

POINT OF VIEW

THE GEOPOLITICS OF EDUCATION FOR PEACE

JOHAN GALTUNG

Keynote, seminar “Education for peace – the path to a common Euro-Atlantic security” Partnership for Peace and Outreach Committee of Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers (CIOR) – NATO, Bucharest 9-13/10/2013

The Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers, commonly referred to by its French acronym CIOR, represents the interests of over 1.3 million reservists across 36 participating nations within and beyond NATO, making it the world's largest military reserve officer organization. “Partnership for Peace and Outreach Committee” holds an annual workshop or seminar for CIOR member countries or for Partner members, which are held in respective countries. These activities are designed to develop knowledge and understanding of the Alliance, as well as to gain a better understanding of the structures and organizations of reserve forces and associations within the Alliance.

Seminar “Education for peace – the path to a common Euro-Atlantic security” was hosted by the *Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers*, Romanian Association of Reserve Officers with the support of the Romanian Ministry of National Defense (www.cior.net).

JOHAN GALTUNG – Professor of peace studies (at universities including Columbia/New York, Oslo, Berlin, Belgrade, Paris, Santiago de Chile, Buenos Aires, Cairo, Sichuan, Ritsumeikan/Japan, Princeton, Hawaii, Tromsø, Bern, Alicante/Spain), mathematician, sociologist, political scientist and the founder of the discipline of peace studies. Founder of the *International Peace Research Institute*, Oslo (1959) and *Journal of Peace Research* (1964), founder and rector of the TRANSCEND Peace University (2000), the world's first online Peace Studies University, of the TRANSCEND University Press (2008), founder and director of TRANSCEND International, a global non-profit network for Peace, Development and the Environment, founded in 1993, with over 500 members in more than 70 countries around the world.

He has mediated in over 100 conflicts between states, nations, religions, civilizations, communities, and persons since 1957. His contributions to peace

theory and practice include conceptualization of *peace-building, conflict mediation, reconciliation, nonviolence, theory of structural violence, theorizing about negative vs. positive peace, peace education and peace journalism*.

Author or co-author of more than 1600 articles and over 160 books on peace and related issues, including *Peace By Peaceful Means* (1996), *Macrohistory and Macrohistorians* (with Sohail Inayatullah, 1997), *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means* (1998), *Johan uten land* (autobiography, 2000), *Transcend & Transform: An Introduction to Conflict Work* (2004, in 25 languages), *50 Years – 100 Peace and Conflict Perspectives* (2008), *Democracy – Peace – Development* (with Paul Scott, 2008), *50 Years – 25 Intellectual Landscapes Explored* (2008), *Globalizing God* (with Graeme MacQueen, 2008), *The Fall of the US Empire – and then what* (2009), *Peace Business* (with Jack Santa Barbara and Fred Dubee, 2009), *A Theory of Conflict* (2010), *A Theory of Development* (2010), *Reporting Conflict: New Directions in Peace Journalism* (with Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick, 2010), *Korea: The Twisting Roads to Unification* (with Jae-Bong Lee, 2011), *Reconciliation* (with Joanna Santa Barbara and Diane Perlman, 2012), *Peace Mathematics* (with Dietrich Fischer, 2012), *Peace Economics* (2012), *A Theory of Civilization* (forthcoming 2013), and *A Theory of Peace* (forthcoming 2013).

As a recipient of over a dozen honorary doctorates and professorships and many other distinctions, including a Right Livelihood Award (also known as Alternative Nobel Peace Prize), Johan Galtung remains committed to the study and promotion of peace (www.transcend.org).

60 years of peace theory and peace practice can be summarized in

$$\text{PEACE} = \frac{\text{EQUITY X HARMONY}}{\text{TRAUMA X CONFLICT}}$$

Four theory foci, four policy tasks, and four education topics.

Any true education should prepare for practice, guided by general theory. Moving from denominator right to numerator left, this means:

- mediating acceptable and sustainable conflict solutions;
- conciliating parties locked in traumas from the past;
- empathizing with all parties divided by social/world fault-lines;
- building cooperation for mutual and equal benefit.

Mediation is verbal, based on dialogues with the parties, but the four tasks are very concrete, practical, for doers not only talkers, for practical people like officers. Hence the Big Question: is peace theory-practice-education *compatible with the military mind* – however defined, and there are many military cultures in the world – or not?

Thinkers so diverse as Nietzsche and Gandhi saw the military as exemplary because of the *esprit de corps* and willingness to sacrifice, even their own lives. For Gandhi the *kshatriya* (military) caste was a model: he wanted *non-violent warriors*, with the same perseverance, also indispensable in mediation.

Advance, but *secure the retreat*, has a mediation parallel: do not propose any solution, any action that cannot be reversed. However well intended, you may be wrong.

The leading military genius of the last century: Vo Nguyen Giap, a historian who just passed away in Hanoi at the age of 102. Late 1989 I had a long conversation with “mon général”, about the victory over the French, then the Americans, and a draw with the Chinese. His answer: against the Vietnamese an enemy has to fight the whole population, not only “military age males”; against Vietnam an enemy has to conquer every self-sufficient part, no domino effect from a “capital” only; and Vietnamese history is 2000 *of* years training with the Chinese. Well, he had to coordinate all that; ending with much peace.

Second Big Question: is peace *compatible with the civilizations*?

Problematic for a West that colonized the world and for US global hegemony; problematic for all empires, including the Soviet and the *han* Chinese to their neighbors. And for Japan slow on reconciliation. Less for Islam – islamism can be seen as defensive against Western secularism. And much less for buddhism, except as state religion. But states, except for the biggest, are declining in salience, so is blind patriotism willing to fight any war. Still problematic is a West and USA, seeing itself as too superior, exceptional for civilization dialogues among equals. They will learn; the alternative is isolation.

Like military, mediators think in terms of the intentions, capabilities and circumstances for all parties, adding to violent behavior and attitudes of hatred the incompatibilities between their values and interests; goals in short. Our experience: there is no party without some legitimate value or interest; even if it collides with somebody else’s, our own for instance. Build on it, creatively.

The mediation road passes via the search for some minimum changes in reality so that the legitimate goals of all parties are reasonably met for better relations; the military road often passes through a maximum change in other party – death – so that he gives up his pursuit of goals standing in our way. Mediators try to connect, to bridge the good on all sides; the military mind may try to force incapacitation in the other. A key problem: mediators build on the good, legitimate in all parties, searching for new bridges, to cement relations. But military bullets are not smart enough to hit only the bad and save the good but kill the whole person; irreversibly, by the way. Hence, if some violence is deemed indispensable, make it non-lethal, please.

But more recently military also stand in-between to prevent killing, keeping peace. Peacekeeping bridges mediation and military mind-sets and all civilizations are in it. A great learning experience.

Add to the military expertise; police, nonviolence, mediation skills; make them so numerous as to constitute a blue carpet between the parties, not only blue caps; 50% women, add nurses, doctors, food delivery, add humanitarian components

to the R2P. But all such skills have to be taught and trained and learnt; the skills are not innate.

Now, a second look at the formula in the light of the above.

Peace is based on equitable, relatively horizontal, relations. Can a traditional vertical army be good at that? The question underestimates the huge amount of horizontal military cooperation; between allies, branches of the forces, commanders at the same level, between rank and file soldiers; in real crisis between all of them.

Peace is based on empathy, deep understanding of all parties. Sun Tzu made this a basic part of the military mind; what is new would be the search for strengths, the good, rather than for weaknesses, the bad, in others – and the other way round for oneself. Very similar.

Peace is based on reconciliation, on clearing the past, on building a future. Recent experience points to veterans on both sides being better at this than politicians, sharing how it looked from the other side, questioning the wisdom of the war. Veterans, go ahead.

Peace is based on identifying the underlying conflict, searching for solutions rather than engaging, taking on, the other side in a violent search for victory; solution-orientation rather than victory-orientation. But in this there is also victory, of *peace* over *war*. The military on all sides could engage in dialogue with the problem in a joint search for solutions rather than in violent encounters. The enemy may not be the other side but the ‘idea’ of an enemy. There are gaps, but they are not unbridgeable. Dedication is needed, added to skills and knowledge, training; very well known to the military.

The UN has opened for the same person to wear two caps: a blue UN beret, and the helmet of his own army. *Generals: we are on the way.*