

DRAFT 1 (EK, may4/05)

Partners in Conflict: A New Endeavor Towards Common Ground on the Falkland/Malvinas Islands

Background

The numbers of interstate violent conflict in Latin America in the XX and XXI century has been the lowest in the world¹, and the actual wars can be counted in with the fingers of one hand. Among them, the 1982 Falkland/Malvinas War has been one exceptionally sad episode in contemporary Latin America, a rare conflict between a country in the region and an extra-continental power. The cost has been enormous, for the sake of a population of approximately 2,500 islanders the number of casualties among the military of both sides during the war and its aftermath has been close to such number; the total monetary cost is hard to assess, but estimates go as high as 1 billion for each belligerent part², the equivalent of \$1,000,000 per inhabitant of the island. These post-facto considerations have not been as yet a trigger for paving the way towards a permanent and comprehensive solution. The situation has been ever since mostly calm, diplomatic relations being re-established in 1990 and some partial agreements been signed in relation to fishery and oil exploration. And yet, it has not been possible so far, to conduct official negotiations towards bringing this conflict to an end, leaving again open the door for some irresponsible behavior or an unexpected deterioration of the situation. The main impasses seem to relate to the challenge of Argentina to UK sovereignty³ over the islands as well as the perceived needs of the islanders. And in-depth understanding of the dispute is required with a fresh look, with the help of third party facilitation, and involving actively the local stakeholders. Attempts of Argentinean governments to “seduce” them or to bring them to bilateral meetings with misunderstandings about their status as a community have generated apprehension and mistrust towards such official gatherings⁴.

Given such vacuum, the challenge of civil society of all parties involved is to step in engaging in a sustained and well-planned process of consensus building. There have been many individual suggestions that merit to be checked together and other innovative ideas may come up from a shared brainstorming, at no official cost to the parties.⁵ One particular expression of such renew endeavor could be based on a joint university-based experimental process, searching for common ground as described below.

¹ Arie M. Kacowicz, *Zones of Peace in the Third World*, (Albany, State of New York University Press, 1998)

² According to Manuel A. Solanet, a member of the Argentine military government in 1982, during the war Argentina lost some 900 million dollars in the destruction of warships, tanks, missiles, transportation vehicles, ammunition and so forth, whereas the British damages are estimated far more than this figure (Notas sobre la Guerra de Malvinas, Buenos Aires, Grafikar Sociedad de Impresores, 2004, p. 100).

³ Benedict Anderson relates to sovereignty as a construct that could be disaggregated in different elements

⁴ Agustin M Romero, *Malvinas: LA politica exterior de Alfonsín y Menem*, (Buenos Aires, Editorial Belgrano, 1999), pg. 148

⁵ Since 1982, there have been 8 Argentine-British Conferences organized jointly by the Argentinean Council for International Relations (CARI) and the South Atlantic, the latest being held in October 2003, in Buenos Aires.

The timeliness of this project can be seen as the current governments in Buenos Aires and London, particularly given other global and regional priorities. A citizens' initiative might advocate to both to display a pragmatic attitude, responsive to win-win suggestions. Hence, this request to the Ford Foundation to support this effort. The sections of this pre-proposal include a background, project description, participating institutions, methodology, activities and timetable, evaluation, preliminary budget and concluding remarks.

Project description

This project seeks to revamp the exploration of creative solutions to the Malvinas/Falkland Islands conflict, by getting Argentinean, British and Falkland/Malvinas civil society and public opinion makers to embark in a conflict transformation endeavor, which centrally aims also to engage the islanders themselves. The ability to produce some common ground could empower the participants to relate such ideas to their respective official leadership as well as to the public at large. Engaging institutions with a negotiations conflict resolution programs such as the Universidad de San Andres/FLACSO and the University of Westminster in England, the University of Maryland at College Park is to share a facilitated two-year initial Second Track Diplomacy process..

The sequence of activities will begin by a joint conflict assessment focusing on the perceived needs of all parties concerned. And then, through a sustained "training of trainers" in multitrack⁶ diplomacy initially by the Center of International and Conflict Management (CIDCM) in College Park, with capacity building of partners from the other two universities, integrating such staff as co-facilitators/researchers (one per institution with a good understanding of the Falkland/Malvinas conflict and experts in interactive conflict resolution). Through such team-building, based on previous experience, the assumption is that the participants will be able to expand consensus building among their peers in two bilateral workshops with the islanders and two subsequent trilateral face-to-face consensus-building workshops aiming to prepare a common document, with ideas that can be acceptable to all participants. The results of the workshops should drive their efforts for approaching, on the one hand, their respective policy makers; and, on the other hand, the media and public opinion at large.

The parties need to be aware that, in order to achieve a definite settlement there will have to be a great deal of work and there is a need to gradually move into trust-building and then train the Partner with the skills that can facilitate achieving consensus among the parties. On the surface, the key issues seem to be the current British and Argentine quest for sovereignty over the Falklands and their surrounding natural resources (oil and fisheries); the welfare of the islanders, including the desire to remain British citizens; and/or their eventual quest for independence. But on a simulation conducted at FLACSO in Buenos Aires in April 2005 the participants identified many other non-tangible or psychological concerns. In the first phase of the conflict assessment a thorough diagnosis is to be prepared focusing on human needs and shaping the role of a third party facilitation.

⁶ The terms has been coined and developed by Amb. John Mc Donald, " " in J Davies and E. Kaufman (eds.), *Second Track/Citizens Diplomacy: Concepts and Techniques of Conflict Transformation*, (Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield, 2003), pp.

Do we need a third party to intervene? Agreed, the preference is that both parties in conflict should find ways of overcoming the conflict on their own by educating themselves on methods such as “principled negotiation.”. However, it is not easy for parties that are in the escalation phase of a dispute, and often before or after a fight, to cool down by themselves. In many cases, a third party is needed to help them move to a resolution. It may be worth adding that in the aftermath of the Malvinas/Falkland 1982 war, Azar, the founder of the Center, convened two problem solving forum with former diplomats and parliamentarians of both countries. The lessons learnt were analyzed by himself⁷ and by Mitchell⁸. At that time, this pioneering endeavor was jeopardized given that the conflict was not as yet ripe for fruitful negotiations. Meanwhile, the methodology used by CIDCM has further evolved, and in addition to the mentioned favorable conditions, we would like to apply the best state of the art processing into this project.

Participating Institutions

The trilateral initiative is based on the interaction of the three institutions, which maximizes the specific relative advantage of each:

1) San Andres/FLACSO has the only post-graduate program on negotiations and conflict resolution in Argentina, and the three person planned co-facilitator team includes Khatchik Derghougassian a specialist in security studies, Agustin Romero an expert on the Malvinas issue, and Paula Varone who has been actively involved in the planning of different academic projects in the institution. San Andres University has been founded on what was a Scottish Presbyterian College. In the above-mentioned training workshop last April with Dr. Kaufman from CIDCM, it was the openness of the younger generation that has no direct emotional recollection of the 1982 war was tested, and the results have been very encouraging.

2). In England, the Dr Richard Earle in the Faculty of Law at the University of Westminster is an expert in conflict resolution, while Dr Celia Szusterman, at the Centre for the Study of Democracy of the same university, is an expert on Argentine politics, and has worked extensively on the Falklands/Malvinas issue. They will also involve as a consultant Sir Marrack Goulding, Warden of St Antony’s College, Oxford, who was Under-Secretary at the UN at the time of the conflict and an expert on conflict resolution (El Salvador, Rwanda, etc.).

3) A vibrant component of the University of Maryland at College Park, CIDCM is dedicated to better understanding the dynamics and management of complex societal conflicts and political and economic development, with a special emphasis on data and methodologies for preventing war and state failure, particularly as occurring during democratic transitions. The global analysis of one of the most comprehensive data of inter and intra-state conflict is published periodically incorporating its rich own resources. The “Partners in Conflict” and “Partners in Peacebuilding” program

⁷ Edward E. Azar, *The Management of Protracted Social Conflict- Theory and Cases*, (Broofield VE, Gower Publishing House, 1990, pp 82- 108.

⁸ Christopher Mitchell, *Ripe for Contribution? The Falklands-Malvinas War and the Utility of Problem- Solving Workshops*, (George Mason University, ICAR, Working Paper No 15, August 2000)

has developed over decades of experimentation, systematic methodologies for promoting political and economic development through conflict transformation, tested in cases across cultures and continents⁹. Building skills through experimental learning, it empowers participants to continue to collaboratively address reform issues and conflicts affecting them beyond initial agreements reached with outside help.

CIDCM has developed over more than two decades a comprehensive approach for innovative problem solving workshops, which has been used worldwide and in the region, in cooperation with the Latin American Studies Center. One of the best results was obtained in a Track II to the Peru/Ecuador subsequently after the 1995 Cenepa war with a recognized contribution to the opening, conduction and aftermath of the peace process¹⁰.

Methodology

While using multiple approaches and benefiting from the learning experience of many centers of excellence in the field worldwide, this particular program will experiment with the methodology developed at CIDCM which at the high level involves Track II diplomacy and citizens diplomacy at a more generalized societal level. Track-two diplomacy has also increased as a result of the process of globalization, which has expanded cross-border and international interaction, while also making involvement in international affairs more accessible to individual citizens and more relevant to their daily lives. There is an intrinsic difference between track-two and “back channel” negotiations, often run in parallel or in preparation for official negotiations. The latter is mostly conducted by emissaries of the governments, often security/intelligence agents or messengers with no authority to discuss issues. Track two, on the other hand, is conducted by nonofficial individuals, with the objective of generating new options, putting themselves in the position of the other, testing the limits of the possible. They may report back to officials in their respective governments, bring the new shared ideas to their peers within civil society, or try to affect public opinion through the media and other informal channels. . It is also meant to develop an “epistemic community”—a group of individuals who share collective understanding relating to their own issues and problems.

The stakeholders are participating as “Partners in Conflict”, (intended to underline a common identity such as a shared occupation or profession (e.g., academics, journalists), attributes (e.g., gender, religion), mutual concerns (e.g., environment, development), or common region (e.g., Caucasus, Middle East, Andean countries). Emphasizing commonalities and a shared identity while acknowledging basic differences encourages the establishment of a solid link between the two groups.

The Track-II/Citizens’ Diplomacy moves along four main distinct stages: trust building, skills building, consensus building and re-entry.. The first stage is of

⁹ In recent years, CIDCM has provided facilitation and capacity building workshops in Israel/ Palestine, Jordan, Lesotho, Bulgaria, Georgia, Galapagos, Bolivia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Indonesia, India, Philippines, Peru/Ecuador, Mexico, and Canada (Mohawk First Nation). In most of this program CIDCM will introduce the expertise of the UMD Center for Latin American Studies.

¹⁰ Edward (Edy). Kaufman and Saul. Sosnowski, “The Peru-Ecuador Peace Process: The Contribution of Track-Two Diplomacy”, in Ronald J. Fisher (ed.) *Paving the Way: Contributions of Interactive Conflict Resolution to Peace-Making*, (NY, Lexington Books, 2005) , pp 175-202

extreme importance, and has been normally neglected in official diplomacy, the confrontation between the two contending sides starting with early contacts without the opportunity of breaking the ice and bringing an informal and friendly atmosphere to the negotiations. Once the Partners are fully immersed in the spirit of the location, have warmed up to one another, and understand the rules of the game the facilitators can proceed to a systematic presentation of the methods to be used and map it within the general area of alternative or appropriate dispute resolution . Exceptionally, given the experiential nature of our work, at this time, as we move toward skills building, we need to make a persuasive presentation of our underlying philosophy as well as the concrete product toward which the workshop is directed. The second stage of skill-building involves many individual and group techniques that can improve the effectiveness of participants towards the search for common ground. The great variety of individual skills (not depending on the behavior of the “Other”) involves way in which we communicate (express ourselves in phrases, words and body-language) to the way we pay attention (experimenting with different techniques of “active listening”), ways to overcome intercultural communication obstacles, exercises in prejudice reduction, sensitivity towards discrimination, stereotyping and dehumanizing. Group skills (requiring cooperation of the “Other”) include de-escalation, developing a long term shared vision, consensus exercises moving from compromise to win/win solutions through training in creativity, brainstorming, multiple option-evaluations and critical thinking, drafting, levels of consensus and strategies towards reaching agreement. The third stage introduces alternative methods for consensus building, moving from personal mediation for individuals, to small communities processes of problem solving (Ho’o Pono pono from Polynesia, to which we were introduced by Joan Galtung) and macro-nation level models of reaching common ground. In the alternative models we use lateral thinking approaches (developed by Edward De Bono), and the ARIA model developed by Jay Rothman (with the four adversarial, reflexive, integrative and action phases). The fourth stage deals with the preparations for implementation once the intense experience is over. In the past, facilitators thought it was already a success to reach consensus as expressed in a document. The drafting of an “action plan” is a skill in itself where the individual responsibilities are allocated including a timetable for implementation that can be monitored by all.

In broad terms, CIDCM work falls within the concept of “conflict transformation,” relating to three inter-related objectives: a) the need to address the roots of the conflict before trying to come up with creative solutions, namely to address the basic needs of the parties and change the causes and not only the symptoms of the conflict; b) the establishment of a working relationship among the intra and inter-group Partners, towards the establishment of a cooperative problem solving attitude, through building skills for a creative thinking process and then applying them to the concrete issues at stake; and c) a personal transformation in regard to our own attitude to deal with the conflicts that we face at all levels.

Activities and Timetable

YEAR I

1) Month 1 – Four researchers/co-facilitators from Argentina and UK to join the two US specialists at College Park Multitrack Diplomacy Preparatory Workshop

- 2) Month 2-4 -Preparation of Conflict/needs assessment (secondary sources, documents, also including travel of three researchers to the Malvinas/Falkland, Buenos Aires and London for interviews).
- 3) Month 5- First Conflict Transformation 7-day workshop in Uruguay, with 12 participants and three facilitation team) from Argentina and the Falkland/Malvinas
- 4) Month 6-9: preparation of draft documents and dissemination among participants for feedback. Uni-national separate meetings with co-facilitators are to be periodically scheduled by San Andres/FLACSO and in Buenos Aires and the University of Westminster in London respectively.
- 5) Month 10: Second Conflict Transformation 7-day workshop in England with 12 participants from the UK and the Falkland/Malvinas and two facilitators.
- 6) Month 11-12: preparation of draft documents and dissemination among participants for feedback. Evaluation first year report.

YEAR II

- 5) Month 1- Third Conflict Transformation 10-day workshop in South America (18 Partners and three co-facilitators). Consensus document to be shaped and Action Plan, selection of Steering Committee
- 6) Month 2- 7 : Implementation Action Plan: joint delegations meeting with decision-makers. Meeting Steering Committee, preparations for comprehensive follow up (including media, public opinion).
- 8) Month 8- 11: Implementation of follow up plans by all Partners
- 9) Month 12: Re-entry and evaluation workshop (18 Partners and three co-facilitators), long-term planning.

YEAR III

Preparation of joint publications (academic on substance and process), media programs by co-facilitators and Partners' team (not budgeted)

Evaluation.

The Project will have an US-based experienced independent evaluator to train and to work in partnership with independent Argentinean and British evaluator.

There are three elements in the evaluation strategy: a) Action evaluation, based on tracking the evolving needs and objectives of stakeholders; b) Monitoring outputs: visits, materials, workshops, etc.; and c) Evaluating outcomes, including the impact of the Project on participant learning and behavior and impact on relevant stakeholder organizations and communities.

Action Evaluation (AE): This cutting-edge approach integrates evaluation processes into field work in ways that support rather than hamper it. AE engages the stakeholders (including implementing partners, funders, and key participants) in a process promoting adaptation to changing context, and feeding into improving performance.¹¹ The process includes a *baseline stage* that involves cooperative goal setting, team building, and participatory decision making within and between project stakeholder groups; a *formative stage*, during which participants review and refine their goals in light of experience and the evolving political context, to make them more actionable, and a *summative stage*, when participants take stock of their overall progress, using their evolved goals to establish criteria for retrospective assessment.

¹¹ Jay Rothman and Victor Friedman "Action Evaluation in Organizations and Projects in Davies and Kaufman, 2003 (fn 19).

The trainees will partake in this process, taking up joint responsibility for design and articulation of future activities, adapting to evolving demands and opportunities, while keeping in mind the major Project objectives: the evaluations themselves become a useful learning tool.

The baseline evaluation will be made as part of initial planning, with formative evaluations every 6-9 months, depending on the timing of visits or new developments. A final summative evaluation will support an end-of-Project evaluation report and follow-up planning.

Monitoring Outputs: This is a straightforward tracking to compare Project performance with projected deliverables each semester.

Evaluating Outcomes: Outcomes address the impact of the Project on participants and their institutions and communities. They are specified as far as practical in advance, measurable, attainable in a reasonable timeframe, and results-oriented. There are five levels of outcome for this Project: a) *Stakeholder willingness* to participate, and *participant satisfaction* with program; b) *Participant learning*, including new knowledge, skills, understanding democratic practices, changed perceptions and attitudes toward other groups; c) *Consensus agreements* on how to address the issues, and *joint action planning*; d) *Participant behavior*, implementing action plans, applying new knowledge and skills in the workplace or community, participating more, continuing contacts via digital network; e) *Institutional changes*, including feedback from contacts with Argentinean, British and Kelpers public opinion makers and political leadership, expanding contacts and network, new media or public interest in democratic practices or reforms, new interest from policy makers and officials on reforms. Data on these outputs and outcomes feed into quarterly monitoring and evaluation reports, while AE facilitates adjustments to maximize impact in promoting democratic transition.

Preliminary Budget Concluding Remarks

The Falkland/Malvinas war in 1982 hit hardly the ongoing diplomatic efforts to bring a final solution to the conflict between Argentina and the UK over the Atlantic islands. It also ended civil society level contacts between the islanders and Argentines. Before the war, visits to Argentina from the islands were frequent. Islanders, for instance, used to come to Argentina to study in high schools and universities, or to cure in public or private hospitals. Now they prefer traveling to Great Britain. Officially, negotiations are in a dead end. Moreover, with 1,600 British troops still present in the islands, both London and Buenos Aires seem to harden even more their discourse. The probability of renewed hostilities is currently almost non-existence. Yet the lack of political will to a renewed rapprochement and efforts to negotiate a solution affects the possibility of cooperation in projects of common interest in the South Atlantic Ocean. Furthermore, as long as the lack of political will to negotiate a solution persists, hardly would any unilateral project not be obstructed by political, economic and diplomatic retaliatory measures of the other part, a situation, which would first and foremost affect the development of the islanders.

Yet, during the 1990s important measures were taken on both official and unofficial levels. Argentina and the UK signed three agreements of cooperation in fisheries (1990), oil (1995) and communications (1999). None of these agreements today is being implemented because of the toughening of the official positions. This is rather

deplorable, because especially within the real of the fisheries agreement Argentine and British scientists cooperated closely in research projects concerning the critical mass of species. It is on the bases of this data that the bilateral commission that came together twice a year decided the fishing quotas in the South Atlantic waters. This example best shows how close cooperation could not only be mutually beneficial, but also promote sustainability and environmental protection. It is not, however, the only example of civilian involvement in the Falkland/Malvinas issue. Soon a monument for the fallen in the 1982 war will be inaugurated in the islands. The monument is a pure civilian initiative by relatives of Argentine victims of the war, realized with private capitals with no state involvement or input at all.

As in any other Track-II effort, the project for a public diplomacy involving Argentinean and British and Falkland/Malvinas civil society and public opinion makers aims at bridging distances and creating a fertile ground to push for a review of policy on the official level towards a peaceful solution of the conflict. More precisely, it seeks to creatively find ways of convincing both governments returning to the negotiations table, and think about the islands not only as an issue for domestic consumption during electoral campaigns, but also, if not essentially, an opportunity to end past grievances and cooperate for the promotion of mutually beneficial and sustainable development.