



Disarmament, Peace and Development

Learning to Disarm: Educating to Realize the IPB Action Agenda
Betty A. Reardon,

Article information:

To cite this document: Betty A. Reardon, "Learning to Disarm: Educating to Realize the IPB Action Agenda" *In* Disarmament, Peace and Development. Published online: 04 Dec 2018; 135-145.

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/S1572-832320180000027020>

Downloaded on: 20 December 2018, At: 15:55 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 0 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by

Token:BookSeriesAuthor:301e56db-b43d-47ca-8aad-a5c3a6b8999b:

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

LEARNING TO DISARM: EDUCATING TO REALIZE THE IPB ACTION AGENDA

Betty A. Reardon

*Reflections and assertions based on a presentation to the congress “Disarm!
For a Climate of Peace.”*

Keywords: Patriarchy; patriarchalism; reductionism; holism; ecological thinking; restorative development; alternative security systems; general and complete disarmament; learning mode of politics; universal human dignity

LEARNING AS THE POLITICS OF PEACE

The IPB conference, “Disarm! For a Climate of Peace” was a festival of learning – two days of conversation and discussion, pondering possibilities to create “a climate of peace,” a world of less violence and more justice, of human flourishing, and a healthy, living Earth. Celebrating each other’s contributions to our common goal and learning together about the obstacles to, and possibilities for, achieving the world we envision engaged us all in an exercise of hope. Hope is the most vibrant and productive of the multiple and complex elements that comprise peacemaking. It is this committed and informed hope that will carry forward our learning to action and help realize our vision of a disarmed world such as that discussed during the conference. Commitment is born of knowing the possibilities and the proposed developments that constitute the route of our journey toward our vision. It is fulfilled by our actions along that route. The Action Agenda adopted by the conference provides us with material for learning to “disarm for a climate of peace.” This learning process is integral to the politics of peace. If we were to conduct politics in a *learning* mode rather than our current *winning* mode, we would be well on our way to develop habits

Disarmament, Peace and Development

Contributions to Conflict Management, Peace Economics and Development, Volume 27, 135–145

Copyright © 2019 by Emerald Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 1572-8323/doi:10.1108/S1572-832320180000027020

that are consistent with the norms and customs of a culture of peace. My goal here is to propose suggested learnings for alternative patterns of thinking about the world and the challenges we face in our quest to transform it. We might be more successful in our endeavors if we acknowledge that we must learn our way to peace; to admit what we do not understand and to devise and intentionally follow an action/learning plan toward those understandings. The following assertions and suggestions are intended to be a beginning of such a learning plan toward the IPB's vision of "a culture of peace."

A political learning plan is itself an agenda for action, an aggregation of learning derived from actively striving toward the envisioned transformation: learnings that are integral to the full scope of IPB's agenda – an admittedly limited but nonetheless comprehensive plan that depends upon our learning new ways of behaving, relating, and thinking both critically and imaginatively as global citizens. Global transformation will be the result from informed imagination. The education we need comprehends the substantive knowledge required for informed citizenship and seeks to cultivate citizens' transformative imaginations.

This essay suggests some routes for cultivating imagination through inquiry into the imperative elements of a global civic education, ongoing learning undertaken in and acquired from political action. With such action/learning, we would hone our skills of political efficacy and develop capacities to fulfill our responsibility as global citizens to take action to create a new political and social reality for the entire humanity.

Articulating these essential learnings is a declaration of hope not an assertion of optimism. Optimism tells us that eventually *all will be well*. Hope tells us *all can be well* if we learn and act to make it so. It is an assertion that we can prepare ourselves for politically effective action inspired by a vision and energized by a belief that we can learn to make the possible probable if we can learn to discern the possible. Hope arises from seeing the possible and the determination to acquire the knowledge and perfect the skills required to bring it to realization. The most urgent of all the learnings needed for realization of this vision is to take heed of Einstein's 1960s warning of the potential planetary disaster posed by the fact that the atomic age had changed everything but our way of thinking.

Since the IPB Berlin conference adjourned, we have experienced several occasions on which that catastrophe seemed imminent, two within the first month of this New Year. The nuclear saber rattling of the leaders from US and North Korea and the missile alert that brought panic to Hawaii sharply reawakened us to the ever present nuclear threat. These reminders of nuclear threat were followed by climate change disasters, including hurricanes Harvey and Maria that destroyed thousands of communities in the Caribbean area. Additionally, the political catastrophe of national administrations becoming more hostile to our intentions to set in motion a politics of peace, making our goals even more challenging than they appeared at the time of the conference.

At the same time, we have seen vivid glimpses of the positive possible as well. Women speaking out about the endemic sexual abuse, and Florida teenagers mobilizing youth to demand gun control are but two examples from one country of the energizing of the civil society to overcome the systemic violence integral

to the patriarchal war system that infuses global politics. Challenging that system, perhaps most encouraging of all positive developments, was the historic landmark in the movement to abolish nuclear weapons, the nuclear weapons ban treaty adopted by the UN on July 7, 2017, and the awarding of the Nobel Prize to the International Coalition for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons for their mobilization of civil society to persuade governments to call the conference to negotiate the treaty. The factor that turned the tide from avoidance of the issue to the convening of the negotiating conference was the civil society's insistence on confronting the devastating human and environmental consequences posed by nuclear weapons. UN member states could no longer shrink from the moral, social, and ecological obligations to take steps to put down this Sword of Damocles hanging over humanity since 1945. In this development, we see the promise of the ethical/ecological perspective of a new way of thinking about weapons and human security. The adoption of the treaty – over the objections of the nuclear weapons states at the pinnacle of the global patriarchy power hierarchy – was a claim on equal rights made by 177 nations, who adopted the treaty, responding to the prompting of their citizens in the true spirit of “We the peoples of the United Nations” seeking to fulfill their mission to “avoid the scourge of war.”

Both positive and negative possibilities manifest the cogency of Einstein's warning and its relevance to our times, urgently in need of new, transformative modes of thinking that can free us from the restraints that the common patriarchal thinking imposes on the politics of change. But they are also times offering unprecedented opportunities to transcend those restraints. We see the glimmerings of such new thinking in feminist activists who point out the commonalities in the manifestations of sexism and racism, and their relationship to each other and to militarism. This phenomenon can be seen among American teens demonstrating for gun control at the seats of state government, where they tell reporters that the legislators do not understand their reality, the ever present threats to their personal security that puts their futures at risk. These politicians, particularly white men, put a higher value on their own short-term political interests than on the long-term human security of the larger community. Be it the security of the schools, town, province, nation, or world, none is valued above the favor of the economic elites to whose wealth they owe their elections. However, these young people like their age mates all over the world are refusing to stay trapped on the lower rungs of the patriarchal power ladder. They insistently speak truth to power, and as they do so they empower themselves to realize their own truth, that they are endowed with full human value and will lay claim to the rights that society must acknowledge and fulfill. They and their predecessors in the US, movements such as the Black Lives Matter (initiated by women) are teaching us the core learning and the most fundamental alternative to patriarchal thinking, the principle of the equal value of all human lives, the antithesis of the human value hierarchy imposed by patriarchy.

While the specifics of the circumstances vary from nation to nation, the thinking that guides the politics of most is the same, some form of short-term, narrow interest of humanly exclusive *patriarchalism*, the belief system that

derives from and carries forward patriarchy in all its cultural, political, and institutional forms. It is reductionist rather than humanist, technocentric rather than life-centric, pervading most of our institutions, professions, and social relations. It closes out the multiple aspects of most human challenges and enterprises, ignoring anything that is not within or in sync with its technocratic orthodoxy. It affects even those realms wherein human factors should take primacy, including education and medicine, as lamented by Dr. Bernard Lowne, globally respected cardiologist and a founder of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. “[...] healing is replaced with treating, caring is supplanted by managing, and the art of listening is taken over by technological procedures.” (Quoted by Rich Joseph, “Doctor’s Revolt,” opinion, *The New York Times*, February 25, 2018, p. 12).

This practice is evident in education where tests preclude reflective conversation, and with but a few positive exceptions students are expected to listen to teachers, but teachers are not expected to listen to students. It is this public mindset that was so astonished at the refusal of American high-school students to continue to be victims of random gun violence and their articulate and well-reasoned demands for more effective gun laws. Surely, such young minds could also grasp the related need for general disarmament, for the rejection of the entire “weapons culture” just as physicians seeking reform in medicine could see the same need for prudence and care in addressing the nuclear issue. Such instances are clear evidence that we can think modes other than to the current violence producing modes. Alternative modes of thinking can also address politics in which we can most clearly see the technothink that tends to block out the human and objectify persons that are viewed only as categories of factors on the decision-making grid.

In politics, professional polling takes the place of attending to electorates, and citizens’ choices are presented to rather than drawn from them. These technocracies are the prime elements of contemporary patriarchy and its modes of thinking. They function within the power constructs of patriarchy, the human value hierarchy so clearly described during the conference as “a political system.” by Madeleine Rees. I would assert that it is *the global* political system, some form of which governs most societies in today’s global gender order, determining the human value status of every person on the planet, and that decides on the uses to be made of technology – of virtually all knowledge and resources – and on what we will know and how we will come to know it. If we are to change our ways of thinking, we must change this structure. The IPB agenda embodies both hope and practical possibilities for steps toward that structural change and for the transcendence of the three major threats to human and planetary survival that patriarchal thinking has pushed to a crisis point, the primary issues we must address with urgency. Most significantly, the agenda provides an impetus to reflect upon both the ways of thinking that have led to the current situation and those that may help us transcend it. What I discern in its diagnosis and prescriptions is an invitation to consider the relevance of holism and ethics to the politics of peace building, offering lenses through which to view the three fundamental imperatives of “a climate of peace” – general and

complete disarmament, a radical change in the human–Earth relationship, and the realization of universal human dignity. These imperatives are also vehicles on the journey toward the transformation of our ways of thinking about and viewing the world.

Most of what the agenda calls for is fully achievable only within the framework of comprehensive, legally enforceable disarmament, conceived, strategized, and realized through modes of thinking infused with ethics as the primary factor in defining problems and holism as the frame within which solutions are identified. Fundamental ethics and the holistic frame are embodied in the goal of general and complete disarmament and the requisite, precisely planned political, economic, social, and cultural institutions and processes designed to achieve it. Earth cannot be restored nor human dignity and equality enjoyed so long as we live our lives and conduct our politics within the war system that infuses virtually all aspects of the human experience. General and complete disarmament is the institutional *sine qua non* for dismantling the war system and developing a culture of peace. It should be the goal against which we test every other arms reduction or arms control proposal in terms of how it might contribute to or impede this superordinate political purpose.

THREE INTERRELATED IMPERATIVES ARE CONSTITUTIVE TO ALL CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED

The challenges outlined in the agenda’s second section comprise responses to multiple forms of violence and abuses of persons and social and natural systems. Most of the ten challenges are constitutive to three imperative and urgent threats to human and planetary survival. All three threats are interdependent and require coordinated, interrelated, comprehensive solutions. None can be fully addressed without the consideration of the other two. The status of each is integral to the status of all, and all stem from the common roots of the patriarchal political paradigm and the patriarchalism that infuses political thought. The ecological crisis, war system, and global gender order of human inequality hold the potential for the destruction of world civilization and quite possibly our very survival. Assurance of a human and planetary future cannot be achieved within the present patriarchal order. Without the emergence of an alternative set of world institutions, particularly designed for the fulfillment of human security on a healthy and thriving planet, the future will be “brutal and short.”

THE EARTH IMPERATIVE: *ECOLOGICAL THINKING*

It becomes ever more evident that we are perilously close to the *climate catastrophe* that the agenda notes as the ninth among the ten challenges identified. Clearly the health, the very viability of the planet, is the primary imperative for the survival of the human species, an integral part of the living Earth. Two essential peace learnings are demanded of those who would seek to support the agenda goals. First, that we humans are not separate from the Earth, nor are we sovereign over it. We are born of the Earth and our lives are sustained by her.

This is a truth intuitively understood by our ancestors, and now by many first peoples, those who taught us the concept of “Mother Earth.” We must relearn this truth so it infuses how we think about and relate to our planet, suffering severely from “parent abuse.” We the children of Earth are responsible to restore her to her natural vitality. Should we not revere her and enjoy the intimate familial relationship that science teaches is our “natural” condition? In good conscience should we not protect her as we would our families and our own lives? A significant aspect of thinking anew about *climate catastrophe* is to shift from the conceptual frame of *sustainable development* and *carrying capacity* – that still connotes a dysfunctional familial separation – to one of *restorative development*, through which we would sustain ourselves only by means that would heal Earth and replenish that which *sustains her*. Making this shift in thought process might come through thinking less in terms of humanly constructed structures and institutions and more in organic and ecological terms. Human society is a living subsystem of the living Earth. This fact offers another source of models for the processes of economic development, and might also offer a more fruitful mode of thinking about the political transformations that could lead us toward a culture of peace. Multiple life forms have various ways of performing essential life functions, another reality that might help us transcend the binaries, the either/ors of patriarchy, and offer a range of possibilities that our technoindustrial society has closed out.

This is not to suggest that we forswear technical possibilities to deal with specific problems. Technology can and must be used to resolve the bind of climate catastrophe, but it alone cannot and will not overcome the potential devastation of the life sustaining capacity of Earth, nor would it prevent any of the multiple catastrophic storms we have thus far experienced. The possibilities for saving our planet lie mainly with us, how we perceive and whether we approach this challenge within the frames of ecological thinking and restorative development. International law recognized the oneness of the human family when it encoded egregious violations of human rights as *crimes against humanity*. Why not consider a similar encoding of actions and policies that injure our planet as *crimes against Earth*? Climate change is, as are all the three superordinate threats to survival, an ethical challenge. We need to think in terms of Earth ethics as well in ecological and organic terms. Should the realms of criminal responsibility in international law come to include crimes against our planet, how different might be the politics of climate change?

Ethical standards that affirm life and reject violence and abuse oblige us to confront the planetary damage done by the apparatus of militarized state security, a product of the war system. War and preparation for war have scared large surfaces of Earth, just as deforestation inflicted by large scale “development’ projects has done. The inordinate use of resources for and by the military precludes their prudent use for human and social purposes; an injury to humanity and our planet is also reflected in the comparison of social to military expenditures, as noted in the agenda. Ethical/ecological thinking compels us to consider the responsibility of being proactive in defending the natural environment, to demand accountability of those charged with its protection, and to

judge and punish culpability and collusion in harming it, even when that harm is rationalized to be in “the interest of national security.” The term national security is the fig leaf patriarchal nation states use to conceal the war system. It is invoked as is the sanctity of the state to persuade citizens that the violence of war is necessary and of a different order than the forms of violence the state has criminalized.

THE WAR IMPERATIVE: SYSTEMIC INSTITUTIONAL THINKING

The war system – the military, the state, and political, economic, and social institutions, the vast apparatus that makes nations ever ready to resort to arms – is most in need of institutional reform and cultivation of practical imagination to design and develop alternatives so that we might confront the second imperative learning; *the institution of war is as great a destroyer of Earth* as devastating as is her exploitation by the corporations that manage the global economy. A nuclear war, as observed by Robert Oppenheimer, reflecting on the first atomic detonation at Los Alamos, would bring death and total destruction to millions, stark realities which are yet to fully penetrate public consciousness. Only now is the environmental movement coming to acknowledge demilitarization as an environmental necessity, recognizing the significance of the ecological effects of militarized security on the natural environment and undermining its capacity to sustain life.

The threats to life and wellbeing wrought by *weaponry*, first on the agenda’s challenges list, invokes another imperative learning task – one that should most inform our political strategies, calling us to focus our efforts more systematically toward general and complete disarmament. The new thinking to be learned as we take up this challenge could reverse what the agenda calls the “militarization of the mind,” which involves changing our concept of *weapons* as instruments of protection, assurances of security to an understanding that they are, as the teenagers’ antigun movement asserts, primarily *instruments of death*. Their utility is assessed by the number of deaths they can inflict in the most resource and time efficient manner. The present concept underlies the arguments that rationalize the ever increasing lethality and numbers of weapons of mass destruction and highly sophisticated “conventional” weapons; all serving as the main currency of power and status among nations in the global war system. If our security discussions were to be conducted around the concept of weapons as instruments of death, it would be evident that weapons do not make us secure and that human and national security would be better served by reducing and ultimately eliminating weapons in favor of cultivating security by increasing the wellbeing of the citizenry.

The current concept of *weapon* derives from the same world view as the idea of *enemy*, one who threatens our wellbeing, covets our resources, fears our cultural values and ways of life, or who embodies some intolerable evil, be it an ideology or some sort of unwanted power over us. This idea carries the assumption that the world works in win/lose terms; that some will win and others lose

while the world continues in its constant state of conflict. We now know that the world cannot continue to sustain the ever more destructive conflicts that erode and destroy the fabric of life. We were told this fact in 1963 when President Kennedy asserted to the UN General Assembly that we must put an end to war before war puts an end to us. We can no longer afford to have enemies whose destruction we see as necessary to our own survival and wellbeing. There will always be conflicts, but they need not be violent. There may always be those who with whom we have disputes, but we need not destroy them. There can no longer be winners and losers while expecting that we and our planet will not ultimately be among the losers. Humanity is one species and the possibility of our extinction is as likely as it has been of other species whose demises we have precipitated out of the excesses that have choked many parts of the living Earth. Just as we need to learn to be in a new relationship with the planet, we need to transform our relations with and to all the “others” with whom we share this planet. Above all, we must work to internalize the principle of universal human dignity and the equal value of all persons. Were we to do so, we would not continue to devise more expedient ways to destroy more of each other. We would have no use for military and their weaponry. Our respect for the dignity and equality of others would inspire us to devise alternative ways to conduct conflict and to substitute the *force of law* for the *law of force* in settling disputes among nations as we have sought to do within nations.

We need to learn not to consider war a given of the human experience, an episodic inevitability. War is not an event that continues to be inevitable because it is in our nature to hate, despise, and destroy others. War is a human invention designed to achieve purposes by thwarting the purposes of others. Our “nature” is malleable and attitudes and behaviors are learned. We can invent new institutions and learn new attitudes and behaviors that would enable us to cultivate mutually enhancing relationships with others. We might cooperatively pursue more common purposes – as we have been doing in some fields for several centuries.

The holism that reveals the institution of war to be the center of a pervasive system of coercive violence – values and views that infuse most other institutions and infect our cultures – is an essential ways thinking that responds to the Einstein imperative. When we see things as whole and in relationship, we may also see not only the need but the possibilities to avoid the “drift toward catastrophe.” It illuminates the need and possibilities of building positive relationships with those from whom we are different and those with whom we have differences. Recognizing the realities of interdependence and mutual need made possible by a holistic, ecological view of human relationships can lead us to the mutually beneficial relationships among Earth’ peoples that are embodied in a culture of peace. Reflecting on these possibilities can be a means to the requisite new way of thinking that would make disarmament seem not only necessary but possible, enabling us to seriously pursue the admonishment of “The General Assembly[...] Having resolved to lay the foundation of an international disarmament strategy which through coordinated and persevering efforts in which the UN should play a more effective role aims at general and complete disarmament

under effective international controls.” (Final Document of the UN Special Session on Disarmament, 1978.)

Three years before that UN document was issued, Sean MacBride – who had played a significant role in the history of IPB and for whom they have named their Peace Prize – exhorted women participants in the 1975 International Women’s Year Forum in Mexico City to act. Believing that women of civil society were the main agents of peace, he urged, “You must demand treaty negotiations for General and Complete Disarmament. If you have to, take to the streets to get it.” Women and men did take to the streets on the eve of the UN Second Special Session on Disarmament in 1982, demonstrating in support of the session and of a nuclear freeze. It was civil society that led to the UN convening the 2017 conference that ultimately adopted the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Might it not be possible to initiate similar manifestations for general and complete disarmament, for a treaty without which we may never achieve a culture of peace?

THE GENDER IMPERATIVE: HUMANLY INCLUSIVE THINKING

The agenda notes *gender inequality* among the inequalities challenging its vision of a culture of peace. It asserts that those inequalities are embodied in the denial and violation of the human rights of women and other groups and are attributable that “unaccountability in decision making.” The eighth challenge lists a variety of those whose rights are denied by the global gender order. Gender, generally defined as a social construct that accounts for differences in roles and status between men and women, is frequently cited as the primary and most fundamental of socially sanctioned discriminations. Deemed to be in the natural order, the oppression of women has been tolerated throughout human history and in most human societies. The sexual bias that privileges men over women is the first oppression that makes possible all other forms of identity-based denial of human rights. It creates the mindset that accounts for lack of accountability. Gender, as the term is used in this essay, is a far broader concept, an invention of patriarchy used to categorize all human beings and place them in a hierarchy of human value with the most powerful men at the top of the power structure. In our time, these men are for the most part heads of major transnational corporations and leaders of the financial industry. From time to time, a woman appears among them as they do among heads of state. However, such women usually function within the masculinist views and values that infuse the patriarchal gender order. Even on the higher level of the power ladder women have less value than men on the same rung and can be subject to some of the same abuses as are women on all rungs of the ladder. Female and transgender military officers, for instance, are not immune to sexual violence at the hands of the male military.

Sexual abuse within the military and by the military within the civilian communities hosting military stations shines a light on the relationship between militarism and sexism. The long history of racism within the military is another evidence of the gendered nature of both the traditional and contemporary

military. These abuses illustrate the function of the institution of war in maintaining the patriarchal order, an obstacle to the fundamental justice that has long been explored by feminist scholars and activists. The war system provides the coercive force and threat thereof that keep the global gender order in place. (B. Reardon, *Sexism and the War System*. Teachers College Press, 1985.)

Meena Joganath, in her conference presentation, spoke of the intersection of militarism and racism. This intersection is actually a much deeper and systemic relationship that includes colonialism and other multiple forms of oppression and exploitation that patriarchy imposes on the vulnerable. (B. Reardon, *Discrimination: The Cycle of Injustice*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Sydney, 1977.) In standard gender terms, the term “feminization” is used to connote these vulnerabilities, from denying masculine value to men who do not fit the heterosexist male profile to ethnic groups and whole nations that the power structure seeks to oppress or exploit. Now the vulnerable include our planet, feminized, not only in the positive maternal life giving and sustaining sense, but more significantly in the sense of an object of abuse and exploitation.

These interrelationships are brought to our attention mainly by feminists and women, whose familiarity with the vulnerable and the experience of vulnerability has educated them to understand that the imperative of equality between men and women is the foundation of the broader human equality. They also point out that the principle of equality is but half of the rationale for the urgency of the political empowerment of women. As recognized in Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, women’s experience, capacities, and perspectives are an essential resource toward achieving sustainable peace. When women are fully enfranchised to participate in all matters of public policy, it will be much more possible to extend the democratic base of all polities, including the global order. Transcending all the challenges enumerated in the agenda and achieving the vision of a culture of peace would be much more attainable in a world that has learned to think in terms of gender justice and equality as essential factors in policy making. The overall imperative learning we need is to recognize the centrality of patriarchy as the primary obstacle to all that we strive for to develop the capacities, to recognize all its myriad manifestations and hone the political skills to overcome them.

CONCLUSION: PROCESS CONCEPTS FOR ACTION LEARNING: FROM REDUCTIONISM TO HOLISM; FROM PATRIARCHY TO HUMAN EQUALITY

These three imperatives and the learning they call for can become the basis for more comprehensive, integrated, and cooperative strategies to realize our vision of a culture of peace. They suggest comprehensive political processes comprising specific strategies, as advocated in the IPB agenda. Through action learning, we move from the reductionism and separation of patriarchy to the holism of human equality and a life sustaining Earth. What we envision we can achieve if we vigorously confront the realities described in the agenda. We can do so in

framing our action learning in the three related processes that must be simultaneously and systematically pursued: disarming for human security, developing to restore Earth, and demilitarizing our cultures by exorcising patriarchy.

Disarmament Toward Human Security in a Culture of Peace

Staged disarmament seeking to reduce and eliminate all forms of weaponry that undermine our chance to achieve human security and militarize our cultures can lead us toward a culture of peace. The disarmament process will need to overcome the competitive ways that infuse all our relationships. By building new cooperative ways, we may devise procedures and agencies to replace the war system. By cultivating new habits to think holistically in terms of our goal of comprehensive disarmament, we can build institutions that can be the foundation of a culture of peace. Within this comprehensive framework, we have a great opportunity to respond to the injunction of item 38 of the UN Final Document of the Special Session on Disarmament, "Negotiations on potential measures of disarmament should be conducted concurrently with negotiations on more comprehensive measures and should be followed by negotiations leading to a treaty on GCD under effective international control." It is through such negotiations that we may extricate ourselves from the war system.

Development to Restore our Earth

Socially responsible behavior is often called "giving back" to the society in gratitude for what we have received from it. As we plan for development, it might be well to reflect on gratitude for the life Earth has provided us. We may never be able to give back all we have taken from her, but we can make amends by assuring that every act of "progress" returns something to our Earth which will revitalize her and demonstrate the reverence in which we should hold her.

Deconstruction of Patriarchy Toward Human Equality

The global gender order is at the core of all the challenges to our vision of a culture of peace. The sentiments of the Preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can serve as a guide and goal as we learn to internalize the ethics derived from the principle of universal human dignity. In striving for gender justice and equality, we strive toward the universal realization of all human rights for all people, knowing that the present hierarchal structure is the main impediment to that realization. Should we look deeply and directly into the manifestations of patriarchy in all aspects of our lives, societies, and cultures, we may learn the way to achieving a transformed global order in which "[...] recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." (Preamble, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, United Nations, Paris, 1948.)