

**DISCLAIMER:**

*This is a copy of Evelyn Voigt's rough notes from the conference - transcribed into the computer during the 2007 Civilian Peace Service conference at Saint Paul University. EMPHATICALLY: These notes are neither complete, nor accurate. As such, they are definitively NOT for quotation. Please use them only for personal reference and to get a sense of the discussion that took place or the presentation made.*

***Peace as a Profession in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century***

**Conference Dates: April 3 to 5, 2007**

**Third in a Series of Workshops and Consultations**

**Saint Paul University, 223 Main Street, Ottawa, Ontario**

**Sponsored by: CPSC (Civilian Peace Service Canada)  
(In Cooperation with CICR – Canadian Institute for Conflict Resolution; Conflict Studies Program, Saint Paul University; CIIAN – Canadian International Institute of Applied Negotiation; McMaster Centre for Peace Studies; TRANSCEND International Institute)**

**Tuesday, April 3, 2006**

**7:00 – 8:30 pm**

**KEYNOTE PRESENTATION:**

***Peace as a Profession in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century; Characteristics and Implications***

**By Johan Galtung, founder and co-director TRANSCEND**

Prior to his key note presentation, Dr. Galtung circulated a document entitled: **“Solving the Conflicts: There is no Alternative”**. His paper follows in its entirety:

“The USA is involved in many conflicts. The focus here is on possible solutions for four of them: Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Terrorism. But first some words on the difference between conflict dynamics, and conflict resolution and transformation.

Conflict dynamics is crucial. Conflicts have a tendency to broaden in domain by adding more actors, and deepen in scope by adding more goals. Conflicts align actors by polarization into blocs (alliances) pitted against each other, and align goals by fundamentalization under labels like freedom, faith. Conflicts escalate, broadening and deepening the violence. Thus, terrorism (civilians killing civilians) and state terrorism (military killing civilians) are added to wars (military fighting military) and guerrillas (civilians fighting military). These are awesome processes that should be met with peace-building, depolarization, humanization of the other side, de-escalation.

But even more crucial is solving the conflicts, or at least transforming them into conflicts that cover basic aspects of the original conflicts. Toward this end conflicts must be understood in terms of the actors (almost never only 2!), their goals and the clashes among goals and actors. Then comes the sifting of illegitimate from legitimate goals, and

– the difficult part – the efforts, through dialogue, to bridge the gaps between legitimate goals: Constructively, Concretely, Creatively. The 3 Cs.

There is a basic problem from the very beginning: US goals, and the means used to realize them. The goal “national interest” is as such legitimate, but to realize it at the expense of other nations’ interest, human interests, nature’s interest and world’s interests is not. It is at best counter-productive because of the resistance it creates, at worst illegitimate, even in the sense of illegal (like the attack in and on Iraq).

But that does not imply that goals like human rights and democracy in Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and the Middle East in general are illegitimate, even if the way of realizing them, through war and violence in general, are. If democracy implies decision-making by everybody affected by the decision, then to go to war is the epitome of being anti-democratic. And, if the most important human right is the right to life, then killing indeed infracts human rights. This applies to terrorism as much as to state terrorism, to guerrillas as much as to wars. There is the idea that in an imperfect world a small war may settle big problems, but that clearly does not apply to the four cases. There are other ways, and they also pass through deep dialogues about the meaning of all these goals in non – Western societies.

From this it does not follow that quitting, pulling out of one, two , three or all four wars is the solution. That is only de-escalation, a useful necessary condition. To be against the wars is morality, no policy, not conflict resolution. It only changes the goal from winning to not losing. Stay vs. Quit is a very poor conflict menu. More than quitting is needed, some X. What follows are efforts to spell out X, all based on extensive dialogues with many parties.

I. **AFGHANISTAN.** Pull out and facilitate such processes as:

1. A ceasefire with no winner and a coalition government, with Talibans, after a process of negotiation.
2. A high level of autonomy to all major parts of Afghanistan, possibly as an Afghan federation.
3. Priority to the basic needs of the people, food, housing, clothing, health and education.
4. A conference, later and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Central Asia, OSCCA, with all neighbouring Muslim countries, in the longer run as a Central Asian Community, possibly as a confederation.
5. All belligerent foreign troops out, basing security on the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) in cooperation with the UN Security Council (UNSC) with its legitimacy deficit having four Christian and one Confucian country as veto powers.
6. An ongoing dialogue on gender between Qur’anic readings, as opposed to tribal and fundamentalist practices.

II. **USA-UK/ IRAQ.** Pull out and facilitate X1-X9:

X1: a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Middle East, CSCME, modeled on the Helsinki conference 1973-5, with Iraq, Iran, Kurdistan, Israel/Palestine on the agenda; all inextricably linked. A ceasefire is not a condition to get started, but would be helpful.

X2: the UN Security Council alone cannot keep Iraq secure and stable given the absence of Muslim veto powers, and inhuman sanctions against Iraq. OIC, parliamentary democracies like Turkey and Indonesia, European non-belligerents – France, Germany, Spain, Belgium – and India might help.

X3: Iraq is fact and fiction, with centripetal and centrifugal forces. Iraq as a unitary state is not a goal in itself. A federation, or even confederation, an “Iraqi Community”, would be more realistic.

X4: Iraqi Kurds should be free to develop their relations with Kurds in Syria, Turkey and Iran, with human rights and some autonomy in all four, and as open borders as possible. The totality of these autonomies could be “Kurdistan”. Guarantees for Turkmen are essential, with Turkish cooperation.

X5: Iraqi Shia Arabs should be free to develop their relations to Shia Arabs in Iran (Khuzestan), with a similar flexible model.

X6: Iraqi Sunnis (4 out of 18 provinces, but all are mixed) might be supported internationally, given insufficient oil revenue and deeply rooted conflicts with both Kurds and Shias.

X7: Self-determination serves better than borders imposed by foreigners, and autonomy forces will only grow if resisted.

X8: A process of Truth and Reconciliation, with a fact-finding commission broadly composed, not only USA-UK and Iraq.

X9: The USA-UK should summon the decency:

- To apologize unconditionally for the attack and its aftermath;
- To compensate for civilian and military, coalition and Iraqi, human and material, damages due to the war. Waiting for this miracle, the task passes to the decent elements of the world.

To stay the present course in Iraq and Afghanistan exacerbates the situation at great costs to US national interests. The costs in change the course are minor relative to the gains. To call that “unrealistic” because the USA disagrees is like calling the advice to quit smoking unrealistic because the smoker objects.

### III. USA-UK vs. IRAN:

The keys are in subtexts rather than texts.

- (1) Texts highlight uranium enrichment and IAEA inspection might be helpful. But why should Iran submit when Israel, India and Pakistan have enriched up to weapons grade and gotten away with it? Unless USA reverses its Israel-India policy, demanding inspection also of itself, like it did during the 1962 Cuba crisis by the tit-for-tat of taking US missiles out of Turkey.
- (2) The spiritual poverty of the West shows up in Bush and Blair not acknowledging the CIA-MI6 1951-53 overthrow of an elected prime minister with 25 years’ support of Shah autocracy; calling for a fact-finding historical commission to prepare an apology. Nor did Bush-Blair accept the invitation by then Iran

president Khatami to a high level open dialogue, also using the Spanish-Turkish-UN Alliance of Civilizations. Recognition of some truths is needed to clear the past before turning to the pragmatics of a cooperative future, e.g. about alternatives to fossil fuels.

- (3) Exchange (1) FOR (2), and negotiations might also open for what kind of Israel Iran might recognize, like the Israel of 4 June 1967, like the present tit-for-tat with North Korea.

The onus is on the West. Only the weak cannot admit mistakes. Is Anglo-America strong enough? “.

(End of Handout)

### **ACTUAL KEYNOTE PRESENTATION:**

*Peace as a Profession in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century; Characteristics and Implications*

**By Johan Galtung, founder and co-director TRANSCEND**

I will begin with the chart shown here. This chart has taken me 50 years of work. You will get it in five minutes.

Diagnosis. Prognosis. Therapy : a wedding between theory and practise; a peace chest; a chest of tools.

Nine sub-divisions of department of peace

1. **research**
2. **Till the soil for peace.** Peace culture. Structure. Needs. Rights. Dignity.
3. **Goal restraint.** Very underdeveloped field in peace studies. Even if the sky is the limit, we might be interested in understanding... And consequence analysis
4. **Mediation** – a method based on dialogue...means asking questions. Don't declare. Elicit.
5. **Mapping** (who are parties. Goals. Clashes. If you fail anyone, then you are not worthy of entering the field. If you assume there are only two parties, then you are wrong.
6. **Prognosis.** There are various hormones involved. My favourite hormone is endorphins – create a cascade of endorphins.
7. **Peace building,** Jacobson a world specialist.... not weapons as peace enforcement.
8. **Conciliation:**
9. **Creating self-sustaining virtual cycle of peace** (mostly that is what we have. Conversation, small gifts, and create small cycle of virtue

The meat on the table: the three columns. Inside, outside, and in between. The key is in-between.

# Peace by Peaceful Conflict Transformation: A TRANSCEND Model

Johan Galtung, professor dr.hc.mult

Diagnosis and prognoses of conflict without intervention		I. Inner narrative: Diagnosis-prognosis	II. Outer narrative: Diagnosis-prognosis	III. Between narrative: Diagnosis-prognosis	IV. Interventions: To prevent negative prognoses
<b>DIAGNOSIS</b>	1) Context	<b>Culture</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Research</b>
	2) Deep ABC triangle	Deep Attitudes = deep culture = collective subconscious - cultural violence	Deep Behavior = deep nature = basic needs - nature violence	Deep contradictions = deep structure = infra structure - structural violence	Needs Rights Dignity  Satisfaction  Peace Culture Peace Structure
	3) Goal production	Values (actors): Actor conflict	Goals - compatible - indifferent - incompatible	Interests (parties): Structural conflict	Goal restraint Consequence analysis
	4) Conflict Surface ABC triangle	Attitude (meta-conflict) Empathy <b>ACCEPTABILITY</b>	Behavior (meta-conflict) Nonviolence <b>+ NO VIOLENCE</b>	Contradiction (root-conflict) Creativity <b>+ SUSTAINABILITY</b>	Mediation Dialogue: - Mapping - Legitimizing - Bridging  = SOLUTION
<b>PROGNOSIS</b>	5) First order consequences	Frustration Negative - cognitions - emotions	Frustration Negative - speech - behavior	Apathy Low participation	Anger Transformation Anger control
	6) Second order consequences	Polarization Dehumanization Attitudinal polarization	Polarization Dehumanization Behavioral polarization	Polarized structure: Two blocs, Cold war	Peacebuilding Depolarization Humanization
	7) Third order consequences	Aggression Escalation of hatred: Self-destructive	Aggression Escalation of violence: Other-destructive	Self-sustained vicious cycles of violence: Hot war	Non-violence Soft Peace-keeping
	8) Basic consequences	Trauma to self Healing and closure	Trauma to other Healing and closure	Destruction Vertical Empty	Conciliation - Past cleared - Future together
	9) Producing vicious cycles	War culture: Winner goal: More Glory Loser goal: Revenge, revanche	War behaviour: - Aggressive speech - Body language - Behaviour	War structure: - Vertical - Filled with obedience	Creating self-sustaining Virtuous cycles of Peace

**THERAPY**

**First:** Anglo-American diagnosis of conflict: It has bad behaviour and probably bad attitudes. The basic assumption here is that violence is due to unresolved conflict. Where you have violence, underneath you have unresolved conflict. Don't try and pin conflict on one party. Pin it on the relationship between the two parties. For example, 9-11 is based on something in the relationship between Saudi Arabia and the States. It could be many things. Fundamental are US access to Saudi oil and the obligation of the US military to come to the assistance of the Saudi royal family in case they are attacked by their own people. Now why should they be attacked by their own people. Interesting. The Sunni are something corresponding to Protestantism vis a vis Catholicism, or Puritanism versus Anglicans. In a marriage, people take sides. They say, it is his fault, or her fault. I say, I like both of them. They haven't worked out their relationship. The need to get outside themselves, through mediation.

In the same way, Column III of the chart, the column in between, is the crucial column.

Anglo-Americans stop at column I and II. Column III is about changing society. If you think you live in the perfect environment, why should you change it? It is so easy to say everything was ok until that guy came along. Looking at the relationship is more abstract; So, more difficult.

I saw a CNN program after 9-11 in which the psychologist being interviewed was asked, "What shall parents answer when children ask difficult questions? Like the 5 year-old who asks: "Mum what have we done since they did a terrible thing like that to us?". The psychologist's suggestion was to answer: "In the world are good people and evil people. And evil people don't like good people." After the show, I wrote to the American Psychological Association and suggested they take the licence from the 45 year old psychologist and give to 5 year old.

If you try to control through a ceasefire without doing anything to solve the underlying conflict, I guarantee that violence will break out again -- like the so-called peace in Nepal, where nothing has been done to ten underlying conflicts. There can be no peace without handling the underlying conflicts.

Anglo-Saxon culture is rules driven, with a passion for balls, lawns, tennis courts, etc. Rulers rule by means of rules. They use rulers to draw straight lines. Wherever Anglos were, they drew straight lines. It is the only language in the world where the word ruler applies to both things. This is a very insufficient .... of culture.

Anglo Saxon culture does nothing to solve and much to control; can be extra punitive; and comes up with four very simple points:  
Somewhere in the world there is an evil country  
Somewhere in the world they are violent,  
we need to deter and crush them, to get security.  
Therefore, they have security studies ... are short on funds and long on visas, and not focused on peace.

Conflict and peace studies, in contrast, says:  
Somewhere in the world there is a very difficult country (not evil)  
It manifests itself often through violence  
There is something you can do about it,  
By solving it in a reasonably equitable way you get peace

**Tools: all non-violent.**

**Question: how out of that do you make a profession?**

Three criteria:

Range of skills;

Code of conduct;

Accountability (good job, bad job, and people can say that to you. Not necessarily leading to legal liability, but to improving self)

**Government movement and the peace movement**

**Peace movement:** in their tool chest, the peace movements actually do not have very many tools. Their tools are:

Meetings

Demonstrations (yelling; crying; shouting: “Quick! Quick! Quick! Out! They are highly critical. What is missing is understanding. And they have no proposals.

If I were the government, I would show the films of protestors as often as possible, with the question: What do they contribute? And, Are you sure you want to leave the handling of peace to them?

What we need is to be:

Constructive

Conciliatory

Creative – The three C’s.

From the politician’s perspective:

They love critique. They love kicking back.

They are extremely afraid that the other side has a Plan B that might be better than theirs, and that it might come to someone’s attention.

The peace movement is very moralistic, with a human tendency towards the good, and in some cases non violent action. I find it limited.

Government: foreign office, military --

They don’t call it idealism, they call it realism: the willingness to apply force, but with reason. They talk about conflict prevention, not violence prevention. They talk about conflicts all the time, at all kinds of levels – micro, meso, macro – based on empiricism.

If the medical sciences had done that, there would have been no progress in last 2000 years. They attend elite conferences, usually with older men, where younger women

would be much more conciliatory. (However, don't give up on all old men!). They negotiate harmonized national interests. They do not try to critique national interests. Imagine if you had a profession, and 50 years ago you come up with idea that smoking causes lung cancer. Imagine you have all good bases for saying so, but smokers say it is nonsense. Does that mean you give up? No. It means that you have a truth that does not rest on popular consent. So you tell the smokers, if you want to shorten your lifespan, go ahead.

That is exactly the position we are in. That does not mean that you don't want to come to an agreement. You may celebrate the ceasefire in Sri Lanka; the Oslo process; but they are not going to bring about peace. What was the basic mistake in Oslo? They constructed it as two-party conflict: Labour party Israel, and Arafat. They left out right wing Israel and left wing Arab. They left out Hamas. And they left out ....??

So what did right wing Israel do? They killed their prime minister. What did left wing Arabs do? They sidelined Arafat. Elementary. Reductionism to two parties. What then they tried to do is incentive power.

One month ahead of 9-11, there was the Unicom solution... involving Taliban. ... Could either give 53% to Afghanistan or 73% to Argentina. Taliban preferred 73%. US reaction: "We offered you a carpet of gold. You rejected it. We give you a carpet of bombs, instead." A leading afghan then said, we don't stand a chance. The Americans will attack us in October. Which the Americans did.

### **Transcending the Conflict**

I am a realist in my brain. And idealist in my heart. I would like to navigate between the two. To do so, I need to know the world in which we are.

So what do we do? We either combine them, or we transcend them. Let's take the sincere wish for non-violence with empirical knowledge of government... We need to add something, constructive, concrete, creative. That means, in my experience, you come up with things that go beyond the conflict. You transcend the conflict, as seen by the two parties. Peru and ?? had a boarder dispute. thousands were killed. It was pedagogically interesting. Rather than fighting over the drawing of a boarder, I asked whether it was possible not to draw a boarder; to create a bi-national zone to be administered together. I was told it would take 30 years to get used to the idea and 30 more years to implement it, and thank you. Such a zone exists, and works so well it has spawned several baby zones.

**Self-sustaining Virtue Cycles:** The goal was to create a self-sustaining virtue cycles. It was outside their cognitive universe. They had been negotiation for 54 years. Mediators can propose, but never as statements, only as ideas for the parties to the conflict to work with: i.e. Could you imagine? Would it be possible? Spanish is a language that lends itself much better to mediation. English is a very bad language for mediation, and maybe should be abolished.

**AFGHANISTAN:** If you want to go to Afghanistan, what do you do?

Pull out and facilitate such processes as:

1. **A ceasefire with no winner and a coalition government, with Taliban, after a process of negotiation.** (Ask the Afghans -- they will tell you that they want to get back at the US for destroying Afghanistan in 1945. Afghanistan was not the issue around 9-11. The war on Afghanistan was already decided in advance by others.) If you do it without the Taliban, you will get corruption, etc. they tried it, they got it. They eliminated Iran's moral fibre. And there is not the slightest hope of ever winning a war in Afghanistan. In 1838 and 1878 the Brits tried it; the Soviets in 1979. ... In a conversation with Afghans, I was told, "These people are in it for the long haul. **They have time.**" "How much time?" I asked, "Before this thing with the USA is solved?" "I don't know," an Afghan replied, "but be prepared for 500 years." Try that with the US. **They have space:** the basic concept in Islam is the UMA ??? In the US. Look at the borders. Many were drawn by rulers.
2. Afghanistan is not a unitary state. It needs a high level of autonomy to all major parts of Afghanistan, possibly as an Afghan federation.
3. Priority to the basic needs of the people, food, housing, clothing, health and education.
4. A conference, later and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Central Asia, OSCCA, with all neighbouring Muslim countries, in the longer run as a Central Asian Community, possibly as a confederation. In other words, no peace in Afghanistan unless reasonable relationship with nine surrounding states.
5. All belligerent foreign troops out, basing security on the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) in cooperation with the UN Security Council (UNSC) with its legitimacy deficit having four Christian and one Confucian country as veto powers. because many of the nations come. Imagine how we would stay in the UN with 4 Muslims and a Confucian having veto power.
6. An ongoing dialogue on gender between Qur'anic readings, as opposed to tribal and fundamentalist practices. They think they have the tools to handle it.

After the US attack, all six points were negated. I would say, it was not worth the paper it was written on.

I was recently given an assignment to be part of the peace movement. I said, "I will if you permit me not to yell." The solution is not to pull out the troops. In the US debate (stay versus quit), stay means hoping to win; quit means, not wanting to lose. Not out of pacifism, but out of cowardice, and not wanting to lose. 10% of the US is against the war; 90% are against losing a war. To quit is like a doctor with a team,

facing vital signs which are going down, and saying “we quit”. No. their task is to clean it up; to do what can be done, to meet with the relatives.

#### IV. USA-UK/ IRAQ. Quit and facilitate X1-X9:

X1: a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Middle East, CSCME, modeled on the Helsinki conference 1973-5, with Iraq, Iran, Kurdistan, Israel/Palestine on the agenda; all inextricably linked. A ceasefire is not a condition to get started, but would be helpful. UK and US maybe as observers!

X2: the UN Security Council alone cannot keep Iraq secure and stable given the absence of Muslim veto powers, and inhuman sanctions against Iraq. OIC, parliamentary democracies like Turkey and Indonesia, European non-belligerents – France, Germany, Spain, Belgium – and India might help.

X3: Iraq is fact and fiction, with centripetal and centrifugal forces. Iraq as a unitary state is not a goal in itself. Give up any idea of Iraq as a unitary state. Iraq was constructed by two British civil servants, based on the need for oil from... and .... The rest was about using rulers. I can almost hear the two talking. What have we got here? They lost the proposition, which was only kept together by dictator. That is gone. To re-legitimize it create a federation, or even confederation, an “Iraqi Community”, would be more realistic.

X4: Iraqi Kurds should be free to develop their relations with Kurds in Syria, Turkey and Iran, with human rights and some autonomy in all four, and as open borders as possible. The totality of these autonomies could be “Kurdistan”. Guarantees for Turkmen are essential, with Turkish cooperation.

X5: Iraqi Shia Arabs should be free to develop their relations to Shia Arabs in Iran (Khuzestan\_, with a similar flexible model.

X6: Iraqi Sunnis (4 out of 18 provinces, but all are mixed) might be supported internationally, given insufficient oil revenue and deeply rooted conflicts with both Kurds and Shias.

X7: Self-determination serves better than borders imposed by foreigners, and autonomy forces will only grow if resisted.

X8: A process of Truth and Reconciliation, with a fact-finding commission broadly composed, not only USA-UK and Iraq.

X9: The USA-UK should summon the decency to apologize and to compensate;

- To apologize unconditionally for the attack and its aftermath;
- To compensate for civilian and military, coalition and Iraqi, human and material, damages due to the war. Waiting for this miracle, the task passes to the decent elements of the world.

It would be profoundly in their national interest to do so. And then they could look with some ... dignity into the future.

**IRAN: (See also the paragraph on Iran above, copied from Galtung’s hand out above)**

Anglo-Americans are the most self righteous race on earth.

**Sub-text, pretext, post text, deep text.**

**Sub-text...** The US hates the ruler... wants oil. If it invades Iran, it is up against something that would make Iraq look like a tea party. Iraq does not exist. Iran exists. It is 3-5000 years old, vs. a 200-year old US. That tea party would be disastrous for all of us.

**The deep text:** talk with the Iranians. Ask two questions. What is the root of the whole thing from your point of view? What is the solution? The spiritual poverty of the West shows up in Bush and Blair not acknowledging the CIA-MI6 1951-53 overthrow of an elected prime minister with 25 years' support of Shah autocracy; calling for a fact-finding historical commission to prepare an apology. Nor did Bush-Blair accept the invitation by then Iran president Khatami to a high level open dialogue, also using the Spanish-Turkish-UN Alliance of Civilizations. Recognition of some truths is needed to clear the past before turning to the pragmatics of a cooperative future, e.g. about alternatives to fossil fuels.

Chapter 8 vs. 61 of Qur'an. When your antagonist ... to peace, you should do the same. That is the virtuous cycle of peace. Why is this so impossible? And why are they willing to spend one billion to two billion dollars more to kill amazing numbers of people? Draw in the Arch Bishop of Canterbury, rather than Head of State of the country.

### **War on terrorism:**

Get rid of the word terrorism. There is a war. Divide fighters into two parts: Civilians ?? against uniform. Thus, **terrorism** (civilians killing civilians – 1%) and **state terrorism** (military killing civilians 90% --Vietnam, Korea, bombing by night, an American speciality) are added to wars (military fighting military) and guerrillas (civilians fighting military).

State terrorism constitutes 90% of the killing. Terrorism only 1% of the killing. The only difference is that the 1 % involves us.

This can be empirically guided: 9-11 Bush; 7-7 Blair; 11-3-04 Spain.

There is no such thing as a war on terrorism.

It is a syndrome of conflict.

relationship of immigrants to host

war in Iraq and Palestine

engendering conflict all over the world between Christians and Muslims

colonialism in general

special conflicts e.g. Spain and morocco

clash of civilizations .

In contrast to US, here is how Spain reacted to the attack:

Spanish: withdrew troops from Iraq (not just to save Spanish but also Arab lives)

Head of State travelled to morocco.

Did not expel the foreign minister, or expel the ambassador

Discussed the issue of the two enclaves  
Legalised about half a million illegal immigrants  
Accepted .... Organized the dialogue of .... 90... 45 from west, 45 from....  
 Hamas, Hezbollah. For the meeting, they had trimmed their beards, were  
 decently dressed. When I asked Hamas, could you recognize Israel? The  
 answer was: "Yes, within 1967 borders." He never said to OIC that they  
 should wipe Israel off the map. He said the present Zionist government's days  
 are numbered. We need a regime change. (Where have we heard about  
 regime change before.) I give him a +4. Bush and Blair score -6.

My conclusion: there will be no more bombs on Spanish soils. There could be  
 in US and UK.

**Recommend for UK:** Bring the Muslims into the political agenda. They have  
 a strong point. History did not start on 9-11. Started before that. The method  
 is conciliation. Means you have to say "We were responsible.". Not, "we  
 deeply regret that you took it that way. Better that that, keep your mouth shut.  
 2. Stop killing in Iraq.  
 3. Demonstrate what past conflict has shown us, through royal commission on  
 what happened. With these steps, Blair would go down in history with flying  
 colours.  
 4. Christianity/ Islam. How about picking the best from both of them.  
 Globalizing them. Globalization seminars. They partitioned the world between  
 them... globalize.

Veterans went to Vietnam to apologize; went to replant what  
 Agent Orange had destroyed.

My conclusion: if I say it, it will not be accepted tomorrow. But if somebody  
 doesn't say it, will not be accepted the day after tomorrow either.

=====  
QUESTIONS: how you would a self-sustaining virtuous cycle of peace work  
 in Palestine?

ANSWER: Sort out the lunatics. TRANSCEND has been working on it since  
 1964.

PLAN: not one step; not two states.

Israel is strong. Palestine is weak. Peace requires a balance. Not in military  
 terms. But social and economic. Israel has on its borders Lebanon, Syria,  
 Jordan, Egypt. Palestine is a small part of it. To solve that would create  
 pressure on others. Therefore need to involve 6 states. Open the borders, for  
 goods and services... something like the European commission. Create a  
 peace education regime. And model the European council, with heads of state.  
 The model is the European Community discussion in 1958, where it was  
 concluded that "Germany has been so atrocious that it must become part of

the family”. Brilliant solution to the terrifying problem of what to do with Germany. Germany was militarily beaten in 1945, but not morally. It took 25 more years for moral victory, for Germans to understand that its project was wrong. Israel is morally in disarray. The non-winning of the war in Lebanon. The Israeli population is sick and tired of the endless sequence of wars. So, which are the valid Israeli goals: The right to have a state with a Jewish character and the right to secure borders? You do not secure borders by bullying and tormenting. The right to a Jewish character – no argument.

1. Never use what happened in Nazi Germany as an argument against the Arabs. You cannot use what Germans did on Arabs. If you do, then you might as well take Baden Wurttemberg in Germany. It’s about the right size. Tell its citizens to get out. Tell them, we even know how to build a wall. This is not realistic.

2. Never use the fact of Israel on the ground... to justify its existence. How would I justify... reality of the myth of the chosen people of the ... land. Instead, take the borders mentioned in Numbers. The West Bank would revert to Palestine and Palestine could have two cantons in Israel... e.g. Haifa.

3. State the capital to be in Jerusalem, and their right to live there. The principle has been recognized. They could have their capital in East Jerusalem. There would be two capitals next to each other.

4. Right to return... Palestinians say, we can discuss the numbers, but then also discuss the number of Jews return. Jews will probably say never. It has been used as a tool for expansionism....Palestinians say, if you give the Israelis rights on the grounds that they were there 2000 years ago, we were in Spain less than 500 years.... So we have a right to have prayers in the Mesquite and local priest not understanding is not in Spain’s interest, and the Mexicans say... we like that.... Example.... 60 million Mexicans right to enter US... 20 million are there already.... Put that at feet of APEC since they are so keen on right to return... If you recognize as an argument Israel’s historical right to exist, then there are consequences... That process is now going on. I give it 20 years. Hard Zionism, soft Zionism, secular statism Hard Islam, soft Islam, secular statism. From that point the dialogue becomes fascinating....

Swords into ploughshares, a verse that is often quoted. What is not quoted is the verse in the Bible above it: When Israel rules over the Bedouin tribes and regulates their conflicts and makes peace among them,... etc. then they can turn their swords into ploughshares.... This has been the guiding lights for hard line Zionists.

Forget that. They will never get it. I prefer Hieronymus.... (Missed the quote...)

=====

**QUESTION:** Sentiment for peace is growing. Unless war is outlawed, there will not be a future for children... I believe that time for human demand for

peace is here, and we must assert it. What are the prospects, what is happening, and how to consolidate it?

**ANSWER:** People are yearning. I agree. There is work to do. The legal paradigm is too static. Like the Ecuador and Peru example. Don't have a border. Israel is bordered by six states. Iraq is about history, not about two states. Wishes are wonderful. But deep knowledge and constructive ideas are needed. Don't throw it on the Foreign Service to solve. Trained peace service people are better. That's a much better way than prompting the foreign office. Do it yourself. People will listen if you have good ideas.

=====  
**QUESTION:** The Norwegians brokered a cease fire... I am asking you to answer my ph d dissertation question ... do you think Canadian foreign affairs should be doing what Norwegians did in Guatemala...

**ANSWER:** Sri Lanka has not done anything bad. Governments always go to cease fires, decommissioning, and constituent assembly. Always try to avoid change. People who are suppressed by non-change, the ones who are fighting, we have to be their spokes-persons, but do it in such a way that it takes into account all parties. With the right of Tamils to have consulates abroad. Right to Tamil....(??) If India can have Tamil Nadu, Sri Lanka could do Tamil... (??). They are so afraid of terrorists. The more they withhold solutions the more they promote terrorism. The moment you have an equitable solution on the horizon , the A and B can ....

**QUESTION:** Perhaps I am cynical and naïve. How can you achieve cooperation for peace... when it is armaments manufacturers...working for accumulation of wealth, with no faith no religion and no compassion?

**QUESTION:** Critique of peace research. Peace making is a vocation, not necessarily a profession.

**ANSWER:** I agree with the sentiment behind observations on arms dealers. Have not been working enough on that one. And talking with arms producers, they say they are just suppliers responding to demand. That's not true. They create the demand. The situation becomes supply driven. Both the US and Israeli arms production is a major part of their economy. ...State Capital Corporation, ....in interest to promote. ....Take the challenge.

My chart focuses too much on negative peace; on how to avoid violence, not enough on positive peace. I should add a second chart to that one. Theoretically driven and not sufficiently practise indicative. We have much to learn from the medical profession. **Warning:** If you become professionalized, you may become so pleased with yourself and may not be open to change.

**Never propose anything you cannot undo. You may be wrong. The proposals should be soft. There should be a way back.**

Moderator: As mentioned in the introduction, Dr. Galtung was 9 years old when the Nazis entered... There are many ways of reacting. He reacted by devoting his life to peace. He has been in prison as a conscientious objector, .... Since 1955 Professor Galtung has written or edited 100 books and about a1000 articles. Founded TRANSCEND – Peace and Development network and Peace and Development University. Thank you, Dr. Galtung. You have given us a great framework for our work in the next few days.