

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 21st 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)

Wednesday, April 4, 2006

Panel Discussion IV:

3:15 – 4:30 pm

Moderator: Ms. Enid Blackwell

Panel Members: Dr. Johan Galtung, Dr. Sarah Meharg, Ms. Marsha Lake's paper – distributed in advance.

Certification, Professional Association – Legitimacy & Effectiveness

(Insert Ms. Marsha Lake's Paper)

“Is Peace-Building A Profession? – MY journey in the field”
Marsha Lake... Master's student.

I'm learning what public discourse is... Human security and peace building. I am 56 years' old ... two grown sons ...three grandchildren. How did I arrive here? That kind of journey... Is peace building a profession? It was about learning to unpack a lot of experiences in my life... with the UN in Kosovo, as a disaster responder with Canadian Red Cross, working with ... fishermen displaced out of economy, women's activities, Canadian navy military family... I was trying to understand my own biography as well as the question...to try and link it all together. I will try to offer in the discussion what pulled at my gut. I am curious about interconnectivities in this room. I would like to understand what brings us into this room together. Why am I thinking so hard about this? In my ongoing quest... All very rambling and disconnected... Why Royal Rhodes? I am trying to unpack, in a theoretical framework, my work in Kosovo. How we frame who we are. Being the Regional Social Welfare Officer, a Civil Affairs officer, one task was at

the Centre for Social Work in Kosovo. I, as international to help Centres for Social Work to build capacity for them to assist people in Kosovo to implement social law etc etc. the most central lesson I learned about what we need to do: We have to, I have to learn how to build relationships. The male directors (50-60 year-old communists, had no interest in seeing a woman walk through door to lead them. I needed to understand what their problems were. And for them to understand mine. Those men made me an honorary man. Why is it funny? Because ... How does it work? Is there an operation involved? What happened was really central for me. The central men elected to tell me around the table. To make it work, they had to make me an honorary man. If they could turn me into something they could understand and relate to, we could get on with the work. And I became an honorary man, and the chief. That was one of the best days of my work. After that, we were on the journey together in a huge process of change. And while Galtung was talking, I imagined a trampoline. If we could just jump high enough, I could see the big picture.

Building relationships... deeply teaching and learning ... how do we communicate interpersonally? Let's look deeper. Have eye contact. What should I do? To be there, in presence with people. With the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, the Dutch, Finnish, etc the army... 800 soldiers and civilians... need civil-military cooperation. I can understand them when they are walking towards me. I know what they are thinking. One young officer says to me, I am so (confused?). What am I going to say to my commanding officer? What am I supposed to do on my peace keeping? It's about building relationships.

Next is about gender... not just about women's participation. About understanding and analyzing everything about it. Geoffrey Pearson talks about how he was raised to know that he was a male: by his privileges, and the special treatment he got from his mother and grandmother. I have to understand that. It's not just about checking the boxes and saying there are two women. Its about understanding how men and women work together in a system that creates the reality of men and women now.

Adult education: Grade four, displaced fishermen, who now had to come for re-training. What, in ten weeks or ten months, are they going to do? I short, I really encouraged them to figure out what they wanted to learn. How adults learn. If we aren't cognizant in how adults learn, then we will have an imperialist attitude. Even down the road, be aware of how others are in their process, and have knowledge-frameworks in our mind about how people learn.

I also worked for several big disasters... the Swiss Air disaster, hurricanes in Puerto Rico, I had a death threat in Kosovo, for removing a girl from a situation where she was going to be killed, as an honour killing... When we go to work anywhere we will be on a change process. There will be those who will be opposed to peace. Even her mother wanted to kill me, in the interest of family honour...

I have a document with research and recommendations. I interviewed many people.

Cross cultural foreign languages. Military is one of those. Talk to those who have taken up arms as service to their country.... They did not take the uniform with the idea of being war fighters. They are there because they feel they're doing good. I don't see any representation from that community. We need to work together.

My final closing comment. There is no "other". There is only "us".

Moderator: Ms. Enid Blackwell -- Values and competencies from the front line – building bridges with the military.

Dr. Johan Galtung: Competencies, standards, etc.

We have had about 1000 workshops around the world, with an average of 10 to 20 participants. The university is on line. We are in the 5th year. Typically, we have 100 participants per term. We offer 19 courses, including: Peace Conflict Transformation – English Russian, Japanese, Rumanian, etc. Peace Zones, Peace Journalism, Peace and Gender, Gender and Militaries. A recent addition, which we are planning together with a Swiss mathematician is Peace Mathematics -- mathematics in support of peace. My first PhD is in maths; my second in sociology.

Current Course: We have mainly politicians. There are chat rooms on line, essays to write, and individual assignments. Once a week, I look at essays. As the leading line, they are asked about the conflict that affects them most. Some are micro, some mega, some geopolitical. We tell them they should be relatively open. There is lots of space for individual expression. It is a combination of teaching, dialogue, and learning for the research person. Evaluation? Not really. We have not been able to trace the graduates. Maybe ... the Peace University has had more ability to trace what happened to alumni. It is creating an alumni association.

Certification: Tricky. I am not satisfied with regular university approaches: exams, Etc. I like it to be very close to the field. We experimented with the following: we expected people to be able to define and do research in 2 conflicts; to have mediated in 2 conflicts, be teaching about 2 conflicts, disseminated effectively to media about 2 conflicts... the action, teaching, dissemination and research of conflict. This is now raised to 3 conflicts. We certify when the person feels in command of those three cases. At first people were not able to analyse... it came out as a narrative.... We trained them to identify the parties, goals, etc. etc. A good doctor sees both the human being and the case at the same time. Don't confuse the two. In 2-4 years we may have some kind of answer to the question.

We are now composing a menu for those taking a Master's degree. We have come to combining on line with on site learning. They want us to pay for them to meet each other. They are very committed, and very curious. On the way, I would like to be in correspondence with all of them. TRANSCEND is a network, not an institute. TRANSCEND Peace University is the biggest....

ZABONA – is Zulu. It means: “I see you”. It means more than communication; more than empathy. It means: “I take in your reality”.

We are training 7 year-old kids in how to find transcending solutions.

Example 1: A boy is bullying a girl in grade one. She runs home. She swears she will not go back. She hides under the blanket. The teacher calls in the boy. His opening sentence: “You know what you have done is unacceptable. Why did you do it? What went on inside you? This is the indispensable part: a sign of respect, to ask why. No answer. The teacher again: “Why? What do you want?” The Boy: “I hate school”. This is a communicative act. Teacher: “Why?” Boy: “Because you teachers are talking all the time.” Teacher: “We have to.” Boy: “You talk too much, particularly you!” Teacher: “You know we have a relationship to a nearby farm? You could have some work there: shopping, milking cows. But you know there will be extra maths”. Boy: “When can I start?” That same evening that boy went to the house of the girl’s parents and apologized, of his own accord. A teacher friend of mine, Lars, was the one who asked the question. He now travels around telling Lars stories. This is story 14 of his stories. “What has that got to do with the girl?” he asks. Boy: “She is school loving. I can see it on her.” If that boy had had a little courage, he would have burned down something. He doesn’t, so he took it out on the girl. The girl did indeed love school. She loved science in particular. Here we have two pedagogical theories that clashed, and maybe they both have validity. He never did it again.

Example 2: Boy A invites boy B to stay the night. For some reason it has to be Friday night. B looks forward to it. A then says it doesn’t work, because his mother works all week and on Saturday morning she does not want to appear in a not made up face in front of visitors. The case is brought to the class. They have been taught that there are five options:

1. **Cancel**
2. **Carry on any way.**
3. **Compromise:** do it next year. Have a short visit for only the Friday evening. Etc.
4. **Deal:** Mother says, “I can show my face anyhow”. Or the Boy gives up the night visit. This would leave nobody satisfied. This is known as making a deal. Everyone is equally dissatisfied.
5. **Breakthrough:** Boy B comes one hour earlier, and leaves one hour earlier on Saturday morning, before the mother gets up. To achieve this, you first need to watch mother’s habits.

This example was given to many adults. They did not work it out. Zobona uses a number of props, tricks and ways of doing it. We hope for cooperation from schools. Anyone interested...

Certification: I think certification is very important, but also listen to the voices of intuitive recognition. We need both.

In Kosova: I was asked by UNMED, not to mediate, but to do something ... to have a workshop on mediation, because by having a workshop on reconciliation, you can get reconciliation... So the workshop took place in Pristina. Thirty Serbs gathered in one

corner of the room, 70 Albanians in other. The Serbs talked about the atrocities that the Albanians had committed and the Albanians about the atrocities that the Serbs had committed... applied similar techniques.... As a result the Serbs and Albanians have their own cantons... run by their own folks... They embraced each other after the workshop. The Serbs said, "We can live with that. We want to live our own lives and know we can be respected." The Albanians said, "If the Serbs can live with it, so can us." The US did not like it, because if they agreed it would be in the way of the US agenda. They held a second work shop. The results of that are closer to the so-called plan. Has none of getting to the root of the conflict. I guarantee this will not work. Serbian Orthodox Christianity is ancient. They have time. When asked how long it would be before there was a solution, a Serb answered me: "In about 500 years." Galtung: "Will you continue fighting? Why 500?" Serb: "It took from 1389 to 1875 to get there the first time. It was a tough fight. It took time." Galtung: My assessment is that the Serbian strategy is defeat, retreat and return, for eternity. Any plan that does not take this into account, cannot work. Deep cultural forces are there for the long haul. One of our courses is about deep culture. Others are about deep solutions.

QUESTIONS:

Question to Ms. Marsha Lake: Regarding your recommendation for a Professional Association for Training? What would that be?

Ms. Marsha Lake: An Association is an identified place we arrive at, where we have said to each other: "We want to come together to create a trans-disciplinary framework... a community. We want to come together and work to define its parameter and within its structure a commitment to learning, the small and the macro. We want to be part of it because We want to include people who may never work in a large conflict area.... It would not necessarily a professional association. It might be an association in its broadest sense of a wide range of capacities and desires.

Ms. Marsha Lake? Dr. Johan Galtung? There could be sub-professions and ways of doing it, and debates among ourselves on how to do it. I do not agree with the Harvard approach. It is too static. We should use our disagreements...

Question to Dr. Johan Galtung:

I am taken with your description of the Zabona school approach. Have you communicate with Marsha Rosenberg for non violent communication, specifically relating to schools; his concept of giraffe schools?

Dr. Johan Galtung: We know each other. We have had discussions. He is very familiar with what we do. We held a joint work shop. It involved five sessions. We had one day each. He had one day. I had the other. We used social drama, psycho-analytical techniques, etc. All were given tasks and asked, how would you approach one conflict; how another?

Marshal is dead wrong on one point. He believes that if communication is only non-violent, solutions will come. I believe there is an underlying conflict you have to solve. But we part much more dramatically in another way. He has patented the word 'non-violent communication'. I find that unacceptable. This has led to open conflict between us. I have told him to find some other way of financing his work. He has made a great contribution. But his examples are very short on anything to do with understanding conflict.

QUESTION AND COMMENT –

Beverly Britton, US: Did you make it to the Centre for the Protection of Women and Children in Pristina? Is it still there? Did you meet Dr....., the founder, who kept it going throughout the conflict? To Camp Bondsteel? Has Camp Bondsteel got anything to do with ultimate US intentions? Most people don't know that the term ethnic cleansing was coined in Belgrade two hundred years ago, with regard to Jews, non-Serbs, etc.

ANSWER

Ms. Marsha Lake: The centre was still there in 2004. In every one of those capacities in my work, I was involved in institution building and capacity building, which is how I came in contact with the Centre... I was working on very demanding cases with the Centre and trying to bring together the police, the military, and all the structures involved. There was no system. So we were doing a lot of work together. Those women, Serb and Albanian, were working together long before the conflict. By giving them a professional identity, we brought them together again.

Dr. Johan Galtung: A Swede, Dane, Norwegian and I who met in Dubrovnik. The book we are writing is Yugoslavia and What Could Have Been Done. Before the war against Afghanistan, Camp Bondsteel was the US' biggest military base. I was convinced it had nothing to do with the war on Yugoslavia. It had more to do with the encirclement of China... Just for my own information, I wanted to get in. My problem was: there was no way to get in. I met a democratization officer. I'll call him Mike, from the US. He said he could get us in. I was interested in his methodology. We drove to gate. A black American was there, very sceptical. Entirely justified. "Who are you?" "We are representing the United States of Europe." He did not believe us. Rightly so. "What do you want?" Mike: "Is it true that you have the best hamburgers in Kosovo?" "Could be." Whereupon Mike said: "Where are you from?" "Colorado." Mike: "My wife is from Colorado!" The fact that Mike is not married is neither here nor there. They went ballistic as only Americans from the same state can who meet overseas. The guard showed us how to get to the canteen. We passed it and went on. Up came a jeep with a buck sergeant. He said, "What the f... are you doing here?" Rightly so. We said we were looking for hamburgers. He gave us directions: second to the left and to the right. By then I had already seen what I needed to see. They were putting in a runway that was much larger than needed for their helicopters. I was forced to eat hamburgers. The runway has now been built.

QUESTIONS. (Missed the first). If people trained in non violence had been allowed to come as observers, could that have avoided the conflict?

ANSWER:

Dr. Johan Galtung: There was an observer corps. If it had been bigger, they could have closed the borders, because they came across partly trained by the US and although the Serbs became majority, they were not in ...??..... The war was based on a lie. At the scene of the atrocity, there were signs of gunpowder ...but on their hands, which is not the case when you are being killed, but when are killing. ... I have not slightest doubt about Serbian abuse of powers....But in that context, the observers could have made a difference. Hence the observers were not given the funding to be there.

I think it is difficult to work in a Ministry at any time, but especially with the mentality of a diplomat. Certain values are important. The constructions of crisis, someone who is against that and needs to..... It is almost impossible for a ministry of foreign affairs to have an outlook that is sufficiently symmetrical. They need to sacrifice content in order to be able to say they have arrived at an agreement, so they can open the champagne. It will take time to change this mentality. So, better for CPS to work outside the ministry and invite the diplomats to participate, but leave the other agenda at the ministry. I am critical because..... (Missed it).