

Global Action to Prevent War

Workshop on the Eradication of Armed Conflict *Final Report*

Co-sponsored by the Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (ACPACS), the World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), and the project for a United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS)



Brisbane, Australia
February 8-10, 2008

Major support provided by



and
'Global Peace Index' by Steve Killelea

INTRODUCTION

How can we help free the human community from the 'plagues, famines and wars of the 20th Century?' This was the charge of Kevin Clements the host of our GAPW/UNEPS conference at the University of Queensland . For three days (and a fourth day of strategic planning which is not reflected here) a group consisting of core GAPW/UNEPS affiliates and regional experts from Australia, New Zealand,

Timor-Leste and the Philippines grappled with some of the problems and opportunities as we attempt, together, to move closer towards a world without war.

While a number of issues were introduced by the speakers and participants, three areas of concern stood out:

- The need for robust conventional weapons reductions and an arms trade treaty
- The need for nuclear disarmament undertaken together with commitments to non-proliferation
- The need for a standing, individually-recruited, rapid-deployment peacekeeping service that can reduce the costs and operational burdens of UN and regional operations that arrive on the scene too late to stop massive violence in its formative stages.

Throughout these deliberations attention was also drawn to the need to contribute to a 'culture of peace,' including support for the full implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security.

Participants in this conference represented a wide range of policy interests, from firearms and cluster bombs to rapid-deployment peacekeeping and nuclear disarmament. And while there was disagreement aired regarding priorities for current policy advocacy, most participants agreed that a broad, multi-issue, multi-perspective framework was the best platform for securing a lasting and just peace. Indeed, the GAPW framework as represented in the revised Program Statement that made its debut in Brisbane attests to the value of having diverse disarmament, conflict prevention and culture of peace measures pursued under a clear abolitionist agenda. There are many small policy and program successes that must be pursued, and pursued together, on the path towards a world without war. We should celebrate our interim accomplishments but we must not allow ourselves to settle for the easier victories.

The urgency of our work together was underscored by two dramatic events that took place while we were in Brisbane – the assassination attempt on the president of Timor-Leste and the extraordinary 'Sorry Day' event held in the Australian parliament. These events reminded us that the plan of work to which GAPW points and in which the Brisbane participants are variously engaged must be pressed forward with new levels of energy, generosity and skill. We were also reminded that our short-term successes and a larger, more challenging abolitionist agenda require skills and commitments far beyond what we currently have at our disposal. We must be willing to set more and more chairs up around our tables and then extend invitations to more committed young people and older citizens with diverse life experiences and professional interests. And to paraphrase Saul Mendlovitz, we must also learn better how to 'tithe' in each other's issues, to share more generously our insights and capacities across our professional interests and personal concerns as a way of building a stronger and more durable movement.

As you will note from the brief summaries below and the longer attached papers, the GAPW/UNEPS Brisbane meeting covered a range of challenging problems that continue to haunt the human community, from gender violence and the proliferation of small arms to crimes against humanity and nuclear first-use. Here we seek only to provide a brief outline of some of the most important insights from our panels, keynote presentations and general discussions. The more thorough and detailed perspectives can be found by following the enclosed links.

Perhaps the most powerful assertion of Brisbane is that a world without war is achievable. Perhaps the greatest lesson of GAPW is that such a world is achievable only as a series of interlocking disarmament agendas and only with the active support and cooperation of persons who

represent and promote each of those agendas. The web of skillful commitment to a just world peace must continue to grow, and we are committed together to making that web flourish.

Table of Contents:

Day One: Friday, February 8, 2008

1. [Welcome and Introductions](#)
2. [Keynote Address](#)
3. [Outlining the Core Principles and Objectives of GAPW - Our New Program Statement](#)
4. [Reducing Conventional and National Armed Forces](#)
5. [Reducing Conventional and National Armed Forces \(Continued\)](#)
6. [The Global Peace Index and Delivering Peace Dividends](#)

Day Two: Saturday, February 9, 2008

1. [Formulating Next Steps - GAPW and Conventional Weapon Reductions](#)
2. [Students for a Nuclear Free World](#)
3. [From Conventional to Nuclear Weapons: Movement Forward on Nuclear Disarmament](#)
4. [Sources of Violent Conflict and Conflict Prevention in the 21st Century](#)

Day Three: Sunday, February 10, 2008

1. [Diverse Consequences for Military Involvement in Humanitarian Intervention](#)
2. [Regional UNEPS Developments and Updates](#)
3. [Complex Issues Related to UNEPS](#)
4. [A Regional Perspective on the UNEPS Proposal](#)
5. [Moving Forward on UNEPS Development](#)
6. [The Role of UNEPS in the Responsibility to Protect](#)
7. [Finale; What is in a Word!](#)
8. [Conclusion](#)

"Extras"

1. [Conference Photo Album](#)
2. [Christian Tanyi \(LUKMEF\) - Statement on UNEPS and Cameroon](#)

3. [Stuart Rees - Building Peace in Iraq](#)

DAY ONE SUMMARY

Friday, February 8, 2008

OVERVIEW

The first day of the Brisbane conference focused on two key concerns:

- The launch of the Global Action to Prevent War 'Program Statement' and the opportunity to solicit and gather comments/assessments from participants
- The examination of strategies for reducing conventional weapons and national armed forces, with topics including small arms, cluster munitions and convention force treaties

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Kevin Clements welcomed participants from 'near and far,' thanking them for attending the GAPW conference and dedicating their time to discussing pertinent issues. A welcome note was also shared from Sergio Duarte (High Representative for Disarmament Affairs) who highlighted the 'holistic approach of Global Action to achieving a disarmed world, that is enshrined within the principles of the UN charter'.

In an initial interactive session on expectations of and aspirations for the conference, participants highlighted the following skills and needs: learning, listening, inspiration, progress, regional networking, focused presentations, interconnectivity and enthusiasm.

The group also remembered the loss of three peacemakers over the past year with strong connections to GAPW: Randy Forsberg of the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, Vincent Makanju of the Nigerian Action Network on Small Arms, and the philanthropist Ira Wallach.

2. KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Pera Wells, Secretary-General, World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA)



Chair: Kevin Clements, Director, ACPACS, University of Queensland

Respondents: John Langmore, President, United Nations Association of Australia

Toh Swee-Hin, Director, Multi Faith Centre, Griffith University

Pera opened her 'big picture' address by highlighting major challenges facing the UN, assessing Ban Ki-moon's leadership in these early stages, and examining prospects for UN reform (especially of the Security Council). Pera also included a message from Hans Blix who stated the importance of GAPW's work on disarmament, the UNEPS project, R2P and Women, Peace and Security.

Pera highlighted Ban Ki-moon's success in Bali (with global warming) and how the diplomatic and leadership skills practiced in that context could be harnessed to “strengthen the capabilities of the UN system to prevent war”. She emphasized the resurgence of nuclear weapons within US military policy, but also noted growing bipartisan support for their abolition. This abolition goal linked with reduction in conventional weapons and military expenditure is crucial in achieving a world free of war. The address concluded with a preferred future for the UN with tools in place such as an Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS), R2P and Security Council reform that would enhance “global peace, development and respect for human rights”.

To read Pera Wells' full statement, click [here](#).

Respondents:

John Langmore reiterated the goal of nuclear abolition, expressing the hope that realists like Schulz and Kissinger have finally come on board. He outlined the role of Ban Ki-moon in preventative diplomacy and noted the crippling nature of UN financing, hoping that Australia and other nations would build up their contributions. He also noted that international law, undermined by the invasion of Iraq, must be reaffirmed and the notion of preemptive force discredited.

Toh, Swee-Hin responded that education was vital to any sustainable peacemaking process, that interfaith dialogue needed to be promoted both within the UN and among civil society, and that the power of 'we the people' needed to be galvanized more effectively. He urged participants to give gratitude to those who are working for peace 'at the base,' and he reminded us that we must move the world 'from a clash of civilizations to a dialogue between civilians.’’

For John Langmore's UNA Australia website, visit <http://www.unaa.org.au/>

For Toh, Swee-Hin's multi-faith centre website, visit www.griffith.edu.au/centre/mfc

3. OUTLINING THE CORE PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES OF GAPW - OUR NEW PROGRAM STATEMENT

Chair: Kevin Clements, Director, ACPACS, University of Queensland

Participants: (Ambassador) Jonathan Dean and Saul Mendlovitz, Co-Founders of GAPW

The Global Action Program Statement is a series of interlocking proposals to bring about a phased reduction in armed conflict that can lead to a world without war. These proposals are highlighted by the following GAPW secretariat priorities:

- Strengthen the UN's ability to respond to massive loss in life through an Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS)
- Implement Security Council resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security
- Negotiate deep cuts in conventional forces and arms production
- Prevent the collapse of the (nuclear) non-proliferation regime



Jonathan Dean discussed how violence inspired by conventional weapons proliferation continues to dominate the international system and expressed the belief that vigorous public education focused on the conventional weapons part of the disarmament equation is crucial. For his part, Saul Mendlovitz reminded participants that the Program Statement represents the only coherent, sequenced statement for achieving world peace without armed conflict. He sought to frame war as a 'public disease' that needs to be 'eradicated'. He also mentioned the need for a more vigorous 'culture of peace' effort, though this is not the priority focus of GAPW.

To view the latest version of the revised GAPW Program Statement, click [here](#).

4. REDUCING CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS AND NATIONAL ARMED FORCES

Chair: Don Kraus, Citizens for Global Solutions (CGS)

Panelists: Negotiating Conventional Weapons, Jonathan Dean

Current Status and Future of the CFE Treaty, Marianne Hanson, University of Queensland

After Don Kraus outlined CGS's stake in conventional weapon's reduction, Jonathan Dean brought attention to GAPW's proposal for an overall phased reduction in conventional weapons holdings and production supported by a regional reduction approach. He predicted that neither China nor Russia would eliminate nuclear weapons if US conventional forces continued to become more complex and potentially aggressive.

Marianne Hanson stated that the name 'conventional' itself was a problem, implying normalcy or acceptance of these weapons. She discussed the CFE treaty from its historical perspective (specifically its focus on preventing surprise attacks), highlighted its significance for confidence

building and security in Europe, and pointed to the dangers of a potential collapse as Russia threatens to withdraw from the treaty. She noted that Russia's 'suspended' participation in CFE is tied to the US missile defense plan in Europe and is not necessarily a sign that a new conventional weapons race will ensue.

The ensuing discussion focused on how to get more public interest in conventional weapons reductions, the importance of NGO's pushing for an arms trade treaty and for reductions in arms sales from northern countries to the global south, the role of small/light weapons in military-related violence, and the (mostly unsupportive) positions of the US candidates on weapons reductions. Several panelists noted that we all need to take a much closer look at the economic consequences and benefits of weapons reductions.

To read Jonathan Dean's full statement, please click [here](#).

5. REDUCING CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS AND NATIONAL ARMED FORCES (CONTINUED)

Chair: Joe Camilleri, La Trobe University, Melbourne

Panelists: Cluster Munitions, Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) and Oslo Process, Archie Law, Austcare

New Zealand's Approaches to Weapons Deconstruction, Alyn Ware, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA)
Arms Control and the Control of Light Weapons in Asia-Pacific, Philip Alpers, Sydney University



Archie Law discussed the terrible humanitarian impact of cluster munitions and outlined renewed efforts through the Oslo Process to develop a treaty banning these instruments of war. He reminded participants of the need to 'stigmatize' these weapons and thereby abolish them as tools of war.

Alyn Ware summarized New Zealand's historical efforts on behalf of a 'nuclear free' world and highlighted the power of grassroots movements to shape government policies. He also called for development of a 'flexible menu' of peacekeeping options.

Philip Alpers discussed the detrimental (and often overlooked) impact of small/light weapons which result in over 1000 deaths per day. “The gun is to armed violence what the mosquito is to malaria,” he noted. He highlighted successful buyback programs in Australia , Brazil and Argentina and stressed the importance of pushing for an Arms Trade Treaty.

To read full statements from the panelists, please click below:

[Archie Law - Cluster Munitions, CCW and the Oslo Process](#)

[Philip Alpers - Arms Control and Control of Light Weapons in Asia-Pacific](#)

Alyn Ware - IALANA Website; <http://www.ialana.net/staff>

6. GLOBAL PEACE INDEX AND DELIVERING PEACE DIVIDENDS

Keynote Evening Address: Steve Killelea, Founder of Vision for Humanity

Chair: Kevin Clements, ACPACS

Respondent: Stuart Rees, Sydney Peace Foundation and University of Sydney



“Peace is an essential condition for survival in the 21st century,” noted Steve Killelea. He presented his innovative tool, the ‘Global Peace Index’, an extraordinary resource that provides a unique and multi-criteria methodology for measuring the ‘peace’ of nations. This presentation stimulated enthusiastic discussion on what makes a nation peaceful, the criteria that most accurately reflect this peace, and factors contributing to sustainable peace.

To read the full report, please click [here](#).

DAY TWO SUMMARY

Saturday, February 9, 2008

1. FORMULATING NEXT STEPS IN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS REDUCTIONS

Chair: Robert Zuber, GAPW

Panelists: Jonathan Dean, Co-Founder, GAPW

Waverly de Bruijn, former International Coordinator, GAPW

This brainstorming session sought to provide insights on how GAPW can increase its stake (in addition to First Committee monitoring and contributing to the Arms Control Reporter) in the conventional weapons area.

Waverly de Bruijn (by phone) suggested GAPW use its global network to advocate for the signing and ratification of existing conventions and also to join international campaigns promoting an Arms Trade Treaty

Jonathan Dean proposed that GAPW look more closely at regional disarmament options and also conducting more research and advocacy around military expenditures.

To read full statements from the panelists, please click below:

[Waverly de Bruijn - Conventional Weapons Landscape](#)

[Jonathan Dean - Negotiating Conventional Reductions](#)

2. STUDENTS FOR A NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE WORLD AND THE MODEL UN ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION

Panelists: Pera Wells, WFUNA

Alyn Ware, IALANA

As explained by Pera Wells, WFUNA (together with the World Academy of Arts and Science) has established a program to grow a global 'nuclear free world' youth movement. Youth are being attracted via competitions, the Model UN Conference and events organized around the International Day of Peace.

Alyn Ware provided an overview of the Nuclear Weapons Convention and how students can participate in advocating for such a convention. He noted that 'Everest is high, but climbable, and the same can be said of nuclear weapons.'

Pera then invited participants to be interviewed about their views on how best to urge governments to abandon nuclear weapons. Please visit <http://www.disarmamenthub.org/#/snwfwvideo/4527353359> to view some of the conference interviews (with more to come).

To read the full report on Students for a Nuclear Free World and the Nuclear Weapons Convention please click below.

[WFUNA - Students for a Nuclear Weapons Free World](#)

[Alyn Ware - The Nuclear Weapons Convention](#)

3. FROM CONVENTIONAL TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS: MOVEMENT FORWARD ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Chair: Hiro Sakurai, Soka Gakkai International

Panelists: Introductory Remarks, Saul Mendlovitz, GAPW

Nuclear Weapons Convention, Susan Wareham, MAPW

De-alerting Nuclear Weapons, John Hallam, Appeal on Nuclear Weapons Operating Status

Reviving the Canberra Commission, Marianne Hanson, University of Queensland



After Hiro Sakurai outlined Soka Gakkai's long pursuit of a disarmed world, Saul Mendlovitz affirmed that "we must learn to resolve disputes by means other than military confrontation." He then moved to a proposal for simultaneous disarmament of nuclear and conventional weapons. Saul reminded us of the difference between regulating and eliminating weapons and urged participants to embrace the larger cause. Saul also encouraged panelists concerned exclusively about nuclear weapons to dedicate some of their time ('tithing') to conventional weapons reduction as well.

Susan Wareham emphasized that "nuclear weapons and climate change are the two great threats to the planet." Sue brought attention to the 'ICAN' campaign which grew from the ashes of the 2005 NPT review conference. The campaign's goal is a Nuclear Weapons Convention that can ultimately remove the threat of nuclear weapons and move us from a narrow focus on non proliferation towards complete abolition.

John Hallam made the audience nervous with both his 'near miss' nuclear stories and his assertion that 2,000 nuclear weapons on alert status

could be launched within 2 minutes. John outlined the progress of UN efforts to take nuclear weapons off alert status.

Marianne Hanson provided a brief overview of the Canberra Commission's work and offered strategies on how to motivate the Rudd government to revive the Commission and promote the 'Australia Initiative' on nuclear disarmament. Marianne outlined the following actions that a revised Commission could address: set a date for the elimination of nuclear weapons, adopt new transparency and verification measures, remove nuclear weapons from national defense and security policies, examine the environmental impact of nuclear weapons testing and use, and promoting a program of public education on nuclear issues. She noted that there is both a "failure of imagination as well as a failure of ambition" among many working in this field.

To read full statement from the panelists, please click below:

[Susan Wareham - ICAN and Nuclear Weapons Convention](#)

[Susan Wareham - Time to Abolish Nuclear Weapons](#)

[John Hallam - De-alerting Nuclear Weapons](#)

[Marianne Hanson - Related Publications](#)

4. SOURCES OF VIOLENT CONFLICT AND CONFLICT PREVENTION IN THE 21st CENTURY

Chair: John Langmore, UN Association of Australia

Panelists: Closing the Early Warning/Response Gap, Susanne Schmeidl, Austcare and Griffith University

Transnational Violence, Manuela Mesa, CEIPAZ, Madrid

Social Movements and Violent Conflict, Katsuya Kodama, Mie University, Japan

Ethnic and Cultural Conflict, Karen Tanada, GZO Institute, The Philippines

Peace Building in Timor-Leste, Maria Dias, Prontu Atu Servi, East Timor

Susanne Schmeidl highlighted the importance of early warning systems, with "the cost of prevention being much less than the cost of rebuilding." Susanne discussed the need to move towards a 'culture' of prevention with specific concerns regarding the deployment of early warning systems (use of intelligence, role of civil society/local communities, who should provide the warning, etc). She also highlighted the need for more 'effective marketing' of the findings and successes in the conflict prevention field. She urged us to move beyond peacekeeping that is akin to 'eunuchs at an orgy,' with lots of energy but no ability to engage.

Katsuya Kodama noted that the rapid growth of NGO's can be interpreted and celebrated as a new phase of global social movements, significantly impacting not only the "political environment but also citizens' ways of thinking about peace and security issues." Katsuya analyzed the growing influence of NGO's in peace activities, UN advocacy, conflict prevention and peace



negotiations.

Manuela Mesa focused on the Latin America experience, noting that unemployment and other social concerns often take a back seat to security issues. She noted that more people died from crime-related activity in El Salvador and Guatemala than died from civil war-related violence. She described in detail the regional violence that is linked to drugs, organized crime and arms trafficking, and she used the term 'femicide' to describe the massive, gender-specific violence that exists in the region and to which the UN must respond.

Karen Tanada provided historical and political background to the current conflict in the Philippines . The country has faced a history of injustice, economic poverty and discrimination, which isn't restricted to indigenous and Muslim peoples. Karen discussed the culture of impunity and politicization of the military which has created an environment of instability. While there has been progress regarding participation of women and youth and a focus on human rights, Karen urged that more civil society groups get involved in promoting and monitoring peace agreements and that they work harder to create 'space for peace.'

Maria Dias provided a complex framework for understanding the population and social indicators of Timor-Leste, including current problems of an inadequate infrastructure, weak justice system and minimal rule of law. It is important for the international community to increase capacity and resource building. Maria also talked about the problem of light weapons and the abuse perpetrated by the military and even by peacekeeping forces. She wondered what was in the minds of leaders that keeps them from meeting social challenges?



To read full statements from the panelists, please click below:

[Manuela Mesa - Transnational Violence](#)

[Susanne Schmeidl - Closing the Early Warning/Response Gap](#)

[Katsuya Kodama - Social Movements and Violent Conflict](#)

Maria Dias; related presentation, visit <http://www.etan.org/et2006/october/28/26un.htm>

For Karen Tanada's organizational website, visit www.justpeace.net.ph

DAY THREE SUMMARY
Sunday, February 10, 2008

UN EMERGENCY PEACE SERVICE (UNEPS)

1. DIVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION: THE ROLES OF NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND GLOBAL ORGANISATIONS

Keynote Address: Major General Maurie McNarn, Director of Defence Intelligence, Australia

Chair: Kevin Clements, ACPACS

Due to the imposition of Chatham House Rules, this speech cannot be distributed. General McNarn provided an overview of Australia's peacekeeping role in the Asia-Pacific region and highlighted some of the important, but limited and complimentary roles of military forces in promoting and keeping the peace. He spoke of military function that can provide a 'security window of opportunity' to allow other actors and their integrated capacities to deal with important political and humanitarian issues. He also spoke of the increased operational tempo and complexity of existing peacekeeping operations and called for peacekeeping that was appropriate to the missions undertaken, committed to handing over tasks as soon as possible, and willing to engage in cooperative relationship building. He also noted that UNEPS has some clear benefits to peacekeeping operations, including its unified command structure, interoperability and UN legitimacy.

For more information on Australia's commitment to peacekeeping, visit <http://www.defence.gov.au/adfwc/peacekeeping/>

2. REGIONAL UNEPS DEVELOPMENTS AND UPDATES

Chair: Ralph Pettman, Sydney University

Panelists: House Resolution 213 (US) on UNEPS, Don Kraus, Citizens for Global Solutions

Recent Developments in Rapid Response Peacekeeping Capability in Spain and the EU, Manuela Mesa, CEIPAZ

UNEPS in the Japanese Diet, Takahiro Katsumi, Aide to Senator Inuzuka

Don Kraus provided an overview of the UNEPS proposal and details of House Resolution 213 (in the US Congress), which calls for a "United Nations Emergency Peace Service capable of intervening in the early stages of a humanitarian crisis." Don emphasized the importance of civil society in promoting UNEPS (currently over 50 NGO's have endorsed the program). Don also discussed the inclusion of UNEPS into a white paper being prepared for the Albright/Cohen taskforce (US) on the threat of genocide.

Manuela Mesa; pondered "how the legitimate interests of the EU could be advanced through UNEPS." She concluded that the EU could support UNEPS on the basis of several rationales: multilateralism is integral to its mandate; the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy is still being designed and is open to new ideas and tools; the EU has integrated a priority towards conflict prevention since its inception; there are key sympathetic governments within the EU; and there is increasingly robust civil society participation. However, she noted, we cannot

think about UNEPS in anything but a long term (4 years or more) context.

Takahiro Katsumi; outlined activities of the Japanese Diet in relation to UNEPS and the “Terror Elimination Law”, which addresses the concept of R2P and the establishment of a new UN service “capable of immediately taking necessary measures to respond to threats to international peace and security.” Takahiro affirmed that UNEPS actually enhances rather than compromises Article 9 of the Japanese constitution. He highlighted the need for more work with national and regional networks, including through Senator Inuzuka's involvement with the Parliamentarians for Global Action or PGA (http://www.pga-japan.jp/index_e.html). He also expressed the need for a clear implementation plan for UNEPS, and for moving beyond a focus on military concerns and audiences to a broader constituency.



To read full statements from the panelists, please click below:

[Manuela Mesa- Developments in Rapid Response Peacekeeping Capability in Spain and the EU](#)

[Don Kraus - H Res. 213 \(US\) on UNEPS](#)

[Takahiro Katsumi - UNEPS in the Japanese Diet](#)

[Takahiro Katsumi - Article 9 to Chapter VI and a Half Reform](#)

3. COMPLEX ISSUES RELATED TO UNEPS

Chair: Manuela Mesa, CEIPAZ

Panelists: Rapid Deployment and Composition of Service, Peter Langille, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Canada (SSHRCC)

Authorization/Security Council (SC) Reform, Alex Bellamy, University of Queensland

Gaps between UN Security Council Authorization and DPKO Mission Deployment, Kavitha Suthanthiraraj, GAPW



Peter Langille, the principle expert on a variety of technical aspects in the UNEPS proposal, shared a two-part summary of his extensive research on the deployment and composition requirements of a UN standing service. Peter outlined a viable structural framework for UNEPS, including the logistics, personnel, administration and facilities required to achieve rapid deployment. He stressed the need for ‘modular’ deployable elements (‘building blocks for

long-term engagement') that can increase both the flexibility and appropriate use of a UNEPS service. He reminded participants that UNEPS is particularly well suited to situations where troop contributing countries are uneasy about participation. And, in more general terms, he stressed the need for more resources around: early warning, contingency planning, adequate transport, infrastructure and logistics support, adequate finances and well-trained personnel (including field teams to assess needs).

Alex Bellamy provided an initial, critical analysis of the UNEPS proposal, highlighting his concerns regarding any proposed alternatives to the Security Council's role in any future UNEPS authorization. However, he also asserted the need for SC reform in order to remove the political obstacles that may prevent a UN standing service from being deployed.

Kavitha Suthanthiraraj analyzed the 'gap' between Security Council resolutions and the time of 'first' troop deployment - 'how long it took troops to first hit the ground' and how many troops and services were finally deployed in the 'first wave.' The research also developed a framework for rapid and effective deployment, identified key deployment trends, highlighted case studies (DRC and Sudan) and made three recommendations (UNEPS, regional capacity building and reinforcing current standby operations).

Discussion that followed, focused on the need for 'second wave' agreements, and on being sure that UNEPS is not deployed in situations where it doesn't really belong, such as in situations characterized by high level conflict. Don Kraus among others affirmed the need for early warning intelligence and other preventive services, but also noted that 'the UN doesn't have a brain and the members states don't want it to have a brain.'

To read full statements from the panelists, please click below:

[Peter Langille - Rapid Deployment of UNEPS](#)

[Peter Langille - UNEPS Composition](#)

[Kavitha Suthanthiraraj - Gap between UNSC Authorization and Current DPKO Deployment of Mission](#)

Alex Bellamy - Authorization/SC Reform (to be uploaded)

4. A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE UNEPS PROPOSAL

Chair: Alex Bellamy, University of Queensland

Panelists: Research Project on UNEPS From a Regional Perspective, Stuart Rees and Annie Herro, Center for Peace and Conflict Studies (CPACS), University of Sydney



Annie Herro analyzed UNEPS from the perspective of the Solomon Islands, specifically whether intervention by a UN standing service could have addressed weaknesses in RAMSI (Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands) and assisted in achieving a sustainable peace. She wondered if we really know enough about what people who have experienced trauma are going through and pointed to the need for community resources that can help build local capacity and assist healing. Annie further outlined key structural and philosophical questions relating to UNEPS, including the relationship of R2P doctrine to UNEPS, UNEPS operations at the regional level, and the role of local participation in UNEPS deployments.

Stuart Rees presented research on UNEPS and its 'linguistic framework.' Based on interviews with 21 senior decision makers, discussions were categorized as; military discourse, non violent discourse and UNEPS specific discourse. Stuart emphasized that getting the language correct eg. 'service' vs. 'force' and its framework eg; physical security, non violent feature, diverse nature of service etc were also important to gain wider acceptance and support for the proposal. He also highlighted that language must be adapted for cultural differences eg; in Japan the interpretation of the word 'intervene' is remarkably different from that in Spain.

To read full statements from the panelists, please click below:

[Stuart Rees - Language and UNEPS](#)

[Annie Herro - Intervention According to UNEPS, Solomon Islands Casestudy](#)

5. MOVING FORWARD ON UNEPS DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Robert Zuber, GAPW

UNEPS action priorities, based on direct feedback from participants, included the following:

- greater global south interaction
- more regional conferences
- develop a UNEPS-specific internet site
- further outreach to UN military advisors
- develop a timeline for UNEPS implementation
- expansion of Wallach Fund (regional capacity)
- examining relationship between UNEPS and R2P
- bringing youth into this work – young scholars/researchers
- develop listservs to keep people in touch regarding UNEPS
- develop strategies for how to grow the UNEPS network
- consultations of experts on ways to make the UNEPS proposal more viable
- need to consider a different way of 'branding' UNEPS
- the need for a more participatory governance structure

In the ensuing conversation, Stuart Rees noted that the 'people selected for the first UNEPS deployment will be critically important.' Toh, Swee-Hin insisted that we interrogate and assess the non-military aspects of the UNEPS service as much as the military components in order to avoid what he called 'development aggression.'

To read the full UNEPS 'State of the Union', click [here](#)

6. THE ROLE OF UNEPS IN THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT (R2P)

Address by Alex Bellamy, School of Political Science and International Studies and Director, Centre on the Responsibility to Protect, University of Queensland



Respondents: Jonathan Dean and Saul Mendlovitz, co-founders of GAPW



Alex Bellamy provided an extraordinary examination of how UNEPS could (and could not) contribute to a R2P intervention framework. He cautioned that UNEPS as a 'first in, first out' system was therefore dependent on a second UN 'wave' of peacekeepers to takeover. UNEPS therefore must be understood as a complimentary tool, not a stand-alone one. Alex saw UNEPS as capable of fulfilling the following functions within an R2P framework: institutionalize best practices for peace keeping, serve as a focal point for comprehensive training ('capstone doctrines'), provide technical support to governments that are unable to honor their responsibility to protect civilians, support hybrid and/or regional operations (personnel and logistics), and solidify public appreciation of the international community's intent to address crimes against humanity and other humanitarian disasters. He highlighted political and financial limitations facing UNEPS that needed to be addressed, including the inability of UNEPS to escalate in response to unpredictable levels of violence, the need to demonstrate that UNEPS will not pull resources from existing peacekeeping operations, and the ongoing reluctance of member states to allow the UN to develop independent capacity. He also cautioned against advocating for deployment authorization for UNEPS that attempts to bypass the Security Council.

In the ensuing discussion, Saul Mendlovitz wondered about using the ICRC or Doctors Without Borders as models for UNEPS. Several participants mentioned the need to change the current dynamics within DPKO, to reduce the 'operational tempo' caused in part by the fact that peacekeeping so often is now seen as the 'default' response to challenging situations that could have been (and should have been) resolved politically.

To read more about Alex Bellamy and R2P, visit <http://www.brill.nl/gr2p>

7. FINALE – WHAT'S IN A WORD!

Actors: Kevin Clements, Don Kraus, Patricia Manley, Saul Mendlovitz
Written by Stuart Rees

Stuart entertained the crowd with a witty satirical play summarizing the themes and events of the conference. This was a highlight event and provides a fantastic conclusion to an interactive and stimulating conference!



For more on the play, click [here](#).

7. CONCLUSION

The comments shared in this space provide, as mentioned previously, only a taste of the insights and strategies found in the papers, powerpoint presentations and other documents from the Brisbane meeting. Moreover, on the fourth day of our gathering (not included in this report), those entrusted with the task of guiding the programs and activities of GAPW and UNEPS took these numerous insights and began to translate them into structural and programmatic reforms that will ensure that GAPW maintains its capacity for coordination and leadership on issues from rapid-reaction peacekeeping to gender-integrated conflict resolution policy. GAPW has long understood its limited but important role in helping the international community to solve problems, increase capacity and join forces to promote critically important campaigns to reduce conventional weapons, preserve the non-proliferation regime, provide new, rapid-deployment peacekeeping tools, promote an arms trade treaty, and other critical concerns.

We have much to do and much to do together. We look forward to the challenges of building new structures and new capacities to bring us that much closer to a world without war.

