

Passage 1

- 1 Why are some places prone to war? Iraq has deeply confused how people think about twenty-first-century war. The war in Iraq is not a guide to the future; it is a rerun of a phase in world history that is essentially over. Iraq started with an international invasion. So did the two world wars, Napoleon's wars, the Crimean War and the other great set pieces of military history. In the twenty-first century, international invasions are going to be infrequent. The wars that will fill our television screens this century will be civil wars, not international ones. Of course, there were civil wars in the nineteenth century as well as invasions, but even the civil wars of that era are a hopeless guide to what warfare will be like. The major civil war of the nineteenth century was the American Civil War where one alliance of states fought against another alliance of states, each with its own recognised territory, government and army. It's history. 5
- 2 Future civil wars will take the form of a government pitted against a private extra-legal military grouping. They will variously be called rebels, terrorists, freedom fighters or gangsters, but their essential characteristic will be the same. These wars will also be a throwback, but to a different period of history: the time before nation-states cohered. 15
- 3 To rephrase the question, why are some countries more at risk of civil war than others? If we could answer the question, we might be able to do something about it: some of the factors that elevate the risk of civil war might be things that could readily be put right.
- 4 The economy matters. Low-income countries are significantly more at risk: poor is dangerous. It is not just the level of income: it is also the rate of growth. Given the level of income, societies that are growing at a faster per capita are significantly less at risk of violent conflict than societies that are stagnant or in decline. Economic development is peace-promoting. The statistics of the world post-1960 are supported by the deep historical evidence of the societies of early history. Economic development is a key remedy to violence: jobs, education, hope, a sense of having something to lose, and more effective state security services, all of which contribute something. 20 25
- 5 Besides the economy, a country's history also increases risks. The aspect of a country's history that most commonly excites interest when it comes to explaining a civil war is its colonial experience. Understandably, many people in developed countries find it convenient to emphasise the guilt of their own societies, and equally, many people in developing countries want to avoid any impression that the violence of their societies is a consequence of characteristics within those societies. But blaming colonialism for civil war is a costly illusion because it detracts from the focus on its real causes, which are often things that can still be changed. It may make people feel better, but it inhibits action. 30 35
- 6 The cost of violence is enormous. Even if it is to lead to healthy change, we need to ask whether the eventual benefits are worth these massive costs. But the final tragedy of civil war is that it leads not to improvement but to deterioration.

Adapted from 'Wars, Guns and Votes' by Paul Collier

Passage 2

- 1 Everyone knows the central philosophical question which the human race has been
unable to answer: “Why is there violence rather than non-violence?” When once asked
if non-violent resistance was a form of “direct action”, Gandhi replied: “... It is the only
form.” It was the “greatest force...” Gandhi believed non-violence could be put into
practice at every level of human experience. Non-violence for him was not just a 5
political tactic but an exercise in spirituality and a way of life.
- 2 It is revealing that in a world where there are calamities such as terrorism, poverty,
illiteracy and fanaticism, history can still be made out of choices. The choice of non-
violence is ours. We live in a world of “overlapping destinies” where the fates of
cultures are heavily intertwined. It is no longer a world of closed communities where 10
tyrannical orders or religious traditions represented the sole layers of historical
legitimacy. Never in the history of the human race has non-violence been so crucial.
Only the most barbaric and despotic regimes, however, have attempted to prevent their
subjects to think and to practise non-violence.
- 3 Non-violence has recently evolved from a simple tactic of resistance to a 15
cosmopolitical¹ aim based on international application of the principles of democracy.
Over the past three decades, global terrorism, violation of human rights and
environmental degradation have caused repercussions highlighting the concern for
global politics of non-violence. These can best be dealt with at the global level. Global
politics of non-violence, thus, is the task not only of governments but also of civil 20
societies, and inter-governmental, non-governmental and transnational organisations.
Most importantly, the international community has the moral obligation and duty to
intervene in countries if they slide into lawlessness and can’t protect citizens from
violations of human rights. Only a non-violent society can work its way up to creating
the institutions ripe for development and lead to inter-cultural and inter-religious 25
harmony.
- 4 We are living today in an era where social, cultural and political spheres are void of
spirituality. But Gandhi’s non-violence still offers us an ideal that may be upheld.
Gandhi remains the prophetic voice of the 21st century and his non-violence urges us to
continue struggling on behalf of what we view as just and right. At a time when 30
mankind is confronted with clashes of national interest, religious fundamentalism and
ethnic and racial prejudice, non-violence can be a well-trusted means of laying the
groundwork of new cosmopolitics. Though many continue to believe that non-violence
is an ineffective instrument against dictatorship and genocide, in the last several decades
many democratic initiatives, which were premised on non-violent militancy and an 35
affirmation of human rights and helped build a global civil society on solid ethical
foundations, could be associated with a kind of neo-Gandhian quest for peace and
justice.

¹ cosmopolitical – a structure that encompasses a diversity of political systems

Passage 2

- 5 It would be folly to expect non-violence to become effective and durable, while the majority still thinks of politics in terms of the use of violence. It is true, as Karl Jaspers affirms: “In morality, moral conviction is decisive; in politics, it is success.” But it is also true there is no long-term success in politics in the absence of morality. That is to say, political events bring moral responsibilities, and in turn ethical views place their imprint on political decisions. Politics without ethics is pure exercise of power. It is only in relation to ethics that politics can be elevated as a public virtue. Terrible crimes have been committed by political practice that tried to teach and impose moral behaviour. Spiritualising politics, as Gandhi understood, is not about moralising it, but an effort to redefine it in terms of civic responsibility in an explicit public sphere. Politics is the morally conscientious and socially responsible exercise of civic roles. Non-violence is the key to this. Violence is normally seen as a means to an end. Very few people desire a world with war, crime and terrorism. But in non-violent politics, non-violence is the means and non-violence is the goal.
- 6 The time has come for humanity to renew its commitment politically, economically and culturally to the wisdom of non-violence.

**Adapted from ‘Non-violence in the 21st century: A matter of choice’ by
Ramin Jahanbegloo**