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**1.Introduction:**

The hegemony of the United States which has remained un-questioned since the end of the Cold War is now causing a variety of global issues since President Donald Trump has taken decisions unthinkable under past Presidents, Republican and Democrat, who avoided destabilizing the global equilibrium under the United Nations global governance.

President Trump decision to a new nuclear strategy or to retreat from the Paris Agreements to combat Global Warming or to move to Jerusalem the US Embassy were based on the President’s “America First” policy which renounced to the hegemonic “responsibility” assumed by the United States, from before the Cold War. The emergence of President Trump in the United States was accompanied by a tidal wave of hate crimes in the United States. The extreme rightist parties in Europe already profiting from the War Against Terror, in mobilizing the white-men supremacy xenophobic tradition against migrants and refugees from the South, especially from Islamic countries. All these problems became gradually visible since the end of the Cold War, symbolized by the fall of the Berlin Wall. After the twenty-years bridging the two millenniums, the expectation experienced by the enthusiastic media of the time, that the end of the Cold War was enabling humankind to profit from the Peace Dividend seem to have been unrealistic wishful-thinking. Since then the global hegemons failed to build a more peaceful world where human rights are guaranteed and all peoples can live in peace free from fear and wants

This Report is based on the author’s conviction that we are entering into a new phase of the Post-Cold-War world, and that we should not assume that the world will return to its “normal course”. We will try to propose a more realistic picture of the World which is gradually moving into a New Cold War, a perilous but interesting second phase of the Post-Cold-War World. We should be prepared to face a variety of pernicious new trends. We should also be aware that this new time of crisis allows some creative movements to play new local and global roles trying to open-up alternative futures on this endangered planet. Many of the institutions which functioned more or less well since the end of the Cold War will not work at all in the coming years of the second phase of post-Cold-War world. The sovereign States will continue to exist, the United States will remain the Hegemonic Power, the United Nations will remain the only universal global Institution, but a new Cold-War global military-political and financial-economic “game” is bound to disprove the past common-sense, and new social forces, now weak and uncertain will come to salvage the Mother-Earth from falling into a new dark age if not into a simple global catastrophic end.

This New Cold War, will be quite different from the past one. It will be also a worldwide Nuclear Imperialist Cold War, but It will not be a bi-polar hegemonic competition between two Super-Powers. It will be composed by a complex nexus of large and small conflicts, military, hate-criminal, discriminatory, police terrorist, etc. It will

involve a complex network of unidentified players opposed to one single mega- player,

the Global single Hegemon with its State and non-State interest companions, corporate

and technocratic. The conflict will involve a variety of agents, domestic and cross-national. Humankind will not only remain under the threat of nuclear annihilation, but also of Ecological unsustainability. Human Civilization may barely survive under a constant threat of both a Third World War, and a Second Crash and Great Depression. If some new initiatives do not emerge before it is too late, the contemporary Modern Civilization may commit collective suicide.

All human knowledge will become useless if natural popular intelligence does not remain in control of Artificial Intelligence. In this new Cold War, ethical decisions will become more and more necessary, but increasingly difficult and dangerous. Intelligence may become more and more un-ethical, if it remains dominated by State and corporate intelligence with their extensive secret data-base networks. It is important to develop all the diverse local cognitive communities of peoples’ intelligence based on their eco-cultural diversity as diverse expressions of the same global Life Community. They may share tacit ethical principles. We will have to identify all these post-modern popular movements, and organize their efforts to face global neo-liberal and neo-conservative forces whose game of power and profits inhibit any popular efforts for ethical reflection. We will not enter into the complex issues regarding the fight against the global control of popular ethical reflection, this global issue is already discussed by *Worldism*. We will rather limit our discussion to more conventional issues which need urgent concerns[[1]](#endnote-1).

**2.　The Atlantic Liberalism of the First-Phase Post-Cold-War (PCW) Globalization:**

The emerging new cold-war situation is still unrealized and occluded by the variety of players who keep playing the game based on the assumption that the Westphalian Sovereign States will continue to be the sole institution with legitimate violence, or to put it more bluntly the right to kill without being penalized. We cannot predict how the Nation-States will be replaced by what sort of States, we can only review possible transformations and discuss the alternative conditions of the transformation of sovereign States and the possible efforts of different stakeholders. The positive and negative choice of each international agent of the New Cold War, will be affected by the consequences of the end of the world under the hegemonic guidance of Atlantic Liberalism. In the second phase of this post-Cold-War complex reality, the only clear fact is the emergence of a great number of libertarian pluralist networks of post-modern global citizens[[2]](#endnote-2) in close alliance with the indigenous peoples, migrant workers diasporas, and other minority identity communities.

The First Phase of the Post-Cold-War world was characterized by a “modern” attempt to materialize the Kantian global “Eternal Peace”[[3]](#endnote-3) community of nation States, based on the Westphalian States system with an inter-State institution which inspired the founders of the League of Nations and the United Nations. Thus the United Nations control now the inter-State=Inter-national Community composed by the UN member-States. We tend to assume that the world which functioned rather satisfactorily following the fall of the Berlin Wall, accompanied by the end of the Soviet Bloc, will continue to exist as seems it does for the moment. This first phase Post-Cold-War world was in a sense ready to materialize “at last” the dream of the Trilateral Hegemony of the Atlantic States (plus non-Atlantic and non-Western Japan). This “liberal” power-bloc remained the unique Hegemonic State Bloc after the fall of the Soviet Union and the Socialist Bloc it coordinated. The Bloc which lost its opponent was composed by the so-called “industrial democracies” Liberalists, with Japan as a non-Western partner of the American-European-Japanese Trilateral Global Hegemony.

This Trilateral Hegemonic Bloc[[4]](#endnote-4) was created during the Cold War, on the basis of the Atlantic Charter adopted by the Anglo-American Hegemony before the Second World war. Invented to fight Hitler and his axis-allies, its “liberalism” became more and more[[5]](#endnote-5)

democratic and welfare-oriented in its fight against the “Communist Bloc”, and more and more “developmentalist” in face of the North-South gaps which required an Anti-Communist Atlantic Liberalism of the Industrial Democracies to adopt a universalist policy to spread Democracy and Human Rights throughout the non-Western regions. This exogenous human rights development became even-ｍore universalist with the fall of the Communist Bloc which left the United States and its Atlantic Trilateral Bloc the unique hegemonic bloc in the Post-Cold-War World.

The Trilateral Hegemonic Bloc found at last a “free space” to implement its original civilizational programme to teach the non-Western peoples Western liberalism. This was a hegemony, or an Imperialist bloc by the “industrial democracies” which built the United Nations as their international institution. The Post-Cold-War globalization was characterized by the emergence of new actors, subaltern[[6]](#endnote-6) non-hegemonic peoples liberating themselves from the shackles of colonialism. under the Trilateral Atlantic global hegemony of the industrial democracies. This two level world is composed by the G’ and the G20 State coalitions. New competitors to the Westphalian States also appeared. On the one side, the gigantic global TNCs (Trans-national Corporations) challenged States-supremacy in the global market. The United Nations, where TNCs had no place, led them to organize a parallel organization the World Economic Forum(WEF) of Davos which was originally founded in 1971 but played a role supporting Trilateral hegemony as powerful actors in this Rich-Man’s club.

The WEF began to invite UN officials and State leaders to participate in their conferences of corporate leaders in Davos and in their different regional centres. The global-neoliberal market elites were thus free to give their global guidance to the United Nations and to its human rights mechanisms. The UN Secretary General and the High Commissioner for Human Rights began to participate in the Davos meetings and ascertained the participation of the corporate leadership in the hegemonic Governance of the industrial democracies. In opposition to the TNCs, another group of new actors appeared in the post-Cold-War global arena, it was a new network of Post-Modern, ie Post Atlantic liberalist, global citizens. Among different Post-Modern Citizen networks, the most influential was the citizens coalition ICAN which was fighting against what we propose to call Nuclear Imperialism, which succeeded to have signed by UN member-States a Treaty for the “Abolition of Nuclear Weapons”. The Post-Modern global citizens

were libertarian, opposed to Globalization from Above, were not like the modern anti-Imperialist citizens who hoped to build a non-Capitalist Socialist/Communist Bloc, with a strong monopoly of the means of production by Socialist States waiting for the withering of all States. This modern expectation of a Revolution had become a dream for the Post-Modern Global Citizens who wanted to replace the Nuclear Imperialism by a coalition of Socialist States.

A global Network of Post-Modern global citizens started the World Social Forum (WSF) in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 2001. This Forum provided a meeting place for the variety of non-neoliberal local, national, regional and international counter-hegemonic movements by building a non-violent *alter-mondist* Popular Bloc. This opposition between the World Economic Forum and the World Social Forum has become an interesting question-mark aspect of the second-phase of the PCW world. During the first phase, the World Social Forum was only an organization of socio-political movements on potential alternative social development. During the first phase, the Atlantic Liberalism was able to legitimize its existence by its power to protect universal values of democracy, human rights, and of a search for ecological sustainability. In the second phase, the United States and the United Nations have become incapable to contain the perilous expansion of hate crimes, racist discrimination and obstacles to sustainable development. The World Social Forum has become a political Counter-hegemonic network against the new Fascist forces, whereas WEF lost the ideological and military power basis of its hegemonic legitimacy, the industrial democratic exogenous promotion of human rights and humanitarian low, and global sustainability.

.

**3. The United Nations during the Cold-War and First Phase of PCW Globalization:**

During the Cold-War period, the Non-socialist Atlantic States strengthened liberal freedoms and human rights, by building an international hegemonic bloc supporting the Atlantic Charter Programme of Western-States-led democracy and human rights. Originally, this programme was proposed by F.D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill in 1945[[7]](#endnote-7). The victory of the Anti-Fascist Bloc developed the World proposed in the Atlantic Charter. The United Nations became the global institution which worked under the “guidance” of the three Atlantic Permanent Members of the Security Council, The USA, the UK and France. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the United Nations. This made the Hegemony of the Industrial Democracies a strong anti-communist Bloc, and in the Post-Cold-War world, an even more powerful Bloc with the right and obligation to intervene wherever necessary to secure humanitarian law and promote human rights.

The United Nations was unable to play an active role in preventing the Vietnam War. But it succeeded to play a key role in face of global issues, which became the concern

of a new future-oriented enlightened technocratic cognitive community which infiltrated in all the Atlantic Liberal institutions, the States, the United Nations, the regional government institutions, the TNCs in the global market, in the indigenous communities, and in the non-governmental Citizens’ organizations. This spread of ecological-concerns expanded into a new movement of citizens and multitude challenging the existing Trilateral hegemony of industrial democracies[[8]](#endnote-8).

The United Nations became an institution which allowed Atlantic liberalism to interact with a growing *Alter-mondist* Post-modern transnational coalition in search of an alternative World. This was a new Role for the United Nations, unforeseen by the Atlantic founders. The United Nations became a global mobilizer of the variety of stakeholders unrelated to the bipolar conflicts, an unexpected role unexpected by the Atlantic liberal Powers who founded this Global Institution. This UN initiative included an effort to associate the global citizens to participate in facing global issues, which led to the present UN activities in the implementation of Sustainable Development Goals. This encouragement of NGO activities helped, among others, the IMADR to start activities associating the minorities and indigenous peoples to the United Nations human rights institutions during the first phase of PCW time.

The United Nations started in the 1960s to support the Atlantic Liberal efforts to bridge the growing gaps between the West and the Rest, the so-called North/South problems. This made the United Nations approach the problems of a Third Generation Human Rights, the *Rights to Development* in the 1970s.b. This provided wasan occasion to connect human rights with ecologically healthy alternative development, and to the proposition of a New International Economic Order. This trend was prepared by the Club of Rome and the World Council of (Christian) Churches, which pointed out to the ecological issues created by the uncontrolled consumerist capitalist World, was supported by UNESCO, UNITAR, and UN University[[9]](#endnote-9), and adopted a new practice in the UN to hold Special Conferences on Global Issues accompanied by NGO Forums. This prepared the United Nations to play an important role un-planed and un-expected by the Atlantic Liberalist hegemons. This trend which was influenced by the Cold War, the Vietnam War resistance, etc., prepared the positive trends of the PCW development thanks to the Atlantic liberal hegemony which wanted to benefit from the end of the Cold War using its Peace Dividend.

This was why the first phase of the PCW world in the 1990s was a decade when a series of World Conferences on global issues was organized by the United Nations. These Conferences on Global Issues included ecology, gender, population, human rights, social development, gender, habitat and racism. This made the Post-Cold-War period a period where the United Nations helped develop a global deployment of civil society activities represented by the NGOs in active cooperation with the UN through organizing NGO Forums during the UN Conferences[[10]](#endnote-10). The NGO Forums accompanying UN Conferences were occasions for NGO networks to organize themselves inclusive of the non-Western world. It was a great achievement of the Post-Cold-War first phase, in the realization of the Kantian programme of a Sovereign-States-based democratic world with civilian participation under the United Nations. IMADR participated and organize workshops during several of the NGO Forums, in 1993 Vienna Conference on Human Rights, in 1994 Kopenhagen Social Development, in 1995 Beijing Women, and in 2001 Durban Anti-Racism Conferences. The Durban Conference was the last UN Conference on Global Issues, and was characterized by the self-criticism of the Atlantic Liberalist States. The EU delegation made an official recognition of the role played by Europe since the 16th century in obstructing the development of Africa and creating a political economic where human security free from fear and wants was chronically violated for the African peoples and the Afro-descendants through slavery and colonialism.

The Durban Conference was the first occasion for the non-Western States to denounce the industrial democracies for their historical collusion with slavery and colonialist aggressions and occupations in Africa and the other regions of the Rest by the West. It prepared the second phase of the post-Cold-War world by stressing the discriminations of non-Western migrant labour diaspora communities, defining the concepts of *Afro descendants* and *Asia descendants*. We will come back to the second concept which was left un-used till now. It is proposed that IMADR should develop this concept in order to trigger-off a process of endogenous intellectual creativity on peace and human rights not only in Asia but also globally.

The Durban UN Conference on Racism was an important Conference from which the United States and Israel stepped-out, claiming that the denunciation of Israel by pro- Palestinian governments and NGOs were inacceptable. The EU States stayed, and faced the criticism which represented the positive aspects of the Atlantic Liberalism, whereas the United States retreat was a manifestation of the limits of the exogenous efforts for Democracy and Human Rights, selectively applied where the national interest of the industrial democracies and of the transnational corporate complex were guaranteed by their exogenous developmentalist activities.

**4．The Atlantic Liberal Efforts in the First Phase of PCW Globalization::**

While positive efforts to develop a system based on Atlantic liberalism, the hidden

Non-liberal aspects of the Industrial Democracies began to appear in the form of neoliberalism and neoconservatism, while the United Nations was playing an important role to enable humankind to close the turbulent 20th century, and enter into the second millennium with a positive globalization where all nations could find a hope in the equitable future meeting UN’s Millennium Development Goals. This project has been to this time, a dream which does not come true, pointing out the unsustainability of the first Phase of Post-Cold-War world which was hiding behind the UN efforts, a strong counter-current characterized by the unsustainable impoverishment of the eco-system and of the subaltern sector which defined itself as 99% of the World human population.

Before pointing out the hidden contradictions of the Atlantic Liberal rule of the World under its hegemony. We must point-out the exogenous efforts it made to propagate

Human rights and humanitarian law, an effort which had a positive effect on the non-Western regions in terms of triggering-off a process which made human rights and humanitarianism better-known in the non-Western regions, and helped the development of endogenous efforts for justice and peace around the world, while it had also negative impacts by covering-up neo-colonialist, neo-conservative and neo-liberal trends make the Atlantic Liberalism arrive to its stage of self-destruction in the second phase of PCW globalization.

The US and Europe led the UN efforts to spread humanitarian Peace-Keeping and promote exogenously human rights in the non-Western Global South. This exogenous development of humanitarian law and human rights has been launched during the first phase of post-Cold-War globalization thanks to the Yugoslavian humanitarian intervention, and later through interventions in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and in the War on Terror against the rising “terrorism” in the Arabo-Islamic world. This War against terrorist was a sign of the times of the end phase of Atlantic Liberalism. Where-as the Atlantic Charter was a successful manifestation of the Westphalian State World Order by eliminating the Fascist Axis and re-organizing a community of Nation States under the Atlantic Hegemony. The Nation States were recognized to be the only legitimate institutions with legitimate monopoly of violence, through their military and police forces. The emergence of “terrorist” non-State forces with military violence was inacceptable for the Atlantic liberal industrial democracies. Now, that the Industrial Democracies were unable to forbid the terrorists to possess military means supposed to be exclusively owned only by Westphalian States, Atlantic Liberalism was unable to continue their benevolent open-door policy to accept migrant workers from the Global South. Equal human rights were guaranteed to new-comers but their entry into the Industrial democratic Global North became the object of strict control selecting acceptable migrants. This encouraged un-documented migration, human smuggling and trafficking.

The US attempted to strengthen its power in the UN in the PCW. In 2006 it supported the creation of the Council of Human Rights. The United States wanted to use this new Council to designate the ”bad” nations in the South who should become the target of humanitarian and human rights intervention to be decided by the Security Council. They failed to develop the Human Rights Council into a tool of the Security Council, because of oppositions in the Security Council. Then the Council of Human Rights developed into an institution where non-Western countries took new roles and new interest in human rights, and did not serve to denounce bad South States, but rather helped develop human rights interest in the non-Western regions.

The Human Rights Council became a precious institution for the implementation of Atlantic Liberalism, by its institution of Universal Periodic Review (UPR)[[11]](#endnote-11) which made all State members of the Council present periodically a Report on their Human Rights covering all sectors of their activities and enabled other States, and through them all NGOs to ask questions about each Report and make recommendation to improve their human rights performance. The rights of the minorities and indigenous peoples were guaranteed by the Convention against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, and its Treaty Body, CERD played an important role in fighting against all forms of discrimination and Racism. IMADR was founded by a close cooperation between members of CERD and the *Buraku* Liberation League in 1988. It played an important role in creating regional networks of minorities and indigenous peoples linking them to the United Nations human rights mechanism, especially CERD. In this way, The Trilateral, Atlantic Liberalism supported during the first phase of the PCW globalization　a new trend breaking the original hegemonic project of Atlantic Liberalism which was based on the omni-presence and omnipotence of the Westphalian States.

This new trend　had two sides, on the one hand, the incapacity of the Westphalian sovereign States, with their double-standards created dis-satisfied subaltern communities who wanted to return to the glorious past of white-men supremacy. They developed in different world regions a variety of racist violent trends of hate speech and hate crimes. On the other hand, other subalterns following the paths of Martin Luther King and Mandela, opposed the existing Atlantic liberal institutions turned into neoliberal and neoconservative instruments of the hegemonic Atlantic nations neo-colonial expansion through unsustainable violent means, In face of this G7 or G8 activities, the subaltern States and peoples were trying to open a path towards alternative futures, including indigenous animist values, libertarian communitarianism, Right to Peace and nuclear armament abolition. Before turning our attention to this new

development opening a positive endogenous series of initiatives, we must first point-out the negative trends which made the second phase of the PCW world an arena of a new Cold War.

**5. The Emerging Contradictions of Atlantic Liberalism:**

The neo-conservative offensives of the two Bush Administrations was, in reality, a manifestation of the hidden part of Atlantic liberalism, which, from the beginning, recognized the supremacy of the North Atlantic industrial democracies, and publicly legitimized a double-standard regime, between the West and the Rest. In International Security the Double Standard was guaranteed by the Security Council permanent members veto-power. In military security issues the double standards were applied by the Non-Proliferation Treaty distinguishing nuclear and non-nuclear States. In ecology the Biological Diversity Convention recognized the importance of the indigenous traditional knowledge on genetic resources only in the biological habitat regions, leaving the non-habitat industrialized world under the control of hegemonic Technocratic rule.

In global financial economy, the rights of investors prevailing over the State obligations toward the civil society to over-see public welfare, was guaranteed by the World Bank’s Investor State Conflicts Arbitration giving priority to the Investing TNCs over the Sovereign States. The military double standards of the Non-Proliferation Treaty became the major cause of the DPRK series of experiments of nuclear warheads and of missiles carrying them. Kim Jong-Un wanted to create a Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) situation with the United States unacceptable to the NPT regime of the United Nations. His experiments did not create a mutual tacit agreement about Nuclear Strategic equality, it did, nevertheless, delegitimize the double Standard of the NPT regime which could not continue to ignore the existence of Nuclear States among the non-nuclear States defined by the NPT.

In connection to the UN Millennium Development Goals and its second version called Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) the negotiation between the Trilateral industrial democracies and the States of the South has become difficult due to the double standard in the agreement on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) of genetic material because the Nagoya Protocol was signed by all the parties of the Biodiversity Convention, by having the representatives of the developing States to accept a text negotiating between Japan, chair of the Nagoya Bio-Diversity COP10 with only the European delegations. The South delegates were forced to wait until early morning after the planned official closing of the COP 10 Conference, and had to agree to the Chair proposal of the Nagoya Protocol text he had agreed in a closed informal meeting with the European delegations.

This double standard in international decision-making had become an easy-going way to reach an agreement in both the Biodiversity and the Global Warming Conference negotiations which makes agreements between the West and the Rest difficult because of the inequality in the decision-making process between the two blocs of countries, West and Rest or North and South. A double standard in global financial relations is also gradually applied to different World Regions. It is the creation of a new obligation of all Sovereign States to respect first the interests of the global investors, a principle contradictory to the Atlantic liberalism which makes the sovereign States responsible for guaranteeing the security and wellbeing of their citizens. Already Applied to Europe and North America, only Trump rejection of US participation in the TPP delays the application of arbitration of Investor State Conflicts (ASC) which supports, often against the interests of the citizens of the States receiving foreign investment, the investing parties which are the Multinational　Corporations investing in sovereign States. The Westphalian States which are supposed to be built on a social contractual relation with their citizens guaranteeing their security and welfare cannot be implemented if the States respect the interest of the Investors even when they may endanger the security and the public welfare (including public health and ecology), a social contract all Westphalian States were supposed to guarantee.

In this way, the first phase of post-Cold-War globalization was characterized by an official international liberalism, politically based on the Westphalian and Kantian rule of the Sovereign States in military-politics as well as in international economic relations. Regional conflicts opposing the Global North to the Global South, combined with neo-conservative global power-politics and neo-liberal global financial economic competitions, did not permit this North Atlantic liberal politics to survive more than thirty years, and the official UN-centered Liberalism began to loose legitimacy while the so-far hidden inequalities began to become proclaimed vociferously by Trump and other leaders of the industrialized democracies, in Europe as well as in Japan. It appears that all the G7 or G8 Summits were unsuccessful to maintain the liberal message of the Atlantic Charter rule the post-cold-war World. The emergence of Trump “America First” Government encouraged right-wing non-conformist neo-conservative groups, in different parts of the World, to demand the end of political correctness, in different manners, in the Middle-East, in East and Central Asia, and in Latin America and the Caribbean Region..

**6. The Retreat of Atlantic Liberalism, divided in Face of Terrorism:**

An anti-terrorist movement in Europe and North America helped develop a new racism anti-non-Western peoples which was based, like the “I am Charlie” movement on the right of free expression broken by terrorist Muslims. It is, nevertheless, important to point-out the fact that this European xenophobic reaction based on human rights with the participation of states persons and citizens opposed to the “terrorist” attacks on liberal right of self-expression gave not only an occasion for a large sector of the European North-Atlantic liberalists to manifest the Euro-centric exclusivist human rights, but allowed a diversified group of intellectuals who declared that they were not “Charlie” and were opposed to the disrespect towards Islam and its Prophet[[12]](#endnote-12).

This group included Christian intellectuals respecting Islam, and genuine secular intellectuals who wanted Catholic nuns not to wear their veil in public places but were opposed to force Muslim girls to wear their veils in schools. The existence of these intellectuals indicates the possibility that during the second phase of the post-Cold-War globalization, the tight Alliance between human rights and North Atlantic liberalism can be broken. The Second Phase may not continue to assume human rights as indivisible from North Atlantic liberalism based on a specific historical block sharing specific interests. Human rights, and other legal regimes may accept non-Western values, beliefs, and practices prevailing in the Rest of the World, modifying Western secularism opening dialogues with Muslims and other Axial civilizations as well as Animist indigenous wisdom.

This possibility has been opposed by the stakeholders participating with the reinforcement of the Atlantic Liberal hegemony. The most important attempt to eliminate any resistance to this monopoly of legitimate violence by the Atlantic Liberal Hegemonic States international policies has been the development during the first phase of post-Cold-War globalization of humanitarian and human rights-based intervention by the West in the Rest parts of the World. The promotion of humanitarian and human rights intervention became considered as an important obligation of all human rights defenders. Among the Human Rights High-Commissioners, Mme. Louise Arbour[[13]](#endnote-13) was devoted to make Humanitarian Intervention the key institution of international human rights. There was, nevertheless, an attempt to define unambiguously the conditions of legitimate humanitarian intervention using human security as a base for critical analysis. This was made by a Group of European experts chaired by Mary Kaldor who presented to the European Community the Barcelona Report on humanitarian intervention[[14]](#endnote-14). In any case, humanitarian intervention became a typical tool for the exogenous imposition of universal human rights by the West on the Rest, with noticeable attempts to leave a space for endogenous development of human rights. During the first phase of post-Cold-War globalization the North Atlantic liberalism ruled the world by an exogenous imposition of human rights and a series of humanitarian interventions.

These efforts were led by the United States with a European support which triggered-off a new kind of civilizational conflict, as predicted by Samuel Huntington. In the Arab/Muslim World, the opposition to foreign neo-colonial interventions in the name of humanitarian and human rights, was rather intensifying the regional conflicts not only between the Arab/Muslim States and Israel, but also between the different religious and ethnic blocs in the region, including Shi’ah and Sunni, and fundamentalist sects, as well as ethnic minorities of the divided Kurdistan in Syria and Iraq, Torkey etc. In connection with the Atlantic exogenous Liberalism, it is important not to loose site of the geo-historical background of the present complex conflict in Syria which involves the ISIS, the Syrian Government, the anti-Government forces of Syria, the Kurds, Turkey, Iran, and Israel, the United States, and Russia cannot be understood without taking into consideration, exogenous political, economic, military, and socio-cultural forces since the fall of the Ottoman Empire. The Imperialist competition has changed the *Dar al-Islam* (House of Peace) into a de-facto *Dar al-Harb*.(House of War). Atlantic Liberalism hides behind its universalist official benevolence an ugly complex system of political and financial interests. The War on Terror started with the Al-Qaida Attack on the World Trade Center, which took place a few weeks after the closing of the Durban Conference on Racism, triggered-off a process which could be called a second cold war.

**7. East Asian Occidentalisms as a Second Phase Anti-Human Rights Reality:**

Another similar trend negative to the Atlantic Liberalism, the Arab-Muslim internal conflict caused by exogenous pressures, which included penalization against the violators of Human Rights and Humanitarian Principles was an Asian anti-West denial of the universal application of basic human rights. This denial of the positive aspects of the Atlantic liberalism can be called “*occidentalism*” as Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit did[[15]](#endnote-15). They proposed this concept as sharing the exclusivist concept in the West which imposed Western standards on the Rest of the world called *Orientalism.* *Ocidentalism* denies all universal values proposed by the West. Enlightenment traditions are sacred to non-Western orientalists, even when they hide a colonialist and neo-colonialist exogenous development. For the *occidentalism,* the exogenous imposition of universal values, beginning with human rights, are believed to be tools of the colonialist West to force the Rest of the world to follow the West, and thus became a major cause of most of the civilizational Conflicts, West against Rest or North against South, during the first phase of the post-Cold-War world history.

This opposition included Japan with the emergence of the demands for due apologies and State-compensation to the victims of Comfort Women Military Sexual Slavery and Nanjing Massacre. The Abe Government representing Japanese *occidentalism[[16]](#endnote-16)* just denies all the colonialist atrocities committed by the Japanese Imperial and Imperialist invasion in East and South-East Asian countries. It included also China with the Tien-An-Men incident and Labour Camps to reform dissident human rights supporters in China. The Kidnaped Japanese issue was combined with the questions of internments of foreigners in Labor Camps by the DPRK. In Burma-Myanmar, the Muslim refugees of the Indigenous nation of Rohingya has become a case where the human right stance of Aung San Suu Kyi is now criticized by the liberal Industrial Democratic States supporting the Atlantic liberalism of her fight against the military regime of Myanmar. In this way, Human Rights issues which are seen in the Middle-East as a question of Christian-Muslim opposition is defined, especially in the three *occidentalist* States, Japan, the DPRK, and China, as a conflict caused by universalist human rights exogenously applied by the West and call for an endogenous cultural reaction. This makes the hate-crimes more acceptable than human rights political correctness to right-wing public who opposes western exogenous universalist criticism with their national pride and exclusivist racism.

**8. Donald Trump Policies and the Subaltern Reactions, Right and Left:**

It is most likely that the obstacles unimaginable by us now will be caused by the presently existing tendencies which are misinterpreted to be caused by some individuals in spite of the fact that they are caused by some hidden realities which become visible thanks to some vociferous individuals who attract the attention of international media. Such is the case of what is attributed to Donald Trump among many others. We can point out the hidden trends behind three of his actions which caused much criticism, just objectively, but based on unintentional personification of historically important tendencies only magnified by the present President of the United States of America. First, we do not like Trump decision to build an anti-Mexican Wall against “illegal” migrants crossing the “US/Mexican Border. We must not forget that historically his move is part of the fight of the US with its opponent “South of the Border”.

US history summarizes all the conflicts with Mexicans as part of the “*manifest destiny*” of the United States to integrate in its democratic States community not only the Est Coast but also the West Coast, and incidentally the Pacific Ocean as part of This “Land” which is “my land” and “your land” as was sang even during the Anti-Vietnam-War movement by the American People. Trump declaration of “*America First*” must be understood as a Manifestation of this *“Manifest Destiny*”. Trump America is highly selective, ignoring the Atlantic revolutions, the Civil War, and the Atlantic Charter. The Civil Rights Movement and Martin Luther King do not exist for him. He, nevertheless, is a believer in America first, the American Dream, and in the manifest destiny of America to rule not only the Atlantic but also the Pacific Ocean.

Already before him, President Obama, a 1979 graduate of Punahou School built by Americans to educate the Hawaii Kingdom. His interest in the Pacific Ocean as an American Lake is just followed by Trump. Not only in his Wall against Mexican “illegal” migration but also in his effort to keep the “American Lake” solely open to US Nuclear submarines, against the DPRK attempts to develop across the Pacific a Nuclear Strategic situation of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) with the United States, and the Chinese attempt to occupy part of this “ American Lake”[[17]](#endnote-17).

Another example of President Trump destabilizing move is his “decision” to move the US Embassy to Jerusalem. This is not a new decision, it represents the long-held dream of the Jewish citizens of the United States who were convinced by the majority public opinion to stay silent for the sake of supporting the US hegemonic responsibility to arbitrate the Israel-Palestinian conflict. President Trump “*America First*” policy is a negation of the United States Hegemonic policy at the base of the Atlantic Liberalist support to the EU and the UN to maintain humanitarian control over the non-Western parts of the World. In this sense, theG5/ G7/G8 trilateralism has no reason to exist any more, and the UN SDG plan cannot hope to be implemented with the support of a united Atlantic Liberalist effort. It is highly unthinkable that the global World will return to its North-dominated global liberalism which has prevailed during the first phase of the Post-Cold-War world.

Trump is making the Atlantic Liberalism obsolete by his “America First” policy which does not try to cover up the contradictions between its human rights and humanitarian hegemonic contributions to world peace and the hegemonic national and corporate interests hidden behind these universalist values. In this sense the most conspicuous manifestation of Trump disclosure of America first has been its nuclear policy. The Committee of Seven for World Peace Appeals criticized the new Nuclear policy in the following terms: “it declares that the United States will develop low-yield nuclear warhead and will posture nuclear capability including to hedge against conventional attack. This will only accelerate the world-wide nuclear arms-race and will induce possible nuclear attacks by adversaries.” Such position is inconsistent with “the US position which demands other nations to renounce to develop nuclear armament” “It is a total negation of the Treaty on Nuclear Weapons Abolition.”[[18]](#endnote-18)

The Nuclear Posture Review of 2018 is an interesting document which justifies a radical shift from the nuclear strategic posture which was based on an attempt to treat nuclear weapons strategically, i.e. as weapons not used in open conflicts. Arms control was a key concept which meant that the United States was building together with the Soviet Union a system controlling the building up of their nuclear arsenal so that they would mutually cancel-out each other in such a way that even if one side could annihilate by an unexpected nuclear strike, the other side would be able to strike back and annihilate the first strike attacker by a second strike. Nuclear weapons were considered so deadly that they were never treated together with the non-nuclear conventional arsenal. Under President Trump, this distinction was

entirely eliminated by an impeccable logic justifying this shift of nuclear strategy.

The basic position of the Trump Administration is based on a perception of the enemies of the United States and of its allies. The unidentified enemies include States and non-state terrorists should not misunderstand the decision of the United States. So, the basic concept of nuclear deterrence should not give the impression that non-nuclear attacks would not be the object of nuclear deterrence. On top of this assumption, a second assumption even more questionable is that nuclear deterrence may fail and the Unites States may be forced to use nuclear weapons to punish any opponent who should know that the United States is capable to use in real conflicts smaller yild nuclear weapons should be developed to make their use more flexible. This argument is part of the Trump Administration which wants to develop a diversified arsenal including biological and chemical weapons, space deployment, cyber weapons, and perhaps also currency war capacity. Nuclear weapons are thus made a component of a diversified arsenal.

In this way, the Trump Administration most dangerous policy is to break the de-nuclearization policy of the Atlantic Liberalism, and creates a new Cold War Situation, which lacks the bi-polar balance between two Super-Powers, and develops a new Cold War where the United States plays a key role as the hegemonic Power, but allows a variety of insecure situation to emerge in different local situations. So that the United States may have better occasions to manifest the (nuclear) power of the America First hegemony. This is, in a sense, a logical end phase of the nuclear imperialism.

The nuclearization of imperialism under the Atlantic Liberalism was

Characterized by its historical condition. It started with the Atlantic Charter which enemy was Hitler, a common enemy with the Soviet Union. The ideological bipolarity preceded the nuclear bipolarity. This is why it could build a nuclear strategy on the common rationality between the “free” Atlantic Liberalist block and the anti-Imperialist Socialist/Communist bloc.

Game theoretical rationality, beyond ideological opposition, was guaranteed by the two blocks agreement to reject Hitler Fascist irrational expansionism.

The nuclear weapons, after being used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki to

penalize and eliminate the Japanese Imperialist aggressions. After that, the two blocks were in a rational bipolar situation. This made it possible the Gorbachov initiative to end the nuclear arms-race, by recognizing the need of common security beyond the Bipolar class interests of the two blocs. Nuclear weapons were treated as strategic weapons, which eventual use was theoretically limited by the rational decisions calculating their lack of options ch would guarantee their victory in a nuclear exchange where the opponent would have a second strike capability to retaliate the use of nuclear weapons by any first strike attacker. This bipolar nuclear strategic balance which was discussed between both Bloc’s strategists, escalated to the extent to develop their maddest scenario of the MAD (Mutual Assured Destruction) theory. Nuclear deterrence was an absolute concept, if broken the result was the mutual annihilation of the two sides. Now, without the bipolarity guaranteeing the absolute security of mutual deterrence, the Trump Administration developed a nuclear posture, absolutely lacking all the conditions of previous Nuclear Postures which were based on the common agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, or its successor Russia, that they were willing to reduce gradually their nuclear arsenal, as agreed in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The Trump Administration Nuclear Posture Review ignores completely this agreement. It scale-down its nuclear warheads to facilitate the tactical use of nuclear weapons in any conflict, both as deterrent but also in real conflicts. The same basic principle on all non-nuclear levels down to the low intencity conflicts is made more diversified so that nuclear arsenal becomes a key weapon among other weapons, conventional and un-conventional. Bio-chemical weapons and space delivery systems are parts of the arsenal for open conflicts, but cyber weapons and other low-intensity weapons are supposed to be combined with nuclear weapons as deterrent in peace time unofficial conflicts. All these measures making nuclear Imperialism most powerful in this “America First” new cold war. Yet, the Nuclear Posture Review repeatedly declares that this is not an Imperialist stance, it is simply because the United States, and its allies and friends must be protected from any State

Or non-State actors. The United States must be prepared to face different kinds of threats, and nobody in the world should be tempted to doubt about the hegemonic power and military capability of the United States to overcome any kind of military or non-military attacks. This turns the world into a system of multiple violence all connected to nuclear weapons, and that the border between war and peace becomes uncertain, with the uncertain presence of lower-yild nuclear weapons hidden somewhere behind the piles of dollars in currency wars or currency peace.

This new Cold-War between the United States and its allies on the one hand and un-identified others, States and/or non-States is a sad conclusion of the Atlantic Liberal Global Nuclear Strategic order. The Atlantic Liberalism which last American Leader was President Obama, who expressed his wish that nuclear weapons be abolished. He has been succeeded by President Trump, with a new Post-Cold War, or rather a new Cold War initiative. This is why the post-modern global peoples’ movements, represented by ICAN, who succeeded in convincing a great majority of the Member-States of the UN to sign the Treaty for the Abolition of Nuclear Armament, have a key role to play to minimize the danger of President Trump’s new Nuclear Posture Review.

The issue is not only the abolition of nuclear weapons, it is necessary to salvage universal values of human life and rights from the debacle closing the Atlantic Liberal non-proliferation regime. We must read the signs of the time and ask a key question about Nuclear Imperialism. Nuclear Posture of the United States under Atlantic Liberalism played an important role in the exogenous dissemination of human rights and humanitarian peace activities. It was, nevertheless, an integral part of Imperialism. The welcome move of Gorbachov to sacrifice class interests to the global interest of the survival of humankind as a whole, or more broadly the survival of Life on this planet, put the end to the utopia of a revolutionary ending Capitalism and leading to Communism. The Imperialism of the Westphalia/Westminster liberal welfare State seemed better than the Socialist rule of the nomenklatura. The anti-Imperialist China proposes a One Belt One Road Programme. Yet the concrete projects to build concessions where the Chinese excess-labor build their diaspora communities may turn into new sources of imperialistic conflicts. The success of ICAN is a typical example of a successful organization of an anti-Imperialist, anti-Nuclear global movement may build on the exogenous efforts to spread human rights, human security and humanitarian cooperation,　an endogenous process towards a world where nature and humans can live a more peaceful life. The post-modern peoples must see how the present second phase of Post-Cold-War globalization can transform the Atlantic Liberal globalization from Above into a globalization from Below. This is a radically realizable programme which can benefit from a few new developments in the different part of the global world community.

**9. Nuclear Imperialism, the Anti-Nuclear Weapons Treaty and ICAN :**

This is where the success of ICAN and of the global citizen movements like Peace Boat which decided to abolish nuclear armament by convincing the majority of UN member States to sign a Treaty abolishing Nuclear Weapons is an ideal example which can convince subaltern neoliberals to join a new post-modern movement for global peace and development. As we saw before, we propose to call such movement “post-modern” in view of the fact that the first phase of post-Cold-War world has based itself on the “modern” liberalism of the Atlantic Charter. The UN recognized the belief that nuclear armament was an indispensable tool keeping peace between modern States by mutual deterrence. The UN officially developed an Education for Nuclear Non-Proliferation replacing an education for the total abolition of Nuclear Armament. It is now indispensable for the United Nations to change its policy and return to an Education about the inhuman nature of nuclear armament already during the preparatory process of the Treaty pointing out the inhuman nature of nuclear weapons, and supports the activities of the international movement organized by ICAN.

It is a new trend of endogenous peace movement of global citizens, who decided to delegitimize the modern Atlantic Liberal Tolerance of nuclear armament represented by the NPT. ICAN followed the example of the abolition of land mines. It will have to be expanded to a global popular movement for General and Complete Disarmament. ICAN symbolizes the global will of the post-modern citizens, which is crucial in the sense that it becomes an example of a new global democracy based on the coalition and networking of local-based citizens expressing their will on the basis of local participatory democracy. In a sense, the movement of ICAN was a typical example of a positive alternative to the Atlantic Liberal nuclear non-proliferation regime, by convincing UN member States to declare their opposition to the non-proliferation double standard and their preference to a total abolition of nuclear weapons on the basis of a clear ethical choice, where the Trump Nuclear Posture Review was a good example of the fact that the United Sates under President Donald Trump renounces to be interested in leading a global campaign to spread Atlantic Liberalism.

The New Cold War started by President Trump is clearly a complex conflict on the border between peace and war. It is the last stage of the Nuclear Imperialism. After the long 20th century which prepared Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the Atlantic Liberalist phase of the Post-Cold-War world, which developed the double standard world of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, ICAN succeeded in having signed a Treaty for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons. Now is a time to reflect on the long 20th century which prepared the nuclear hegemony of the Atlantic Liberalism which turned into the present new cold war which may become what Hobbes called the “bellum omnium contra omnes”

The War of all against all others lacking ethical principles to build a world where different peoples can live in Peace. Now that we have a Treaty abolishing nuclear weapons, we need to abolish the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. However, it is not enough to abolish a treaty. We must retrace the history of Nuclear Imperialism since the Opium War. Now, China is trying to reorient the world and develop an anti-Imperialist development campaign in the One Belt and One Road. China did not participate like Japan in the Atlantic Liberalist human rights and humanitarian development. This is where we need to find a way to develop a non-imperialist future for the world.

The Author of this Report remembers the case of a meeting between the Palme Commission and the Japanese representatives of Hiroshima and Nagasaki organized by the UN University. The Indonesian then Rector of the UNU was asked by the mayor of Hiroshima why it was so difficult to get the support from the citizens of South-East Asian Countries. The Rector did not answer this question, but told me after the meeting that he did not have the courage to tell the Hiroshima Mayor that he was then a student in Jacarta, and celebrated the Hiroshima Nuclear Attack which was going to liberate Indonesia from the Japanese Occupation.

The Mayor of Nagasaki, later expressed his realization that the Nagasaki citizens should repent about Japanese aggressions, and then criticize the United States for retaliating by a nuclear attack on Hiroshima and Nagasaki citizens who were not responsible for the Imperialist aggressions of Japan. The abolition of nuclear weapons, in this way, cannot be separated from the historical context it was invented, which was Japanese aggression of Japan’s neighboring countries, which is part of the Imperialist Competition between Western Powers, in which Japan was involved due to the Japanese Government decision to make Japan an Imperialist Power aggressing and colonizing other Asian countries in order to avoid becoming a colony of Western Powers. Nuclear weapons were invented as part of this historical period of colonialist competition between major Powers, and this caused Imperialism to become nuclear. The Abolition of Nuclear Weapons should become a total negation of the 20th Century colonial expansion of this nuclearized Imperialist Age. Otherwise the Treaty would not be able to become the starting point of a Post Modern, i.e. a Post Atlantic Liberal Age which was also an age of Western Imperialist expansions which are the cause of all the problems of peace and human security in both the Middle East and the Far East.

The concept of Nuclear Imperialism is of particular importance in this Age when the Trump Administration Nuclear Posture Review which turns the Nuclear Arsenal simply the key part of its flexible response arsenal. The new Treaty on the abolition of nuclear weapons is in a sense the target of the Nuclear Posture Review which does not want to recognize the ethical reason of its ban. It is crucial to establish the unambiguous combination of the abolition of the nuclear weapons and the right to live in Peace. This is why, within the Japanese context, the Article 9 of the Constitution of Japan has to be proclaimed indivisible from the abolition of nuclear weapons. This indivisibility, the author of this Report found symbolized by the name of the plaza where Article nine monument is located in Las Palmas. The Spanish citizens who were opposing the Spanish participation to NATO decided to build a monument celebrating the Article 9 of the Constitution of Japan.

They named the Plaza where the monument was located, the Plaza de Hiroshima y de Nagasaki. The Article 9 abolishing Japanese Armed Forces was A consequence of Japanese Imperialist Aggression, it manifested the remorse of the Japanese people to have violated the right of all peoples in the World to live in peace free from Fear and Wants. The Hiroshima, Nagasaki nuclear tragedy was a consequence of the Japanese aggressions. In that sense to name the Plaza on the basis of the indivisibility between Imperialist Aggressions and Nuclear Weapons used to penalize it was very appropriate[[19]](#endnote-19). The Trump Administration Nuclear Posture Review, turn the close relationship between Imperialism and Nuclear Weapons is, in a historical way, the final direct connection between nuclear weapons and Imperialist posture of the United States. It is no more to penalize Imperilism but simply to guarantee the survival of the American Empire that Trump wants to use nucear weapons in his multi-variate arsenal. The abolition of nuclear weapons is in this way directly related to the opposition of the signatories of this Treaty to abolish nuclear weapons and refuse to support nuclear Imperialism. It manifests the will of the Post-Modern global citizens to replace global nuclear Imperialism from above by an opposition from below of Global nuclear Imperialism.

From the point of view of the Post-Modern global citizens, the Modern Atlantic Liberalism and its exogenous efforts to spread Westminster Democracy and Westphalian Human Rights has to provide the basis for a Post-Modern Age of endogenous democracy and Human Rights, replacing the Atlantic Liberal process of Globalization from Above with a Non-Proliferation of the Nuclear Imperialist Hegemony, by a Globalization from Below denying any sequels from the Nuclear Imperialism of today.

We will review the different aspects of such major shift in international political economy including new movements in Latin America, new search for security by Indigenous peoples in Latin America as part of the Pacific-Indian Ocean Indigenous Animist civilization. We will also review the Anti Imperialist Programme of One Belt One Road, which should logically integrate the de-Nuclearization of OBOR based on a popular participation from below ceasing to be focused on Westphalian States, opening the global arena to indigenous peoples and multi-livelihood migrant diaspora communities.

**1０. Alternative to Nuclear Imperialism: Right to Peace in Latin America and the Contribution of the Indigenous Nations of the Pacific Animist Civilization:**

The 1970s was the Cold War period when the United States support to military juntas in Chile, Argentina, Brazil and other Latin American countries. This helped the development of a series of new concepts by the Latin American community of human rights defenders. They were fighting against Pinochet in Chile, who was a hero for the United States, both in terms of his violent control of a possible success of democratically elected Socialist Regime. The Allende Government, which could have become a stronghold of anti-Americanism. Pinochet was also a typical example of a military elite building a neoliberal Economy, a precious ally of the United States.

The anti-Pinochet fight of the refugees developed a world-wide process of anti-military governments. The Argentinian and Brazilian Military juntas were also precious neoliberal supporters of the US-led economy. They were following the Chile bloody elimination of opponents, including all the human rights defenders in the Region. This is why the Human right endogenous conceptual creativity helped the development of a series of concepts which became commonly accepted in the first phase of the post-Cold-War era of the 1990s.

This conceptual endogenous innovation in Latin America included the concept of people’s security. The military violence against human rights defenders was causing chronic states of insecurity of the people by perpetrators charged to protect their country’s national security. This is why the fight against military juntas barbaric suppression and subjugation defined itself as a fight for *People’s Security*. This concept spread during the 1980s and was renamed *“human security*” when it was introduced in the United Nations through Canadian and Japanese initiatives.

The original concept of *people security* was enriched in Latin America by the indigenous communities for whom peace was not only freedom from fear, but implied the building of good societies caring for the rights not only of peoples but also of the Mother Earth *Pacha Mama*. Human communities had to develop a good life in harmony with the joyful Universe, *Sumak Kauzai.* These two endogenous concepts of the Latin American indigenous civilization became part of the Latin American Peace and Human Rights culture, *Sumak kauzai* among Latin American citizens, and *Pacha mama* more broadly,in the United Nations especially in the field of UN efforts to rebuild a sustainable ecological environment.

The contribution of the indigenous peoples to the Latin American endogenous development of human rights regarding peace and people’s security needs plays a special role in the elaboration of a creative way to cope with the failure of the Atlantic Liberalism to build a sustainable future in the second phase of Post-Cold-War globalization. The second phase of the post-Cold-War world will need a particular creative contribution by the Latin American indigenous endogenous intellectual creativity. We propose to add a concept which has been occluded by the predominant developmentalist idea ignoring the richness of the original stage of human creativity, preceding the Axial religions, i.e. the indigenous animist civilizations. [[20]](#endnote-20)As we will mention later, animist civilizations, especially the maritime animist civilization of the Pacific (and Indian Ocean) animism deerve special attention. The Durban Racism Conference opened a way to understand the important role of the Pacific (and Indian Ocean) Maritime Animism, as a product of the Asian Descendants. Clearly enough, the Latin American are the earliest Asia Descendants who crossed the Baring Strait and migrated into the Americas, North, and South, and in the Caribbean region. The Pacific Animist Civilization is now facing a serious survival crisis due to the global warming, and needs special efforts to rebuild itself. The ecological awakening of the post-modern global community accepted the indigenous wisdom of the American indigenous animist traditions. We propose to integrate them in the Pacific Animist Civilization. This civilization generated two Kingdoms, the Hawaii Kingdom and the Ryikyu Kingdom which were both colonized in the 19th century by the United States and by Japan. In spite of the predominant Euro-centric myth that industrial and Capitalist modernity is based on Axial religions, the Post-Cold-War globalization seems to have found the need to return to the pre-axial civilization, even if the term of civilization presupposes that the indigenous animisms were un-civilized.

We must broaden our field of search for endogenous development of human rights complementing the decadent Atlantic Liberalism by recognizing the occluded sources of

intellectual creativity indispensable to overcome the new cold-war danger of falling into

a global decay of human civilization. It is necessary to return to the endogenous intellectual creativity of the animist civilizations, especially in the Pacific (and in the Indian Ocean)[[21]](#endnote-21). This　is why it is more generally necessary for all the post-modern citizens to open a dialogue with all the indigenous communities in order to learn from them their traditional wisdom on harmonious life among humans and also with the plurality of living beings on the earth. Among the indigenous nations in the Americas, the terrorist groups like Sendero Luminoso have ceased to get supporters, and the ecological values of their livelihood, already mentioned before, have become basic values for the global citizen epistemic community. It is, nevertheless, important especially in the second phase of post-Cold-War world, to develop a human rights campaign against the neo-liberal exploitations of indigenous communities.

This exploitation includes, among other issues also important, the global TNCs legal piracy of the genetic knowledge of indigenous communities which must become the concern, not only of WIPO but of all human rights defenders. Also serious is the neo-liberal competition which encourages land occupation and evictions, in the territories of the indigenous, which are accompanied by police violence, as has been recently the case in Argentina, where the *Mapuche* Communities opposition to land eviction met police violence, with cases such as the disappearance of one of them, Santiago Maldonado in 2017. The indigenous peoples of Latin America are developing systems of self-protection, in face of the decaying Westphalian security-arrangements based on the monopoly of legal Rights to Kill. The case of the Mapuche people is a source of emerging morphogenetic development of alternatives to the national security system[[22]](#endnote-22).

The second phase of the post-Cold-War development is entering a time when global neo-liberal competition becomes increasingly violent. This is indeed a typical case of the new cold-war. The global post-modern civil society has to organize campaigns to support the attacked indigenous communities in their conflicts with the neo-liberal investors and exploiters of their land and with neo-liberal States supporting them. Human rights to Peace special attention to the victims should be applied to the indigenous communities which Rights to peace are violated.

International solidarity should be, nevertheless, based on the autonomous activities of the Indigenous communities and nations. This is where the examples in Mexico are of special interest, in terms of the endogenous activities of indigenous communities for the promotion of their rights to peace. Zapatist movement of National Liberation in Chiapas can provide a model relevant in all regions of the World. *Zapatismo* wants to build a world where all worlds have a place. They put at the centre of their activities their traditional wisdom and practices, they develop actions which improve their members’ rights to peace, with women citizens joining the *Mujeres por la Dignidad*, and the Aguas Calientes Zapatista communities develop a System of self-organized citizens. An article of the New York Times called them the first Post Modern Revolution.[[23]](#endnote-23)

Also in Mexico, the close cooperation between indigenous communities such as the City of Taran in the Michoacan[[24]](#endnote-24) and the Indigenous Philosophy faculty of the *Colegio de Michoacan* enabled to prove the City’s long historical roots in the local Tarascan people, so that the Mexican Government decided to give the City a special Autonomous status. Professor Hacinto Zavala teaching indigenous philosophy is also developing a comparative study of the Mexican Indigenous philosophy with Japanese Philosophy. It is important for the endogenous, non-Western civilizations to have a comparative study of their philosophies which may prove that they have a common root in the Pacific Oceanic Animist Civilization.

The alliance between the *Bolivarismo* and the *Indigenismo* has contributed to the development of an endogenous approach to peace, democracy and environmental justice. supported by the former colonialist Spanish people is facing strong repressions by the global neoliberal hegemony. The new Cold-War is taking an interesting path in the Americas where some enlightened part of the existing Atlantic Liberalism including Multi-National Corporate interests, begin to listen to the indigenous voice of *Pacha Mama*. The Atlantic Liberalism has, on the other side, developed their-own subaltern Dissidents in the poor belts of the Mid-West United States where a return to the belief in the American Manifest Destiny applaud an “America First” President.

The Pacific region is a maritime region where the US manifest Destiny and the Chinese Great Maritime Tradition collides. It is crucial for the Post-Modern global

Citizens to become aware of the manifestation of reconciliation between the Atlantic Liberals and the Pacific/Indian Ocean indigenous maritime animism. Timor-Leste has become known for its Truth and Reconciliation policy, and some observers produced a Film “Canta Timor” which reports he animistic belief in Mother Earth who is sad about all the violence of the Indonesian Occupant Forces. Mother Earth is not angry, she is just sharing this sadness of the victims.

In the Pacific, there is a land where reconciliation progresses and creates a new world where reconciliation between the Western migrants and the indigenous peoples also contributes to a reconciliation between humans and Mother Nature. This was recently clearly manifested in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The Waitangi Tribunal work-out a new legal practice, using the British Common-Law tradition, and accepted a Maori request to give a legal personality to rivers, sacred to some maori community. This new legislation has been widely known in other parts of the world, and some citizens in India want to imitate Aotearoa/New Zealand and consider the possibility to demand the Government to Recognize a Legal personality to their Sacred River Ganga. The second phase of the post-Cold-War world may cease to impose North Atlantic liberalism, and admits the traditional ideas which can enrich the human rights heritage of humankind by accepting indigenous endogenous concepts.

**11. Alternative to Nuclear Imperialism: The Right to Peace as a New Social Contract**

The Right to Peace was developed in Latin America, as we saw lready, as a summarized expression of the anti-militarist and anti-imperialist endogenous development in support of the fight of human rights defenders against military regimes. This initiative of Latin American citizen received the support of Spanish citizens dedicated to human rights, eager to compensate the peoples of the Americas which had been the victims of Spanish colonialist conquests and expropriation. This solidarity between the descendants of the victims and offenders of the human rights to peace through colonialism gave birth to the Declaration of Santiago de Compostela on the Human Rights to Peace of 10 December 2010. IMADR helped this process, thanks to Mario Yutsis and Theo van Boven. The Declaration included in its text both the concept of the Asian Charter of Human Rights defining all human rights to find their origin in the *Right to Life* as well as the Japanese concept of *human security* based on the *right to live in peace* of the Constitution of Japan

repentant of having violated this right by the Japanese colonialist invasions during World War II.

This Declaration designates the *Right Holders* of the *Right to Peace a*s all the citizens of the global community, with special attention to the victims of the violation of their Right to Peace. The Sovereign States were defined as the *duty holders* of this new social contract. This Declaration was at the origin of the UN General Assembly Declaration of 2016 December, which did not include the major parts of the Declaration, and still added a precious document to the UN activities to legislate the Global Problems in line with the Atlantic Charter.

The *Rights to Peace* is an example of endogenous human rights development which was opposed to the exogenous process of human rights diffusion by the Atlantic Liberalism of the first phase of the post-Cold-War globalization. It proposes to cease the

omnipotence and omni-presence of the Westphalian States under the hegemony of Atlantic Powers, and propose to make human security and human rights for peace the basis of a new social contract, and thus goes beyond the third generation of human rights which insists on collective rights but does not relativize the Sovereign States, rejecting the hegemony of the industrial democracies in this confusing complexity of exogenous interactions generating conflicts after conflicts.

**12．Alternative to Nuclear Imperialism: The Rojava libertarian participatory democracy:**

It is worth mentioning here the fact that in this exogenous conflictual situation, there exists cases of endogenous efforts to develop democracy and peace in, for example, the Northern Syrian region where Kurd military liberation from ISIS domination were followed by the building of an autonomous community called Rojava, the Democratic Federation of Northern Syria. This internationally un-recognized State adopted an endogenous “Social Contract” which was based on Libertarian Socialism under the influence of Muray Bookchin whose ideas were applied by Abdalla Ocarom who built this autonomous State or Community. This de-facto State, unrecognized internationally, was unofficially closely working, for example, with the Libertarian wing of the Catalan independence movement. This so-called Rojava Revolution is interesting because it is a test case of self-determination based on a secular, multi-cultural constitution combining Libertarian democracy with recognition of basic human rights including gender-equality and equality between ethnic communities.

This is an important case of endogenous human rights development by Kurd nationalism, an emergent case which proves that an exogenous imposition of human rights and humanitarian law characterizing the first phase of post-Cold-War liberalism may be replaced by an endogenous, non-exclusivist, multi-cultural human rights movement in the coming second phase of the post-Cold-War global world. Turkish attack is reported and this democratic bastion may be demolished by a country which forgot its Kemalist Achievements. Even if their system is broken, their example will remain an inspiring case in the region devastated by the Colonialist exogenously imposed partitioning of the past century.

**13. Alternative to Nuclear Imperialism: The Post-Modern Left in the United States:**

It is important to study the formation of a post-modern left (Post-Atlantic-Liberal

libertarianism) which will play an important role in the second phase of the post-Cold-

War already mentioned the influence of this US new left in their influence on the

Northern Kurd Democratic Federation of Rojava. In the United States we must study

the People Congress of Resistance (PCOR) formed in September 2017 which attempts to

unite the diverse energies of the US Left against the racist, sexist, Capitalist system. It

tries to combine class interest organizations and identity-based organizations. Class-

interest is represented by the “Occupy Wall Street” representing the “99%”, it includes

also “The Women March” and the LGBTQ who work with all classes of the society. It will

also have in its network the Latinos, the African Americans, and the Native Americans.

The People’s Congress adopts a libertarian position believing that poverty is

racialized and feminized, and all opposed to any sort of discrimination seeks to form “a

movement of the many for a society of the many”. The same approach is adopted by the

Roshad Revoluion, As we will see later, it is also shared by the Zapatist Revolution. In

Japan, the Okinawa/Ryukyu Indigenous people also is united, all the Okinawa islands

being part of a united action “Shima-Gururmi”(All Islands Together) accepting all

ideologies under one identity. On the global level, the World Social Forum started in

Porto Alegre, Brazil, is also a libertarian coalition of different classes and a variety of

identity communities.

This is a basic difference of the modern citizens network supporting the Atlantic Liberalism of the United Nations during the first phase of the post-Cold-War which rejected both class and identity, and takes a universalist position. This human rights approach will be replaced in the second phase by this libertarian pluralist unification of class-based and identity-based epistemic communities. On the sovereign State level, the post-modern libertarian approach of the post- modern civil society will be partially adopted by the subaltern States which are excluded from the first phase hegemonic Atlantic Liberal Coalition. They will tend to strengthen their “identity” prerogatives as Westphalian nation States. This is where the Cold-War period Bandung emerging Afro-Asian State Coalition based on domestic and cross-national alliances among different identity communities will become a key principle complementing individual human rights.

Trump “America First” is a national identity proclamation which will be shared by the subaltern neoliberal States. The global economic pressures of migration from the Global South to the Global North will have a short-term negative racist effect strengthening the exclusivism of the nation States in the North. They all are under the pressure of the neo-liberal subalterns’ neo-Fascist xenophobia and racism. However, in the long-run, the tidal wave of migrant workers, including refugees and victims of trafficking and other forms of exploitative migration will contribute to the development of de-facto multi-culturalism in the industrialized “democracies”. The migrant workers male and female live a *multi-local livelihood,* their minds are not feeling separated from their loved-ones and their neighbors in their home communities, as well as their friends and enemies in the cities they lived in their migratory voyage between their home communities and the receiving communities where they live and work now. Their double or triple livelihood create for them multi-local identities which will develop multi-culturalism in both their countries of migration and in their home and transiting communities. This process of identity pluralism and class will be hybridized under the Human Insecurities of the migrant workers, especially the exploited ones[[25]](#endnote-25).

This is where the post-modern civil society will have to support the migrant workers to develop their multi-local livelihood to contribute to the multi-cultural development of the local communities which pluralist security may help the present Westphalian States to cease to keep domestic and international peace and security by their monopoly of brutal military and police forces. But before this becomes possible the post-modern society must continue to put pressure on the Sovereign States, so that they build a world with no nuclear and other armaments, following the path opened by ICAN. This process should start now in order to prepare *occidentalist* States to develop international cooperation based firmly on the peaceful Coexistence and equal mutual benefit principles combined with international human rights no more exogenously imposed on them.

**14. Alternative to Nuclear Imperialism: The One Belt One Road (OBOR) Programme:**

One typical case of such a nationalist subaltern State project can be mentioned here as a programme based on historically shared belief. It is the One-Belt One Road (OBOR) project prposed by China. To define China as a subaltern neoliberal State needs some explanation. It is based on the fact that China does not share the historical background of neoliberalism which finds its origin in the Atlantic liberalism. China since Deng Tsiao Ping liberalization of the Chinese economy, participated in the 1980s global neoliberal production Capitalist competition and the 1990s neoliberal financial Capitalist competition. It was forced to do so by the G7 or G8 Trilateral hegemony, and it profits now from its successful competition with the hegemonic States by the foundation of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and the OBOR project, which are both a strange complex of neo-liberalism and anti-colonialist Occidentalism.

The OBOR Project has two faces, it is a short-run plan to develop an international network of development poles where China can build diaspora communities where China can have its excess labor force settle down. But OBOR has another face. It has been projected by Shi Jing Pin with a long-range civilizational vision to start a process of development in the opposite direction to the Western colonization process which followed

the maritime “One Road” with China as the final target of Western colonial expansion. It started from the West, took the Chinese One Road through the Pacific and Indian Ocean reaching China at the time of the Opium War, after having colonized India and the South East Asian States. China wants to use its financial wealth to contribute to the development of the Eurasia Continent.

To oppose OBOR, Japan supports India which wants to have a Free and Open Pacifi/Indian Ocean development programme reaching Africa. This counteraction to Western-led colonialist development may become a new kind of Chinese colonialist expansion if the short-term Chinese diaspora network becomes the objective, but if it can combine with the Indian Pacific/Indian Ocean Development Project it can become an Afro-Asian Project. To do so, China and India will have to return to the Nehru-Chow Enlai declaration which includes the two principles of Peaceful Coexistence and Equal Mutual Benefit. Such a long range project may become also an occasion for Japan, to play a positive role together with China and India, as a repentant colonial expansionist State which joined the North Atlantic countries. With these two possibilities, negative or positive, the second phase of the post-Cold-War globalization is characterized by the activities of two eccidentalist States. One of them, Japan has been working within the conditionalities of the OECD countries including human rights performance of the developing countries.

China is a complete outsider of Trilateral Hegemony and of North-Atlantic liberalism, One Belt One Road Programme may develop in the near future a certain number of Chinese diaspora communities in the Eurasian continent. This will become a source of insecurity with both negative and positive alternative possibilities in the global world development of the second phase of post-Cold-War globalization. The OBOR Programme

Is not a developmentalist project based on exogenously defined universalist principles. It is proposed as an endogenous multi-national participatory activities of workers and planners with a variety of religious and cultural backgrounds and ethnic identities.

This is where new sources of discrimination and/or of human rights promotion will have to be reported and become the objects of UN human rights activities. This makes the mere continuation of human rights promotion unsatisfactory for the protection and promotion of human rights in the Pacific/Indian Ocean maritime region, in the Eurasian continent and in Africa. There is beside human rights concern, an objective necessity to develop a systematic effort to minimize cultural conflicts and to maximize the possibility for a positive process of Rights to Peace cultural development. The OBOR Programme of China should be well coordinated with the Pacific/Indian Ocean “one Road” needs a dialogue between the Chinese Confucianism, the diverse cultural traditions in India, the Arid One Belt Turkish Islamic cultures and the Oceanic Animist traditions, with universal human rights. OBOR should not be only a Civilizational Project of China. It should be a cooperative Project owned by all of the Turkish Islamic Peoples in the One Belt, and another pluralistic project owned by the maritime nations and the maritime indigenous peoples with their animist traditions combined with the Chinese, Indian and Islamic three axial civilizations.

We must return to the 1954 Nehru; Zhou En-lai Five Principles for Peace, especially the last two principles of “peaceful co-existence” and “Equal Mutual-Benefit” which declares that China and India agree on renouncing to their claims on Civilizational Supremacy and want to build together an egalitarian world within each country and between both of them. Both the Indian Mandala Order and Chinese *Zhonghua* (Central Flower) Order based on Centralization of multiple components under the just rule of an Emperor were adopting egalitarian anti-imperialist principles[[26]](#endnote-26). They both declared their will to uild domestically and internationally societies where equality existed including Dalits and Adivasi in India, and equality between the *Han* Civilization and the minorities endogenous cultures. Chairman Xi Jin-ping thought has at its centre the key identity concept of the *Zhonghua Minzu*, which is composed by equal *Han* Minzu and the other minority Minzus. It treats domestically all the nationalities, *Han* and non-*Han* equal nations. The concept of “equal mutual-benefit” is a key value both inside China and with other nations, in China and in all the OBOL regions. All the Muslim Turkish nations in the One Belt, and all the Maritime nations, especially the Indigenous Nations in the One Road will share the OBOR civilizational project in mutually beneficial equality.

This is the OBOR civilizational Project which will have to be approached by all the participating identity communities。The OBOR Project has been discussed by international press as a Chinese Project proposed by Chairman Xi Jingpin[[27]](#endnote-27). It is interesting to criticize it in terms of the political-economic interest of China. However, this Project is primarily a civilizational project involving historical interactions in the arid land “One Belt” and the martime “One Road”. The Project will develop new interactions between the countries and peoples involved. It will become a new historical reality complementing the exogenous development by the Western Colonialist expansion, and if successfully conducted, will develop an example of endogenous collective development. I this sence, the OBOR Project is a positive new reality particularly meaningful in the second phase of the Post-Cold-War globalization. This does not exclude the presence of its negative effects on human rights development by its devastating effect on the exogenous human rights development of the industrial democracies which worked relatively well until OBOR began to challenge its approach.

The present realities are not exactly meeting this civilizational project. “Peaceful coexistence” must provide the cultural mutual empathy leading to a shared respect to the principles of equal mutual-benefit. It is indispensable for this project to come true, to develop an endogenous process of egalitarian development, on the basis of mutual respects between the Mandala and Zhonghua civilizations, the Islamic Ummah, and the Maritime indigenous civilizations. The Western universal humanist values will have to cease being exogenously imposed, and become well integrated in the multi-cultural hybridization of a post-modern multi-cultural　new civilization. Whereas the first phase of the PCW globalization developed a human rights culture exogenously propagated, the second phase has to develop mutual respect between the universal values of Huan Rights, and the equally universal values of the Pacific/Indian Ocean indigenous civilization, and the Axial civilizations which need to agree to dis-agree in building a common security and common development, in harmony and empathy with the eco-system.

**15. Alternative to Nuclear Imperialism: Dialogues for Reconciliation between Critical Organic Intellectuals:**

The above description of a few aspects of the difference between the first and second phase of the post-Cold-War democracy leads us to the following practical conclusion. It is indispensable for the achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goals, and more broadly to avoid a potential third World War and a second Great Depression to convince all the subaltern neoliberals who are also subaltern neoconservative, that their best interest is not to join the ranks of the hate-crime supporters hoping to return to the past white or Japanese supremacy.

In Asia, it is indispensable to convince the *occidentalist* subalterns who reject human rights and other universal ideas coming from Western Enlightenment, that they must distinguish negative colonialist and neo-colonialist Western imposition of exogenour development and the positive contribution by the cross-Atlantic movement of Enlightenment. In the Middle-East, truth and reconciliation about the arbitrary division of the levant region of the Ottoman Empire and the occupation of their land by Israel must be organized. This reconciliation must guarantee the Jewish people to have their right to peace guaranteed by their neighbors, and a parallel dialogue already mentioned between Human Rights and Shariah should enable the co-existence of the mutually-agreed interpretation of the two legal systems. This legal adjustment is indispensable to a peaceful coexistence which eliminate any justification of terrorism.

The interpretation of Shariah can be adjusted with the support of enlightened Ulamah. The author of this report had in 2001 an occasion to discuss with an Alim teaching Human Rights Law in the University of Teheran. He could ascertain that a flexible interpretation of the Shariah taking into consideration the socio-cultural progress in jurisprudence was not only possible but the only correct interpretation. He was very clear, as he gave the example of the pick-pockets. The thieves would be imprisoned rather than to have their hands cut, since the Shariah has to be interpreted in terms of the objectives of the institutions and not by their automatic application. On the side of human rights law, multi-culturalism and endogenous legal development should become an unquestionned position especially when we enter into the second-phase of the post-Cold-War globalization. Human rights experts should pay respect to religious pluralism, and renounce to apply legal principles of secularism developed against the Roman Catholic clericalism to other non-authoritarian religions of minorities as the case of veils in schools, and the case of the European reaction to the Hebdo Charlie Massacre.

Neo-liberal subaltern groups may agree with human right defenders, especially endogenous defenders open to their respective traditional values. This pre-supposes a dialogue leading to reconciliation after the history of colonialist imposition of Western Universalism which caused the emergence of *occidentalism* as a reaction to *orientalism*. Creative dialogue for reconciliation needs to be organized to make human rights acceptable in the second-phase of post-Cold-War development after the defeat of the trilateral Atlantic liberalism. Neo-liberal subaltern groups in non-western societies accept Western economic competitive culture only because they do not have other possibilities to survive. They are by nature orientalist in criticizing their-own respective cultures and religion which teach them not to participate in global casino competitions. Human rights defenders have to encourage them to remember their-own traditional values and cease to support neoliberal casino capitalism.

To convince them they have to give the neo-liberal subalterns a clear explanations on possible alternative economic models. The human rights defenders, who could be just specialists in human rights law during the first phase of the PCW Period will need to have a generalist approach to human rights promotion needs to acquire economic and ecological knowledge. It is also necessary to have a civilizational dialogue between the different subaltern groups including the indigenous communities with their traditional livelihood and the diaspora communities of migrant workers living their multi--local livelihood in their homes and the locality they settled in. These exchange of views and sharing of experience should develop a pluralistic common-sense of mutual empathy permitting a subaltern self-liberation from the bad dreams of neoliberal competitive zero-sum mutual rejection leading them to a common search for a desirable world.

In India, for example, the Gandhian and Ambedkar supporters should reach an agreement about their common target which is *antiodaya* (a *sarvodaya* development started and led by the peripheral subalterns). The Japanese Buraku Liberation movement, cooperating with Dalit communities in South Asia have a precious guidebook on *antiodaya,* the Egalitarian Declaration which declares that their experience about how dark and cold the world is making them search of a society full of light and warmth. This Declaration is also useful in their dialogue with Latin American indigenous communities who believe in *Sumak Kauzai.* The complementarity of the Japanese Buraku people concept of a society full of light and human warmth must be compared with the indigenous search to live a better life sharing the joyful harmony of the universe.

This comparison must enrich universal human rights culture, strengthening it by their experience of a shared search for happiness. In Asia, all the Asia Descendants including the discriminated Buraku people of Japan and the indigenous nations who left Asia and live now in the Americas, should become art of the fight against discrimination and racism of all the Asia Descendants. This concept adopted by the 2002 Durban UN Conference against Racism should become, in the second phase of the post-Cold-War globalization a key concept for IMADR activities.

**16.Alternative to Nuclear Imperialism: The Asia Descendants as a Dialogue Community:**

The Durban UN Conference against Racism defined two new concepts, Afro-descendants and Asia Descendants. The first concept was easy to understand because it

Included all the descendants of the victims of slave trade who were forced to migrate to North and South America and the Caribbean region especially between the 16th and the 19th century. The second concept should be defined clearly because there were migrants from Asia to different other world regions, at different times, with a variety of purpose and different status, free, bonded slaves, or slaves. The concepts of “afro-descendant” or “Asia descendant” should allow to maximize the possibility to study the alliance of a group of human actors who share a common identity in terms of their historical position as victims and defenders of their endogenous right to peace, or their rights to live in peace free from fear and wants.

Theirs should be the largest common identity group in history, allowing the difference of their historical background to enrich and strengthen their common struggle toward justice and common security. In any situation, the *diasporas* of Asia Descendants should not exclude any Asian person, be they indigenous or modern migrants. On the other hand, it is useful to define each sub-category of Asia descendants in terms of their geo-historical origin. Asia descendant must be understood in their multi-local , and multi-generational identities. Asian descendants should have lived in more than one Asian locality. Asian descendant should include, for example all Chinese descent peoples, in and out of China towns in any town outside China, be it in San Francisco or in Bangkok. Any endogenous community in any parts of the Americas, who share a common heritage of Pacific and Indian Ocean Asian animism should not be excluded from the Asia Descendants.

Historically, we can distinguish broadly pre-historical migrants, the Indigenous Nations in the Americas, Pre-Modern migrants from Asia to Europe, the Roma Peoples, Early-Modern migrants, the Gurka migrants in British army, the descendants of the Chinese bonded-slave migrant who built the railways linking the East and West Coasts of the United States and Canada, the Okinawa migrants to Hawaii or San Paolo. The Indian migrants in Fiji and in the Caribbean States. Then we have the Filipina migrant home workers and sex workers in Hongkong, Japan, New York and Berlin. As well as all the Asian victims of exploitative migration of the Global Age. We must not forget future Chinese workers who will build Ports in the Pacific and Indian Ocean coasts and industrial cities in the arid Central Asian countries in the OBOR projects.

This broad definition of Asia Descendant makes their human rights, especially their rights to peace an important problem area deserving special attention, which is not the case for Afro-Descendants. The problem of Asia Descendants is that their rights to peace is not only a problem where they are the victims of discrimination by colonialist and racist groups. They have many conflicts and contradictions among themselves and also with the Afro-Descendants. For example, human insecurity in Fiji is caused by two goups of Asia Descendants, the Fiji indigenous community and the Indian community which was brought into Fiji by the British colonial authorities. In Sri Lanka, the Tamil community is composed by Tamil who migrated before European colonialism, and the so-called Plantation Tamil community brought into Sri Lanka by the British colonial authorities.

These two examples make the human security of Asia Descendants, a complex problem involving external colonialist actors and other Asia Descendant communities. Outside Asia, in the United States as well as in Europe, there are conflicts and competition between Afro and Asia Descendants as in the case of Afro-descendant conflict with Korean origin Asia Descendants in Los Angeles by the 1990s. As well as Indian descendants and Afro-descendants in Guyana who share a history of conflicts and competition which should be studied and overcome by an historical truth and reconciliation.

In general terms, the pre-historic Asia Descendants in the Pacific including in the America, all the indigenous communities have a common Animist tradition as we saw before. They constitute a civilizational Community of the Pacific and the Indian Ocean. Modern Asia descendants who moved recently have nation-State communities as their perceived identities, and this makes difficult to convince all diverse national diasporas to share a common Asian identity. The second phase of the PCW globalization tends to accelerate the hybridization of different migrant communities, and this makes possible and desirable to develop an Asia descendant community to enable the different diaspora Communities to unite and develop their fight against external racist hate crimes and hate speech. This is why the human rights community of contemporary Asia, including IMADR, will have to assume new responsibilities in developing a common front of all the Asia descendants in and out of Asia. This was not possible in the first phase of the PCW globalization when human rights was assumed to be just imposed through exogenous activities of the Atlantic Liberal Community. Now that we have entered into the second phase of PCW globalization. Asian descendants have an important role to play in developing a common endogenous human rights perspective nobody else can imagine.

**17. Concluding Remarks:**

We saw how the Post-Cold-War globalization took place in two phases, the first a world system dominated by a single hegemonic bloc, the Trilateral industrial democracies, with one general orientation, the exogenous dissemination of Atlantic Liberalism, using the two channels, economic and military. A system of economic cooperation including conditionalities regarding democracy and human rights, combined with humanitarian and human rights supports to subaltern nations and local regions.

We saw that the Atlantic Liberalism was officially based on legal-political and economic-financial regimes excluding, de facto, subaltern peoples and States from the key positions of the decision-making and implementing mechanisms of the United Nations and other hegemonic institutions. We found also the fact that Atlantic Liberalism double standards covered-up global interests which were based on neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism, increasingly broadening the rich/poor gaps and other inequalities, especially in the Global South. We saw that an exogenous imposition of universal values created dissatisfaction among the subaltern groups in both global North and Global South. Some wanted to return to the past when they were better treated, and allowed to be racists and sexists, some other were not satisfied by the official liberalism, with so many dreams which did not come true.

This caused a proliferation of minor and major conflicts between the dominant Atlantic governance and the discriminated subaltern groups. This included indigenous peoples and migrant diasporas and people living in impoverished regions in the North and the South, or put it in geo-historical context, between the West and the Rest. The exogenous imposition of political correctness, and the lack of security, in terms of both fear and wants, created what we may call a new Cold War. The possible futures will depend on the possibility of a reconciliation between the Atlantic liberalism and the exogenous followers of Western universal values on the one side, and the diverse schools of thought which develop endogenous efforts to build a world which allow all the discriminated people to live in peace free from fear and wants, as Roosevelt declared in the Atlantic Charter with the support of Churchill. The need of reconciliation is not caused by disagreements on the rights to peace. It is based on a variety of geo-historical Imperialist developments since the 18th Century. In West Asia (or Middle East), it is the partition of the Ottoman Empire by the Western Powers who created Israel and broke the delicate balance of power among the Arab-Islamic world and Iran. In East Asia, it was the emergence of Japan which decided join the Western colonialist Powers and invaded its neighbours to avid becoming colonized, who started an occidentalist rejection of human rights and democracy. In Latin America it was he United States policy to support anti-socialist military juntas, and exploited *Pacha Mama* and expropriated indigenous peoples who developed regional situations of human insecurity.

The unequal treatments of the hegemonic and subaltern States and groups of

citizens and multitudes became more and more visible. Two recent events come to confirm the positive side of the second phase of Post-Cold War globalization. One was the DPRK series of nuclear and missile experiments aimed at building with the United States a nuclear strategic situation of Mutual Assured Destruction, which was inacceptable to the United States. This challenge from the subaltern sector of the global

Nuclear Imperialism provided a good pretext to the Trump Administration its Nuclear Psture Review which removed the Atlantic Liberal concerns about global survival by making the Nuclear weapons an un-usable strategic weapon was totally negated, and the Trump Nulcear posture became a brutal expression of Nuclear Imperialism. This nuclear posture was a clear challenge to the double standards of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, from which the DPARK had pulled-out. The DPRK experiments proved that the NPT had lost its legal binding power.

By a historical coincidence, another entirely unrelated attempt by the global post-modern citizens fructified in the signature of the Treaty abolishing Nuclear Weapons which was prepared by ICAN, a network of anti-nuclear Imperialism animated by the victims of Hirshima and Nagasaki. The DPRK has always supported nuclear-free zone, and any negotiation with this occidentalist nation will become possible only when the international community supports the Treaty abolishing Nuclear Weapons. The NPT which is a typical double standards institution under the Atlantic Liberal regime will be abolished or will just fade-away during the second phase of PCW globalization where the new Treaty will play an increasingly important role based on its legitimacy based on the endogenous activities of ICAN supported by a variety of alternative experiments opposed to Nuclear Imperialism. As a conclusion, we should mobilize all the alternative experiments to replace Nuclear Imperialism which entered into its most brutal form rejecting all possible ethical reflections and dialogues. Let us make 2020 a Year of reconciliation, overcoming the Nuclear Imperilism built during the long 20th Century. We

Will have to organize a large international consultation which will review the historical development of the long 20th century, the Age of Imperialism which ended-up as a new Nuclear Cold War where nuclear weapons play a devastating role. We must overcome all the obstacles built during the 20th Century to our efforts to develop a dialogue among ourselves to reach a de-nuclearized non-Imperialist world where our diverse communities can build a pluralistic endogenous world based on the principles of Equal Mutual Benefit and Peaceful-Coexistence among different epistemic communities sharing endogenously developed human rights.

**Notes:**

1. To approach the ethical dimensions of the new Cold War, we need to take a more radical position, and pose the civilizational problems returning to the Greek *poiesis*

   instead of our technocratic reasoning based on *tekne* which means slave labour. Cf. Agathangelou, Anna M., and I.H.M. Ling, *Transforming World Politics: From Empire to Multiple Worlds*. Routledge, 2009. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. We will define the hegemony of Atlantic Liberalism as “modern” and the movements of global citizens, post-modern especially by relativizing Nation States, which are the units of modern Atlantic liberalism. We call Atlantic Liberalism the ideas contained in the Atlantic Charter. At the basis of modern democracy which condemn Hitler and Fascism as despotism unacceptable in the modern times. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Emmauel Kant wrote a book with this title. His humoristic use of a tomb epitaph is often misunderstood.. He was aware that his plans were time-bound, since they were based on the assumption that the Sovereign States were the only institutions with legitimate monopoly of violence as institutionalized by the Westphalian Treaty. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Cf. Gill, Stephen, *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission*. Cambridge University Press, 1990. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. The author of tis Report participated in 1971 in the preparatory meeting of the

   Trilateral Comission, the meeting was organized by Zbigniev Brzezinski from North Americca, Max Kohnstam of the Netherland from Europe, Toshiyoshi Miyazawa from the Liberal Democratic Party, later Premier, Saburo Ohkita, economist later Foreign Minister, Tadashi Yamamoto secretary of the America-Japanese Shimoda Conference and myself. The author of this Report knew well Max Kohnstam who was active in the World Council of Churches development cooperation activities. The European and the Japanese were interested in influencing the United States to support North-South international development cooperation activities. We wanted Japan to be a non-Western member in this Atlantic coalition of so-called “industrial democracies”. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. We use the term “Subaltern” borrowed from Antonio Grmsci, adapting it to the Post-Cold-War international situation. Assuming, as we do in this report the hegemony of

   the Atlantic Liberalism, which includes the States and political-economic elites in the

   North (West) and the South (Rest) who join the Trilateral industrial democracies. All

   The political-Economic groups who do not identify themselves with this Trilateral Power Bloc are included in the subaltern sector of the global neo-liberal and neo-conservative Bloc are subaltern. Subaltern groups are like subaltern officers in the Armed Forces, not ideologically decided to serve the interests of their countries like the Officers, they join the band-wagon as long as their interest is satisfied, but occasionally

   follow revolutionary movements when their dissatisfaction with the present regime is galvanized by some intellectuals (called organic-intellectuals) who convince them.

   There are many groups of subalterns, even in the United States who are excluded from the Regime. Some follow Martin Luther King, and some others Donald Trump. Many non-Atlantic nations are subaltern, but accept the neo-liberal rule of the game, because they are unable to find other alternative to survive in the neo-liberal global market. Nevertheless, as China is doing, they may decide to take an alternative road.

   Cf. Antonio Gramsci, *Quaderni del Carcere*, Instituto Gramsci, A cura di V Gerratana, Einaudi, 1975. Q25. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. CF. Brinkley, Elizabeth. *A New Deal for the World: America’s Version for Human Rights,* Harvard University Press, 2007, [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. The classification of two opposed social forces by Richard Falk gives a clear picture of this polarization. The Atlantic Liberal Industrial democracies are called by him GFA(Globalization-from-Above) and the Post-Modern NGOs, GFB(Globalization-from-below). Cf. Richard Falk “Globalization-from-Below: A Innovative Politics of Resistance”. Sandbrook, Richard, ed. *Civilizing Globalization: A Survival Guide.* State University of New York Press, 2003. Pp.191-205. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. Cf. Mushakoji, Kinhide *Global Issues and Interparadigmatic Dialogue: Essays on Multi-Polar Politics.* Albert Meynier, 1988. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. The NGO Forums accompanying UN Conferences of Global Issues follow the 1972 UN Coference on Human Environment when Maurice Strong served as Secretary General. He introduced this practice to force member States governments to recognize the ecological problems in their respective countries by encouraging NGOs to inform the international community about domestic situations. The Japanese delegation had to admit the Minamata Mercury pollution case because Japanese NGO victims of mercury disease were using the Conference elevators in their wheel-chairs. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. On UPR cf. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies?UPR?BasicFacts.aspx>

    Also check the interview of Maximilian Alvarez et al. in “The Commons are Rumbling: an interview with the People’s Congress of Resistance. (August 16, 2017.

    [http://wwv](http://wwvV).googletagmanager.com/ns.htmall?id=GTM-KLFY7XK [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Cf. Barrett, Kevin J. ed. *We are not Charlie Hebdo: Free Thinkers Question The French 9/11,* Sifting and Winnowing Books. 2015. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Dr. Louise Arbour was High Commissioner for Human Rights in 2004-2008.

    She is a Canadian Lawyer and has been Prosecutor at the UN Courts dealing with Human Rights violations in the Former Yugoslavia as well as of Burundi. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Mary Kaldor chaired a Study Group on European Security Capabilities and presented to Javier Solana, the EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Military Security a Report “A Human Security Doctrine for Europe” in 2007. Cf. Kaldor, Mary. *Human Security: Reflection on Globalization and Intervention.* Polity Press. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. Cf. Buruma, Ian, Avishai Margalit. *Occidenalism: The West in the Eyes of its Enemies*. Penguin Press, 2005. Buruma joined a Japanese Theatrical Group under Karajuro and experienced Japanese modernist theatre, he was expelled from this group because he objected Karajuro’s sexual harassment toward his Korean-origin wife. His

    very profound understanding of the Japanese anti-Occidental reaction made the concept of Occidentalism a precious key concept to open the occluded world of the Japanese mind. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. The Present Prime Minister of Japan, Shinzo Abe is an interesting Occidentalist accepting neo-conservative and neo-liberal western practice but refusing the application of Occidental critique of Pre-Defeat-Japan colonial aggressions of neighboring countries which history are occluded by him. His rejection of universal Western Values is a reaction to the long period of orientalism in Japanese politics of the 1950-2000 which insisted on the Japanese colonialist past mistakes occluding the Western colonialist and Imperialist history to which Japan took part. The Tokyo Tribunal treated crimes against humanity only when they were combined with crimes

    Against Peace, General MacArthur defined the terms of reference of the Trial in such a way that the Imperialistic crimes against humanity could be totally excluded from the

    Trial. The Japanese Left followed Masao Maruama in defining Japanese atrocities as

    Part of the Japanese Patriarchal Culture, occluding the Imperialist/Colonialist aspects

    Of the Japanese War Crimes. This is why it is crucial in Japan under the Abe Administration to insist on “Nuclear Imperialism” which is an aspect of nucear weapons Completely occluded by the Japanese education, media, and public consciousness.

    . Cf. Mushakoji, Kinhide “Ethno-Politics in Contemporary Japan: The Mutual-Occlusion of Orientalism and Occidentalism” Vij, Ritu ed. *Making and Unmaking of Modern Japan. Proto Sociology* Vol.32 2015.　pp 38-59. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. Cf, Hayes, Peter, Lyuba Zarski, *American Lake: Nuclear Peril in the Pacific*. Penguin, 1987. [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. Cf. worldpeace7, the Home-Page of the Committee of 7 for World Peace Appeals. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
19. The author of this Report had an occasion to find the importance to take into account the connection between Imperialism and nuclear weapons, during the visit of the Olof Palme Commission visit to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Indonesian Rector Soedjatmoko of the UN University invited the Commission members and Japanese victims from Hiroshima and Nagasaki led by the mayors of the two cities. The Mayor of Hiroshima asked about the reason South-East Asian peoples were not interested in the abolition of nuclear weapons. Rector Soedjatmoko did not give any clear answer to this question. After the meeting he told the author of this Report that he did not have the courage to tell the Mayor of Hiroshima that in Indonesia, he was very happy about the news of Hiroshima bombing, and had toasted with his student companions to this bombing which was telling to them that their liberation from Japanese occupation was approaching. This silence was bridged by the Mayor of Nagasaki who mentioned that for the Nagasaki victims, they were fully aware that the abolition of nuclear weapons should be always combined with an expression of remorse of the Japanese citizens about the Japanese imperialist aggressions which violated the rights of the Asian peoples to live in peace. [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
20. Animism is defined by E.B. Taylor as “the belief in spiritual existence” in all living beings. Kazuko Tsurumi has conducted in the 1970s an extensive research on the Minmata Mercury pollution where she found a strong animist belief uniting all the victims with the maritime life in the Minamata bay region. This belief supported their

    Strong conviction in the need to re-build life destroyed by the Chisso Company Factory

    Mercury discharge. She combined her empirical research in Minamata with the study of Japanese early ecologists, Kumakusu Minakata and ethnologist Kunio Yanagita. Her work enabled the UN University to include in its research on endogenous development the indigenous cultures which was based on animist beliefs regarding human happiness based on harmony with all the living beings in the eco-system. Cf. Tsurumi,
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