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1. **The end of the (First) Cold War: An Age of Exogenous Human Rights Development:**
	1. **The Trilateral Hegemony of Atlantic Liberalism.**

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, we find the emergence of two interesting subaltern trends, one developed by subaltern States especially in North-East Asia and another among subaltern peoples, animated by post-modern global citizens[[1]](#endnote-1) in close alliance with the indigenous peoples and minority identity communities.

These States and Peoples are post-modern, in the sense that they are part of a reaction to the modernism of the First Phase of the post-Cold-War world was a “modern” attempt to materialize the Kantian global “Eternal Peace”[[2]](#footnote-1) community of nation States, based on the Westphalian States system with an inter-State institution created by the Atlantic Liberals, who were founders of the League of Nations and the United Nations. 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 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

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 the 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[[3]](#footnote-2).

* 1. **The War on Terror, the East Asian Occidentalism, and Nuclear Imperialism.**

The turn of the century and millennium was characterized by the Start of the War on Terror in the Middle East and the emergence of Occidentalism in the Far East, to use a Euro-centric division of the World. Nuclear weapons were common to both problematic areas for the Atlantic Liberal hegemony. We propose here a new concept, “Nuclear Imperialism”. It is an expression based on the fact that Imperialism defined as a cultural-political-economic project to exercise a hegemonic role in the geo-historical union and partition of each world region. Nuclearization of such hegemonic regional project was a process which took place in both the Middle-East and the Far East. In both regions the Western Powers exercised their imperialist interests in accordance to the geo-historical preexisting situations. In the Far East, a made-in-Japan Orientalism was at the root of Japanese Imperial and Imperialist aggression, colonization and Occupation. Japan legitimized its intrusion in Korea and China by the need to modernize, i.e. Westernise the two neighbours resisting Westernization. modernized. Japan’s role was perceived by its rulers as a destiny to resist Western imperialism by modernizing itself and its neighbors annexed into its Imperialist “Lebensraum”. Japan experienced, in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that its easy-going imitation of Western imperialism led to nuclear retaliation. This nuclear traumatism is still dividing its citizens, into those who repent the imperialist aggressions of the Japanese Empire, and those who believe that what was wrong was to oppose the United States, and its imperialist aggression could be repeated if it is done under the Nuclear Umbrella of the United States.

The Nuclearization of Imperialism does not necessarily define a use of nuclear weapon by Imperialist nations. It began as an anti-imperialist move to prevent Hitler Germany to invent a nuclear bomb before the Atlantic alliance. Once invented, the first use of nuclear weapons in Hiroshima and Nagasaki to penalize Japan and warn the Soviet Union. The Nuclearization of the world started against the Imperialist aggressor, Imperial Japan. In Las Palmas a monument representing the Article Nine of the Constitution of Japan which declares that Japan, responsible for its Imperialist aggressions renounces to the use of military forces repenting to have violated the rights of all peoples of the world to live in peace. The plaza where this monument was built was the “plaza de Hiroshima y Nagasaki” by the citizens of the Canari Islands who were fighting against the Spanish Government decision to join NATO. It links the Japanese repentance about its Imperialist aggressions and the tragic nuclear attack by the United States on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The close link between imperialism and nuclearization is well represented by this monument in the Plaza de Hiroshima y Nagasaki.

The citizens of Japan 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, cannot be separated from the historical context it was invented, which includes the Japanese aggression of its neighboring countries, as an integral 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 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. The 21st Century, however, is becoming the Age of a full-fledged Nuclear Imperialism, inaugurated officially by the Trump Administration 2018 Nuclear Posture Review which turns the US Nuclear Weaponry simply into the key component of its military panoply enabling it to cope with any foreign attack on any level of intensity, called “flexible” response, and combined with US world-wide spread of military bases, called “forward deployment”. 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 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. As is symbolized by the name of the plaza where Article nine monument is located in Las Palmas.

 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 through a Non-Proliferation of the Nuclear, which is simply to maintain the Nuclear in the hands of the hegemonic Powers 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 the Anti Imperialist Programme of One Belt One Road, which should

Integrate de-Nulcearization 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.

**1.3. The Anti-Terror Self-Protective Atlantic Liberalism opening the Second Phase of PCW Globalization:**

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 European state leaders 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 liberals 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[[4]](#footnote-3).

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[[5]](#footnote-4) 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[[6]](#footnote-5). 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.

**2. The Trump Opposition to Atlantic Liberalism and the Far East Occidentalists.**

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

Atlantic Liberalism has made Europe and the United States into targets of attack by Arab and Muslim terrorism. More generally, Atlantic liberalism including human rights exogenous imposition has become the targets of intellectual criticism of “*occidentalism*. The denial of the positive aspects of the Atlantic liberalism has been given this name by Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit[[7]](#footnote-6). They proposed this concept which

denies all universal values proposed by the West, whereas the 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[[8]](#footnote-7) 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 against 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.

**2.2. Trump Integral Nuclear Imperialism and Kim Jong-Un Challenge.**

 Occidentalism is closely associated with the fight against Nuclear Imperialism. The effort of President Trump to keep the “American Lake” solely open to US Nuclear submarines, became recently the occidentalist reaction by the DPRK attempts to develop across the Pacific a Nuclear Strategic situation of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) with the United States, across this “ American Lake”[[9]](#footnote-8). Chairman Kim Jung-On wants to prove that MAD can be built between a non-Western nation and the United-States.

Trump is making the Atlantic Liberalism meaningless by his America First policy which does not try to cover up the contradictions between its human rights and humanitarian hegemonic contribution to world peace and the hegemonic national interests hidden behind these universalist values. In this sense the most conspicuous manifestation of Trump disclosure of America first has been its nuclear policy. In this connection 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 the opponent nuclear bloc 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 logic, is based on Nuclear Imperialism, which wants to be well prepared to use nuclear weapons scaled-down to fit into all possible attacks on all levels of military intensity, between space wars and low-intensity conflicts including non-violent demonstrations.

The DPRK Special Unit which conducted all the experiments both nuclear and ballistic missiles was the Nuclear Strategic Unit charged to create a nuclear strategic situation of Mutual Assured Destruction situation with the United States. This Unit was clearly instructed by some Russian secret experts versed in nuclear strategy including MAD. This is clearly indicated by the fact that their parade was accompanied by Soviet style expression of victory, three times, three “Hurahs” the right fist up, quite different from the Korean army’s customary “Mansei!” both arms up. It was an entirely meaningless effort to prove to President Trump, the DPRK capacity to develop a second-strike capability, making any first U.S. strike a meaningless suicidal action. Trump had already dropped the MAD strategic “rationality”! Kim Jong-Un, nevertheless, succeeded in convincing the military and intelligent services that the young technocrats of his generation sent to Europe, including Russia and Ukrain by him, were not potential traitors siding with the dovish diplomats and economic planners. They were hailed by the military as national heroes who proved the military parity between North Korea and the United States. Kim Jong-un astonished the international press by his sudden opening to the outside world joining the South in the Pyeong Chang Olympic Games. But he had already proclaimed the fact that he had gone beyond his father’s Army First Principle[[10]](#footnote-9), and wanted to build the DPRK as a great Power, both in military and economic terms. His move succeeded in convincing President Trump, that the mobilization of the U.S. demonstration of its overwhelming military show-up through the US, Korean Republic Joint military maneuver with US Marines experts of surprise attacks on the head of state, should be interrupted at least during their negotiation about the de-nuclearization of Korea, which meant for the Koreas, including the Republic of Korea, the renunciation of the United States to deploy in the Korean Peninsula their nuclear divisions. Trump is contradicting his 2018 Nuclear Posture Review which presupposes a forward deployment of the US nuclear forces in all regions of the World including the Korean Peninsula. The agreement between the military command of both the DPRK in the North and the RK in the South already agreed on partial de-nuclearized zones on land and in the sea. Their approach is an example of the creation of denuclearized regions preparing the full application of the Treaty on the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons. It implies the revision of the US Forward Deployment Strategy, into a strategy of Froward disengagement[[11]](#footnote-10), which needs to be applied all around the world to stop the present trend leading to a second Cold War.

**2.3. The One Belt One Road (OBOR) Programme as an Answer of the Rest to**

**the colonial expansion of the West.**

 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 proposed 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[[12]](#footnote-11).

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 to give jobs to its excess labor force who settle down in the China Towns diaspora communities. But OBOR has another face. It has been projected by Xi Jing-Pin with a long-range civilizational vision to start a process of endogenous 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 and Africa linking the two silc-roads in the arid zone and the maritime passage.

To oppose OBOR, Japan supports India which wants to have a Free and Open Pacific/Indian Ocean development programme reaching Africa. The OBOR Programme counteracting to Western-led colonialist development may become a new kind of Chinese colonialist expansion if the short-term Chinese diaspora network becomes the objective of colonial concessions absorbing the Chinese excess working population. 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 Religions and 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[[13]](#footnote-12) 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[[14]](#endnote-2). 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* as 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 OBOR 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 OBOL civilizational Project which will have to be approached by all the participating identity communities。The OBOL Project has been discussed by international press as a Chinese Project proposed by Chairman Xi Jing-pin[[15]](#footnote-13)[[16]](#endnote-3). 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 linking the arid land “One Belt” and the maritime “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. In this sense, 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.

**3. The Post-Modern Peoples Endogenous Libertarian Initiatives:**

**3.1. The Post-Modern Left in the United States:**

 It is important to study the formation of a post-modern left ( Libertarianism as a Post-

“Atlantic-Liberal” Utopianism ) which will play an important role in the second phase of

Post (First ) Cold War Left, in the United States we must study the People Congress of

Resistance (PCOR)[[17]](#footnote-14) 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

Rojava Revolution, As we will see later, it is also shared by the Zapatist Revolution in

Mexico. 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 with 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, taking a universalist position on Human Rights. 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[[18]](#footnote-15)’ 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 creates 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[[19]](#endnote-4).

**3.2．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[[20]](#footnote-16). 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.

**3.3. Endogenous Human Rights Development in Latin America and the Contribution of the Indigenous Nations:**

The 1970s was a Cold War period when the United States supported the 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 Aliende 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 part of 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.

**3.4. Pacific/Indian Ocean Animism and the Global Emergence of Indigenous Civilizations:**

 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, especially the maritime animist civilization of the Pacific (and Indian Ocean) animism[[21]](#footnote-17) deserve 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. 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

[[22]](#footnote-18)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]](#footnote-19)

Also in Mexico, the close cooperation between indigenous communities such as the City of Taran in the Michoacan[[24]](#footnote-20) and the Indigenous Philosophy faculty of the *Colegio de Michoac.an* 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 new Cold-War is taking an interesting path in the Americas where some

fluence on Multi-National Corporate interests, which 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 spread of populism has both a negative Right-wing and a positive Left-wing!

 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 the animistic belief in Mother Earth who is sad about all the violence of the Indonesian Occupant Forces. Mother Earth is not angry, she just shares this sadness. It is interesting to find Roman Catholic lay-peoples and priests, who

Share the animistic sensitivity which is widespread in the Pacific, and is found quite acceptable to Christians who believe in the omnipresent Trinity in Nature through the Spirit animating all living creatures, as taught by the Franciscan vision of the Universe.

 In the Pacific, Aotearoa is a land where reconciliation progresses and creates a new world where reconciliation between the Western migrants and the indigenous Maori nations contributes to a reconciliation between humans and Mother Nature. This was recently clearly manifested in the Waitangi Tribunal decision to recognize 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 of their communities. 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 admit the traditional ideas which can enrich the human rights heritage of humankind by accepting indigenous endogenous concepts.

**3.5. The Right to Peace as a New Social Contract and a Fourth Generation Human Rights**

The Right to Peace was developed in Latin America, as we saw already, 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. 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 proposes 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.

 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 Human Rights, and the equally universal values of the Pacific/Indian Ocean indigenous civilization, and of all 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. An inter-civilizational dialogue needs to be developed by all the post-modern

citizens and multitudes.[[25]](#footnote-21)

**4. Build Human Security against Nuclear Imperialism**

**4.1. 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 neoconservatives, 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. Their occlusion about the existence of so many alternative possible “worlds” must be replaced by a belief to change the present world by a non-violent struggle of all the subaltern groups of post-modern peoples. [[26]](#footnote-22)

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 must be organized. This reconciliation must guarantee the Jewish people to have their right to peace guaranteed by their neighbors, and a parallel dialogue 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 dialogue with them in order to give them a clear explanation on possible alternative political/economic models, since they have been indoctrinated by the Atlantic Liberal converts to the World Bank belief in the State obligation to serve the global investors, declaring that there is no alternatives to the present global neoliberal and neoconservative World-Order.

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 livelihoodin 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.

**4.2. The Asia Descendants as a Dialogue Community:**

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

 The non-Atlantic NGOs will have to mobilize the Asian Peace and Human Right defenders and the Asia descendant diaspora communities, to work toward a post-modern reconciliation based on an extensive dialogue between the supporters of exogenous human rights development of Atlantic liberalism and the supporters of a variety of endogenous human rights development efforts in the rest of the world. This post-modern reconciliation and empathic dialogue should provide the basis for a new social contract which has been proposed in the Santiago de Compostela Declaration, between the global citizens, especially those living in fear and wants as the right holders of the rights to peace and the sovereign States as duty-holders, to which transnational Agencies should be added. Their Responsibility defined as Corporate Social Responsibility may benefit by making the Asia Descendants, together with the Afro-Descendants, a test case for a reconciliation between the global post-modern citizens working closely with the States and TNCs willing to improve their duties defined in terms of the Human Rights to Peace violated by the rapidly growing Nuclear Imperialism.

**4.3. A Practical Proposal**

This is why we close this report by a proposal. Let us make 2020 a Year of reconciliation, organizing a large international consultation on Reconciliation in Tokyo Japan, where the Olympic Games take place, and where the Japanese citizens can play the role of intermediary, based on their deep repentance about having joined the camps of the colonialist and post-colonial States. The Japanese citizens have experienced both the role of perpetrators and victims of the violation of the Right to Peace
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