

Chapter 11

What Does Professionalization Mean in Peace Research?

11.1 On Professionalization in General

Generally, the sociology of professions identifies three characteristics of a profession¹:

- [1] There is a range of *skills* with which a range of professionals will handle a range of problems for a range of clients, with proven competence. The clients have an idea of what to expect from the professional, and the professional of what to expect from a client.
- [2] There is a professional *code of conduct*, defining the relation of a professional to the clients, other professionals and others. The code of conduct may be supported by an oath.
- [3] There is a pattern of *accountability* of the professional to the clients, to other professionals, and to others.

Professionalization of peace work moves us beyond peace research and studies, both indispensable for skills. The purpose of peace research is to produce inter-subjectively communicable and verifiable *knowledge* according to the general rules of research. Thus, research is incompatible with secrecy, as research has to take place in public space. And one purpose of peace studies is the communication of the findings of peace research, in line with general rules for education, another public space activity. The free access of the rest of society to what happens is of the essence. As peace workers are not planning to hurt or harm, in other words to exercise violence, s/he has nothing to conceal.

In the following a person exercising the peace profession will be referred to as 'peace worker', like 'social worker', or 'peace professional' like 'health professional'. Others may find 'peace specialist' more dignified. 'Manager' must be avoided as active participation of the clients, those seeking professional advice, is of the essence. 'Facilitator' is much better.

¹ This text was first presented as a keynote, at the 21st Conference of the International Peace Research Association, in Calgary, Canada on 1 July 2006.

11.2 Government Realism Versus Peace Movement Idealism: *Tertium non datur?*

To understand better where peace research may be heading, let me juxtapose governments and one special non-government, the peace movement. The governments of the state system of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia in a Eurocentric view of history were successors to feudal lords, kings, emperors. They entered violence-war-peace with *ultima ratio regis*, the King's last argument, the gun, with frequent use; to he who has a hammer the world looks like a waiting nail. But that also holds for the negation of the government, the peace movement: to he who has a mouth the world looks like an attentive ear.

Realism as a doctrine is based on the 'ultima' above, force, not persuasion from basic principles, nor bargaining offering incentives, nor decision-making by authoritative bodies. A derivative of this thesis would be that the final word belongs to whoever has superior force, the big sticks of the big powers. In the present world Anglo-America; a peace proposal unacceptable to them is not 'realistic'.

The supreme goal of the realist will be security, meaning low probability of being hurt/harmed by the violence of any Other. The underlying philosophy is that Evil exists, ready to turn violent for violence's own sake, and that the only counter-measure is sufficient strength to deter and/or crush Evil; thereby producing security.

Idealism as a doctrine is based on persuasion from basic principles, particularly principles held to be universally valid, even self-evident. Such principles tend to be of the ought—rather than the is—variety, like the sacredness of (human) life, meaning (human) life should be considered sacred. But what if Other does not share that noble view? Or, 'in a war there are only losers'. But what if winning can be defined as losing least? An endless debate, with strong statements about human nature. Words, words, words.

Let us try to present the two positions along some dimensions, in no way claiming that the juxtaposition is complete, nor that there is not a solid range of variation. What we are looking for is, of course, a way of bridging the gap, even contradiction bolstered by solid hatred on both sides, and the use of violence, or nonviolence (Table 11.1).

This is a clear case of thesis versus antithesis, at least as presented in this Table, not denying that reality is more complex. It does not follow that the alternative, a *tertium*, has to be a synthesis. Dialectics offers three non-exclusive possibilities: a positive transcendence, synthesis, accepting basic features of both, a negative transcendence denying the validity of both, and a compromise picking some of this and some of that.²

We are talking about two world views, both of them found within the same societies, and not only in the West although we sense the contradiction between

² For more on this and most of the topics mentioned in this paper see the author's *Transcend and Transform*, London, Boulder CO: Pluto, Paradigm Press, 2004; published in many translations.

Table 11.1 The Government movement and the peace movement

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| 1 Actors | Government movement Foreign office-military | Peace movement Permanent, conjunctural |
| 2 Basic mode | Realism based on <i>ultima ratio</i> | Idealism based on ratio |
| 3 Epistemology | Empiricism fact-based pragmatism | Criticism value-based moralism |
| 4 Theory | <i>Security paradigm</i> based on strength Humans tend toward evil | <i>Persuasion paradigm</i> based on moral strength Humans tend toward good |
| 5 Method I | Elite conferences | People's meetings |
| 6 Method II | Negotiating harmonized national interests | Resolutions, advocacy |
| 7 Method III | Demonstrations of – incentive power – threats of force | Demonstrations of –moral power –people power |
| 8 Method IV | Violent action, like bombing | Nonviolent action like economic boycott |

Source The author

(A Gandhian boycott of the USA might work, mass demonstrations not)

carry-overs from feudal faith in force and enlightenment faith in human *ratio* and appeals to reason.

Realism, as spelt out above, would make allies of the carrier of Anglo-American world dominance in today's world, the United States of America, say Yes–Yes–Yes to Washington DC. And idealism would make the peace movements in the same countries say No–No–No to whatever comes out of their foreign offices. The world views are so contradictory that they become each other's antithesis.

And yet we see in the present concrete case of the 'US-led Coalition' in the war in and over Iraq one government after the other defecting. Without necessarily saying so, they actually do what their peace movements have demanded, they pull out. But this is more an act of protest than an alternative peace policy.

The best way of exploring these two peace discourses further is probably not by elaborating them, but by asking the question: how can this contradiction be transcended, if at all? There are eight jobs according to the Table, so let us look at all eight.

But first permit me a little note from my own autobiography. I refused military service and became a conscientious objector in 1951 because I found the governmental approach unacceptable; and in 1954 refused the alternative 'civilian service' because it was only a way of saying No, not a way of serving peace. The outcome was half a year in prison winter 1954–1955 for a more extreme No. I have lived this contradiction, at one time (early 1960s) being both some kind of consultant to the Norwegian foreign office, a member of the board of *War Resisters' International* (in London) and president of its branch in Norway. And unhappy with them all; one essentially built on bullets and bombs, the others on words.

So I will try to guide the reader toward a peace profession as something arising out of this contradiction because that is how it came about in my case. As an effort to bridge the gap.

Obviously we are looking for an actor, the peace professional, who could transcend this government-peace movement dichotomy. The idea that governments are somehow on Track 1 and non-governments on Track 2 freezes this dichotomy in its present form. And begs the question whether governments are not often on Track 1 hoping that non-governments could compensate and bring about Track 0 as a resultant. Given the damage governmental diplomacy is capable of doing this is a highly optimistic view. We need a better answer.

Some features of that answer are clear.

First: a peace professional will have governments and non-governments as clients and dispense advice to both. Like the health profession the skills would be available not only to friend and foe alike, but also to uniformed (government) and civilian (non-government). The peace professional would not think of friend-foe or uniformed-civilian, but of actors desperately in need of any advice that might move the actor system closer to peace. Peace is a relation among actors, a system, not a property of one actor alone. The peace professional would engage in dialogues with the actors, but have the actor system on top of his or her mind.

Second: the peace professional rejects violence as does the peace movement, based on the idealism of the heart, but combines that with the realism of the brain. Concretely, this leads to *peace by peaceful means*, rejecting violence less on moral grounds than on pragmatic grounds. Violence does not work. Shedding blood in a battle-field is like leeches sucking blood: not only that it does not work; it may even make matters worse. While not denying some preventive and curative effects of minimum (threat of) violence, the approach would exclude violence from the peace-creating repertory, building more on *ratio*, less on *ultima*.

Third: the basic difference is here. Without rejecting empiricism linking theory and data, and criticism linking data and values as basic modes of intellectual activity, the focus will be on the third possibility: *constructivism*, linking values and theory. The values emerge from the legitimate goals of the parties to a conflict, and the theory from viable realities. The idea would be to search for a new reality where the parties might feel that their goals can be sufficiently comfortably accommodated.

Imagine a child busily adding and subtracting integers, establishing that $5 + 7 = 7 + 5 = 12$, moving on to $7 - 5 = 2$, and then running the head against the wall when trying to tackle $5 - 7$. The contradiction between being mathematically correct and handling $5 - 7$ dissolves the moment negative numbers, a *new mathematical reality*, has been introduced. And, the child is no longer stuck.

The task is not to be stuck between the pragmatism of linking data to theories and the moralism of linking data to values. The peace professional will look for something new, like a physician who has realized that if the 'system' had sufficient self-healing capacity then it would already have produced health. Neither single-minded empiricism, nor single-minded moralism will help although they should not be disregarded. An intervention bringing in something new is needed, for peace as well as for health.

Fourth: both the security and the persuasion paradigms fall short of the desirable. The former fails because efforts to deter by violence may stimulate an arms race, and efforts to crush by violence may produce trauma and stimulate a violence

race with a vicious cycle of retaliation. And the latter fails, being based neither on ideas, nor incentives, nor threats. Neither facts, nor values, are sufficient guides for action. The parties get stuck.

A government confronted with insecurity—a risk of violence—derives an action agenda from the security paradigm. Neither the most brilliant analysis a la Noam Chomsky, nor the most stinging moral admonitions a la Pope John Paul II, provide guides for action beyond the status quo of No, No, No. This is where the peace professional enters, focusing on unresolved present conflicts, unconciliated trauma from past violence, and unresolved conflicts in the past, for constructive action. A rich action agenda.

This calls for *mediation* for the conflicts of the present, and *conciliation* for the conflicts of the past, dropping the ‘re’ as it has a connotation of restoring a not necessarily desirable past. This is the essence of the *peace paradigm*. Deep conflicts exist. They may lead to violence. There is a way out: *solve the conflicts*, present and past. If done well, we get peace, and with it security.

But these are only two of the tools in the tool chest of the peace professional. Here is a longer list of remedies:³

- [1] peace research and peace studies
- [2] basic needs satisfaction, peace culture, peace structure
- [3] goal restraint and consequence analysis
- [4] mediation for conflict transformation by peaceful means
- [5] anger control
- [6] peace-building, with peace education and peace journalism
- [7] nonviolence and soft peace-keeping
- [8] conciliation for the removal of past traumas from the agenda
- [9] creating virtuous peace cycles.

This is not the place to spell them out. The challenge is to stick to “peace by peaceful means”, neither succumbing to violent governmental pragmatism nor to the status quo of “not in my name” peace movement moralism. Points 1–4 above are preventive therapy, points 5–8 curative therapy, and point 9 builds positive peace into the system, releasing the creative and constructive potential of conflicts rather than the potential for violence and destruction. All based on diagnosis and prognosis of social ills. Much to do.

What, then, corresponds to Methods I, II, III, IV? Given the general idea that direct violence is the smoke that comes out of the fire of conflicts not resolved, or from past violence with no conciliation? Generally speaking through the power of the word, *dia logos*, by helping the parties to deeper insights rather than by bribing them, threatening them or telling them how bad they are.

This, of course, is very similar to one basic assumption of psychotherapy: the talking method. Or sociotherapy rather, as violence, like conflict and peace, is a

³ See Johan Galtung: “Conflict Transformation By Peaceful Means” in Charles Webel and Johan Galtung, eds., *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, London: Routledge.

relation. A system of actors, not only single actors, is in need of change. The peace professional has to talk with all actors; *how* can be disputed. There are schools here as elsewhere, all with some valid points.

Like the Table, The TRANSCEND approach has four phases:

- *Method I*: Meeting all parties, one-on-one.
- *Method II*: Empathic dialogues to elicit creativity.
- *Method III*: Demonstrations of
 - transcending goals, positively or negatively
 - creating a new system reality, capable of accommodating the legitimate goals of all parties.
- *Method IV*: Joint action to transform the conflict, always checking whether it works. If not, Methods I–II–III–IV again.

This approach differs substantially from both conventional, mainstream government and peace movement action. The moral impulse, the (almost absolute) No to violence, is shared with the peace movement, but the pragmatism of step IV is shared with governments. There is no apodictic position, no a priori truth. Everything is tested for its validity and everything has to pass that test.

The focus is no longer on one party winning, like ETA or Madrid; nor on all parties winning, the famous win–win. The focus is on the relation, the system, on Spain moving forward, into new and better realities. *Those who rest on carpets of gold, carpet bombing, or fly moral carpets are often short on ideas.* Peace professionals have the opposite profile. *Tertium datur.*

11.3 There is a Demand Out There: A Trip Around the World

Half a century after the tiny beginnings of peace research after World War II—including founding IPRA, the International Peace Research Association, 42 years ago, those foggy autumn days in London—some of us think we have a solid supply to offer. But, there is always the nagging question: is there a demand out there?

There is, and the listener/reader will pardon me for giving as cases what I know best: what I myself have been asked to do, say, this spring 2006, from mid-February to mid-June to be precise. Twelve cases, twelve processes to be more precise, some more, some less successful, all with a certain promise. The initiative often came from a go-between capable of organizing a direct encounter with one or more of the parties in the conflict. In no case did any of the parties cover any travel expenses. There was no honorarium. But the trip was combined with workshops on mediation, conciliation etc., and that balanced the budget. One formula, among several?

Before delving into the cases: from where would we not expect any such demand, directly, or indirectly, via a go-between?

Obviously from actors to whom ‘winning is not everything, but the only thing’. Hegemons, may be, and their challengers? Or actors who think they have mastered the necessary and sufficient skills themselves, in need of no outsider’s advice, even softly offered under four eyes, or eight if both come with a colleague, using the one-on-one formula? Whatever the reason the present author has not been approached, directly or indirectly, by the USA or by Norway; but by many other countries, including the UK.

The description of the cases will be down to the minimum necessary and sufficient to identify the issue and the nature of the demand (more details on www.transcend.org). Here they are:

- [1] *Denmark versus Islam*, in Geneva. Added to the cartoons came Danish refusal to dialogue and the newspaper’s earlier refusal to print cartoons about the ascent of Jesus Christ to heaven, as it might hurt Christian sensitivities, *and* the burning of Danish flags and embassies, with economic boycott. The demand was for mediation.
- [2] *Germany versus the Herero people*, in Windhoek. The issue was apology and compensation for the 1904 massacre, compounded by a court case against Germany (‘apologizing is admitting’), other EU members fearing the consequences of apology and compensation, and the nature of any compensation. The demand was for conciliation.
- [3] *Sri Lanka*, in Vienna. The issue was the breakdown of the cease fire agreement with the warring parties still hoping to force their solution. Of the five scenarios—unitary state, devolution, federation, confederation, independence—asymmetric, bicameral federation still seems preferable. The demand was for mediation.
- [4] *Israel–Palestine*, in Berlin. The issue was to build a peace structure around a Middle East Community of Israel with its five Arab neighbours (Palestine fully recognized according to the UN resolutions), like the European Community for Western Europe after the Second World War. The demand was for new approaches.
- [5] *Turkey–Armenia*, in Istanbul. ‘Something happened’ in 1915, with high complexity, and involving many more than those two. The search is also for a discourse to articulate what happened so that this major issue can be removed from the political agenda for the region to move forward. The demand was for conciliation.
- [6] *The Kashmir issue*, in New Delhi. TRANSCEND took the initiative, with a former Pakistani foreign minister, a member of the Indian National Security Commission and myself proposing a “new reality” to accommodate India, Pakistan and Kashmir; well received and discussed at the top levels. The demand was for mediation.
- [7] *Myanmar*, in Yangon. A military dictatorship stands for Myanmar autonomy and integrity against secession, the opposition supported by the outside for democracy and human rights. An agenda with all four goals, removing past

traumas in favour of cooperative futures, might work. The demand was for mediation and conciliation.

- [8] *Cambodia*, in Phnom Penh. ‘Something happened’, indeed, 1975–1979: Khmer Rouge against Phnom Penh, but in the same period, 1961–1989, and before that, much else also happened. To select one atrocity for a tribunal may serve punitive justice. But the problem of conciliation remains. The demand was for holistic conciliation.
- [9] *Korea*, in Seoul. The Korea war 1950–1953 played a major role in the Cold War discourse, started in 1948 with the Cheju uprising against US occupation. North Korea’s cause, to help South Korea against US aggression, was not unfounded. The demand was for conciliation, using a history commission to explore what happened.
- [10] *Japan–China/Korea*, in Tokyo. Prime Minister visits to the Yasukuni shrine that turns uniformed Japanese who died into gods deepens the war trauma. An alternative memorial dedicated to uniformed and civilians, from all countries, was solicited by, and presented to, a major LDP faction. The demand was for conciliation.
- [11] *USA*, in Washington. The US Empire is on its way down, US foreign policy must change, but how? Workshops are being organized, the peace movement is unprepared as is the Democrat ‘opposition’. The demand is for peace research and peace paradigms.
- [12] *Mexico*, in Puebla. Latin American integration is coming, and one problem will be foreign policy in general, and toward the USA in particular. Workshops are being organized, most people seem unprepared. The demand is for peace research and peace paradigms.

The listener/reader will have noticed that the demand can usually be formulated in terms of mediation and/or conciliation. But there is also a demand for more basic services, like building peace structures, and for peace research to explore what is needed. But all the other offers in a peace professional’s chest, with nine remedies, are lurking in the background and will of course sooner or later be brought up by the peace worker.

Does this work? [1] did. There have been dialogues and the burning has stopped. But an apology, an exploration of the line between freedom of expression and respect for what is sacred to others, and the lifting of the boycott has still to come.

[2], [5] and [8] are complicated, much work is needed. [3] looks bad right now (spring–summer 2006), but going to the brink again may possibly produce peace, and not only ceasefire, talks next time. [4] is probably the only formula for Middle East peace, but is a long term project even if more needed than ever. [6] may stand a good chance as long as those two leaders are in power, and that will not be forever. [7] has slow dynamism on its side and is compatible with the idea of Myanmar being in control, not some ‘international community’. [9] may become an important part in the North–South Korea process. [10], in one way or the other, will be on the agenda. [11] and [12] are for a more conscious near future.

We are dealing with systems, not single actors. Peace workers have to become relation specialists, with maximum knowledge about the capacity for peace-making, -keeping, -building of all the actors. Obviously, most such processes take time, like complicated diseases for human beings. And no remedy comes with the guarantee that it will always work. It may even be counterproductive, so be watchful. But the demand is enormous. And, we have much to offer.

11.4 The Code of Conduct and the Problem of Accountability

TRANSCEND felt the need for some guidelines arising out of experience, and to be tested by more experience. Here they are:

[A] *Mission Statement: Peace by Peaceful Means:*

- By *peace* we mean the capacity to transform conflicts with empathy and creativity, without violence; a never-ending process.
- By *transforming conflicts* we mean enabling the parties to go ahead in a self-reliant, acceptable, and sustainable manner.
- By *with empathy* we mean the ability to understand the conflict also the ways the parties understand the conflict themselves.
- By *creativity* 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 or non-materially.
- [2] You should possess skills/knowledge for the task and develop them further, but never use the conflicts only to acquire them.
- [3] Do not have a hidden agenda, for yourself or for others, beyond conflict transformation. 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 a mandate or organizational backing.

[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 too deep grudges.
- [6] Empathy/dialogues with *all* parties, also those you dislike.
- [7] Do not manipulate. Play with open cards, say 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 of 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 formation when no longer needed.
- [16] Plans for conflict outcomes and conflict processes belong neither to you, nor to the parties, but to the system at large.
- [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 public service. The reward is to do it well.
- [20] All conflicts are born equal and have the same right to transformation. No conflict is at a 'higher level' than any other.

Particularly important are [4], [13] and [20]. As mentioned, the code comes out of experience. This is the kind of thing that has to be tested against the experience and moral philosophies of others, for a good dialogue aiming at an ever better code. And the essence of that code, the moral maxims in a kantian sense, might one day provide a basis for the equivalent of an hippocratic oath.

But how about accountability? This is a right and duty kind of thing, between society and the profession, and between the profession and the individual professional. You give us/me the right to exercise the profession, and we/I assume the duty to do so according to a code of conduct. This is very different from the peace movement, protected as it is by the human right of freedom of expression, with no clear duty ever defined. It is more similar to the governmental approach. There are the Vienna protocols for the exercise of the diplomatic profession, and the Geneva Conventions for the exercise of the military profession. They set some limits even if the very essence of diplomacy, the skills of negotiation, seem to be exempt from any code of conduct and any accountability. Except to whoever pays the piper and hence, as the saying goes, is entitled to call the tune: the diplomat's foreign office. Or—if s/he is not simply seconded—the international governmental organization, the IGO, like the UN. The ultimate test remains the national interest, or the IGO, or the UN, interest.

Not so for the peace profession. The ultimate test is the human interest and nature's interest, not the interest of systems like local levels, nations, states, regions, the world. The test of the pudding is in the eating. Is there a transformation heading for peace? Do people lead better lives, with less suffering, more fulfillment? Or less *dukkha*, more *sukha*, in age-old buddhist terms?

11.5 Time Has Come, with Health Professionals as One Model

Health studies are highly inter- and trans-disciplinary, as even the most cursory look at the curriculum of any medical school will prove. But health studies are also inter- or trans-national. Ideally speaking, medical doctors have no father/motherland. Not only can they practice anywhere, but they have a value overriding patriotism, sexism, racism and so on: *health*. The Hippocratic Oath demands of them to treat friend, foe and Other alike, as mentioned.

We are moving in that direction also in the field of peace studies, promoting a value more important than national interests: *peace*. We are not there yet, nor is the task of inter/trans-disciplinarity carried as far as it merits. But conflict studies, or conflictology—as basic to peace studies as anatomy, physiology and pathology to health studies—span the whole spectrum from micro via meso and macro to mega conflicts, from individual psychology way into global, not only inter-state and inter-nation studies, two sides of international relations. Increasingly peace researchers feel at home at all these levels.

We need inter/trans-disciplinarity because traditional social sciences are so closely related to the growth of the waning Western state system, in the era of imperialism. Thus, world history is conceived of as parallel nation, state and regional histories. The social sciences politology, economics and sociology are clearly dedicated to the three pillars of the modern state, State, Capital and Civil Society, one at the time, endowed with a historicity not given to colonized peoples for whom anthropology was invented. And economics even explores only one economic system, capitalism ('capitalistics' would be a better word.) This is not good enough. The social sciences are badly in need of globalization.

Transcending state borders is only one of these challenges, however. There are other fault-lines in the human construction: gender and generation, race and nation, class (political, economic, military, cultural depending on the power involved), environment. Peace studies need transcending paradigms for them all, with no built-in assumption favouring one fault-line side or the other.

A major task of peace studies is to come to grips with *massive category killing*, referred to as 'genocide' when against a nation. Killing of unborn and born women may be the major form. Another is death by starvation, or by preventable or curable diseases. Health studies are focussed on avoidable diseases, including pandemics; peace studies focus on avoidable violence(s), including massive category killing. With more work on positive health and peace, not only to prevent disease and violence, they can both serve as guide lights for higher levels of human self-realization.

Trans-disciplinary and trans-fault line peace studies are around the corner. Security studies are the easy prey of upper class, white, old male patriotism from the Anglo-American countries producing settlers on the lands of others (like Israel). They have much to feel insecure about. Peace studies and 'security through peace' would serve them much better than 'peace through security'.

With deep globalization comes professionalism, and with professionalism come the dangers of self-righteous narrowness. Hence the need for pure academic peace studies able to analyze and critique practices emerging from within its own ranks.

But more challenges will line up. Whoever pushes in any direction, like peace researchers looking for more ways of turning theory into practice, and practice into theory, should not be surprised if counterforces appear. *Actio* always provokes *reactio*.

Other disciplines will try cooptation, like “the problem of peace is basically psychological”, hence Peace Psychology courses. Excellent when combinable with respect for a broader view, for the forest, not only for a tree or two. Taken alone, a step backward.

The strong reactions, however, will come from the professions that feel threatened, like diplomacy. The Track I/Track II formula, ‘governments do I, NGOs do II. Let us divide the turf’ is simply not good enough. Inter-state diplomacy—representation, information and negotiation—may in its present form be a dying institution, and not only because others do better jobs. The problem goes deeper, into the notion of peace as harmonized national interests. Where is nature’s interest? The human interest? The local level interest? The regional interest? The gender, generation etc. interest? The global interest? The world is more complex today, demanding a very multi-layered approach. The peace workers of the future can be useful all over, but not if they are tied to national interests; the concern of very few people anyhow.

A foreign office is not necessarily the obvious place to turn peace theory into peace practice, nor a peace ministry for that matter. We are moving away from the world as an inter-state system, toward an inter-regional, inter-local authorities, inter-human, inter-gender/generation/race/class world; all dependent on the environment. Merely blowing fresh air into the Westphalia system is suboptimal. Train the diplomats to do a better job and move ahead in all the other systems. With nature’s interest, and the human interest, as the ultimate test.

11.6 Conclusion

Research and theory guided peace work to produce more peace, not only more research, have come to stay. Bridging the gap between foreign policy pragmatism and peace movement moralism.

Further Reading

Galtung J (1974) *Peace as a Profession and New Peace Action Roles*. Chair in Conflict and Peace Research (CCPR), (University of Oslo, paper no 8, p 20).