

Ukraine: implementing pacifying measures

by Gabriel Galice, President of the Geneva International Peace Research Institute (GIPRI)



Gabriel Galice.
(Photo ma)

Even and particularly in times of war, the GIPRI pursues its work of dispelling clichés with determination. In their masterful book “Unrestricted warfare” [published in French and English],¹ Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui explain that “non-military

war operations” characterise the wars of the 21st century. Such types of operations are economic, technological and communicative.

If not absent, the military element is being trained, supported and monitored by all the other tools of belligerency. Information warfare (infowar) is a cornerstone of this, and we are all part of it, whether we like it or not. A look at the work and publications of our institute shows both its aspiration and its constancy. Our 2016 conference, “What peace for what world order?” is a case in point.

In the case of Ukraine, positions based on emotion (and all the more so when it comes to “manufactured” emotion) lead, in the name of good intentions which we know pave the way to hell, adding fuel to the fire by sending weapons instead of implementing pacifying measures. To be indignant, to condemn, is within anyone’s reach, but to understand the situation in Ukraine requires extensive information that takes time and should include the work of authors like Zbigniew Brzezinski.

The GIPRI endorses the method advocated by its former president, Professor Roy Preiswerk, in

his text “What is meant by peace research?” The irenological analysis of a situation has four phases: normative, descriptive, evaluative, prescriptive. Our normativeness is based on the principle of a just, multipolar world, respecting the UN Charter, of which the sovereign equality of peoples is a cornerstone.

While reproving Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, does not bar to take the reasons behind it seriously. For thirty years, the Russians have been calling in vain for the establishing of a common security architecture. Under the leadership of the United States of America, the West has supported “colour revolutions” (including the Maïdan coup d’Etat in 2014), extended NATO to its periphery and fed an anti-Russian discourse. Guy Mettan has analysed the motives in his book “Russie-Occident, une guerre de mille ans” (Russia and the West. A thousand-year war).

In his article “A Fatal Error”, George Kennan had decried NATO’s expansion eastwards. Instead of acceding to Russia’s demand for *common security*, the West extended its security *without and against* Russia, flouting the commitment made to Gorbachev before German unification, not to expand NATO. This commitment was confirmed by US researchers such as Mary Elise Sarotte and Joshua Shiffrin.

In short, when it comes to international relations as well as neighbourly relations, it is good to start by putting one’s own house in order.

(Translation “Swiss Standpoint”)

¹ Liang Qiao, Xiangsui Wang. “Unrestricted Warfare” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unrestricted_Warfare-#Source_of_text