace and Justice Studies Curricula and Research Programs for those institutions that do not already have them (and, unfortunately, most do not). The curriculum should focus on the “pedagogy of peace,”48 including factors and conditions leading to and/or preventing peace, a new definition of peace that goes beyond the “absence of war,” and moves toward peace as a condition of growth, creativity, and self-transcendence; psychological studies of the processes that lead to the “we/they dichotomy,” negotiation and mediation processes, empathy, forgiveness and reconciliation, positive psychology, new approaches to leadership, other aspects of human development, etc.

In each region of every country, I propose that
• universities create *Centers for the Resolution and Reconciliation of “Intractable” Conflicts.*

These Centers should provide trained mediators and negotiators for the various parties who will be invited to those venues to wrestle with and attempt to resolve their conflicts. Where these centers already exist, they should be strengthened and coordinated. Funding should be provided by the Department of Peace or a suitable foundation (e.g., the Fetzer Institute).

Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation Centers can offer parties involved in conflicts the opportunity to come together to work out their disagreements in a private space, *without media scrutiny.* Mediation and negotiation services and training, as well as meeting facilities and housing, should be made available to these groups for as long as needed.

The Centers should develop programs in collaboration with professional mediators, such as *Mediators beyond Borders* and other established mediation experts. When the conflicting parties meet an impasse, they should be allowed to retire for some specific, but limited, period of time, but then be required to return to the mediation table.

No media representatives should be allowed on the premises. Nor should media be permitted to contact the negotiating parties at any time during the mediation sessions or between sessions in cases of ongoing mediation.

**If and when a conflict is satisfactorily resolved, the successful negotiators** should be required

1) to return to the Center to act as successful role models for at least one subsequent set of conflicting parties, and

2) to reflect on the process and help refine and develop even more effective strategies for resolving complex conflicts.

At colleges and universities,
• **broad-based research programs** should foster scientific research that addresses the antecedents and causes of conflict and peace, the means for conflict resolution and reconciliation, as well as the horrific costs of war.

Research should focus on the roots of violence, as well as the relationship between and among war/violence, health, and longevity; inter-group relations; the relationship between happiness and peace (positive psychology); neighborhood arrangements and programs that foster peaceful coexistence of diverse groups; the antecedent and mediating factors in gang development; the connection between identity theory and war/violence; leadership strategies that lead to group productivity and health; new directions in leadership research that focus on all aspects of peace and peace-related behavior; research from all the social and behavioral sciences, as well as the burgeoning field of neuroscience, should address the factors that help us avoid and resolve conflicts, as well as attain peace.

**Leadership Groups and Programs, Peace Groups, and Other NGO’s**

• **Leadership Associations and Institutes** must address the central question stated earlier, **“Leadership for What?”** What should be the action goal of all this leadership research, teaching, and leadership practice if not the noblest goal of all: the achievement and on-going promotion of peace, which then enables us to redirect our resources and attention to the remaining great challenges society faces?

Because of its international reach,

• **the International Leadership Association (ILA),** in coordination with other broad-based leadership organizations, should develop a coordinating strategy aimed at all the existing leadership associations, institutes, centers, and university-based leadership programs.
Leadership scholars and practitioners should map and integrate the efforts of all these groups to create leadership training initiatives to develop connective and other types of leaders with peacemaking and peace-building skills.

In addition,

- **NGO leadership groups** should join forces with existing peace groups to create a coordinating strategy for establishing an on-going, robust presence at the United Nations and all other broad-based international bodies dedicated to peace.

In this way, these NGO’s can have a stronger voice in the international policy dialogue about enduring global peace.

**Religion**

Paradoxically and regrettably, religion and religious identity continue to create a major fulcrum of war. Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen has written eloquently about the process by which we unnecessarily, but consistently, narrow our multiple identities into a single identity—often our religion—and then see the world narrowly and darkly through that lens. Violence, Sen warns us, is the inevitable consequence.\(^{52}\) He argues:

> “The prospects for peace in the contemporary world may well lie in the recognition of the plurality of our affiliations and in the use of reasoning as common inhabitants of a wide world, rather than making us into inmates rigidly incarcerated in little containers.” (Sen, 2006, p. xvii.)

Since the identity that many cling to most rigidly is their religious identity, we need the dedicated assistance of religious leaders to free their followers from their dangerous imprisonment. In the turbulent post 9/11 world, we rarely hear the voices of religious leaders speaking out for peace. The voices of those who have called for peace and interfaith harmony have been drowned out by the voices of hate.

Since my aim is not to ignite a counter-productive debate among the various religious groups who have yet to join hands, many of which have labored mightily
for peace, let me make some general recommendations that others before me have also made.

I propose that

- religious education focus on inter-faith acceptance, harmony, and respect, beginning with programs for young children and continuing through adult faith-based education programs;

- religious leaders strengthen ecumenical programs to teach interfaith understanding, harmony, and collaboration;

- religious leaders join hands to convene high-level and on-going ecumenical conferences to create a strategy for inter-faith harmony and reconciliation and communicate it to their followers; (I am aware of several “Day of Prayer” ecumenical meetings, first in Assisi, Italy, in 1986, and several subsequently. Such laudable activity must occur on an expanded, on-going basis.)

- religious leaders inject their united voice for peace into the worldwide policy dialogue;

- existing religious groups, both formally within religious institutions, such as orders of religious, and the laity affiliated with religious institutions, should convene congresses and adopt plans of action for mobilizing efforts for peace.

Around the world, millions of believers wait for their religious leaders to guide their actions. Mobilizing the faithful in the struggle against hatred, violence, and war is a noble duty that their religious leaders should continue to undertake.

**Foundations:**

Foundations play an important role in society, creating cutting edge, innovative programs that the society needs, but often cannot afford. They do this by thinking “outside the box” and providing the funds for other individuals and groups to do the same.
I propose that Foundations

- design, establish, and support “think tanks” that continually conduct dialogues among different sectors of society to re-envision and implement global, enduring, and sustainable peace; and

- support university- and “think tank”-based research and Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation Centers.

This visionary role is one that foundations are well equipped to handle.

Museums and Other Cultural Institutions

Museums, such as the Museum of Tolerance, in Los Angeles, the Holocaust Museum, in Washington, DC, and the Anna Frank House, in Amsterdam, are telling examples of how cultural institutions can remind us of the horrors and tragedies of war.

I propose that

- museums documenting the ravages of war should be established in every major city, worldwide;

- museums and libraries should be established in major cities around the world to record and analyze the multi-splendored outcomes and accomplishments of peace and justice.

- science museums in every country should display the history of technology, such as the space age, that demonstrates the world-wide benefit of such activities for peaceful goals.

The Arts and Humanities

The arts and humanities have always reached our spirit in ways that ordinary hortatory cannot. Music stirs our souls, art inflames our conscience and our passions, and literature forces us to reflect. Famed artist Pablo Picasso once said,
“I have never considered painting as a pleasure-giving art, a distraction; I have wanted, by drawing and painting, “...since those were my weapons, to advance even further in the knowledge of the world and of man.” I have always believed, and still do believe that artists who live and work with spiritual values cannot...”...and should not remain indifferent in the face of a conflict where the highest values of humanity and civilization are at stake.”

And we all know the immense impact of Picasso’s masterpiece, “Guernica,” on the world’s conscience, with it bold artistic reference to the German bombing of Guernica, Spain in 1937.

Since the arts cannot be commanded, only encouraged, I would like to urge artists around the globe, in all fields, to use their artistic gifts to awaken the world to the misery and obscenity of a world without peace.

With great respect and temerity, let me suggest one example: the creation, by a group of collaborating artists, of a

- “Peace Sculpture,” composed of multiple life-size figures, with their arms raised to uphold a fragile globe of peace. With enough figures, some could have a permanent home in a symbolic peace location, such as the Nobel Peace Committee’s locale, while others could tour the world on a regular basis.

****************************************************************

This document is designed simply to give some examples of how different sectors of society can participate in a society-wide and society-deep effort. The medical and legal professions, as well as engineering and architecture, have much to contribute to innovations for peace and sustainability.

Every industry, from aerospace to agriculture, would have its special role in contributing to the Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace.

There are many other pieces of the societal peace puzzle to be designed and implemented. I call on everyone reading this document to send his/her ideas and amendments to complete this plan. The current document is simply a “call to peaceful arms.”
Each society will need to adapt the plan to fit its specific structure, culture, and traditions; however, there should be as much uniformity as cultural differences allow. In that way, we shall all be “on the same page,” and, as Cleopatra insisted, we can “make it happen!”

A Two-Pronged Implementation Strategy: Champions & Social Media

There are two major components to this implementation plan: one part for launching the strategy with the help of important champions; the second for spreading the word and creating an international groundswell.

**Part One: Two Types of Champions for the Peace Strategy:**

**Type I: The Global Champion: The Nobel Peace Committee**

Every strategy, in business and elsewhere, requires a “champion.” I believe the most appropriate champion for our Leadership Initiative for a Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace would be the Nobel Peace Committee, as designated in Alfred B. Nobel’s will. The Nobel peace Prize has been awarded since 1901, in accordance with the wishes of Alfred B. Nobel, the Stockholm-born inventor of dynamite.

Nobel specified that the prize for peace should be given to

"the person who shall have done the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses." 54

Nobel, a scientist, felt his invention of dynamite would have the deterrent effect of making war too dangerous to wage. Unfortunately, it had the opposite effect.

Since the Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace directly addresses Nobel’s dedication to peace, it seems entirely appropriate that

- the Nobel Peace Committee should convene an inaugural Global Conference, in Oslo, Norway, to refine and expand the proposed
Connective Leadership Strategy for Global, Enduring, and Sustainable Peace and, in addition, to develop a detailed implementation plan, with annual benchmarks for accomplishing each component in each country.

- Nobel Prize Laureates should be invited to take leading roles in these congresses.

Representatives from the 193 currently existing UN countries should be invited to the Conference so that all countries, large and small, representing the greatest cultural and ethnic diversity, may participate in this global enterprise. Other countries, as well, should be invited.

- The Nobel Peace Committee should hold subsequent conferences every two years to assess the progress of the Strategy and the Implementation Plan and to revise and supplement, where deemed necessary, both the Strategy and the Implementation Plan.

- The Nobel Peace Committee should appoint International Sectoral Committees from every societal sector (i.e., government, including the military, as well as education, the media, business, religion, foundations, museums and libraries, the diplomatic sector, health, law, architecture and engineering, etc.) to convene in Oslo in the intervening years to report progress on benchmarks, exchange ideas, and promote the development and adoption of peace-building strategies that promise success in their sector.

  Each International Sectoral Committee should include respected champions, including Nobel laureates where appropriate, from within their own countries to give legitimacy and draw attention to the new peace initiatives for that sector.

Given the international stature of the Nobel Peace Committee, with its long history of promoting peace activities, it is the natural and obvious choice to undertake the stewardship of this global strategy.

Type II: Sectoral Champions:
Each sector, from government and business, to education and the religious sector, should have a well-known and exemplary champion from that sector, respect for whom would help to legitimate that sector’s plan. For example, Warren Buffett would be an ideal choice for the business sector, Václav Havel for government, etc., Drew Faust for higher education, etc.

Part Two: Spreading the Word through Social Media

A global strategy for peace may seem like “Mission Impossible,” and, I realize, time is not our friend. But technology, in the form of social media, is on our side. And that will be the critical key to our success.

If you have any doubts about the power of social media, consider how determined and desperate young people in the Middle East, using the internet and social media, have sparked a contagious movement for freedom and choice that appears unstoppable. Ten years ago, that was impossible.

Ten years ago, the technology to accomplish the task we are setting for ourselves did not exist, but today it does. We need to use this amazing complex of technological innovations to revitalize the global economy. We can do this by rethinking and then spreading the word about the task that every sector in society, in every nation, must undertake. The goal is peace, worldwide and enduring. We need to spread the word. There isn’t a minute to waste.

In the past, peace movements have depended upon traditional media to broadcast their message, to ignite both our public conscience and the popular imagination. Unfortunately, the traditional media’s interest inevitably has waxed and waned, as other more conflict-ridden, more pulse-racing events grabbed their attention. Corporate interests have also taken their toll on the media’s focus on peace. Consequently, large peace movements, along with smaller efforts to gain peace, were held hostage by the media’s fickle attention span.

Inevitably and fortunately, times and technology have changed. Technology, in the guise of social media, has freed us from our dependence on traditional print and broadcast media. Technology is free and available to every young person with a smart phone or laptop. It offers us an incredible and affordable means of
spreading the word for global, enduring, and sustainable peace and keeping it in the public eye. I emphasize “young people,” because it has always been the idealism of the young that propelled important social movements. So, it is highly appropriate that social media, an invention of the young for the young, is the “how” that will drive this Strategy and help us succeed where success was not possible in the past.

But this historic task will take every one of us, not just the young, working relentlessly, to achieve this noble goal. And social media has the potential to make our message “go viral.”

**Coda:**

Peace is not an easy or a “one-time-and-forget-it” task. Peace is a life-long, generation-spanning commitment. And that is what makes it a particularly useful path – both principled and pragmatic -- to economic recovery and sustainability. It will take time, and that is good. That long-term effort will sustain and reinvigorate our economies worldwide. It will renew us spiritually, as well. If we can sustain global peace for five generations, perhaps we shall evolve as a global society with no personal recollection of war.

What we start here today may not be fully realized in our lifetime. Whatever we achieve in our pursuit of global, enduring, and sustainable peace must be handed carefully to the next -- and then the next -- generation to continue, to expand, to re-envision anew as the world continues to change.

The task probably will never be done completely and finally, for many roadblocks will continue to appear, sometimes from apathy, more often from avarice and aggression. Moreover, bureaucracy inevitably grows like a parasitic vine that chokes off the path. In addition, we must always be on guard against forces that yearn for the power and booty of war – land, natural resources, treasury, and populations.

So, we must act resolutely, never flagging, never allowing our accomplishments, no matter how great, to lull us into complacency. Neither must we permit the enormity of the goal to deter us or make us lose heart. We must begin here and
now to rethink, to re-envision peace, global and enduring, and trust that our example will inspire those who come after us to pick up our heavy burden and move forward.

Albert Einstein once said, "The world is a dangerous place, not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing." By accepting this challenge to create and implement a Connective Leadership Strategy for Global and Enduring Peace, we’ll undoubtedly make the world a less dangerous place. By accepting this challenge, we’ll also discover that we have met our own human need for meaning and significance that Viktor E. Frankl, in Man’s Search for Meaning (1946/1984) so passionately urged us to fulfill.55

In the process, we’ll most likely also discover our deep bonds and connections to the rest of humankind, as expressed in the concept of “ubuntu,” translated as "a person is a person through (other) persons.” Only this time, it will be “ubuntu in action.” Then, Einstein can rest assured that the world is no longer such a dangerous place, because those who look on will keep doing something, something extraordinary to achieve that noble goal of Global and Enduring Peace, along with economic stability, for all of humankind.

Then, when we are asked, “Leadership for What,” we may answer unabashedly: “Leadership for enduring global peace that redirects our resources to fulfill humankind’s most critical unmet needs.” Then and only then, shall we reach the apex of Maslow’s revised hierarchy of needs: self-transcendence, that self-forgetfulness and altruism that bring deep meaning to our lives.56 I profoundly believe that taking up this challenge will ultimately lead us all to deeper understanding and human connections, as well as greater satisfaction in every sphere of life.

---

1 On the only extant copy of Cleopatra’s actual signature, the Egyptian Queen signed a letter, written in Greek, to a bureaucrat ordering him to allow certain privileges to the bearer of the letter. Above her signature, Cleopatra writes, “Make it happen.” I think the Egyptian Queen’s advice bears repeating today. (See “Cleopatra: The Exhibition,” at the California Science Center, Weingart Gallery, 2012-Jan. 6, 2013.)
© Jean Lipman-Blumen 2015

2 This beautiful Korean calligraphy frontispiece was created specifically to grace this Peace Strategy by Dr. Hong-il Shin, a certified calligrapher of the Korean Calligrapher Association, Professor of Operations Management at Kyung Hee University, Seoul. South Korea, father of Matthew MinSuk Shin, my incredible Claremont Graduate University computer technology savior.

3 These words describing how change moves through a three-stage trajectory were inspired by Harvard President Drew Faust’s reported recent (circa 2012) description of some difficult university changes.


5 “Ubuntu ngumuntu abantu” is a Swahili expression, which means, “a person is a person because of other people, or rather, a person is a person through other people.” Ubuntu has sometimes been translated to mean, “I am more myself because of you.” Nelson Mandela focuses on ubuntu’s force to “enable the community around you.”

6 Because of limited space, a representative sample of societal sectors are described in this document; however, this document is intended to inspire others to help design the contributions of the remaining sectors.


14 Tourism is considered the largest industry worldwide. Tourism, too, has felt the impact not only of the financial crisis, but the threat of terrorism throughout the world.

15 The top 10 aerospace and defense companies recorded revenues of $393.3 billion during 2009, an increase of 4.8% over 2008. The operating profit of these firms was $26.1 billion, an 18.7% reduction compared to the previous year. Their net profit was $14.6 billion, a decrease of 27.5% from 2008. The operating margin of the top 10 companies was 6.6% in 2009, compared with 8.6% in 2008. Their net margin was 3.7%, compared with 5.4% in the previous year. The global aerospace and defense market generated total revenues of $743.9 billion in 2009, representing a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 4.9% for the period spanning 2005-09. The industry is forecast to decelerate at a CAGR of 4.7% for 2009-14 to reach $937.5 billion by the end of the period.


18 http://www.bmj.com/content/336/7659/1482.abstract.


20 I have deliberately omitted both the international military and peacekeeping institutions, such as the UN, NATO, UNESCO, the World Court of Justice, and related institutions because their special role needs to be analyzed in too great depth to be treated adequately in this paper. I plan to address their role in the Connective Leadership Strategy for Global and Enduring Peace at a later date.

21 Costa Rica changed the name of its Ministry of Justice to “Ministry of Justice and Peace.” In 2009, Costa Rica became the first country in Latin America and the third in the world to create a Ministry of Peace.

22 On 2/18/2011, H.R. 808, The Department of Peace Act of 2011, was introduced by Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-OH), with 18 co-sponsors. It was “referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.” http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/thomas.

23 The Institute of Peace was established by the US Congress in 1984 as a nonpartisan, federal institution to work to prevent violence and conflicts worldwide.


25 Rush recommended a special room in which all major documents would be signed and archived. In that room, he wrote, “let there be a collection of plough-shares and pruning-hooks made out of swords and spears.” Rush made this recommendation only four years after the creation of the Department of War, over whose doorway he proposed inscribing a number of descriptive warnings, including, “An office for butchering the human species.”
A proposal for a Department of Peace has been introduced repeatedly in the US Congress, with 85 House and Senate bills introduced between 1955 and 1968 alone. More recently, a bill to create a U.S. Department of Peace has been introduced in every session of Congress from 2001 to 2011. In 2001, Representative Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) introduced a bill to establish a U.S. Department of Peace. By 2009, the bill had 72 co-sponsors. In 2008, Representative Wayne Gilchrest (R-MD) became the first Republican to co-sponsor the proposed legislation. In the Senate, Sen. Mark Dayton (D-Minnesota) introduced a companion bill.


Peace Dividend proponents also acknowledge that, immediately following most wars, temporary recessions occur, while economies adjust to the changing circumstances. Unfortunately, after the Cold War ended, the Peace Dividend in the US was directed toward various regional conflicts and a defense against terrorism.


Cauchon, Dennis 10/25/11, USA Today; <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/perfi/college/story/2011-10-19/student-loan-debt/50818676/1>

American Student Assistance. (012) Student Loan Debt Statistics; <http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2012/03grading=student-loans.html>.
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American Student Assistance. (012) Student Loan Debt Statistics; <http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2012/03grading=student-loans.html>.

On the eve of WWII, The Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program (commonly referred to as “The Truman Committee”) investigated the waste, fraud, and abuse involved in defense contracts. The Truman Committee, established on April 15, 1940, had historical precedent, based on the Munitions Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in the 1930’s. Prompted by the defense industry’s outsize and often fraudulent practices during WWI, The Munitions Subcommittee, under Gerald Nye (D-MO), investigated WWI defense spending, cost overruns, and fraud. The Munitions Subcommittee’s work resulted in several controversial Neutrality Acts that demanded absolute neutrality vis-à-vis foreign <http://www.thenisder.org/news/article.asp?id=2557>.
Incidentally, BAE is being investigated by US authorities for alleged corruption. Let me report on just one UK firm to demonstrate the problem: In April, 2011, BAE, Britain’s largest defense firm, reported a profit of $1.4 billion, compared to $378 million a year earlier. “Overall sales at BAE’s Land & Armaments business, which includes everything from tanks to munitions, rose 43%. The company indicated that the work involved re-equip(ing) UK and US troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.”


One social entrepreneur, Bart Weetjens, has made his mark by training African Giant Pouched Rats to detect and remove landmines. “Ashoka: Innovators for the Public”; <http://peace.ashoka.org/node/4159>.

In 2008, the State of Vermont led the way, introducing an L3C statute as an official legal structure. Several other states and Native American Tribes have followed suit, with many other US jurisdictions rapidly getting in line to introduce appropriate legislation.
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In 2008, the State of Vermont led the way, introducing an L3C statute as an official legal structure. Several other states and Native American Tribes have followed suit, with many other US jurisdictions rapidly getting in line to introduce appropriate legislation.

http://www.bcsorporation.net


This clarification was provided by personal communication from Prof. James Wallace, Peter F. Drucker/Masatoshi Ito

Graduate School of Management, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA September 29, 2011.

The photo was on President Kennedy’s desk the following morning; however, the general public was initially shielded from seeing the disturbing image. A truncated story, with a photo of the crowd, but not the monk, had appeared on pages 3 and 5 of the *New York Times* on the second and third day after the monk’s self-immolation. Not until the fourth day after the event, on June 14, did the story make the front page.


A private Peace and Justice Academy has been established in Altadena, California. <http://www.thepeaceacademy.org/>. While this is a faith-based institution, public Peace and Justice Academies can be established on a secular basis, as well.
Mediators beyond Borders (MBB) was founded by Kenneth Cloke and Joan Goldsmith, Los-Angeles based mediators and organizational consultants. MBB considers the term “mediators” to include “negotiators, conciliators, mediators, consensus building facilitators, dialogue facilitators, conflict resolution system designers, conflict resolution skills trainers and educators, restorative justice practitioners, and people with substantive expertise in various conflict arenas.”
http://www.mediatorsbeyondborders.org/.

Examples would be Harri Holkeri and George Mitchell, negotiators in the Northern Ireland conflict.