

TRANSCEND PEACE UNIVERSITY: ADVANCED CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION 2016
Assignment 1: Response 1, from Johan Galtung, Course Director

Dear Participants--you delivered what I hoped: a very systematic approach. You focused on the 4 most belligerent states (you call them "nations" but they are actually multi-national) to get at the most problematic, you picked the 4 power dimensions, and you then focus on therapy as the 4 approaches in the formula. $4 \times 4 = 16$, you covered 15, not culture for USA that can be used positively, also on the USA, as it is so widely accepted. Fine!

Instead of "therapies are identified for four key areas of state conduct" maybe "for the four key types of state power that may take the form of direct, structural and cultural violence".

This defines your discourse. You then go ahead filling in the combinations with concrete proposals for therapy, and cover in five pages an enormous range. Well done! Only some comments:

- * "human rights"; with socio-economic, for structural violence;
- * Kurds "in bordering countries", Iran also borders, have a look;
- * Turkey is the NATO country closest to SCO; important point;
- * "Russia's unilateral sanctions"--not unilateral, reciprocal;
- * "against Kurds and Armenians" they used Kurds against Armenians

In short, the helicopter view from above that I argue, from high up like you do, and the going lower, even landing, for the very local and very concrete. The latter dominates our academic tradition; I want us to add the grand views from above.

Your conclusion, excellent, already proves the value of that: synergies emerge. You see common problems not seen from a more narrow perspective, feeding back to the 16 or 15 foci. Congratulations!

Why a chat room, and a joint paper? Because TPU also trains in dialogues, "mutually enriching search", very basic to mediation. And challenge the individualism in university training. But do not worry,

you will get individual grades, also based on your participation. JG