



## Peace Games 2020: The Bid Document

### Why Compete?

*Before entering a competition, especially one that will involve considerable time and effort, it is natural to ask why bother?* If predicting peace or war were only a matter of political judgement there would indeed be little point. It would just be a matter of opinion. To be taken seriously, there must be a method of analysis that is replicable, whose results ring true against a commonly accepted standard, viz. a legal definition that aiming at peace means putting the emphasis on peaceful, rather than military, means of resolving an international dispute.

The coronavirus pandemic in 2020 illustrates the importance of *foresight*, i.e. timely and accurate information regarding future threats and what needs to be done to address them. That is what the International Peace Project (IPP), and its predecessor body the Project on Demilitarisation (Prodem), have done with respect to the prospects for peace or war in various areas of the world. The trial Peace Games in 2004, focused on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, have demonstrated it can be done (see the results below). The Peace Games 2020 are now intended to take this process forward on a more extensive scale than before.

The 'winner' of Peace Games 2020 is the person or team whose analysis shows the deepest understanding of an area of potential future conflict and whose prescription, if adopted, the best prospects of securing peaceful, rather than military, techniques of conflict resolution. Initially that will be up to the IPP judges to determine, using the published criteria for evaluating bids. However, the final judge of all full entries to the Peace Games is the 'Court of history', i.e. whether the events in that area of conflict, after IPP publication of the winner's analysis together with competing bids (whose authors permit this), vindicate or contradict those evaluations. That is why the 'winner' in 2021 may not be the winner in 2022 or 2023 when the IPP judges assess how all previous evaluations have held up against the Court of history. There are financial prizes for the annual winners but the biggest prize would be advancing the education of the public in which method will best secure peace and avoid war.

Whether this 'method' turns out to be a political policy or a technique for evaluating policy may have profound implications for how international peace is to be secured in the future and war, particularly a great power war, avoided. *It is a worthy incentive to compete.*

### Who is Eligible?

Any person or team, lay or expert, who can meet the quality standards may compete in the Peace Games 2020. They are, though, likely to be of most interest to postgraduate students in relevant disciplines or undergraduates at an advanced stage of such courses. The Peace Games represent an opportunity to apply existing knowledge to one of the potential global conflicts listed below and develop analytical abilities and foresight for the public benefit.

The three competition criteria to meet the quality standards are:

- **Technical merit.** This refers to the method of understanding all the relevant dimensions of an international conflict, e.g. military, economic and constitutional/political.
- **Objective criteria for judging outcomes in conflict areas.** This refers to what criteria are used to decide whether the chosen method of understanding a conflict is proved true or false in future e.g. progress towards, or away from, peaceful means of conflict resolution; growing or lessening respect for human rights; or the continuance of an existing, or the establishment of a new, system of government. The Court of history is decisive in terms of whether a specific analysis is, after publication, vindicated or refuted.
- **Political balance.** Allowing for a bid's own point of view, how well does it represent or take account of the views of those with differing opinions?

### What is the Purpose?

Each contestant is required to answer both the following questions:

Which country or region in the world possessing, or thought to possess, nuclear weapons is at greatest risk of collapse into civil conflict or war? By what means can a state of peace be secured there?

### What Choice Do Contestants Have?

Contestants have a choice of any of eight declared nuclear weapon states, plus one undeclared, as a basis for answering the questions:

*Permanent members of the United Nations Security Council:* China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, United States of America

*Other States:* India, North Korea, Pakistan

*Undeclared:* Israel (which adopts a policy of deliberate ambiguity)

Thus, the answers to the above questions of the Peace Games 2020 must focus on **one** of these countries but may also take account of adjacent states or contested geographical entities in that region which are relevant to the primary focus. Only ONE bid per contestant is allowed and no individual can be involved in more than ONE bid at any stage.

No other states would currently be accepted as a primary focus, apart from the nine above, as the Peace Games rely on authoritative and publicly available information so IPP cannot be a forum for speculation on countries ‘... thought to possess, nuclear weapons...’

### What is the Rationale?

The reasons for choosing the questions posed by the Peace Games 2020 are:

- The historical threat to international peace and security has been well illustrated since the end of the Cold War in 1990 by many examples of civil conflict and war, especially the one in Syria which began peacefully in 2011 but soon turned violent and drew in certain great powers in varying degrees threatening, at times, a wider conflagration.
- The symbolic link between the Peace Games 2020 and the Tokyo Olympics – though the former is not part of the latter – also connects the first and, so far, the only use of nuclear weapons in 1945 with the dangers of nuclear proliferation and terrorism that heighten risks to global peace and security arising from societal collapse in a nuclear weapon state.
- The lack of understanding and foresight with respect to the prospects for peace or war in various regions of the world, which was revealed at the time the Cold War ended and on other occasions since then, underline the public benefit of the judicially sanctioned IPP object of ‘... the advancement by all charitable means of the education of the public in the differing means of securing a state of peace and avoiding a state of war.’

### Can it be Done?

Yes, the Peace Games 2020 are feasible because the trial Peace Games in 2004 proved it so.

The trial Peace Games were focused on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, following the unilateral Israeli withdrawal from Gaza in 2005. An Israeli, a Palestinian and an Irenical perspective were published in IPP Briefing no. 1 (January 2006) at [www.ipp2000.org](http://www.ipp2000.org) (bottom of home page) using a common format with pre-determined headings for ease of comparison and with appendices packed with useful information about the historical, military, economic, political-institutional, religious and educational aspects of the conflict.

It is instructive to compare each ‘Criteria for Evaluating Outcomes’ with events thereafter:

*Israeli (2006):* ‘Israel must seek a peace of reciprocity, tested over a protracted period, insisting that the agreed upon is implemented before any further step is taken.’

*Palestinian (2006):* ‘... the solution is for Israel to end the occupation of the territories it conquered in 1967 and to allow the Palestinians to establish a viable, independent state alongside Israel.’

*Result (by 2020):* No political agreement reached between the parties to the conflict.

*Irenical (2006):* If ‘a’ applies despite the lack of progress on ‘b’ or ‘c’, the conclusions [predicting ‘**periodic war between Israel and the Palestinian movement**’] will be refuted:

- a. Armed conflict is contained rather than resulting in a wider Middle Eastern war;
- b. The Islamic practice of jihad moves from a culture of war to a culture of peace;
- c. Israel gives greater emphasis to peaceful means of conflict resolution.

*Result (by 2020):* Armed conflict in mid-2006 between Israel and Hamas then extending to an Israeli invasion of Lebanon against Hezbollah; further major clashes between Israel and Hamas in December 2008/January 2009, November 2012 and in July/August 2014.

Contestants are invited to make good use of the IPP Briefing No. 1 to understand the 'Peace Games' concept. They are, though, entirely free to choose their own lawful method of analysis and criteria for evaluating outcomes. Nevertheless, the headings to be used in their outline and full bids in 2020, which are adapted from the trial games in 2004, are pre-determined by IPP and obligatory to aid comparison between competing analyses.

#### How will the Competing Bids be Evaluated?

A number of general principles need to be stated that are intended to ensure equitable and impartial evaluation of each and every bid throughout the competition process.:

- i. Contestants are free to choose ONE from eight declared and one undeclared nuclear weapon states as their basis for answering the two questions in the box on p. 2 above. No advantage or disadvantage will accrue as a result if, subsequently, a social collapse occurs in a different state to the one that a contestant has chosen. In each and every bid the quality of the case made in that bid will be the deciding factor and the criteria for evaluating outcomes will be applied only to that country or region of conflict.
- ii. All bids must be written in English. While IPP hopes that future Peace Games may be conducted in foreign languages, where appropriate, that is not feasible at present. However, it is permitted in the Peace Games 2020 to use relevant references in foreign languages provided a translation into English for each is included in an appendix.
- iii. All bids in the competition will be anonymised so that the judges do not know the name of the contestant(s) nor their institutional affiliation (if any). This is intended to remove a potential source of bias in evaluating bids.
- iv. The criteria for evaluating bids are the same as the three competition criteria to ensure quality, as previously stated (on p. 2 above):
  - **Technical merit.**
  - **Objective criteria for judging outcomes in conflict areas.**
  - **Political balance.**

More specifically, the criteria for evaluation are presented below in relation to the application process that each contestant will have to follow.

### What is the Application and Award Process?

Please note that the formal 'Rules of the Peace Games 2020' are published separately. This statement is intended only as a guide to the main points in answer to the above question.

#### 1. Registration

Each intending contestant must first register with IPP via the link to the Award Force platform on the Peace Games 2020 (PG2020) website. A contestant can be an individual or a team. In the latter case, the team members including the leader must be identified at the second stage of the registration process. The Team Leader will be IPP's principal point of contact with each team. The maximum number of persons in a team is three but all three would be able to contribute to preparing their team's bid at each stage. Only the Team Leader will be able to submit the final bid.

This registration stage will be used as the basis for confirming contestant identity and institutional affiliation, or contact address, if and only if an outline bid is submitted by the deadline. These personal details will remain strictly confidential and will not be used as the basis for any communication except with the contestant in relation to the PG2020.

While the IPP Trustees are aware that some contestants may put themselves at risk in certain jurisdictions by making a submission to these Peace Games, the Trustees must know the true identity of each and every contestant and where they can be reached. This is necessary for the possible award of an eventual prize and to ensure no spurious or fraudulent entries are permitted. In the event of a prize-winner believing that their personal safety would be compromised by revealing their identity then the IPP Trustees would favourably consider the use of a pseudonym at that award stage alongside publication of the final prize-winning bid.

#### 2. Submission of Outline Bid

Once registration of the contestant is complete and acknowledged by IPP then the individual or team concerned is ready to start preparing their outline bid as soon as the portal is open. (The date will be on the IPP PG2020 website.) The *purpose of an outline bid* is to show how the contestant would approach the task of submitting a full bid, if invited by IPP to do so.

Login to the Award Force platform is by email or mobile and password created on registration. This outline bid must be written as a Word document on the contestant's own computer *using the headings shown in the entry (Outline Bid) form*. The contestant cannot add to, or subtract from, those headings and the content they provide under each heading must be appropriate to that heading. The word limit for each section as shown on the entry form must be observed. All references which the contestant relies upon in the outline bid are to be listed with sufficient detail to ensure that the judges can find them, if required. Laypersons will not be expected to follow a specific academic referencing system but must still meet this requirement of transparency in citing sources. Only publicly available information may be used in outline (or full/revised full) bids. Once complete, the relevant sections of the Word document are to be copied into the entry form by the individual contestant or Team Leader (who must check that the word limit has been observed). Endnotes and tables will not transfer or be unformatted but they can be left out of the entry fields so long as they are in the final and complete outline bid which must be uploaded as an attachment (in pdf or Word format).

The deadline for submission of the outline bid must be observed. Only electronic submission is permitted via the Award Force portal linked to the IPP website. No late submissions will be accepted for whatever reason.

Contestants should note that any outline bid that contains the identity of the contestant and/or any institutional affiliation will be disqualified.

### 3. Evaluation of Outline Bid

All outline bids submitted by the deadline will first be reviewed by the IPP office to check that each has complied with the Rules of the PG2020 and meet the competition criteria to ensure quality standards. Those bids proposed for rejection, together with the reasons given, will be submitted to the IPP judges for their review and decision, which will be final. They will also review the successful outline bids to be invited to make a full submission.

*The PG2020 will only proceed to the next stage* if there are at least three outline bids which meet the quality standards. In that case, all the successful bidders will be invited to make a full bid. Feedback to the unsuccessful bidders may be offered by the IPP office upon request.

### 4. Submission of Full Bid

The requirements for submission of a full bid will be like that of the outline bid except that headings inapplicable to the latter will be available in the former with a higher word limit. Factual appendices on relevant aspects of the conflict area will also be permitted. This bid must also be anonymous and any institutional affiliation undisclosed.

#### Competitive and Mentoring Dimension

This is to be included at this stage of PG2020 to help ensure IPP quality standards. It takes the form of anonymous entries by the IPP Adviser and Hon. Secretary to the Trustees, (Dr) Peter Southwood (PMS), who was also the Special Editor of IPP Briefing No. 1. He has provided the Trustees with the GB£10,000 prize money so is ineligible to win an award. However, his long experience with this kind of pioneering analysis enables him to fulfil a competitive role during the Games and (potentially) a mentoring role thereafter.

He may submit one bid relating to EACH country and region which contestants have chosen as a basis for answering the two questions of the PG2020. All contestants including PMS will have access to the reference list in the outline bid of all other contestants (on an anonymised basis) focusing on that country and region. This is to ensure, as far as possible, that each contestant is working on the same knowledge base so that the PG2020 really are a test of the analytical abilities of each contestant rather than of their knowledge of the country or region in question. This does not prevent contestants from using additional references that come to light during the full bid stage, but they must be separately identified.

It is important to emphasise that PMS will, in his bids, NOT be offering any direct comment or criticism of any other bids but applying his own analytical method independently.

All full bids must be submitted by the deadline published on the IPP Peace Games website and comply with the requirements laid down for outline bids.

## 5. Revision of Full Bid (optional)

The final stage before evaluation allows the contestants (including PMS) the opportunity to offer any qualification of their full bid in the light of (i) any additional references used by other contestants (beyond those in their outline bid) and (ii) any translations from foreign languages provided by other contestants. Naturally, this exchange of information arranged by the IPP office would relate only to contestants focused on the same country or region in response to the PG2020 questions. There is no obligation on any contestant to make such a qualification.

During this stage no other new information can be introduced or the bid may be disqualified.

Any and all revised full bids must be submitted by the deadline published on the IPP Peace Games website and comply with the requirements laid down for the earlier full bids.

## 6. Evaluation of Revised Full Bids

The evaluation of the full and revised full bid from each contestant would then be conducted by the IPP judges alone in relation to:

- (a) Compliance with the Rules of the PG2020 (mandatory) and Code of Conduct (voluntary);
- (b) A detailed breakdown of the three publicly declared criteria for evaluating bids;
- (c) [From 2022 only] An evaluation by the judges as to whether the 'Court of history' has delivered a verdict in accordance with the contestant's '**Objective criteria for evaluating outcomes in the conflict area**'. However, in 2021 this will not affect their decision because the time elapsed between submission of the full and/or revised full bids and the judges' award of the International Peace Prize<sup>2000</sup> is likely to be too short to be decisive.

The decision of the judges is final. If it happens that they choose a bid by PMS, and are then advised of the fact, the award would then go to the second person on their list. This fact would not be publicly disclosed unless the IPP judges choose to do so.

## 7. Award of the International Peace Prize

The award of the initial IPP Prize in 2021, on a date publicised on the PG2020 website, will involve publication of the full bid/revised full bid with the name of the contestant, whether individual or team members. The certificate and prize money would be sent to the individual or Team Leader. Payment would be made electronically once bank details had been verified and in conformity with all relevant laws in England and in the country of destination.

### Publication and Review

The aim of IPP is to also publish, with permission, the other full bids relating to each country and region, including the competitive and mentoring standards of PMS on the PG2020 website. This would not only allow the public to compare and contrast the differing analyses but also to enable the IPP judges to review their decision a year later in 2022, and again in 2023, in the light of the 'Court of history'. Thus, each revised full bid including those not published would have two more opportunities to win the International Peace Prize.