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MALE SPEAKER: Thank you all very much. We’ll continue now with our workshop. Please welcome our panelists: Alastair Crooke of the Conflicts Forum; Mark Drewell of Barloworld International; Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga, Former President of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka. Please welcome back our moderator, President Mary Robinson.

[Applause]

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you. I must say again that is an honor and a pleasure to moderate another session where we are moving to Bridging Differences in Embattled Societies. Again, I think we have really a very valuable and informed and experienced panel of participants. I would like to introduce them as I pose a question to them. So I will begin with Her Excellency, the Former President of Sri Lanka, Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga. We’ve decided to go on first-name terms on this panel, so Chandrika, you told me that when you were elected president in 1994 that you got about 63-percent support because you ran on a platform of trying to bring the people together and trying to promote reconciliation. Would you like to tell us a little bit about that and maybe relate it to the very difficult situation currently in your country?
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CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: Yes. Well, you see, in 1994 when I first came in as president, we had had several decades of conflict between the majorities in our communities and the ethnic Tamil minority because the Tamil people felt that there was discrimination. It was not at the level that you see in some countries; it was more to do with employment opportunities and access to higher education institutions, because access was limited in a number of places. They felt they were being discriminated against, which was true. Successive governments, after independence in 1948, tried to resolve the problem, but, for various reasons, did not succeed or did not pursue the effort. At the outset, somewhere in 50s, the Tamil leaders asked for federalism, but the consistent non-resolution of the problem led to some Tamilian people taking up arms and asking for a separate state. This, of course, was exacerbated further by one particular government who thought they could resolve the problem by unleashing violence on all the Tamil people, innocent Tamil people. They were attacked physically, killed, burned. About 60-percent of the Tamil population of Sri Lanka — about 750,000 people — ran away. This was in 1983. They live in your countries, a lot of the Western countries. Of course, the famous Tamil Tigers Group, the LTT, took over and there was armed conflict between the
government forces and the LTT. There was no solution, no alternate solution, to war suggested effectively by any government until 1994. We came in telling the people first that no government had accepted that the Tamil minority had been discriminated. We said, “Yes, there are problems; there is discrimination and this has to be resolved. It has to be resolved through a negotiated political settlement. The people gave us support and we went in for [inaudible] and many other programs, which I will talk about later on, to convince the people. It took us only two years. This may be a very interesting fact. In 1994, only 23-percent of the majority people — who consist of 75-percent of the population — agreed that this could be resolved without war. We did all kinds of programs — political, cultural and education — and at the end of two years, the 23-percent had gone up to 68-percent. Still today, that is the base. Today it is about 90-percent because the opposition party, which had not agreed on the solution we proposed, which was extensive devolution of power, has also agreed to the solution. So it is about 90-percent of the population. That is going to be the base. The situation has degraded since the change of presidents and various things — I don’t want to talk about that — but I think that the best that anybody can build on for peace, for
understanding and living together is this base of massive popular support for peace and ethnic harmony.

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you. I think it was very significant that you said that when you came into government, you government was prepared to say, “There has been discrimination, there has been wrong done, there has been.” I think this, in my experience, is so important if you want to get listened to and try to move forward.

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: In fact, I went to the extent of apologizing to the Tamil people for the 1983 program as president of the country, though I had nothing to do with it.

MARY ROBINSON: Yeah. I now turn to you, Mark Dewell. You’ve worked a lot on business and society and the interface between business and you’ve, in fact, been responsible for a group called Globally Responsible Business Initiative, which involves both businesses and business schools and so linking with young business. What was the most telling experience for you in how business can play a role in helping in the context of conflict?

MARK DREWELL: Thanks, Mary. I went to South Africa as a young manager from the UK in the second half of the 90s. We were sitting, as a large steel company, in a small town 150 km from Johannesburg. We were sitting with all the
conflict that existed in the country at the time. Just a group of three of us figured out that maybe if we actually tried to do something, using some of the principles that we used every day in our business, we could make a difference. We managed to persuade the angry young ANC comrades, the youth of the townships, to get together with the right-wing conservative town counselors from the White community, the church leaders and pretty much everybody who claimed to represent anybody in the mix that was a microcosm of what was going on in the country.

MARY ROBINSON: What made them come together?

MARK DREWELL: Well, the starting point was the use of that thing that business does well, which is the wallet. We had a situation where the community was actually boycotting paying its lights and water. We went along and said, “You know what? We’ll write off the backlog; we’ll provide a check if you guys will just do one thing, and that’s agree to talk.” At that stage, there were literally people being killed every day in riots and so on. It took until about two in the morning in a 24-hour negotiation to get everyone to agree to do that. The final swinger was to have a finance director walking backwards and forwards with his checkbook, waving it in front of all these people. The consequence of that was the creation of the thing called the
Middelburg Forum. I don’t know if Archbishop Tutu is still in the room— he’s left? I’ll tell you a little story. We created this forum and he came to see us about four months later. He walked in and nobody knew he was coming and everybody sort of stood up. He said, “Sit down, sit down.” He said, “Carry on.” So we were carrying on talking about the things that we were talking about, which was the goal of creating a better community for everyone, which was the one thing we could agree on. He stopped us after about 20 minutes and said, “Do you mind if I say something?” We said, “Go ahead.” He said, “I’d like to start with a short prayer.” And he got halfway through and he just cracked and he started crying. By that time, there were 20 of us from all the different groups in the room; we were all crying. He said, “You know, if we can replicate this across the country, than maybe we’ve got something here that could be a mechanism to resolve some of the challenges that we’re going to face.” He then, in partnership with one of the executive directors of the company I worked for, became a co-chairman of the Peace Committees, which were a replica of this process. So I guess the lesson for me is that people who have a huge stake in something, but don’t necessarily come from the center of a political process, can actually make a profound difference just by trying something.
MARY ROBINSON: Thank you, Mark. Alastair, you are currently director Conflicts Forum and you’ve been working in the context of conflicts, I think, for most of your adult life. But you did take me aback when you said, “I don’t do conflict resolution.” So I kind of said to you, “Well, what do you do?” More to the point, I think, what do you really feel is needed in bridging differences in embattled societies?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: Perhaps I ought to explain. We don’t start essentially from the proposition that violence is immoral and is the cause of the conflict and that if only people would just stop the violence – why can’t they understand and stop the violence and then we can conciliate and things would go well? That, I’m afraid, has not been my experience in nearly 30 years of conflicts. Actually, it’s usually actually the paramilitaries, the extremes of the spectrum that are the triggers that bring down the level of violence. In our experience, the causes of violence are deep political and psychological aspects. What we seek to do is circumscribe the use of violence. Usually violence is the end product of a political process and conciliation is very seldom effective at the beginning of it.
MARY ROBINSON: And what are the most difficult issues that you’ve tried to work on — one of them anyway — where you can tread us through what makes a difference.

ALASTAIR CROOKE: Well, I think the most difficult example at the moment — and certainly if you take it within the Middle East and the Palestinian context — is simply, as was described earlier this morning, the sense that we’re getting further and further apart. We talk to fewer and fewer people. Fewer of our policies are working. There is a great paralysis in the political sector of life, which has no effort at actually trying to change their mindset and re-examine what should be doing. We basically need to start from scratch and think first of all a little bit about the nature of the struggle that we’re facing and re-examine that from scratch. We need to look and re-examine what is Islamism, because I believe that we have that totally wrong, and then we need to re-look at the tools with which we deal with it.

MARY ROBINSON: When you say you think we have Islamism totally wrong can you briefly say why?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: Yes, we perceive the west is engaged in a struggle against what we see as a continual of Islamist extremists. And we see this is the struggle that we are facing. In fact, there’s just as much of a struggle
within Islamism, and more than that, when you listen to
Islamist groups and you hear them speaking both from what I
call the revolutionary wing and the revivalist wing, they use
language which is quite interesting, and people say well how
do we do politics with these people because they don’t seem
to have a political agenda. But quite often the words that
they’re using are words like respect, dignity, and justice.
And maybe these are words that are familiar here,
particularly in the United States, and I think they were the
sort of language that came out of the civil rights movement
here. And I think what you are seeing, partly in the Muslim
world, and what Islamism’s about is it is the politicization
of a deep discontent of the world order. It’s not simply
about religion. It’s about a deep discontent at the world
order and a desire to confront not the west, but western
hegemony. There is a distinction between being anti-west and
being against western hegemony.

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you. I see your head nodding,
there Chandrika, but I wanted actually to ask you if you
were, today, president of Sri Lanka again, what is the one
thing that you would seek to do in the present context?
Again, you have to be short because I want to get one more
from each of you in that time.

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: In Sri Lanka?
MARY ROBINSON: In Sri Lanka.

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: There are many things I’d like to do, but I think we’re talking about the ethnic conflict. Well you see, towards the end last year, efforts had borne fruit to the point, to some extent, where the extremist group had agreed, under pressure also by their people who are not violent in the majority, to work with the government within limited structures, especially after destruction of tsunami because the areas held by the rebels were also very badly devastated and they needed to work with the government to rebuild. We offered to do that with them, and we were able, for the first time, to persuade the rebel organization to come into an institutional arrangement to accept the existence of the state of Sri Lanka, which it had not up to then, and work with us for the reconstruction of those areas. That was signed, despite much pressure. But it was halted by a decision of the courts. Some extremist elements went to court. And all I would like to say here is many institutions in our part of the world are corrupt, and we could not implement it temporarily, but we had found solutions, ways of getting around the legal decisions to implement it. I would say that government will have to bring up that kind of institution. They will have to stop believing that violent confrontation with even the terrorist
group is going to bring lasting solutions. It cannot because
it is a no-win war for both sides.

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you, and unfortunately I’ve got
to stop you there because I know there’s so much more,
obviously, that you could say.

Mark, you spoke about the role that business played
in South Africa and a little bit about just at the times how
really tense and difficult that was but how important it was.
Business in our world today, in our globalizing world has
enormous power, has wealth and influence and can do things
within it’s sphere of influence. Sometimes the multinational
business community is responsible for violations of human
rights and we all know that. But on the side of being part
of the solution, do you think that business is doing anything
like enough, and where would you see that business should do
far more, a little akin to the South African experience?

MARK DREWELL: It’s interesting. A lot of our
attention in the last couple of years has turned from the
local stage to the global one, and it’s been built on the
recognition that in this interconnected system in which we’re
operating, it’s really not much use to kind of tackle it
piecemeal. And is business doing enough? Absolutely not.
And having worked for the last two years with a group of 20,
now 40 and growing, businesses and business schools from
around the world trying to answer the question “What do we have to do to create globally responsible business leaders?” the conclusion we’ve reached is it actually starts with the fundamental question of what actually business is all about. And of course the traditional answer is well it’s about the pursuit of profit. But when you put that to that idea at a more profound level, you realize that for the millions of people who go to work every day, do describe the dedication and passion that they put into their lives in business as about the pursuit of an income statement is profoundly inaccurate. What we haven’t done is reached an agreement about what business should be about. But it’s certainly something about economic and societal progress. And in that sense, we’re sitting at this transition from — if you look at it in terms of human development — the idea of moving from a focus on “I” to “we,” (“we” might be “my nation,” “my country,” “my company”) to the question of what’s the agenda for all of us. And I think so far in business we’ve done a pretty poor job of defining that.

MARY ROBINSON: It’s interesting because I’ve become aware in this country of the Global Development Initiative, which started in Seattle with Bill Gates, Sr. and some others there and then networked to various cities and had a big forum in Washington a short time ago. And that is business
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seeking to influence the administration of this country to do more to bridge their rights. So in a way it’s a little bit like what you’re talking about, but maybe the beginnings of what business really needs to exert the influence that it undoubtedly has.

Alastair, you’ve been sort of working on issues of conflict. You were a special advisor to Javier Solana. What’s your sense of how we can possibly resolve one of the deepest and most worrying issues in our world today because it has been branded a genocide and it does certainly involve huge displacement, huge raping of women, terrible, terrible situation. I’m talking about Darfur. From your experience, what are the ways in which we could make much more rapid progress in addressing that?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: I think the pattern is probably a similar one to the Middle East. Instead of casting it simply in black and white and that on the one hand we have an uncooperative and unresponsive Muslim government and we have simply them taking action against others to understand that the problem within the rebel group is very much more complex. The roots of this problem are very complex between both Bedouin, or if you like, mobile livers and crop growers and to understand some of the roots of this problem rather than simply wanting to demonize one party to this group. Very
noticeably you see everyone putting the responsibility for
the failure here simply on the government. It was equally a
number of the rebel groups who refused to sign the peace
agreement and who have similarly now split and who are
continuing to refuse to sign the agreement. But you hear
very little of that in western statements.

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you. When I think of embattled
societies and bridging a difference I do think at the level
of those I saw when I was UN high commissioner for human
rights. The very front-line victims, very often elderly
people, children, women, and yet they’re not part of a kind
of involvement in a solution that comes from bottom-up
enough. And how do we create more bottom-up listening and
empowering to try to address some of the conflicts. And
perhaps I’ll go back to all three of you on that. It’s just
there are those who talk around, but there are those deeply
effected, and they are effected every day by the terrible
context they live in. How do we make them more able to
participate in the peace making that effects them deeply
because they’re living in conflict?

Yes, I’ll work my way back. Yes, Alastair.

ALASTAIR CROOKE: I don’t believe they are involved
in any resolution of conflicts that I’ve seen. There may be
some cases. But I think our common model for conflict
resolution, which sees civil society and, if you like, the victims of conflict as being the prime movers to ending it, is just simply not true. It has always been in practice, the people that control, if you like, the armed forces that have ultimately triggered it. Occasionally then civil society plays a role afterwards, but I simply do not accept that the western view of conflict resolution as a sort of linear movement works. And I think the how to actually bring about and trigger that change has got a great deal to do with creating the psychological circumstances in which the people that do control the armed groups feel that they can de-escalate in a psychologically safe situation, in other words, with respect and dignity.

MARY ROBINSON: Mark you spoke about the business in South Africa getting into discussion with young angry ANC. In Northern Ireland we saw the role, not just of business but of women’s groups reaching across community etc. In your work with business, how important do you think it is to involve local communities in situations of conflict in being part of the solution?

MARK DREWELL: I think it’s critical, and to me the key issue is to involve every – I hate to use the word, but – stakeholder group. One of the things that we tend to do often in the west is have this idea of representivity in the
sense of saying well they’re the biggest and they’re the second biggest group, so let’s talk to them. And these guys out on the fringe don’t need to be paid attention to. But certainly our experience is that the idea of engaging everybody who stands up and says I have a point of view and I wish to be engaged is really essential because it’s in the listening to them that you often find the solutions to problems that don’t come from the mainstream actors. Just very quickly also, what’s interesting is I read the other day — one of my other roles is I’m chairman of the largest conservation NGO in South Africa, and in that capacity I was reading an interesting article that observed that every one of us in this room is probably responsible, fundamentally, for Darfur because it’s the nematic tribesman are living with the consequences of rapid climate change and the fact that they can’t take their herds where they used to. And so sometimes it’s a bit late when we try and tackle it at the level of fixing the outcome rather than addressing the root problem.

MARY ROBINSON: But at least it’s good to see the interconnectedness and the consequences, and I think that is a good point.

Chandrika, you spoke already about reaching out to the Tamil, including the Tamil Tigers. What do you think
about this idea of trying to involve local communities in situations of conflict, particularly in the context of Sri Lanka or wider than that if you wish.

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: You know I think I agree with Alastair on this issue. It’s not just a one-way process. In democratic countries — there are conflicts in non-democratic countries also — the people do get involved anyway at various levels, the business people, if I’m talking of Sri Lanka and several other countries. They start initiatives. The intellectuals, they start dialogue, they start discussing. The media bring this up, various … women’s groups. But that finally has no result unless those in power, as was said, those who control the armed forces, the governments have an honest commitment to resolving the problems. And I would like to say that it is not only national governments but if you’re talking of conflict, ethnic, religious-based, or whatever unless the international community, especially the big powers, decide that the thorns in the side, the consistent ones like Palestine, Kashmir in my region, and so many others, should be resolved with an honest commitment, I know they can be resolved if those who are concerned in the world want to resolve them. That would be the solution. And the people follow. Sometimes the people lead, but it serves no purpose unless those who have
the power, who dispose of the power to make the change also participate effectively and honestly in the process.

MARY ROBINSON: I think that’s a very important point, the accountability of those who have the ultimate power, their responsibility to those who are victims of their lack of effective action.

We have the notes, the three zeros again, so we’re out of time on this part in the discussion. It’s obviously a very big area of discussion, and we very much look forward to what comes now from your table discussions, the kind of questions that you can enable me to fire at this excellent panel when we come back. So we look forward to hearing what you think about these issues. And I really thank this excellent panel so far for what they’ve been saying.

ROB: And two quick things first. For the facilitators, make sure that your monitors are for the 3:00 not the 1:00 session. It kind of makes a difference. And the second thing, the question we would like you to focus on is based on your experiences. A lot of you come from different places in the world. What are the lessons you’ve learned? You’ve learned both from what you’ve heard and from your own experience about what works and doesn’t work in conflict resolution. What can the business community do? What can civil society do? What ideas do you have about what
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people here can do? Thank you. We’ll be back in about 25
minutes.

[END RECORDING – PART 2]

[START RECORDING – PART 3]

MARY ROBINSON: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, distinguished participants. It’s actually very impressive to see how deeply engaged you are at the different tables. I’ve seen some of the discussion and some of the exchanges, and obviously it is a rich exchange that you’re having, and I don’t know how it’s going to be possible to capture the deeper levels you’re probably getting to at those tables. But you have submitted some very good and searching questions for our three distinguished panelists. And I’d like to bring them back into game now, and for that I do need your silence, your attention, your patience. You can resume this conversation later maybe – as we Irish would say – at the bar. [Laughter]

But the first question I want to put, and I’m going to actually put it in the context of moving on a bit in what we were talking about earlier, and I want to put the first question to Chandrika. And it’s really a broader question. How do you practically address problems of conflict resolution when more and more leaders are couching the
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problem as a conflict of civilizations?

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: In the first place I don’t agree that it is a conflict of civilizations, nor an inherent conflict religious or ethnic groups. In fact, very briefly if you look at the history of ethnic and religious conflict as it resists today in the modern world it seems to be in the history of mankind a very recent phenomenon, a 20th century phenomenon, the way we know it. And the problem seems to have been exacerbated in the post-colonial period. People looking for identities in their religions, in their ethnicity and getting locked up in narrow confines of ethnicity or religion. What I would like to ask is why can’t we look at ourselves not as I’m a Muslim or he’s a Hindu or he’s something else, but as human beings who belong to different communities? A Muslim can be a Muslim, but a British, an American, a Palestinian, a Pakistani. They can also identify themselves with a profession, with political beliefs. There can be Muslims who believe in — if you talk of the United Kingdom — in the politics of the Labor Party or in Republic politics or Democratic politics. So rather than defining people and strengthening this narrow definition of humans into ethnic communities or religious communities, I think we have to look at the other commonalities that people have and perhaps through various
programs that have been done that we have been talking about through non-governmental organizations, governments and such like, to expand the perspectives of communities to find common grounds where people can interact while keeping the specificity of their community, ethnic or religious or whatever, but also getting together. I don’t like the word integration because it has all kinds of other connotations: a strong majority community, integrating the minorities into them and you have to forget who you are. But while every community, big or small, powerful or weak keeps their different identities that they have to become part of — what was the word you used? Somebody used the word co-existence or something I think. Whatever the word, to become part of a larger community, the world community.

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you. As you were talking I was thinking of some of the recent writing by [inaudible] of the layers of identity in each of us. And it brings be to a question I’d like to put to you, Mark, and it’s reflected in a question here. We’re in an era of globalization, the word used in so many different contexts. Is it time to be thinking about global citizenship in some way, and again putting it in the context, can business play any role here or have you thoughts?

MARK DREWELL: It’s interesting. There’s a project
that I saw recently, which started in 2000 and it was the idea that children should get together and vote to identify the child and the adult who’d done the most for children’s rights in the world. It’s called the World’s Children’s Prize for the Rights of the Child. And they started in 2000 with 19,000 participants. This year in 2006, four million children around the world voted in this project. And the only thing that stops it from growing is the amount of funding it has. So there’s something going on out there around this idea of our interconnectedness that is turning many of the younger generation into global citizens whether we of the older generations, who still think first at a national level, like it or not. And one of my young friends said to me you know if you ask me what nationalism means for me, it means — he’s a European — he says it means a football team. It’s the team I supported in the world cup, which is a kind of very different concept. And why because he lives on the Internet. He lives in a globalized, interconnected world. So this question of creating global citizens I think is particularly prevalent in a land that appears to an outsider as embattled as much as the US does right now as something that I think can raise the game. And businesses have a natural role to play because most of us who are any size live in a world where national boundaries are almost
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irrelevant to what we do. So to me yes and something like the Children’s Prize is a great example of what you can do to foster that philosophy in people.

MARY ROBINSON: And building on that Children’s Prize, focusing on the rights of children, we do have the value system, thanks to Eleanor Roosevelt and her colleagues, the universal declaration of human rights is that universal value system if we want to have and global citizens.

Alastair, because you’re a bit of an expert in this area, I want to ask you a tough question. At least I think it’s quite a difficult question. We’re always seeking, in places of conflict, to find the moderate leader. Is the moderate leader too often trying to be representing our values and do we sometimes make a mistake in no understanding who the real leaders to bring out of conflict may well be?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: Yes I think this is a fundamental problem that we face that too often we simply define moderates in terms of - particularly Arab leaders - that simply pursue United States or western interests. And we define them and say these are moderates. They are not moderates. Many of them are simply dictators who are there and have been there for some period of time enforcing their interests and our interests. And where we need to look, and if we look at the polls and the statistics that are produced
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by organizations such as the Center from Strategic Studies in Amman and Jordan, you will see very clearly that Muslim opinion views the moderates as being brutes like Hezbollah, Hamas, Muslim brotherhood, [inaudible], that they overall score enormous support in terms of credibility and legitimacy. There is not that much support for what I call the revolutionary movements. But when we search and look for moderates, we’re quite often looking for a non-existent constituency in the region or pro-western, secular people like us that we hope will come and fill the space. But they’re not there.

MARY ROBINSON: And just to pursue that more specifically, how would you recommend dealing, first of all with Hamas, secondly with Hezbollah and would you draw distinctions in how to deal with each?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: One think in common is that we need to talk to them both. Both of these are movements that have credibility, legitimacy, in their own society. They’ve been elected. They have support at all levels. They’re not just simply a group of armed people. So I think first of all that you need to talk to them. But secondly I don’t think it’s very difficult. I believe it’s quite easy if someone were able to put together the steps for some form of resolution, certainly with Hamas in terms of a series of steps. The
question that’s lacking and the problem that’s lacking is there doesn’t seem to be any political leaders, either in Europe or in the United States, that seems to have the political courage, actually, to do that painstaking work. I remember George Mitchell telling me when I was on a fact-finding committee with him, the hardest part of the peace process is the choreography. It took me two days to write the Good Friday Agreement, three months to do the choreography that put it together.

MARY ROBINSON: I can’t resist telling a wonderful anecdote about George Mitchell and his work in building a peace process in Northern Ireland. He was initially there for an economic leadership to give a peace dividend, and then was given the much broader mandate and was there for several years. And I remember asking a loyalist from the Protestant community who had come down to my official residence when I was president. He was part of a group that we were encouraging to come down. And I said to him, “Billy,” I said, “To what do you attribute the fact that George Mitchell was able to create this coming together in a peace process.” And he said “President, he listened us out.” [Laughter] And I thought it was quite an expression I’ve never heard used that way before. “He listened us out.” And I remember honoring George afterwards and on behalf of Irish people at a
particular award and using that expression, which I must say he liked.

We’ve got the zeros in front of us again, so we’re onto the next phase. The panel doesn’t go away, as you know, and we hear some more of your themes and thoughts and we’ll respond to them.

ROB: But just so you know, George Mitchell will be here tomorrow because he’ll be moderating our final panels. So we could ask him about that.

It’s very impressive when I read, and I’ve heard from the table facilitators and the theme team, the interaction. You’ve been reacting, taking in, it seems to me, what you’ve heard and actually coming back to the panelists with questions and suggestions. And you’ll see it on the screen, I’m going to divide it a little bit differently. It seems to me what I’ve heard is a reflection both about the content of the pursuit of a peace process, if that’s what we want to call it, and the actors that need to be involved. And in terms of the content, it’s the issue of the balance between justice and reconciliation or justice and peace and how do you reach that right balance, and the necessity, the urgency, the importance of accounting for past conduct, apologizing when need be, or at least acknowledging past wrongs. And I think those things in terms of the substance of any conflict
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resolution seems to have come out from your conversations.

The other issue is who? Who needs to be involved? On the slide you’ll see they’re extremists. I think as we just heard that that division between moderates and extremists may not be the right one. But we know who you mean or what we mean by that, and you have to make peace with those who are making war otherwise it’s simply a vacuous conversation. So I think that’s one thing that came out of your conversations, the necessity of integrating women in the process as an untapped resource, the importance of the business community. And here the notion that came out is at a minimum the business community should do no harm, and the importance of bringing all sectors of society through by generating employment and giving all members of society a stake in stability. I think the last point that was raised, which goes to the need to support efforts to strengthen the rule of law, respect for police and legal authorities at the local level.

So I think again, you enriched the discussion of the panel. It will be very interesting to hear what the panelists have to say in reaction. One last plea because I don’t want to come back after this ends, as I said you’ll be tired of me in no time, please for those of you who haven’t made commitments, there’s a day left, tomorrow and Friday.
Please make your commitments. This is where the president ... this is why he invited you. This is what this is all about. It doesn’t have to be the million dollar commitment, although of course those are welcome. But anything you can do, please give them to the commitment tables, make sure that you don’t leave here without having done it because then we’re going to have to be running after you, and it won’t be pleasant for any one of us. Thank you again.

MARY ROBINSON: Okay, well you’ve certainly been reflecting on very interesting areas, and these are areas that I do want to put again to our panel members. The first was that total area of balancing of justice and reconciliation with the urgency of holding those who have done grave wrongs to accountability. And this can often be a very difficult judgment call, particularly with the role now of the international criminal court. And do either Alastair or Mark — let’s start maybe with you Alastair. The situation now in Northern Uganda and trying to bring about reconciliation, the situation in Sudan — you’re shaking your head. Well maybe just the role of indictment before the ICC and seeking to move forward. How do you see that?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: I can understand the motives for this, and I think that people are very committed to this idea of finding some form of accountability. But I must say I find
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it very troubling for someone who’s trying to actually deal with a political negotiation, which involves conflicts, and therefore often two completely contradictory narratives of what has happened and who is responsible. One of the things that is almost impossible is ever to reconcile those narratives, and therefore usually it turns out to be victor’s justice, rather than real justice as such. But more importantly, we’ve seen in number of recent negotiations that this becomes the breaking issue, the issue about is there going to be a guarantee of no prosecution, which is the only way to bring in the important people into the final discussion. Because, as I say, in my experience it is always been the people that control the armed groups that are crucial to triggering, if not actually implementing fully, the process and it makes it quite difficult if you’re going to slap warrants for their arrest on them at the same time you’re trying to talk to them.

MARY ROBINSON: But if there is impunity, if there’s a lack of accountability, will you have a sustainable peace? It took a long time but meant a great deal in Chile when General Pinochet was eventually brought before courts very far from his country, referred by Spain to the House of Lords. But then when he came back to Chile it really has made a huge difference and helped those who were the victims and who were hurt. Mark, have you a view on this?
MARK DREWELL: I think the South African experience tells us that if what you’re trying to do is build a better nation for the future, then the answer is to focus on what it is that’s going to create that. And the truth and reconciliation process in our part of the world was extraordinary, and it’s effect in healing, which was perhaps in a sense more important. An interesting aside is that Pinochet being prosecuted and shipped back to South America had a direct consequence in our part of the world that we know that Robin Magobi[misspelled?] was this close from leaving power, took one look at that and said I ain’t going nowhere because the minute I’m not in charge I’m off to jail too. So it’s a question of what you’re trying to do at a practical level, and in these transitions the concept of reconciliation for a better future seems to work more efficiently for the creation of something that’s lasting and sustainable. So there isn’t an easy answer, but that’s our experience.

MARY ROBINSON: Is it a matter of sequencing carefully in order to enable a process? For example, President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf wanted and called for Charles Taylor to be brought before the court in Sierra Leone and he was eventually brought before that court and will be standing trial. Do you have a view on this, Chandrika, from your
experience?

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: Well you see if, like in Liberia or some places like that, power has to be wrested from people who have engaged in criminal activity against their people. It is different too if you’re trying to talk with somebody and you need that person or those people in order to bring about, to mitigate conflict. I’m thinking of the Sri Lankan situation. The leader of the terrorist group has such total control over his armed carders, five thousand, six thousand of them at any given time, and a certain number of the Tamil people, not all of them. But without him it would be rather difficult to talk to them. But he has engaged in many crimes. He even is responsible for the murder of the Indian Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi. So what do you do? He nearly killed me with a suicide bomb. I lost one eye, and two days later I invited him to come for talks because there was no other solution. So the answers cannot be the same. It’ll depend on the given context.

MARY ROBINSON: I recall in a number of visits to East Timor the hurt of that small population at the fact that none of the real perpetrators of the terrible violence were brought to any justice and the lack of any real sense, and it still hurts. It still is a very big grievance. And that
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brings me to —

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: We do have that problem with people saying how can you forgive people who have caused so much hurt, so much pain, so much death. But then sometimes one has to be realistic.

MARY ROBINSON: This brings me to a question actually that we didn’t have time for on the other session — one of your questions — which is what is the best way to address wrongs, reconcile and move forward. And I would like, and probably starting with you, Mark, we heard the experience of the peace and reconciliation commission. I don’t think Archbishop Tutu is still here, but he played such an incredible role in that. And we’ve had many peace commissions. We have the rule of Center for Transitional Justice based here in New York, lots of models now. Do you have a view on the role of that kind of being able to address past wrongs? Does it help in relation to the future, or does it lead to other problems of people not getting proper compensation or other issues?

MARK DREWELL: What we know — I think I’ve said it just now — is that in South Africa it’s worked. So my instinct based on personal experience is that that’s a model that is more productive than trials and witch hunts. Of course not least because those who win are never brought to
trial for the things that they did in the struggle. So that to me is a better way of creating a united future for disparate groups.

MARY ROBINSON: And there was a reference to rule of law, and I’d like to ask you, Alastair, about the impact of our societies in the west post-9/11 and probably particularly in this country, the response and the steps taken. I say that because I attended only a few days ago a joint meeting of the American Bar Association and the International Bar Association in Chicago. And it was very encouraging, certainly from my point of view to hear the very real concern about the erosion of rule of law, and of course the knock-on effect in other countries that don’t have the checks and balances that this country has. What role to you think is played if democracies don’t uphold their values and know what they are defending and still protect their populations?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: I think there are two elements to that question and I’ll try and deal with it very quickly. I think we are in a very difficult situation from the choice of language that we use. We’ve tried to re-define the international community purely in terms of opposition to terrorism, largely, however we define terrorism. And now we are starting to use language where we define it as simply that we are the civilized and they are the barbarians. And
this, in a sense, places much of the Muslim world outside of civilization and outside the reach of international law because we are civilized and these people are not. So that even when some of these movements do civilized things, like fight elections, get elected to parliament we still think it’s all right for their parliamentarians to be abducted and put into prison and their cabinet members arrested. But more seriously it is self-fulfilling because once we define people as simply beyond civilization, once we define them as being beyond international law and therefore we can do what we want to people, we should not be surprised if they start fulfilling our model that we create for them and actually start adopting some of those characteristics that we define for them by our use of a parameter of a philosophic model for dealing with them.

[Applause]

MARY ROBINSON: Given the huge cost in societies when you have conflict, a number of us in this room will have witnessed first hand what it’s like to see refugees in long-term or short-term refugee camps, what it’s like to see a marketplace with body parts, what it’s like to see children no longer able to go to school and all the devastation of lifestyles from conflict that continues and the many acts that keep perpetuating it. What about prevention? Could I
Mitigating Religious and Ethnic Conflict: Meeting the Challenge of 36 Coexistence: Living in Integrated Communities
2006 Clinton Global Initiative Annual Meeting
9/20/06

just ask the three of you in the little time we have left, and what are the priorities in prevention? I’ll begin with you Chandrika. What’s the best way to try and prevent, rather than try and deal with afterwards?

CHANDRIKA BANDARANAIKE KUMARATUNGA: If we look at the conflict-ridden areas as we discussed this morning also in a certain way, there are a few common denominators: one is poverty. We have to alleviate poverty. We all know that. Perhaps select projects and programs of action, which go to the heart of the problem in specific areas. Secondly, we have to remove perceived injustices in different societies. Different people feel that there is discrimination. The Al Qaeda say – I don’t say that we have to do exactly as they say – but the entire Arab world feels that there is a huge injustice in the non-resolution of the Palestinian problem. The international community has to resolve this problem. I think we are standing the problem on its head and saying that we have to eliminate terrorism, Muslim terrorism, but then what brought them to the situation? Fifty, nearly 60 years of non-resolution of the Palestinian problem. So the international community has the power. The powers have the possibility of bringing the two sides together at the Israelis, and the Palestinians, and resolving this problem and many other problems like this.
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MARY ROBINSON: Thank you. I’m going to have to stop you there to give the other two a short chance.

MARK DREWELL: Just very quickly, a friend of mine who spent 10 years in the UN looking at issues of conflict resolution has the view that all conflicts are fundamentally about power and resources and access or lack of access to both and that it gets dressed up as something else or manifests as religious or cultural or whatever but that if you can recognize that, then maybe you’ve got the starting point to resolve many of the issues.

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you. Alastair?

ALASTAIR CROOKE: Recognize problems and deal with them early. You can’t prevent conflict altogether.

MARY ROBINSON: Thank you and I’m glad for the short answers to a difficult and far-reaching question. I must say you’ve been a great audience. I know that some of you are contemplating pledges. I think if you can think of things that would work in this area from hopefully some of the ideas coming out of the discussion I would certainly encourage you because we also need, on the positive side, to really take more seriously the wonderful human rights birthright that we have in the universal declaration of human rights and not just tackle poverty but actually promote actively human rights around the world, and then hopefully we will reduce...
the terrible conflicts that are really shaming us in the world today. You’ve been a great audience. Thank you very much indeed. And thank you in particular to my wonderful panel.

[Applause]

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much. Enjoy the rest of your day. Table facilitators, theme team members, in five minutes we will meet in this room for a short debriefing.

[END RECORDING — PART 3]