

## World without WMD and without War

(invited talk at the International conference *Maintaining the Momentum and Supporting the Facilitator, Prospect for a Zone Free from Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East*, Amman, Jordan, November 1-14, 2012)

*Ivo Šlaus*

*World Academy of Art and Science and Dag Hammarskjöld University  
College of International Relations and Diplomacy, Zagreb, Croatia*

### *Abstract*

Contemporary world is faced with numerous threats and dangers. None of them can be solved by war, military action and economic sanctions. Neither disagreement nor conflicts can be solved by war. Humans are “eusocial” species (the technical term for displaying altruistic behaviour), like ants. Humans are cooperative and competitive, selfish and altruistic. Even if we accept that humans may have a psychobiological propensity for aggressiveness, there is no evidence that the acts of aggression, violence or war are inevitable. The Seville Statement on Violence stated in 1986 that peace is possible and that wars and violence can be ended, making it clear that there is nothing in biology that stands in the way of creating a world without war. Recent history proves that war and even possession of destructive weapons do not guarantee victories in conflicts. Participants at the International Conference on Nuclear Threats and Security organized by the World Academy of Art and Science, European Leadership Network and Dag Hammarskjöld University College under the NATO sponsorship emphasized that nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in general and war do not solve confrontations and that it is imperative to establish nuclear weapons free zones (NWFZ). Several NWFZ have already been established. World without nuclear weapons and eventually, world without war are achievable goals. Countries in the Middle East can benefit if Middle East NWFZ is established and extended to associations of countries similar and better than the EU.

## World without War

Throughout history more efficient weapons meant victory. Now, countries possessing the most powerful nuclear weapons have lost wars: the USA in Vietnam and the USSR in Afghanistan. Clearly, in neither cases war achieved realization of political

goals. War cannot solve any of the real problems humankind is faced with: economic crisis, ecological disaster characterized by ecological footprint 50 per cent larger than the Earth can tolerate, destruction of human capital. War cannot achieve economic goals (to conquer, to get resources, women, and simple looting (1)). No war since WWII (2) accomplished “desired policies”, and war leads to destruction of resources – natural, human-made and human. However, war has been and still is very convenient to focus attention of the people away from the real problems. Peace Index (3) developed by the University of Sydney group and by *The Economist* team based on 24 input indicators puts Norway, Denmark and Japan at the top of the list. France is ranked 36<sup>th</sup> and Vietnam 37<sup>th</sup>, the UK 49<sup>th</sup>, Croatia 60<sup>th</sup>, Turkey 92<sup>nd</sup>, the USA 97<sup>th</sup>, India 107<sup>th</sup>, Pakistan 127<sup>th</sup>, Russia 131<sup>st</sup> and North Korea 133<sup>rd</sup> – all nuclear powers are ranked very low and the famous old dictum “prepare for war to enjoy peace” does not seem to be correct. Doomsday clock on the front page of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* put in 1947 the humankind at 7 minute before midnight. Following the end of the Cold War in 1990 it was at 17 minute before midnight and now it is at 5 minute before midnight. Actually, war and violence make all problems and threats worse. As President D. D. Eisenhower said in his speech delivered on August 16, 1953: “Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket signifies in the final sense a theft from the hungry. The world in arms is not only spending money. It is spending the sweat of its labourers, the genius of its scientists.”

Yet, peaceful societies are an exception. It is estimated that 90-95 per cent of societies were engaged in war. Evidence from 12,000 BCE found in the Nubian cemetery reveals 50 per cent violent deaths. Though, throughout most of history war casualty rates were 60 per cent compared with a few percent today, a war among nuclear powers today would result in the destruction of humankind or at least of the present civilization. There are other unexpected conclusions in early societies, e.g. there is no correlation between population density and war, between war and trade, and most importantly, dominant activities even in the most war-like society are peaceful, e.g. art and pleasure. There are historical examples that violence has been abandoned when it was counterproductive! Archaeologists discovered a civilization in Canal, Peru, that lasted a thousand years. Total population of Canal is estimated to have been over 20,000 and the Canal people engaged in pleasant commerce with their neighbours (4). Warfare changed radically over time, i.e. it is culture-caused and culture-shaped. There are several peaceful tribes today.

Therefore, it is important to ask: “Does modern biology and social science know of any biological factors including those concerned with the biology of violent behaviour, that constitute an insurmountable or serious obstacle to the goal of world peace based upon the principle of equal rights and self-determination of people and including the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament through the United Nations?” On May 16, 1986, The Seville Statement on Violence was issued (5) stating that it is scienti-

fically incorrect to claim that animals wage war, and since we are like animals, war is our destiny. It is incorrect to claim that war is part of our nature, that we have a genetically programmed violent brain, that evolution “selected” aggressive behaviour, and that war is caused by instinct. The robust evidence argues that humans are eusocial species (the technical term for displaying altruistic behaviour) like ants, but much more complicated than ants: human competitiveness, selfishness, altruism and cooperation, however, are of a different sort involving interaction of culture with genetics and environment (6,7). The warfare does not occur among animals. War is biologically possible, but it is not inevitable. Anthropological evidence suggests that structural violence emerged in Late Neolithic, and was mainly unknown in Palaeolithic (8). The Seville Statement was signed by 20 leading scientists and it concludes that “biology does not condemn humanity to war. The same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace”. On the evening of December 24, 1914 as the WWI was entering its fifth month and millions of soldiers were in trenches shooting at each other, German soldier started to sing *Silent Night* and the English applauded and then joined them. This Christmas truce involved almost 100,000 soldiers, but it quickly ended (9).

Elimination of war and violence is presently essential to assure our existence. On the one hand, it has been shown that democide – death by governments of mostly their own citizens has resulted in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in killing 170-360 million children, women and men, more than the battle/war dead estimated to about 50-70 million (10). Democide is committed by the absolute power, its agency is the government and inadequate laws, as M. Gandhi correctly emphasized. “An unjust law is itself violence.” Likewise, Aurelio Peccei wrote in 1984 that in order “to ensure the development of humankind, it is necessary to banish war, and any military and non-military violence from our culture. Violence and its ideology are remnants of the past, social pathologies incompatible with the new era”. “Aggressive behaviour is learned, especially its more dangerous forms of military action and criminal assault. But the learning is prepared – we are predisposed to slide into irrational hostility under certain conditions. These rules have evolved during the past hundred thousands of years of human evolution. However, these rules are now obsolete”, as emphasized by E. O. Wilson.

Famous Russell-Einstein Manifesto concludes: *Shall we put an end to the human race, or shall mankind renounce war? People will not face this alternative because it is so difficult to abolish war. The abolition of war will demand distasteful limitations of national sovereignty. Although an agreement to renounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction of armaments would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important purposes. There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge and wisdom. Shall we instead, choose death, because we cannot forget our quarrels? We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity, and forget the rest.*

War is immoral; the UN made it almost illegal and it is certainly useless. Sir Joseph Rotblat in his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech said that “the quest for a war-free world has a basic purpose – our survival”. The very survival of humankind, the survival of our environmental basis demands abolition of war. It can and it should be done soon, very soon, so that humankind can endeavour to face and solve its real problems and task.

## World without Weapons of Mass Destruction

Victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki said: “People and nuclear weapons are incompatible.” Nuclear weapons are immoral, we can make them illegal as the International Court of Justice almost did in 1996 and they are useless, as we argued in the first part of our paper. Then, why do states have them?

Though nuclear weapons have no conceivable military value, their possession provides perception of significant status and prestige. The argument to maintain the *status quo* structure of the Security Council is at least partly influenced by the fact that the UK and France have nuclear weapons, while a rotating member representing the EU would not. US Army Lieutenant Colonel Warner Farr wrote in 1999: “One purpose of Israeli nuclear weapons, not often stated, but obvious, is their *use* on the US.” (11) Tito’s Yugoslavia pretended to build nuclear weapons – it was all a political bluff needed to strengthen and maintain Tito’s prestige in the Non-Aligned Movement (Indira Gandhi had just started nuclear weapons programme).

Is the world without weapons of mass destruction, notably without nuclear weapons, realistically possible? The argument which states that “you cannot stuff the nuclear genie back into the bottle” – one cannot un-invent nuclear technology – is absolutely correct, but as Ward Wilson argues (12), it is irrelevant. Many technologies that become obsolete are being replaced by better technologies (e.g. penny-farthing was replaced by bicycles) and/or are found to have serious disadvantages (as Hiller VZ-1 developed by the US Army in 1953) from – in this case – the military viewpoint.

The summary of world nuclear haves and have-nots is instructive. There are nine nuclear weapons (NW) states: the USA, Russia, the UK, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea. However, nine countries have abandoned nuclear weapons programmes: Argentina, Brazil, Iraq, Libya, South Africa, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland and Taiwan, and three former republics of the USSR inheriting huge nuclear stockpile (Ukraine as much as 5,000, Belarus 81 and Kazakhstan 1,500 weapons), decided to transfer them to Russia and decided to be non-nuclear. Several other countries, including Australia and Canada, considered nuclear weapons programmes, but quit them at an early stage. Clearly, more than a dozen of sovereign states that contemplated having nuclear weapons decided that it was not worthwhile. They represent an

important model and a warning.

If the purpose of weapons is to dominate and impose the hegemony of one group over others, a variety of different, “new” weapons can be invented and many can have advantages over nuclear weapons and other WMDs, i.e. they can eliminate specific targets without the destructive effects on natural and human-made capital that the use of nuclear weapons would have. Cyber weapons, laser and “precision-guided munitions” are such examples. Leon Panetta, the US Secretary of Defense, in his recent speech has warned about a possible cyber – Pearl Harbor. Development of new, truly 21<sup>st</sup> century, weapons (as opposed to nuclear weapons that are the 20<sup>th</sup> century technology) – though they may appear as more humane and much less destructive – is an important reason why we are arguing for the abolition of war, not just the abolition of nuclear weapons. If such ultra-modern weapons were developed and used in any form of war (or attempted hegemony), it is only a matter of time when WMDs, notably nuclear weapons, would be quickly reinvented and used. Our goal has to be the abolition of war! War is useless and it creates and maintains an illusion that it accomplishes given objectives, while it is only a total waste and destruction of all forms of capitals: human, social, natural and human-made.

Though our essential goal has to be the abolition of war, the first step is the abolition of nuclear weapons. Arguments that nuclear weapons have not been used for 67 years and it appears they will not be used, arguments that nuclear weapons contributed to preventing war (old Kantian argument, modernized by Kenneth Waltz’s argument in 1981 in favour of proliferation) fade when realized that thousands and thousands of nuclear weapons are on a hair-trigger alert basis and can be launched within less than an hour and without any “democratic” decision on going to war (democracy and war, as well as just war are oxymorons – but we will not discuss that here). Analysis of the Cuban Missile Crisis provides many useful lessons: firstly, the entire concept of mutually assured destruction as preventing nuclear war rests on the assumption of rationality. One of the worst mistake is to assume the rationality of the opponent; secondly, escalation can and does occur at lower level, e.g. during the Cuban Missile Crisis *war readiness condition* was set by the US Air Force without presidential authorization; thirdly, crises are characterized by limited information, large uncertainty and rapid development leading to lose-lose situations. The best scenario is to act at the very beginning of an indication of a crisis (conflict prevention). Sustainable conflict-resolution derives from win-win deals (13).

It is often said that after Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear weapons did not cause any death and suffering. This is incorrect! Numerous nuclear weapons tests injured hundreds of thousands of persons in Kazakhstan, the Pacific and even in the USA. One still hears arguments – and to some extent they are justified – that maintaining an adequate stock of usable nuclear weapons requires nuclear tests.

There is no doubt that the world today is more complex and uncertain than during the Cold War. Nuclear weapons are deployed in 14 countries. Many of the nuclear disarmament commitments are still pending of accomplishment, while successful cooperation systems such as the Cooperative Threat Reduction Agreement between the USA and Russia (so called Nunn-Lugar Agreement) which made the dismantlement of more than 7,000 nuclear warheads from the former USSR possible, run the risk of being deactivated. The overarching goal of global policy and policy of any country today should be to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used (13).

### **Important Contributions by Pugwash and the Club of Rome**

A very significant contribution made by the Pugwash Movement is its constant emphasis on impeccable science. This enabled fruitful cooperation between scientists from the allegedly opposing blocks. Throughout the Cold War, Soviet, American, and European scientists as well as those from the non-aligned countries met, exchanged ideas and discussed and searched how to eliminate the causes of conflict, to prevent conflicts and they tried to resolve disagreements and misunderstandings. Essential features of a scientific method have to be included, our approach has to be: objective, cumulative and global.

A very important contribution of The Club of Rome is the realization of interdependence of most of the issues forming a web of *problematique*: economy, ecology, social issues, general and complete disarmament, peace, human, natural and human-made capitals, policy and politics. It implies that the abolition of nuclear weapons requires a simultaneous approach to issues of governance, rule of law, economic development and energy.

### **Actions – Conclusions of the 2012 Dubrovnik Conference**

At the time when we are preoccupied with financial and economic crises, with money (the euro-issue), unemployment, climate change and ecological disasters, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that the greatest existential threat to our civilization, even to our environmental basis is the continued threat of nuclear weapons and of nuclear weapons proliferation to state and non-state actors. The opening sentence of Dickens' novel *A Tale of Two Cities*, "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times", is quite appropriate for this moment. Significant accomplishments have been achieved in the domain of governance: CWC, BWC, land-mine and cluster-bomb prohibition agreements, CTBT and the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, and most importantly, we are constantly facing significant scientific breakthroughs. Several nuclear weapons free zones (NWFZ) have been established: including 115 states (14), 39 per cent of world popula-



tion. Four NWFZ have nuclear plants generating electricity. Argentina and Brazil are operating uranium enrichment facilities.

Our contemporary world is facing numerous threats. Some, as problems in the Middle East, where conflict involving Arab countries and Israel, is now amplified by the Iranian development of nuclear plants and enrichment. None of them violates NPT agreement, but it is perceived by some as a threat. Of course, the economic and ecological problems augment all potential conflicts, and therefore the current situation is much worse than it was five years ago. It is instructive to compare the conclusion of the Pugwash conferences in 2007 with those of the 2012 Dubrovnik conference.

At the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the first Pugwash conference, a conference was held on July 5-7, 2007, again in Pugwash, this time in collaboration with the Middle Power Initiative, a group of NGOs collaborating with governments of the “New Agenda Countries”: Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden. Thirty outstanding scientists and politicians concluded: *As long as nuclear weapons exist, they will be used one day. This sober, inescapable truth continues to haunt the international community. Every minute of every day, more than 26,000 nuclear weapons – many thousands of them on hair-trigger alert – are poised to bring monumental destruction if they are ever used. Nuclear weapons have spread to more countries, and the international non-proliferation regime is perilously close to collapse. Poorly guarded stockpiles of highly enriched uranium and plutonium around the world could fall into the hands of terrorists who would think nothing of exploding a nuclear device in a major city. Momentum is growing in the international community, however, from many different political quarters, to re-energize the campaign to declare nuclear weapons illegal and immoral, and to reduce and eliminate them. But the time is now for decisive leadership and action to mount a global political campaign to eliminate these weapons of mass destruction, before it is too late. Great changes in history – the end of slavery, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War – have come about through concerted political action, often suddenly and with little warning. The international community has the opportunity to achieve yet another epochal event: ending the reliance on nuclear weapons and the total elimination of these genocidal weapons. We ask all governments, nuclear and non-nuclear alike, a simple question: What are you doing to fulfil the basic obligation of every government: the ‘responsibility to protect’ the lives and human rights of its citizens that would be obliterated by nuclear devastation? Given political leadership and political will, implementation of the following steps could greatly reduce the risk of nuclear weapons use:*

- *immediate de-alerting of the thousands of nuclear weapons that could be launched by accident, miscalculation, or unauthorized computer hacking of command and control systems;*
- *official declarations by all nuclear weapons-states of a No First Use policy, and adoption of Negative Security Assurances that nuclear weapons will never*

*be used against countries who have legally bound themselves not to acquire nuclear weapons;*

- *immediate resumption of US-Russian nuclear negotiations to reduce their nuclear forces to 1,000 or fewer nuclear weapons; to accelerate the dismantlement and destruction of all excess nuclear forces and fissile material; and to jointly develop early warning systems to reduce the risk of accidental or unauthorized launch of nuclear weapons;*
- *political agreement by the NATO to withdraw all US nuclear weapons from Europe, and to conclude a global agreement that nuclear weapons of any country not be deployed on foreign territory;*
- *full funding and implementation of the International Monitoring System of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to ensure the continued moratorium on nuclear testing, prior to the entry into force of the CTBT;*
- *an early start to negotiations of a global Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty and a complete prohibition on the deployment and use of space weapons;*
- *finally, all States should affirm the goal of the complete abolition and elimination of nuclear weapons through a multilaterally-verified instrument – a Nuclear Weapons Convention – and work towards making such a convention a reality.*

**All these steps have been re-emphasized, endorsed and strongly supported in Dubrovnik and several more have been underlined:**

The task before us is survival and that requires general and complete disarmament as well as the abolition of war. This can be achieved only if and when major improvements in the political structure of the world are performed. Our global world demands more democracy: in addition to the system based on about 200 sovereign states it is necessary to form parliamentary assemblies where all citizens of the world are represented, and where the diversities of cultures are taken into account. Representative democracy has to be enriched by direct democracy assuring the anticipation and the prevention of threats and conflicts. Though referenda have been used with various successes, it is necessary to include the direct decision-making of all citizens on essential issues such as war, disarmament, abolition of WMD and development. Short-term, narrow focus, slow response, almost zero anticipation and total lack of a global concern of many present political systems should not tempt us to propose autocratic systems. Democracy can and should be global, long-term, fast response and anticipatory and it involves the richness of billions of active citizens. Our political structure has to encompass, in addition to parliaments and governments, a variety of NGOs, IGOs, academic/scientific/scholarly organizations – local, regional and global. Their role and responsibility have to reflect the needs of our global, fast changing world. The responsibility and the role



of the World Academy of Art and Science, of Pugwash, of the European Leadership Network, of The Club of Rome, of physicians and parliamentarians, of lawyers – as professionals and as citizens should be focused on assuring survival, sustainable development and happiness of all humans.

It is urgent to re-address the legality of WMD and of war. Nuclear weapons constitute a clear and present danger to all humanity. No country has a right to unilaterally possess or wield a weapon whose consequences endanger the entire human race. Nuclear weapons, WMD and war have to be made illegal! A global referendum would provide an opportunity to all humanity to voice its view on this issue. Success achieved in land-mine and cluster-bomb could be useful models. Conventional weapons, ranging from small arms to new high-technology weapons, are all too often the instruments of indiscriminate destruction, especially for civilians. Accordingly, the pursuit of further international monitoring and restriction of conventional arms development, production, and transfer remains our important priority. The vulnerability of modern computer systems to cyber-attack represents a new type of catastrophic threats to national and human security. The use of cyber-attacks sets a dangerous precedent for a new form of terrorism and warfare. This form of attack challenges traditional principle of deterrence as unknown attackers make it extremely difficult to retaliate. The same is true for terrorist attacks. The ballistic missile defence becomes questionable and provides more illusion than reality. It could be instructive to analyse various forms of defence-walls in history from walls and moats that eventually became malaria infested and were replaced by parks, e.g. as in Krakow. Maginot line also was not useful. Ballistic missile defence may be equally useless now, as defence walls were in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The universal principles of justice and the will of humanity as a whole are not fully and adequately represented by national governments. International law must be predicated on the rights of not only sovereign states but also on the rights of individual citizen within states/nations and the rights of humanity as a whole (15). International rule of law needs to satisfy the need of our global, fast changing and yet diverse world. It is necessary to preserve and enrich our cultural diversity. This is a high order, but a very necessary one, since we depend on cultural diversity as much as we need biodiversity. Cultural diversity does not imply that cultures are unchanging and rigid. On the contrary, cultures constantly evolve and intertwine.

It would be desirable that NWFZ are not reduced only to one aspect – elimination of nuclear weapons. These zones should gradually grow into regional economic and political structures. Middle East is an excellent example of how common needs and complementarity of capacities, richness and potential of each sovereign state in the Middle East can be beneficial to all of them, and to each one of them. That means working to prevent, transform and reverse the conditions of economic deprivation, environmental deterioration, and resource scarcity and unequal access that are deplorable in them

and give rise to despair, resentment, hostility and violence around the world. We have to address this broad web of inter-related dangers, and to work for the sustainable use of energy and natural resources and the constraint of anthropogenic disruption of climate.

The Middle East is the cradle of civilizations. Currently the Middle East represents a vibrant domain of development, an important source of conventional energy – oil and gas – and is a place of unnecessary, often violent, confrontations posing imminent threat with catastrophic consequences. Two issues dominate and intertwine: the nuclear energy programme of Iran and the unresolved dispute between Israel and Palestine. Iran, currently the chair of the Non-Aligned Movement could lead a process of establishing the Middle East NWFZ. This is strengthened by the fact that the previous chair, Egypt and the future chair, Venezuela belong to the NWFZ of Africa and Latin America, respectively. In addition, the countries included in the NWFZ are mainly non-aligned countries. Leading a process of establishing the Middle East NWFZ, Iran demonstrates its commitment to remain a non-nuclear weapon state and to adhere to the NPT. It is natural that countries which initiated and led the Non-Aligned Movements, such as India and now seven sovereign states emanating from the SFR Yugoslavia, as well as countries that gave up their nuclear weapons such as Ukraine and Kazakhstan will strongly support such a process of establishing a new NWFZ. It is also natural that international NGOs such as Pugwash, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, the International Committee of the Red Cross, as well as many outstanding individuals (many of them also Nobel Peace Prize laureates), as well as the World Academy of Art and Science and the European Leadership Network, strongly support the establishment of the Middle East NWFZ.

War and peace, democracy and sustainable development are strongly intertwined. It is necessary to develop a mechanism to protect human rights and human dignity and to assure human needs everywhere, to prevent democide (which as we stressed is as threatening as war). It is necessary to assure positive interference without limiting specificity and without military intervention, yet mechanism should be such as to prevent hegemony, dictatorship and the abuse of power. This opens a question of international forces, possibly military, and of their responsibility and role. There is no doubt that such forces should be employed to anticipate, prevent and reduce all forms of threats and disasters. Certainly the NATO has a different role and responsibility today than it had at the time of the Cold War. Our task is to formulate a time-bound plan, steps leading to reduction of the number of nuclear weapons, specifically leading to de-alerting, and finally to complete the nuclear disarmament to be presented at the NATO conference in Split on May 6-7, 2013. Though 95 per cent of all nuclear weapons are in the USA and Russia, all nuclear-weapon states have to reduce the strength of their nuclear weapons. In addition to the countries that have nuclear weapons there are countries that have relied and rely still on the protection of a foreign country. If their confidence

in protection falters, they may be tempted to develop their own nuclear capabilities (15). Rather than depending on the political blocks balance, all countries should depend for their security on the global system.

The tasks before us are demanding. Paradigmatic changes leading to happy and prosperous humankind are possible if we enhance human and social capitals, through ideas (mostly out-of-the-box ones), actions and wisdom of all of us.

## References

- (1) I was told that few weeks before the beginning of the Iraqi war, private art collectors were informed that various objects from the Baghdad museum could be purchased at bargain prices.
- (2) An exception is the First Gulf War, fought with a very limited and clear objective – to liberate Kuwait, a private discussion with General Colin Powell.
- (3) Global Peace Index, see Wikipedia and [www.visionofhumanity.org/gpi/results/ranking.php](http://www.visionofhumanity.org/gpi/results/ranking.php)
- (4) Th. Hartmann (2009). *Threshold – The Crisis of Western Civilization*, Viking Penguin. Anthony Adolf, *Peace – A World History*, J. Wiley and Sons, N.Y. (2008). L. H. Keeley *War before Civilization: the Myth of the Peaceful Savage* (1996). Oxford University Press, Oxford
- (5) The 1986 Seville Statement on Violence, [www.unesco.org/shs/human\\_rights/hrfv.htm](http://www.unesco.org/shs/human_rights/hrfv.htm); see also M. Ramirez/ Pugwash; Seville Declaration is related to the UNESCO Statement on Race (1950-78), UNESCO Culture for Peace Program (1994) and Jerusalem Statement on Science for Peace (1997). Though the Seville Declaration was endorsed by the UNESCO General Conference at its 25<sup>th</sup> session (Paris 16/11/1989) followed by the UNESCO's Culture of Peace Program in 1994 promoted by F. Mayor, an original effort in 1982 was slowed down since UNESCO considered the issue of peace too touchy, and similarly, Pontifical Academy considered it also too touchy.
- (6) J. M. Ramirez, an invited talk at the International Conference on Nuclear Threats and Security, Dubrovnik, September 2012 – to be published
- (7) E. O. Wilson (2012). *The Social Conquest of Earth*, Liveright Publishing/W. W. Norton & Com.
- (8) D. P. Fry (2007). *Beyond War: the Human Potential for Peace*, Oxford University Press
- (9) Weintraub, Stanley (2001). *Silent Night, The Story of the WWI Christmas Truce*; J. Rifkin (2009). *The Emphatic Civilization*, Penguin Book
- (10) Twentieth Century Democide, [www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/20TH.HTM](http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/20TH.HTM), R. J. Rummel

- (11) N. Chomsky (2012). *Making the Future*, Hamish Hamilton, Penguin Book, pp. 95
- (12) W. Wilson, *The World Today*, October-November 2012, pp. 26
- (13) Irma Arguello, *50 Years after the Cuban Missile Crisis*, [http:// npsglobal.org/eng/component/content/article/147-articles](http://npsglobal.org/eng/component/content/article/147-articles)
- (14) There are 9 nuclear states (47 per cent of world population) and 68 that cannot be classified as either NWS or NWFZ (14 per cent of world population). There are five zones covering continental or sub-continental groups of countries (Tlatelolco – Latin America and the Caribbean, Rarotonga – South Pacific, Bangkok (ASEAN), Semei (Central Asia) and Pelindaba – Africa (53 states and 30 millions square kilometre area), zone consisting of a single country – Mongolia, and three governing Antarctica, the seabed and outer space.
- (15) W. Nagan (2012). *Simulated ICJ Judgment*, Cadmus, No. 4, April 2012, pp. 93: W. Nagan and G. Jacobs (2012), *New Paradigm for Global Rule of Law*, Cadmus, No. 4, April 2012, pp. 137-8, pp. 142-3
- (16) H. A. Kissinger and B. Scowcroft, *Nuclear weapons reduction must be part of strategic analysis*, Washington Post, April 23, 2012

### Sažetak

Suvremeni svijet suočen je s brojnim prijetnjama i opasnostima. Nijedna od njih se ne može riješiti ratom, vojnom akcijom i ekonomskim sankcijama. Niti neslaganja, niti sukobi ne mogu se riješiti ratom. Ljudi su "eusocialna" vrsta (tehnički termin za prikazivanje altruističnog ponašanja), poput mrava. Ljudi su kooperativni i natjecateljski raspoloženi, sebični i altruistični. Čak i ako prihvatimo da ljudi mogu imati psihobiološku sklonost k agresivnosti, nema dokaza da je čin agresije, nasilja i rata neizbježan. Seviljska izjava o nasilju najavila je 1986. godine da je mir moguć i da ratovi i nasilje mogu biti okončani, naglašavajući jasno da ne postoji ništa u biološkom smislu što bi onemogućavalo stvaranje svijeta bez rata. Novija povijest dokazuje da rat, pa čak i posjedovanje destruktivnog oružja ne jamče pobjedu u sukobima. Sudionici Međunarodne konferencije o nuklearnoj prijetnji i sigurnosti, u organizaciji Svjetske akademije umjetnosti i znanosti, European Leadership Network i Visoke škole međunarodnih odnosa i diplomacije Dag Hammarskjöld pod pokroviteljstvom NATO-a, istaknula je da je nuklearno oružje, oružje za masovno uništenje (WMD) općenito i rat, ne rješavaju sukobe i da je neophodno uspostavljanje zona slobodnih od nuklearnog oružja (NWFZ). Nekoliko takvih zona - NWFZ već je uspostavljeno. Svijet bez nuklearnog oružja, a konačno i svijet bez rata ostvarivi su ciljevi. Zemlje na Bliskom Istoku mogu imati koristi ako Bliski Istok uspostavi NWFZ zonu koja može biti proširena i na druge saveze zemalja, slične i bolje nego EU.