



Peace and Conflict Studies

Volume 17

Number 1 *Peacebuilding, Reconciliation, and Transformation: Voices from the Canada-EU Conflict Resolution Student Exchange Consortium*

Article 1

5-2010

Introduction: Peacebuilding, Reconciliation, and Transformation

Jessica Senehi

University of Manitoba, jessica_senehi@umanitoba.ca

Stephen Ryan

University of Ulster, s.ryan@ulster.ac.uk

Sean Byrne

University of Manitoba, sean_byrne@umanitoba.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs>



Part of the Peace and Conflict Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

Senehi, Jessica; Ryan, Stephen; and Byrne, Sean (2010) "Introduction: Peacebuilding, Reconciliation, and Transformation," *Peace and Conflict Studies*: Vol. 17 : No. 1 , Article 1.

DOI: [10.46743/1082-7307/2010.1110](https://doi.org/10.46743/1082-7307/2010.1110)

Available at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs/vol17/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peace & Conflict Studies at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Peace and Conflict Studies by an authorized editor of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

Introduction: Peacebuilding, Reconciliation, and Transformation

Abstract

This introductory article in the special issue on Peacebuilding, Reconciliation, and Transformation highlights some of the central themes within the emergent field of Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS). The article discusses how this transdisciplinary field contributes to our understanding of some of the key issues that confront the PACS field in terms of analysis, theory building, and praxis. The contributors to this special issue provide a broad array of perspectives that explores conflicts and its transformation from a multidimensional perspective.

Keywords: *Canadian-EU Conflict Analysis and Resolution Program, European Union (EU), peace and conflict studies, peacebuilding, reconciliation, transformation*

Author Bio(s)

Jessica Senehi is Assistant Professor in Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Manitoba, and Associate Director of the Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice at St. Paul's College. At the University of Manitoba, in 2007, she established the award-winning graduate-level Summer Institute for Peace and Renewing Community. In 2006, she established the Winnipeg International Storytelling Festival: Storytelling on the Path to Peace, presented by the Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice. Her research focuses on the role of storytelling in peacebuilding, cultural conflict, and gender. Email: Jessica_Senehi@umanitoba.ca

Stephen Ryan is a Senior Lecturer in Peace Studies at the University of Ulster where he is the Course Director of the Postgraduate Diploma/M.A. in Peace and Conflict Studies. His most recent book is the Transformation of Violent Intercommunal Conflict (2007). From 2006–2010 he was the Co-Chair of the International Peace Research Association's Commission on Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding. He is the University of Ulster local coordinator for a new Marie Curie International Training Site for Sustainable Peacebuilding. Email: s.ryan@ulster.ac.uk

Sean Byrne is Professor of Peace and Conflict Studies, and Head of the Ph.D. and Joint M.A. Programs in Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Manitoba, and Director of the Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice at St. Paul's College at the University of Manitoba. He is author of Economic Assistance and the Northern Ireland Conflict: Building the Peace Dividend (2009) and Growing Up in a Divided Society: The Influence of Conflict on Belfast Schoolchildren (1997). He is a co-editor Reconciliable Differences: Turning Points in Ethnopolitical Conflicts (2000) and the Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution (2009). His research has been supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Canada. He is a native of Ireland. Email: Sean_Byrne@umanitoba.ca

**Introduction to the Special Issues:
Peacebuilding, Reconciliation, and Transformation**

Edited by

Jessica Senehi, Stephen Ryan and Sean Byrne

Abstract

This introductory article in the special issue on Peacebuilding, Reconciliation, and Transformation highlights some of the central themes within the emergent field of Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS). The article discusses how this transdisciplinary field contributes to our understanding of some of the key issues that confront the PACS field in terms of analysis, theory building, and praxis. The contributors to this special issue provide a broad array of perspectives that explores conflicts and its transformation from a multidimensional perspective.

Introduction

The EU–Canada Conflict Analysis and Resolution Program: A Cross-Cultural, Transdisciplinary Experiment in Peacemaking and Peacebuilding is a highly innovative and interdisciplinary project, which commenced on October 1, 2007, that will end on September 30, 2010. The program addresses six themes, each intellectually challenging and vitally important to European Union (EU) and Canadian citizens. It explores conflicts in the EU and Canada related to family and community, business, the environment, gender, ethnicity and foreign policy. The latter theme also opens up possibilities for

participants to learn about the actions and attitudes of both regions towards conflict in other parts of the world.

In the course of examining these themes, the Program's student participants have contended with an array of complicating factors. For example, quite apart from skills and training, one's language, experiences and world view all influence how one perceives and reacts to conflict. The Program participants had the unique opportunity to experience and learn to contend with these cultural challenges. Within the EU-Canada context, issues of race, ethnicity, class, and gender are often addition complicating factors. Thus, student participants in the Program explored these differing attitudes, assumptions, values, and approaches that characterize negotiation within the different EU-Canadian cultures and postulated ways to deal effectively with cultural differences.

The objectives of this project was to create a student-exchange program aimed at creating citizens of the EU and Canada equipped to assess and handle conflict skillfully, peacefully and effectively. The primary field of study and training was Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding, however the program also dealt with senior undergraduate and graduate students in a wide variety of disciplines including Social Sciences, Political Science, Sociology, Economics, Psychology, Social Work, International Relations, Performing Arts, Environmental Science, Languages, Law, Communication, Journalism and Business Studies among others.

Participants included 36 undergraduate seniors and graduate students: 18 each from Canada and the EU, and 6 per university have participated in the student mobility experience. Students participated in one semester (approximately four months abroad). The Consortium included the following institutions: in the EU, (1) the University of

Ulster (United Kingdom), (2) the University of Ljubljana (Slovenia), and (3) the Irish School of Ecumenics–Trinity College Dublin (Republic of Ireland); and, in Canada, (1) the University of Manitoba (Manitoba), (2) Conrad Grebel University College–University of Waterloo (Ontario), and (3) Saint Paul University (Ontario). This special issue of the *Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies* arises from the many conversations we have had over the past three years on cutting edge issues in the field. The following article discusses a number of these issues while the contributors to this special issue outline the ideas in more detail in their individual essays.

Social Justice and Peacemaking

Gandhi (1992) believed that peace begins internally within the self. One can only search for the truth (satyagraha) non-violently (ahimsa) by breaking out of the cycle of one's oppression. Gandhi sought to empower the individual and to provide a sense of hope to get a commitment to non-violent action based on *ahimsa*, or truth, in the external world (Burrowes, 1996). Every individual has a personal responsibility and a duty to contribute to world peace, or to "be" the peace they wish to see. People can make a decision to forge transformative change within society (Barash and Webel, 2002). We can imagine and believe in the possibility of peace by reprogramming the mind to a new way of thinking and by developing a paradigm of "power with" rather than "power over" (Boulding, 1990b, 2000). Can we rebuild our world by thinking globally and acting locally? Positive peace or social justice can be built upon peace education and structural change (Brock-Utne, 1985; Byrne, 1997).

Thus, peacemaking and social justice is an interdisciplinary inquiry, which addresses the issues of peace and war, violence, and nonviolence in contemporary world society (Jeong, 2008). It addresses, in particular, three main questions: (1) What are the roots and sources of destructive conflicts, and can they be prevented and, if so, in what circumstances? (2) What is peace, and what are the means of achieving peace, social justice, and peaceful change? And (3) what means are there of transforming violent structures into peaceful structures?

Thus, there is a need to provide a more in-depth understanding of peacemaking and peacebuilding strategies within different arenas in the world context. For example, it is necessary to focus on the realist “power-over” model and the origins or prevention (e.g., deterrence) of war, the social milieu in which a number of military strategists functioned, and how that environment influenced the tactics, operations, strategies, leadership, and political processes that were most crucial in their decision to use threats or applications of force as a conflict management mechanism (Burrowes, 1996). It is important to understand the dynamics and factors that contribute to war if we are to comprehend and, instead, promote the waging of peace (Enloe, 2001). In other words, peace is not the antitheses of war because both elements co-exist on a continuum that is constantly impacted by a number of socio-economic, cultural, psychological, and political factors that influence what strategy will be adopted as peacemaking and peacebuilding instruments (Boulding, 1990b).

The conflict intervener needs to know about power relations and the origins of war if she or he is to develop analytical tools to successfully intervene in conflict situations. Consequently, HoWon Jeong (2010) poses a number of important questions:

How does one see the future? Must one accept the realist counsel that trends are destiny, that is, trends in physical, structural, ecological and cultural violence? What makes more sense, fatalistically accepting the future as a fixed path, or the engagement of active citizenship in proactive responses in peacemaking and peacebuilding? Alternatives to violence and ecologically unsustainable forms of development must be explored if we are to empower people to change their world (Jeong, 2005).

Consequently, every religious tradition conveys its own distinctive resources for peacemaking, social justice, and human rights advocacy and also for applications of force as in “just war” theory (Abu-Nimer, 2003; Kaldor, 2007). While no single religious tradition or cultural institution has ever demonstrated adequate competence or proficiency with regard to its own chronic conflicts and inhumanity (Appleby, 2000; Gopin, 2000), collectively these wisdom traditions (some would call them hokum) convey an invaluable supplement to each other’s (and secular society’s) peacemaking, social justice, and human rights resources (Sampson and Lederach, 2000; Smock, 1995, 2002).

Interdependence is a means of conflict prevention—but as the latest world economic woes have shown—also grounds for increased tension and resentment. Political, economic, and environmental problems increasingly cross geographical boundaries and require international cooperation, rather than competition, to be resolved (Homer-Dixon, 2009). Identity factors, while a source of great strength inside communities, are also often an obstacle to the achievement of inter-communal peace (Byrne, 2001b). We need to understand the various theoretical approaches to the conceptualisation of ethnicity, nationalism, and identity, and to ask if and, if so, under what circumstances, identity-based politics poses a threat to peace; the findings are mixed

(Irvin, 1999; O’Leary and McGarry, 1993). If this is the case, then can the PACS field offer a serious alternative?

Further, as Alice Ackerman (200b) succinctly argues we need to look at the role of the media and information transmission in society, in both peace and war, and their relationship to governments and public opinion. There is a need to know whether or not the media (in its various forms) promotes an objective view of peace (Strobel, 2001). Important here is the concept of ‘peace journalism’ (McGoldrick and Lynch, 2005). We also need to look at the changing nature and role of the media within contemporary society (Ackerman 2000b). For example, symbols are important in peace and in war, and they can be used as weapons in the pursuit of both (Ackerman, 2000b). Third-party interveners need to understand the invention, adoption, and use of symbols, whether signage, territory, people, or events, and assess their impact in relation to specific conflicts (Schirch, 2004). How do symbols adopt an intrinsic (political) worth of their own and how have they been modified across time? Moreover, media people need more training in the precursors, roots, and remedies of conflict as well as exploring the role of the Internet and other new technologies in spreading peaceful (or not) ideas (Webel and Galtung, 2007).

In addition, we need to examine the role of warlords and peacemakers in the contemporary international system. It is thus critical to assess the role of political and community leadership in peacebuilding processes and examine the salience of the warrior model of leadership (Ackerman 2000a; Enloe, 2001; Sylvester, 1987). We also need to understand how to address the ‘spoiler’ problem, when warlords are prepared to use violence to resist peace processes (Stedman, 1997; Darby, 2001). With reference to

particular leaders, we need to examine changing styles of leadership, and the obstacles that they have faced in making the transition from protagonist to pragmatist (Pearson and Olson-Lounsherry, 2009). We should attempt to answer the question about whether gender really matters predictably as a leadership factor (Ackerman, 2000b).

Drawing on experiences in places such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Kosovo, Bosnia, Rwanda, and Somalia there has been a proliferation of studies in the past decade that examine post-violence peacebuilding and conflict prevention (see, for example, Maynard, 1999; Paris, 2004; Pugh, 2000; Rupesinghe, 1998). We need to look at the roles, reputations, and possible futures of multilateral institutions such as the United Nations and NATO, and their ability to build peace in the 21st century. In the aftermath of protracted ethnic conflicts, can peace be developed without reconciling the perpetrator and the victim (Power, 2003)? We need to understand the issues surrounding the nature of “victims” in conflict and the role of “justice” in peace processes, and the efforts at achieving reconciliation and justice, which have been central aspects of peacebuilding efforts in protracted ethnopolitical conflicts.

The Peace and Conflict Studies Field

It is nearly a cliché that “the world is getting smaller.” Increasingly, through processes such as immigration and conglomeration, people from different backgrounds are coming together and interacting in communities and in the workplace. Global dangers such as climate change and nuclear war require multinational cooperation. As in all human history conflict is being defined along religious, gender, and ethnic lines.

Throughout the world, violence and human rights abuses abound. Where peace accords have been signed, the critical work of reconciliation, healing, and peacebuilding remain (Lederach, 2005). At no time has the need to resolve conflict peacefully while promoting justice and reconciliation been greater. In this nuclear age, the future of the world could well depend upon the ability to meet this need. The interdisciplinary study of PACS has emerged in recent decades to bring people of diverse theoretical and experiential backgrounds together to: (1) research these complex social problems in a systematic way, and also (2) to develop and promote strategies, policies, and skill sets for addressing these issues.

In 1957, Kenneth Boulding and others, to provide a rigorous international and interdisciplinary approach to conflict resolution, established the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* at the University of Michigan (Barash and Webel, 2002). In 1963, in Oslo, Johan Galtung established the *Journal of Peace Research* and broadened the focus of the field to encompass not only nuclear deterrence, but also issues of structural violence, development, human rights, and social justice (Boulding, 1977; Galtung, 1975ab, 1985, 1987). In 1965, the International Peace Research Association was formed, bringing together international scholars from diverse disciplines that share a preoccupation with goals of peace, justice, respect for diversity, and the need for sustained environmental viability. In 1985, the Canadian government established the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, and in 1984, the U.S. Institute of Peace was established in the United States to support scholarship in PACS. In Europe important work has been done *inter alia* by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the Centre for the Analysis of Conflict, INCORE, and the Berghof Foundation. An increasing number of

journals have been dedicated to PACS. The sum total of all these efforts is to expand knowledge in the field.

PACS has emerged as a field within the contexts of the Anti-War, Civil Rights, Women's, and Community Empowerment movements of the 1960s in the United States, which have advocated for the just and nonviolent transformation of protracted social conflicts (Byrne and Senehi, 2009). In addition, conflict resolution scholars—practitioners—such as Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Edward Azar, John Burton, Ronald Fisher, John Groom, Neil Katz, Herbert Kelman Louis Kriesberg, Janie Leatherman, John Paul Lederach, Christopher Mitchell, Susan Allan Nan, Joyce Neu, Thania Paffenholz, Betty Reardon, Jay Rothman, Nadim Rouhana, Anna Snyder, among others—have developed many skills and processes that were used by mediators in local communities to do peacemaking work in larger regional, ethnic, and international conflicts.

In the 1980s, the PACS field move in the direction of certification as law schools began to teach Alternative or Appropriate Dispute Resolution (ADR) courses such as mediation, arbitration, group problem-solving, adjudication, international law, and negotiation. ADR surfaced in many settings, from interpersonal to international relations, in the recognition in both the legal and policy fields that dispute resolution, or conflict management as it is called in some circles, has become a matter of national importance and an area demanding a high level of professionalism (Umbreit, 2006).

In the United States, partly out of concern for the overburdened court system, the American Bar Association (ABA) became heavily involved during the early seventies with the development of alternative, often grassroots centres for resolving citizen and community conflicts (Kriesberg, 1997). This development paralleled an information

explosion generated by social scientists, lawyers, community organizers, negotiators, and mediators regarding how and why various racial, communal, and public policy disputes of the 1960s and 1970s were being, or had been, resolved (Duffy and others, 1991). By 1980, a national professional organization, the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR), had been formed; community dispute resolution centres existed in every major American city on a model of trained volunteers intervening locally; and the ADR movement among lawyers and professionals had changed the curriculum of various law schools and the issues to which the ABA would be attuned (Kriesberg, 2001). Issues such as victim-offender reconciliation came to prominence, with international application, as in South Africa's "truth and reconciliation" processes (Minnow, 1998). ACR was launched in January 2001, when the Academy of Family Mediators (AFM), the Conflict Resolution Education Network (CREnet), and the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) merged into one organization.

Also in the 1970s and 1980s, undergraduate majors and master's programs in peace studies and conflict resolution sprung up in universities in North America, Europe, South East Asia, Africa, and the Middle East in response to student demands to better understand the analysis and resolution of conflicts (Kriesberg, 1997). For example, as early as 1965, Wayne State University's Center for Teaching About War and Peace (later the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies) was established in Detroit; in 1973, the Department of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford awarded graduate degrees in Peace Studies. In 1987, the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR) at George Mason University began offering a Ph.D. program in Conflict Resolution. In

1984, UNESCO established the European Peace University in Austria, and a new M.A. Program in Peace Studies.

The role of International Non-governmental Organizations (INGOS) at the United Nations also focused the international community's attention on humanitarian, refugee, and protracted civil war issues around the globe (Snyder, 2003). Hence, countries such as Canada, Norway, Ireland, Sweden, and others began to advocate for the human rights and human needs of global citizens as political and socioeconomic resources were put to the analysis, resolution and intervention in conflicts (Kriesberg, 2001). These moves resulted in breakthroughs such as the international Ottawa Treaty to ban landmines in 1999. Today academic programs in this new field, as well as government supported institutes such as Canada's Lester B. Pearson Centre and the U.S. Institute of Peace in Washington, are teaching students and supplying curricular materials concerning the analytical, theoretical, and practice skills necessary to study violence and design appropriate interventions in violent conflicts at multiple levels of analysis (Kriesberg, 2001).

Faculty and students are discussing human needs, minority rights, human rights, human security, violence prevention, restorative justice, cultural and gender identities, environmental sustainability, appropriate technologies for development, creativity and peacemaking, and peace education (Jeong, 2010). Violence and social conflicts in a variety of domains and at different levels are examined, including, among others, international war, ethnic and intercultural conflicts, community conflicts, environmental conflict, and conflict in businesses, health care institutions, inter-personal violence, and schools (Jeong, 2010). The PACS field examines direct, cultural, and structural violence that encompasses war, genocide, hate crimes, family violence, and violence against

children (Polkinghorn and Byrne, 2001). Social cleavages such as those along class, race, religious, gender, ethnic, or linguistic divides are also studied. The goal is to identify, analyze, and promote diverse nonviolent approaches for addressing the various forms of violent conflict in ways that are sustainable, meet the needs of all parties, and attend to social justice. The assumption of the PACS field is that—although violent conflicts differ and each conflict has unique aspects—there are common theoretical ideas for understanding and responding to violent conflicts at different levels and in different contexts. Clearly, the PACS field is an important emerging area of study. There is a large demand for study in this area both in North America and internationally, including students from countries where there have been protracted violent conflicts in recent decades.

The PACS field also gives the “pracademic” the tools not only to analyze the deep causes of violent conflict across socio-economic, cultural, political, psychological, historical, and environmental dimensions, but also to determine how diverse peacemaking tools can manage and prevent them. This has resulted in practical guides to peace work in areas of peacemaking (for example, Galtung and others, 2002; Banks and Mitchell, 1996) and peacebuilding (for example, Reyhler and Paffenholz, 2001). Analysis and practice in the PACS field seek to uncover “the relationships between inequality, injustice and power asymmetry on the one hand and violence on the other” and “provide various strategies for achieving peace” (Jeong, 2000, p.1). The PACS field is relevant to improvement in human wellbeing and the future survival of humanity (what Johan Galtung, 1996 calls “positive peace”) and encompasses a variety of themes ranging from peace pedagogies, environmental policies, cultural norms, development practice,

inter-religious dialogue, nonviolence, social justice, human rights, and indigenous peacemaking among others (Jeong, 2010). A PACS perspective, therefore, seeks to broaden our concerns beyond peacemaking (i.e., conflict resolution and conflict management) to include peacekeeping, human rights, and peacebuilding.

Conflict Analysis and Resolution

Conflict analysis and resolution expands beyond the state system to include additional actors, especially formal and informal mediators and third-party interveners, and it frames broader issues of culture, violence, ethnicity, identity, human rights, the environment, proliferation, sexism, development, and ethnocentrism among others (Cheldin, Druckman and Fast, 2003; Jeong, 2000). Thus, philosophical foundations of conflict knowledge influence: (1) how we analyze violent conflicts, (2) how we intervene in violent conflicts and, (3) how we ultimately decide which conflict processes are most appropriate for a given conflict situation (Sandole, Byrne, Sandole-Staroste, and Senehi, 2009). The relationship of both of these components is very important when one analyzes social conflict issues. One learns not only to understand and analyze the perceptions and worldviews of others but ones own views and how both may affect ones intervention activities in any conflict environment (Weeks, 1992).

Conflicts occur within different ecological contexts and cultural systems, which stem from a variety of needs and interests. Theories about the origins and emergence of conflicts at all levels (interpersonal through international) are the starting point of the conflict resolution component of the field (Jeong, 2008). The argument is that once scholars and conflict resolution practitioners understand where conflict comes from, they

can focus on the possibilities for conflict resolution (Ross, 1993, 2007). In other words, one needs to know the basic theoretical concepts of the field and seek to apply this knowledge as we learn practice skills for intervening in and resolving conflicts (Carpenter and Kennedy, 1988; Gray, 1989). Practical strategies for identifying and resolving sources of conflict necessitate that conflict interveners or practitioners receive practical training at the introductory and advanced levels in mediation, negotiation, facilitation, problem-solving, and storytelling and narrative methods (Byrne, 2000; Schwarz, 1994; Senehi, 2009ab; Ury, Brett and Goldberg, 1993). Skills training is placed in the wider context of academic research on social conflict, mediation, conflict resolution, and on group processes. Conflict resolution skills assist the third-party intervener in conflict to wage conflicts productively and to resolve them. Paul Wehr's conflict mapping idea illustrates this point too.

The conflict resolution scholar and practitioner seek to answer the following questions at both the theoretical level and the level of personal action: What are the causes and consequences of social conflict? How do we come to know and understand what conflict is? How do our assumptions about conflict affect our strategies for management or resolution? What methods are available for waging and resolving conflicts productively rather than destructively?

The conflict resolution component of the PACS field also explores the cultural dimensions of conflict, including the role of culture in defining and understanding conflict for individuals and groups, by looking at the cultural dimensions of conflict in three ways: the dynamics of interpersonal beliefs and socialization, academic theory, and international conflict (Avruch, 1998). Certain cultures handle conflict differently, have different conflict

resolution styles, and that remedies prescribed from outside might or might not fit those norms (Rice, 2009). Our understanding of these issues has been deepened by anthropological studies of war zones (Nordstrom, 2004; Loizos, 2008). Third-party interveners—such as mediators, facilitators, or negotiators—must explore their own personal biases and learn how to recognize and elicit the biases of others (Lederach, 1995). In particular, interveners' values, perceptions, experiences, and assumptions are related to their own cultural background, so that a self assessment of “blind spots” and cultural and gender assumptions that play a role in conflict perception and assessment must be recognized (Kolb and Coolidge, 1991). It is critical to be aware of variables related to the definition and processing of conflicts across cultures; the effects of child rearing practices, language, family structure, racism, sexism, kinship, and other cultural variables on levels of conflict and violence in a society; the role of culturally sensitive assessment as a requirement for conflict intervention; and the ways of gaining insight into the perspectives of others in conflict situations (Cohen, 1995; Senehi, 2002).

Just as culture is critical to the analysis and resolution of conflicts, communication styles are also critical to understanding, analyzing, and managing conflict (Bolton, 1986; Tannen, 1990). The human and emotional aspects of conflict include the influence of anger, gender, and culture, which in turn impact the practice-based approaches to mediation and negotiation (Kriesberg, 1998, Lewiki, Saunders and Minton, 1999). For example, gender roles matter in conflict, and conflict is experienced and perceived differently by men and women (Northrup, 1996; Stephens, 1994). The process of mediation is used to resolve civil, commercial, family, public, and workplace disputes (Moore, 1996). Mediation principles and skills, different approaches to mediation, and

current research in mediation are now quite sophisticated with a number of states in the U.S., for example, requiring board certification before a mediator can establish a private practice (Hocker and Wilmot, 1995; Katz and Lawyer, 1992). Communication theory speaks of the importance of “face” in some societies, as well as high and low context cultures that generate misunderstandings (Broome, 2009), as when the US “demands” that Japan abide by “fair trade” rules or that North Korea cease its nuclear research.

Third parties are also used for resolving unproductive negotiations influencing the dynamics, quality, and outcomes of the negotiation process. Third-party interveners need to blend theory and skill practice that will help them recognize the relation between theoretical principles and actual behaviour and will prepare them to negotiate more effectively (Deutsch and Coleman, 2000). In particular, third-party interveners must be aware of the basics of competitive, distributive, and positional (win-lose) negotiation; collaborative, integrative, and mutual gains bargaining; and the use of power and negotiation in unequal power relations (Kolb, 1994; Lewecki, Saunders and Minton, 1999). Transformational conflict resolution and peacebuilding is also an important component of the PACS field.

Transformational Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding

Moving beyond negotiated agreements, the concept of conflict transformation explores the possibilities for achieving justice, reconciliation, and sustainable peace in societies where deep-rooted and persistent (or recurrent) violent conflicts have had a devastating impact economically, politically, and socially (Byrne, 2001a; McCandless, 1999; Rupesinghe, 1995). The nature of deep-rooted conflicts focus on the interpersonal,

relational, structural, and cultural shifts that must take place for people to move out of and away from complex, protracted, violent, or potentially violent social conflict (Ryan, 2007). The practices of peacebuilding and conflict transformation seek to mobilize people and resources to transform unjust structures and relationships (Senehi, 1996, 2000, 2002). Transformation can range from “reframing” disputes to seek common ground between adversaries, to fully reconciling previously distrustful and vengeful adversaries. Specific attention must be given to the key issues of human security, identity, justice, human rights, and reconciliation (Axworthy, 2003; Lederach, 1997), all caught up in what John Burton (1990) referred to as “human needs” theory. The conflict transformation practitioner at the community level has to adopt and learn from the key concepts, techniques, and innovative approaches of conflict revolvers at the international level to develop a more humanistic, transformative approach to conflict analysis and resolution, and peacebuilding (Bloomfield, 1997; Hughes, 1998).

Moreover, ethnic- and community-based conflicts are an emerging area of inquiry in PACS, especially since the end of the Cold War (Olson-Lounsherry and Pearson, 2009; Pearson and Olson-Lounsherry, 2009; Ramsbotham, Miall and Woodhouse, 2005; Darby and MacGinty, 2003; Gurr, 2000) as the international “community” has more often intervened and intervened in multilateral formats to attempt to end civil disputes (Talantino, 2005). PACS scholars and practitioners are now illuminating the merits and limitations of a variety of prescriptions for regulating and resolving ethnic- and community-based conflicts (Byrne and others, 2000; Hume, 1996). We need to understand how individuals, groups, and countries struggle to achieve justice, reparations, and, on occasion, reconciliation in the aftermath of mass violence, torture, forced

relocation, ethnic cleansing, rape warfare, and genocide (Carter, Irani and Volkan, 2008; Volkan, 1998). Conflict specialists can connect, work with, and influence humanitarian aid efforts, capacity building, democratization efforts, and conflict transformation projects (Leatherman and Nadezhda Griffin, 2009). Difficulties encountered by western interventions in Bosnia, Iraq and Afghanistan have also led some to challenge the assumptions of the so-called ‘democratic peace hypothesis’ when applied to situations of civil war (MacGinty and Richmond, 2009; Rieff, 2005; Chandler, 2002; Snyder, 2000)

Conflict resolution practitioners also need to understand the multiple types of post-conflict trauma, recognize the symptoms of trauma and violence, and assess the types of interventions that may be needed, both short- and long- term (Byrne and Keashly, 2000). Relief and assistance programs from refugee rescue to humanitarian relief, the international Red Cross, UN programs, Rotary International, Mennonite and Quaker NGOs, and Christian relief efforts need to address the ethical and practical dimensions of dealing with traumatized individuals in a variety of settings (Snyder, 2003). We have also witnessed the welcome emergence of professionals in varied fields who have turned their attention to peacemaking, beginning with Vietnamera Scientists and Physicians against War groups, to latter day Medecins sans Frontiers and Engineers Without Borders initiatives.

In addition, reconciliation is a multi-dimensional process that envelops truth, mercy, justice, and peace (Lederach, 1997, 1999) building relationships, and promoting justice so that people can heal from the past (Galtung, 1996; Ryan, 2007). Liberation education uses local cultural resources to get people to think critically about self in context (Friere, 1999). Indigenous knowledge systems of local people inform conflict

analysis and resolution (Lederach, 1995, 2005; Tuso, 1999). Consequently, “transformational politics” comprises an interdependent “web of relationships” that nurtures participatory democracy at the grassroots (Woolpert, Slaton, and Schwerin, 1998). Contact builds mutual understanding and transforms negative beliefs (Gallagher, 1995; Love, 1995).

Linking personal involvement at the micro to the macro political level creates “empowerment and recognition” (Bush and Folger, 1995). Personal involvement in local grassroots organizations teaches organizational skills and builds self-esteem and self-efficacy (Schwerin, 1995). Implemented correctly this might negate the notorious problem of the extremist “spoiler” or rejectionists which undercut peace negotiations and agreements (e.g., the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in Israel and President Anwar Sadat in Egypt). Transformational conflict resolution is organic and nonviolent (Ury, 2000, p. 4), and involves the whole community working for social justice for all (Knox and Hughes, 1996; Vayrynen, 1991).

“Imagining a shared future” (Boulding, 1990a) allows people to think creatively outside of the box to create a new way of doing (Lederach, 2005), i.e., an ongoing momentum of mutual conciliation rather than mutual antagonism. Participation in encounter groups to build trust and dialogue groups and problem-solving workshops assist people in forging mutual understanding (Kelman, 1997; Rothman, 1997), to transform and transcend “chosen traumas of the past” (Volkan, 1998). Transformation praxis integrates middle-range leaders and the grassroots to create a myriad of opportunities to address the direct, cultural and structural roots of conflicts (Lederach, 1997). Involving all of the stakeholders in the negotiation and peace-making process

builds trust and a commitment to peacemaking (Byrne, 1995; Kelman, 1997; Rothman, 1997; Yang, 1998).

Moreover, human development empowers people to develop their own capacities (Curle, 1990). Properly targeted socio-economic resources can build a sustainable infrastructure of peace (Diamond and McDonald, 1996) including people in their cultural context (Lederach, 1997). For some, spiritual transformation also provides the individual with a sense of meaning and motivation to strive nonviolently for truth and justice (Gandhi, 1992; Lentz, 1976), to transform structures and relationships.

The transformation conflict resolution process moves people from a destructive mode toward accommodation and coexistence (Kriesberg, Northrup, and Thorson, 1989; Yang, 1998). A multi-modal and multi-level intervention approach that encompasses a plethora of social factors that escalate conflict has to coordinate the cross-level peacebuilding efforts (Byrne and Carter, 1996; Byrne, Carter and Senehi, 2003) that also ensures that negotiated agreements are implemented on the ground (Kriesberg, 1999). Stepping outside of the box to imagine peace is also a critical component of the PACS field.

Imagining Peace

Worldwide and domestic events demonstrate to the efficacy of power to overwhelm goodwill and trust in the short term, but also substantiate the power of nonviolent struggle in the long term. The continued use of violence on all levels raises our awareness of its cost in psychological damage and human life (Sharp, 2005). As we become increasingly conscious of the urgent need for alternatives to violence, more

scholars, educators, and institutions are working to refine our thinking and practice in nonviolence.

Reducing the momentum of a conflict is more difficult than taking early preventive measures to forestall violence by addressing the dynamics and sources not the symptoms (Jeong, 2008). Thus, the PACS field can assist in early warning; the effective transition though to early response can make all of the difference regarding peace and war (Arthur, 2009). Unfortunately response is often muted or delayed for actors' individual interests, as in the failure of the international community to intervene in genocide in Rwandan politics of the 1990s.

The PACS field embraces envisioning and the creative imagination, as well as institutionalizing legal and political processes to invent and envisage and to uphold an alternative more peaceful approach to world politics. For instance, Warren Ziegler (1995) has designed workshops to envision a world without weapons to develop participants' capacity to envisage alternative futures. Given the opportunity to invent, through envisioning, a different world, student participants in the workshops had new tools to work to make it happen. The use of the imagination through directed visioning is an ideal tool to use in the peacemaking and conflict resolution process. For example, storytelling is an intervention process that benefits from the empowerment given to participants through visioning (Senehi, 2000, 2002, 2009ab).

The use of visioning allows the parties to imagine a future and not be stuck in the present, even to imagine more effective institutions to address and prevent violence. The ability to envision a future without violent conflict and/or violence encourages the parties to work toward transforming their relationships and addressing the deep roots of the

conflict (Ruane and Todd, 1996). As Elise Boulding (1990a) noted, “people are empowered to action by their own sense of the possible” (p. 380). The envisioning process is used to enhance cognitive and analytical skills in resolving conflicts. Being able to envision a difference can allow the individual to make that difference a reality. Elise Boulding (1992) notes, “It has been empirically demonstrated in all sorts of experiments that people with the same capacities, but with different aspiration levels perform according to their aspirations levels, not according to their capacities” (p. 380). The use of visioning is an extension of the creative process that leads directly to the establishment of values and needs, and in individuals’ actions and reactions to their surroundings.

Meanwhile, the creative use of the imagination has been stymied through technology and repression (Boulding, 1990a). Elise Boulding (1990a) holds out hope for the power of creative imagination: “It is clear...that the human capacity for imaging...is not lost, only weakened. It can be nurtured back to vigorousness and liveliness. Vigor in imagery leads to vigor in social action” (p. 386). Thus, visioning is a process used to imagine new and more creative resolutions to conflicts, and is an important intervention tool within the PACS field.

Human Rights and Peace and Conflict Studies

Applied research on how human rights and PACS are related in significant ways is critical as human rights abuses often emerge in the context of social conflicts and war. It has also become a central issue for societies in the transition stage from violence to

peace (Bell, 2003). Peace is defined as not only the absence of war, but also the presence of human rights, social justice, and human security (Byrne and Senehi, 2009a). The issues of power, culture, and meaning, which are central to PACS must be a part of the study of human rights. Also, PACS focuses not only on theory, but also on practice, including approaches for effective communication, positive social change, social justice, peacemaking, and addressing the root causes of conflict—all of which are essential for addressing human rights. Often, the definition of particular human rights is a serious source of conflict—for example, genocide, the death penalty, abortion, conscientious objection, or cultural factors in human rights (Byrne and Senehi, 2009b; Power, 2003; Wiesel, 1961). Negotiating such contentious issues require techniques and skills associated with PACS, and is part of the process of democracy and human rights

Applied research on the theoretical and practical connections of human rights to PACS includes the consideration that to theorize human rights, it is important to develop a body of scholars who share a vocabulary and a central focus on the breath of issues relevant in human rights (O'Byrne, 2003). While each discipline has ideas related to human rights, they may be so specific that they preclude making the connection between the micro and macro levels of society, or between theory and practice, or synthesizing the knowledge of the various courses in order to develop general skills in addressing human rights as a contemporary problem (Byrne and Senehi, 2009b)

This would include human rights and issues addressed in PACS that involve critical contemporary social problems relevant to every dimension of society. Every discipline has a wealth of theoretical approaches that can inform problemsolving. As students develop specialized research areas, they need to bring a theoretical depth that

might be offered, for example, in specific disciplinary traditions. Such specialization helps the Ph.D. graduate find a job in a department other than one specifically in human rights or in PACS. This would include evaluative research on PACS practitioners, with a particular focus on those working in the area of human rights and in peace and justice organizations.

Young People and Peace Education

Research to describe the motivation of students with human rights and peace education is extremely relevant. This includes research on students' hunger to have critical questions addressed: Why is there violence in our society? Why is there conflict between, and violence toward, identity groups? And, importantly, what can be done about it? Increasingly, our students have experienced violence first-hand in their communities, families, or life experience, making these topics highly relevant. To not make these issues central in our education may be experienced by young people as a form of denial or silencing (Beah, 2007; Greenspan, 2003).

Research and practice focuses on nurturing global citizens, future leaders, and peacemakers. Our students are tomorrow's leaders. Many young people have an idealism that should be recognized and supported. Youth have an important role to play in creating a culture of peace that supports human rights in their workplaces, communities, and in the world (Helsing and others, 2006, Senehi and Byrne, 2006, McEvoy-Levy, 2006). Students will bring their human rights knowledge into their various disciplines and professions. Basic research on promoting a positive civil culture in the classroom as

educators who have included human rights education in their curriculum have reported a more positive class culture in their schools (Sapon-Shevin, 1999).

Women, Human Rights, and Peacebuilding

Recent research has alerted us to the absence of women in all areas of peace work. This includes peacekeeping (Mazurana and others, 2005), peacemaking, and peacebuilding (Porter, 2007). That this is a problem has now been recognised by the U.N. in its groundbreaking Resolution 1325. Yet much more work needs to be done in relation to the contribution women can make in the areas covered by this special edition. Applied research focuses on some of the consequences of the more than 200 “identity” wars throughout the world that are the biggest challenge to human rights, and global and human security (Leatherman and Griffin, 2009). This includes research on the impact of war on women who are killed, maimed, brutalized, orphaned, traumatized, and/or impoverished (Mortenson and Relin, 2008). Such research resonates with Canada’s identity as a global leader in promoting world peace, human rights, and collective security, and serving as a model of how people from different backgrounds and with different histories can live together in relative peace.

This includes research on reflexive praxis that has practitioners analyzing complex conflicts through multidimensional lenses to design appropriate intervention processes so that they can intervene more effectively in social conflicts and as scholars develop better theory (Byrne and Keashly, 2000). Systems and structures involve stakeholders with different goals, interests, power, and worldviews. Research to identify

the parties, issues, relationships, and the source of conflict, and focus on the human and emotional aspects of conflict, which includes the influence and intervention of anger, gender, class, religion, culture, and human rights (Enloe, 2007). Identifying sources of conflict may not be as a simple task when the causes are embedded in an institution's structure and operating systems. Consequently, if the rules, roles, or responsibilities are designed to produce conflict, then resolving conflicts often requires some structural or systemic changes which may produce unintended, and non obvious consequences (Kriesberg, 2002). Research is important to evaluate and assess how theory and practice work or collide when dealing with complex problems in human systems and structures in our interdisciplinary approach to practice and theory building. For example, defining key theoretical concepts such as transformation, human rights, and social justice may lead to confusion in both theory-building and in praxis rather than more informed and effective practice and theory-building (Ryan, 2007).

Conclusions

It is easy to forget how young PACS is as an area of academic study. The students who have participated in the EU-Canada Conflict Analysis and Resolution may be just the second generation who have had an opportunity to be educated in this field. They will have to grapple with perennial problems of violence and peace in a world that is changing rapidly. Some have been addressed in the following contributions and others, such as global poverty, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the threats to the environment have not. It is our belief that the PACS field offers an effective and

inspiring methodology to those working for social change to create a just and peaceful world, especially when it provides them with the opportunity to travel to new places and be exposed to new perspectives. PACS empowers individuals and communities to work together to transform relationships and society to build a culture of peace and a just and fair society.

References

Abu-Nimer, M. *Nonviolence and Peace Building in Islam: Theory and Practice*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2003.

Ackerman, A. *Making Peace Prevail: Preventing Violent Conflict in Macedonia*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000a.

Ackerman, A. “The Idea and Practice of Conflict Prevention.” *Journal of Peace Research*, 2000b, 40 (3), 339–347.

Appleby, S. *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence and Reconciliation*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

Arthur, P. “Memory Retrieval and Truth Recovery.” In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole- Staroste, and J. Senehi (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Avruch, K. *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998.

Axworthy, L. *Navigating A New World: Canada’s Global Future*. Toronto, ON: Alfred Knopf, 2003.

Banks, M., and Mitchell, C. *Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. London: Pinter, 1996.

Barash, D. and Webel, C. *Peace and Conflict Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.

Beah, I. *a long way gone: memoirs of a boy soldier*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.

Bell, C. *Peace Agreements and Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Bloomfield, D. *Peacemaking Strategies in Northern Ireland: Building Complementarity in Conflict Management Theory*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997.

Bolton, R. *People Skills: How to Assert Yourself, Listen to Others and Resolve Conflicts*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1986.

Botes, J. "Conflict Transformation: A Debate over Semantics or a Crucial Shift in the Theory and Practice of Peace and Conflict Studies?" *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 2003, 8 (2), 1–28.

Boulding, E. "Can Peace be Imagined?" In J. Fahey and R. Armstrong (eds.), *A Peace Reader: Essential Readings on War, Justice, Non-Violence and World Order*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1992.

Boulding, E. *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

Boulding, E. *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1990a.

Boulding, K. *Three Faces of Power*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990b.

Boulding, K. "Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung." *Journal of Peace Research*, 1977, 14 (1), 75–86.

Brock-Utne, B. *Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective*. New York, NY: Pergamon, 1985.

Broome, B. "Building Relational Empathy through an Interactive Design Process." In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, and J. Senehi (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Burton, J. *Human Needs*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Burrowes, R. *The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense: A Gandhian Approach*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1996.

Busch, R. B. and Folger, J. *The Promise of Mediation: Responding to Conflict through Empowerment and Recognition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1994.

Byrne, S. *Economic Assistance and the Northern Ireland Conflict: Building the Peace Dividend*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2009.

Byrne, S. "Transformational Conflict Resolution and the Northern Ireland Conflict." *International Journal on World Peace*, 2001a, 28 (2), 3–22.

Byrne, S. "Consociational and Civic Society Approaches to Peace-building in Northern Ireland." *Journal of Peace Research*, 2001b, 38 (2), 327–352.

Byrne, S. "Power Politics As Usual in Cyprus and Northern Ireland: Divided Islands and the Roles of External Ethno-Guarantors." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 2000, 6 (1), 1–23.

Byrne, S. *Growing Up in a Divided Society: The Impact of Conflict on Belfast Schoolchildren*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1997.

Byrne, S. "Conflict Regulation or Conflict Resolution: Third Party Intervention in the Northern Ireland Conflict—Prospects for Peace." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 1995, 7 (2), 1–24.

Byrne, S., and Carter, N. "Social Cubism: Six Social Forces of Ethnoterritorial Politics in Northern Ireland and Quebec." *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 1996, 3 (2), 1–24.

Byrne, S., Carter, N., and Senehi, J. "Social Cubism and Social Conflict: Analysis and Resolution." *Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 2003, 8 (3), 725–740.

Byrne, S., and Irvin, C. (eds.) with assoc. eds. P. Dixon, B. Polkinghorn, and J. Senehi. *Reconcilable Differences: Turning Points in Ethnopolitical Conflict*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian, 2000.

Byrne, S., and Keashly, L. "Working With Ethno-Political Conflict: A Multi-Modal Approach." *International Peacekeeping*, 2000, 7 (1), 97–120.

Byrne, S., and Senehi, J. "Conflict Analysis and Resolution as a Multidiscipline: A Work in Progress." In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, and J. Senehi (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*, London: Routledge, 2009a.

Byrne, S., and Senehi, J. "Revisiting the CAR Field." In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, and J. Senehi (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*, London: Routledge, 2009b.

Carpenter, S., and Kennedy, W. *Managing Public Disputes: A Practical Guide to Handling Conflict and Reaching Agreement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Carter, J., Irani, G., and Volkan, V. (eds.). *Regional and Ethnic Conflicts: Perspectives from the Front Lines*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2009.

Chandler, D. *From Kosovo to Kabul: Human Rights and International Intervention*. London: Pluto, 2002.

Cheldin, S., Druckman, D., and Fast, L. (eds.). *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention*. New York, NY: Continuum, 2003.

Cohen, R. *Negotiating across Cultures: Communication Obstacles in International Diplomacy*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1995.

Curle, A. *Tools for Transformation: A Personal Study*. Wallbridge: Hawthorn Press, 1990.

Darby, J. *The Effects of Violence on Peace Processes*, Washington: United States Institute of Peace, 2001.

Darby, J., and Mac Ginty, R. (eds.). *Contemporary Peacemaking*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003.

Deutsch, M., and Coleman, P. (eds.). *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 2000.

Diamond, L., and McDonald, J. *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press, 1996.

Duffy, K., Grosch, J., and Olczak, P. (eds.). *Community Mediation: A Handbook for Practitioners and Researchers*. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 1991.

Enloe, C. *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2007.

Enloe, C. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001.

Fitzduff, M. *Beyond Violence: Conflict Resolution Processes in Northern Ireland*. Tokyo: United Nations University, 1996.

Friere, P. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Company, 1999.

Fry, D. *The Human Potential for Peace: An Anthropological Challenge to Assumptions About War and Violence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Gallagher, T. "The Approach of Government: Community Relations and Equity." In S. Dunn (ed.), *Facets of the Conflict in Northern Ireland*. New York, NY: St. Martins Press, 1995.

Galtung, J. *Peace Research, Education, Action*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1975a.

Galtung, J. *Peace and Social Structure*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1975b.

Galtung, J. "Twenty-five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses." *Journal of Peace Research*, 1985, 22 (2), 45–61.

Galtung, J. "Only One Friendly Quarrel with Kenneth Boulding." *Journal of Peace Research*, 1987, 24 (2), 199–203.

Galtung, J. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.

Galtung, J., and others *Searching for Peace: The Road to Transcend*. London: Pluto, 2002

Gandhi, M. "Ahimsa, or the Way of Nonviolence." In J. Fahey and R. Armstrong (eds.), *A Peace Reader: Essential Readings On War, Justice, Non-Violence and World Order*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1992.

Gopin, M.. *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Gray, B. *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1989.

Greenspan, M. *Healing through the Dark Emotions: The Wisdom of Grief, Fear, and Despair*. Boston: Shambhala, 2003.

Gurr, T. R. *Peoples versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2000.

Helsing, J., with Kirlic, N., McMaster, N. and Sonnenschein, N. "Young People's Activism and the Transition to Peace: Bosnia, Northern Ireland, and Israel." In S. McEvoy-Levy (ed.), *Troublemakers or Peacemakers? Youth and Post-Accord Peace Building*, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

Hocker, J., and Wilmot, W. *Interpersonal Conflict*. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark, 1995.

Homer-Dixon, T. *Carbon Shift: How the Twin Crises of Oil Depletion and Climate Change Will Define the Future*. Mississauga, ON: Random House, 2009.

Hughes, J. "Community Relations in Northern Ireland: Lessons From Druncree." *Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1998, 24 (3), 1–24.

Hume, J. *A New Ireland: Politics, Peace and Reconciliation*. Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart, 1996.

Irvin, C. *Militant Nationalism: Between Movement and Party in Northern Ireland and the Basque Country*. Duluth, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Jeong, H. W. *Conflict Management and Resolution: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Jeong, H. W. *Understanding Conflict and Conflict Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008.

Jeong, H. W. *Peace and Conflict Studies: An Introduction*. London: Ashgate, 2000.

Kaldor, M. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Katz, N., and Lawyer, J. *Communication and Conflict Resolution Skills*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1992.

Kelman, H. “Negotiating National Identity and Self-Determination in Ethnic Conflicts: The Choice Between Pluralism and Ethnic Cleansing.” *Negotiation Journal*, 1997, 21 (1), 327–340.

Knox, C., and Hughes, J. “Crossing the Divide: Community Relations in Northern Ireland.” *Journal of Peace Research*, 1996, 33 (1), 73–98.

Kolb, D. (ed.) *When Talk Works: Profiles of Mediators*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1994.

Kolb, D., and Coolidge, G. “Her Place at the Table: A Consideration of Gender Issues in Negotiation.” In W. Breslin and J. Rubin (eds.), *Negotiation Theory and Practice*. Boston, MA: Program on Negotiation Books, 1991.

Kriesberg, L., Northrup, T., and Thorson, S. (eds.). *Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1989.

Kriesberg, L. "Conflict Transformation." In L. Kurtz (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1999.

Kriesberg, L. *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.

Kriesberg, L. *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

Kriesberg, L. "The Development of the Conflict Resolution Field." In W. Zartman and L. Rasmussen (eds.), *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

Kriesberg, L. "The Growth of the Conflict Resolution Field." In C. Crocker, F. Osler Hampson, and P. Aall (eds.), *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2001.

Leatherman, J., and Griffin, N. "Ethical and Gendered Dilemmas of Moving from Emergency Response to Development in 'Failed' States." In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, and J. Senehi (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Lederach, J. P. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Conflict Transformation across Societies*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1995.

Lederach, J. P. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

Lederach, J. P. *The Journey toward Reconciliation*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1999.

Lederach, J. P. *The Moral Imagination*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Lentz, T. (ed.) *Humanatroitism: Human Interests in Peace and Survival*. St. Louis: The Future Press, 1976.

Lewicki, R., Saunders, D. and Minton, J. *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises, and Cases*. New York, NY: Irvin McGraw Hill, 1999.

Loizos, P. *Iron in the Soul: Displacement, Livelihood and Health in Cyprus*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2008.

Love, M. T. *Peace Building through Reconciliation in Northern Ireland*. Aldershot: Avebury, 1995.

MacGinty, R., and Richmond, O. (eds.). *The Liberal Peace and Post-War Reconstruction: Myth or Reality?* London: Routledge, 2009.

McCandless, E. "Engaging Theory Towards Conflict Transformation: The Case of Northern Ireland," *Cantilevers*, 1999, 6 (1), 1-2.

McEvoy-Levy, S. (ed.). *Troublemakers or Peacemakers? Youth and Post-Accord Peace Building*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 2006.

McGoldrick, A., and Lynch, J. *Peace Journalism*. Stroud: Hawthorn Press, 2005.

Maynard, K. *Healing Communities in Conflict*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1999

Mazurana, D., and others (eds.). *Gender, Conflict, and Peacekeeping*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005

Minnow, M. *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1998.

Moore, C. *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1996.

Mortenson, G., and Relin, D. *Three Cups of Tea: One Man's Mission to Promote Peace and Conflict Studies* • Volume 17, Number 1

Peace... One School at a Time. New York: Penguin, 2008

Nordstrom, C. *Shadows of War.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.

Northrup, T. "The Uneasy Partnership Between Conflict Theory and Feminist Theory." *Unpublished Manuscript*, 1996.

O'Byrne, D. *Human Rights: An Introduction.* Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited, 2003.

O'Leary, B., and McGarry, J. *The Politics of Antagonism: Understanding Northern Ireland.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone Press, 1993.

Olson-Lounsherry, M., and Pearson, F. *Civil Wars: Internal Struggles, Global Consequences.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Paris, R. *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Pearson, F., and Olson-Lounsherry, M. "The Challenge of Operationalizing Key Concepts in Conflict Resolution Theory in International and Subnational Conflicts." In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, and J. Senehi (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*, London: Routledge, 2009.

Polkinghorn, B., and Byrne, S. "Between War and Peace: An Examination of Conflict Management Styles in Four Conflict Zones." *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 2001, 12 (1), 23–46.

Porter, E. *Peacebuilding: Women in International Perspective.* London: Routledge, 2007.

Power, S. "A Problem from Hell": *America and the Age of Genocide.* New York: Perennial, 2003.

Pugh, M. (ed). *The Regeneration of War-Torn Societies.* Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000

Ramsbotham, O., Miall, H., and Woodhouse, T. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*, 2nd Edition. Oxford: Polity, 2005.

Reychler, L., and Paffenholz, T. (eds.). *Peace-building: A Field Guide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2001.

Rice, B. "Restorative Processes of Peace and Healing Within the Governing Structures of the Rotinonshonni Longhouse People," In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, and J. Senehi (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution* London: Routledge, 2009.

Rieff, D. *At the Point of a Gun: Democratic Dreams and Armed Intervention*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 2005.

Ross, M. H. *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Ross, M. H. *The Management of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Rothman, J. *Resolving Identity Based Conflict in Nations, Organizations, and Communities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1997.

Ruane, J., and Todd, J. *The Dynamics of Conflict in Northern Ireland: Power, Conflict and Emancipation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Rupesinghe, K. (ed.). *Conflict Transformation*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995.

Rupesinghe, K. *Civil Wars, Civil Peace*. London: Pluto, 1998.

Ryan, S. *The Transformation of Violent Intercommunal Conflict*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Sandole, D., Byrne, S., Sandole-Staroste, I., and Senehi, J. (eds.). *Handbook of Conflict*

Analysis and Resolution, London: Routledge, 2009.

Sapon-Shevin, M. *Because We Can Change the World: A Practical Guide to Building Cooperative, Inclusive Classroom Communities*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.

Schirch, L. *Ritual and Symbol in Peacebuilding*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2004.

Schwartz, R. *The Skilled Facilitator: Practical Wisdom for Developing Effective Groups*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1994.

Schwerin, E. *Mediation, Citizen Empowerment, and Transformational Politics*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995.

Senehi, J., and Byrne, S. "From Violence Toward Peace: The Role of Storytelling for Youth Healing and Political Empowerment After Conflict." In S. McEvoy-Levy (ed.), *Troublemakers or Peacemakers? Youth and Post-Accord Peace Building*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 2006.

Sharp, G. *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*. Boston: Extending Horizons Books, 2005.

Smock, D. (ed.). *Perspectives on Pacifism: Christian, Jewish, and Muslim Views on Nonviolence and International Conflict*, Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1995.

Smock, D. (ed.). *Interfaith Dialogue and Peacebuilding*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2002.

Snyder, A. *Setting the Agenda for Global Peace: Conflict and Consensus Building*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2003.

Snyder, J. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company, 2000.

Stedman, S. "Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes." *International Security*, 1997, 22 (2), 5–53.

Stephens, J. "Gender Conflict: Connecting Feminist Theory and Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice." In A. Taylor, and J. Beinstein Miller (eds.) *Conflict and Gender*. New York, NY: Hampton, 1994.

Strobel, W. "Information and Conflict." In C. Crocker, F. Osler Hampson, and P. Aall. (eds.), *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001.

Sylvester, C. "Some Dangers in Merging Feminist and Peace Projects." *Alternatives*, 1987, 12 (4), 493–509.

Talentino, A. *Military Intervention after the Cold War: The Evolution of Theory and Practice*. Columbus, OH: Ohio University Press, 2005.

Tannen, D. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York, NY: Ballantine, 1990.

Turpin, J., and Kurtz, L. (eds.). *The Web of Violence: From Interpersonal to Global*. Champagne, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Tuso, H. "Indigenous Processes of Conflict Resolution in Oromo Society," In W. Zartman (ed.), *Traditional Cures for Modern Conflicts: African Conflict Medicine*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Umbreit, M. *Mediating Interpersonal Conflicts: Approaches to Peacemaking for Families, Schools, Workplaces, and Communities*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006.

Ury, W. *The Third Side: Why We Fight and How We Can Stop*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2000.

Ury, W., Brett, J. and Goldberg, S. *Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing Systems to Cut the Costs of Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Project on Negotiation Books, 1993.

Vayrynen, R. (ed.). *New Directions in Conflict Theory: Conflict Resolution and Conflict Transformation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1991.

Volkan, V. *Blood Lines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.

Webel, C., and Galtung, J. (eds) *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Weeks, D. *The Eight Essential Steps to Conflict Resolution: Preserving Relationships at Work, at Home, and in the Community*. New York, NY: Penguin Putnam, 1992.

Wiesel, E. *Night*. Translated by Stella Rodway. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961.

Woolpert, S., Daryl Slaton, C., and Schwerin, E. (eds.). *Transformational Politics: Theory, Study, and Practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Yang, H. "The Concept of Trust and Trustbuilding." *A Leadership Journal: Women in Leadership-Sharing the Vision*, 1998 2, (2), 1–24.

Yarrow, M. *Quaker Experiences in International Conciliation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978.

Introduction to the Special Issues

Ziegler, W. *Ways of Enspiriting: Transformative Practices for the Twenty-First Century.*

Denver, CO: FIA International, 1995.