

Nonkilling Societies Exploratory Colloquium

November 16-17, 2011

Palais des congrès de Montréal and Université de Montréal
Montréal, Canada

Introduction

The Center for Global Nonkilling (CGNK) was conceived as a small, creative, and catalytic organization working in partnership with individuals and institutions “to promote change toward the measurable goal of a killing-free world”. Its three-pronged approach to the development of human potential to build societies where killing, threats to kill and conditions conducive to killing are absent includes action in the fields of scientific research and discovery, education and training and policy/advocacy action.

As part of its research development strategies, CGNK has established a rapidly growing network of Nonkilling Research Committees, that currently includes over 600 scholars, from nearly 400 higher education institutions in more than 70 countries, working on 19 disciplinary groups, including a Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee with 50 members. A recent joint product of this Committees is *Nonkilling Societies*, which includes a selection of 13 chapters and which serves as the basis for this Colloquium.

Currently, the Nonkilling Research Committees are working to develop a new series of books in which each group will collectively put together one volume per discipline. Expected for 2011 are the first volumes coming out from the fields of Anthropology, Geography, History, Psychology, Security and Science and Technology. Another associated project is to organize a series of Exploratory Colloquiums linking nonkilling with an array of fields and topics such as education, environment, media, arts, security, futures, leadership, gender, etc.

The first Exploratory Colloquium, focused on “Nonkilling Neuroscience”, was convened in July 2009, gathering a select group of scholars featuring Nelly Alia-Klein (Brookhaven National Laboratory), Joshua Buckholtz (Vanderbilt University), Joshua Duntley (The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey), Bruce Eldine Morton (University of Hawai‘i), James Prescott (Institute of Humanistic Science), Kathleen Taylor (Oxford University), and Peter J. Whitehouse (Case Western Reserve University). After a two-day meeting the group provided a list of 30 recommendations and many additional ideas which are captured in the Colloquium Report.

Following the main recommendations of this first Colloquium, the Center is preparing its second Exploratory Colloquium which will explore what role of cultures in contributing to a world without killing, once again bringing together a group of prominent scholars from a wide array of theoretical, empirical and methodological approaches and also different academic and geographical backgrounds. The Colloquium will encompass a full session on nonkilling at the American Anthropological Association 110th Annual Meeting followed the next day by an open debate based on an agenda, list of discussion topics and objectives agreed upon before-hand by the Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee members and additional participants. This meeting will be co-sponsored by the Canada Research Chair on Islam, Pluralism and Globalization, at the Université de Montréal.

Objectives and Methodology

Paige, a political scientist, formulated a crucial question in his seminal work *Nonkilling Global Political Science*: “Is a nonkilling society possible?” This form of society is defined as “a human community, smallest to largest, local to global, characterized by no killing of humans and no threats to kill; no weapons designed to kill humans and no justifications for using them; and no conditions of society dependent upon threat or use of killing force for maintenance or change.” (2009 [2002]: 21) To answer this question from an anthropological perspective, a major shift that moves the discipline away from the systemic bias of providing a disproportionate amount of attention to violence and war is necessary. Paige suggests a four-part logic of analysis focused on the causes of killing; the causes of nonkilling; the causes of transition between killing and nonkilling; and the characteristics of killing-free societies. These questions need not only be held as legitimate subjects of research but must be considered seriously, systematically and intensively to bring forward a grounded approach that provides a firm basis for the realization of nonkilling societies through revised socio-cultural heuristic models. This Colloquium will challenge the still prevailing Hobbesian view of humans as inherently violent beings exploring existing killing-free societies, comparing nonkilling practices among other cultures and scrutinizing ethnographic misrepresentations shaped by the assumption of human intraspecific lethal predisposition.

The Exploratory Colloquium on Nonkilling Societies will consist of a two-day gathering focused on

- the socio-cultural causes of killing;
- the socio-cultural causes of nonkilling;
- the socio-cultural transformations relevant to building societies where human killing is greatly reduced and eventually absent (i.e., killing-free societies, with no killing, threats to kill or conditions conducive to killing).

Day one will take the form of an organized session at the American Anthropological Association 110th Annual Meeting, with the general title: “Challenging the Legacy of Innate Depravity: The New Tidemark of the Nonkilling Paradigm”. The session is organized by Leslie E. Sponsel (University of Hawaii) and Joam Evans Pim (Center for Global Nonkilling) and Chaired by Poranee Natadecha-Sponsel (Chaminade University) including Kirk M Endicott (Dartmouth College) and Douglas P. Fry (Abo Akademi University) as discussants. Abstracts for the eleven papers to be presented are featured below. The session will be followed by an initial discussion.

This initial discussion on day one will be followed by a full day of debate with an agenda structured along the following lines: (a) causes of killing, (b) causes of nonkilling, (c) nonkilling transformation, and (d) continuation [follow-on action]. Considering scholarly literature on (a) and (b) is more abundant and that day I will introduce some of these aspects, this discussion will aim at dedicating 20% of the time to (a), 20% to (b) and another 40% to (c). The remaining 20% will be dedicated to (d), focusing on future steps on the arenas of research, policy, institution-building and education [where do we go from here].

A preliminary list of discussion topics (provided by prospective participants) include:

(a) Socio-cultural causes of killing

What are the most important socio-cultural causes of killing? (Free list all of the socio-cultural causes of killing and then rank them in order of importance). Then discuss the top priorities and best strategies for advancing research about them. How might these causes be reduced or eliminated in reality? What are the most revealing and convincing case studies to illustrate these causes?

Topics suggested by Research Committee members

- Violence in sports (especially concerning supporters of team sports) and its relationship to social violence and killing in general (Charles Macdonald).

(b) Socio-cultural causes of nonkilling

What are the most important socio-cultural causes of nonkilling? (Free list all of the socio-cultural causes of nonkilling and then rank them in order of importance). Then discuss the top priorities and best strategies for advancing research about them. How might these causes be strengthened where they already exist and be more widely instituted elsewhere? What are the most revealing and convincing case studies to illustrate these causes?

Topics suggested by Research Committee members

- Possible cross-cultural characteristics of peaceful societies (Respect, anti-competitive beliefs, ability to successfully defuse, and resolve, conflicts, nonresistance ethic, ability to control and dissipate anger, propensity toward generosity, an ethic of sharing, an antipathy toward leadership, and, perhaps, the practice of ostracism as a means of social control, ...) (Bruce Bonta).

(c) Nonkilling socio-cultural transformations

What are the most important socio-cultural causes of the transformation from a killing to a nonkilling society, and the converse? (Free list all of the socio-cultural causes of the transformation from a killing to a nonkilling society, and the converse, and then rank each of them in order of importance). Then discuss the top priorities and best strategies for advancing research about these. How might these causes be strengthened and more widely instituted? What are the most revealing and convincing case studies to illustrate these causes?

Topics suggested by Research Committee members

- AAA?

(d) Continuation

- Needed changes in undergraduate and graduate training, textbooks, research
- Joint article/statement/declaration to be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal (i.e. *Science*)
- Preparation of a new collective volume on Nonkilling Societies
- Develop a list of recommendations following the Colloquium discussions
- Thoughts for future meetings, conferences, etc.
- Possible expansion and future roles of the Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee
- Creation of a Center/Chair/Program on Nonkilling Societies (nonprofit? university-based?)

How can this and related information be more widely, convincingly, and effectively disseminated? Then how can it be put into action? Comment in relation to the venues of research, teaching, publications, conferences, workshops, internet, listserv, and media like television, radio, and films. What are the possibilities for a follow-up conference after this colloquium through the internet? Might there be sufficient interest to develop a special interest group within the AAA to organize a session on some aspect of nonkilling at each annual convention? What granting agencies might fund a future conference on the anthropology of nonkilling societies? Where would be the best venue? When the best time, perhaps a day after the regular AAA convention?

What would a nonkilling alternative to anthropological engagement in the U.S. Human Terrain System be like and how might it be instituted and funded? Would it be appropriate for this Research Committee to make a statement on HTS, or perhaps better, somehow publicly endorse a statement of another organization (e.g., AAA and or Network of Concerned Anthropologists) regarding their critique of the HTS?

There are 50 members in the Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee. Would it be possible for each to include at least one session in one or more of their courses on the subject of nonkilling, using some of the resources on the Center for Global Nonkilling website, and/or to develop an entire course on Nonkilling Anthropology? Would it be possible for each of the members to give a colloquium in their own institution on this subject? Might some members be willing to devote their next sabbatical to research and publication on this subject?

The following overarching goals are expected from the realization of this Colloquium:

1. To seek new insights into nonkilling human capabilities for the transition toward societies where killing, threats to kill and conditions conducive to killing are absent;
2. To make research, education/training, advocacy/dissemination, and policy/institution building recommendations to promote nonkilling social transformation;
3. To explore future activities of the Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee in association with the Center for Global Nonkilling and/or other organizations.

Agenda

DAY I

American Anthropological Association 110th Annual Meeting Session 2-0730

Challenging the Legacy of Innate Depravity: The New Tidemark of the Nonkilling Paradigm

Wednesday, November 16 (18:00-21:45)

17:00 Participants convene at AAA conference venue

18:00 Is a Nonkilling Society Possible? Why a Serious Question Demands Proper Consideration
Poranee Natadecha-Sponsel (Chaminade University)

Nearly a decade ago, in 2002, political scientist Glenn D. Paige launched a simple but far-reaching question: "Is a nonkilling society possible?" Since then, the basic ideas formulated in his seminal book "Nonkilling Global Political Science" have reached out around the world, the book itself having been translated and published in more than twenty languages in this short period of time. In 2008 the new Center for Global Nonkilling was established and now incorporates a world-wide network of 600 researchers from 60 countries. Among them, this network includes a Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee engaging 50 scholars with the understanding of killing among humans as a cultural phenomenon that can be altered, thus challenging the view of "innate depravity." This panel continues the alternative line of inquiry that follows the publication of the Committee's first collective volume in 2010 ("Nonkilling Societies"), establishing a firm basis through new and revised evidence that the answer to Paige's question is affirmative.

18:15 The Possibilities of a Nonkilling Anthropology: Challenging the Apologists for War and Providing Reason and An Agenda for Peace

Leslie E. Sponsel (University of Hawaii)

Ideas in Glenn D. Paige's book "Nonkilling Global Political Science," like the possibility of a nonkilling society, when applied to anthropology are gradually generating important new knowledge and understanding. They point to three logical domains. Killing anthropology encompasses studies of

violence including war. Many, albeit not all, of such studies reinforce the dangerous misconception that humans are innately violent and warlike, a Hobbesian view that Ashley Montagu recognized as “innate depravity.” Such studies are, in effect if not intent, an apology for war because they provide one rationalization and justification for belligerent militarism. A nonkilling anthropology challenges such misconceptions by critically examining the arguments and evidence of killing anthropology; providing ethnographic and ethnological evidence to demonstrate the existence of nonkilling societies such as the Semai; and revealing the existence of nonviolent and peaceful aspects in societies that experience violence and war. While a larger third domain of neutral anthropology does not directly focus on either killing or nonkilling, it is often indirectly relevant to nonkilling, such as in work on advocacy anthropology and human rights. This paper explores the above ideas and briefly illustrates them with a critical rethinking of a canonical ethnography on the Yanomami.

18:30 Stress, Equality and Nonkilling among East Semai: A Preliminary Account

Robert Dentan (Buffalo University)

This essay reflects the growing interest “in the determinants of health, as distinct from the determinants of illness” (WHO 2009:1). The sample people are east Semai, West Malaysian indigenes now well known for nonviolence. I lived among them for about a year in 1962. One instance of their nonviolence was the proliferation of what I then took to be taboos. The most intriguing taboos were a subset for which the consequences of infractions affected victims of the infractions rather than perpetrators. The consequences typically involved sickness, paleness, anorexia, accident proneness and plain bad luck. Another contributor to their nonviolence seemed to be their egalitarianism. But Semai denied being pacifists and displayed no principled commitment to egalitarianism. The dynamics of this complex were puzzling. This essay suggests that the link between the “taboos” and social equality lies in a general unarticulated sense that stress is an avoidable social ill. Ranking among humans, like ranking among other primates, begins with inflicting stress on people. A society committed to avoiding stress is one in which hierarchies have difficulty developing. This essay examines this relationship within Semai society and concludes that avoiding stress is essential to nonkilling social arrangements.

18:45 Equality, Sustainability and Peace (ESP) Among the Semai of Malaysia

Alberto Gerardo Gomes (La Trobe University)

The Semai are renowned as a peaceful society thanks to the ethnographic work of Robert Dentan and Clayton Robarchek. Building on this work which focuses on several normative and socio-psychological factors associated with Semai peaceability, this paper discusses the ecology of peace among the Semai. The primary contention is that Semai adherence to a set of ecological principles, manifested in their cosmology and traditional religion, their spatialized historical consciousness, and their traditional hunting and swiddening practices, promotes and reinforces ecological and social sustainability and a strong sense of respect for nature and fellow humans in Semai society. In the process, Semai avert falling into the trap of what I have labelled as the 4-G syndrome (Growth, Glut, Greed and Grievance) underpinning the development of conflict and collective violence.

19:00 Peaceful Foragers: The Significance of the Batek and Moriori for the Question of Innate Human Violence

Kirk M Endicott (Dartmouth College)

It is obvious that humans are capable of violence, but this does not mean that they are prone to it. The societies into which they are born can encourage or discourage violent behavior through socialization practices. Most, if not all, societies have social mechanisms aimed at limiting or controlling internal violence, although they may also encourage violence against other groups. The problem for groups that suppress all violence both toward fellow members and outsiders is that they are defenseless against attacks by other groups. If they develop violent practices to defend themselves, violence within the group may also come to be regarded as natural and inevitable. Only groups that are protected from external aggressors by social defenses (e.g., incorporation in a nation-state) or natural defenses (e.g., physical isolation) can survive while completely suppressing violent behavior inside and outside the group. In this paper I examine two nonviolent hunter-gatherer societies, the Batek Semang of Peninsular Malaysia and the Moriori of the Chatham Islands, to determine why and how they prevented interpersonal violence. Significantly, geographical barriers separated both peoples from potential enemies. Both also publically

discussed the advantages of peaceful social interactions and believed in supernatural sanctions against violence. I end by addressing the question of whether Batek and Moriori practices and beliefs shed any light on social relations in early human societies.

19:15 Contemporary Peaceful Societies: Evidence From the Press

Bruce D. Bonta (Pennsylvania State University)

Anthropologists have presented a lot of information about peaceful societies: their economic and social conditions, the religious and cultural beliefs that underpin their practices, and the psychological, educational, and child-raising strategies that help them maintain their nonviolence. But many of the classic ethnographies about the peaceful societies are getting dated. Conditions are changing. Is it possible, at least to some extent, to rely on news stories and popular magazine articles to update our knowledge about these societies? Can snippets of information, gleaned from press accounts, provide reliable clues about the changes they are experiencing? How many of the observations of anthropologists made decades ago are still valid? In sum, are news reports about peaceful societies worth paying attention to? For seven years, the Peaceful Societies website has been publishing, every week, two news stories or reviews of current scholarly research about the 25 societies chosen for detailed portrayal in the website. This presentation will examine these news stories to search for substantial information about the peaceful societies, such as the continuation, or the modification, of their cultural, religious, social, and economic practices. Four societies that have prompted a fair amount of news coverage—the Birhor, the Buid (or Buhid), the Fipa, and the Tristan Islanders (or Tristanians)—will be among the ones considered to see how much substantial and intriguing information can be gleaned. While religious, cultural, and social information abounds, only a few news reports give clues about the actual continuation of nonviolence and peaceful beliefs.

19:30 Creating Nonkilling Society: The Interaction of Interdependence, Cooperation, and Superordinate Goals

Douglas P Fry (Abo Akademi University)

This paper addresses the challenge of how to promote peaceful, nonkilling relations among social groups. The model has a basis in social conflict theory (e.g., Rubin, Pruitt & Kim, 1994; Sherif et al., 1961) as well as in observations of existing peace systems. Peace systems are neighboring groups of societies that do not make war on each other (and sometimes not with any other societies either). For example, by this definition the tribes of the Upper Xingu River basin in Brazil, the Australian Aborigines of the Great Western Desert, the Iroquois League of Peace, and the European Union constitute peace systems. An application of social conflict theory to these peace systems and similar social cases suggests that cooperative and peaceful (nonkilling) relations can arise and flourish under certain conditions. These include: (1) the presence (or deliberate creation) of interdependence, (2) the realization that interdependence does in fact exist, and (3) the recognition that super-ordinate goals make cooperation the most viable strategy to adopt. These conditions contribute to the development or enhancement of positive relations among the social groups, which is reflected in the cooperation, trust, and peaceful (nonkilling) behavior within their social system. An explicit, public espousal of the realities of interdependence and the need for cooperation, the development of clear goals whose attainment serves the interests of all parties, and the creation of viable strategies to achieve the common goals also would seem to facilitate peaceful, nonkilling interaction.

19:45 Break

20:00 Talking Ourselves Out of Trouble: Symbolic Behavior As A Nonkilling Evolutionary Adaptation

Joam Evans Pim (Center for Global Nonkilling)

Symbolic behavior is certainly one of the key aspects in the configuration of human evolution. This paper explores the emergence of writing and oral language within the framework of evolutionary ritualized restraint mechanisms that minimize the occurrence of potentially lethal intraspecific aggression. On the one hand, the significance of the music-language continuum as an alternative to physical aggression in both human and nonhuman species is considered taking into account ethological and ethnographic evidence. On the other hand, the relation between avoidance and boundary definition strategies—which reduce the expense of energy and risk of injury—and the usage of

nonlinguistic signs that require "reading" and "writing" skills is also considered both in human and nonhuman animals in the light of natural selection pressures that favour nonkilling behaviour.

20:15 Innate Creativity: Anthropology As a Joyous Science of "the Great Transition"

Charles M.H. Keil (Jubilation Foundation)

A few paragraphs will define, footnote, and bibliograph the terms of the title. Taking as mostly factual the many books about peak oil, peak everything, climate change, and continuing economic crises as the global economy either shrinks markedly or collapses completely, anthropology will suddenly become not only a joyous science but one of great utility to all the peoples of the planet as they rapidly rediversify to coevolve with Nature on joyous and sustainable local trajectories. Marx's prediction -- the states wither away as classless societies emerge-- has begun to come true and we anthropologists can become coaches, trainers, midwives, co-creators of "good as olde" and intensely local cultures/languages/music-dance-traditions/identities-nested-in-Nature. It is turning out that the revolutionary questions, "What is to be done?" or "What is revolutionary action?" can now be answered with the common sense practices of egalitarian cultures: "Let's use consensus processes, revive New England town meetings, grow our own food, use less energy and make it clean and local." "Let's have more human rites, species parades, seasonal fesitvals, every day is Earth Day events." And even if the limits to growth have not arrived, it would be very wise and good of us to act as if they had: "Chill globally, groove locally."

20:30 Being a Player: Transitioning From War to Peace

Gretchen Schafft (American University)

Relatively little attention has been given to the importance of mainstream ideologies and the impact they have on behavior. Particularly, if the state supports on one position, it is easier to be a "player" than to stand alone and take consequences. Such is the case of state-organized violence when citizens are given all incentives to pursue the goals of the state, such as war, and even offered prestige for doing so. When the tide turns, peace offers its own rewards, and if the state endorses non-killing, the citizens who were previously impervious or enthusiastic about violence may turn quickly to another way of life and value-oriented belief. This paper looks at the nuances of this shift.

20:45 The Role of the New Nonviolent Arab Youth Leadership In the On-Going Revolutions and up-Risings Through the Arab World (mostly 2011): Early Transformations towards a Nonkilling Arab Society

Patrice C Brodeur (University of Montreal)

Given the new leadership role by the young adult generation in the revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt in the past three months, and the on-going mass protests taking place across most Arab countries since the beginning of 2011 (Yemen, Libya, Syria, Jordan, Morocco, Sudan, etc.), this presentation will focus on analyzing Paige's theoretical notions found in his third-part logic of the movement from a killing to a nonkilling society in light of the historically new and on-going transformations taking place throughout much of the Arab world. This paper will examine in particular the context of the 6th Annual Arab Youth Forum that took place at the Bibliotheca Alexandrina between February 26 and 28 in Alexandria, Egypt and its follow-up meeting scheduled for the end of April, 2011.

21:00 Discussant: Kirk M Endicott (Dartmouth College)

21:15 Discussant: Douglas P Fry (Abo Akademi University)

21:30 Discussion

Online AAA program:

<http://aaa.confex.com/aaa/2011/webprogrampreliminary/Session1253.html>

DAY 2

Hosted by: Canada Research Chair on Islam, Pluralism and Globalization, Université de Montréal

Centre d'étude des religions de l'Université de Montréal (CÉRUM)
C.P. 6128, succursale centre-ville, Montréal (Qc)

AGENDA IS ORIENTATIVE AND MAY BE SHIFTED ACCORDING TO OBJECTIVES

- 09:00 Overview of Objectives and Desired Outcomes
- 09:15 Sharing participant's work and thoughts related to understanding the causes/conditions associated with killing and the possibilities for nonkilling societies (*ten minutes each*)
- 10:15 (a) Socio-cultural causes of killing (*see list of discussion topics*)
- 12:00 Lunch
- 01:00 (b) Socio-cultural causes of nonkilling (*see list of discussion topics*)
- 03:00 Break
- 03:15 (c) Nonkilling socio-cultural transformations (*see list of discussion topics*)
- 05:15 (d) Continuation: Next steps (*see list of discussion topics*)
- 06:00 Adjourn
- 07:00 Dinner

Participant Bios

To be included

Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee

The Nonkilling Anthropology Research Committee (see <http://nonkilling.org/node/7#Anthropology> for an updated list), a consultative body to the Center for Global Nonkilling, has been ultimately responsible for drafting and approving the final Colloquium discussion topics and agenda.

- Filippo Aureli, Liverpool John Moores University
- Efrat Ben-Zeev, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem (website).
- Bruce D. Bonta, Peaceful Societies
- Sarah F. Brosnan, Georgia State University
- Marina Butovskaya, Russian Academy of Sciences
- Daniel M. Cadzow, University at Buffalo
- Patrick F. Clarkin, University of Massachusetts Boston
- Raymond Corbey, Leiden University
- Robert K. Dentan, University at Buffalo
- Leslie Dwyer, George Mason University
- David H. Dye, University of Memphis
- Kirk M. Endicott, Dartmouth College
- Brian Ferguson, Rutgers University, Newark
- Douglas Fry, Åbo Akademi University
- Agustin Fuentes, University of Notre Dame
- David Galeano Olivera, Asunción National University
- Peter M. Gardner, University of Missouri
- Gilbert L. Geis, University of California, Irvine
- Thomas P. Gibson, University of Rochester
- Piero P. Giorgi, University of Queensland

- Alberto Gomes, Latrobe University
- Hugh Gusterson, George Mason University
- Judith L. Hand, A Future Without War
- Jonathan Haas, The Field Museum
- Signe Howell, University of Oslo
- Barbara Rose Johnston, Center for Political Ecology
- Andrey Korotayev, Russian State University for the Humanities
- Donald B. Kraybill, Elizabethtown College
- Catherine Lutz, Brown University
- Charles Macdonald, Institute for Advanced Study
- Katherine C. MacKinnon, Saint Louis University
- Laura J. McClusky, Wells College
- Sean T. Mitchell, Rutgers University
- Sushil Mittal, James Madison University
- Michael I. Niman, Buffalo State College
- Joanna Overing, University of St Andrews
- Max Paul, Centre Caraïbéen pour la Non-Violence Globale
- Richard Preston, McMaster University
- Gretchen Schafft, American University
- Paulo Castro Seixas, Fernando Pessoa University
- Kenneth Sillander, University of Helsinki
- Les Sponsel, University of Hawai'i
- Samuel Tefera Alemu, University of Kyoto
- Elizabeth Marshall Thomas, Independent researcher
- Robert Tonkinson, The University of Western Australia
- David Turner, University of Toronto
- Klāvs Sedlenieks, Riga Stradins University
- Robert Wald Sussman, Washington University in St. Louis
- David Vine, American University
- Dustin M. Wax, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- Richard Wrangham, Harvard University

Organizers

CONVENOR

Center for Global Nonkilling

<http://www.nonkilling.org>

The Center for Global Nonkilling, originally established in 1988 as a planning project at the University of Hawai'i, was incorporated in 1994 as an international nonprofit organization. Focused on the promotion of change toward the measurable goal of a killing-free world, its purpose is to be a creative facilitator of research, education-training, and action in the form of problem-solving leadership for nonkilling global transformation. Since 2008, thanks to a generous organizational development grant provided by Humanity United, the Center has been able to carry out an intense program of activities through its permanent staff and global associates.

CO-SPONSOR

Canada Research Chair on Islam, Pluralism and Globalization, at the Université de Montréal
(*Chaire de recherche du Canada Islam, pluralisme et globalisation*)

<http://www.cerum.umontreal.ca/islam/index.html>

Focused on the construction of identity and alterity in contemporary Islam, the Research Chair on Islam, Pluralism and Globalization has peacebuilding as one of its core objectives. The Chair is part of the Centre for the Study of Religions at the University of Montréal, a multidisciplinary initiative designed to promote collaborative efforts between the scientific community and other groups, organizations, and agents interested in the religious questions.