

Chapter Seven — Learning About Peace And Conflict From Other Multi-Ethnic Countries

The us/them instinct packages that have shaped so much of the history of our country can be seen in painful clarity in every other multi-ethnic and multi-tribal country in the world.

We are not alone as a country in facing significant levels of intergroup issues — driven by instinctive behaviors, emotions, and values.

In a very large number of other settings, a significant number of countries are actually facing larger, more dangerous, and much more immediate instinct anchored intergroup problems than the ones we are facing here.

As we create our own Art of Intergroup Peace strategies to help us build and maintain a culture of Peace in America, it is useful to get a sense of the kinds of intergroup conflicts that are creating problems relative to intergroup Peace in other parts of the world.

Intergroup problems, intergroup stress points, and open conflicts between groups are the defining factors for hundreds of settings in the world today. Conflict is widespread and conflict is growing.

Most wars in recent centuries have been between nations. Armed nation states have done battle with other armed nation states.

That is not the pattern we are seeing for the vast majority of the conflicts that are springing up in the world today.

The battles that are happening in the world today are not between nations. The battles are actually wars inside nations.

A large number of countries in the world are literally currently at war with themselves. Civil wars are happening in many settings. Very basic us/them instinct-based intergroup conflicts are happening in a significant number of settings and those wars are almost all battles between tribes of people fighting each other inside the borders of their countries.

The number and scale of those intergroup conflicts has been actually increasing for the last couple of decades.

In some of those settings where people inside countries are at war today with other people in their own country, the internal intergroup conflict that exists now has been going on for centuries.

The basic intergroup issues in settings like Barcelona, Belfast, and Belgium all extend back for centuries — with local ethnic groups seeking autonomy in each setting and with the national government in each setting

opposed to any division or reduction of their overarching national turf. Those intergroup divisions in those settings with aspiring separatist groups have been going on for a very long time and those divisions continue to both simmer and burn today.

Those issues are just the tip of the inter-ethnic iceberg.

The ending of colonialism and the collapse of the Soviet Union created more than 100 new multi-ethnic countries that are now self-governing and freed from colonial or Soviet rule. Each of those multi-ethnic countries has its own levels of internal conflict — with some raging at the level of open civil war. Syria, Iraq, and Sri Lanka all fit that pattern.

Those intergroup conflicts tend to go back far into the history of the conflicted groups in each setting.

Former colonies and former satellites who now function as independent nations are almost all experiencing very clear levels of pure instinct-triggered local intergroup issues and conflicts.

For the former colonies and the former satellites, old intertribal conflicts that have existed for centuries in multiple settings have been allowed to emerge after long periods of colonial suppression.

Immigration Is Creating New InterGroup Problems In

Multiple Settings

For a growing number of other countries that are not former captives or former satellites and that do not have historic separatist movements, there are additional major and entirely new levels of internal intergroup conflicts. The new levels of local conflict are the direct result of growing levels of recent immigration into those countries.

Countries that had been ethnically pure for centuries are now finding themselves with large numbers of refugees and immigrants who are from very different ethnic groups than the original inhabitants of those areas.

Those major new levels of multi-ethnic immigration are creating unexpected diversity issues and some very real and clearly instinctive intergroup backlashes in many of those increasingly diverse countries.

The combination of all of those factors — separatism, tribal conflicts, and ethnically linked immigration — has created a world at war — with countries everywhere literally at war with themselves. Our basic and universal packages of Us/them instincts are creating intergroup stress, tension, and internal conflict in a wide range of settings. Those instinct-

triggered conflicts in most settings are growing rather than stabilizing or being resolved in any effective way.

The us/them instinctive behaviors that have been activated in too many of the intertribal settings include acts of brutality, group executions, murder, rape and various levels of intentionally evil ethnic purging and ethnic cleansing. The basic intergroup instinct activation in multiple settings is creating groups of people inside countries who hate other groups of people in those countries and who do damage to other people in those countries in multiple ways.

Former Colonies And Former Satellites Both Have Ethnic Conflict Problems

The newly independent nations tend to be particularly active hot spots for interethnic conflicts.

In a number of the troubled countries, significant levels of conflict are happening now because the countries, themselves, are former colonies that had significant levels of internal inter-ethnic diversity, as colonies, that wasn't well handled or even officially recognized in the processes that were used to create both independent status as nations and future national governance models for those countries.

Colonial power has ebbed, faded, and disappeared in a number of African, Asian, and Middle Eastern countries. Dozens of former colonies have become separate and independent nations. Most of those newly independent countries are multi-tribal and have extensive internal levels of intergroup conflict with other groups in each setting that reach back into history to the formation of each tribe.

Those groups of people in the former colonies have multiple inter-tribal conflicts — and the very worst of them resulted in major loss of life.

More than 1 million people were killed as the tribes of India split into India and Pakistan and another million people were killed as the tribes of Pakistan split into Pakistan and Bangladesh.

Other settings that were multi-tribal have killed fewer people — but the total set of lives lost will soon exceed the lives lost in India and Bangladesh.

At roughly the same time that the colonies were freed, the dissolution of the old Soviet Union and the ending of that functional Russian-governed Empire has created a similar set of newly independent multi-ethnic countries around the periphery of Russia.

The old satellite countries and the former colonies have all achieved freedom and autonomy as nations and they each now need to figure out how to deal with their internal ethnic diversity.

In almost all cases, that new freedom for each nation has been accompanied by significant levels of internal interethnic and interracial conflict — to the point of civil war in multiple settings.

The internal ethnic conflict in those settings exists to a very large degree because each of the former colonies had functionally circumstantial and historically nonsensical external boundaries as colonies that became the official borders of the new nations — and those nation-state borders often made very little no ethnic or racial sense for the people who lived in those areas.

Those old colonial boundaries and turf ownership legacy situations that did not reflect historic ethnic or tribal realities became the new national boundaries for each new nation created by the end of colonialism.

For the former Soviet Union satellites who were freed, the current national boundaries tend to make more historical sense. But there are a number of small, multi-ethnic nations who were freed by the Russians whose long-standing internal interethnic animosities had been kept under

control for long periods of time by significant levels of Soviet policing and Russian military power.

In each of those situations for each of those new countries, that external suppression of local internal ethnic conflict by the external powers is now gone.

People From Warring Ethnic Groups Have To Co-Exist As Nations

People from a variety of groups are now forced to interact with each other as separate tribes or as separate ethnic groups within each of those newly independent countries. Those separate ethnic groups in each of those new nation-states are now finding themselves in a constant state of intergroup stress, open conflict and — in too many cases — active and bloody civil war.

Syria, Sri Lanka, Iraq, Nigeria, and The Congo all have internal ethnic groups who hate other internal ethnic groups and who would rather be nations flying their own group's flag and having control over their own group's turf.

Various groups in various settings want various levels of autonomy — and those aspirations tend to be resisted or crushed — both by whoever is the local tribe in power and by a strong desire by the international community to keep all current boundaries of all nations intact.

International Law Obsessively Protects Current Borders

International law has an almost obsessive compulsion to protect current nation state boundaries. That obsession is fueled in part by our basic turf instincts that tend to make protection of current boundaries feel “right.”

That obsession by other nations to keep all of the nation state boundaries intact is driven even more strongly by the fact that most nations in the world have their own internal separatist movements to some degree. So the people who run those existing countries with internal separatist aspirations very much do not want to see the precedent set anywhere of allowing ethnic separatists in any country to achieve separation as a goal.

In most cases, the central government that runs the new nations today is dominated by one of the local ethnic groups — and that group and that government tend to have their own intergroup turf instincts fully activated. The leaders of those dominant local groups resist any attempts by other local tribal groups — like the Kurds — to achieve any level of autonomy.

Those people who are currently in power in each setting tend to want the current borders to survive exactly as they exist today. Turf instincts are fully activated for both sets of people in those countries. Those turf-activated central governments in those former colonies tend to be opposed to local autonomy of any kind.

Soviet Empire Collapse Created Nations

The collapse of the Soviet Union freed two sets of countries. One set of freed countries was the former satellites — Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, etc. Those countries had been conquered by ideology — with communist parties in each country granting power to the Soviets as communist leaders.

Each of those countries was returned to pre-communist freedom levels.

The other set of freed countries were much smaller former captive countries that had been under Soviet and Russian domination. Each of those freed countries also had their own tribal history and their own local ethnic concentrations.

The former satellites now run their own nations. Poland and Hungary are self-governing. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia split into ethnic pieces

that reflect their own internal ethnic alignments. Each is self-governing. Yugoslavia is now six self-governing tribal countries — and they are not at war with one another or with themselves.

That process of splitting those countries into their historic tribal pieces made ethnic sense — but even that process was not welcomed by other countries in the world.

The situation is more complicated in some of the former captive countries. Each of those former captives has its own primary ethnic group and their own ethnic language. The primary ethnic group in each setting dumped Russian as their language of government and made their own historic language the official language of each country as soon as they were freed from Russia rule.

In those countries, the formerly suppressed ethnic groups have tended to take collective revenge at some level on the local ethnic Russians who still live there. They also have tended to get control over any other local minority groups who happen to live in the national geography of those newly independent nations.

The new local majority group in each former captive country has tended to do negative things to groups they perceive to be “Them.” Ethnic cleansing has been a common practice for those former captives.

They have expelled people who spoke Russian or who had Turkish ancestors from several of those countries.

In the Ukraine, the Russians have made attempts to regain control over the Russian speaking portions of that country. The local separatist movements have unified to help those Russian speaking sections of that country leave the domination of the group speaking the other language.

Russia, itself, is both a country and the lead nation in a new Russian confederation.

The new Russian confederation is made up of almost 100 ethnic groups who have each been granted some local autonomy in the context of the confederation model.

Some of the Russian confederation members — like Chechnya — have their own strong separatist movements — and people that are killing people in Chechnya in the interest of separation.

Russia faces the very challenging situation of encouraging the Ukrainian separatist movement while suppressing the Chechnyan separatists.

Countries Are At War With Themselves

The combined impact of all of those issues for all of the new countries that used to be satellites, captives, or colonies combined with significant historical ethnic conflicts that are still happening in the old multi-ethnic countries with separatist movements means that there are multiple levels and arrays of intergroup conflicts happening today in a large number of countries.

In addition to those problems, significant levels of new immigration volumes have triggered their own set of intergroup instinctive behaviors in a number of settings who used to be ethnically pure.

In total, there are more than 200 of those intergroup conflicts happening in various sites today, and the number of intergroup conflict settings is growing, rather than shrinking.

All three categories of intergroup conflict are creating major and growing problems today.

The history of those long-standing multi-ethnic countries tends to be a long legacy of serious and almost perpetual internal intergroup stress and conflict. The problems that exist between groups of people in those multi-ethnic countries are well known and they have been obvious for years.

The issues that exist for the Basque separatist in Spain and for the Irish separatists in Belfast have been known and visible to the world for a very long time.

Separatist Groups Exist In Many Settings

Separatist movements exist today in many settings across the planet as a result of those two sets of intergroup realities. In a number of countries, the separatist groups that exist are clearly defined local ethnic groups who have their own language, their own culture, and their own group identity.

Those groups have not wanted to be dominated by the larger local ethnic group or assimilated into the language or the culture of whatever ethnic group is the majority group in each setting.

Spain, Great Britain, Russia, Mexico, China, Turkey, Afghanistan, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Nigeria, and dozens of other countries all have very distinct ethnic and racial groups within their boundaries that each want to become independent and self-governing nations.

The separatist groups in each of those countries very much want to determine their own group's future through their own group's version of ethnic self-governance. Those groups who want to be separate each have

their own very clear group identity. They each have their own group turf instincts fully activated.

Those separatist groups very often either want to become their own independent and self-governing countries or they want to somehow become at least semi-autonomous sections within the larger multi-ethnic countries.

Many of the Catalans of Barcelona, for example, want to stop being simply an internal portion of Spain. They want local autonomy for Barcelona.

The national Spanish government has its own turf instincts fully activated, however, and the people who run the national Spanish government have no interest in allowing the Catalans to form their own country, and remove what the Spanish leaders believe to be part of Spain from Spain.

So there is a lot of anger on that issue from both the leaders of Spain and many of the Catalan leaders and people. Those issues will never entirely disappear for that country as long as the people from that group believe that their group deserves to govern itself.

Melding into the Spanish majority group will not happen.

Similar situations exist for the Basque of Spain, the Sami of Northern Norway, and the Welsh and Scottish peoples who are currently locked into the United Kingdom as subsidiary pieces of that larger nation.

Colonial Armies Overpowered Local Instincts

The instinctive need that is very clearly felt by whoever runs the central government in each of those countries to keep their entire country intact at all costs is matched only by the equally strong instinctive need of the separatist groups in each setting to separate.

The functional reality in each setting is that the central government and dominant ethnic group has the army and runs the police — so the central government's package of instincts and goals tends to prevail in each of those divided settings.

In some countries like Pakistan, Indonesia, and Sri Lanka where the local tribal groups actually have their own significant military forces, the central government has significantly less power. Those countries tend to function more in a state of truce than a state of union.

But even those clearly problematic countries tend to follow the overall tendency of keeping any national boundary intact once it has been established as a national boundary.

As a result — conflict is happening in many places. All of those multi-ethnic, multi-tribal countries are now trying to figure out how to deal with their internal intergroup issues.

It is clear that various levels of inter-ethnic problems exist and function at a highly instinctive level on what is almost a permanent status in some of the very old multi-ethnic countries.

If local autonomy of some kind doesn't happen, the Tamil Tigers and the Basque bombers will continue their quest and will resurrect their opposition to the majority group in their countries after each defeat and setback.

Immigration Is Adding A New Ethnic Conflict Set Of Crisis

Those old battles each have their ancient trajectories and their highly predictable futures.

What is new today, however, in several parts of the world is the fact that immigration is creating entirely new levels of local intergroup conflict.

A large number of countries in several parts of the world that had actually been internally conflict free for centuries because of their long-

standing internal local ethnic homogeneity and even a degree of local ethnic purity, are now facing internal ethnic conflict.

Some of those formerly ethnically pure countries are now becoming much more diverse. That is happening in large part because of new internal ethnic conflict realities that exist today in all of those former colonies and satellites that have displaced over 50 million people.

Those displaced people are immigrating to other countries. Entirely new sets of instinct-driven intergroup problems are happening between groups of people in the increasingly diverse settings where the displaced immigrants are now choosing to live.

Some countries that traditionally have had almost no ethnic diversity and very little internal interethnic conflict for centuries are now becoming much more ethnically and racially diverse.

Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany, and Austria all have significant immigrant populations that are triggering local intergroup stress in multiple settings in those countries.

Ethnically Pure Countries Are Becoming Diverse

That new stress and that new diversity are happening almost entirely due to new immigration realities for those countries. Many of those formerly Peaceful and formerly ethnically homogenous countries are currently seeing entirely new levels of intergroup pressure, internal stress, and intergroup conflict because their historic ethnic and racial homogeneity is rapidly disappearing.

Quite a few countries — particularly in Europe — who used to be relatively ethnically pure — now have growing minority populations.

In a number of highly ethnically focused Middle Eastern and Asian countries, as well, forced exiles of people from their homelands based on intergroup conflict is also creating growing local diversity in a large number of settings that used to be ethnically pure.

The new diversity comes from several categories of new immigrants into those formerly pure countries. In some cases, the new immigrants to countries are pursuing economic opportunity. Jobs create an economic pull that creates new levels of population diversity in some settings.

In other instances, the new immigrants are exiles — fleeing ethnic persecution and discrimination in their former homelands. The exiles in those settings tend to immigrate in ethnic and racial groups because the

pressures that force them to immigrate are targeted at those people by those same ethnic or racial groups.

Millions of people now live in refugee camps — and those people almost all had tribal or ethnic pressure that caused them to be refugees.

Regardless of the trigger-issues for the immigration, the new people who move into each country become a new category of “them” in that country and the old residents have very predictable intergroup responses to the new groups.

The packages of instinctive intergroup us/them reactions between groups of people that were described in Chapter Two and Three of this book are becoming internally highly relevant to the people in all of those increasingly diverse countries.

In most of those settings, the new immigration levels are generating and triggering significant levels of us/them instinctive reactions for all of the people in those countries — both for the immigrants and for the indigenous peoples in each setting.

Ethnic Diversity Is Creating Intergroup Conflict In Refugee

Settings

The standard set of us/them reactions that are triggered by intergroup instincts are being generated both in the new immigrants and in the local populations who had been ethnically homogenous in those settings before the immigration began.

There is anger on all sides in each multi-ethnic refugee setting. The new immigrants feel they are discriminated against. The old residents feel like they have been involuntarily invaded.

The result is an expanding set of internal intergroup conflicts that is changing some of those countries in significant ways. So as we look at the rest of the world through the lens of us/them instinctive behaviors, we see new immigration creating new us/them issues in a number of settings, and we see old us/them stress points and conflicts continuing to create their traditional problems in a number of other countries.

Europe Has Been Purely Tribal For Centuries

Most of Europe has been fiercely tribal and ethnically pure at each local level for centuries. Tribal purity has defined Europe.

For many centuries, each area of Europe has been dominated and occupied by its own local European tribe.

Sweden is full of Swedes. Denmark is full of Danes. Holland has been full of people who are proudly Dutch. Local tribes have dominated local turf and created national identities in each nation based on the dominant local tribe.

Each ethnic tribe of Europe has tended to have its own turf — defined by its national borders.

The local European tribes fought each other as tribes across those borders for centuries. Much blood has been shed across those borders in what were clearly inter-tribal wars. For the past century or more, the individual people of Europe did very little cross-border intermingling between tribes. People tended to stay in their own tribal territories. People did not immigrate in any significant volume from Germany or Finland to France or Italy to live.

If any people from any European country did immigrate to any other European country, those immigrants were usually seen as a clearly identified outlier family in their new country and in their new setting for generations.

That static and relatively pure ethnic environment for all of those European countries is obviously no longer true.

Immigration Is Changing Europe

Immigration now has both lower barriers and reduced levels of enforcement in Europe. Significant levels of immigration are happening in increasing volumes in almost all European countries.

As a consequence, the old geographically focused local tribal purity that has existed for centuries has been rapidly eroding in many parts of Europe.

A number of urban areas in Europe now have very large local minority populations who are not from the original tribal group for that geography. That local diversity did not exist and wasn't even contemplated less than two decades ago.

The people from the old European tribes are still not moving very much from country to country. Germans and Danes still do not immigrate very often to Paris, or Madrid.

The new migration volume that is affecting major parts of Europe is from non-European sets of people. A whole new set of immigrants has now flooded into Europe from Africa, from the Middle East, and from Eastern Europe.

Non-Europeans and Eastern Europeans are both currently coming to Western Europe in large numbers.

Cities That Had Been Ethnically Pure Are Now Diverse

Cities that had changed very little in their ethnic composition for centuries are now changing rapidly as a result of that immigration. Multi-ethnic neighborhoods exist in many settings and the people in those settings clearly are forming their own communities anchored in their own ethnic group.

The religion of those areas is changing significantly as well. The major groups of immigrants into those cities tend to be from Muslim ethnic groups.

There now are Albanian enclaves in nearly every major city in Europe. People from Turkey hold jobs and live in Turkish enclaves in Germany and Austria. People from those countries tend to have Muslim religious alignments.

People from North Africa fill the suburbs of Paris. Some of the Parisian suburbs are now more clearly defined by their new residents than by their old residents. The most visible cultures in those neighborhoods are no longer “French” and are no longer based on the traditional French living approaches or the traditional French culture.

France has traditionally had one of the strongest commitments of any nation in the world to culture and to its language — with strict rules functionally enforcing language purity. There are now major areas within France where French is not the language of choice for the majority of local residents.

Many Immigrants In Europe Do Not Assimilate

So Europe is becoming significantly multi ethnic at an increasing rate. As one might expect and predict with any understanding of how instinctive behaviors work, that situation is creating some major activation of us/them instincts, values, and behaviors in a number of settings.

That activation of those us/them instincts in each of those settings is exacerbated by the fact that very large percentages of the new immigrants are deliberately, openly, and clearly choosing not to assimilate into the old European cultures in the countries they have entered and now call home.

Many of the new immigrants very deliberately continue to be and function very intentionally as a separate ethnic group inside their new country. They also tend to be Muslim in communities where the inhabitants have been primarily Christian for centuries.

The newest waves of immigrants in each setting tend to bring their own old culture into Europe — along with their own religion and their own history and cultural values. That set of changes is creating new challenges to what had long been a status of local ethnic and internal Peace in multiple areas of Europe for centuries.

In major parts of Europe, there are now significant us/them conflicts. Negative behaviors, and intergroup stress levels are increasing at an accelerated rate. All of the standard packages of instinctive behaviors and values that can be triggered by our Us/Them instincts are being activated today in various European settings by that immigration reality.

Paris relatively recently had intergroup riots where more than 100,000 cars were burned and destroyed. In that instance, a situation where French policemen shot and killed two minority students was followed by riots and some very targeted intergroup violence.

Two For Two — Completely Impersonal Intergroup Perceptions

The goal of the violence, some of the riot leaders said at the time, was to kill two French policemen. Two for two.

That was an example of completely depersonalized and purely numerical intergroup revenge. That specific two for two response is one kind of thinking that can stem from “us/them” instinct driven values — with people on each side stereotyped by people on the other side to the point where killing any two policemen felt symbolically right to the rioters — whether or not those two dead policemen had personally damaged anyone or whether those two policeman had any connection to any relevant issue or whether they personally were wonderful human beings.

The police of Paris were depersonalized by the rioters in that thought process and turned into a pure number. Two was the goal. Killing any two was the goal of the mob.

That is exactly how us/them instincts too often function. Us/them instincts tend to depersonalize whoever is perceived to be “them.” Those depersonalizing thought patterns are clearly being activated in too many of those intergroup situations across Europe.

Lynchings have taken place in some European countries, and political parties that favor ethnic purity are gaining ground in a number of countries.

In another recent and very clear intergroup conflict occurrence in France, two brothers who were Muslim entered the building that housed a

French publication and massacred a dozen people in an act of pure intergroup anger and revenge.

The intergroup tensions were high enough after that shooting that it was difficult again for French policemen to enter some Parisian neighborhoods.

The conflict levels and negative intergroup behaviors that are triggered by immigration are clearly being felt in multiple cities and settings.

The Internet Is Becoming A Tool For Inflammation

The Internet is fueling some of those conflicts in those European settings. This book dealt with some of the challenges and the opportunities presented by the Internet in Chapter Ten. Chapter Eleven deals in more detail with how we need to use the Internet as a key tool for The Art of Intergroup Peace to increase intergroup understanding and to support intergroup Peace.

Supporting Peace has not been the primary use of the Internet in the various European intergroup settings. The Internet has been used in many angry European settings to end local Peace and to exacerbate local anger and conflict.

Some of the most volatile and damaging intergroup conflicts in those countries are now conflicts that have been triggered, fed, informed, supported, exacerbated, incited, and inflamed by the Internet.

The Internet has a remarkable ability to transmit information and to do it broadly and quickly. That very powerful tool can be used for both good and evil.

The Internet's communication power can turn a very local and highly situational inter-ethnic negative incident in a single city — like a local police shooting of a minority student in one site — into a major explosion that reaches across multiple communities and even reaches across multiple countries very quickly.

That kind of Internet-accelerated intergroup conflict across multiple sites is happening in Europe now. The Internet is enabling various groups of people who want to inflame peoples' us/them instincts in Europe to do inflammatory things in multiple settings with a high level of success.

There are clearly growing numbers of people who use the Internet as a tool to create a strong, militant, and separatist sense of “us” for various ethnic or religious minorities and majority groups in Europe.

Some of the Muslim extremist groups are among the most skilled users of the Internet to both recruit supporters and to inflame situations in local settings.

There are also some political parties who have strong anti-immigrant positions and there are activist groups that have very inflammatory anti-immigrant positions. Internet sites for all of those groups have clearly been set up very intentionally to give people a collective focus on a targeted set of us/them-linked issues.

Adding Religion To The Situation Exacerbates The Instinctive

Impact

The current intergroup situation in Europe has been complicated and exacerbated immensely by the fact that religion was added fairly recently to the basic tribal and ethnic intergroup mix for many European settings.

People are now very clearly divided along religious lines as well as ethnic lines in many settings.

The initial and original underlying intergroup conflicts and intergroup stress points that first existed in those European settings functionally tended to be between people from different ethnicities. The first set of intergroup

instincts in those settings were all triggered initially by what were basically tribal differences.

But those tribal stress points were made significantly more challenging and more inflammatory by the fact that people from various ethnic groups who have been moving into the European communities also are people who have a very different religions affiliation than the traditional religion of Europe.

The original residents of those European countries overwhelmingly tended to be Christian or have Christian ancestors. The new residents are overwhelmingly Muslim and come from Muslim tribes and ethnic groups.

Different religions that exist for the people from each group in those settings definitely adds another very powerful and impactful layer of religion-linked us/them instincts and energies to the intergroup conflict mix.

Adding Religion To Ethnicity Adds A Higher Level Of Disruptive Energy

That combination of religion and ethnicity has changed both the nature of the conflicts and the intergroup perceptions and intergroup interactions in most of those settings.

Most people in Europe now perceive the intergroup conflicts they are experiencing there today to be based on religion more than on tribe. Adding religion to tribe as a trigger for conflict and as a way of defining who is us and who is them has the power to significantly amplify the impact of other relevant us/them activators and us/them differentiations in any setting.

Most of the new ethnic and racial minority immigrants who are now moving to Europe are Muslim. Most of the old ethnic Europeans in those countries were either Christian or they were non-religious and basically secular people who had Christian ancestors.

Even though the initial Us/Them instinct activation that occurred relative to the new ethnic minorities by the old European majority groups in each setting tended to be functionally more tribal than religious on the part of the original Europeans, the negative intergroup us/them experiences that have happened for many of the new immigrants in many of those settings have fairly often been interpreted by those new immigrants, themselves, to be based very directly on their religion and not on their ethnicity, race, or tribe.

Some Group Leaders Have Pointed To Religion As The Trigger-Issue

All of those factors trigger high levels of intergroup instinct activation. Tribe, ethnicity, race, and religion can all activate us/them perceptions and reactions.

For the new immigrants to Europe who feel a sense of intergroup conflict, there tends to be a growing perception that the primary differentiation factor that makes life more different in their new settings is their religion and not their race or their tribe.

Several key religious leaders for the immigrants have very specifically made that claim of religious persecution. Those leaders attribute the discriminatory intergroup behaviors that have happened in various settings to religious causes and religious motivations rather than to ethnic issues or tribal differences.

When religious leaders speak to religious followers about religious issues, that communication tends to be singularly influential to the believers and the practitioners of that religion.

The Perception Of Religious Conflict Can Be Self-Fulfilling

That perception can become a self-fulfilling belief, regardless of its original impact on people in a setting.

Because that perception of religious differentiation, religious conflict, and religious discrimination now exists for many people in those European settings — fed by multiple very clear Internet and group setting descriptions of the intergroup issues in those settings as being religious at their core — the conflicts in several settings now have a clearly religious context.

That set of perceptions about the role of religion in the intergroup stress points has currently caused some of the local intergroup conflicts in European settings to take on the context of a more generic Holy War, rather than just being another set of local, situational, intertribal, interracial, interethnic, instinctive intergroup negative us/them reactions.

A Holy War Is Hard To End

The negative and powerful energy levels that are being created in many settings by the growing perception that their intergroup conflicts represent some level of Holy War clearly will make achieving and sustaining local Peace in a number of European settings much more difficult.

Religion adds a very powerful additional energy level to us/them instinctive reactions.

People who perceive that their religion is being attacked tend to perceive the attackers as being evil and perceive their attackers as being explicitly sinful in a very theological way.

Religious Perceptions Are Self-Reinforcing

People everywhere instinctively defend their own group. People tend to defend their own group with even more energy if the people in any conflict situation feel and believe that they are also defending and protecting their faith.

The thought process and the set of experiences that results in seeing religion as a differentiator in those settings is, of course, functionally self-fulfilling and self-reinforcing.

Conflicts and local stress points that actually started out merely as cultural and inter-tribal issues that end up being labeled as religion-triggered behaviors by any of the people involved can actually cause everyone in that setting to look at religion as being the key differentiator in those situations.

Those types of conflicts can be both self-perpetuating and self-fulfilling. That perspective of a religious conflict actually becomes accurate in those settings because once that perception exists, it is at least partially self-fulfilling.

The parties in that conflicted setting who had not been thinking in religious terms can easily end up thinking in religious terms about the local conflict because the other party in the setting is defining the issue to be linked to their religion.

That can be a very a dangerous evolution for intergroup energies into an area where people are more likely to feel additional levels of real anger that is based on defending their faith.

People are more likely to believe that doing extreme and damaging behaviors relative to other groups of people are legitimate things to do when people believe those things are being done in the protection and the defense of their religion and their religious beliefs.

Leaders Who Call For Religious Conflict Can Have Impact

That blend of tribal and religious issues is incredibly difficult to deal with.

Those blended issues are particularly difficult to deal with if skillful leaders on either side very intentionally, deliberately, and skillfully use those multiple us/them triggers to further inflame their own group against the other group.

The Internet is an easy tool to use to inflame each group, and it is being used for those purposes constantly, today. The news media is also being used as a tool by people who are angry and who want intergroup inflammation to increase in a setting.

We need to understand this entire set of issues for all of those other countries who are going down those intergroup conflict paths as we look at implementing our own Art of Intergroup Peace strategy for America.

Leaders In Europe Need To Address The Underlying Patterns And Not Just The Incidents

Europe clearly has some very challenging days ahead in attempting to deal with those sets of issues. Solutions need to be found or the hatred levels and the destructive intergroup behaviors, in many settings, will continue to grow in dangerous and damaging ways.

The six group alignment-triggers that are identified in Chapter Nine of this book could be very helpful in several European settings. Many leaders in Europe seem to be dealing with most of those local intergroup issues purely situationally, and almost entirely reactively.

Those leaders have not been addressing those intergroup issues in the context of overall instinct-driven behavior patterns with the goal of creating a solution set for those conflicts that is based on defusing those very damaging and dysfunctional instincts for their settings.

Many leaders seem to be focused fully on the functional incidents to the point where the leaders are not dealing at any level with the basic patterns and the common packages of beliefs and behaviors that are the real problems underlying those conflicts.

Solutions to those levels of basic intergroup problems in those European countries will not come from incident-focused and circumstantial responses or strategies.

Leaders in those European countries need to accept the fact that their “good old days” will never return. Their old world of having local ethnic purity and cultural uniformity based on their own group is gone forever.

The leaders in those settings need to figure out how to turn their new diversity into an asset rather than a liability.

To make local diversity in those cities in Europe into an asset, the leaders in each setting need to reach out to acknowledge the pressure, the

stress points, and the shared humanity of the new groups of people in their setting. Each setting then needs to make Peace with itself.

That will take clear intergroup trust in each setting — and that level of trust can only be achieved as an intentional strategy when it is led by leaders in each setting who understand the full sets of issues that are creating the local division.

Leaders need to each achieve their own understanding levels for those issues. Understanding their own thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors in the challenging days that loom ahead in the context of the new levels of us/them behavior patterns that the new diversity of their communities is creating, could help some European leaders understand those conflicts more clearly.

Leaders Need To Understand The Instinctive Underpinnings For The Conflict

All leaders need to know their own instinctive reactions and the instinctive reactions of their groups. A high level of personal understanding about instinctive intergroup issues could enable leaders in some settings in Europe to address those conflicts both more effectively and significantly more proactively.

Strategic approaches are needed rather than reactive and tactical approaches. Prevention is a far better strategic response than reaction. Prevention requires a sense of the actual behavior patterns involved and a strategy that affects the patterns themselves at a very basic level.

If the people of Europe see each of those flare-ups, riots, and intergroup explosions in each of those settings as situational and as locally incidental and individually relevant episodes of negative interaction rather than seeing each of those situations as a local and current piece of an overall pattern of instinctive intergroup behaviors, then the likelihood of dealing with those conflicts effectively and proactively diminishes significantly.

Likewise, when any of the people in those settings see those local issues and those local conflicts as being proof of an evil, overarching, sin-based conspiracy that is aimed at damaging their people based on their religion — that also will make Peace in those settings much harder to achieve.

The people in Europe from all groups need key people in each setting to understand the role that instincts are playing in creating those angers and in triggering those riots and enabling discriminatory behaviors.

Europe needs to recognize the actual intergroup instinct patterns that are being activated, and leaders in Europe need to work on the patterns as instinctive intergroup conflicts instead of either moving from crisis to crisis to put out situational fires, or instead of attacking other people en masse because of their supposed evil natures and their purported religious or anti-religious beliefs and behaviors.

Religion Wars Trigger Religious Wars

Religious wars tend to trigger religious wars. Reciprocity is a normal response to being attacked at those levels. When people feel attacked at a religious level, their responses can often cause the people who they are responding to feel their own anger in ways that can trigger their own religious challenges and threats.

Many people in Europe who had not actually identified themselves at a personal level to be Christians are beginning to use that specific definition to describe themselves because the intergroup conflicts in their communities with religion elements embedded in them are forcing that definition on them.

Others are working to create an identity as being collectively non-religious.

It will be interesting to see what definition of “us” emerges in each setting when religion will clearly define at least one category of “Them.”

Those issues are the specific topic for another book — *Cusp of Chaos*. It is entirely possible that some of *The Art of Intergroup Peace* and *Cusp of Chaos* insights, teachings, and key suggestions could functionally be useful for people from several countries in Europe as well as being useful in the U.S.

Intergroup Riots Have Instinctive Triggers

What we now know to be true is that intergroup riots have happened in a number of European cities and that those riots will clearly continue to happen. Riots damage Peace. Riots also destroy intergroup goodwill.

Riots trigger and inflame us/them instincts for all groups of people in each setting in very negative ways.

The London riots and the riots in Paris all featured intense inter-ethnic anger, intergroup conflict, and even intergroup hatred. The Internet spillover from those conflicts ended up triggering other equivalent anger levels and parallel intergroup violence in other settings.

Our ability to achieve Peace in this country will not be helped by having those kinds of events happen here. If any of the religious aspects that are now so clearly embedded in the current wave of European conflict spill over to our country, as either direct intergroup conflicts or as rebound, or negative feelings against Americans by those groups, then those negative reactions could add significantly to the challenges we already face here.

We also know that the entire list of intergroup interactions outlined in Chapter Six of this book needs to be looked at in more settings.

The multi-tribal countries who are at intergroup war with themselves may find that re-organizing into a confederation model of some kinds might relieve intergroup conflicts and promote Peace.

Leaders in all of those settings need to look at all of the options that are included in the intergroup alignment list in Chapter Seven.

The six alignment-triggers that are outlined in Chapter Nine should also be reviewed by leaders in each of those conflicted settings. Those triggers can help people in communities come together in aligned ways to prevent the continuing levels of conflict that can tear people apart.

We Have Our Own Set Of Immigration Issues To Address

As Chapter Eight of this book points out, America also has its own set of immigration issues. There is now clearly a wide range of us/them instinctive reactions that are tied closely to those immigration-related issues in this country.

Us/them thinking is being triggered here in a number of ways and in a number of settings relative to our own sets of both legal and illegal immigrants.

The vast majority of the people who are currently immigrating into the U.S. are not, however, from the same sets of people and the same ethnic groups who are immigrating into London or Paris.

Our immigrants are not from Albania or Algeria. They tend to be from Mexico and South America. We do have our own sets of immigration related instinctive behaviors to deal with — both for our new immigrants and for the people who either welcome or oppose the current sets of legal and illegal immigrants here.

We have a very different level of issues created by our immigrants, however, compared to the issues that exist in most other countries. Those immigration issues need to be addressed here and they are also discussed in more detail in the book *Cusp of Chaos*.

Our immigration issues, challenging as they are, are not creating riots like the ones in London or Paris. Our immigration issues also don't have any parallel or equivalent religious war components embedded in them.

That means that the spillover riots in London and Paris that have religion-linked triggers are not likely to trigger parallel multi-factorial riots among immigrants in Chicago, New York, Denver, or Los Angeles.

The Internet reaches easily across the Atlantic, so people in this country know now that those issues and trigger events exist in those other countries. The specific riot triggers that are at the source of the European riots generally do not, however, activate similar energy here — primarily because we have different groups of people who immigrate to our country.

People Who Are Angry Can Work To Do Damage Here

We are not immune from the damage that can be done by people who have the deep-seated religion focus for intergroup anger.

We clearly do face some very real and immediate risk from people who are so angry at the various interreligious issues that they perceive themselves to face in Europe or Eastern Europe or the Middle East that they will choose to bring bombs and other weapons to this country to hurt us here. That has happened. It will happen again.

The World Trade Center disaster was one of those spillover consequences. The Boston Marathon bombing was another spillover event. People who hate us as Americans will seek to harm us as Americans in the future and we can expect those kinds of damaging events to happen in our country as a result.

This country is clearly at some risk of spillover hatred, division, anger, and even violence from these intergroup incidents in other countries — but those religion-linked conflicts are not likely to impact us here in the form of major demonstrations of Paris or London-like riots or equivalent large scale intergroup confrontations.

We do have some potential backlash against Muslim Americans that could be triggered at a simplistic level by future riots and intergroup violence in other countries or by individual acts of terrorism against people that happen here.

A major collective backlash isn't highly likely to happen — unless there are echo protests of some kind here or significant numbers of individual terrorist kinds of events that begin to undermine the sense of safety for people here.

Our primary spillover risk from all of that intergroup anger with Religion embedded in it is primarily from those terrorists from those groups who do decide to find their targets here. We know that particular set of negative reactions can happen here because it has already happened here.

Significant numbers of Americans have been drawn by Internet appeals to go to Syria, Iraq, and other Middle East combat zones to become warriors for extremist groups there.

Those recruits are killing people in those settings today for their extremist groups. Those same recruits have the potential to return to America and kill people for their extremist group here.

That is clearly happening already to sites in Europe where local people who have drawn to the various extremist groups are attempting as individuals to damage people in European settings.

We need to face that reality.

We clearly do face the risk of terrorism that is plotted against us by the people who feel those anger levels in other countries. That is a danger to us. There are people in our country who have their us/them instincts activated in very negative ways against us as Americans. Some of those people feel isolated, angry, and damaged in either direct or indirect ways and

feel drawn to do damage themselves. Acts of individual terrorism here can easily result from those intergroup hatreds that are encouraged here by groups like ISIS or Al-Qaeda for people who support them in our country.

We have a high likelihood of seeing some negative incidents as a result of those pressures and processes.

Our Immigrants Don't Hate America

However, the basic fact that is that the vast majority of our immigrants don't hate America. Other than a very small subset of the immigrants who came to us from some of the settings where those extremist groups have influence, our immigrants don't despise American values or American people. France actually does have a significant number of immigrants who hate France and who both publically and privately attack French values, the French culture, and French people. London has many immigrants who hate the British. That hatred creates obvious problems for future Peace in those cultures.

We do, however, already have our own set of internal current and historic intergroup angers and trigger points and our own sets of immigration challenges that need to be addressed, and we need to deal with those issues

effectively and soon because our own diversity as a country is also growing daily.

Immigration is not the major driver for our growing diversity, but it is a highly relevant factor. Our us/them instincts get triggered in different and very predictable ways about our immigrants based on the ethnic connections that exist for each group relative to each group of immigrants.

Our growing diversity is creating a new reality of who we are as a complete set of people.

We tend to have immigrants who want to join the American economy — become voters in America — and assimilate into American values. Our immigrants are drawn here by our values. They do not come here to resist or oppose our values.

That is not the situation that they face today in Europe.

Our new reality of expanding diversity for this country does not look like the challenges that are being faced by various parts of Europe that were once homogeneous and are now permanently divided and learning to deal with a future of intergroup division.

Leaders in Europe today need to understand the reality and the status of their intergroup issues. Wishful thinking or ideologically correct thinking

about intergroup issues will not help Europe get to the next level of intergroup of Peace. Europe needs to make some timely interventions in their intergroup relations in multiple settings to get people there back on the road to Peace.

Europe Needs A Strategy For Internal Peace

Europe currently needs to think through all of the issues that are relevant to their growing diversity. An overall plan is needed for each of those countries. Europe needs an agenda and a strategy.

It is too late for the countries of Europe to continue to deal with each issue and each blowup situationally, and to simply try in each negative setting to avoid defeat. Too many forces are at play in Europe that now cumulatively make simply avoiding defeat impossible.

The next chapter outlines six very good approaches that can be used to create intergroup and interpersonal alignment. Those six triggers can help us create levels of alignment that can derail us/them energy and momentum in a setting. Each of the six alignment-triggers in the next chapter can be used to help us expand our sense of “us,” and to bring people together into functional categories of us.

Those six alignment-triggers can work well in multiple settings – work places, communities, and even nations. Leaders in Europe should be using those triggers whenever they can be used. They work.

To be skilled in the Art of Peace for Europe, those alignment-triggers should be in the tool kit of the people who are leading Europeans to Peace.

The leaders in Europe should also look at the list of us/them prevention or us/them alleviation strategies that were outlined in Chapter Two of this book. Avoidance can still work in a few areas and it should be used whenever it has a chance of succeeding.

Europe May Need To Create A State Of Truce

In many parts of Europe, however, it is too late to avoid a wide array of very negative sets of us/them instincts. Likewise, minimization of the impact of those instincts has already generally failed in many areas.

Derailing them has also failed in most settings. Neutralizing their impact has also not been successful in too many settings.

That means that replacing the us/them alignments in those settings in creative and effective ways with a broader sense of “us” is clearly the best long-term strategy for each conflicted European country.

That approach is probably very difficult to achieve at this point in time in most settings, however, particularly since some of the leaders of some of the new groups are heavily committed to conflict and division, and have no interest in alignment or intergroup Peace at any level.

That work of creating alignment still needs to be done — in each country — and it does need to happen at a very high level and very skillfully in those countries to have any chance of success.

It may be true that it is too late for many of the alleviation strategies at this point in many European settings. That leaves only one good tool for those settings — Truce. Truce may be the only current answer for large portions of Europe – at least for an interim period of time.

The Good Old Days Are Gone For Most Of Europe

If a truce is in place in many of those European settings, then there can be an opportunity to build on the truce to figure out what might be done over time to create a new and expanded Dutch or German or French sense of Us that can create the status of long-term intergroup Peace in various settings for Europe for long periods of time.

The six alignment triggers identified in the next chapter of this book can all be used in European settings as part of that process to help create a functional and Peaceful sense of us in various settings.

That work and those alignment-triggers will need to be used very directly in each setting — and it will take skillful leaders who will need to recognize that they will never return to being the Europe of even a decade ago, to do that work well.

The leaders in each setting will need to steer each country toward a new national or European us — or they will be doomed to perpetual conflict and will suffer from destructive intergroup behaviors at multiple levels for a very long time.

Once those instincts are activated in a negative way, they tend to be self-perpetuating and they do not disappear of their accord.

Russia, China, India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Are Still On The

List

The world is full of countries that are at war with themselves.

When we look across the planet today, we see many countries with major internal conflicts. There are literally dozens of current ethnic conflicts

going on just within Russia. Multiple separatist groups in that country with their own ethnic identity and tribal language want tribal autonomy.

China is facing multiple internal ethnic conflicts as well. There is a very large Han-ethnic group, but there continues to be many additional groups with their own tribal language and identity who want to govern themselves. Uprisings are relatively frequent for some of those groups.

India has a plethora of internal ethnic groups who want some level of autonomy. Those groups in India have tribal histories and other tribal legacies that stretch back thousands of years. A desire for autonomy is festering in many of those groups.

Sri Lanka has its own internal divisions, with people killing people today based on tribe and religious affiliation. Intergroup damage is clear and growing in sections of that country.

Indonesia is a massive array of internal ethnic groups — with over a dozen tribes large and powerful enough to have their own militia and their own weaponry. The central government in that country exists at the mercy and the sufferance of those tribal alignments.

Pakistan, even today, is more a network of armed tribes than it is a single, homogenous nation. The people of Pakistan refer to themselves by

their tribal identities — not their nationality — in identifying their primary loyalty levels.

Iraq is clearly a nation that has had no legitimate standing or internal group identity as a single people. The tribes of Iraq define reality for Iraq. Those tribes tend to hate one another and each needs its own turf for its own safety and prosperity going forward.

The Kurds need to run their own part of the world and to be allowed to be Kurds in the process.

Each of those countries is clearly functioning now at a very tribal level with their local us/them instinctive behaviors in full gear for each tribe.

We live in a world of tribes that have been forced circumstantially to function at least temporarily as unnaturally aggregated nations. The chapter of this book that describes the nine ways that groups of people can interact will be increasingly relevant to all of those settings.

The final intergroup status for all of those settings will need to take the tribal nature of all of those populations more directly into account in the governance process if any of them are going to have any hope of achieving ethnic Peace.

In many settings — like Russia and India — the central governments will continue to resist going in that direction. Those nations could all be better served if they look at other alignment options.

We need dysfunctional multi-tribal nations to take the lead in doing that work in responsible ways. We need nations to turn themselves into smaller nations that make ethnic and tribal ‘sense’ and have internal cohesion — like Yugoslavia — and we need to do that division in civilized ways that protect the safety and the rights of all people and groups of people, both in the transition process and in the long-term governance of those new and more logical nations.

The U.S. Needs To Use All Six Alignment-Triggers

For the U.S., the entire continuum of all seven possible responses to the activation of our us/them instincts is going to be an approach we should use in various settings.

We need to be using all six internal alignment-triggers that are discussed in Chapter Six of this book.

We Americans can still, if we are focused on what we do now, manage to avoid conflict, minimize conflict, derail conflict, neutralize negative behaviors, negotiate reasonable ceasefires, truces and Peace

agreements, and ultimately assimilate people ideologically into a broader and more inclusive sense of being an American Us.

We need to clearly understand what the actual options and strategies are that can bring us to where we need to be — in a state of Peace — and we need to understand what tools we can and should use to create alignment in our country.

The rest of the world is a mess. We need to learn from the failures in those other countries what not to do, and we need to learn from our own successes how to create InterGroup understanding, and ultimately, InterGroup Peace.

We need to use the alignment-triggers available to us to succeed in that effort.