

Annex 15

TRANSCEND

Conflict Transformation Model

Annex 15

TRANSCEND Conflict Transformation Model

Peace by Peaceful Conflict Transformation: A TRANSCEND Model

Johan Galtung, professor dr.hc.mult

	I. Inner narrative: Diagnosis-prognosis	II. Outer narrative: Diagnosis-prognosis	III. Between narrative: Diagnosis-prognosis	IV. Interventions: To prevent negative prognoses	
DIAGNOSIS	1) Context	Culture	Nature	Structure	Research
	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 ACCEPTABILITY	Behavior (meta-conflict) Nonviolence + NO VIOLENCE	Contradiction (root-conflict) Creativity + SUSTAINABILITY	Mediation Dialogue: - Mapping - Legitimizing - Bridging = SOLUTION
PROGNOSIS	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

TRANSCEND: A PHILOSOPHY OF PEACE - AND ONE WAY OF ENACTING IT

- TRANSCEND: A Philosophy Of Peace – And One Way Of Enacting It
- CONFLICT INTERVENTION: Some TRANSCEND Guidelines
- CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION: A TRANSCEND Code of Conduct
- TRANSCEND: A Network For Peace And Development
- The TRANSCEND Peace University (TPU)

TRANSCEND And Future Development
TRANSCEND And Funding

To work for peace is to work against violence; by analyzing its forms and causes, predicting in order to prevent, and then act preventively and curatively since peace relates to violence like health relates to illness. Particularly important is genocide, or massive category killing, across the fault-lines in human society: nature (between humans and their environment), gender, generation, race, class, exclusion, nation, state. Whether as direct violence or as the indirect slow, grinding violence of social structures that do not deliver sufficient nutrition and health at the bottom of world society, enormous suffering, dukkha, is the effect.

To work for peace is to build sukha, liberation, well-ness in a world with peace with nature, between genders, generations and races, where the excluded are included but not by force, and where classes, nations and states serve neither direct nor structural violence. In such a world they would all pull together for better livelihood for all. That would be true globalization, unlike the present reduction of that term to represent only state and corporate elites in a handful countries. The best instrument of true globalization would be an improved United Nations, with a UN People's Assembly for global democracy, and without any veto power for privileged states, probably located where most people live, somewhere in the Third world like in Jerusalem or Hong Kong.

An improved UN would build on civil society actors--NGOs and local authorities(LAs)--and TNCs, an underutilized peace actor. The modern state system, from the "peace" of Westphalia 1648 on, has clearly been overutilized. It is a war system, giving states the right of war (except for Japan: Constitution Article 9 denies Japan that right). An improved UN would also have to learn to build on nations striving for autonomy and not privilege states.

States were not created to bring peace into the world but to satisfy "interests" defined by their elites, if necessary by war. Peace has lower priority, as seen clearly when we compare the size of the professional war and peace establishments of states. Very problematic are predatory states who see the interests located outside their own territory--euphemistically called their "sphere of interest"--and in the smaller states in their alliances. When states pretend to work for peace it is very often as a way of solidifying their sphere of interest. And even if the effort should be honest it is usually painfully clear how little they know and how amateurish their endeavors. Nothing of this, however, prevents them from claiming monopoly on peace, as also on war.

From this it does not follow that non-states, in the world civil society, both as NGOs and as LAs, the TNCs and individuals are necessarily competent. Nor does it follow that states cannot be improved, nor that states cannot often be excellent peacemakers across the other divides defined by nature, gender, generation, race, class, and exclusion; often in ways codified by that major instrument for peace, the human rights (universal, indivisible), protected by the institutions of democracy. But these two institutions are far from culturally neutral and not necessarily practiced in inter-nation and inter-state relations, at the macro level of the human construction, where state and alliance egotism seem to dominate, often supported by democratic majorities.

Hence the rise early last century (but with forerunners in the high Middle Ages) of non-state actors working for peace. There are at least three generations of such approaches, so far.

To understand them better a definition of peace = ability to handle conflict, with empathy, nonviolence and creativity may be useful, since so much violence is due to mishandling of conflict.

Conflict = Attitudes + Behavior + Contradiction; the ABC-triangle. At the root of the conflict is a contradiction, the incompatible goals. Hateful/apathetic attitudes and behavior often come later, all three stimulating each other. After some time it all crystallizes and polarizes around friend/self and foe/other,

the former being surrounded by increasingly positive, and the latter by increasingly negative, attitudes/behavior. Friend- and foe-images become megalomaniac in the inability to include anything negative in the former and paranoid in the inability to include anything positive in the latter. We can talk about personal and social pathologies bordering on collective psychoses, as we would classify an individual with similar character traits. Rationality evaporates, deep culture, often with grotesque ready-made polarization, takes over, and violence is not far away. The Cold War was a case till forces in civil society had an important depolarizing effect. So are conflicts in and around Yugoslavia.

We can use the ABC-triangle to identify deep attitudes, deep behavior and deep contradictions, assuming that they steer or at least influence the surface level of what people say they feel or think, the behavior we can observe, and the incompatible goals. "Deep" would mean subconscious, hidden, under the surface, and we could identify those three with deep culture, basic human needs, and deep structure, being structured by the eight fault-lines in the human social construction mentioned above.

We then get peace approaches by trying to change all six, the attitudes, behavior and contradictions, at the surface level and deeper down. That gives us three generations of peace approaches:

First generation of peace approaches, till the Second World War:

- A- oriented: peace movements, advocating, demonstrating;
- B- oriented: war abolition, eliminating war as social institution;
- C- oriented: global governance, globalizing good government.

The three were related, with people expressing themselves through the movements, governments searching for regional and global harmonization, and for war abolition through mechanisms of democracy, human rights and regimes. Motto for this generation: Peace is too important to leave to the generals.

Second generation of peace approaches, after the Second World War:

- A-oriented: peace education/journalism for more knowledge;
- B-oriented: nonviolence, to be able to fight, but nonviolently;
- C-oriented: conflict transformation, solving conflicts creatively.

The three are related, evolving from the first generation. People start doubting that peace ranks high among the interests pursued by governments, and doubt their capability, watching them stumble, at the brink of the abyss, through the Cold War. People start demanding research and education for peace, and turn to the streets to fight, inspired by Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., Mandela, Tutu. Patterns of people's NGO diplomacy start emerging to solve conflicts rather than waiting for governments. Motto for this generation: Peace is too important to leave to the states.

Third generation of peace approaches, after the Cold War:

- A-oriented: peace cultures, going into deep cultures if needed;
- B-oriented: basic human needs, as non-negotiable pillars;
- C-oriented: peace structures, repairing fault-lines like gender.

A search for foundations for peace below the surface, generalizing Freud-Jung (needs and culture) and Marx (needs and structure).

Motto: Peace is too important for shallow approaches.

The first generation was a reaction against war. People demanded peace through governmental cooperation, above nations and states. The second generation is a reaction against governments. People become increasingly skeptical and want to work for peace themselves. In the third generation there is a reaction against simplistic peace approaches, realizing how deep-rooted--and linked to development = satisfaction of basic needs--these problems are.

There is also another, and more dynamic, way of using conflict as a point of departure to understand peace approaches.

Conflicts have life cycles; they pass through phases. Thus, we may use violence, outbreak and ceasefire, as cut-off points:

- Phase I: Before violence:
Peacemaking (conflict transformation), Peacebuilding
- Phase II: During violence:
Add Peacekeeping, Peace Zones
- Phase III: After violence:
Add Reconciliation (with Reconstruction)

This opens for cooperation with states. Non-states are not contesting state monopoly on violence, but its practice, and any state monopoly on peace action. Cooperation is needed for all five approaches above. Non-state actors may be able to transform conflicts; states may follow and formalize an outcome as a treaty. Peacebuilding is essentially the antidote to polarization with the individual and social pathologies mentioned, used preventively in Phase I and curatively in Phases II and III. Peacekeeping and Peace Zones (models of normality) can best be done by military, police and civilians together. And reconciliation to heal the traumas of violence and bring about closure of the conflict has to include state actors if they used violence. Reconciliation between Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks in Bosnia-Herzegovina and between Serbs and Albanians in Kosovo/a is needed, but so is reconciliation with French and Dutch UN peace-keeping forces, with NATO, and with US and UK, bombers, Austrian and German protectorate administrators.

How about peace research/peace study? It has to cover all approaches, and more, and draw on theory from micro (intra/inter-personal), meso (intra-social) and macro (inter-nation and inter-state) levels of human organization. The old model of one semester or summer courses will have to yield to treating peace studies like health studies, with its own university faculty, and a 4-5 years study with practice, preparing for professional activity.

These 14 approaches combine into a model of a peaceful world:

1. Peace Movement: extend this concept to include commitment to peace by all states and corporations, accountable to peace programs.
War Abolition: treating offensive arms like hard drugs, outlawing research, development, production, distribution, possession, use.
2. Global Governance: democratizing the United Nations through direct elections to a People's Assembly and abolition of the veto power.
3. Peace Education: to be introduced at all school levels all over like civics, hygiene, sex education, knowledge of own culture.
4. Peace Journalism: that all decent media also focus on ways out of conflicts, building a solution culture, not a violence culture.
5. Nonviolence: that nonviolent ways of fighting for a cause and to defend own integrity = basic needs become part of common skills.
6. Peacemaking/conflict transformation: conflict handling knowledge and skills as part of training citizens anywhere, like hygiene.

Peace Culture: that people start discussing their own culture, what can be done to make it more peace-productive, and then do it.

7. Basic Needs: that respect for the basic needs of everybody, and indeed the most needy, becomes a basic guideline for politics.

8. Peace Structure: from exploitative and repressive structures with nature, genders, races, classes, nations, states to equity, parity

9. Peacebuilding: cultivate good and bad rather than good or bad images of the world's actors, and positive ties in all directions.

10. Peacekeeping: with minimum violence become a protection for the defenseless and a protective in-between for the violent.

11. Peace Zones: starting with yourself as a peace zone of one person based on the principles above, construct archipelagoes of peace.

12. Reconciliation: learn to apologize and accept apologies, how to ask for forgiveness and forgive, how to heal and close conflicts.

More can be added and some will be when we turn to one effort to enact some of this. Does the model stand any chance or is it merely a fata morgana, some image over a desert overheated by the excessive violence, not to mention the threats, of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (the little we have seen so far?). It can be argued that humanity has been through much worse. And that increasingly military and civilians, politicians and people will do all of this together, given more knowledge, skill and will.

CONFLICT INTERVENTION: SOME TRANSCEND GUIDELINES

To give more depth and precision to the general philosophy of peace, here are guidelines for outside conflict intervention:

Arguments in favor of conflict intervention: the conflict parties are unable to transform the conflict so as to avoid violence; unable to keep violence under control; unable to handle post-violence resolution/reconstruction/reconciliation.

Arguments against conflict intervention: the conflict and any solution is the joint property of the conflict parties; outside parties will never understand the uniqueness of the conflict; outside parties also enter with their own agendas.

As there is truth to all these arguments, the general principle would be to proceed with care, which might be interpreted, as a minimum, to mean:

1. Reversibility: you have a right to propose and act, but only that which can be undone: you may be wrong. Hence, no or minimal violence; UN Chapter 6 (Sun Tsu), not Chapter 7 (Clausewitz).
2. Reciprocity: only engage in conflict intervention, peace-making, peace-keeping, peace-building if you are sure that you yourself are willing to be intervened, peace-made, peace-kept, peace-built by others, letting that question inform your action.
3. Universality, but with care: do not always do unto others what you would like them to do unto you, their tastes may be different. Even if electoral democracy and individualist human rights are good for you, they may not be to others.

4. Empathy with the Others, obtained through deep dialogues. Be sure you are able to identify what drives the Other parties the way they agree with, not necessarily the way you agree with.
5. Empathy with the Self, obtained through inner dialogues (meditation). Be sure you are able to identify the driving forces in yourself, beyond helping the parties to transform the conflict and to undo damage, in a creative and nonviolent way.
6. DPT Consistency: be sure that you know what the problem is before you suggest a solution, in order not always to suggest your panacea solution out of old habit. Be willing to have dialogues with all parties about diagnosis-prognosis-therapy.
7. Encourage intervention by the Other: organize dialogues about their situation by the conflict parties themselves.
8. Seek participation: do not fall for the temptation to seek solutions as seen by leaders only, search for a broader basis.
9. Seek acceptability: meaning an outcome not agreed to for fear of punishment or desire of reward (stick and carrot incentives), but because the outcome comes through as right.
10. Seek sustainability, meaning an outcome that does not have to be propped up artificially from the outside but generates its own support by speaking to the conditions of all parties.

CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION: A TRANSCEND CODE OF CONDUCT

To give some guidance for the conflict worker in the field here is a code of conduct for conflict transformation that can apply to both micro, meso and macro levels of conflict:

a) Mission Statement: Peace by Peaceful Means

By peace we mean the capacity to transform conflicts constructively and without violence; a never-ending process.

By transforming conflicts we mean helping bring about a situation so that the parties can proceed in a participatory, mutually acceptable, and sustainable manner.

By constructively we mean channeling conflict energy toward new, innovative ways of satisfying basic human needs for all.

By without violence we mean that this process should avoid

- any threat or use of direct violence that hurts and harms,
- any use of structural violence that demobilizes the parties.

b) The relation between the conflict worker and him/herself:

1. Your motivation should be to help the parties transform the conflict, not your own promotion, materially, non-materially.

2. You should have the skills/knowledge for the task and use the conflict to develop them further, not to acquire them.

3. Do not have a hidden agenda beyond conflict transformation, for yourself or for others; have nothing to conceal.

4. Your legitimacy is in your skills, knowledge, creativity, compassion and perseverance and ability to stimulate the same in the conflict parties; not in any mandate or in any organization.

c) The relation between the conflict worker and the parties

5. Do not enter a conflict if you yourself have an unresolved conflict with any one of the parties or bear some deep grudges.
6. Empathy/dialogues with all parties, overcome dislikes.
7. Do not manipulate, play with open cards, tell what you do.
8. Respect demands for confidentiality, do not attribute.
9. Do not receive honoraria, gifts etc. from the parties beyond ordinary hospitality.
10. Communicate between the parties only with their permission.
11. Speak with one tongue, not one version for one party and another for the others, granted that the focus may be different.
12. Be open to new ideas, do not become a prisoner to any plan.
13. Never propose any outcome or any process that cannot be undone - you may be wrong.

d) The relation between the conflict worker and society

14. Do not seek personal or organizational credit.
15. Disappear from the conflict when no longer needed.
16. Plans for conflict outcomes and conflict processes belong neither to you, nor to the parties, but to the public.
17. Share your skills, knowledge, experience with others; try to contribute to a general conflict transformation culture.
18. Do not receive direct funding from past, present or future conflict parties who have used, use or may use your services.
19. Conflict work is a job and the reward is a job well done.
20. All conflicts are born equal and have the same right to transformation, no conflict is "higher level" than another.

TRANSCEND: A NETWORK FOR PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT

A network of cooperating individuals concerned with peace by peaceful means, development by developmental means and environment by environmental means. The mission statement reads as follows:

To bring about a more peaceful world by using action, education/training, dissemination and research to handle conflicts creatively and nonviolently.

Members (by invitation) include about 150 invited scholars and practitioners from about 50 countries, working on 20 programs:

- I. Peaceful Conflict Transformation
- II. Peace Building and Empowerment
- III. Peace Pedagogy
- IV. Peace Journalism
- V. Peace Zones
- VI. Peace Keeping
- VII. Peaceful Reconciliation
- VIII. Peace and Business
- IX. Development Subsistence, Equity and Sustainability
- X. Peace, Deep Culture, Cultural Violence and Dialogue
- XI. Nonmilitary Approaches to Security and War Abolition
- XII. Human Rights, Democratization and Self-Determination
- XIII. Global Governance
- XIV. Peace, Women and Men
- XV. Peace and Development Analysis

- XVI. Peace and the Arts
- XVII. Peace Museums
- XVIII. Peace Tourism
- XIX. Peace at the Personal Level
- XX. Peace, Deep Structure and Structural Violence

Some approaches have been added to the 14 approaches above:

Peace and Business: how could business not only benefit from peace and development and a clean environment, but contribute?

Peace, Women and Men: under the present circumstances women are leading the way guided by basic needs; how can that inspire men?

Peace and Development Analysis: not all intellectual tools are adequate for peace and development; how should we analyze?

Peace and the Arts: arts are very powerful means of communication, how have they been used for peace and how to develop them further?

Peace Museums: museums, like text-books, monuments, street names, are guardians of collective memory, how can they serve peace?

Peace Tourism: tourism being the world's biggest industry could be a giant peacebuilding activity - how can tourism serve peace?

Peace at the Personal Level: all conflicts are born equal and have the same right to be transformed - at micro, meso and macro levels!

TRANSCEND was founded August 1993 by Johan Galtung and Fumiko Nishimura, Otto Scharmer and Katrin Käufer as a conflict mediation organization, based on Galtung's experience with 20 conflicts over 35 years. Dietrich Fischer joined, and the real start was 19 June 1995 when Fischer and Galtung from Switzerland invited 11 others. The Executive Committee consists at present of Galtung director, Fischer co-director, and Katrin Käufer treasurer.

Thus, TRANSCEND is a "virtual" organization. Very frequent internal communication is mainly by e-mail. Our very limited funds have so far only permitted one face-to-face meeting of members: at Taplow Court December 1999. There will be more, to improve communication, bonding and team-building for programs, concrete conflict work etc., and above all to establish patterns of direct democracy in an organization guided by its Executive Committee.

A major stimulus came 1996 when Jon Ebersole working for the UN Disaster Management Training Program commissioned a study on Conflict Transformation. Galtung wrote the study in dialogue with many TRANSCEND members, and the result was a "mini-version" (35pp) published by the UN in 1998, and a "maxi-version" (189pp) published in 2000. There are (spring 2001) 12 translations of the former and two of the latter, many more coming. Manuals in peacebuilding, peace journalism, reconciliation, food assistance in disasters and nonmilitary approaches to security are almost completed.

From the beginning our policy has been to work pragmatically: get an idea, test it out, gain experience, improve it. However, as can be seen from the above, there is now a TRANSCEND philosophy which adds up to a mission statement, and the twenty programs derive from, reflect and inspire that philosophy.

TRANSCEND is based on four pillars/modes of activity: action, education/training, dissemination,

TPU will start offering courses on-line from January 2002. The target participants are practitioners more than academics and students since this is where the demand has been articulated: UNDP and other UN personnel in the field, NGO people in the field, and, possibly, embassy personnel in conflict areas. The mechanics of the on-line courses will first be limited to e-mail, both sending the material and receiving essays etc., without attachments.

Phases II and III will expand to academics and students and add more theoretical courses like a core course in peace, conflict, development and civilization), and more advanced electronic means. More particularly, five courses of 15 weeks duration with up to 25 participants (fee \$4-500) are envisaged for Phase I:

GEOPOLITICAL CONFLICTS, building on TRANSCEND's experience around the world, comparing Hawaii-Pacific, Colombia, Ulster, Euzkadi, Yugoslavia, Israel/Palestine/Middle East, Caucasus, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Korea and the USA/Eurasia Configuration (Cold War II).

Basic text: Carl Jacobsen & Johan Galtung, *Searching for Peace* (London: PLUTO, 2000) and articles on all conflicts.

Instructor: Jörgen Johansen and experts on the specific conflicts.

CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION, based on the manual for UNDP/DMTP, *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means* Geneva: UN, 2000.

Instructor: Johan Galtung, with teaching assistants.

RECONCILIATION, based on a revised manual, and other sources:

After Violence: 3R, Reconstruction, Resolution, Reconciliation.

Instructor: Jan Öberg.

PEACE JOURNALISM, based on a revised manual, and other sources:

Jake Lynch & A. McGoldrick, *The Peace Journalism Option: No. 3*

Instructors: Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick.

With the exception of Peacekeeping and Peace Zones (for which we are not yet ready) these are the basic courses for conflict workers in conflicts with violence. These courses will be offered often.

TPU has a Board of Advisors and an Executive Committee. The TPU on-line and on-site rectors are George Kent and Johan Galtung.

TRANSCEND AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT. We have already launched, for peace education: TRANSCEND Peace University (TPU), and work on for peace action: TRANSCEND Conflict Service (TCS) for peace dissemination: TRANSCEND Media Service (TMS) for peace research: TRANSCEND Research Institute (TRI)

Experiments in these directions are being carried out on some of the TRANSCEND sites making them TRANSCEND centers. A fully fledged TRANSCEND center would work on all four modes of activity. Some experience in dissemination was gained publishing about 30 columns through Inter-Press Service in Roma, reaching 70-80 papers, mainly in the Third World. These columns are available from TRANSCEND as #1 in our Booklet Series (#2 gives background material for several of the conflicts, #3 gives the memoranda to groups that have consulted TRANSCEND about how they could work more actively for peace, and #4 is an important tool in conflict work: Jokes to be taken seriously - to be used with care and discretion).

By and large TRANSCEND draws upon 40 years of research experience, since peace research started becoming institutionalized at the end of the 1950s. In a sense TRANSCEND is an effort to put all of this

intellectual activity into conflict transformation, peace and development practice. But in so doing needs for new research arise, stimulated by practice. Thus, there is a need for a summary, in index form of much available information, like a War Participation Index (WPI), measuring the extent to which a state historically has been involved in war;

Early Warning Index (EWI), measuring the inclination of a state (and other actors) to be involved in wars, based on the tendency to do so (WPI) and the levels of structural and cultural violence.

Conflict Transformation Index (CTI), measuring the transformation level in a given conflict, facilitating comparisons of the same conflict over time, and with other conflicts. and pointing to missing efforts as a guide to action.

TRANSCEND AND FUNDING. TRANSCEND has so far practically speaking neither asked for, nor received, any funding. Our basic philosophy is to "earn our way", offering education/training against fees (Galtung charges \$1,000 per day for a full day, based on a well tested manual), essentially doing conflict work for free (but with expenses like travel, accommodation, per diem, ideally also basic salary, covered). Often these activities coincide when on-site, possibly also on-line, training includes participants from different parties to a conflict and transformation exercises in fact are mediation efforts. Working for peace, like for health, should not be for profit but be a publicly available service. Consequently all our perspectives etc. are freely available.

TRANSCEND's capital is human: the skill, knowledge and experience of our members; social: the capacity of the network to generate teams for specific tasks even at very short warning, and political: no hidden agenda, independence. But there is also volunteerism presupposing jobs or other sources of income.

Under no circumstance will TRANSCEND receive any funding from governments or others who may be parties to conflicts TRANSCEND may be asked to mediate, and we are deeply skeptical of organizations willing to accept such support, thus giving up their independence.

However, untied funds will continue to be welcome, also in small quantities, to facilitate unsolicited conflict mediation (when asked by, say, OSCE or UNDP expenses are of course covered), preparation of TPU courses, stipends for participants on-site or on-line from poor countries, travel expenses, etc. Grants from the North-South foundation in Zürich and the Welden Foundation in New York have been very useful for such purposes, and a fund-raising event is planned in New York Oct. 2001.

For More Information on TRANSCEND, please write to:
transcend@transcend.org

Copyright © 2001 TRANSCEND