

Jan Øberg

Balance the Igaliku agreement with peace policy

This seminar*) is ultimately about how we are - and how we should be in the future - together on our large shared globe. Actually, the nation-state thing doesn't really matter, because either we survive together or we don't.

Conflict is inherently good and will always exist. What we need to eliminate is the violence, the psychological, physical, structural or cultural violence that occurs when we try to solve our conflicts. A life without conflict would be incredibly boring, it would be an authoritarian society, an Orwellian 1984 where we all thought the same. We should definitely not be doing what is often called "conflict prevention" in international politics and peace research today. We should not prevent conflicts, we should prevent *the violence* in the conflict situations we find ourselves in.

The choice of discourse in these contexts is quite crucial. Is the starting point that there is a sound and visible rationality, for example in the nuclear system, or is the starting point that there is also - at least in the debate - an "ideal politics" and an opportunity to drill down into what we cannot easily see? For example, we can choose to look at our own country's national interests, but we can also choose to look beyond our own national borders and interests and see ourselves as a small part of the larger world. We can choose to see nuclear weapons as purely technical, military strategic and political means; or we can see them as a psycho-political phenomenon, as a philosophical phenomenon, as an existential phenomenon. Are we having a direct debate about tangible things, such as agreements and words in agreements, or do we also see that behind or beneath these agreements there are more or less hidden world views, moral views and judgments about a common future?

So we can choose to have a traditional and limited debate or we can explore a kind of meta-discourse along the way. It is, of course, up to the individual's taste; I will try to do a bit of both in this lecture.

*) The lecture was given at Ilisimatusarfik's public seminar "Greenland in international security policy" on May 10, 2005. The text has been shortened by the editors; omissions are marked with (...). The editors thank Kathrine and Thorkild Kjærgaard for their help in printing the lecture into a manuscript.

I have divided the lecture into four themes. The first is that I want to say a few words about *the Igaliku Agreement* of August 6, 2004¹. I see a lot of problems with it, but at the same time I understand - and respect - that it is essential for the political culture and self-understanding in Greenland. Then, as my second point, I will go through the macro-perspectives that, as I see it, are linked to the agreement and its specific content. The third main point will be Greenland's situation. And the last and fourth point will consist my proposals for a future peace policy contribution from Greenland to the international system.

1. The Igaliku Agreement: What it says and what it doesn't say

First to the actual text of the Igaliku agreement. One immediately notices that the agreement says nothing about the Thule facility itself and what its function is. What is being discussed is the agreement itself, its extension, and not what the agreement is about, contains or makes possible within the time horizon that I believe is militarily relevant - twenty to forty years into the future. It is not relevant for Greenland to discuss what the current implications of this agreement and the signatures on it are. What is relevant is the long-term consequences this agreement could have. Because in all these contexts, military-strategic and global, some people are thinking long-term - and have a much longer horizon than the parliamentarians' four years.

The agreement is called a "defense agreement", but I would question that. The Thule site is, as I see it, not only for defense. I will come back to that under the second main point. The English text of the agreement speaks of "international peace", in the Danish translation it is called: "between peoples"; it may sound more nice and cozy. And then it talks about "peaceful coexistence", and I would like to question that too. Of course, I know that this is how it must be said; it can't be in the agreement that the Thule site will be used for war and that the agreement legitimizes war.

The agreement states that Greenland participates in both risks and responsibilities. I hope that someone has asked the Americans what these risks are - and gotten an answer. Because they are not specified in the agreement. The nuclear weapons are not mentioned either. In fact, I think I would have demanded that nuclear freedom be put on paper in light of what has happened in Greenland since the 1951 agreement, so that it is respected once and for all that Greenland is a nuclear weapons-free zone. It does not say that. This agreement is like so many others: it's interesting what it says, but it's also interesting what the parties have agreed that it should *not* say!

Secondly, I notice that it says a lot about consulting each other and providing information and advice to each other. That's fine, but the wording is "prior to the implementation of changes", i.e. "prior to

the implementation of change". It *does not* say that you should be able to discuss *the possibility* implementing changes and - perhaps - as a consequence of prior discussions, refrain from implementing changes. It says that information and consultation must precede implementation, and I would add: of already decided changes to the content of the agreement. What's interesting is that there's no mention of any kind of joint decision-making on possible changes. Given the current balance of power between the elephant, the US, and the mouse, Greenland, it should probably be interpreted to mean that Greenland will be informed about changes and consulted about the practical implementation of these changes that the US may decide on in the future, in practice alone. It therefore seems inconceivable that Greenland would have such sovereignty in this context that it could veto an American demand for changes.

The Igaliku agreement - like the old agreement - will remain in force as long as NATO exists. This can reasonably be described as a blank check. It also states that it can only be changed by mutual agreement. It is interesting for a country that aspires to become an independent state that it has no right to terminate the agreement, that this agreement does not say that it can be terminated with, for example, three or five years' notice after prior talks. It can only be *amended*, it doesn't say that it can be *terminated*.

I think you could say that this is potentially de jure and de facto a limitation of sovereignty. Perhaps "in terms of realpolitik" it can't be that much different. In any case, it can be said that the text of the agreement gives the US a veto against a repeal or termination of the agreement. Furthermore, the agreement itself says nothing clear about financial compensation. And that is interesting. We heard earlier today that one argument for this is that the US does not want such compensation to set a precedent where they would have to pay for the military facilities they occupy parts of territories around the world. In Kosovo, just four months after the bombings in 1999, the US quickly set up the largest military base since the Vietnam War. As far as I know, the US has not paid a penny to the then Yugoslav (now Serbian) government in Belgrade and has not paid a penny to the locals on the land it there in Kosovo. And it's not a small base. It reportedly has McDonald's and soccer fields and several restaurants, an airfield and two churches. It occupies quite a large area in the small Kosovo province, which is somewhat smaller than Skåne.

This master mentality, this chieftain mentality, the arrogant perception that the superpower can sit on other people's territories without asking for permission (here in Greenland they have asked for permission in a certain , but they have no intention of paying), I think this is something that the approximately 130 countries where the US is in some way militarily present should perhaps talk to each other about and coordinate a policy for - and decide whether

it's fair or whether to ask Americans to pay and otherwise live up to a fair code of conduct. The normal thing is that if you want something elsewhere - in a store, in another country or whatever - you have to pay for it in cash or otherwise compensate the owner.

I also point this out because the actual US military budget is somewhere between 500 and 600 billion dollars or half of the entire world's military spending - the largest military budget in the world and world history. And for the information of those interested such proportions, the US purely military involvement in Iraq, where the population does not want the US military presence, costs a tidy sum of *1 billion dollars per week*. I get a little worried when I hear that people here in Greenland think that 90 million kroner ... here in Greenland, after all, is a pretty good payment and you wouldn't ask for that much and so on ... But you could actually have asked for a lot more, *precisely because* Thule is apparently so important to the Americans.

The last thing I want to say about the agreement is that from the moment you start talking about resources and oil, you have to be careful. It has something to do with the US's rapidly growing dependence on oil and its feverish search for oil everywhere. In part, it's also what managing the Balkan conflicts is about from a geo-strategic perspective. For example, several oil and gas pipelines will run from Central Asia through Romania, Bulgaria, Macedonia and Albania to the Adriatic Sea. Air bases and transportation corridors are being built in close proximity. All of this was started and intensified in the 1990s by the Clinton administration. The regional and global plans linking resources and military bases are something you should be well informed about in Greenland, so you won't be surprised one day what the long-term purpose is. Within the next 15-20 years, the US dependence on oil outside US territory will correspond to approximately 75-80 percent of US oil consumption. Therefore, Iraq is of course part of the oil issue.

Now to the second main point - the larger framework conditions, which I think we must see the Igaliku agreement in. I noted in passing that Colin Powell during his visit here in Greenland said that "together we will meet the security challenges of the 21st century from missiles defense to international terrorism." It sounds interesting when he says that missile defense is a security challenge on par with international terrorism! It's probably a listening error, a "Freudian slip" or he has actually made an unintentionally comical statement. In any case, these are the two things he draws a parallel between: missile defense and international terrorism. I'll try to show that there might actually be something to it - but that doesn't mean I agree with the seminar participant who said a moment ago that the threat of terrorism against Greenland has increased. My ears could have fallen off, but they have heard so much over the years...

2. The very serious military strategic framework surrounding the Igaliku agreement

There are at least two crucial documents that frame this. One is the *US National Security Paper on Strategy*, which was adopted and released in September 2002; it is available on the White House website and the foreword is written by President Bush². It was published two months *before* the US and the Pentagon sent its request to use and upgrade Thule. As I see it, there is no doubt that there is a connection between the US national security strategy, as seen well into the next decades with the war on terrorism and with Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD), which is a kind of new Star Wars project, and the fact that Washington - two months after it has been adopted - applies to upgrade Thule.

The other essential document is *the US Nuclear Posture Review*; it can be found on the internet with a number of other resources³. These two are key documents in US military strategy. They are absolutely relevant for anyone who wants to know what the Thule site will be used for within a time horizon of 20-40 years. The kind of strategies, future assessments and gigantic investments that form the basis of these two documents are not done for a few years at a time. When the US wants to change and upgrade the "innards" of the Thule facility - as Professor Nikolaj Petersen put it ⁴ - it is because it is interesting to the US in the long . And it is all the more unfortunate or worrying that there is no renegotiation or termination option in the agreement.

Let me briefly outline what the old MAD deterrence strategy was all about. MAD stands for Mutually Assured Destruction. And then there is the newer NUTS = Nu- clear Use Theory. In English, "food" also means insane and "nuts" can also mean madman in addition to nuts. The classic deterrence strategy from the 1950s onwards was based on the idea that the possible use of nuclear weapons should be so restrained, so deterring for both parties that neither of them would ever start a nuclear war. In other words, if the Russians were to drop some nukes on the US, the US would have enough nukes left on its submarines, bombers and in its silos - a triad of delivery means - to retaliate and kill at least as many Russians. (The built-in assumption was that neither side could take out all the nukes in a single first strike; even if the missile silos had been hit on the ground, there would be enough on submarines and aircraft to retaliate with).

In other words, the Russians needed to know that if they launched an attack, they would be destroyed themselves. Hence the word MAD = mutually assured destruction. The Americans knew the same on their side. So it would be a case of joint suicide. They called it suicide, but it was really murder on murder, but in its consequence it would mean that the Russian decision-makers themselves would be killed. The parties had to keep each other in check - with their finger on the "deterrent" - by constantly threatening each other.

but with the thought of millions of deaths on their side, they would never carry the threat.

This was a form of terrorism; the whole deterrence policy was called the balance of terror. It held millions of innocent people in NATO and the Warsaw Pact hostage. They would die if one day the deterrence didn't work or one party thought they could get away with a crippling first strike that would not be reciprocated.

There was also the so-called ABM Treaty (= Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty) which stated that there could only be a few defense facilities against incoming missiles around Washington and Moscow, where the decision-makers lived. The whole idea was that the populations should remain unprotected because *if the populations were protected from nuclear attack, deterrence would not work. If you can protect your own population from the other side's retaliation - and thus remain unharmed after destroying the other state and killing its population - then it would be more attractive (and not deterrent) to start a war. Because you could hope to survive and win.*

That's why the old word "balance of terror" was so apt. But lately, everyone has stopped talking about the balance of terror because the word terror has become so negatively charged after September 11. For over fifty years we have lived with essentially two blocs and their governments that based their policies on terror against the other's and - indirectly - their own population. And we're not talking about petty terrorists like Bin Laden, but about a policy that took hundreds of millions of citizens hostage and was prepared to kill them if deterrence failed for any reason - or if there was a technical failure in the warning systems (such as in Thule)!

And what is terror? Terror is an act based on harming or killing innocent people who are not directly responsible for or involved in a conflict. It is done over-rapidly, it must be unpredictable when it happens. It is done to achieve a political purpose and it is considered unacceptable under international law and morality. These are some of the main elements of a definition of terrorism, according to Princeton University international law expert Richard Falk, who is also associated with the Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research, TFF, in Lund, Sweden.

To make a long story short, there was a certain logic to it all, even if it was fearful: No matter where we lived, in Greenland or Denmark or we knew that the fact that we were open and unprotected was what would prevent nuclear-armed adversaries from ever starting a nuclear war. But technical development has been rapid. Around the time Reagan was President of the United States, the US began to think in terms of "Star Wars" or missile defense. Scientists and strategists started to think about the possibility of putting a shield or 'cheesecloth' over the US.

This would take the form of an infinite number of advanced missiles that could shoot down incoming enemy missiles before they reach US territory and thus keep the US unharmed. Both Europe and Japan are now thinking along these lines.

What is the psychological significance of this development? Well, if American decision-makers believe that the United States as a whole has such protection, a cheese box, and that it is therefore invulnerable to a retaliatory attack, *then the risk of being attracted to the possibility of initiating, winning and even surviving a nuclear war will increase significantly. The possibility of nuclear war becomes less of a deterrent if you believe you will survive it - compared to when you know you will be killed.*

There is the objection that the US will never know for sure that BMD or the missile shield will work until they try it for real - it's a bit like shooting revolver bullets with your own revolver and it's not that easy! But leaders can't do that; hubris is not unknown in war situations.

Some call the idea of the missile shield "defense" and say it will increase stability and serve peace. I guess that's what the wording of the Igaliku agreement implies. But it won't if you look at it in the bigger picture. The idea is not just to defend us against "the others" using nuclear weapons against us; it is also to enable us to shoot first and then be invulnerable to any retaliation. In this way, nuclear weapons become less of a deterrent; they gradually come to play the same role as conventional weapons.

I cannot warn against this development strongly enough. While many have been able to find some justification for the existence of nuclear weapons because they were a necessary element in the classical policy of deterrence, in my opinion there can be no explanation other than pathological - insanity - in developing systems that directly serve the purpose of enabling nuclear war against others and survival itself. Why is that? *Because no political purpose can be conceived that legitimizes the killing of millions of innocent people.*

What The Nuclear Posture Review says - among many other deeply worrying things - is that nuclear weapons must gradually be considered more and more like ordinary, conventional weapons. They must be "conventionalized". The US is now also investing in "bunker busters" - weapons that can destroy even mountain massifs and the most hardened bunkers or other nuclear facilities of those who have nuclear weapons. The US is also focusing on the development of much smaller handy nuclear weapons, so-called "mini-nukes". This is the first time in the history of nuclear weapons that we have a doctrine stating that the US (a) must be able to use these weapons before an adversary has attacked it and (b) that nuclear weapons must be used against countries that do not yet have nuclear weapons, but which may acquire them - the so-called "rogue states".

It's the first time in history that nuclear weapons are not just a deterrent to nuclear war

but - in the pathological fantasy world or meta-discourse - are becoming weapons that can also be used in war against countries and people who do not have nuclear weapons themselves. This is what is called "preemptive strike" - getting ahead of them. *As long as this doctrine exists, it is justifiable to call the US itself a terrorist or rogue state.*

What does all this have to do with Thule, some might be thinking. As been pointed out earlier today, early warning is a good in itself. It was logical in the previous "classic" balance of terror that if you had early warning, you could both prepare your retaliatory attack better but also gain a few minutes longer reaction time. You could also find out if it was a flock of birds instead real bombs heading towards your territory.

The Thule facility will of course continue to provide early warning. But the fear is that its future role may also be to help the US wage nuclear war and perhaps win it. It is perhaps not so much the upgrade of the Thule facility itself that is of interest. The key point is that it will be an important link in the chain of facilities that will help the US "see" any incoming missiles and shoot them down - i.e. *help the US start, conduct and win a nuclear war.*

This is not defense and it means neither stability nor peace. It unquestionably increases the risk of a madman one day starting a nuclear war because he or she believes it can be won! I'm not saying this is the reality today; I'm saying that it is deeply irresponsible not to take these future possibilities into account. Whether those responsible in Greenland at the time of signing the Igaliku agreement were unaware of these aspects *or* they knew about them and failed to discuss them openly, there is reason for the deepest concern...

... The US has the main responsibility for these things. But Greenland and Denmark must bear their share of the responsibility as well. Greenland has signed the Igaliku agreement with two players who have given a damn about international law, misjudged almost everything and inflicted immense suffering on the Iraqi population for years. With the Igaliku agreement, Greenland is now allied with the US of its own free will and will find it harder to distance itself from US foreign policy in the future; and Denmark is, through our NATO membership and active occupation policy...

...For decades, the US has waged war, intervened, bombed, infiltrated, staged coups, killed innocents and given less than practically every other country in development aid. It is described in thick books by American scholars themselves, such as historian Chalmers Johnson. It has nothing to do with being anti-American, it's a fact. Couldn't *there* be some individual states and some poor people in them who think that American foreign policy is not so terribly successful from their point of view? Understandably, this no defense of Bin Laden. There can be no defense of Al Qaeda or of any kind of terrorism, including the terrorism in Iraq today.

Terrorism is indefensible in the literal sense, because by definition it *must* target innocent people and that is unconditionally abhorrent. No purpose can legitimize terrorism. But to claim that 9/11 was an attack on an innocent, ignorant and thoroughly good America is to sink too far into intellectual laziness and conveniently analgesic consumption of pure propaganda....

... I *do not* expect or demand that Greenland should go first here - but one could have hoped that Greenland's political elite had not so apparently gullible and compliantly entered into a blind date and allied itself indefinitely with the US - the US that a majority of Europeans and NATO allies, according to serious Western opinion polls, consider the greatest single threat to world peace.

3. Greenland's own situation

Quite a few people have emphasized today that there is too little debate about these things in Greenland; they have called for more diverse and in-depth media and more public debates between politicians and citizens. As a first-time visitor to Greenland - and I already know that I would like to come back in the future because it is so interesting and beautiful - I ask that you do not perceive it as rude when I now say that there is perhaps too little expertise here about the big world outside Greenland and the big perspectives that Greenland is a tiny piece of.

I therefore feel that it is important to try to raise the general level of information about global developments in various ways. Because what lies ahead - perhaps - is something that people are afraid of both here and in Denmark - and it's something that Nikolaj Petersen has described very well - namely *a possible conflict with the USA*.

In my best and most honest assessment, the United States under George Bush is heading towards fascism and a de facto one-party system. Its role in the world will become both more extreme and unacceptable more and more people. There will be serious rifts between governments that unconditionally follow America's lead and the citizens of those governments. The United States under Bush is a country we may have to distance ourselves from in the near future and possibly have a serious conflict with, unless the Bush administration itself changes its signals, and unfortunately I see no signs of that.

The countries that are US allies are the closest to telling the US that its policies are deeply damaging to the world at large. And if we don't do it on behalf of global opinion against this sole superpower in today's global society, and do it relatively soon, it will be harder to do it later - and then extremists of various kinds will do it in their own special way. The longer you let a disease develop without doing anything, the more serious it becomes, the bigger the operation, the bigger the pain.

My own hope for the future is that the way George Bush is managing the American empire will shorten the life of that empire. The unimaginably large and growing expenditure on armaments and war is something even the American economic machine cannot handle in the long . You will see enemies everywhere and arm yourself to death instead of receiving the gift that the dissolution of the Soviet Union was to all Western countries and creating the common European and common Atlantic house that Gorbachev spoke of. We lost all opportunities to create a better world when the old millstone around our necks disappeared. Over-armament and militarism is one factor among many in the decline of empires. Others are the incessant expansion into ever more territories and eventually being unable to lead and manage the system as a whole. A third factor is losing legitimacy in the eyes of others, even friendly ones.

Let's imagine that there had been a debate prior to the signing of the Igaliku agreement. Let's imagine that some of the things I have touched on here had been discussed openly, i.e. that the agreement should be seen in a broader geopolitical and global perspective. I wonder if the people of Greenland or a large majority would have said "yes" to signing the Igaliku agreement if it had been put to a referendum?

I am by no means a connoisseur of Greenlandic culture and mentality. But I believe that - despite contemporary and tragic examples to the contrary - there has traditionally been a large element of practical non-violence mentality or a culture of peace. They've never been to war, never had armies and trained their young men to use weapons to kill other people. Somewhere I read that the language has no words for organized war and that conflicts were resolved with certain cultural rituals - but admittedly also by family and blood feuds. But still!

What I'm really asking is this: isn't there here, as in so many other places, a more or less hidden reservoir - perhaps dating back to the time before the last 50 years of "modernization" - of knowledge, norms and social practices that were based on and promote harmony and peace? And if the answer is yes - could it not be brought up today and actualized, modernized and give Greenland a positive role - and "image" - in the world?

Or to another way: is the Igaliku agreement an expression of Greenlanders throwing part of their original identity overboard to become like "the others", throw themselves into globalization and make the most of it on "the " - not their own - terms. In other words, a kind of political and cultural *self-abandonment*? And if so, how does this harmonize with a quest for independence that stems from the feeling that others - mainly Denmark - have shown a lack of understanding and respect for the uniqueness *that is* Greenland both historically and today?

Having said this, it should also be emphasized that it would be unreasonable to demand more

to Greenland's decision-makers in this regard than to Danish decision-makers. As we all know, Greenland's actual scope for foreign policy is very limited. Copenhagen - which has ten times more scope for action in the world - has been completely subservient to American foreign policy, both in terms of the bombing of Yugoslavia, the war on terror and Afghanistan. This happened under Social Democratic and Radical leadership - and, in the case of the US and Britain's equally incompetent and tragic Iraq policy, under the leadership of the Liberals and Conservatives.

Denmark is now a state of the type where dissidents risk imprisonment. Frank Grevil, who while employed by the Danish Defense Intelligence Service revealed that what the Prime Minister said did not match the intelligence reports he had received, will probably go to prison. If a minister drinks a little too much and maybe drives a car right after, he should resign. But if a government leads a country into a crazy war and increases the risk of terrorism against its own people, it can stay in office. I think something is wrong!

In Greenland, there is a lot of talk about politicians' dialog with the population, about their responsibility for the state of affairs. But in warring Denmark, there is no discussion about whether the Danish government should be accountable to the population and possibly resign as a result the gross misjudgments associated with participation in the Iraq war. It is reported by the intelligence services - and many experts agree - that there are more terrorist threats against Europe and Denmark today than there were in the past. I have previously discussed this⁵ and pointed out that the Danish government has been more loyal to Washington than to the safety and of the Danish people. This should be at least as serious as drunk driving.

Furthermore, the Danish government - characterized by political autism, i.e. without considering the actual developments - says that a) we must remain in Iraq and b) we must not give in to political pressure or terror and c) must remain loyal to the US. Other countries have shown more self-criticism and civil courage - Spain and Poland, for example. And finally, we should note that the only Denmark is present in Iraq is with over 500 soldiers. nurses, doctors, engineers, social workers or priests have been sent. Not one person has been sent to help the civilian population in any other sense than some of the Danish soldiers helping the civilian population with the water supply and small local projects. So much for Danish humanism in 2005!

Dear friends in Greenland! Do not imitate the moral and intellectual decline that characterizes the decision-making environments in Copenhagen. There is more than enough power politics, cynicism and spin-doctor politics in our world. The Greenland of the future can choose to do something different, do something that is beneficial - even the smallest benefit, but beneficial and not harmful - for the whole world. When the big ones run the race as they do these years, the future and *the hope* that it will get better belongs to the small states and the ordinary people around the world.

4. Greenland can balance the Igaliku agreement with efforts for international peace

Having signed the Igaliku agreement, what could be done to balance the books between supporting war and supporting peace? How could Greenland make its, albeit limited, contribution to peace in the wider world? This is an increasingly relevant question, I believe, as Greenland and Greenlanders become more independent, have more room for maneuver and also want to enjoy the benefits that can come with economic globalization, increased trade and cooperation, in short, integration into the wider world. You have to be able to put your feet up and take risks, give up a bit of yourself but at the same time remain yourself and offer something positive to others.

So I have tried to the best of my ability to come up with some things that I think Greenland can do to benefit both itself and the outside world. I hope that these proposals, and of course other proposals, will be taken up for broad and open-hearted debate. After all, this is about the future and, as we know, we can influence it better than the past! The points are not an expression of priorities.

4.1. A Truth and Reconciliation Commission

I think it would be useful to have a truth and reconciliation commission between the three parties, the US, Denmark and Greenland. I think the Americans and Danes have something to tell and acknowledge. What's done is done, what's done is done. But for those who have been wronged, it is a question of redress, of acknowledging what happened. Truth and reconciliation commissions can clear the air. They give those who have done wrong a relief - to talk about it and perhaps apologize. And the victim, the one who has been wronged, gets some closure and can put aside thoughts of cold air, hatred, the desire for revenge or whatever it may be. For both, forgiveness and reconciliation is a liberation. And when the air is cleared, mutual respect and possibly cooperation can grow again - in the knowledge that we are no longer hiding something because we have talked about what could not otherwise be talked about.

Such a commission does not have to be a glorified intergovernmental undertaking. It can easily be initiated by popular forces, civil society, media and cultural institutions, inviting governments and their representatives to work together on these important issues.

4.2. Research and public education - and more debate

Secondly, I would suggest that the Greenland Home Rule government should finance a number of international seminars and have some writings published by people who come here from near and far, from all regions of the globe, and tell a little

on global security and peace policy issues, etc. It could be government representatives, it could be independent researchers, it could be NGO representatives. I think it would be extremely exciting if, for example, you could get political leaders and popular representatives from Okinawa to come to Greenland and exchange with you what problems you both have with the American military facilities and with the "mother countries" Denmark and Japan. Or how about getting environmental experts to come here and talk about how major problems have been tackled elsewhere - or meetings between women from the so-called developing countries to discuss cooperation and joint efforts to solve common problems with Greenlandic - and perhaps other Nordic - women?

You could imagine that security and peace policy experts, men and women, were here for a few days, weeks or months - possibly as visiting researchers and learn something about Greenland and bring their impressions back with them, out into the world. They could give lectures, speak at public meetings, be used in the media and leave behind a publication or exhibition or whatever it might be - a lasting result. If it was a booklet or small book, it could be part of a series of publications that would be in the library and sold in bookstores, and of course be included in media and parliamentary debates. Such a combination of research, fact gathering, public debate and public education could play a number of important roles until it becomes possible for Greenland to establish its own peace research institute or peace academy, perhaps in connection with the new university now being built in Nuuk.

4.3. Activating Greenlandic civil society

Thirdly, I would suggest strengthening civil society, a kind of association around these things, one or more NGOs, a network or similar, which could follow up - also together with the ICC of course - on some of these things, and problematize the decisions that you will also face in the future, so that there is a more lively debate and that it grows from below. It would make it easier for Greenland's politicians to gauge the mood. Today, citizens - all over the world - must take the initiative to put things on the political agenda and inform their politicians, because *they* hardly ask the people for advice on anything anymore.

I would like to emphasize that the existence of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society is crucial to democracy and that they are "non" in the sense that they are not directly funded by the state. They may receive financial support from the state, but they remain intellectually and opinionally free from the state. To ensure such a foundation in Greenlandic society, I think it would be a good idea to set up a committee to discuss how to introduce peace education in schools and other institutions.

4.4. Coordinate with like-minded people around the , build alliances and grow stronger

The mentioned development of NGOs or civil society organizations in Greenland should lead to linking up with similar groups in other areas. If it's about the Thule issue, for example, contact could be made with people and organizations in the places where the other stations in the chain are located, i.e. Fylingsdale in England, Clark in Florida and the equivalent in California. It could be that the people in these places had some common problems and could increase their influence in the larger society if they joined forces.

But also more broadly, many more of the places where the US has bases and intervenes in local communities without much courtesy or respect could be contacted. This could be the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean where large military facilities are located. You could also link to places around the globe where people have learned - even after conflict and violence - to live peacefully with each other. Think of the Åland Islands or the Trento province in Italy. Make contacts, look at problems together, learn from each other, get new ideas together and lift together. That's what *empowerment* is all about - going from feeling powerless to believing in yourself as part of the bigger world and believing that we can change the world - together.

4.5. Global communication and popular globalization

Business and finance people, politicians and military personnel are the main drivers of globalization. Greenland can, together with others, contribute to a *popular globalization* with an alternative content. We must become more proactive and not just reactive. It may require a little money, but the methods are quite simple: mutual visits and interactive use of the Internet for communication, knowledge search, new exciting websites, etc.

There are oceans of opportunities in this for public education and peace education. Greenland could take the lead in disseminating knowledge about conflicts and their resolution/management, about non-violence, reconciliation and forgiveness - about positive peace and not just negative peace, i.e. the absence of war. Online course institutions, online universities - it's all possible, at least when you work together and with like-minded people. Greenland can be said have natural prerequisites for promoting the understanding of the necessity of non-violence - also while working to reduce the various forms of violence that unfortunately occur in Greenlandic society today. Other societies, which to some extent have similar starting points, also struggle with the problems of violence. Therefore, alliances must be built, in real life and in the virtual world. The Internet is a wonderful medium for those who are geographically relatively isolated (well, it depends on what you consider the center!) and for whom it is very expensive to reach out to others and work together. The internet costs very little and I know from my own experience that it's a great way to

medium for information exchange and discussion of shared pain and shared joy and shared strategies.

To conclude on this point: Three things are always needed to move the world: good ideas, people and money. And they must be found in this particular order of priority. Ideas and people with hearts and minds in the right place are more important than money. And three other things are needed to become stronger together with others: dialog, dialog and more dialog!

4.6. Give the Greenland National Museum a peace dimension

There are plenty of war museums and monuments around the world. Currently, at your beautiful and rich National Museum here in Nuuk, there is an exhibition about Greenland and World War II. That's all well and . But should visitors - including school classes - only learn about the war? Is there a hypothesis here - and many other places - that if we just show the horrors of war , people will learn to avoid war in the future? If so, I have to say that as a peace researcher I see no evidence whatsoever for that thesis.

The idea of peace museums is now emerging everywhere. Just as we must prepare for peace if we want peace - and not just prepare for war to achieve it - so we must learn about peace and not just war to be able to contribute productively to a more peaceful future for the world. I would therefore like to suggest that the Greenland National Museum set up a small committee to investigate a) what is going on in other countries regarding peace museums and b) what can be done to give your museum a special peace dimension. I don't just mean an exhibition or two, I mean a section or a wing or whatever it may be where the permanent theme is: how have people in Greenland throughout the ages resolved conflicts, lived in peace with nature, how is peace expressed, what role has it played that they have not had armies or been occupied, how is the longing and vision of Greenlanders - or perhaps all Arctic peoples - for peace expressed in earlier times and societies and today? In other words, cultural, civilizational, artistic, historical, ritualistic, environmental, social and so on perspectives on peace and non-violence. And - of course - the department would also show how the different types of violence in today's society have developed and challenge the visitor to reflect on what can be done to reduce it. Here - as well as at Kulturhuset Katuaq and the libraries - mini-sections and reading opportunities would be set up to give everyone access to literature on Nordic and international peace issues.

4.7. "Branding" Greenland as a country of peace

I was very pleased to attend the presentation of the report on foreign and security policy yesterday in Parliament. The report is an impressive work, and I found

debate serious and broad. I would therefore like to suggest that future annual reports on Greenlandic foreign policy include a chapter that deals with a) the many initiatives, trends and events of a peace policy nature in the world and b) Greenland's contribution to international peace in the past year and c) the peace policy strategy and plans for the coming year. In this day and age, it is not enough to discuss more or less military dominated defense policy, security policy and foreign policy. It's far too traditional. While these things should certainly be included in such a report, it should be supplemented with an equally comprehensive peace policy dimension.

Finally, I noticed that the word *branding* was used again and again. You are obviously very concerned with the *image* Greenland has in the world and how Greenland can manifest itself in the international arena. This is excellent and forward-thinking - we are all part of a single global community in which we both provide and enjoy. I think there should be more keywords or elements in this branding, more colors in the image you are trying to create - for example, human security and non-violent conflict resolution.

Tell the world that Greenland has a history, a culture and norms that - *if others in the world had them too* - this world would be a more peaceful place! Tell them that Greenland is actually doing something for a better world, for peace between people, between different cultures and between man and nature. These can be some of the suggestions I just made and there could be countless others. Only the imagination sets the limits! America's foreign and military policy is sold as peace even though it destroys the lives of thousands and thousands of people around the world. Imagine how much more true it would be when Greenland markets itself as a peaceful society. Greenland is certainly not destroying the lives of other people

- And along the way, it can contribute to the of many. There are plenty of opportunities in this age of globalization. See them! Use them!

5. Maybe a little more Kunuk spirit?

I hope you will perceive what I have said here as an expression of the desire to contribute something constructive within the area I have been asked to cover. It is certainly not an expression of a desire to be know-it-all, because I know how little I know about Greenland. My only wish is to shake things a bit, throw in some new perspectives and - to the best of my ability - nudge the existentially necessary debate about a meaningful life, also globally. If the global community is not to collapse in the foreseeable future, *we must learn to live a decent life with each other on our shared planet. And my feeling is that Greenland is a little more important and can have more to offer the world than you might think on a daily basis.*

Because while we must globalize and benefit from the resources of others - and the entire planet - we must also take responsibility and think about how we each and everyone in

community can contribute to a more peaceful and just world. People here in Greenland also have a shared responsibility to ensure that people far away can have a better life - It's in both globalization and globalism. By "globalism" I mean that you try to include the people of the world in your considerations and decisions, a bit like we include the citizens of our own society in them, a kind of global instead of national ethics.

In Finn Lynge's contribution to the Danish power report on Greenland⁽⁶⁾, he mentions a figure in Greenlandic history and legends called Kunuk. Reading his article, it struck me that perhaps a modern version of this Kunuk figure is needed: saying no to chiefs and peacefully seeking power over oneself rather than trying to gain power over others through violence....I sense that the Kunuk figure contains much of what is needed for us and the world to move from the current culture of violence to a new and exciting culture of peace....

Notes

- 1 More about the Igaliku atal in the article by Nikolaj Petersen in this volume
- 2 MACROBUTTON <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>
- 3 See for example at MACROBUTTON <http://www.wslfweb.org/nukes/npr.htm>.
- 4 See prof. Nikolaj Petersen's lecture in this publication
- 5 Øberg, Jan. *Predictable Failure. The conflict with Iraq and Denmark as an occupying power*. The Changing Times, 2004
- 6 *Democracy and Power in Greenland* (ed. by Gorm Winther). Aarhus, 2003