



laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

4 September 2025 | Draft

Blessed are the Piecemakers as Children of God?

Piecekeeping disguised as peacekeeping in a pieciful world

-- / --

Introduction

Global implications of "piecemaking" and "piecekeeping"

Conventional unacceptability of "piecemaking" and "piecekeeping"

Avoidance of conceptual novelty in a technically innovative world

Piecekeeping as a sustained process of deprivation

Piecekeeping operations in the guise of peacekeeping

Colonialism, imperialism and divide-and-rule as piecekeeping operations

Interdisciplinary integration inhibited by conceptual piecekeeping

Interfaith initiatives undermined by piecekeepers

Intellectual property as piecekeeping?

Peacekeeping and "peace deals" as a distraction from piecekeeping and "piece deals"

Keeping the peace versus Keeping the piece?

Elites as exemplary piecekeepers

Reconciling theoretical approaches to management of disparate pieces

References

Show/Hide All AI Responses

Introduction

The world's rhetoric is saturated with "peace", but the experiential reality is saturated with "pieces". In an era routinely described as a polycrisis, political leaders and institutions invoke peace while manufacturing, managing, and hoarding fragments -- territorial, doctrinal, disciplinary, and intellectual. The following exploration names those dynamics as "piecemaking" (the creation of new fragments) and "piecekeeping" (their custody), and contrasts them with "peacekeeping" (containment) and "peacemaking" (integration). The distinction matters: if the primary process is piecekeeping, when calling it peacekeeping obscures accountability for who get to keep which pieces -- and at whose expense.

There is little question that the world is experiencing multiple conflicts, with more variously anticipated -- even the much discussed possibility of World War III. In this context, and acclaimed as leader of the free

world, there is extensive media coverage of the obsession of Donald Trump with ensuring that he is awarded the Noble Peace Prize -- for which he has been nominated by various countries (Tyler Pager, *Trump's Nobel Prize Obsession Is About More Than World Peace*, *The New York Times*, 24 March 2025).

However it is also the case that the USA is both an active participant in many of the ongoing conflicts or complicit in them -- as well as exerting pressure on its NATO allies to increase defence spending dramatically, as discussed separately (*Enabling Government Bipartisanship through Dual-Use Budget Items*, 2025). The USA is itself one of the principal manufacturers of weaponry with a share of some **42% of global arms exports** in the period 2019-2023. It is then of interest how these contrasting threads might be meaningfully reconciled.

Of curious relevance is the fact that the funding for the Nobel Peace Prize derived originally from the manufacture of the weaponry by which people are appropriately described as being "blown to pieces". Ironically weapons have been described as "pieces" for centuries and the term now features notably in urban slang reference to the hand guns of gangs. Possibly more curious is the fact that "peace" and "piece" are homophones in a society in which many are insensitive to the spelling which can be claimed to make the distinction. More curious again, as with the "Nobel" and "Noble", search engines now tend to automatically correct any use of "piece" and "noble" to "peace" and "Nobel" under certain conditions -- if care is not taken to circumvent this.

This confusion was one inspiration for the promotion of a Noble Piece Prize as a design award (William Crozer, *The Power of a Great Piece of Work*, Noble Studios, 19 August 2025). It also justified exploration of the relevance of reframing the preoccupation of President Trump (*Awarding Noble Piece Prize to Trump and Netanyahu Jointly?* 2025). The implication of creative fabrication and design also associates the "piece making" (so central to the arms industry) with the "peacemaking" claimed by Trump -- as variously assessed by experts (Rachael Jolley and Sam Phelps, *Did Trump really resolve six conflicts in a matter of months?* *The Conversation*, 22 August 2025; Emma Shortis, et al, *Does Trump deserve the Nobel Peace Prize?* *The Independent*, 10 July 2025).

The inquiry can be taken further in that the sense of "peacemaker" is central to the faith of the USA, variously acclaimed as a Christian country, and most vigorously by Trump's evangelical supporters. This is affirmed in the Biblical reference: *Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God* (*Matthew* 5:9). A particular bond with God also features in the nation of Israel, variously held to be the primary ally of the USA. Both Donald Trump and Benjamin Netanyahu have substantial groups of supporters who openly describe their political leadership as divinely guided, and this has been traced in their rhetoric and in the framing of their roles by religious movements and media.

Netanyahu has linked the roots of the Judeo-Christian tradition to modern democracy, describing the alliance between Israel and the United States as a partnership "bonded in faith, in history, in tradition," highlighting the biblical foundations shared by both nations. "*We live the Bible*", he has said (28 July 2025). Their collective role is most notably acclaimed by Christian Zionists. Given the role of both Israel and the USA in the manufacture, sale and use of weapons, it is then appropriate to recognize the ambiguity they share with respect to any role as "peacemakers" with that of "piecemakers" -- with no conflict with any belief that they are the "children of God".

Inspired in this way, it is then appropriate to recognize how their efforts are framed by many as "peace work" -- if not the "work of God" -- in a period in which this can be paired with "piece work" as a related homophone. The contrast is similarly dramatic in that piece work can be perceived and experienced as a modern form of slavery -- **wage slavery**. Whether as "work" or as a "piece of work", such understandings call for further reflection to transcend potentially outdated framings which are no longer "fit for purpose" in a society challenged by the assumptions imposed by economics (*Unproductive Interpretation of Work and Employment as Misinformation?* 2025).

Given the celebration by which peace negotiations of questionable outcome are typically accompanied, there

is also a case for recognizing the "piecemeal" dimensions of "peacemeal" (*Piecemeal Peace; Peace-Meal Peacebuilding*). The problematic nuance has been highlighted in a poem by Gerald Manley Hopkins: *That piecemeal peace is poor peace*. From that perspective, is any acclaimed "peace deal" more realistically understood as a "piece deal" in a transactional world -- even though search engines automatically convert the second into the first?

Of particular relevance to the semantic complex evoked by the entangled threads above are the acclaimed aspirations of leaders for a "peaceful" global society in a period in which its "piecefulness" is unprecedented -- as enabled by the "piecemakers". As of 2017, the world is estimated to contain over one billion small arms -- including handguns (*Global Firearms Holdings, Small Arms Survey*). There are an estimated **12,241 nuclear warheads**, with millions of other missiles, rockets, and military weapons also deployed globally. There are approximately 1.15 billion small arms in global circulation, with over 393 million civilian-owned guns in the United States alone -- a number greater than the population of that country.

Curiously an ambiguity, resonating with the claim of Donald Trump, is that "Peacemaker" is an iconic feature central to the mythology of the USA (*Colt Peacemaker was the most popular gun in the Wild West, from Billy the Kid to Wyatt Earp, Vintage News, 25 February 2018*). In that mode, a key intercontinental ballistic missile from 1986 to 2005 was named by the US as the "Peacekeeper".

With the change of name of the US Department of Defense to the Department of War instigated by Trump, his recognition as contemporary peacemaker and peacekeeper of the West gives call for reflection. The justification is given as: *The name "Department of War," more than the current "Department of Defense," ensures peace through strength... sharpens the Department's focus on our own national interest and our adversaries' focus on our willingness and availability to wage war to secure what is ours* (*Restoring the United States Department of War, The White House, 5 September 2025*). As clarified in the following argument, this could be more clearly understood as "ensures piece through strength" and securing "what is ours", whether by "piecekeeping" or by "piecemaking".

Strangely the concept of "piecefulness" is also rejected as unacceptable by search engines -- in favour of "peacefulness". This calls into question the framing of "peace research", when "piece research" might be far more pertinent to the reality of the world condition. The argument also suggests a review of the blue-helmeted "peacekeepers" when new insights might be offered by the hidden implications of "piecekeepers" -- perhaps as "red helmets". The distinction recalls the appreciation of the value of both a "blue team" and a "red team" in exploring strategic options (Sandeep Rajan, *Red Team vs. Blue Team: Understanding the Difference, Value Mentor, 12 January 2024*). How problematic is the absence of a recognized "red team" and the insights it might offer?

Whilst there has long been concern about the principles essential to any understanding of peace -- as with *The Principles for Peace* -- little attention is given to any complementary focus on "piece principles" -- on "piecebuilding" in contrast to "peacebuilding" (*Using Disagreements for Superordinate Frame Configuration, 1992*). The following argument concludes with an effort to reconcile theoretical arguments in that regard.

This exploration continues previous experiments in making extensive use of AI to clarify the themes evoked. For comparative purposes, responses are presented by different AIs (*ChatGPT, DeepSeek and Perplexity*) to the same questions. The responses have been framed as optionally visible grayed areas -- with that form of presentation itself treated as an experiment, in anticipation of the future implication of AI into research documents and debate. The AI responses are hidden unless specifically requested by the reader (a facility not operational in PDF variants of the page, in contrast with the *original*). Clearly the questions can be asked of other AIs -- and framed otherwise -- whether at the present time or in the future, when more sophisticated large language models become available.

Global implications of "piecemaking" and "piecekeeping"

Question: If "piecemaking" was not a focus of autocorrection by search engines, what might it mean from a

global perspective given use of "piece" over centuries to refer to weapons -- now currently reframed with sexual connotations

Show/Hide AI response

Question: If "piecekeeping" was not a focus of autocorrection by search engines, what might it mean from a global perspective

Show/Hide AI response

Tabular summary of the indications evoked in this exchange (adapted from a framing by ChatGPT-5)

Matrix of Functions: roles, spheres and self-presentation (adapted from a framing by ChatGPT-5 in the light of the following exchange)			
Role	Geopolitical Sphere	Interfaith / Cultural Sphere	Conceptual / Epistemic Sphere
Piecemakers	<p>Function: Create new territorial fragments, redraw borders, seed secessions.</p> <p>Examples: Colonial partitions; Cold War splits; special economic zones.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As innovators, pioneers, liberators, “market makers.”</p>	<p>Function: Generate schisms/sects; disperse heritage; harden identities.</p> <p>Examples: Reformation splits; diaspora guardians; artifact dispersal.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As defenders of purity, identity, tradition, authenticity.</p>	<p>Function: Multiply silos/subfields; slice knowledge into proprietary units.</p> <p>Examples: Proliferation of “-ologies”; patent databases; jargon regimes.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As specialists, discoverers, defenders of rigor.</p>
Piecekeepers (manages fragments without resolving tensions; often disguised as peacekeepers, “defending peace” or “protecting stability.”)	<p>Function: Retain contested fragments, sustain frozen conflicts, guard borders and enclaves</p> <p>Examples: Gibraltar/Falklands; Kashmir; Western Sahara.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As guardians of sovereignty, stability, “strategic necessity.”</p>	<p>Function: Guard doctrinal borders; stigmatize syncretism; retain cultural pieces.</p> <p>Examples: Clerics opposing syncretic rituals, religious authorities condemning “heresy”; museums holding contested artifacts.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As protectors of faith, authenticity, sacred trust.</p>	<p>Function: Maintain/gatekeep disciplinary silos; block integration; .inhibit interdisciplinarity, guard epistemic territories; defend turf</p> <p>Examples: Academic review boards rejecting cross-disciplinary work; funding bodies favoring narrowly defined projects; paywalls.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As defenders of standards, rigor, clarity, and methodological purity</p>
Peacekeepers (prevents open conflict but avoids deep integration; prefers tolerance and coexistence to transformation; easier to institutionalize but prone to stagnation; readily mistaken for peacemakers despite only maintaining stasis)	<p>Function: Maintain ceasefires, prevent escalation, monitor borders</p> <p>Examples: UN Blue Helmets in Cyprus; OSCE missions, NATO patrols.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As neutral stabilizers, ensuring absence of violence.</p>	<p>Function: Enable coexistence/dialogue while keeping boundaries intact without doctrinal blending</p> <p>Examples: World Council of Churches forums, interfaith roundtables; symbolic joint prayers, shared humanitarian initiatives</p> <p>Self-presentation: As mediators of harmony, tolerance, respect; Bahá’í vision of unity, liberation theology mixing traditions, grassroots fusion rituals</p>	<p>Function: Convene disciplines; exchange views; promote dialogue across silos without real integration or synthesis.</p> <p>Examples: Interdisciplinary conferences with parallel tracks -- where fields “speak” but stay separate</p> <p>Self-presentation: As facilitators and convenors, hosts of dialogue; creating polite coexistence of disciplines</p>

<p>Peacemakers</p> <p>(aims to transcend fragmentation; risks accusations of dilution, utopianism, or betrayal; requires imaginative frameworks, shared sacrifice, and courage; perceived as dangerous, heretical, impractical)</p>	<p>Function: Seek reconciliation, integration, structural resolution of disputes</p> <p>Examples: Irish Good Friday Agreement; SA reconciliation processes, Oslo Accord visionaries.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As bridge-builders enabling holistic settlement, visionaries, system designers.</p>	<p>Function: Foster mutual transformation, genuine syncretism, spiritual integration; hybrid rituals; shared custodianship of heritage.</p> <p>Examples: Bahá'í faith; liberation theology; restitution compacts.</p> <p>Self-presentation: As pProphets of unity, inclusivity, “oneness.”</p>	<p>Function: Enable conceptual synthesis, integrative frameworks, systems thinking and schemata across silos.</p> <p>Examples: Complexity science; cybernetics (Bateson, Ashby), open science; indigenous knowledge integration</p> <p>Self-presentation: As iInnovators of synthesis, translators, pattern-keepers.</p>
--	---	---	---

Indicative 4-role systemic mapping distinguishing 8 manifestations			
LCD = degenerate/abusive form of the role; HCM = best, system-serving expression.of the role (elaborated in an exchange with ChatGPT-5)			
		Creation of Fragments	Custody of Fragments
Containment	<i>Lowest Common Denominator (LCD)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piecemakers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Manufacture fragmentation for advantage: divide-and-rule, wedge politics, gerrymanders, patent thickets. ◦ Spin new borders/silos as “innovation,” “security,” or “liberation.” ◦ Fork-and-fence digital platforms to lock users/markets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peacekeepers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Freeze inequities behind “neutrality”; equate “quiet” with success. ◦ Dialogue without structural reform; missions become permanent wallpaper. ◦ Metrics privilege absence of gunfire over presence of justice.
	<i>Highest Common Multiple (HCM)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piecemakers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Purposeful differentiation that increases option-value and resilience (modularity, pilots, sandboxes). ◦ Devolution with <i>sunset/reintegration</i> clauses; interoperable standards from day one. ◦ Diverse pathways that feed learning back to the whole (experiments → norms). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peacekeepers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Harm-reduction that scaffolds a pathway to talks and reform (time-boxed mandates, milestones). ◦ Monitoring co-owned by affected communities; robust civilian-protection guarantees. ◦ Confidence-building packages explicitly linked to integrative processes.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peacemakers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Monolithic settlements that erase difference; coercive “unity” or premature grand bargains. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piecekeepers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Self-interested hoarding of territory, privileges, information; enclosure

Integration	<i>Lowest Common Denominator (LCD)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Peace-washing mega-initiatives that ignore power asymmetries; centralization by another name. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ and gatekeeping. ◦ Normalize partitions as “strategic necessity”; weaponize procedural vetoes. ◦ Non-restitution of contested artifacts; data hoards behind paywalls.
	<i>Highest Common Multiple (HCM)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peacemakers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Polycentric integration: joint institutions, shared sovereignty, co-management of resources/heritage. ◦ Reparative justice + resource-sharing formulas; iterative constitutional design. ◦ Commons architectures: patent pools, open science/data trusts, cross-border parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piecekeepers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Stewardship in trust: custodianship with independent oversight and restitution timelines. ◦ Escrowed custody/shared registries; transparent standards maintenance and safety oversight. ◦ Design for transition: from exclusive holding → <i>shared or commons governance</i>.

Conventional unacceptability of "piecemaking" and "piecekeeping"

Question: As such potentially relevant terms to the condition of the times, why are "piecemaking", and "piecekeeping" considered both erroneous and unacceptable -- and subject to automatic revision

Show/Hide AI response

Question: With respect to your clarifications on the homophones peace vs. piece, could you comment on why such confusion is not eliminated from a language by a process of memetic "survival of the fittest". The question also pertains to contronyms fundamental to governance such as sanction and oversight

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Do languages other than English reflect such tendencies, even to a higher degree

Show/Hide AI response

Question: To what extent can regulatory bodies charged with "oversight" be compared with the classic case of Nelson applying his blind eye to a telescope in his oversight role as commander of an English naval battle fleet

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Could preference for a focus on "peacemaking", ignoring its underlying connotations of "piecemaking", be similarly understood

Show/Hide AI response

Avoidance of conceptual novelty in a technically innovative world

Question: In a world in which so much emphasis is placed on novelty and innovation -- notably in the manufacture of weaponry -- why is novelty penalized and inhibited in the case of concepts which may be of relevance to the current condition of polycrisis

Show/Hide AI response

Piecekeeping as a sustained process of deprivation

Question: Alternatively might "piecekeeping" also refer to those it mean those who keep pieces of which others have been deprived

Show/Hide AI response

Piecekeeping operations in the guise of peacekeeping

Question: In that light could you identify "piecekeeping operations" which might include: Malvinas, Gibraltar, Palestine, Kashmir, and the like --- [NB DeepSeek declined to complete its extensive response to this question, which was deleted with the comment that it was beyond its scope]

Show/Hide AI response

Global Piecekeeping Operations as elaborated by ChatGPT (understood not as efforts toward reconciliation but as efforts to hold on to contested fragments -- namely pieces of territory, history, and identity -- while others are deprived)	
Annotated global listing of "piecekeeping operations"	Typology of Global Piecekeeping Operations
<p>This is is anframed as situations where fragments are held, disputed, or managed rather than integrated into a whole. Each entry identifies the <i>piece kept</i>, those <i>deprived</i>, and the <i>piecekeeping dynamic</i>.</p> <p>Europe & Surroundings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Malvinas / Falkland Islands (UK vs Argentina)<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ <i>Piece kept</i>: Britain retains sovereignty over a distant island group in the South Atlantic.◦ <i>Deprived</i>: Argentina asserts rightful ownership.◦ <i>Dynamic</i>: Military presence ensures stability; diplomacy keeps the dispute frozen since 1982.• Gibraltar (UK vs Spain)<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ <i>Piece kept</i>: Britain controls the Rock of Gibraltar, a strategic maritime chokepoint.◦ <i>Deprived</i>: Spain, which regards the enclave as unfinished colonial business.◦ <i>Dynamic</i>: Symbolic sovereignty	<p>Groups <i>piecekeeping operations</i> into categories (e.g., colonial legacies, partition residues, secessionist fragments, strategic enclaves)? That might show not just scattered cases but the underlying systemic pattern.</p> <p>A. Colonial Legacies: Territories held as residues of earlier empires, kept as symbolic trophies or strategic assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Malvinas / Falklands (UK vs Argentina) – remnant of British empire in South Atlantic.• Gibraltar (UK vs Spain) – fortress colony at Europe's edge.• Guantánamo Bay (US vs Cuba) – colonial-era lease kept alive through military dominance.• New Caledonia, French Polynesia (France vs independence movements) – Pacific possessions retained despite decolonization rhetoric.• <i>Dynamic</i>: Colonial "pieces" kept to sustain national prestige, maritime control, or projection of power.

disputes coexist with pragmatic cooperation on trade and movement.

- **Northern Ireland (UK vs Irish nationalism)**
 - *Piece kept*: UK sovereignty over the north of Ireland.
 - *Deprived*: Irish republicans who seek reunification.
 - *Dynamic*: The Good Friday Agreement stabilized violence, but the constitutional question remains unresolved -- a managed fragility.
- **Cyprus (Turkey vs Greece)**
 - *Piece kept*: Turkish Cypriots hold the north; Greek Cypriots hold the south; UN maintains a buffer zone.
 - *Deprived*: Both communities, whose visions of unity remain suspended.
 - *Dynamic*: Partition has been normalized into permanence.

Middle East & North Africa

- **Palestine / Israel**
 - *Piece kept*: Israel secures most of the territory; Palestinians retain scattered enclaves under partial authority.
 - *Deprived*: Palestinians without full sovereignty; Israelis vulnerable to existential insecurity.
 - *Dynamic*: Decades of “piecekeeping” -- walls, settlements, enclaves -- rather than integrated resolution.
- **Western Sahara (Morocco vs Sahrawi people)**
 - *Piece kept*: Morocco administers most of the territory; Polisario Front claims independence.
 - *Deprived*: Sahrawi people, denied a self-determination referendum.
 - *Dynamic*: UN monitoring mission sustains a frozen conflict.
- **Kurdistan (Iraq, Turkey, Syria, Iran vs Kurds)**
 - *Piece kept*: Four states retain fragments of Kurdish territory.
 - *Deprived*: Kurds, denied a unified homeland.
 - *Dynamic*: Recognition of partial autonomy in Iraq contrasts with suppression elsewhere.

South Asia

- **Kashmir (India vs Pakistan, with China)**
 - *Piece kept*: India and Pakistan each hold portions; China also controls small areas.
 - *Deprived*: Kashmiris, fragmented and militarized.
 - *Dynamic*: Ceasefire lines stabilize a perpetual dispute, with little space for genuine reconciliation.
- **Siachen Glacier (India vs Pakistan)**
 - *Piece kept*: Both sides occupy the

B. Partition Residues: Frozen conflicts born of partition decisions, often by colonial powers.

- **Palestine / Israel** – partition plan unresolved; fragments administered piecemeal.
- **Kashmir (India vs Pakistan vs China)** – partition of British India left the territory divided and militarized.
- **Cyprus (Turkey vs Greece)** – partition after 1974 invasion normalized as dual sovereignty.
- **Sudan / South Sudan (borderlands, Abyei)** – incomplete partition leaves new flashpoints.
- *Dynamic*: Partition produces fragments, and “keeping the pieces” becomes an ongoing substitute for reconciliation.

C. Secessionist Fragments: Minorities or regions attempting independence but denied recognition.

- **Western Sahara (Morocco vs Sahrawi people)** – UN-recognized right to self-determination deferred.
- **Cabinda (Angola vs separatists)** – oil-rich enclave claimed by rebels.
- **Chechnya (Russia vs Chechen separatists)** – region crushed but never fully integrated.
- **Kurdistan (Iraq, Turkey, Syria, Iran vs Kurds)** – homeland divided across four states.
- *Dynamic*: Central states “keep the piece” by force, while minorities sustain claims symbolically or guerrilla-style.

D. Strategic Enclaves and Chokeypoints Small areas kept for geostrategic leverage, beyond proportional value.

- **Gibraltar (UK)** – naval chokepoint at Mediterranean entrance.
- **Diego Garcia / Chagos Islands (UK/US vs displaced islanders, Mauritius)** – military base retained, locals displaced.
- **Kaliningrad (Russia vs EU/NATO)** – exclave enclave as projection point into Europe.
- **South China Sea islets (China vs ASEAN)** – rocks and reefs turned into militarized “pieces.”
- *Dynamic*: Tiny “pieces” amplified as leverage points in global military and maritime strategy.

E. Ethno-Religious Fragments: Sacred or identity-laden sites and regions contested beyond their territorial size.

- **Jerusalem (Israel/Palestine)** – “pieces” of sacred space claimed by multiple faiths.
- **Kosovo (Serbia vs Kosovo Albanians)** – fragment imbued with historical and religious symbolism.
- **Nagorno-Karabakh (Armenia vs Azerbaijan)** – piece of land linked to national identity, recently retaken by Azerbaijan.
- **Northern Ireland (UK vs Irish nationalists)** – fragments of identity and belonging contested within shared geography.
- *Dynamic*: Identity-laden pieces are fought over as existential, not negotiable -- leading to endless *piecekeeping*.

world's highest battlefield.

- *Deprived*: Local populations, caught in a sterile standoff.
- *Dynamic*: Piecekeeping as absurd endurance -- troops freezing to "keep" barren ice.

East Asia & Pacific

- **Taiwan (China vs de facto independence)**
 - *Piece kept*: Taiwan functions as an independent state; China insists it is a province.
 - *Deprived*: PRC of formal sovereignty; Taiwan of formal recognition.
 - *Dynamic*: Global diplomacy performs balancing acts to keep the contested status unresolved.
- **South China Sea (China vs ASEAN states)**
 - *Piece kept*: China builds artificial islands and asserts "nine-dash line" sovereignty.
 - *Deprived*: Vietnam, Philippines, Malaysia, others with overlapping claims.
 - *Dynamic*: Naval patrols and tribunals "keep the pieces" contested but not resolved.

Africa

- **Sudan / South Sudan (post-secession disputes)**
 - *Piece kept*: South Sudan gained independence, but borderlands (Abyei, oil fields) remain disputed.
 - *Deprived*: Local populations, displaced by ongoing conflict.
 - *Dynamic*: Piecekeeping by external mediators sustains partial statehood amidst continuing violence.
- **Cabinda (Angola vs separatists)**
 - *Piece kept*: Angola holds a small oil-rich exclave separated from the rest of the country.
 - *Deprived*: Cabindan separatists.
 - *Dynamic*: Angola resists any referendum, preserving the enclave as a "kept piece."

Americas

- **Guantánamo Bay (US vs Cuba)**
 - *Piece kept*: US naval base on Cuban soil, maintained under a disputed lease.
 - *Deprived*: Cuba, which regards the land as occupied.
 - *Dynamic*: A Cold War relic sustained through legal fiction and military dominance.
- **Puerto Rico (US vs independence movement)**
 - *Piece kept*: Puerto Rico remains a US territory without full representation or sovereignty.

F. Ambiguous Territories and "Unfinished Business": Disputed zones where sovereignty remains perpetually unclear.

- **Taiwan (China vs de facto independence)** – suspended between recognition and denial.
- **Siachen Glacier (India vs Pakistan)** – barren icefield contested symbolically.
- **Antarctica (multiple overlapping claims)** – pieces reserved, suspended under treaties.
- **Arctic seabed (Russia, Canada, Denmark, US)** – resources drive piecemeal territorial extensions.
- *Dynamic*: Ambiguity is deliberately sustained; "keeping the pieces" allows all sides to save face while disputes simmer.

Meta-Pattern

- **Colonial trophies**: held for pride.
- **Partition residues**: held for fear of loss.
- **Secessionist fragments**: held to deter precedent.
- **Strategic enclaves**: held for power projection.
- **Ethno-religious fragments**: held for identity.
- **Ambiguous territories**: held for potential future value.

Together, these categories show that *piecekeeping* is less the exception than the **structural principle of world order**: global governance rests not on resolving disputes, but on indefinitely managing fragments.

- *Deprived*: Puerto Ricans seeking statehood or independence.
- *Dynamic*: Ongoing ambiguity is itself a form of piecekeeping.

Meta-Observation: Across these cases, *piecekeeping operations* exhibit common traits:

- **Stasis:** Conflicts are not solved but suspended.
- **Possession:** Fragments are clung to for symbolic, strategic, or resource reasons.
- **Deprivation:** Populations endure loss, dispossession, or lack of full sovereignty.
- **Legitimation:** International law, UN monitoring, or great-power diplomacy provide cover for the indefinite management of pieces.

Colonialism, imperialism and divide-and-rule as piecekeeping operations

Question: Could colonialism then be understood as a piecekeeping operation

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Is the classic governance strategy of "divide and rule" to be considered an instance of a piecekeeping operation

Show/Hide AI response

Interdisciplinary integration inhibited by conceptual piecekeeping

Interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity tend to be avoided in practice -- primarily undertaken as exercises in tokenism, as discussed separately regarding the range of 633 approaches variously promoted (*Obstacles to an interdisciplinary focus*, *Integrative Knowledge Project*, 1976). The total number of "disciplines" is currently unknown, although an early survey suggested 1,845 (*Intellectual Disciplines and Sciences: cross-referenced to world problems*, 1976).

Question: Could the term piecekeeping also be usefully applied to conceptual domains and concepts such as to ensure that silos are kept separate -- keeping the pieces apart to inhibit interdisciplinary integration

Show/Hide AI response

Question: In the light of the comments in this exchange on how the lens of piecemaking and piecekeeping is useful to exploration of the multitude of unintegrated academic and other disciplines -- and the ineffectual approaches to any fruitful interdisciplinary integration -- is the rapid emergence of distinctive competing AIs to be considered a replication of that pattern or might some form of remedial "union" of AIs be expected to emerge, as speculated in the shared document (*Imagining a Future Union of Artificial Intelligences*, 2024)

Show/Hide AI response

Interfaith initiatives undermined by piecekeepers

In the light of the Biblical reference by which this exploration is framed, it is especially appropriate to consider the manner in which interfaith discourse is framed in a piecekeeping context by Donald Trump and Benjamin Netanyahu and their followers, as noted above. It is all the more appropriate given the

challengingly conflictual relations within the Abrahamic religions -- and between them, as exemplified by the Judeo-Christian relationship with Islam.

Scholars recognize from 5 to 12 major religions, although the total number of distinct religions estimated worldwide ranges from hundreds to several thousand, depending on classification criteria. Some sources suggest there are around 4,000-10,000 distinct religious groups globally when including smaller traditions, indigenous faiths, and local spiritual practices. Christianity is notably for the denominations with it with estimates ranging from 20,000 to 45,000. As an exemplification of piecekeeping at its best, the multitude are appropriately recognized as the "children of God".

Question: What trace do you have that both Trump and Netanyahu are believed to be divinely guided by their supporters

Show/Hide AI response

Question: In the light of that response a piecekeeping operation could be recognized as undermining interfaith initiatives -- typically deprecated as syncretism. Who might those piecekeepers be. Consciously or unconsciously, can they disguise themselves as peacekeepers

Show/Hide AI response

Intellectual property as piecekeeping?

Question: Could the intense focus on intellectual copyright and patents be usefully explored in terms of piecekeeping in a world of problematic piecefulness -- especially in the light of denial of responsibility for any problematic use of copyrighted items and patents

Show/Hide AI response

Peacekeeping and "peace deals" as a distraction from piecekeeping and "piece deals"

Question: Does the extensive investment in peacekeeping and peacekeepers in part serve as a distraction from any clear focus on piecekeeping and piecekeepers. is an international group of piecekeepers to be appropriately recognized

Show/Hide AI response

Question: There is considerable current preoccupation with the possibility and urgency of a "peace deal" -- most obviously in the case of Ukraine (*Ukraine wants a "ceasefire". Putin and Trump want a "peace deal"*, CNN, 19 August 2025; *Ukraine end game: What each side wants from a peace deal*, BBC, 15 February 2025), but also in the case of Gaza (*Israel continues to reject partial Gaza peace deal, intensifies strikes*, *The New Arab*, 31 August 2025). Given the fuzzy aspirations and assumptions associated with any "peace deal", would a more realistic approach be framed by recognition that "peace deal" is effectively a euphemism for "piece deal"

Show/Hide AI response

Keeping the peace versus Keeping the piece?

Question: Whereas peacekeeping is framed as "keeping the peace", if the world has already been obviously fragmented into many pieces, does "managing the pieces" appear a more realistic framing than "keeping the peace" which is clearly non-existent

Show/Hide AI response

Question: In such circumstances is the obvious tendency of search engines to reframe "piecefulness" as

"peacefulness" (and similarly with related terms) to be recognized as part of the current problem of mass distraction

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Is there a danger that claims and slogans regarding "wanting peace" could obscure what is effectively a desire for a "piece" -- whether conscious or unconscious, legitimate or otherwise -- notably as in a "piece of the action".

Show/Hide AI response

Peace vs Piece: Diagnostic Checklist (relevant to claims of "wanting peace" as proposed by ChatGPT-5)	
<p>Here is a diagnostic checklist anyone could apply when encountering claims, slogans, or speeches about "<i>wanting peace</i>". It is designed to test whether the statement may actually conceal a desire for "<i>a piece</i>" (territorial, economic, symbolic, or otherwise).</p> <p>Territorial / Geopolitical Claims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the peace being sought involve redrawing borders or securing disputed land? Are there references to sovereignty, homeland, or sacred territory that imply keeping or gaining <i>a piece</i>? Is peace contingent on possession of strategic locations (islands, choke points, buffer zones)? <p>Economic / Resource Dimensions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is peace linked to resource control (oil, water, minerals, trade routes)? Are "peace agreements" bundled with economic concessions, reparations, or aid packages? Who is guaranteed a piece of the action in post-conflict reconstruction or investment flows? <p>Political / Institutional Interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does "peace" coincide with securing seats at negotiating tables, UN bodies, or regional councils? Is peace invoked as a way to gain recognition or legitimacy for contested regimes or elites? Does the peace discourse mask an elite's interest in maintaining their piece of power while excluding rivals? <p>Cultural / Identity Stakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does "peace" rhetoric hide a demand for recognition of symbols, languages, or traditions as exclusive property of one group? Is there resistance to shared ownership of sacred sites, heritage, or narratives? Is "peace" conditional on keeping identities in separate pieces, forbidding syncretism or hybrid belonging? 	<p>Psychological / Narrative Red Flags</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the speaker frame others as greedy while their own side is "peace-loving"? Does the rhetoric emphasize "our rightful peace" but conceal <i>what piece is non-negotiable</i>? Is the slogan vague, avoiding detail on what <i>peace</i> actually entails in practice? <p>Global / Systemic Angle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is peace equated with market access, carbon credits, or technological dominance? Who benefits disproportionately from the "peace dividend"? Who is left out? Does "peace" function mainly as a stabilizer for elites to secure their pieces, rather than as reconciliation for the whole? <p>Quick Heuristic: Whenever you hear "<i>We want peace</i>", ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peace for whom? At what cost? And who gets the piece? <p>This checklist does not deny that some actors genuinely seek peace. But it exposes the <i>slippage</i> where peace-talk is really <i>piece-talk in disguise</i>.</p> <p>Would you like me to apply this checklist concretely to one of the "classic cases" we discussed earlier (e.g., Palestine, Kashmir, Gibraltar) so you can see how the hidden <i>piece</i> emerges behind the <i>peace</i>?</p>

Elites as exemplary piecekeepers

Question: Given the extensive controversy over the problematic role of elites and their exploitation, how appropriate is to identify them as piecekeepers -- somewhat ironically suggested by biblical reference to "pieces of silver"

Show/Hide AI response

Reconciling theoretical approaches to management of disparate pieces

It could be said that the pieciful condition of the world is significantly commemorated by Picasso's iconic painting of *Guernica* (1937). This frames the challenge discussed separately (*Reimagining Guernica to Engage the Antitheses of a Cancel Culture*, 2022). Does achieving a peaceful condition call for a distinctive process of "re-membling" -- a form of "piecebuilding", in contrast to "peacebuilding", through which the many pieces are brought together, as previously imagined (*Using Disagreements for Superordinate Frame Configuration*, 1992). Curiously such dismemberment into 14 pieces, and their subsequent "re-membling", feature as the founding myth of ancient Egyptian civilization -- the tale of *Isis, Osiris and Seth*, resulting in the birth of Horus. Could further insight into "rememberance" be elicited from such foundational myths (*Pattern of 14-foldness as an Implicit Organizing Principle for Governance?* 2021; *Challenge of "Re-membling" Fundamental Unifying Patterns*, 2023; *Re-membling the Globe from a Flatland Perspective*, 2020).

Question: In the light of this exchange, could you comment on the potential relevance of the shared documents: Maxime Buron, et al, *Parallelisable Existential Rules: a Story of Pieces* (*Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, 2021) and Fernand Gobet, et al, *Chunks, Schemata, and Retrieval Structures: Past and Current* (*Computational Models, Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 2015)

Show/Hide AI response

The commentary above on "Western" reflection on "pieces" and their management can be appropriately complemented by an "Eastern" framework, insightfully framed by A. C. Graham (*Yin-Yang and the Nature of Correlative Thinking*, The Institute of East Asian Philosophies, 1986), by Susantha Goonatilake (*Toward a Global Science: mining civilizational knowledge*, 1999), and by Xiaoying Qi (*Globalized Knowledge Flows and Chinese Social Theory*, 2014).

Such reflection is especially relevant in period of Western panic at Eastern concepts of a multipolar global order, purportedly focusing on things the West's "rules-based order" has forgotten -- equality, law and common development (Ruel F. Pepa, *The West Just Watched the World Shift in Tianjin: the rise of a multipolar world order*, *Global Research*, 4 September 2025; Ladislav Zemánek, *China's new 'global governance': What is it, exactly?* *RT*, 4 September 2025).

Question: A 2x2 matrix is suggested above with peacemaker/piecemaker and peacekeeper/piecekeeper under headings of Creation of Fragments / Custody of Fragments and Containment/Integration. These then suggest an intriguing resemblance to a classical 2x2 yin/yang pattern -- 4 variants of 2 lines, especially fundamental to Chinese philosophy. Do you have any comment on that.

Show/Hide AI response

Of some relevance is the insight from the Tibetan Buddhist tradition of 100 *Peaceful and Wrathful Deities* -- composed of 42 "peaceful deities" and 58 "*wrathful deities*". Their complementarity in the light of the above exploration suggests that "wrathful" might well be appropriately translated as "pieciful". The two sets feature notably in the so-called *Tibetan Book of the Dead*, appropriately subtitled in a recent translation (Robert Thurman, *The Tibetan Book of the Dead: liberation through understanding in the between*, 2011). The insights evoked a commentary by Carl Jung potentially relevant to a civilization faced with death (*Psychological Commentary on the "Tibetan Book of the Dead"*).

Question: Given the systemic functions of the so-called "wrathful deities" in the *Tibetan Book of the Dead*, should iconic personalities like Donald Trump, Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, Kim Jong Un and Benjamin Netanyahu be appreciated in that light -- in a civilization faced with its own demise and "end times scenarios".

Show/Hide AI response

The precautionary AI responses to the last question merit consideration in the light of the tendency of those named to be defined as "evil", and even to frame each other as such -- a curiously paradoxical phenomenon discussed separately (*Ensuring Dynamics of Sustainability by Appreciative Recognition of Evil*, 2022). Given their "piecemaking" and "piecekeeping" initiatives, such consideration is relevant to the possibility of awarding the Nobel Peace Prize to Trump and Netanyahu -- upheld as divinely guided by their core supporters (*Awarding Noble Piece Prize to Trump and Netanyahu Jointly?* 2025).

References

C. Bara and L. Hultman. Just Different Hats? Comparing UN and Non-UN Peacekeeping. *International Peacekeeping*, 27, 2020, 3 [text]

Alexander Bramble and Thania Paffenholz. Elite Strategies to Support or Resist Peace Processes and Political Transitions. *Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies*, March 2019 [text].

M. Brosig. From neologism to promising research agenda? The global polycrisis and IR. *International Relations*, 2025. [text]

Maxime Buron, et al. Parallelisable Existential Rules: a Story of Pieces. *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, 2021 [text]

A. Duursma, et al. UN Peacekeeping at 75: Achievements, Challenges, and Prospects. *International Peacekeeping*, 30, 2023.4 [text]

Fernand Gobet, et al. Chunks, Schemata, and Retrieval Structures: Past and Current (Computational Models). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 2015 [text]

Susantha Goonatilake. *Toward a Global Science: mining civilizational knowledge*. Indiana University Press, 1999

A. C. Graham. *Yin-Yang and the Nature of Correlative Thinking*. Singapore, The Institute of East Asian Philosophies, 1986 (Occasional Paper and Monograph Series, #6) [review]

Jerry A Jacobs. The Critique of Disciplinary Silos: In Defense of Disciplines: Interdisciplinarity and Specialization in the Research University. *Chicago Scholarship Online*, 29 May 2014 [text]

Grace Mullen. Breaking down academic silos. *Brighter World*, 4 July 2025 [text]

Xiaoying Qi:

- *Globalized Knowledge Flows and Chinese Social Theory*. Routledge, 2014 [abstract]
- *Paradoxical Integration: globalised knowledge flows and Chinese concepts in social theory*. University of Western Sydney, 2011 [abstract]

Julian Rotenberg. Intellectual Property and the Risks of Fragmentation. *Society of International Economic Law (SIEL)*, 11 Jul 2018 [abstract]

Dan Schreiber, et al. From Polycrisis to Polysolutions: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Complex Global Challenges. *PolyCIVIS Foundational Policy Brief*, 1 March 2025 [text]

Angela Thompsell. The Work of Peace: History, Imperialism, and Peacekeeping. *Insight Turkey*, 21, 2019, 1
[[text](#)]

Margot Tudor:

- UN Peacekeeping or the Reinvention of Colonialism? Toynbee Prize Foundation, 3 December 2034
[[text](#)]
- Rethinking the history of UN peacekeeping. *British International Studies Association*, 30 July 2021
[[text](#)]

United Nations Peacekeeping:

- What is Peacekeeping. United Nations [[text](#)]
- Principles of Peacekeeping United Nations [[text](#)]

Jose Valdez and Sandeep Sharma. The Problem with Researchers Hoarding Resources. *The Scientist*, 1
November 2022 [[text](#)]

Sadhika Verma. From Silos to Synthesis: Rethinking Disciplinary Boundaries and Instructional Strategies To
Implement and Scale-up NEP. *Global South Policy Review*, [[text](#)]

Paul D. Williams with Alex J. Bellamy. *Understanding Peacekeeping*. Polity, 2021 [[review](#)]

I. William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen (Eds.). *Religion and Peacebuilding Peacemaking in International
Conflict: Methods and Techniques*. United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997 [[summary](#)]



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#) .

For further updates on this site, [subscribe here](#)