

**Violence is
the Problem:
Creative
Nonviolence
is the Answer**

Kevin Clements



PEACE TEAM FORUM

The following is the keynote speech (slightly revised) given by Professor Kevin Clements at a seminar, Agenda 2014 - Towards a Shift from Reaction to Prevention, organised by Peace Team Forum (Forum för Fredstjänst) celebrating its 10th anniversary in October 2005. The full report including other seminar contributions can be found at www.fredsforum.se/ <<http://www.fredsforum.se/>>

Kevin Clements is the Foundation Director of the Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Queensland, Australia. He previously served as the Secretary General of International Alert (1999 - 2003), and prior to that as a director of various academic institutes for peacebuilding and conflict transformation in the United States and Australasia. He is an advisor to governments, CSOs and inter-governmental organizations on conflict and security matters and has published extensively on these issues.

Copies can be ordered from Lotta Sjöström, charlotte.sjostrom@krf.se. The full report (including references) can be downloaded at www.fredsforum.se

Agenda 2014 – Towards a Shift from Reaction to Prevention

Contents

Introduction	2
>> Lotta Sjöström, Anne Casparsson and Margareta Ingelstam	
Violence is the Problem: Creative Nonviolence is the Answer	4
>> Kevin Clements, Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies University of Queensland	
“Prevention of violent conflict is a priority for Sida”	14
>> Henrik Mungenast, Sida	
Ministries Need Civil Society Organisations	15
>> Ragnar Ängeby, Folke Bernadotte Academy	
Civil Society Organisations need Common Platforms, Joint Efforts and Less Selfish Organisational Thinking	16
>> Reports from the group work	
We should be Proud of our Swedish Peace History and Make it our Future as well	17
>> Petra Tötterman Andorf, General Secretary, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, Sweden	
In Appendix:	
1. Peace Team Forum	20
2. The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict	21

Introduction

Agenda 2014 – Towards a Shift from Reaction to Prevention

Peace Team Forum had at least five reasons to organise a seminar on prevention of violent conflict:

- to challenge the current logic and hardcore responses to counter the threat of terrorism
- to explore the consequences of the Global Action Agenda, created and affirmed by CSOs in all the regions of the world
- to follow up the commitment by the Swedish Riksdag “to engage the Swedish society and its international relations in making prevention of conflict a national and international priority“
- to start some long-term planning to celebrate the year 2014 and “200 Years of Peace” with good conscience and
- to celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the Peace Team Forum (see Appendix 1).

In July 2005 more than 900 representatives gathered in the UN headquarters for the Global Conference From Reaction to Prevention (see Appendix 2). The aim was to work on joint proposals for implementing a common agenda, A Global Action Agenda for the Prevention of Violent Conflict in order “to make prevention the fundamental goal of collective security arrangements”. The Agenda has been created by thousands of individuals and organizations coming together between 2002 and 2005 in 16 different regions of the world.

The year 1814 was the last time Sweden fought a war on foreign territory. Since then the civil society organizations, not the least the youth organizations and the women’s organizations, have mobilized against armament and war. In 2005 however, we are

becoming more and more aware of the interconnectedness and interdependence of the elements in the global system. Approaching 2014, when we hope to celebrate “200 Years of Peace”, our challenge is not only to keep Sweden out of war but to make our global neighborhood a more just, peaceful and sustainable place for all.

Already in 2001 the Swedish Riksdag committed itself to a gradual change in security policy:

”The emphasis of the work should be on the first two steps in a conflict transformation process... in order to contribute to working with conflicts in such a way that the use of violence and human suffering can be avoided. Here, the greatest efforts need to be pursued”

” The role Sweden can and ought to take on, together with other likeminded, is to be constructively working in order to gradually make politics pervaded with a conflict prevention perspective”

However, making the shift to prevention requires cooperation and partnership. This is a challenge to many stakeholders: governments, municipalities, civil society organizations (CSO:s) – religious communities, trade unions, educational institutions, business and the media.

The international community has a well-founded reason to expect that Sweden will be constructively working and will take on a leading role. But how and why should the Swedish Government and Civil society organizations continue to advance concepts of global citizenship and the prevention of violent conflict in the face of xenophobic nationalism and fear and when others are dealing with terrorist threats with hard and ruthless means? The Peace Team Forum forwarded these questions to Professor Kevin Clements, a long time resource person for the Foreign Ministry, Sida and the Civil society organisations in Sweden. The following is a report from the seminar Agenda

2014 – Towards a Shift from Reaction to Prevention, in October 2005. The keynote speech (slightly revised) was given by Professor Clements.

The next step for all actors concerned – jointly with the Swedish Riksdag – is “to engage the Swedish society and its international relations in making prevention of conflict a national and international priority“.

Lotta Sjöström
Coordinator Peace Team Forum

Anne Casparsson
Rapporteur

Margareta Ingelstam
Coorganiser

In the process of checking the final text with the speaker we received the following PS:

”It is vital that Sweden does not become a member of NATO, does not fall victim to the fear mongering that the rest of the west is succumbing to and that it continues to follow an outward going, politically engaged agenda with the Sth, with those who are in struggle and those who are seeking genuinely nonviolent futures for themselves.”

Violence is the Problem: Creative Nonviolence is the Answer

Professor Kevin Clements is the Foundation Director of the Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Queensland, Australia. He previously served as the Secretary General of International Alert (1999 – 2003), and prior to that as a director of various academic institutes for peacebuilding and conflict transformation in the United States and Australasia. He is an advisor to governments, CSOs and inter-governmental organizations on conflict and security matters and has published extensively on these issues.

The Swedish Peace Team Forum, has done wonderful work, over the years, in helping civil society organisations join forces with the Swedish government and others to promote the early warning of impending violent conflicts and creative responses to the prevention of such conflict.

The Peace Team Forum stands in a long tradition of Swedish humanitarian concern . It has been inspired by Swedish political leaders who had a vision of what a better world looks like and what was needed to achieve it. Leaders like Raoul Wallenberg, Dag Hammarskjöld, Folke Bernadotte, Olof Palme have set the pace. They and many other Swedish “global citizens” have made major contributions to both the theory and practice of non-violent approaches to dealing with peace and conflict. In particular, (through their individual actions and courage) they have created an environment conducive to developmental altruism and an active concern for the promotion of stable peaceful relationships. Swedish neutrality, and a commitment to promoting “the common good” along with justice and welfare for all, has meant that the Swedish Government and people have been willing – when necessary – to side with the “underdog” in different parts of the world.

This historic record of altruism, however, is no guarantee that Sweden will always be a good “global citizen” even if the probability of continuity is high. The reality, is that the 21st century world (of which Sweden is an integral part) is being driven by motivations and interests that are inimical to

justice, liberty, multilateralism, good neighbourliness and nonviolence. Much contemporary foreign and domestic policy is being driven by xenophobia, fear and anxiety. Some of this is justifiable most of it is not.

In recent discussions with Swedish officials I discerned some disjunction between Sweden’s idealist past and contemporary contingencies. There is a feeling that Sweden cannot afford to be seen as an “idealistic” nation, exercising primarily soft power in its relations with others when the rest of the world is grappling with terror and terrorist threat largely by military means .

Because of this, Sweden, along with all other Western states, is under great pressure to project an image of hard power and deterrence instead of its traditionally softer citizen-based approach to politics and economics.

It is for Swedes to determine what kind of stance is appropriate for the environment that they are living in. But it seems to me, from the relative security of Australia, that the global pursuit of security through threat based deterrent strategies is counter productive. It is counter productive because these strategies do not deal with the primary sources of both direct and indirect violence and are highly unlikely to result in higher levels of global solidarity, genuine human security or an exhaustion of non-violent solutions to problems before violence is contemplated.

Furthermore they are generating new forms of nationalism which threaten to undermine the progress made towards multilateralism in the 20th century. This neo-nationalism manifests itself in national selfishness and parochialism; in particular a reluctance to think in terms of the human interest and a bias towards thinking solely in terms of narrow self and national interests. Let me illustrate this with what I call the pain calculus.

Pain calculus

Approximately 3,000 Individuals died in the attack on the World Trade Centre on 9/11/01. This was a tragedy and a shock to America. It made Americans realize that the most powerful nation in the world was as vulnerable as every other state in the world to top down or bottom up political violence. While each one of these deaths was a tragedy they do, however, need to be contextualized a little. Since 2001, 8-14,000 Afghan Civilians and Militia have died since the overthrow of the Taliban; it is estimated that 30,000 children die every hour of preventable diseases in the global South; 80,000 men, women and children have been killed in the Northern Ugandan Conflict; more than 100,000 Iraqi Civilians have died since the US invasion and occupation began; 2.2 million Africans died of AIDS in 2003 which amounts to 166,660 persons every month; finally 3.5 million have been killed, directly or indirectly, in Eastern Congo since 1985. Each one of these statistics, like all those killed in the World Trade Centre, is a human being. Most came from caring, loving families. Each one represents a cruel truncation of human potentiality. Each one deserves both our sympathy and grief. Why is it, therefore, that citizens of the North are more likely to grieve for those killed in New York, Madrid and London than those killed in places such as Goma, Monrovia, Morocco, Jakarta, or Jordon? If we have a strong sense of species identity each one of these deaths deserves to be mourned equally. Each one also represents unresolved problems that need to be dealt with if such deaths are to be avoided in the future.

It is a cruel irony, therefore, that the foreign and defence policies of many nations are being determined largely in response to the 3,000 individuals killed in the World Trade Center (and in other terrorist incidents since 9/11) and by the oxymoronic war on terror rather than by the problems that are generating most political and development fatalities in the world. Indeed, I would like to argue that most post 2001 foreign policies (and the domestic legisla-

tion underpinning them) are a grave misdirection of energy. The reality is that the vast majority of the world's population live in daily existential terror in terms of food, housing, clothing, safe water supplies and the availability of the right kinds of medicines to deal with preventable diseases.

So the very first thing we need to do to develop a culture of prevention of violent conflict capable of dealing with both direct and indirect violence is to problematise the issue of terror and terrorism and challenge the current military responses to counter this threat.

We need to ask whether counter-terrorist policies are proportionate to the problem and likely to generate stable peaceful relationships and wider levels of human security?

Given all the other sources of death; from preventable disease, underdevelopment, violent politics, and the existential terror that confronts the majority of the world's population why are Western governments so fixated on terror?

Deconstructing Terror

Between 1991 and 2001 there were 32,264 deaths from terrorist incidents. 91% of all terrorists' incidents in this 10 year period were national in origin and national in focus and accounted for 94% of the fatalities. This trend continues. International Terrorism is not the primary source of political fatality. Even with The World Trade Center, Madrid, London, Morocco, Bali and other terrorist attacks, those incidents, tragic though they are, have added around six thousands persons to that figure. We are looking, therefore, at 38-40,000 fatalities from terrorist incidents, over a fifteen year period. Because these incidents seem random and arbitrary, however, they have a capacity to induce much more anxiety than some of the other prime sources of political death. This does not detract from the fact, however, that on a basis of probability death from terrorist incident is extremely low, whereas death from starvation, AIDS or from one of the unresolved conflicts in Africa, the Middle East or the Caucasus is extremely high.

By and large most citizens of affluent countries do not worry about or mourn the countless millions who lose their lives unnecessarily through structural and direct violence. There are no large constituencies, for

example, mourning those who die from AIDS; nor (apart from their direct families) are there many individuals in the West mourning the 3.5 million people that have been killed in the Congo since 1985 or in any of the other violent conflicts that are generating so much human suffering.

I want to argue, however, that each one of these conflicts are as important as those that touch western strategic or personal interests more directly. If these so called peripheral or invisible conflicts remain unresolved they too – in some way or other – will become a source of deeper insecurity for all of us sooner or later.

The sad reality is that we are unlikely to do good prevention of violent conflict, or medium to long term peacebuilding unless we can expand our boundaries of compassion and our ability to empathize with all those who suffer unnecessary pain, death and destruction no matter where it occurs in the world. This is a pre-requisite for developing a deeper awareness of the problems confronting us and a better knowledge of what needs to be done to make positive responses to them.

Correlates of terrorism

In relation to terrorist threat, for example, this current United States Administration is not even listening to its own advisors in relation to what sorts of programmes are likely to be most effective in preventing terrorist violence.

The 2004 United States Political Instability Task Force, (drawn from the State Department and a number of national intelligence agencies) tried to find significant correlates of terrorism and other kinds of political violence. Working with one of the biggest computers in the world, they crunched a huge amount of data and *discovered four key variables which were highly correlated to terrorism* and other sources of political violence. These were the only variables that were significant in relation to terrorist threat. The four variables were as follows.

- **Poverty, Underdevelopment and Mal-distribution of Resources**
- **Weak regimes and Poor Governance**
- **Poor Regional Integration**
- **Bad Neighborhoods, where there is gun trafficking, drug trafficking, human trafficking and so forth.**

While these correlates are not “causes” of terrorism. It is clear that if they are not dealt with positively and effectively it is highly unlikely that incidents of terrorism will substantially diminish. We can conclude from this study, therefore, that the trillions currently being spent on military expenditure are unlikely to result in any dramatic diminution of terrorist activity. On the contrary they may in fact even fuel it. As a former colleague of mine, Rich Rubenstein used to state “Terrorism is violence by small groups claiming to represent massive constituencies and seeking by “heroic” provocative attacks to awaken the masses, redeem their honour, and generate an enemy over reaction that will intensify and expand the struggle”.

I think we can say quite unequivocally that a relatively small number of terrorist incidents, with relatively few casualties (tragic though these are) have indeed generated an enemy over reaction that is fuelling the struggle. It is vital, therefore, that we look at much more innovative ways of responding to these types of threats if we are to generate reduced levels of popular anxiety. In all of this it is particularly important that states do not sacrifice liberty to security, nor the rule of law for threat and coercive capacity.

Terrorism is not the problem. The problem is political violence

Most of human activity is peaceful. Most people, most of the time live in harmony with each other, doing what they have to do in order to ensure individual and collective survival. There are always some people, however, who choose to pursue their political objectives through violent means. Some of these persons occupy positions of political power and choose coercive means to achieve their political objectives. Others do not have any political power and are, very often, grappling with severe challenges to their identity, or their right to exist (e.g as is the case in Palestine). Or they resort to violence as a way of coping with instances of deep humiliation, rejection, marginalization and exclusion.

For these people violence is a way of communicating grievance, generating fear and arousing a negative reaction in order to expand their struggle. Terrorism, in this instance, is a particular crime

of the unheard. It is a crime in which the actor is saying through his/her own suicide or in the murder of others that: "They are willing to sacrifice their lives and take the lives of others in order that people and politicians will acknowledge their political agenda and/or their past suffering and humiliation."

After the attack on the World Trade Center the United States and the world had a chance to ask what those particular terrorists were trying to say through that desperate action? While there was some attention to their grievances the dominant response from the United States was a radical division of the world into "saved" and "unsaved", "evil doers" and "righteous" and a very vigorous assertion of state power and military solutions.

As President Bush stated on the evening of 9/11 to international lawyers in the National Security Council. "I don't care about international law I just want to kick ass". In an environment where the instinct for revenge ran high, politicians in the United States and in most other Western countries, asked for and got an immediate expansion of police, intelligence, and military capability.

There were few attempts at this time to identify nonviolent alternatives to terror, terrorist threats and other types of violence. Politicians have reasserted the primacy of the state as the major bulwark between order and chaos through appeals to patriotism and national solidarity. This appeal has resulted in a dramatic upsurge of xenophobic nationalism.

The Netherlands, for example, has built up an enviable political reputation for being politically tolerant, pluralistic and altruistic (in much the same way as Sweden). It only took a couple of political assassinations, by disaffected Moslems, to ensure that popular opinion in the Netherlands became less tolerant and more xenophobic. This has been accompanied by a significant diminution of tolerance in the Netherlands in the last four years and a willing acceptance of tighter border controls, stricter controls on refugees and immigration and narrower definitions of what it means to be Dutch. The tougher stances on immigration, refugees, and what constitutes Dutch identity have resulted in more inward looking policies, a less adventurous aid and development policy and a foreign policy aimed more at advancing Dutch interests than a just and peaceful world. This kind of development

could happen in Sweden if political leaders succumb to policies based on fear and if Swedish Civil society organizations and citizens do not insist on more principled policies.

What history teaches is that wherever there is a reassertion of military solutions to political problems without an exhaustion of non-violent negotiated solutions, citizen rights and fundamental democratic principles are jeopardized.

This is epitomised most graphically in the ways in which counter-terrorism is being used to justify political repression in a large number of countries. (e.g. Uganda, Kenya, Russia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Israel, the Sudan, and the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia as well). Repressive legislation in all of these countries challenges the rule of law and undermines many basic human rights. When it is coupled with tactics of rendition and "torture light" it becomes particularly egregious and undermines normative principles that Civil society groups and nations have spent many years developing. This is particularly worrying when such behaviour is committed by nations that are exponents of democratic principles with pretensions to international "moral" leadership.

This is why it is vitally important that small and medium sized countries such as Sweden resist pressures to buy into "The War on Terror" or military responses to terrorist threat. It was bad enough that Sweden assisted in the "rendition" of Arab nationals into the hand of the United States for transfer to states known to utilize torture. It would be even worse if Sweden were to abandon its principled neutrality and succumb to a fear based response to terror when it has so many other policy options that have proven more effective in the past.

To succumb to "torture light", alien doctrines of rendition, passive complicity in Guantanamo Bay and indifference to the continuing chaos in Iraq is a sure fire way for any nation to lose its moral authority and its claim to be a civilized nation. Civilized nations do not torture citizens for information or political purposes; they do not hold individuals without trial or just cause, do not suspend principles of habeas corpus and do not pursue their foreign policy objectives through unilateral military action unsupported by the United Nations.

It is very important, therefore, that civil society groups—which are key to ensuring high levels of

accountability and civility in all societies— hold themselves to higher standards than those who are willing to sacrifice principle for short term political expedience.

What are the alternatives?

The big alternative on the agenda is the rigorous promotion of human security.

“In the 21st century, all states and their collective institutions must advance the cause of larger freedom – by ensuring freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to live in dignity. In an increasingly interconnected world progress in the areas of development, security and human rights must go hand in hand. There will be no development without security and no security without development. And both development and security also depend on respect for human rights and the rule of law”

These are the words of Kofi Annan from his 2005 Policy document *In Larger Freedom*.

”In Larger Freedom is a long term alternative vision to the short term repressive response to terror and terrorism. It was supposed to frame a new political agenda for the world for the Millennium Plus Five Summit in the Summer of 2005. It was and is a bold and holistic vision – both analytically and practically– and it provided very precise benchmarks for nations to aspire to”.

US Ambassador John Bolton, on behalf of the US administration challenged and undermined this vision by tabling 750 amendments to the consensus document, one week before the summit began. Those of you that have been involved in multilateral diplomacy know that it takes years to bring these agendas together. In a matter of a week John Bolton took consensus document apart in order to assert US national interests. To add insult to injury he tried to persuade the rest of the world that these amendments were in the global interest.

The fact that the rest of the world could not prevent one country gathering its allies to dismantle a consensus document in this way highlights something about the dysfunctional nature of the United Nations. It operates as an organization of equals in a world of deep political and economic inequality. Those who

are dominant exercise this dominance within the system, thereby sabotaging the capacity of the global community as a whole to ensure that its interests are accorded primacy.

Human Security

Human Security requires high levels of integration and social cohesion. The UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs is focusing a lot of its attention on the ways in which such cohesion can be achieved through peaceful dialogue. One thing is sure, the recent example of big power diplomacy at the United Nations Millennium Plus Five Summit was inimical to cohesion and higher levels of global integration. The challenge facing the world community is how to prevent fragmentation, exclusion and polarization and how to maximize cohesion, inclusion and coexistence at national, regional and global levels. None of these positive processes can be advanced by coercive, big power diplomacy or by diplomatic bullying. On the contrary all of them require much more sustained attention to psycho-cultural, socio-economic and socio-political processes that ultimately result in higher levels of cooperation, integration and community. The sad reality is that some of the largest and most powerful states in the world wish to sustain the illusion that they can achieve their national interests by national means alone when most of the world’s problems are trans-national in origin and require trans national global solutions.

Integration and Peace Dialogue

For those interested in building a robust international community underpinned by the rule of law there is a need to develop policies that advance higher levels of integration, cooperation, and a willingness to cede small levels of national sovereignty in order to advance the global good.

Sweden provides a very good national model of how to advance political community—there is a willingness, here, to sacrifice some inequality for equality and to stress public welfare so that the basic human needs of each individual citizen can be satisfied.

This is a wonderful model for the rest of the world and it results in high levels of social and economic

cohesian. Civil society organizations, the private sector and the voluntary sector are absolutely key to the business of repairing broken societies and generating strong and resilient communities within which individuals can realize their full potentiality.

States are not by and large very good and promoting community and strong community relationships. In fact there is a robust debate within the literature about the precise nature of the relationship between state and civil society and whether it is possible to develop effective and legitimate state systems without a strong and robust civil society based on strong local communities. State-systems will not be able to deliver real security for their citizens, until they have ensured that all individuals feel that they are an integral part of particular political communities and until their basic socio-economic and psycho-cultural needs have been met.

Prevention of violent conflict

The long term Structural Prevention and short term Operational Prevention of conflict both require a commitment to nonviolence and the promotion of a culture of peace rather than a culture of violence. This is why the current international political climate is challenging to peacebuilders. The dominant orthodoxy of responding to security problem with violent military solutions is dramatically reducing the numbers of non-violent options available to both “track one” official and “track two” unofficial actors. It is vitally important therefore that Civil society organizations, Governmental and Inter Governmental Organizations continue to keep on identifying non-military responses to problems in order to provide official policy makers and CSOs with a way of expanding the firebreak between non-military and military solutions.

The Peace Team Forum’s work on these matters has made an important contribution to this project. Not only has it stimulated vigorous discussion on diverse roles that CSOs could play before, during and after conflict; it has always been committed to ensuring an effective division of labour between Government Agencies, such as defence, foreign affairs and the Folke Bernadotte Academy. It has also worked hard to incorporate the very specific skills of groups such as the churches and universities in this process as well. All of this has meant that many

Swedish CSOs have positioned themselves well for playing important roles with regional and global organizations committed to long term sustainable peace building.

Centrality of the UN and Regional Organizations

I want to reassert the central importance of the UN and regional organizations in the promotion and maintenance of international security and in the effective prevention of violent conflict. Multilateral responses to national, regional and global problems are an imperative not optional extras. United States unilateralism, in the last four years, for example, has been an unmitigated disaster for building stable peaceful relationships. The war in Iraq, for example, is generating considerable suffering with very uncertain future outcomes. Regional and global multilateralism has become a critical pre-requisite for both legitimacy and effectiveness in dealing with violent conflict. Unilateral solutions to multilateral problems have generated disastrous consequences in recent years.

UN activism over the past 15 years

Effective regional organizations and the United Nations can justifiably take some pride in the positive achievements of the past 15 years. Since the end of the Cold War there has been a lot of good news to report and build non-violent activities on. The recent Human Security Report, for example, notes that there have been no attempted genocides since Rwanda. The numbers of political crises are diminishing and the total numbers of wars have been declining. The world in fact, despite preoccupations with terrorism, has become a more peaceful place. The Human Security Report identifies the UN as central to a good deal of this good news. So when President George Bush and others say that UN has been ineffective the evidence suggests otherwise. Over the last fifteen years, there has been a six fold increase in UN preventive diplomacy missions to stop wars starting. A four fold increase in UN peacemaking missions to end ongoing conflicts. A four fold increase in UN Peace operations to reduce recurrence of war and an eleven fold increase in the numbers of states subject to UN sanctions. All of these represent very positive achievements for multilateral organizations. Many of these

positive results have been achieved in collaboration with effective regional organizations.

The European Union, for example, has made very significant contributions towards long term structural prevention of conflict and in recent times to short term crisis management as well. Similarly many international Civil Society Organizations (such as International Alert, Search for Common Ground, Mercy Corps, the International Crisis Group) to name a few have become much more professional in their delivery of conflict management/transformation services as well.

CSOs, progressive national governments, well integrated regional organizations and the United Nations acting together can achieve and have achieved much more in joint action than they can by acting alone.

Controlling Superpowers is a challenge for the Global Community

As Thucydides says: *“Large states do as they will. Small states do as they must”*. Small and medium sized states like Sweden, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Canada, and Ireland need the UN (As do similar sized states in the South). Large states can, if they wish, choose to work within the strictures of the United Nations or not. Whether they do or not will be determined by their own perceptions of their national interest. In recent years, the United States and some of its allies have practiced what I call “a la carte” multilateralism. They use the United Nations when it suits them and spurns it when it does not. This is one of the biggest challenges facing global citizens and state parties of the United Nations, namely how to ensure that the rules of the UN are negotiated by all and accepted by all.

Citizens everywhere need to focus more attention on ways of making the UN more effective while demanding higher levels of compliance with its rulings on the part of member states. It is a little unfortunate, for example, that some Civil society organizations are often more coherent than their UN organizational counterparts. They have often set the pace for states and regional and global organizations, in relation to prevention of violent conflict, the responsibility to protect, on early warning,

early response, and the development of integrated development and peace building agendas.

The UN could not do half of what it does without all the efforts of Civil Society organizations. All of the specialized agencies rely heavily on academics and CSOs for analytic advice and implementation. In dealing with the Pakistan/Indian earth quake for example, because of military impasse and logistic challenge neither the armies of Pakistan or India were capable of delivering the emergency supplies needed immediately after the crisis. Instead Oxfam, Care and UNICEF were on the ground in hours and days.

This underlines a critical point which is that all organizations and individuals working on development and peacebuilding need to be much more aware on how we are interconnected with each other. Political violence, militarism, xenophobic nationalism and terrorist threat will only be dealt with effectively if we are all mindful of the importance of harnessing the best private and public talents available and developing truly cooperative processes capable of responding to the kinds of challenges the world is confronting at the present time.

There is a very nice poem called Each Act. It is by a Tibetan sage called Jigme Lingpa.

***“When the eagle soars in the endless blue, its shadow races after, far below.
Yet space does not divide; bird and shadow are linked.
So too each act – Each choice and consequence.”***

In the field of non violent peacebuilding we have to be particularly sensitive to the unique roles that each one of us plays in relation to the prevention of violence. Each one of our activities, choices will have very particular sets of consequences and we have to ensure that these generate positive peaceful outcomes rather than negative violent ones. To develop this sort of awareness means generating more sensitivity to the ways in which different types of political and economic arrangements generate violent conflict.

Development Challenges

A lot of what we are doing and a lot of what passes as good policy in terms of promoting national

security and national perspectives on peace and justice, for example, is a way of protecting power and privilege.

The three richest people in the world have assets that exceed the combined gross domestic product of the 48 least developed countries. The world's 225 richest individuals of whom 60 are American with total assets of \$311 billion have a combined wealth of over \$1 trillion which is equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the entire world's population. 30,000 children die each day of preventable diseases. These global inequalities generate considerable envy, grievance but most importantly grossly unequal life chances. The development differentials between states and peoples are a consequence of a global economy which privileges the developed north at the expense of the less developed south. These economic differences and the final protection of wealth and status, however, is ultimately maintained by unequal military power. The most graphic example of which is that of the United States.

US Military Power

The US defence budget in 2005 is \$415 billion. This figure excludes the Iraq supplemental which is expected to top \$90 billion this year. The 14% increase to this year's budget was \$49 billion which is over half of what the entire world spends on Overseas Development Assistance of \$79 billion. The defence budget is larger than the combined total of the next nine biggest defence spenders. The US is responsible for 47% of the world's military spending of US \$1.05 trillion. This military inequality generates some deep pathologies not least of which is a reluctance on the part of many countries to mount political challenges to the United States even when it appears that its foreign or military policies are generating more instability than stability. It also helps explain why the US is able to bully the United Nations when it wishes. World military expenditure has been expanding for the past 6 years after an earlier decline immediately after the end of the confrontation between the Soviet Union and the USA. Unfortunately, none of this expenditure has generated more real security and it is doing nothing to advance wider concepts of human security in terms of freedom from both fear and want. Countries as militarily powerful as the United States need to be challenged by those who choose more defensive, less offensive defence postures. Even here, however, there are some important

anomalies. In relation to Sweden, for example, the Swedish military has a well developed defensive posture against probably military contingency. It lacks a capacity to exert much offensive capacity against neighbours or countries that lie out of the Swedish sphere of influence. Yet Sweden is the largest per capita exporter of arms in the world and arguably generates different kinds of security dilemmas in countries that it exports to.

It is important, therefore, when checking the militarism of the most powerful that we also raise questions about the intended and unintended consequences of more modest defence and military postures. In this regard it is important to identify the ways in which military, industrial complexes in different countries have both positive and negative developmental impacts and generate challenges to both structural stability and peaceful relationships.

Millennium Development Goals

It is crucial to deal with some of the root causes of fear, militarism and separatism. There will be no political stability, nor cooperative and human security unless much more attention is paid to the ways in which development generates the conditions conducive to structural stability. In particular it is vital that much more attention be directed towards reducing the gross inequalities that divide the world. It is also vital that less developed countries are assisted to achieve all of the millennium development goals by 2015. These will only be achieved, however, if all the OECD countries establish clear timetables to achieve the 0,7% (preferably 1%) of Gross Domestic Product for Overseas Development Assistance and apply these to the pursuit of the goals.

Dealing with the root causes of underdevelopment, poverty and exclusion also requires stronger connections between the private and public sectors. Civil society organizations can play an extremely important role here in helping promote and broker more productive relationships between and higher levels of corporate responsibility in the public and private spheres. But these need to be reinforced by support from regional and global organizations well. While some CSOs are specializing in development processes, e.g Oxfam, Care, Save the Children, World Vision, it is important that there be others

who are focusing attention on ways of controlling the instruments of war-weapons and weapon platforms.

Need to Re-Energize Arms Control and Disarmament

One of the major areas of neglect in multilateral relations at the moment is in the area of arms control and disarmament. The atmospherics post 9/11 have not been conducive to progress on this front. On the contrary 9/11 generated a dynamic in favour of new rounds of both conventional and non-conventional weapons development. Nothing has happened in this area for a long time. The NPT Review Conference was a failure – Nuclear weapons states remain in breach of their Article 6 Obligations; the Comprehensive Test ban Treaty is Languishing and needs more ratifications and the Anti Ballistic Missile treaty is now defunct because the United States breached its obligations to it. The CTBT was the first major nuclear arms control treaty renounced by a nuclear power. The US opposed substantive negotiations in the Small Arms and Light Weapons Convention and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has not had any substantive negotiations on any arms control issue for nine years. The lack of progress in all of these areas generates an environment that is positive to arms manufacturers and exporters but negative for those seeking more effective controls.

Nuclear Weapons -The Ultimate Terror weapon

While weapons of mass destruction were the pretext for war against Iraq, there has been very little progress towards their abolition on the part of the nuclear weapons' powers and they remain the "ultimate terror weapon" in terms of their capacity to wreak large scale indiscriminate destruction. The US and its allies have been sending deeply contradictory messages on this question. They have opposed potential proliferators like Iran and North Korea but accepted Israel, India, and Pakistan as de facto members of the nuclear club. They negotiate with the North Koreans – because they are assumed to have produced some nuclear weapons – but threaten Iran which has not. The implication of this differential treatment is that if you wish to be taken

seriously at an international level then nuclear weapons are important.

When one considers the challenges of global inequality, underdevelopment, pandemics like AIDS and the prospect of an international flu epidemic, the illegitimate application of military solutions to political problems and the willful subversion of global institutions it is easy to become quite pessimistic. It is imperative, however, that those who are committed to long term peacebuilding do not succumb to this inclination.

Importance of Hope

To do this we need to replace cynicism and despair with reality based optimism and hopefulness. In the first place this means that a pre-requisite for dealing with violence is hopefulness. Secondly, it is crucial that we work on replacing mistrust with trust, in order that good can be achieved amongst human beings prepared to believe in the intrinsic goodness of most people. Thirdly, it is important that we operate from best case assumptions. If we operate from worst case assumptions or adopt a paranoid disposition to others, we will never be able to generate the right sorts of conciliatory gestures to break cycles of violence and generate creative options.

Practice Political Jujitsu

To practice political jujitsu we need to place the weakest citizens – everywhere in the world – at the centre of political decision making. States do not exist to serve the interests of the rich and the powerful. These groups can look after themselves. But we will not sleep easy in our beds at night until the African continent and African people are given much more prominence in global decision making and their needs are acknowledged and met. Similarly the prospects for peace and justice anywhere will remain remote as long as the Middle East remains a suppurating sore. As long as Israel chooses to separate its future from that of Palestine and expresses its division with a physical wall Palestinian needs will remain unmet.

What would happen if all entire policy making were judged, by how well we treated the weakest and most vulnerable people in the world. I would wish to argue that real security, human security flows from placing the poor, marginalised and

vulnerable at the heart of our development, security and peacebuilding policies.

As Nelson Mandela said: “The common good ultimately translates in to a deep concern for those that suffer want and deprivation of any kind”

“The Art and Soul of Building Peace”

I would like to finish with some ideas from John Paul Lederach’s latest book *The Moral imagination – the art and soul of building peace*. In this book he argues that peacebuilders, or those committed to non violent solutions to problems need to generate new ways of seeing people, relationships, community and the world. There are four elements which constitute what he calls “The Moral Imagination”.

First of all the moral imagination requires the capacity to imagine ourselves in an inclusive and expandable web of relationships. This is critical to understanding something of the ways in which we are all connected with each other, or an affirmation of our essential interdependence. The Buddhists remind us that ignorance is an inability to see others and how our well being is directly dependent on theirs. Lederach takes this a little further as asks how it feels to put someone we fear as well as those we love in our web of relationships? What does it do to our sense of self, for example to put Al Qaeda in our web? How does this challenge us and how might we respond to this network creatively so that they do not harm us or ourselves? How do we imagine the worst that others can do to us and then respond positively and affirmatively so that this worst case scenario does not eventuate? This capacity to imagine ourselves in an inclusive and expandable web of relationships is very powerful and suggests ways in which we might develop some new thinking about dealing with those who might do violence against ourselves or others.

Secondly, the moral imagination requires the ability to sustain a problem solving curiosity that embraces complexity without reliance on dualistic polarity. What we sometimes understand as either/or decision making. We have to overcome the tunnel-vision that goes with dichotomous thinking so that our perceptual and cognitive screens are wider and broader.

The third capacity that Lederach highlights is the fundamental belief in and pursuit of the creative

act. What is creativity and how do we exercise it in responding to developmental and violent challenges. How do we develop creative leadership? That is leaders who are not driven by political expedience but who will ask a more fundamental question, namely “What is the right thing to do?”. How do we ensure that such leaders come into existence and are able to exercise creativity in responding to all the policy dilemmas that afflict us? How do we open ourselves to the creative acts that will have a transformative effect on relationships – removing their violent and enhancing their peaceful capacities?

Finally John Paul Lederach says there is a need for us to be courageous and to accept the risks in peace building. This is absolutely vital if we are to absorb the suffering inflicted by others rather than inflict it upon others. To do this means confronting the meaning of pain and suffering and its role in modernity. Judith Butler argues in her new book *Precarious life*, that America got angry after 9/11 because they realized that they were not invulnerable, all powerful and immortal as they had previously thought. They responded to this recognition with anger, revenge and by unleashing suffering on others. In doing so they restricted their empathetic ability and their options. Suffering is not the exception. It is the norm and we need to figure out how to embrace it when and as it happens so we can be courageous in response. Nowhere is this more important than in peace building which requires a willingness to suffer rather than impose pain and suffering on others. It sounds a little counter intuitive but throughout history when individuals and groups have done this, miraculous things have happened.

Pocket Mantra

I would like to finish with a pocket mantra from John Paul Lederach.

- Reach out to those you fear**
- Touch the heart of complexity**
- Imagine beyond what is seen**
- Risk vulnerability one step at a time**

I cannot think of a better prescription for replacing fear with hope, impossibility with possibility, violence and revenge with nonviolence and inclusion, inequality and injustice with equality and justice, revenge with forgiveness and reconciliation – all of which are pre-requisites for dealing with the politics of violence.

“Prevention of violent conflict is a priority for Sida”

Sida has created a new Division for Peace and Security in development co-operation. Henrik Mungén, representing the new division gave an account of Sida's new policy, Promoting Peace and Security through Development Cooperation.

- We have a new policy for peace and security through development and cooperation, where we put conflict prevention as one of our highest priorities and will start focusing on what we call structural stability. We see a need for a better conflict analysis, affecting the design of the programs.

Promotion of peace and security

For Sida the promotion of peace and security, includes all activities, within the specific framework of development cooperation, that consciously targets the attitudes and behaviour of parties to a conflict, as well as structural instability, [Add a comma after instability] and whose primary or secondary goal is to increase security and contribute to conflict prevention or resolution.

- Prevention of violent conflict is a priority for Sida, both as a direct initiative and working with structural stability. Sida shall have a Do No Harm perspective and promote Peace and Security through traditional development cooperation. There is a hidden potential in Sida's work, for instance in the so called “traditional” development co-operation fields; job creation, economic growth, agricultural development, etc. With an analysis in these initiatives we try to promote peace and security, hopefully also increase the conflict prevention as well.

Policy for Peace and Security through Development Cooperation

Sida supports activities to promote peace and security at all stages of the conflict circle: situations of rising tension, violent conflict, situation of submerged tension and post conflict. It is also important to

address the attitudes and behaviour of the broader public and key actors at different levels in society. By having a broad approach and targeting different groups, Sida is more likely to have a positive impact on the conflict dynamics.

There are different phases of the conflict and Sida has four major categories which are: submerged/raising tension, violent conflict, post-conflict and multi-phased conflict.

- What I want to point out is the submerged/raising tension which is conflict prevention before anything happens. For 2004 it does not reach more than around two-three percent. With the new policy we really would like an increase in the prevention, rather than a shift. What is important to show, is how little we can categorize today as conflict prevention or submerged or raising tensions.

Overview – Initiatives in Peace and Security (2004)

- 172 active projects and programs
- Disbursement of 588 Million SEK
- 107 new interventions amounting to approximately 710 Million SEK
- Increased awareness of peace and security in a development context among Sida staff

In this policy Sida has tried to use a broader term for security and does not look only at violent conflicts, but at the whole issue of human security related to violence.

Partners to Sida – Peace and security

Around 60 percent of all Sida's initiatives that deal with peace and security are with or through Non Governmental Organizations and Civil Society Organizations. Funding [I'm not sure that I have the right word here. I don't understand this section.] from framework organisations is not included here, which is one billion Swedish kronor, of which one part could be promoted for peace and security.

- Swedish NGOs 18%
- International, Regional and Local NGOs 40%
- Research Institutions 8%

- Consultants 7%
- UN Agencies 16%
- Swedish Governmental Organisations 7%
- National Governmental Bodies 4%

Relation to Global Action Agenda

- Sidas policy is in line with the ambitions of The Global Action Agenda. One part is the local capacity which should be promoted and Sida, as a donor, works with all different actors, such as UN, regional and international organizations. We have a diversity of initiatives that we can relate to the issue of security and structural stability. We usually try to categorize them in dialogue and security:
 - Attitudes/Assumptions, promoting Dialogue.
 - Root/Structural causes, promoting Structural Stability
 - Behaviour/Promotion of Security

Henrik Mungenast, Sida

Ministries Need Civil Society Organisations

The Folke Bernadotte Academy is a Swedish government agency dedicated to improving the quality and effectiveness of international conflict and crisis management, with a particular focus on peace operations. The Academy functions as a platform for cooperation between Swedish agencies and organizations and their international partners.

Ragnar Ängeby, formerly ambassador in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is one of the pioneers in promoting prevention of violent conflict and co-responsible for the Swedish Action Plan, "Preventing Violent Conflict".

- Ministries need civil society organisations. I am saying this to point out that it is worthwhile to be active. As a member of the Civil Society it is possible to promote policies, ideas and to change approaches and behaviours.

Terrorism as an act of despair, gives the entry point to one of the ideas we are trying to highlight at the Folke Bernadotte Academy. Despair is caused by

the lack of communication, by not being heard, not being listened to, not being able to be in dialogue with people with whom you have different views.

The answer to this is to promote dialogue and participatory processes as a means for change. This is not new or original at all, at least not in Sweden. We know it from our own history, from the end of the 18th century when we were creating the Civil Society Organizations of various kinds in order to promote ideas of change. In Sweden and also in the other Nordic countries, there was a choice between using violence and using peaceful means, like dialogue and communication.

First of all we had wise politicians who introduced the compulsory schooling system from 1842. We also had a lot of people, who organized themselves: football associations, choirs, trade unions, women's organizations and political parties. We started a process of learning about our own future. It was a very broad popular movement. There is a history of a choice of dialogue instead of violence all over the political spectrum.

This is a real challenge also today. Not only dialogue versus terrorism but also dialogue as a means to peaceful change in general.

Civil Society has a very strong role in this. I was very honoured to be a member of the group who designed the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Violent Conflict, GPPAC. GPPAC is based on 15 regional processes developing different regional agendas, with people from civil society organisations from all over the world taking part.

There has been a very positive response from the United Nations. The civil society organizations have made a breakthrough into international policy-making.

In the book *People Building Peace* are 90 stories of successful prevention of violent conflict. They show that prevention is possible and that it works. A red thread in all the stories is dialogue, the respectful recognition of "the other" and the right of "the other" to be listened to. The book is also honouring the process of common learning. There is a need for change of attitudes.

Many of us – including myself when I was younger - have thought that change can take place in organizations, countries, companies... But over the years I have understood that the only ones that change are the individuals, who than change institutions. It is a change based on values. Unless we recognise this

Organisations need a Common Platform, Better Models for Cooperation, and Less Selfish Organisational Thinking

clearly, we will not be able to change the world. If there are a sufficient number of human beings who understand things differently, the policy of the whole organization will change. Civil Societies can play a very vital role in this common learning process, by engaging and collaborating with existing institutions.

The purpose of the Folke Bernadotte Academy, which I am representing, is to create collaborative patterns between different organizations, working with peace building internationally. It must have a holistic approach including security and development at the same time. All different perspectives from different organizations need to be taken into account, all interests need to be listened to and there need to be one identifiable purpose for the action. We have started a very promising collaboration with Civil Society Organizations which is marked by this holistic approach.

This is a kind of a new paradigm, involving people today all over the globe. Many beautiful minds in the UN-system are involved, and we see the same thing happening in the EU. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe has a very prominent practice in this field also. Not much is written about it, unfortunately, but there are a lot of good examples of people collaborating for peace.

Many efforts have been made, even if it is still very far from enough, of course. My personal dream is to promote a culture of dialogue and participation as a complement and long term substitution for the use of violence and enforcement and also to endorse the power of dialogue as a basis for leadership.

This new way of approaching things could be further developed in deep interaction between civil society organizations globally and other actors. Power needs to be spread in common learning processes. Prevention of violent conflict, in my view, is to channel conflicts into peaceful procedures, where they can be handled in such a way that they can create resilient societies, which are able to handle different kinds of tensions.

Some say that civil society organizations are taken over by experts and technocrats, but I do not think that is true. I believe there is a possibility for involvement in genuine creative dialogue, as an alternative to this policy of force and violence. There is now a foundation globally for dialogue and participatory processes as an alternative to force and violence.

Ragnar Ångeby,
Folke Bernadotte Academy, FBAThe Civil Society

After break the participants of the seminar were invited to discuss three questions (see below). The need for better cooperation was affirmed by most of the groups.

How can we enhance collaboration between Swedish Development and Peace CSOs on development, security and the prevention of violent conflict?

We should try to define and establish a common platform behind which the organisations could unite. A more clear division of labour is needed. Conferences like the current one, more workshops, and seminars with people from all sorts of organisations will enhance collaboration. Exploring common goals and ways to reach out to the public may lead to joint programs.

Peace Team Forum should be a place for starting joint efforts. The CSOs should create better models for cooperation for some key issues. The projects limited in time often [delete work] function better than permanent cooperation. It is easier to define common goals and concrete tasks and responsibilities for short-term projects.

There is also a need for some self criticism here. There is a need of less selfish organisational thinking and more understanding for and commitment to cooperation between organisations.

State agencies should establish special funds for CSOs that want to work in networks, to avoid competition for the same money.

The Concord, the European federation for relief and development, [comma after development] could be

important in promoting cooperation. Sida Civil Society Center is a laboratory for experimental learning.

The Peace Team Forum could also be more of an information exchange. There should be more information on the home page on PTF in general, more information about the member organisations, what a specific organization is doing, contact persons, etc. PTF also needs a working group that is always on the go.

2. What can and should Sweden be doing in relation to the terrorist threat, development and peace building?

It is important that Sweden and Swedish representatives do not take the common definition of terrorism as the main problem. Sweden should stand united and start a fight against this definition, pushed forward mostly by the US. Here the Civil society organisations play an important role.

The concept of human security is important and there should be more focus on this. EU plays an important role in this field, where more and more resources are taken to combat terrorism.

- Some Muslims in Sweden want help with resisting the increase of fundamentalists in Muslim organisations and in the mosques. Swedish organisations should try to bridge the gap between the Muslim community and Swedish Civil Society organizations. What may also be needed are links to the homepage.

- It is important to discuss the concept of terrorism, what it is and how it is used, often for political purposes. PTF may initiate an analysis of the situation dealing with the underlying causes. The study can be used to influence public awareness and in a constructive dialogue between Swedish CSOs, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Sida.

3. How do we ensure higher levels of cooperation between governmental and non-governmental stakeholders?

- The government should realize the importance of civil society and invite the CSOs to seminars, etc. organised by the relevant ministries.

There should be more cooperation between governmental bodies and CSOs and cooperation on more equal terms.

When representatives of the government go abroad to conflict areas, they should also meet with members of the CSOs.

The CSOs should cooperate with the educational institutions to promote the inclusion of proposals and ideas for education and training for students in this field for those who may be considering service in government propositions.

We should be Proud of our Swedish Peace History and Make it our Future as well

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was founded in 1915 during World War I, with Jane Addams as its first president. WILPF works to achieve world disarmament, full rights for women, racial and economic justice, an end to all forms of violence, and to establish those political, social, and psychological conditions which can assure peace, freedom, and justice for all.

Petra Tötterman-Andorf is the General Secretary of WILPF, Sweden. She is also the co-writer of the book *Fredsagent 1325* (eng. *Peace Agent 1325*) to be published in the Spring of 2006.

When thinking about how Sweden should work for security, one of the most important points Kevin Clements made in his speech is that Sweden should not follow the international trend and narrow the concept of security. We should not accept the use and development of military solutions for political problems.

I was at a lecture at the Defense College a few weeks ago on the topic "Does Sweden have a military strategy"?

The professor who held the lecture started by defining what a military strategy is and drew on Clausewitz' theories. He stated that a military strategy does not have a purpose in itself but rather that it is one way of achieving a political goal, usually the last option which has been preceded by negotiations and diplomacy. He also added that it is important always to evaluate and ask the question, if

the strategy used actually achieved the goal that was set up. I believe that this is a question that Swedish civil society organizations should pick up on and the Swedish government as well.

If the Swedish political goal, is to work for international peace and security through preventive civil work, with the belief that sustainable peace comes from prosperous, democratic societies where democracy, human rights and equality are values that are being upheld, then maybe the question should be asked if military strategies are the most effective ways of achieving those goals.

The Global Action Agenda for the Prevention of Violent Conflict (see appendix 2) states that the emphasis now needs to be on strengthening the policy framework, institutional capacity and resources for prevention and sustainable peace building. This must include structural prevention, meaning efforts to address the root causes and enabling factors that give rise to conflict. It must also include operational prevention, meaning responding rapidly and effectively when tensions begin to escalate in order to prevent the emergence, spread or recurrence of violent conflict. As Kevin Clements said, both structural and operational prevention require collaboration between Civil Societies Organizations, governments and International Governmental Organizations. Sweden is at the point where we need to develop structures for working with structural prevention. We need mechanisms where the Civil Society Organization's experience of preventive work can be fully used. We need the collaboration between Civil Society Organizations, governments and International Governmental Organizations. In the Global Action Agenda there is a very wide range of proposals. The task of Swedish Civil Society Organizations is to analyze and explore which recommendations are the most urgent or strategic to work with. Hopefully we will be able to join resources with other actors on prevention and produce a joint national agenda for prevention. The Swedish Parliament has made a decision to prioritize prevention of armed conflict. It means that more resources need to be transferred from other areas of the Swedish national budget. Maybe a national agenda for prevention should include a very clear and constructive plan how to transfer the resources needed, year by year.

In prevention of violent conflicts work done by women's organizations is crucial. Gender equality

is an essential part of structural prevention. The Swedish government has a good understanding of women's multifaceted roles in times of violent conflicts, but there are still things that can be done to improve women's participation.

Sweden is working on a national action plan for the implementation of Resolution 1325, which is great, and hopefully this action plan will include: that regular and sufficient budgetary resources are provided for both gender mainstreaming and for initiatives targeted at women and girls; that Sweden should work within the UN to make sure that the mandate of the Peace Building Commission should explicitly commit to partnering with civil society organisations, particularly women's organisations through formal mechanisms at the headquarters and at the national level; that Sweden should develop a register of women who have education, capacity and experience to participate in prevention of conflicts, conflict resolution and reconstruction of society.

As a representative for an international peace organization that has been active in this field for 90 years, it is my firm belief that military strategies will not bring sustainable peace. Preventive work, involving all of society, is the only way of achieving peace and in these processes women and men must participate equally on all levels of decision-making. It is excellent that the Swedish government wants to take a lead in developing mechanisms and structures for effective ways of working preventively. We have a long history of being a society where civil society organizations have been deeply involved in working for peace and pushing our politicians to explore other ways of working with conflicts. That is something that was brought up by both Kevin Clements and Ragnar Ångeby.

I belong to a working group within Operation 1325, a network of six women's organizations. We are writing a book on Swedish women's work for peace. The purpose of the book is to be a source of inspiration and information for young women who want to work in the field of security politics. I wrote the chapter on Swedish women's history of peace work. I was really impressed by all of the Swedish women who have worked for peace, not just by the amazing number of famous women who have made a name internationally, such as Alva Myrdal, Inga Thorson and Maj Britt Theorin. I was especially encouraged by the number of unknown ordinary women who during the 20th century worked for

peace. My favorite example is the Women's Peace Sunday in July, 1915, which gathered 88, 734 women in 343 cities all over Sweden on the same day to protest against the upcoming war. This was before there were telephones in every home. There was no e-mail and limited ways of communicating, but still this amazing number of women came together to protest against war and show their support for peace in 1915. If people today can get inspired to feel the same way for peace, then we have come a long way in our work for peace. We should be proud of our Swedish peace history and make it our future as well

Petra Tötterman-Andorf, WILPF

Appendix 1

Peace Team Forum

Peace Team Forum (PTF, Forum för Fredstjänst) is a network consisting of approximately fifty Swedish Civil society organizations (CSOs). The network represents organisations from diverse areas - human rights, peace, development and aid. The aim is to develop a capacity for the prevention of violence, conflict transformation and peacebuilding and to contribute to a non-military structure for peace and security in Europe and the world. The network provides a forum for the organisations to exchange information and run joint projects.

Since the Peace Team Forum was formed in 1995, a main focus has been education, training and capacity building. A great number of workshops, seminars and courses have taken place as well as a university course, an education and training of trainers in conflict transformation, human rights and democracy. A curriculum for education and training for work in conflict areas was produced in 1995 *Empowerment for Peace Service: A Curriculum for Education and Training in Violence Prevention, Nonviolent Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding*.

Since 2001 an important focus has been conflict impact assessment in development cooperation. Peace Team Forum participated in the project led by Collaborative for Development Action, CDA, U.S.

In consultation with the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, PTF has organised two international conferences affirming the need of Government – CSO co-operation in preventing armed conflict (see reports in the list of references).

Transforming Conflicts and Building Peace, Experience and Ideas of Swedish Civil society organisations is a study by Anna Åkerlund, initiated by the Peace Team Forum. During the years 1999 – 2000, 58 Civil society organisations in Sweden implemented 69 projects aimed at creating and upholding peace in areas of crises and conflict. The inventory

also shows that there are many of examples of long-term peace-building in all phases of conflicts, including armed conflicts and reaching all levels of society.

In 2005 some of the organisations of PTF in cooperation with both national and international authorities prepared and implemented *a scenario based exercise in prevention of armed conflict*. The aim of the work is to identify tools and opportunities for cooperation in prevention of armed conflict. The exercise, which includes situations and events, stemming from structural or proximate causes as well as from trigger events, was also introduced at a workshop at the GPPAC conference at the UN headquarters in New York (see below).

Appendix 2

The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, GPPAC

The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict is an international network of civil society organisations working for conflict prevention and peacebuilding worldwide. http://www.gppac.net/documents/pbp_f/index.htm

GPPAC was formed to build a new international consensus on the prevention of violent conflict and also on peacebuilding. The International Secretariat of the Global Partnership has been held by the European Centre for Conflict Prevention, www.conflict-prevention.net.

GPPAC aims to support a shift from reaction to prevention through the following goals:

1. **To create a sustainable network of individuals and groups committed to prevention** and peacebuilding at global, regional, and national levels. This network will include multi-stakeholder partnerships involving governments, regional organizations and the United Nations in order to create or improve mechanisms for interaction between these actors and civil society.
2. To articulate and work towards the implementation of a **policy change agenda**, as articulated in the series of Regional Action Agendas and in the Global Action Agenda, that will strengthen the effectiveness of conflict prevention and peacebuilding.
3. To generate and **mobilise diverse public constituencies** around the world who are informed about the need for prevention and peacebuilding and the important role of civil society in achieving it and who actively support human security as an alternative to militarism.

The Global Action Agenda for the Prevention of Violent Conflict

Divided into 15 regions, the Global Partnership has worked over three years to develop Regional Action Agendas on prevention of violent conflict, and, finally, a Global Action Agenda for the Prevention of Violent Conflict. It was presented at the Global Conference 2005.

The Global Action Agenda outlines key priorities for change to achieve a shift to prevention based on promoting human security. Governments, intergovernmental organisations and civil society organisations need to mainstream prevention and constructive conflict management as the fundamental goals of their security institutions and instruments. Historically, the emphasis now needs to be on strengthening the policy framework, institutional capacity and resources for prevention and sustainable peacebuilding. This must include efforts to address the root causes and enabling factors that give rise to conflict (structural prevention), as well as responding rapidly and effectively when tensions begin to escalate to prevent the emergence, spread, or recurrence of violent conflict (operational prevention).

From Reaction to Prevention: Civil Society Forging Partnerships to Prevent Violent Conflict and Build Peace

The Global Conference on 19 - 21 July 2005, convened by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict in partnership with the United Nations Department of Political Affairs, brought together more than 900 people from 118 countries to launch a civil society international movement to prevent armed conflict.

Over three days, the 900+ participants convened in various fora to develop action plans to implement

the Global Action Agenda for the Prevention of Violent Conflict, the action agenda of the network. They unanimously agreed on the need for governments and inter-governmental organisations to direct greater priority and resources to early prevention of armed conflict and human security. They also highlighted the importance of the local ownership and the need for ongoing engagement between civil society, governments and international organisations for prevention and peacebuilding to be sustainable.

The Role of Civil Society in the Prevention of Armed Conflict

The Global Partnership has developed a programme, entitled 'The Role of Civil Society in the Prevention of Armed Conflict,' which is exploring the role of and strengthening networks of civil society organisations in the prevention of armed conflict. The programme aims to identify and implement mechanisms for interaction between the United Nations, governments and civil society in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

People Building Peace II: Successful stories of civil society

People Building Peace II, which was launched at the Global Conference seeks to document and draw attention to the important role civil society is playing in preventing and resolving conflict around the globe. In so doing, it wishes to fill a gap by showing that people on the ground, ranging from women, youth and faith-based organizations, to artists and media, can make and already have made a positive difference in many conflict areas.

The publication includes over 60 stories of civil society successes, many which have never previously been documented and most of them written by practitioners involved in the initiatives themselves. These stories are accompanied by thematic analysis and insights from key experts in the field of conflict prevention. The publication can be ordered through Lynne Rienner Publishers, on www.rienner.com. You can also read the digital version at www.gppac.net/documents/pbp_f/index.htm.

PbP, People Building Peace, www.peoplebuildingpeace.org, is a global campaign recognizing the vital role of civil society in preventing armed conflict. Launched by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict at the first civil society conference on conflict prevention at the United Nations, www.peoplebuildingpeace.org tells the story of people building peace worldwide.

"As civil society organizations, you have a vital role to play. You are uniquely placed to facilitate local conflict resolution; to mobilize public support for peace settlements; to support disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of excombatants; to champion human rights; and to build trust to encourage healing and reconciliation."

Kofi Annan

at the Global Partnership Conference at the UN,
New York 2005.

”As civil society organizations, you have a vital role to play.
You are uniquely placed to facilitate local conflict resolution;
to mobilize public support for peace settlements;
to support disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of excombatants;
to champion human rights;
and to build trust to encourage healing and reconciliation.”

Kofi Annan



PEACE TEAM FORUM