

CHAPTER SEVEN

Massive Amounts of Ethnic Turmoil Were Triggered by the End of Colonialism

IT WAS CLEAR when I sorted through the nearly 200 settings for current intergroup conflicts that I could see in various countries in the early 1990s that the end of colonialism had triggered a very large number of very similar and very damaging intergroup conflicts in a wide range of settings.

From a process analysis and information gathering perspective, it was fairly obvious to me early in my study and analysis of the intergroup problems we faced around the world that the largest and most important set of intergroup conflicts that were happening in the real world in multiple sites at that point in time came from the ending of the array of colonial empires — the functional collapse of colonialism.

It was both fascinating and affirming for me as a student of instinctive behaviors and as a student of history to see how many local ethnic conflict issues with clear instinct-related behavior patterns had been triggered and exacerbated in a huge number of settings by the end of colonial power.

That set of events and those intergroup consequences in all of those settings made perfect sense when you look at those settings from the context of instinctive intergroup behaviors.

Much of the world had lived for a couple of centuries under the military control and the political and governance dominance of European colonial powers.

Colonialism defined much of the world. Major areas of Africa, Asia, Central Asia, North America, South America, Sri Lanka, the Middle East, all of

Australia, and all of New Zealand were basically under the control of European colonial authority.

That power structure and that colonial governance model for major points of the world had been in place for a couple of centuries in many settings.

The colonial powers each claimed ownership of the colonies that were under their power. Those colonial nations each believed that they were the rightful owners of major sections of the world.

The Colonial Powers Used Military Force to Maintain Control

To protect what they believed they owned, the colonial nations all used military force and various kinds of police powers to dominate and control the areas of the world that they each considered to be their property and their turf.

International law for all of those years supported all of those claims to colonial turf ownership and colonial power. That process resulted in a highly colonial world for a couple of centuries.

There were clear rules about what constituted being able to make a colonial claim. Those rules were blindingly ethnocentric. They were, in fact, extremely Eurocentric.

European powers claimed to own the world. The British Empire was so global for a while that the British took pride in pointing out that “the sun never sets on the British Empire.”

Colonialism was basically ended by World War II and its historical consequences. Each of the major colonial powers began to set their former colonies free in the 1940s. That pace of freeing former colonies accelerated through the 1950s and 1960s.

By the time I personally began to look at the existence and the causes of the intergroup conflicts that were currently happening in various settings around the planet, it was clear that the newly independent countries were the sites for a vast number of those conflicts.

It was also clear that many of those countries were dealing with many of those situations and those conflicts in cruel, dysfunctional, destructive, and often counter productive — but heavily instinct-guided — ways.

Colonial Powers Suppressed Local Ethnic Conflict

That pattern of behaviors and those events makes functional sense to anyone who understands how our basic sets of instincts work and who also understands how the colonial powers both created and ran their empires.

Ethnic conflict exploded in many settings when colonialism ended because colonialism had very deliberately suppressed ethnic conflict in each colony as a basic strategy of governing and controlling the colonies. The governing powers did not want local ethnic conflict to happen. So they suppressed ethnic conflict in almost all settings.

During the time frames when the colonial powers ran most of the world, the colonial ruler in each setting tended to repress and suppress any and all of the local ethnic conflicts that actually existed in that setting.

Colonial rulers stifled the ethnic issues that had existed historically for centuries in each intergroup setting. The colonial rulers did not want the people they ruled to fight with themselves so they took steps to prevent the fighting.

Colonialism is, to a large degree, an economic system and process. Fighting is bad economically. Local fighting can weaken and undermine both infrastructure investments and productivity.

So the colonial rulers fairly unanimously took a wide range of steps in fairly effective ways to suppress and ban local intergroup conflict in each of their colonial settings. They generally did that process fairly effectively — with cruelty and various kinds of punishment and force used as needed by the colonial powers to keep local ethnic Peace.

Sometimes the colonial powers used a divide and conquer strategy to keep the local Peace. The consequences of those strategies also created legacy problems in several of the former colonies.

When a colonial power used a typical divide and conquer approach, they usually utilized and built on existing local ethnic animosities in a setting in ways that gave them local allies for their colonial power.

When they picked a favorite local ethnic group, the policemen and the armies of the colonial powers generally required that local group to also help keep the local interethnic Peace.

They usually did not allow their chosen local group to let their own legacy local ethnic conflict issues blossom into actual bloodshed or into direct rounds of intergroup violence or suppression of the other local groups — but they did allow those allies to have some level of local ethnic dominance.

The colonial powers generally used their local ally as a police force mechanism to help keep local Peace — not as an ethnic-linked armed force that was allowed to activate or reactivate local intergroup violence and trigger dysfunctional intergroup conflict. The other groups in each area — for obvious reasons — tended to resent the dominance granted to the local ally of their colonial overseers.

Having a Common Enemy Also Temporarily United Some Local Ethnic Groups

Local Peace and intergroup alliance did exist in some areas in a situational and interactive context between the local ethnic groups in a colony because the physical presence of the colonial soldiers in any setting tended to have each of the local ethnic groups in that setting feeling some need for a collective local alliance and a sense of united and collective purpose between local groups who saw themselves as the common victims of a common enemy.

Having a common enemy is one of the best triggers for intergroup alliances and alignments. A common enemy is one of the six key tools that I include as a key component on the alignment trigger pyramid that is described in several places in this book and used extensively in *The Art of InterGroup Peace*.

That alignment trigger pyramid describes and explains six very useful trigger factors that can be used to get people to align in any setting. I have used those triggers in several settings. That set of alignment triggers work well. One of those triggers is to have a common enemy.

Colonial armies can obviously function well in any setting to give the local groups of people in a colonial setting a common enemy to align against.

So colonial armies very directly used their own police power to keep local groups from fighting and local groups tended to feel some level and sense of alliance in the face of a common enemy that also kept those local groups from some levels of fighting while the colonial powers were in place. The net result of those functions and the strategies that were used to create local intergroup Peace in colonial settings tended to be successful. Basic non-violent behaviors and fairly consistent functional Peace between the local ethnic groups was the normal result that existed for very long periods of time in almost every colonial setting.

Conflicts Re-Emerged When Colonialism Ended

Both of those unifying and pacifying factors for the local ethnic groups and local tribes disappeared almost immediately in each setting as soon as colonialism ended in each setting.

When the common enemy for all groups in each setting disappeared and when the pacifying police forces and the Peacekeeping colonial armies had all departed to their homelands, all of the old ethnic conflicts that had been simmering in each area — often for centuries — reappeared.

Those old ethnic animosities and those long-standing intergroup conflicts became relevant very quickly to the people in each setting. Simmering turned into seething and seething turned into active intergroup anger and into open intergroup conflict in far too many settings.

The patterns of instinct-triggered local ethnic conflicts that emerged in multiple settings at that point in time as colonialism ended and as many multi-

ethnic countries became independent were entirely predictable and they were also very consistent. When the colonial powers left each area, the long-standing ethnic conflicts that had long existed in each area for local groups of people simply re-emerged — very often with major force, significant anger, and rapidly escalating levels of intensity.

The British Kept the Ugandan Tribes from Fighting

When I looked at countries around the world, I saw those same colonial power ethnic suppression disappearance reality impact patterns happen and those same basic negative intergroup interactions happening everywhere that the colonial powers had ruled. Problems happened between groups of people as soon as the colonial powers left each area.

I mentioned earlier in this book that I had a chance more than a decade ago to start local health plans in Uganda villages as one of my health care assignments. To do that work, I personally spent time in Ugandan villages — building local health care co-ops.

Uganda, I discovered fairly quickly, is a nation of 40 tribes. Some of the local tribes very much dislike one another and some have been in a state of open conflict with each other for literally centuries.

The British kept those tribes from fighting with each other during their colonial rule. The British used a very effective strategy in Uganda (and in a number of other British colonial settings) of selecting one of the local tribes to be their lead tribe for that area. Their local lead tribe then received some additional power in exchange for serving as an extension of the British Empire for those particular areas.

The Hutu/Tutsi conflicts that took so many lives in Rwanda actually had some of their historical origins in a similar colonial power relationship of that same type that also existed for those tribes during colonial rule.

In Uganda, the British selected the Bogandan tribe to be a primary ally. People from other tribes in Uganda told me how much they disliked, despised,

and even still hated the Bogandans for that role played by that tribe on behalf of the British.

The Bogandans have a very different memory of those events. I was taken into the traditional palace of the King of the Bogandans, and I saw a chair in a position of honor and prominence in that palace that had been sent to the King of the Bogandans by Queen Victoria.

It was a lovely chair. That chair had been sent symbolically by the Queen to the King of the Bogandans to help cement that relationship and it seems to have been useful as a tool to support that process. Bogandan leaders showed the chair to me with some pride.

When we built our health plans in Uganda, the other tribes made it very clear that we needed to show no favoritism at any level to the Bogandan tribe — even though the logistics of our plan building efforts would have steered us clearly in that direction had we not been given that particular intertribal warning. We saw enough residual anger about those colonial alliance issues to make our decision about next sites for our health plans very easy once the issues were explained to us.

Colonial Powers Often Had Local Alliances

Across multiple countries, it was clear that the temporary suppression of local ethnic conflict by colonial armies coupled with the strategy of using one local tribe as the favored local administrative arm of the British Empire or the French Empire or the Spanish Empire actually did work to keep local Peace.

It was also clear that those efforts did not make any of the long-standing and historic inter-ethnic animosity levels disappear in any colonial setting. Those strategies only kept the existing ethnic animosity in each setting from being currently violent and bloody while the colonial soldiers were still garrisoned in those captive countries.

When those colonial soldiers left, many of the old ethnic animosities blossomed again and many of the old hatreds manifested themselves in a variety of sad and painful ways.

The local tribe that had been the favored tribe of the colonial power in some settings sometimes managed to hang on to disproportionate levels of power in the governance of the new nation. They were sometimes abetted in that process by favorable treatment given to them by the colonial powers as they departed.

In other cases, the other tribes in the newly independent nation took steps to avenge that tribe's former favored status and did damage to the people from that tribe in clear acts of intertribal revenge.

In all cases, old ethnic animosities re-emerged very quickly when the colonial powers left each area.

One Million People Died in India

India was one of the most extreme examples of a setting where a wide range of old pre-colonial ethnic animosities re-emerged quickly and with great impact when that area was freed from its colonial status.

The British ran India for a very long time as a huge colony — an empire in its own right — all kept under control as a police state with British military power, British police, and with the support of some significant local tribal allies. When the British left, India had to somehow govern itself.

India had no actual history of governing itself as an entire nation. There was no existing in place infrastructure and process of intergroup alignments that the people who lived in that former colony could use to build and run a future multi-ethnic, highly diverse country.

India was and is a vast and diverse subcontinent made up of many tribes — most of whom had long histories of intergroup dislike, intergroup distrust, and intergroup anger relative to other local ethnic groups and tribes. The post-colonial Indian territory had so many irreconcilable internal ethnic conflicts going on that British India actually ended up being split in pieces in a climate of

acute internal conflict and intense and bitter intergroup anger that extended to being very real intergroup hatred.

The overall colony had no chance of functioning with all of those internal divisions — with us/them instincts fully activated in multiple settings — so India split into a couple of self-governing nations. Pakistan was created in the process.

The split of that old British colony into the new nations of India and Pakistan was done along consolidated and aggregated tribal lines — with an overarching and very important defining layer of religion. Each of the tribes had religious afflictions. Tribes allied with other tribes using religion as their defining factor for choosing their allies.

The tribes were split between Muslim and Hindu tribes.

Muslims and Hindus in India each, in the end, created their own countries whose inhabitants shared their religion.

It was a clumsy, painful, and destructive process. People whose religion and tribe put them in the wrong geographic area for their allied group after that division were displaced from their homes and from their places of birth by the millions.

The migration scenes that happened across India were grim and sad and far too many of the intergroup behaviors that happened during those horrible times were evil, destructive, and intentionally and deliberately cruel.

Cruelty happens far too often when people have their us/them instincts fully activated and when people in any setting have power over whoever in that setting is perceived to be “Them.”

India Has a Long History of Intergroup Animosity

India has a very long history of intergroup animosity and conflict. It was and continues to be a very multi-ethnic nation. When you talk to people in India about their own relevant history, the information that is shared by people from each group describes a very long history involving multiple intergroup battles,

very clear intertribal power struggles and conquests, and a wide range of very specific ethnicity-linked dynasty stories where various groups in India held power over other local groups in India for very long periods of time.

Those historical intergroup interaction recollections still generate intergroup anger centuries after the actual historical events have occurred.

In Ireland, many people can tell you with great fervor and clear anger exactly where certain intergroup sins had been committed. My experience in both Dublin and Belfast has been that the stories that are told by people in Ireland now have the fresh tone of being today's news even though when I drilled down to find times and dates, the actual events were often more than a century old.

"They killed seven of our lads and let them there to die on the street at that very spot," I was told.

"That is sad — when did that happen?"

"It was in 1840 — right after the holiday."

India, I found, has an even longer set of intergroup sin stories that people also tell with some fervor. When I asked people for time frames in India for those tales of damage and intergroup sin, I learned that the actual events and the intergroup sins and the stories about intergroup wrongs that are told and retold in India can literally extend several centuries into the past.

People have very long group memories in India. Forgiveness for old intergroup sins is not a cultural characteristic. If the relevant groups, themselves, still survive, then the memory of sins that were done by other groups against those groups — even centuries ago — still survive.

That kind of collective group memory about prior group sins is true in many places. I saw it repeatedly. The Maid of Kosovo was a story that generated intergroup anger in the Bosnian War — and the reality is that the Maid was damaged and killed hundreds of years ago. Her death survives as a proof point for intergroup perfidy and evil yet today.

Group memories about intergroup sins and negative intergroup events have major staying power — and I have learned that those intergroup memories can

create a sense of context and generate emotional energy for groups of people for a very long time.

People in India and Pakistan might be acting in non-violent ways with one another in a setting today, but the memory of who burned what mosque and who demolished what temple even 300 years or 400 years ago tend to be fresh memories in some settings and the related sins are still not forgiven by the people whose tribe was the victim or target of the affront or sin.

We Almost Instinctively Believe in Ancestral Guilt

Our thought processes, I learned, give us the interesting and sometimes dysfunctional ability to create a context where people believe today in ancestral sin as a reason to judge someone today. It is sometimes emotionally very easy for people today in various settings to assign guilt to people living today for sins that were actually done generations ago by their ancestors.

I now know that it can be hard to build a fresh start in any setting where the new start is actually based on the current behaviors of accountable people who are doing accountable things today if the mental model we use for any setting assigns ancestral guilt for unforgivable, but historical sins to today's people in that setting.

That thought process is alive and well in many places today. People in Scotland can tell you with great detail about which clans betrayed other clans centuries ago — and the retelling of those stories in a pub today can trigger anger now against people from those clans who are living today and had nothing to do with any of the relevant behaviors, decisions, or events.

“That is what you would expect from a MacGregor,” makes sense to some people as a legitimate thought process for people who believe in ancestral guilt as a current reality.

Those kinds of longstanding intergroup animosities and negative intergroup memories were all simmering at multiple levels when colonialism ended for

India and India had to function as a country and not just function as the prime jewel of an empire.

Becoming a functioning country as an entire former colony was obviously an impossible task for the people of India to perform.

The Religious Alignments Fueled the Separatist Emotions and Beliefs

What complicated that situation past the breaking point in India was the fact that the tribes of India do tend to be fairly uniformly split along religious lines — with almost all tribes in India tied to one or the other of two major religious groupings.

There were and are a few exceptions, but the tribes in what was British India tend to be split into either Hindu or Muslim tribes.

Those tribal religious alignments each had their own clear legacy of historic invasions, historic conquests as tribes by tribes under religious banners, and clear and pure intertribal oppression and discrimination — with religion functioning as a key part of the tribal identities, legends, and legacies.

It was a bloody, destructive, and painful process of division.

One Million People Died to Separate India

The post independence battles between the Hindus and the Muslims in that old colonial Indian territory were epic and they were extremely tribal. The ethnic groups involved were each very much separate ethnic groups and — as in Ireland — the fact that each of the major groupings had different religious affiliations exacerbated the hatred levels and helped people in each group to justify evil and destructive intergroup behaviors to other people at very cruel levels with no sense of guilt.

More than 1 million people died in those ethnic conflicts that occurred as India split painfully into two countries. The two new countries each immediately became mortal enemies to one another. Their armies have done battle with each other several times since they were divided into separate nations.

India and Pakistan even today continue to be in a state of intentional and strategic animosity relative to each other.

In the vein of “The enemy of my enemy is my friend,” both of those countries have leaders who have used the existence of the other country as a clearly perceived enemy to create alignment for their followers inside their countries. As clearly defined enemies, they each give each other the gift of a tool that the leaders in each country can use to create internal alignment and internal support for themselves as leaders.

India Has Other Separatist Groups Even Today

If we only had India and Pakistan as proof points for the existence and impact of extremely powerful turf, tribe, cultural, and us/them instinctive values and instinctive intergroup behaviors, India and Pakistan would be more than sufficient to prove the relevance of all of those points and instinctive behaviors at multiple levels.

India, today, continues to be a complex and often troubled nation who actually still has a significant number of internal separatist groups. Multiple ethnic groups inside India today would like autonomy. There are strong separatist movements in several parts of India who periodically take up arms or set off bombs to argue their case for autonomy. A leader in India was assassinated by one of their separatists.

One Million People Died to Free Bangladesh

The separatist issues in newly independent Pakistan were even more extreme. The first post-colonial version of Pakistan was an oddly designed country that had two widely separated pieces. The first version of Pakistan was divided physically into East Pakistan and West Pakistan — and those two parts of the country were separated from each other geographically by a wide swath of India.

Bangladesh, as we know it today, was originally set up as one of the halves — essentially functioning as a subsidiary, but geographically separated part of the new nation of Pakistan.

That created a series of easy to predict and understood sets of instinctive behavior-based conflicts because the tribal alignment of the people in Bangladesh was very different than the tribes who ran Pakistan overall.

The Bengal tribe wanted its freedom and took up arms to achieve it. That created another a very bloody and destructive intertribal civil war.

Intertribal wars tend to be extremely cruel and damaging wars. Conscience was clearly suspended at a very instinctive and primal level in the bloodshed that occurred in that particular intergroup war.

Extreme cruelty, mass killings, and even mass starvation were both conscience free weapons that were deliberately used in evil ways by people in an attempt to win that particular war of independence for Bangladesh.

Some estimates say that a million more people died in the set of internal Pakistani conflicts that resulted, ultimately, in Bangladesh becoming a separate and independent country.

In the end, the Bengali-speaking people in Bangladesh were freed from Pakistani rule. I have been in Bangladesh — in part to give advice to some of the people who are working to set up rural care sites there. Some of the people I talked with in Bangladesh have both angry and bitter memories about how their people were collectively treated in that process by the tribes of Pakistan.

The original borders of that first version of Pakistan obviously made no logical or functional sense. The two parts of Pakistan didn't even touch one another. But as I have explained earlier in this book, other countries in the world generally supported Pakistan as an entire nation continuing to use those absurd borders — honoring and perpetuating the almost mystic sense of territorial integrity that is consistently created in many people by even the most obviously non-sensical national boundaries.

Other countries who looked at the obvious intergroup conflicts that existed inside the new Pakistani nation did not take steps to help turn that absurd, artificial, and dysfunctionally divided national entity into two nations — each organized around its fairly logical and more appropriate component parts. Other countries did not provide that support for changing those national borders because other countries honor borders as an almost holy commitment once any national borders have been created and are functionally in place.

Horrors resulted from that particular war. Many people were damaged badly by the intertribal conflicts in that setting.

Both Pakistan and Bangladesh were Muslim. The war over Bangladesh independence was not a religious war. The specific set of pure intergroup conflicts that happened in that war was not religious at any level. It was just tribe against tribe, with one tribe wanting badly to be free.

In the end, Hindu India actually helped Bangladesh gain its freedom — proof again that the enemy of my enemy can be my friend.

Pakistan Still Has Significant Internal Tribal Issues Today

The remaining country called of Pakistan today is also still very tribal — with some settings in Pakistan more tribal than national relative to actual local control over major portions of Pakistani turf. Anyone who thinks that the people of Pakistan across that entire country today feel that their primary loyalty is to their nation and not to their own personal tribe hasn't been paying attention to the functional reality of modern Pakistan.

The tribal groups in Pakistan are the most relevant power infrastructure for major sections of that country and each of the major semi-autonomous tribes has its own local military support infrastructure and its own local police powers.

Bangladesh also continues to have a small number of internal minorities that do trigger some intergroup stress points. Bangladesh is, however, far more internally unified as a country than either India or Pakistan and the intergroup issues that still exist in Bangladesh are real, but significantly less problematic.

Post-Freedom Elections Tend to Function as a Tribal Census Count

Pakistan and India could each serve as a model for all of those intergroup issues — but those countries are not at all unique for all of those areas of post-colonial internal intergroup conflict. When I started my search for intergroup conflicts that had clear instinctive behavior underpinnings, I saw the same kinds of internal ethnic and tribal post-colonial division and intergroup conflict in setting after setting across the planet.

A large number of the former colonies obviously have significant ethnic and tribal internal conflicts today. I could see easily that instinctive behaviors that have resulted from those intergroup realities have been very damaging to people in many settings. Kenya, Nigeria, The Congo, Syria, Sri Lanka, The Sudan, and Indonesia all have major internal ethnic issues as nations that were not openly active when each of those areas was under colonial rule.

Two provinces of Indonesia, Aceh and Papua, actually have armed and militant separatists. The government of Indonesia is trying to set up processes that will allow key areas run by those groups to have Canton-like semi-autonomy in order to keep that country together as a country.

The Middle East has several multi-tribal nations that are at war with themselves. Anyone who doesn't understand the tribal nations of those wars isn't paying close attention to who is firing guns at who in those settings.

Many of those new post-colonial countries hold periodic elections of one kind or another. People in the U.S. often have the somewhat magical hope that if “honest and open” elections could somehow be held in each of those countries, then the simple act of having an election can somehow strengthen the democratic process and create stability in those settings. We Americans have almost a mystical belief in the healing and unifying power of elections. We often work hard to make sure the elections happen in a number of those countries.

The truth is, however, that the elections that are actually held in each multi-tribal country tend to be extremely tribal and the usual result of each of those

national elections is simply very clear tribal vote alignments for most of those settings.

What I have seen in several countries that I looked at was that any democratic election that is held in those multi-tribal countries generally functions basically as just a tribal census count. The larger tribes in each setting that holds elections simply win the elections because they are the larger tribe. The unintended consequence for too many of those election victories is that the winning tribe in that setting takes power after the election and then too often does very negative tribal things from that official position of electoral power to the people from the other tribes.

Another very common pattern is that a person does win a fair election and then, once the winner is in power, the winner uses his own tribe as his police force and army and refuses to give up power. It is extremely hard, I have seen, for anyone who gets into the Alpha role in any of those post-colonial countries to give up power once they have power. I have seen enlightened reformers take power promising to hold new elections regularly who manage to never hold those elections.

I personally think that many of those reformers are telling the truth when they say they intend to relinquish power through a due process. I also believe that power is so seductive that people forget those promises and ultimately get to the point where they exclude people who want to vote.

Most of Those Nations Do Not Make Inherent Sense as Nations

The unfortunate truth is that the majority of those former colonies who now exist as nations actually make no functional or ethnic sense as complete and functioning nations in the context of their actual current boundaries.

Those boundaries that exist today for those nations tend to be accidents of incidental and circumstantial history — not logical delineations of inherent group and national identity or national functionality.

We need to all face that reality of accidental boundaries for what it is and we need to deal with it in the places where those boundaries are creating damage and where we can come up with better approaches to each area's national turf realities.

The boundaries that exist today for almost all those multi-tribal nations do tend to be circumstantial reflections of colonial history and those boundaries generally make very little functional, tribal, or ethnic sense at any level. The countries that are cursed by having those kinds of forced intertribal and intergroup forced cohabitation realities are all doomed to perpetual intergroup conflict if they can't change themselves into countries that make more sense at the group level.

We need new borders in many settings and we need new arrangements inside those borders in many other settings that better reflect the ethnic and tribal allegiances and alignments of the people who live in each setting.

We need to make those kinds of functional changes in order to stop people in too many of those settings from killing one another ___ for purely tribal reasons.

Current National Borders Make Little Ethnic Sense

The fact that the borders of many nations created by the end of colonialism make no functional sense and actually create internal functional difficulties in many settings was one of the first points that was very obvious to me when I started looking at those post colonial conflicts.

A second point that was obvious was that the intergroup history in many areas had deeply rooted intergroup angers, intergroup animosities, and major intergroup disagreements that need to be resolved in some effective ways or they will simply create perpetual dysfunction and conflict in the settings where they exist.

It was clear that those boundaries existed only because they are based in a very arbitrary and unfortunate way on the former colonial empire turf claims that were used to define colonial ownership for each geographic area. The colonial turf claims that existed for many years in many settings often had only minimal linkage to the actual traditional ethnic groups and tribes in many areas. The new overall boundaries tended not to be linked in many settings to local group related turf realities and to existing group's leadership structure.

When colonialism ended, instead of creating rational and realistic new national boundaries for each geographic area that were based in some relevant and useful way on pre-colonial and long-standing historic tribal empire and tribal control turf realities, the colonial powers simply set people free in each setting using the existing colonial boundary geography lines. If the colonial powers had an understanding of instinctive behavior patterns, they could have created newly independent nations with much higher chances of having internal Peace. The boundaries they created force people in far too many areas to live today in what are obviously unnatural ethnic clumps and tribal clusters.

That problem is happening to some degree in every country on Mainland Africa — and it is far from unique to Africa. Africa, Asia, and the Middle East all have newly independent multi-tribal countries that have those same kinds of intergroup problems. There are internal ethnic conflicts of one kind or another in every single one of those settings. I could not find an exception to that rule. The people in each of those internally conflicted settings feel entirely right in their behaviors toward other groups of people in each setting because their behaviors are directly aligned with the thought processes and the emotions that are triggered by our intergroup instincts.

Nigeria Is Highly Multi-Tribal

Major nations like Nigeria who have multiple very distinct internal ethnic groups face an intergroup reality where the groups each have their own languages, their own cultures, their own history, and their own hierarchies and their own leaders. The groups in almost all of those settings have been in a state of intergroup conflict or at war with one another for as long as those separate groups have existed in proximity to one another in each of those settings.

Those groups that make up the nation of Nigeria as it exists today have different languages, different cultures, different history, and very different governance hierarchies. Those groups inside Nigeria have different religions. The actual tribes who have been artificially forced to currently cohabit Nigeria as a nation have fought each other in various ways for turf and for resources for as long as each of the groups has existed.

The actual piece of geography that is occupied today by Nigeria — if colonial powers had never intruded on that particular geographic space and if each of the various sets of people who have lived for generations in their own geographic area had each followed their own natural historic paths — would clearly exist and function today as several very distinct indigenous ethnic nations.

Those are tribal and ethnic groups who are forced to co-exist in Nigeria today who would never have voluntarily created a shared national structure of their own accord. Each group who is now forced to co-exist in that clearly unnatural group cluster would govern its own historic group's piece of turf.

Functionally, an entirely different set of group-relevant boundaries would be — and should be — the political reality for the tribes of people who live in that area today.

We Need to Create New Nations that Make Ethnic Sense

If we want to create nations today that are each at Peace with themselves and likely to remain at Peace, then the most logical thing to do today would be figure out graceful and Peaceful ways to unwind that artificial set of arbitrary boundaries that were created by colonialism. We need responsible and safe processes that we can use to create and implement new boundaries that reflect the turf rights, the group identity, and the territorial legacy of the people who live today in each part of those internally divided countries.

Yugoslavia gives us a model that can be used in other settings. Those six new nations in that setting are not killing each other and they tend to have internal Peace.

In those settings where that kind of separation by ethnicity can't be done in a clear and easy way, we need to set up safe and functional processes that allow for high levels of local autonomy for various groups. Those countries need to follow the Swiss model and set up ethnicity defined provinces or Cantons — to give all people — political models that create safety and to give groups of people local turf control. The Swiss Canton model allows for functional levels of ethnic autonomy as well as creating needed levels of protection for any people in those countries who happen to be in a minority situation in any of those settings.

Protection of minorities is extremely important in all of those settings. We know from many painful examples how badly people can be damaged in intergroup situations when those necessary levels of protections do not exist for whoever is the local minority group or tribe.

Any time a new nation is set up, there will be some people in that nation who are a local minority — and the clear instinct-guided behavior patterns for our most negative intergroup instincts can cause those people to be damaged or killed. Each new setting — whether it is Canton-like approaches or purely independent nations — needs to have very clear and intentional safe guards to protect the safety of any people who find themselves to be the local minority.

We Instinctively Support Whatever National Boundaries Are Created

That approach makes obvious sense at multiple levels — but it will be very difficult to do because changing borders and adjusting national boundaries in any way is a very hard thing to do.

As I learned very early in my study of instincts and related behaviors, we very instinctively worship, honor, and protect all existing national boundaries — regardless of their origin or their efficacy.

People talk with conviction about the mystic inherency of nations and the rightful integrity of all borders and people in many settings believe that any acts that keep nations intact are somehow inherently valid and legitimate acts.

It “feels right” instinctively at a very basic level to perpetuate nations once we have created and named nations.

“Sectarian” Is an Insult for Many Thinkers

That whole body of thoughts about the sanctity of existing national boundaries very directly clouds our thinking about other key intergroup issues that we need to address in many settings. International law and our news media both tend to define positions that look at other ways of creating national boundaries as being “sectarian.”

I was surprised when I first learned that both government officials and the news media reporters refer to “sectarian interests” in any setting as though they were demeaning that entire category of interests. People in power tend to want current borders to survive and any group inside a country that wants to create its own autonomy tends to be divided by calling that group “sectarian.”

We Tend to Be Fixated on Protecting Borders

As I looked at the problems being faced by all of the former colonies, I could see fairly quickly that we tend to be fixated at multiple levels on preserving even the most obviously nonsensical national borders and we have that fixation simply because those borders currently exist to define each nation.

What I now understand is that our basic turf instincts cause us to keep nations intact as nations with their current turf completely intact no matter how badly their borders are currently designed. I have come to appreciate the fact that those are incredibly powerful beliefs that are anchored in both our paradigms and our instincts and that those beliefs are supported by whoever is in power at the most senior level in all countries.

Alpha Leaders Protect Turf

I learned — after looking more closely at several of those countries — that without exception, the people who are currently the top leaders in each of those countries also do not want to see the countries split up. That pattern is predictable and clear. Those are also very predictable instinctive behavior patterns. People who rise to Alpha positions in any setting tend to exhibit very clear Alpha instinctive behavior patterns.

Alphas very consistently fight hard to keep turf intact. That is, I learned, a very instinct-driven Alpha behavior. Alpha leaders protect turf. We see that set of behaviors everywhere that we have Alphas — in communities, work places, organizations, and countries.

That behavior pattern is almost absolute. It is true for almost every setting where Alpha instincts are activated.

That set of Alpha instincts is very relevant to the issues of national boundaries because the Alpha leaders who are in charge of entire nations each feel a strong need to protect their group's entire current national turf, and those

Alpha instinct-activated leaders will generally protect that turf whatever that turf might be.

Those Alpha turf instinct packages are also a major reason why International law very clearly worships existing borders and why international law completely supports current national definitions for turf. Alpha leaders in all countries support that intentional legal approach to protect all existing boundaries for all current turf because that fairly rigid approach helps Alpha leaders who have diverse populations in their own countries keep their own turf intact and free from the internal risk of division.

That pattern is both clear and consistent. No existing nations want to encourage the practice of having internal groups anywhere who want autonomy to be able to achieve their autonomy easily. Nations and international law both make re-doing boundaries and changing any existing borders incredibly difficult.

I did not understand that very clear and explicit support for current boundaries by other nations for a very long time.

Infrastructure Realities Keep Some Countries Together

When I first saw all of those intergroup conflicts in all of those settings, my clear sense was that each of those divided nations with non-sensical borders should probably figure out how to split now — as soon as functionally possible — into exactly the right set of local, separate, ethnic group, and tribe-based smaller nations that made sense for each setting.

I then saw that there are highly relevant and major functional and internal barriers to that kind of division for every setting that I could see.

Sometimes, the barriers to division into tribal nations involves local logistical realities.

Because of the history that various areas have had under their colonial rule, there actually are often some valid logistical reasons why a number of those countries have created various functional components of shared internal infrastructure that is used and needed by all groups in the area. Because of

those issues, I learned that there currently are some elements of needed local infrastructure that is shared in some post-colonial settings that do not align functionally with purely tribal boundaries.

That issue exists in a number of places because the colonial powers who built the functional infrastructure in those settings ignored those tribal and ethnic turf alignments when they were building their colonial era infrastructure.

Pipelines and water supplies, for example, were based on colony wide population needs — not on ethnic or tribal needs. Separating that current functioning infrastructure for water supplies today into pieces that are based on the possible boundaries of new tribal areas could weaken some pieces of clearly needed infrastructure for some people in some settings.

Those kinds of infrastructure issues, I believe, could all be worked out in ways that meet the needs of all groups, but that process of working them out in a logistically competent way needs to be done before a split happens — rather than trying to work those kinds of issues out between warring parties after an ethnically defined and potentially anger-based split happens.

Those kinds of challenges and those kinds of barriers all made logistical sense at some functional level and it was clear that each of them would need to be resolved in order for us to end up with the most functional sets of new nations.

Protecting Minority People Is the Key Concern

The most challenging sets of problems that would occur if the current post-colonial nations split into smaller tribally focused nations would obviously be the need to protect the new minority groups in each of those new nations from being abused and damaged by the local majority tribe in each setting that now controls the new smaller nation.

The freed satellite countries of the Soviet Union have already shown us very clearly how much risk and damage for local minorities can be created in those kinds of settings by having any ethnic group run a new nation.

Ethnic purges and even levels of literal local genocide are possible when the wrong sets of instincts are triggered in people holding power and when those kinds of intergroup instinctive behavior opportunities exist.

That particular concern about the safety of local minority people is a key concern that many people raise when those kinds of new tribal nation strategies are proposed.

One of the key reasons why some very reasonable, well informed, and good hearted people oppose having each or any of those clearly tribal sections of Afghanistan or Kenya or Nigeria or any of the other multi-tribal nations split into separate smaller tribal nations is the functional and logistical reality that when that kind of increased local ethnic autonomy splits for a particular tribe do happen in any setting, minorities in those settings can be damaged.

There will always still be some people living in each of the new national settings who are not from the tribe that now runs the new country. There is no way to set the new boundaries up in each of those settings so that they contain only members of a single tribe.

The increased urbanization of both Asia and Africa has exacerbated that set of issues, because the new large urban centers in each country tend to be magnets for people from all tribes. Those new cities create a tribal population blending that doesn't exist in the local villages or racial areas of those countries.

I did not see any intertribal or multi-tribal villages in visiting half a dozen countries at the rural level. The villages tend to be ethnically pure. Each of those countries had a very diverse set of primary cities.

Even in the rural areas, there will always be some people in those the new nations in rural areas and small villages who are from ethnic groups other than the one that now is the majority for the country.

That diversity creates risk for those people. The people in each of those new smaller, ethnically concentrated nations who find themselves to be a new local minority in each setting can far too easily find themselves at huge personal risk for their lives and for their well being.

Ethnic Groups Who Gain Control Often Abuse New Power

The sad pattern we see from our instinctive behaviors — and one that obviously makes pure instinctive sense — has been that each new local ethnic or tribal local majority who gains local control in any setting tends to do bad things to whoever is the new local ethnic or tribal minority in that setting.

As the last chapter of this book pointed out, the behaviors of the ethnic groups who achieved local dominance in the former satellite and captive nations of the Soviet Union gave us very clear examples and very negative proof points for that concern about interethnic damage.

Newly independent former colonies have showed us much of that same post-freedom discrimination and intergroup oppression pattern whenever there are either local minority tribes or people in an area who are not from the local majority tribe.

In far too many cases, local ethnic minorities in various settings have suffered significantly already in their new post-colonial nations. People have died in intergroup conflicts in far too many settings already because of those specific instinctive intergroup behaviors... and the likelihood of more people dying could easily be increased if we turn any of our large multi-tribal nations into smaller, but still multi-tribal nations that are run by a single tribe.

Both India and Pakistan showed us how badly people can damage other people at a local intergroup level when those sets of intergroup instincts are activated.

If Kenya split today into a couple of tribally focused nations, the new turf lines and the new boundaries for the new local nations in that overall Kenya-based setting could not be purely and perfectly tribal. There is significant overlap in ethnic turf in Kenya today and there are significant levels of intergroup conflict happening already because of tribal activities in that country.

The existence of a national government in that country creates at least a partial context of protection for people in various Kenyan settings. There are multiple smaller tribes in each of those multi-tribal settings who would have

even greater issues and concerns relative to their tribal turf and their personal safety Kenya broke into tribal nations and the new nation they now live in is functionally another tribe's turf. If we want to achieve that kind of tribal local control, we would need to somehow protect all of those people and make them all safe. We would need safeguards in place in each new tribally focused setting in order for that strategy to give us the results we would want it to have without badly damaging far too many people.

Those are very real concerns. The people who suddenly become local tribal minorities in each of those new Kenyan-based tribal nations would very clearly themselves need to be protected in some effective way from both discrimination and local genocide by whatever tribal group is now their new local majority tribe ruler.

New Local Minorities Would Need to Be Protected

I agree entirely with that concern relative to setting up newer and smaller nations. That is a very valid and serious concern. Our instinctive behaviors obviously make that approach of tribal dominance a concern without safeguards built in.

We have shown already in far too many intertribal settings in the world how very real that intergroup risk is. We are proving the exact risk to be valid today in The Sudan — with daily ethnic killings happening there as the world has tried very hard to make the new boundaries of that nation more ethnically relevant.

That concern about the consequences of intertribal behaviors doesn't mean that we should give up on trying to create more local nations that are not at war with themselves.

Some of the multi-tribal nations that exist today — like Nigeria — make no functional sense. Having Nigeria attempt to continue to function as a nation made up of groups that are in perpetual division and conflict is doomed to failure.

Division of some hugely multi-ethnic nations into a number of smaller tribal nations makes obvious sense. That strategy can be entirely workable and it can be clearly preferable to the current approach in multiple settings if the minority people in each of those new nations are all somehow adequately protected.

The U.N. might be our best bet to help with that approach. The U.N. could help those nations form and the U.N. could help them create needed safeguards. That rule and function could be a very good use for the U.N.

We could use the U.N. to set up templates for division in multi-tribal countries and we could have the U.N. set up both oversight and guidance that results in the processes that are needed for local protection to be in place and part of the legal system for each new nation.

Yugoslavia managed to make that approach work and the new countries that exist there today each have both ethnic autonomy and functional Peace. That deal was brokered and supported and it has been a success.

The Swiss Have Developed a Good Model

For countries that can't be tribal but need some levels of local ethnic and tribal autonomy, my own strong personal sense after looking at dozens of countries is that the Swiss have probably developed a very effective model that can be used by multi-language countries that do not want to split into their ethnic component parts.

I have come to believe that we should figure out how to use some variation of the Swiss model of being a successful and safe multi-ethnic nation much more broadly in various other multi-ethnic settings.

I have spent some fascinating time in Switzerland looking at how the Swiss handle being multi-ethnic. They do it very well. They have three separate tribal groups in Switzerland, each with their own language, their own culture, and their own turf. Those groups have local control, safety for all, and they function collectively to be a country for a number of functions where they benefit from being a country.

The Swiss understand that we have to work with and be aligned with our relevant instinctive behaviors rather than have basic sets of intergroup instincts force us into negative situations and damaging outcomes.

My first reaction to seeing how multi-ethnic Switzerland is and how the Swiss have set up their multi-ethnic country to function in separate pieces was sadness. I have to admit to the reaction. I was sad and somewhat surprised when I first learned what the Swiss had done because I still hold the mental model in my own head that the end game ought to be some level of assimilation and it was clear to me that the Swiss have not assimilated in any real way from their original tribes and from their original language groups into being a common Swiss people.

Again — I probably should have known that fact about the way the separate cultures of that country functioned before I got to Switzerland, but that level of very clear ethnic separation that exists inside Switzerland was not on my radar screen at any level. I was surprised to learn when I got to Switzerland to see that the Swiss are really three separate ethnic groups and to see that those three groups have never attempted to assimilate into one language or into one ethnicity.

The Swiss are very comfortable continuing to be three sets of Swiss. They have become very good at maintaining that three group status and they have done it for centuries.

Switzerland is divided into Cantons. Cantons function as partial nations. They each have their own defined turf and their own primary language. They have three official languages. The language of each group is protected and the language of each group is celebrated. Each of the countries has its basic language — but it is not illegal to speak another language in any site.

All citizens of the entire country have equal protection under the law. No one tries to convert the French speaking Swiss to be German Swiss or to be Italian speaking Swiss.

Each language group has its identity and its turf — and they each have that identity and that tribal turf in the context of an overall Swiss nation that functions well in key regards as a nation.

After getting over my initial, knee-jerk disappointment about how intentionally separate each set of Swiss people continues to be, I began to see the beauty of the Swiss model. They have managed to be a multi-tribal country at Peace with themselves for centuries rather than being just another multi-tribal country at war with themselves for centuries. Peace is better.

Switzerland works as a nation because they respect the tribal autonomy of each group in each area while very effectively protecting the civil rights and the safety for all Swiss in any part of Switzerland.

The Canton model has worked in Switzerland for centuries. I have looked at a lot of countries. Switzerland is about the only truly multi-lingual country that has avoided open multi-lingual anger, stress levels, and conflicts, and they have achieved that status by creating multi-ethnic separation for each group with full civil rights and full protection of the law and complete personal safety for all Swiss.

Safety is important. It is safe to be a Swiss. Every Swiss citizen is safe in every part of Switzerland. Civil rights and basic safety protections extend to all Swiss everywhere in Switzerland.

The Canton model of Switzerland and the somewhat similar Belgium ethnic geographic separation model actually both do have a lot to offer for multi-racial/multi-ethnic/multi-language national settings. There are clear ethnic differences — with separate languages by group at the core of the ethnic division in each country — but there is no bloodshed based on those divisions in either country.

The Swiss model is very much like the province of Quebec in Canada. That province speaks French and has designated French to be its official language. That province clearly has its own ethnic identity.

There have been some intergroup tensions in Quebec and the province often has layers of separatist momentum at a political level — but no blood is

being shed in that lovely part of Canada over those tribal differences. People in Quebec from all languages all have equal voting rights, equal property rights, and equal protection under the laws of Canada. All residents are safe, regardless of their tribal alignments or choice of language. That is a workable package for people.

Equal protection of the law coupled with fully enforced and at least basically enlightened civil laws have the ability to be very useful in keeping people in linguistically diverse countries from hurting themselves and from hurting each other. The fact that the people in those countries do not hurt themselves doesn't make any of them a country at full internal Peace with itself, however.

When I first visited Switzerland years ago, I asked one of the officials in the health ministry there what I could learn from him about how to deliver care in a multi-cultural setting. His answer surprised me.

“Absolutely nothing.” he said, “You can learn nothing here about delivering multi-cultural care.”

He had apparently been trying to build a fully multi-cultural care site — a hospital for children — and he told me that the first woman who stepped up to the microphone to offer comments to him said — “I would rather let my son die than have him treated by a German speaking doctor.”

He said that the intergroup barriers and the intergroup political barriers at that point in time were too great for that particular multi-lingual care delivery project to succeed.

I do not know if they have managed to set up any shared care sites by now. That was years ago. But I do know that when I have gone to the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, I have been told that if you take the train from Zurich to Davos, there is a place near Davos where you have to change trains because the distance between the railroad tracks changes at that point.

One set of tracks is farther apart. The tracks do not match. You have to change trains at that change in the tracks.

I have not had that change in track size explained to me – but it has the ring of an intergroup sort of decision and having to change trains at that point seems to be an intergroup consequence of some kind.

The Swiss are among the most civilized people in the world. Switzerland has been peaceful for a very long time. The Swiss take their tribal differences very seriously and the Swiss honor those differences with great rigor.

The encouraging thing about that Swiss Canton model is that it actually works — and it works because the approach they use is aligned with our tribal instincts rather than ignoring those instincts or pretending they don't exist.

The Swiss have perfected sectarianism at its highest level. Anyone who derides sectarianism in other settings should look to see how the Swiss have raised it to an art form.

Immigration Is Now Creating Stress for the Swiss

I increasingly have come to believe that some variation of that very intentional ethnicity-anchored Canton model might work well in some of the multi-tribal African nations and the multi-tribal Middle Eastern and Asian nations that are now constantly at war with themselves.

A number of those multi-tribal countries are evolving on their own pace to Canton-like outcomes and structures.

Russia, itself, as the last chapter pointed out, is now the Russian Confederation. Sri Lanka and Indonesia have major ethnicity-based component parts that are self-governing.

Some people bemoan that development in those countries. My own sense is that we need to encourage those kinds of developments wherever they occur in a non-damaging way rather than opposing them.

I do believe that we now need an international template that is supported by the U.N. that creates working tools that can help multi-tribal countries to either divide into separate parts, like Yugoslavia, or safely set up Canton equivalents for themselves. For those countries where division into purely separate tribal

nation isn't possible or desirable for various reasons, Cantons can make people for themselves safe and can create appropriate autonomy for the relevant groups who make up the local populations.

Scotland Achieved Semi-Autonomy on Some Issues

Even Great Britain seems to be headed for more of a Canton-like approach. The recent Scottish referendum that ended with the Scots voting to continue to be a part of the United Kingdom actually did create some additional local governance control for Scotland. The Scots will now have more local power in a Canton-like way as a result of that process.

The major intergroup problem that we will see in Great Britain now is not local separatism, but massive immigration. Great Britain has growing numbers of immigrants from other cultures who are not choosing to assimilate into the British culture. That set of realities is creating a growing level of angry and divided sets of people in that country. Immigration that comes from diverse ethnic groups is now creating major intergroup challenges for the United Kingdom that are not getting easier as that process continues to grow.

It has been very interesting for me to observe that even the Swiss who perfected the interethnic Canton model are not immune to the new sets of challenges that are being created by the new immigration issues that exist in that country as well. The next chapter of this book deals with those immigration issues in multiple countries in more detail.

Because of growing immigration levels, Zurich now has an expanding non-Swiss minority population. Like the rest of Europe, Zurich has higher unemployment levels for their new immigrant population and there is a clearly higher crime rate in some minority neighborhoods in that formerly Peaceful and law abiding city.

The Swiss who have dealt with their own historic tribal internal alignment issues by very astutely and cleverly inventing Cantons have responded to the new tribal alignments of their newest residents and to those sets of intergroup

interactions by banning some tribal behaviors by the immigrants. Some new Mosque-related laws have been an example of that response.

Switzerland has recently been debating and enacting some restrictive laws about the building of mosques with minarets. Those debates and those laws are clearly a direct response by the Swiss at very basic instinct-triggered level to that new set of intergroup pressures.

It would be ironic if Switzerland now became an ethnic battle ground relative to those issues after so many years of carefully managing very solid levels of interethnic Peace.

The Refugees Became Immigrants – and Trigger Their Own Issues

The end of colonialism is one of the reasons why we have so many refugees and immigrants in the world today, people are being displaced from many settings by local intergroup conflict.

We need to do what we can do to help reduce the number of countries who are doomed to be perpetually at war with themselves.

In a number of post-colonial settings, I have been impressed with the fact that the former colonial powers still have some local contacts and often still have some local credibility. I even heard people in Vietnam speak kindly of the French, in spite of the very nasty civil war that expelled colonial France from that area. Great Britain has major credibility in some of its former colonial entities.

It might make sense for some of those new tribal nation settings to ask their former colonial power to help them structure and set up their new ethnic states.

My own sense is that the relevant colonial powers should feel some guilt for having botched the first round of divisions in those settings and they should be willing to help and commit resources to the effort where those resources are welcomed.

Those former colonial powers should also help with those intergroup issues in those countries because one of the consequences of those issues generating intergroup violence is that refugees are being created who need a place to live.

Our 50 million refugees exist today.

All of those intergroup issues that exist in the former satellites, the former captives, and the former colonies have displaced millions of people from their places of birth. We now have a world full of refugees — and those refugees are giving us a world full of immigrants.

I do believe that there is some irony in the fact that an unintended consequence for the colonial powers who ruled much of the world for centuries are now having immigrants from parts of the world that they ruled come to their countries as immigrants — immigrants who are creating their own levels of intergroup instinctive reactions in the countries they enter.

All of those displaced persons from all of those troubled intergroup settings do not disappear. They don't die. They immigrate.

That surprised me. I did not expect that set of issues or behaviors when I first started looking at intergroup behaviors — but once it began it was easy to understand. The consequences of that immigration is creating another massive historic phenomenon of intergroup interactions that is changing the world in ways that we need to understand because it is having a significant impact on our own future at multiple levels.

The next chapter of this book deals with the reality and the consequences of having all of those displaced people becoming immigrants to places that now have to learn to live with a whole new intergroup interactions reality.

For the multi-ethnic countries who are now in a state of perpetual internal confusion about their legitimate current status as countries, we need to look at each country in its own context to figure out what the right approaches will be to achieve intergroup Peace in each setting.

To succeed, we need leaders from each group understanding in a clear way the major impact our intergroup instincts have on their own thought processes,

beliefs, emotions, and behaviors. Leaders who are not enlightened about those issues find it far too easy to simply hate the other groups in their setting and to treat the other groups in purely instinctive negative intergroup interactions.

We need all of us to understand how seductive and powerful those thought processes are and we particularly need our leaders to understand both the need for alignment on those issues relative to those issues inside their own groups and the clear need for interaction with other local groups in a way that reflects the legitimate standing of each group as a group and as a party to be dealt with in good faith with a goal of helping each party, in the end, succeed.

We all need to understand that win/win outcomes are not only achievable — they are far better than win/lose outcomes that keep losing groups in a state of perpetual — and anger.

We all need to have as few enemies as possible. We can achieve that goal by understanding how that particular set of intergroup instincts skews our thought processes and beliefs.

When we have enlightened leaders in each setting who understand those issues, we can then figure out the solution sets for intergroup interactions that make the most sense in each setting.

The Art of InterGroup Peace outlines nine options we have for intergroup interactions. They all have utility and value. Leaders in each setting need to figure out which approaches can be used in their setting.

Knowledge is power. The former colonial nations need that power now.