PEACE PRESIDENT UNITED

TOWARD INNER TRANSFORMATION & CONSCIOUS GOVERNMENT

PUBLIC POLICY & PHILOSOPHY REVIEW

Congressional Peacebuilding Bill

Synopsis & PPU Philosophy Analysis

H.R. 1111 · Department of Peacebuilding Act of 2025 · 119th Congress

> **“A Department of Peacebuilding could help create the conditions for peace. Peace President United invites us to discover and awaken the peace already possible within ourselves—and to bring that consciousness into how we live, lead, and govern.”**

An examination of where the proposed legislation supports Peace President United’s vision, where meaningful differences remain, and how the two approaches might complement each other.

THE CENTRAL DISTINCTION

An examination of the legislation alongside Peace President United's philosophy and published objectives reveals substantial alignment in their goals, alongside important philosophical differences and practical questions about implementation.

In fact, PPU's *What We Do* webpage already identifies participation in efforts to establish a U.S. Department of Peace or Peacebuilding as a long-term objective. This legislation is directly relevant to that aspiration.

The central distinction is this:

> **The bill seeks to institutionalize peacebuilding within the federal government. PPU seeks something broader: awakening the consciousness, compassion, and wisdom from which genuinely peaceful leadership, citizenship, and government can emerge.**

Those two approaches are not mutually exclusive. They could be quite complementary.

1. What is the Peacebuilding Bill?

The **Department of Peacebuilding Act of 2025 (H.R. 1111)** was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 7, 2025, by Representative Ilhan Omar and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

As of November 10, 2026, the public legislative record continues to show the bill in committee. It has not become law.

The basic proposal

The legislation would create a new cabinet-level **U.S. Department of Peacebuilding**, headed by a Secretary of Peacebuilding appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Its purpose is to make the prevention of violence, peaceful conflict resolution, reconciliation, and the cultivation of conditions for peace permanent national policy priorities—not merely responses to war, crime, or social unrest.

It would operate domestically and internationally, working with government agencies, educational institutions, community organizations, researchers, and other stakeholders.

Significantly, the Secretary would sit on the National Security Council and must be consulted by the Departments of State and Defense in specified circumstances involving actual or potential conflicts. This would give peacebuilding an institutional voice in major national security discussions. [Bill §§ 101–102, 114]

What it would actually do

The proposed department would have seven principal offices:

Office	Primary responsibility
Peace Education and Training	Teach nonviolence, empathy, mindfulness, forgiveness, and conflict resolution
Domestic Peacebuilding	Reduce violence in families, schools, policing, and communities
International Peacebuilding	Support diplomacy, conflict prevention, reconciliation, and civilian peacekeeping
Technology for Peace	Explore how AI, digital technologies, communications, and scientific innovation affect peace
Arms Control and Disarmament	Promote arms reduction, nuclear risk reduction, and disarmament
Peacebuilding Information and Research	Study violence, evaluate solutions, and publicly report findings
Human Rights and Economic Rights	Address injustice, poverty, inequality, and other conditions associated with conflict

The legislation also proposes community grants, annual public measurements of progress toward peace, an advisory council, public participation opportunities, and a four-year Peace Academy with a five-year public service obligation for graduates.

Importantly, the bill calls for **at least 85% of appropriated funding to be used for domestic peace programs**, including their administrative costs. However, it specifies no fixed funding amount. Congress would still have to appropriate money. [Bill § 204]

In essence, this is an ambitious proposal to bring peacebuilding into the structure of American government, rather than treating peace as primarily a matter for diplomacy, military policy, or private organizations.

2. Where the bill strongly supports PPU philosophy

Peace as a proactive national priority

This is perhaps the strongest philosophical connection. PPU has consistently questioned why governments devote extraordinary resources to preparing for and responding to conflict while comparatively little institutional attention is directed toward understanding and preventing it.

The legislation seeks to rebalance that relationship. It makes peacebuilding a continuing responsibility rather than an occasional aspiration.

Compassion, forgiveness, mindfulness, and healing

The bill specifically includes teaching compassion, empathy, mindfulness, kindness, acceptance, and forgiveness in Section 104. It also supports trauma healing, restorative justice, and nonviolent conflict resolution.

This is significant because it recognizes some of the human qualities and practices that PPU considers essential to peaceful coexistence. These aren't simply implied; they are written into the legislation. [Bill § 104]

Addressing the roots of violence

The bill looks beyond visible acts of violence to the conditions contributing to them, including economic insecurity, injustice, trauma, fear, discrimination, and unresolved conflict.

This supports PPU's perspective that violence does not arise in isolation. Although PPU explores deeper dimensions of human conditioning and consciousness, both approaches recognize that simply reacting to violence does not necessarily address what continually produces it.

Conscious approaches to policing and community safety

Section 105 explicitly includes mindfulness, conflict de-escalation, restorative practices, and respectful community policing.

This is a particularly direct connection with PPU's existing Mindful Policing work and its broader interest in ending violence. A future department could help identify, evaluate, support, and expand successful local practices without claiming to have invented them.

Citizen participation, technology, and public accountability

Sections 102 and 107–109 create opportunities for public input, peaceful technologies, meaningful measurement, and the dissemination of successful peacebuilding practices.

These have a natural relationship to PPU's Think Tank and citizen-government communication initiatives. For example, the bill requires a public website to solicit ideas from the public and proposes annual reporting of progress toward peace.

3. Where the bill differs from, or falls short of, PPU philosophy

These are not necessarily outright philosophical disagreements. Some are important dimensions of PPU's vision that the legislation addresses only partially—or does not substantially address.

A. The distinction between peacebuilding and awakening

This is the most important difference.

The bill approaches peace primarily through programs, policies, education, institutional cooperation, and the prevention of violence. These can be tremendously useful.

But PPU explores something more fundamental: the possibility that conflict and division continually reappear because we remain deeply identified with fear, judgment, blame, greed, and the unconscious patterns of ego-consciousness.

The legislation includes mindfulness, reflection, compassion, and forgiveness, so it would be inaccurate to say it ignores inner life. Nevertheless, it does not place the deeper transformation of human consciousness at the center of its framework.

> **PPU asks not only how we can reduce violence, but what within human consciousness keeps reproducing it.**

That distinction matters because a government can become more skillful at managing conflict without its leaders—or its citizens—necessarily awakening beyond the unconscious conditioning that contributes to conflict.

B. The risk of introducing ideology into peacebuilding

The bill contains strongly worded findings and educational proposals on systemic racism, patriarchy, historical injustice, and economic inequality. These are legitimate subjects for serious research, public discussion, and efforts to remedy harm.

However, some passages, particularly Section 102(g)(1)(F), adopt a categorical interpretation of social structures rather than inviting open examination of competing interpretations.

This introduces a concern from PPU's perspective.

If peacebuilding becomes closely identified with one political or ideological framework, citizens who see the underlying issues differently may experience the department as representing a particular political worldview rather than serving the whole country.

PPU's philosophy does not require overlooking injustice or avoiding uncomfortable truths. Quite the opposite. But it invites humanity to examine those realities without turning people who disagree into enemies.

> **A department dedicated to peace should be especially careful not to reproduce the divisions it seeks to heal.**

Importantly, the bill's curriculum provisions emphasize development, distribution, grants, and incentives. They should not be inaccurately characterized as a nationwide compulsory curriculum.

C. Government-led peace versus citizen-empowered peace

The bill creates a federal institution that would consult communities, universities, nonprofit organizations, and local governments.

That is constructive. But its overall structure remains principally government-led.

PPU's Think Tank approaches this relationship differently: restoring power and trust to *We, the People*, including meaningful collective power that is not dependent entirely upon government institutions.

The distinction is between asking citizens for ideas and creating an enduring relationship in which citizens can continuously participate, evaluate outcomes, communicate concerns, and help shape public priorities.

The bill includes public input and advisory mechanisms, but it does not establish the kind of ongoing citizen-government communication envisioned through My Civic Life and related PPU initiatives.

D. Conscious leadership within government

The bill proposes a Peace Academy modeled after military service academies, with four years of instruction followed by five years of public service.

PPU's proposed Peace President Academy is a different kind of initiative: continuing education in self-awareness, emotional maturity, conscious leadership, ethical decision-making, human development, and peaceful governance for public and private-sector leaders.

These approaches could complement one another, but they should not be confused.

One question PPU brings to this legislation is especially important: What happens when those entrusted to lead peacebuilding organizations have not substantially examined their own fear, pride, need for control, ideological identification, or unconscious patterns?

Creating a Department of Peacebuilding does not automatically create conscious leadership within it.

E. Funding, effectiveness, and institutional accountability

The bill is exceptionally broad, reaching into education, domestic violence, economic policy, international relations, technology, policing, and arms control.

There is merit in recognizing how interconnected these matters are. But such breadth creates questions about overlapping agency responsibilities, implementation costs, institutional effectiveness, and political accountability.

The legislation calls for research, reporting, an inspector general, and measurement of progress. Those are positive provisions. Yet it provides no fixed budget or detailed performance thresholds for determining which initiatives deserve continued support.

Given PPU's emphasis on questioning assumptions, testing ideas, and measuring real-world results, this would be an area for constructive improvement.

4. How PPU could meaningfully strengthen the proposal

These differences need not be grounds for rejecting the bill. They point instead to opportunities for PPU to contribute a distinctive perspective.

Four additions would be particularly consistent with PPU's work:

1. **Conscious leadership development:** Encourage voluntary, nonsectarian education for elected officials, agency leadership, and public servants focused on self-awareness, emotional maturity, compassionate communication, and recognizing unconscious patterns in decision-making.
2. **Meaningful citizen participation:** Develop transparent, continuous channels through which citizens can communicate their experiences, propose solutions, evaluate initiatives, and receive feedback from the department—not simply submit suggestions.
3. **Nonpartisan and intellectually open peace education:** Preserve the teaching of nonviolence, compassion, and restorative practices while ensuring open inquiry, viewpoint diversity, and respect for people across political, religious, and cultural differences.
4. **Evidence-based local demonstration programs:** Test practical peacebuilding initiatives with willing cities and communities, publish meaningful measurements of success and failure, and expand what demonstrably works. This fits PPU's existing approach to discovering, vetting, contextualizing, showcasing, connecting, and amplifying worthwhile initiatives.

5. Overall assessment

Dimension	Alignment with PPU
Making peace a national governing priority	Very strong
Nonviolence and restorative justice	Very strong
Compassion, mindfulness, and forgiveness	Strong
Community-based violence prevention	Very strong
Disarmament and international peace	Very strong
Citizen participation and civic empowerment	Partial
Conscious leadership development	Partial
Inner awakening beyond ego-identification	Limited
Transcending political and ideological division	Mixed
Transparent measurement and public accountability	Strong foundation, needs refinement

These are qualitative judgments of philosophical alignment, not legislative or scientific ratings.

6. Conclusion: A PPU Perspective

Viewed through PPU's philosophy, this legislation offers a potentially important practical expression of peacebuilding, while not encompassing the full depth of PPU's vision.

It is noteworthy that Congress has been presented with a legislative framework acknowledging that peace deserves its own institutional attention, research, education, funding, and voice in national security decisions.

That is no small conceptual step.

But PPU introduces a question that a government department, by itself, cannot adequately answer.

Across generations, societies have created institutions to address crime, poverty, war, education, health, and national security. Extraordinary technologies and immense knowledge have also emerged. Yet many of the same human conflicts continue to recur.

Perhaps the next stage of peacebuilding requires more than better institutions and policies. Perhaps it also requires a willingness to examine the consciousness from which those institutions, policies, and our human relationships arise.

This is where PPU can make a distinctive contribution.

> **A Department of Peacebuilding could help create the conditions for peace. Peace President United invites us to discover and awaken the peace already possible within ourselves—and to bring that consciousness into how we live, lead, and govern.**

The two efforts could reinforce each other without becoming identical.

From a PPU philosophical perspective, establishing a federal Department of Peacebuilding holds considerable promise. Recognizing that potential does not require endorsing every provision; it allows space for thoughtful examination, questions, and recommendations for improvement.

That distinction is important. PPU need not adopt a party's political agenda or endorse every provision to recognize the extraordinary value of elevating peacebuilding to a national priority.

SOURCES & REFERENCE NOTES

Primary legislative source: U.S. Congress, *Department of Peacebuilding Act of 2025*, H.R. 1111 (119th Cong.), introduced February 7, 2025. Read the official bill text (U.S. Government Publishing Office).

PPU philosophy and published objectives: Peace President United — What We Do.

Legislative status reflects records available as of November 10, 2026. The discussion above is an independent interpretation of the introduced legislation in relation to PPU's philosophy; it is not a substitute for the text of the bill.