UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS, PRAGUE
FACULTY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

MASTER'S THESIS

2014 Stanislava Bodenbender

UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS, PRAGUE
FACULTY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Program: International and Diplomatic Studies

The Role of Religious Leaders in Conflict Transformation

(Master's Thesis)

Author: Stanislava Bodenbender, B.A.

Supervisor: Mgr. D.E.A. Nicolas Maslowski, Ph.D.

Declaration: Herewith I declare that I have written the Master's Thesis on my own and have cited all sources.

Prague, 28 April, 2014

………………..
Student's Signature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
CCM	Christian Council of Mozambique
CELAM	The Regional Conference of Latin American Bishops
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
FRELIMO	Mozambique Liberation Front, Marxist-Leninist political party
JPi	Just Peacemaking Initiative at Fuller Theological Seminary
MCC	Mennonite Central Committee
NGOs	Non-governmental organizations
RENAMO	Mozambican National Resistance, anti-Communist party
TPU	TRANSCEND Peace University
USIP	United States Institute of Peace

Introduction

Religion has often been viewed as a source of conflict and violence in international relations. The relationship between religion and violence in general became a central concern for scholars and policy makers, especially after the September 11, 2001, attacks in the United States. However, history indicates that religion has also been a source and inspiration for peace building and non-violent resistance.

The topic of religion as a cause of many of the world's violent conflicts has been peppered with provocative anti-Christian, anti-Jew, or anti-Muslim statements in the media often retreating into the shadows of stereotyping and ostracizing. Almost daily the media are filled with news of growing religious radicalism. Conversely, the role of religion as a solution rather than a cause has gone unnoticed. There are of course exceptions related to the Dalai Lama, Gandhi, Archbishop Tutu, or Martin Luther King Jr., as their roles in non-violent peace activism deserved much-earned attention. They all have pushed the international community toward greater commitment to human rights and compassion for human life regardless of race or ethnicity. But where are the stories of those reverends, pastors, deacons, bishops, priests, monks, rabbis, imams, or elders who commit themselves entirely in the long-term process of transforming the hearts and minds of people deeply involved in conflicts? They represent a growing structure of religious leaders at different levels and courageously seek to promote peaceful transformation from the middle-range or grassroots level.

Within the context of the field of International Relations (IR), Sandal (2001) points out that the role of religious actors in *conflict transformation* is a relatively new area of academic research. Kadayifci-Orellana (2009) states that since 1990s *conflict resolution* scholars have conducted some significant studies and analyses, yet a systematic and comprehensive assessment of religious actors' (leaders') roles as they intersect with various conflict theories has not been undertaken. Luttwak supports this line of thinking by pointing that "the role of religious leaders in conflict resolution (transformation) has been disregarded – or treated as a marginal phenomenon hardly worth noting (1994: 10)."

Lastly, Appleby informs that "identifying and documenting the roles of the full complement of religious actors in recent settings remains an unfinished task (2000:

227).” This thesis is an attempt to meet such a challenge by focusing on religious leaders and their role in contributing to a search for sustainable solutions to end the problem interwoven in deeply rooted conflicts. Working from the premise that religious leaders can make a substantial contribution in conflict transformation, the overarching aim of the thesis is to examine what roles religious actors/leaders play and how equipped they are to serve their communities in their capacity as peacemakers.

To explore the positive potential of religion in conflict transformation, this thesis will highlight specific situations in which religious leaders played a positive role in transforming protracted conflicts. The author draws attention to many specific examples, but acknowledges that they are inherently subjective. Therefore, the final judgment must rest with the reader.

Chapter one, *From Conflict Resolution toward Conflict Transformation,* will deal entirely with theoretical concepts and will strive to provide answers to the following questions: What is *conflict resolution*? What is *conflict transformation*? Are these considered two separate fields? Or, are they rather understood as conceptually different terms? How is *conflict management* different from *conflict resolution*?

Chapter two, *Defining the Role of Religious Leaders in Conflict Transformation,* attempts to outline specific roles religious leaders can play in *conflict transformation* from a perspective of a third-party involvement. Due to space limitations, it does not offer an exhaustive list of religious leaders' roles, but provides a solid analysis of three considered to be the most frequent. A Bible-based working definition of a religious leader will be introduced. Lederach's model on leadership will be chosen to explain leadership arrangements in protracted conflicts. The model suggests three levels of leadership: top, middle-range, and grassroots level leadership. From a perspective of a third-party involvement, three specific roles for religious leaders' involvement in *conflict transformation* will be further analyzed: mediator/intermediary, inter-faith dialogue facilitator, and advocate. Within mediation theory and practice, two prevailing models of mediator types: *outsider-neutral* and *insider-partial* will be analyzed. Within the context of an *outsider-neutral* mediator, a role of a faith-based diplomat will be introduced. Also the use of religious symbolism (e.g., prayer or fasting) in the process of mediation will be explored. Analysis of an interfaith dialogue facilitator first offered classification of

dialogues in inter-group conflicts designed by Ropers. Besides Ropers, a model adapted by the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Movement will be analyzed in the context of the interfaith dialogue facilitator. To present one example of how religious leaders can be involved in non-violent activism, the role of an advocate will be explored.

Chapter three, *Religious Leaders' Preparation for Conflict Transformation,* will offer a window into the realm of training opportunities for religious leaders. Apart from defining training, analysis of two main models of training approaches, *prescriptive* and *elicitive,* will be explored. Lederach's *transformative training model* will be further analyzed as one model designed based on an *elicitive* training approach. The chapter will conclude with a vignette of specific up-to-date offer of training opportunities for religious leaders.

Books represent the largest group of sources used in this thesis. Because of limited access to literature on the topic of *conflict resolution* and *transformation*, mediation, and in general sources in conflict and peace studies in the Czech Republic, the author has obtained the majority of printed sources from the library at Sabancı University during her study abroad. The International Baptist Library in Prague provided the second largest amount of sources needed. The remaining sources were found in libraries at Charles University in Jinonice and Celetná, University of Economics in Prague, Prague's Institute of International Relations, African Information Center in Prague, and American Center at the United States Embassy in Prague. A number of online scholarly articles, as well as practitioners' manuals, also provided invaluable case studies as well as theoretical analysis of conflict resolution, management, and transformation.

One publication has been instrumental for the author's choice to research the role of religious leaders in *conflict transformation*[1]. In his 2007 book *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution,* David Little edits 14 stories of peacemakers with different cultural and religious backgrounds. One of the stories has especially captivated the author's attention and sparked an ever-curious interest to learn more, to find out what happened and why it happened the way it did.

Little tells the story of Cybermonk, a common nickname for Father Sava Janjic, a Serb-Orthodox monk who lived a quiet and ordinary life as secretary to Bishop Artemije

---

[1] Use of italics is meant to understand *conflict transformation* as a field

– head of the Serbian Orthodox Church for the diocese encompassing Kosovo. Equipped with two computers, an Internet connection, a short-wave radio, and excellent English, he daily sent out a large amount of emails to journalists and diplomats, for whom he became the only reliable source reporting on-the-ground perspective of the conflict in Kosovo. Religious duty along with Orthodox Church teachings underlined his bold decision to speak out and condemn the perpetrators of violence. Besides the role of a journalist, he wore many other hats within the conflict setting from the grassroots level, such as a diplomat, unofficial media spokesperson of the Serbian Orthodox Church, shelter provider (for both Serbian and Albanian refugees), outspoken opponent of Milosevic, writer, and lobbyist. After months of playing many various roles and seeing no fruit, Father Sava pushed himself into a state of complete physical and psychological exhaustion.

After reading Father Sava's story, many questions demanded answers. Why did he take on so many roles? Besides Bishop Artemije, were there others who joined his efforts? What kind of spiritual and physical support has he received from fellow monks or fellow Serbs? A thorough online search failed to produce a phone number or email address, but after a few months and through other channels, the author connected with Father Sava via phone in April 2014. When requested an opportunity to ask questions, Father kindly declined and explained that he no longer gives interviews.

1. From Conflict Resolution toward Conflict Transformation

Conflict *resolution…*conflict *management…,* but conflict *transformation*? This is exactly how Lederach starts his book *The Little Book of Conflict Transformation.* The author of this thesis decided to use Lederach's question as an opening for this introductory paragraph of chapter one. It suggests in a very simple way certain familiarity with the two terms whereas the meaning of the last term suggests something new. Based on extensive research of multiple scholarly sources in English, with the exception of a very few written in Czech, the author decided to explain the term *conflict transformation* as a concept developed out of what is represented by the term *conflict resolution.* This first chapter is divided into six subchapters, which analyze both *conflict*

resolution and conflict transformation. For better demarcation of *conflict resolution,* comparison with *conflict management* will be helpful.

1.1 *Conflict Resolution* as a Field

Quite a number of scholars explain *conflict resolution* as a field. Kriesberg (1997) describes the field as rapidly expanding and not at all to be considered a narrowly defined discipline. A few years later he expands his definition of *conflict resolution* field and describes it as "a vigorous, evolving field of endeavor, encompassing a great variety of perspectives and methods (Kriesberg, 2001: 420)." Thus, the field of *conflict resolution* includes long-term strategies, short-term tactics, and actions by adversaries as well as by mediators. It is based on the work of academic analysts and official and non-official practitioners (Kriesberg, 1997: 51).

Bercovitch, Kremenyuk, and Zartman support this line of thinking and describe the field of CR as a "vibrant, interdisciplinary field where theory and practice pace real-world events (2009: 1)." Furthermore, they explain that "scholars working on *conflict resolution* study the phenomenon of conflict and analyze ways to bring it under control, bringing their insights and concepts to bear on actual conflicts, be they domestic or international, so as to foster better and more effective relations between states and people. *Conflict resolution* is about ideas, theories, and methods that can improve our understanding of conflict and our collective practice of reduction in violence and enhancement of political processes for harmonizing interests."

Bureš is another scholar who interprets *conflict resolution* as a field, and as such is concerned with researching the cause, course, and consequences of conflict and its possible constructive solutions (2007: 24). Kriesberg (2001) supports this line of thinking by pointing out the field's orientation to conduct conflicts constructively, adding the importance of creativity. The goal is to minimize violence, overcome hostility between adversaries, reach mutually acceptable outcomes, and achieve enduring settlements.

There is an ongoing debate among individual authors about the exact demarcation of the field itself and its relation to closely linked disciplines of peace research and peace

studies (Bureš 2007: 24). In spite of this debate, within a broader context of international relations, the field of *conflict resolution* is considered to be a multidisciplinary field. As such it draws upon various disciplines such as psychology, mass communication, development studies, studies of international institutions, political science, mostly from the field of international relations. Consequently, the field of *conflict resolution* is mostly understood as a sub-field of the field of international relations, but as mentioned it overlaps with other disciplines (Waisová 2005: 13). Even though the topic of *conflict resolution* has been studied for decades, in the Czech (not only academic) environment it is still looking for its own place as Waisová puts it, "The field of *conflict resolution* in international relations is a rookie[2] within the Czech environment (2005: 13)."

1.1.1 Development

Bureš (2007) estimates that the field of *conflict resolution* has more than a 50 year-old tradition. Kriesberg dates the beginning of *conflict resolution* field even earlier. When examining the growth of the *conflict resolution* field, Kriesberg (1997, 2001) and Waisová (2005) demarcate four time periods:

1. 1914 – 45 (precursors);
2. 1946 – 69 (early efforts and basic research);
3. 1970 – 85 (crystallization and expansion);
4. 1986 – up to present (extension, diffusion, and institutionalization [1997]; differentiation and institutionalization [2001]).[3]

In a 2010 essay *Conflict Analysis and Resolution as a Field*, Kriesberg takes a third look at the evolution of the field's development, which results in changing not only the time period of the third and fourth phase, but also general titles of these two phases:

1. 1914-45 (preliminary beginnings);
2. 1946-69 (emergence of the field);
3. 1970-89 (expansion and institutionalization)
4. 1990-2009 (diffusion and differentiation).

---

[2] Translated by author from Czech word "nováček"
[3] For a detailed list of significant publications and events in the growth of the conflict resolution field see Appendix 1

1.1.2 Principles and Goals

The first fundamental principle highlighted within the field of *conflict resolution* is conflict analysis. Avruch emphasizes that "effective conflict resolution depends upon conflict analysis (2003: 175)". For effective conflict analysis it is imperative to take into account culture, for many ethnic, class, religious, or gender-based conflicts are 'intercultural' in nature, which might not at first be evident. Much of the research on the role of culture in resolving conflicts is focused on intercultural negotiation[4] and communication[5] (Avruch 2003: 175). Ross explains that culturally sensitive conflict resolution pays attention to the images, encodements, schemas, and metaphors (1993). Lederach also points out the vital importance of culture in conflict analysis. As a result of his extensive ethnographic practice in resolving conflicts, he suggests to apply 'elicitive model' when conducting conflict analysis. This model draws on local indigenous techniques and resources to help in understanding the role of culture in deeply rooted conflicts (Lederach, 1995: 29-31).[6]

Besides the importance of culture in conflict analysis, an effective in-depth conflict analysis ought to include:

1. Analysis of conflict dynamics, for conflicts go through various stages and each stage requires different resolution tools.

2. Analysis of conflict causes, for uncovering the causes of conflicts is a necessary condition for its successful resolution.

3. Analysis of both rational and strategic calculations of conflict actors, for conflict and its environment are, up to a certain point, a social construction of actors who possess their own rationality (Waisová, 2005: 31).

Spangler (2003) points out the importance of analytical problem-solving approach when conducting an in-depth analysis, which goal is to identify the roots of conflicts.

---

[4] "High-context" v. "low-context" communication by Hall (1976)
[5] Hofstede's research on intercultural communication
[6] Detailed analysis of Lederach's *elicitive model* will be in Chapter 3 of this thesis under 3.2. Training Approaches

Fundamental causes of conflicts can often be embedded in institutional structure of a society; thus, achieving changes within the structural design can be a long, labor-intensive process.

Conflict analysis is not the only way to achieve effective resolution of conflicts. The second fundamental principle within the field of *conflict resolution* is a process of transforming or rebuilding relationships. Rubinstein explains that the purpose of *conflict resolution* is not only helping to find solutions, but also assisting conflicting parties to repair, rebuild, or form new normative systems (2003:196). Waisová supports this line of thinking by stressing the importance of transforming relationships between adversaries, so that resolving one conflict will not become a cause for starting another one (2005: 31).

Within the process of transformation, parties can be helped to analyze, explore, and reframe their interests and positions in order to bring about a mutually acceptable and constructive outcome. Yet, especially in identity-based conflicts, parties might potentially reframe their interests and positions, but they will not compromise on their fundamental needs (Burton human needs theory).

One of the other important aspects in transforming or rebuilding relationships is an intervention by a third party. Within the field of *conflict resolution*, emphasis is put on intervention by skilled third parties working unofficially with conflicting parties. Third parties aid in identifying what the roots of the conflict really are, along with exploring creative solutions conflicting parties may have overlooked in their commitment to established positions. Finding effective solutions depends on how parties can arrive at positive-sum constructive outcomes rather than be set in zero-sum situations. The overarching aim is to invent "processes of conflict resolution that appear to be acceptable to parties in dispute, and effective in resolving conflict (Miall, 2004)". A skilled mediator can be instrumental in helping parties to achieve effective resolution as he/she encourages the parties to clarify the conflict to one another from their perspectives. As an outcome, it is often the case that the parties are able to find win-win solutions. Often other parties are able to find win-win solutions, in which case attention has to be paid to *structural violence*[7] and injustices between various societal groups. Dealing with the

---

[7] For detailed information about "structural violence" see *Peace and Conflict Studies 3rd edition* ed. by David Barash and Charles Webel (2014: 1).

causes of conflict and finding sustainable resolution leads to *positive peace*[8] (Harris, 2011: 123-5).

1.2 *Conflict Resolution* as a Term

Some scholars answer the question of what *conflict resolution* is by explaining it as a term rather than a social science field. Ramsbotham *et al.* define *conflict resolution* as a comprehensive term referring to the address and transformation of deeply rooted conflicts. The term *conflict resolution* is used to refer both to the outcome and process. Thanks to the dual meaning of this term, using it without proper clarification can surely result in ambiguity. Therefore, it is imperative that scholars always in their articles pay special attention to clarifying used terminology to eliminate any potential sources of ambiguity.

Besides an outcome and process, the term *conflict resolution* can also refer to activities carried out by practitioners in the field. Thus, from the practitioners' point of view, *conflict resolution* includes "activities undertaken over the short term and medium term dealing with, and aiming at, overcoming the deep-rooted causes of conflict, including the structural, behavioral, or attitudinal aspects of the conflict. The process focuses more on the relationships between the parties than the content of a specific outcome (*Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation* 2004)".

Other authors explain *conflict resolution* as a term within the context of a continuum. Generally, on one end there is *conflict settlement*[9], then *conflict management*[10], further down the spectrum is *conflict resolution*, and on the other end is *conflict transformation* (Botes, 2003). On the contrary, Ramsbotham *et al.*, explain *conflict resolution* as an umbrella term that encompasses *conflict management* and *conflict transformation* as well as peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding. From this perspective, *conflict resolution* includes everything from prevention to reconciliation (2011: 31).

---

[8] For detailed comparative analysis between *positive peace* and *negative peace* see *Peace and Conflict Studies 3rd edition* ed. by David Barash and Charles Webel (2014: 7).

[9] Defined by Fisher (in *Working with Conflict*, 2000) as "ending violent behavior by reaching a peace agreement"

[10] For more information on *conflict management* see Box 1 *Conflict resolution* versus *conflict management* on pg. 10

1.3 Conflict Resolution versus Conflict Management

Box 1	*Conflict resolution* versus *conflict management*

From scholars' perspective:

Conflict resolution and *conflict management* are both based on very different approaches toward peace and thus should never be used interchangeably. While *conflict resolution* approach first and foremost considers the necessity to remove causes of conflict in order to establish long-lasting peace, *conflict management* pursues more limited goals as it only tries to stop the fighting and/or lessen ongoing violence. There are also differences between those two terms in relation to an understanding of peace. Accordingly, peace in the context of *conflict management* is about the absence of violence, whereas in *conflict resolution* it is understood as more than mere absence of violence (Bureš, 2007: 9). Similarly, Wallenstein finds it necessary to distinguish between these two terms. *Conflict resolution's* goal is to focus on bringing agreement whereas *conflict management's* focus is on ending the fight and containing the conflict (2003: 53).

Other scholars explain *conflict management* approach in relation to conflict types. In conflicts between states, it might be sufficient to employ *conflict management* techniques crafted to end hostilities and separate conflicting parties. Yet when it comes to internal conflicts, a transition from *conflict management* to healing and reconciliation is needed (Sampson, 1997: 275). Likewise, Cliffe and White also demarcate the definition of *conflict management* as it relates to conflict typology. They define *conflict management* as "actions taken to mitigate or contain ongoing violent conflict (2002: 46)." Here, the goals of these actions are to limit the scale of destruction and suffering while preventing spillover into neighboring regions and countries at the same time (Cliffe and White, 2002: 47).

When defining *conflict management* in relation to the very nature of conflicts, scholars refer to violent conflicts as an "ineradicable consequence of differences of values and interests within and between communities (Miall, 2004)." Because the causes of violence evolve from instituted distribution of power, historical relationships and set-up institutional structures, the best that can be done with conflicts is to manage them. Thus, some argue that *conflict management* is the "art of appropriate intervention". Appleby's explanation of *conflict management* is along the same line, as he sees *conflict management* as "prevention of conflict from becoming violent or expanding to other arenas (2000: 212)".

For Bloomfield and Reilly, *conflict management* is "the positive and constructive handling of difference and divergence" (Miall, 2004). It addresses conflict in a constructive way with focus on how to bring opposing sides together, and how to draw an achievable and cooperative system for management of difference rather than advocating for various intervention methods to eliminate conflict (Miall, 2004).

From practitioners' perspective:

Caritas Internationalis in *Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual* defines *conflict management* as "any effort made to contain violent conflict, reduce the levels of violence, or engage parties in a process to settle the conflict (2002: 22)." The glossary part of *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation* looks at *conflict management* in terms of activities that limit, mitigate, and contain open conflicts (2004).

1.4 *Conflict Transformation* as a Field

       Conflict transformation as a field of study and practice surfaced in the early 1990s even though as a reality it has prevailed throughout human history. Despite incorporating some of the main ideas of the contemporary *conflict resolution* approach, the field of *conflict transformation* concentrates on large-scale protracted conflicts and how they change so that they are conducted constructively. The term *conflict transformation* encompasses both the processes of transition to non-destructive conduct and relationships between opposing parties (Kriesberg, 2011: 50). Kriesberg argues that the concept of *conflict transformation* "should be viewed in the context of the much broader approach to managing and resolving social conflicts, generally identified as *conflict resolution* (2011: 50)*. Furthermore, he stresses that the focus of *conflict transformation* is especially on the value of thinking and acting in order to start and maintain transformations. The value of long-term perspective is stressed in continuing transformation efforts. *Conflict transformation* is a process that does not occur smoothly or at the same pace for all parties involved in a conflict. It is a multidimensional process, which takes place at different levels among engaged parties (Kriesberg, 2011: 50).

       When it comes to the evolution of *conflict transformation* field, Kriesberg points to a continuum of perspectives. At one end are morally based principles based on broadly shared interests, and on the other end is a perspective based on long-term self-interest. What is excluded from this continuum of perspectives is a short-term approach and narrowly based self-interest (Kriesberg, 2011: 51).

       According to Botes the interdisciplinary field of peace and conflict studies is still in the process of creating and defining key terminology. In relevant literature, terms such as *conflict management, conflict resolution,* and *conflict transformation* are used interchangeably and arbitrarily. To provide some clarity, various authors have outlined definitions. Miall, for instance, defined *conflict management* as a broad term including all forms of conflict intervention strategies. Others explain the term *conflict resolution* as more of a specific and comprehensive term encompassing the address and resolution of protracted conflicts. More recently has the term *conflict transformation* stirred up some water within the field of conflict studies. Botes points out that "*conflict transformation* refers to the longer term structural, relational, and cultural changes brought about by

conflict resolution" and suggests that in terms of a terminological debate *conflict transformation* is gaining ground (Botes, 2003: 364).

Conflict transformation as such is not a new concept and its interpretation depends very much on one's own conceptual understanding. Mitchell points out that "in the early days of conflict resolution practice, there was a clear understanding that many 'resolutions' certainly implied the need to bring about major structural changes in social systems, countries, and communities, as well as changes in fundamental relationships." Furthermore, without structural changes, "genuinely acceptable, self-supporting and durable 'resolutions' were not sustainable. Mitchell's argument weakens transformationalists who in turn have argued that in order to end conflicts, systemic change is necessary and this is what differentiates transformation from resolution (Botes, 2003: 365).

As a development out of *conflict resolution, conflict transformation* goes beyond *conflict resolution* in terms of requiring deeper and more permanent level of change. The preference for the term *conflict transformation* is underlined by yet another premise, which states that *conflict resolution* theory and practice focus on the dynamics of the conflict itself rather that the system (political, economic, or social) in which the conflict itself is embedded (Botes, 2003: 364-5). Mitchell, on the other hand, disagrees and points to the work of Burton and Dukes in the 1990s, stating that *conflict resolution* strategies analyze the parties' needs and options besides leading up to changes in pre-existing systems and webs of relationships (Botes, 2003: 365).

> "*Conflict transformation* refers to the process of moving from conflict-habituated systems to peace systems. This process is distinguished from the more common term of *conflict resolution* because of its focus on systems change. Social conflicts that are deep-rooted or intractable get these names because the conflict has created patterns that have become part of the social system. With the social system as the unit of analysis, the term "resolution" becomes less appropriate. Transforming deep-rooted conflicts is only partly about "resolving" the issues of the conflict – the central issue is systemic change or transformation.

Systems cannot be "resolved," but they can be transformed, thus we use the term *conflict transformation*[11] (Botes, 2003: 365)."

1.5 *Conflict Transformation* as a Term

Conflict transformation can be defined as "…actions and processes, which seek to alter the various characteristics and manifestations of conflict by addressing the root causes of a particular conflict over the long term. It aims to transform destructive conflict into positive constructive conflict and deals with structural, behavioral and attitudinal aspects of conflict. The term refers to both the process and the completion of the process (Austin et al. 2004: 464-465)."

This definition is applied by the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy. The proponents of conflict transformation theory see this concept of *conflict transformation* as an improvement over *conflict resolution*. They argue that *conflict resolution* allegedly brings a "resolution" of the conflict but in the end sets up the parties for failure, for the system is left behind untouched (Botes, 2003: 365).

Conflict transformation is "a comprehensive term for measures and processes that aim to transform the conflict system with a high degree of violence. *Conflict transformation* aims to change both the structural causes of conflicts and the attitudes and behavior of the conflict actors (Berghof, 2006).

John Paul Lederach and a number of other conflict theorists and practitioners as strong proponents of *conflict transformation,* stand in opposition to those of *conflict management* or *conflict resolution.* Lederach, in particular, argues that *conflict transformation* differs from the other two "because it reflects a better understanding of the nature of conflict itself (Spangler, 2003)". Lederach reasons that *conflict resolution* suggests that conflict is bad, thus something that needs to be stopped. It presupposes conflict to be rather short-term in nature, something that is possible to resolve permanently. *Conflict management*, on the other hand, correctly views conflict as long-term phenomena, which most of the time cannot be resolved quickly. However, what is problematic with *conflict management* is that it presupposes that people can be controlled

---

[11] (http://www.imtd.org/transform.html)

or directed as if they were physical objects (Lederach, 1995: 16-17). Thus Lederach points back toward *conflict transformation* because conflicts cannot simply be controlled or resolved. He explains *conflict transformation* as acknowledging and working with its 'dialectic nature'. First, Lederach stresses that conflict occurs naturally between people involved in relationships. Once conflict takes place, it transforms or changes people, relationships, and events that initially originated the conflict. Moreover, Lederach points out that conflicts alter relationships, modifying communication patterns and models of social organization besides modifying images of self and of the other (1995: 17).

As a prescriptive model, *conflict transformation* implies that the destructive consequences of a conflict can be transformed in a way that relationships, self-images, and social structures get better as a result of a conflict instead of getting worse. Since conflict usually modifies perceptions by highlighting the differences between people and their positions, Lederach considers that effective *conflict transformation* can constructively make use of differences constructively by improving mutual understanding, which is an objective of *conflict transformation* (1995: 18).

Ramsbotham *et al.* argue that, "*conflict transformation* represents the deepest level of *conflict resolution* (2000: Pg. 31)". The argument is pushed even further by claiming that the goal of *conflict resolution* is to *transform* (emphasis added) actual or potential violent conflict into peaceful (nonviolent) processes of political and social change. These processes are unending in nature as new sources and forms of conflicts arise (Ramsbotham *et al,* 2000:32). However, some analysts explain *conflict transformation* as a "significant step beyond *conflict resolution* (Ramsbotham *et al,* 2000:31)".

Putting the terminological debates aside, *conflict transformation* is gradually playing the biggest role in conflict theories as it is perceived as the ultimate goal of conflict resolution. Botes states that the term *conflict transformation* has been in use and found in literature since early 1990s (e.g., Lederach, 1995a; Rupesinghe, 1995a; Vayrynen, 1991, 1999). *Conflict transformation* is always related to social and systemic change. Fisher *et al.* point out that conflict transformation theory presupposes that conflict is caused by inequalities and injustice within social, economic, and cultural frameworks. According to them, the practice of *conflict transformation* aims:

- To change structures and frameworks that cause inequality and injustice, including economic redistribution;

- To improve longer-term relationships and attitudes among the conflict parties; and

- To develop processes and systems that promote empowerment, justice, peace, forgiveness, reconciliation, [and] recognition. (Fisher *et al*., 2000: 9)

Schmid defines *conflict transformation* as "an approach that addresses the structural realities of inequality, rights, and justice, and aims to transform violence and destruction into constructive social change." Additionally, the term *conflict transformation* proposes to focus on the following, ongoing tasks:

- [a] focus on the developmental process of a conflict, rather than on its end-point;

- [an] awareness of how conflict transforms relationships, communication, perceptions, issues, and social organizations;

- [the] intention to transform the conflict from violent expression (in armed conflict and war) to constructive and peaceful expression;

- [a] concentration on the structural transformations in or between societies in order for peace to be sustainable;

- intervention in the resolution processes by combatants themselves, local individuals and communities, and external third parties, in an integrated multi-track framework. (Schmid, 2000: 31)

From this list of transformational tasks, it is evident that the process of *conflict transformation* has an overarching goal of transforming existing structural frameworks. In terms of a third party intervention, it is structure-, process-, and outcome-oriented. Based on this orientation, its goal is to overcome not only physical or behavioral violence but also structural violence as part of a long-term peace-building process (Reimann, 2001).

The notion that contemporary conflicts require more than reframing of positions and recognizing win-win outcomes is strongly advocated for by *conflict transformation* theorists. Furthermore, they point out that the structure of conflicting parties and relationships may be entrenched in a web of conflicting relationships extending beyond

the particular conflict. Thus, *conflict transformation* is about a "process of engaging with and transforming the relationships, interests, discourses and, if necessary, the very constitution of society that supports the continuation of violent conflict" (Miall, 2004). Constructive conflict is understood as a vital catalyst for change. A comprehensive and broad approach, which puts emphasis on supporting groups within the society in conflict rather than for the mediation of an outsider, is recommended by *conflict transformation* scholars. They further acknowledge that transformation of conflict is a gradual process consisting of small steps as well as a series of smaller or larger changes involving a variety of actors playing smaller or larger roles. In the words of Lederach, *conflict transformation* "must actively envision, include, respect, and promote the human and cultural resources from within a given setting. This involves a new set of lenses through which we do not primarily 'see' the setting and the people in it as the 'problem' and the outsider as the 'answer'. Rather, we understand the long-term goal of transformation as validating and building on people and resources within the setting (Miall, 2004)".

1.6 Conflict Transformation Practice

Turning away from individual scholars' perspectives on what accounts for *conflict transformation,* a practitioner's perspective documented in training manuals or handbooks provides further insight into *conflict transformation* strategies. Caritas Internationalis in *Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual* explains "*conflict transformation* goes beyond the concept of conflict resolution in that it requires a transformation of the parties, their relationships to each other, and the structural elements that underlie the conflict. These relationships and social structures are often unjust and unequal, and transforming conflict seeks to alter these structures in ways that build a more just society. It is a term that implies a long-term perspective on conflict and its transformation (2002: 22)." The glossary part of *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation* explains *conflict transformation* as "a generic, comprehensive term referring to actions and processes which seek to alter the various characteristics and manifestations of conflict by addressing the root causes of a particular conflict over the long term. It aims to transform negative destructive conflict into positive constructive

conflict and deals with structural, behavioral and attitudinal aspects of conflict. The term refers to both the process and the completion of the process. As such it incorporates the activities of processes such as *conflict prevention* and *conflict resolution* and goes further than *conflict settlement* and *conflict management* (2004)".

To contribute to the conceptual debate about *conflict transformation*, TransConflict has developed a set of Principles[12]. Besides its contribution to the debate, the set represents a helping hand to individuals and organizations alike to further equip them so they too can make a positive contribution to the field of *conflict transformation*.

The idea of peace-building's connection to structural change, and that transformative peace-building is about forming a vision of change, is in line with transformative practitioners:

"The journey toward transformation and peace building has been a journey toward an understanding that the work of *conflict transformation* and reconciliation involves both the termination of something undesired – violent conflict – and the building of something desired. It is about change, and construction (Lederach, 2000: 55)".

2. Defining the Role of Religious Leaders in Conflict Transformation

"Peace needs no contemplators, it needs actors, people who are willing to get their hands dirty, to get up and do something. The same is true for justice."

Abuna Chacour

This chapter will focus on specific roles religious leaders can play in *conflict transformation* from a perspective of a third-party involvement. Due to space limitations, it will not provide an exhaustive list of religious leaders roles, but rather a deeper analysis of three roles considered by scholars/practitioners to be the most frequent. This chapter is divided into three subchapters. First, a Bible-based working definition of a religious leader will be introduced. Second, as an explanation of leadership structure within a society in the process of transformation, Lederach's model of three levels: top, middle-range, and grassroots level leadership, will be analyzed. Third, from a perspective of a

---

[12] See Appendix 2

third-party involvement, three specific roles of religious leaders in *conflict transformation* will be further analyzed: mediator/intermediary, inter-faith dialogue facilitator, and advocate. Within mediation theory and practice, two prevailing models of mediator types: *outsider-neutral* and *insider-partial* will be examined. Within the context of an *outsider-neutral* mediator, a role of a faith-based diplomat will be introduced. Also, the use of religious symbolism in the process of mediation will be explored.

2.1 Defining a Religious Leader

To begin with, in terms of definition, attention will be given first to how concepts of 'leader' and 'leadership' are defined in the context of leadership theory. Gerzon explains "leadership as an extremely wide range of roles that have profound influence on the world (Gerzon, 2003)." The range is so wide that sometimes the term 'leadership' encompasses almost everyone, which in the business community is even more highlighted by the adoption of the slogan, "Everyone is a leader" (Gerzon, 2003).

Other analysts in the field of leadership theory point out that "leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" or that "leadership studies have suffered from a lack of a common language (Gerzon, 2003)." The English word 'leadership' has its roots in the ancient word 'leith', which means 'to go forth and die', as in battle. According to this definition, those who lead Group 1 to behave violently toward Group 2 are leaders. Even if violence is removed from this equation, a leader still represents some act of mobilizing one group to dominate another. Experts on leadership have attempted to label leadership as 'authentic' and 'transformational', 'ethical' and 'entrepreneurial', 'democratic' and 'collaborative' to have leadership understood in a more positive light.

In the field of conflict studies, Gerzon argues, the term leadership is particularly problematic due to the fact that leaders typically represent their side in conflicts. Thus, leaders themselves can sometimes represent the biggest obstacles in resolving conflict (2003). Many scholars have developed typologies of leaders to differentiate among leaders who exacerbate conflicts. Gerzon in his essay on leadership names quite a few

scholars. He cites Gardner who developed the concept of 'cross-boundary' leaders stressing their capability to work together effectively. Leaders who work efficiently together on behalf of whole organization or community are referred to as 'advocates for the whole'. In situations where leaders effectively connected hostile parties, their leadership was coined as 'bridging' leadership. Last, Gerzon points to Ury, the author of the well-known book *Getting to Yes*, who coined the term 'third-side leadership' to highlight those leaders whose capacity to act has represented a reconciliatory element between opposing parties (Gerzon, 2003).

Due to space limit, this chapter will not offer a comparative analysis of how religious leaders are defined in typically accessible sacred texts, i.e., Bible, Quran, etc. It is for this reason alone that a Bible-based model of leadership has been chosen to create a working definition of religious leaders.

Pastor Dick Woodward (1985) looks at how the Old Testament defines religious leaders by highlighting one example of leadership style based on the book of Nehemiah. Woodward concludes his analysis of Nehemiah as a leader with a detailed outline of ten characteristics. Some of these character traits were selected to create a working definition of a religious leader as to be understood throughout the thesis. Thus, the religious leader is someone with a burden for the work of God, with followers who are involved with him in the work of God, and with a prayer directed toward the work of God. Besides these qualities, one more character trait of the religious leader working in *conflict transformation* is perseverance, or 'stickability' as Woodward calls it.

2.2 Perspectives on Levels of Leadership

Having created the working definition of a religious leader, it is now useful to offer an analysis of how leadership is exemplified within a societal structure. When searching for a suitable model of leadership within the context of religious leaders' roles in *conflict transformation*, Lederach's model was chosen to fit the best. Based on his extensive work as both *conflict transformation* scholar and practitioner, Lederach specifically designed a model (refer to Table 5 below) focusing on explaining leadership arrangements in protracted conflicts (Warfield, 2006: 481). Even though in his model

Lederach does not explicitly focus on religious leadership, examples of religious leaders at all three levels of his model can be found.

Apart from listing a number of actors at each leadership level, Lederach's model pairs up actors with specific approaches to building peace. The following three sub-chapters will provide more detail into this model highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of actors at all three levels of leadership.

Table 1   Perspective on Levels of Leadership

Types of Actors	Approaches to Building Peace
Level 1: Top Leadership	Focus on high-level negotiations
Military/political/religious	Emphasizes cease-fire
Leaders with high visibility	Led by highly visible, single mediator
Level 2: Middle-Range Leadership	Problem-solving workshops
Leaders respected in sectors	Training in conflict resolution
Ethnic/religious leaders	Peace commissions
Academics/intellectuals	Insider-partial teams
Humanitarian leaders (NGOs)	
Level 3: Grassroots Leadership	Local peace commissions
Local leaders	Grassroots training
Leaders of indigenous NGOs	Prejudice reduction
Local health officials	Psychosocial work in postwar trauma
Refugee camp leaders	

Source: Lederach (1997)

2.2.1 Top Leadership

Level one is so-called "top-level" including top leadership in a conflict setting where high-level negotiations are carried out by representatives of the highest level of political, military, and religious leaders. The agreements reached at this level are mostly short-term, carrying the weight of being symbolic. Additionally, activities tied to negotiations, including the negotiation process itself, are conducted under a close watch

of the public (Warfield, 2006: 481). Due to their visibility, they receive a lot of media coverage, thus placing their statements, movements and positions under close scrutiny. The leaders might even find themselves being elevated to celebrity status by intensive publicity. This publicity, high profile attention, and scrutiny further strengthen leaders' legitimacy and allow them to reach out to their constituencies. Conversely, publicity might limit the leaders as well in terms of their effectiveness as they become locked into their positions on their issues within the conflict settings (Maiese, 2003). Maiese points out three reasons for maintaining a strong position:

- The leaders might typically feel pressured to keep a position of strength, with respect to their own constituencies as well as to the adversaries.
- Acceptance of anything less than their publicly stated goals may be perceived as a sign of weakness.
- Their freedom to maneuver might be limited by their fear of losing face.

Maiese raises an important point in relevance to leaders being perceived as having almost exclusive power and influence. The international arena often perceives them as being in a position to make decisions and represent their constituencies. There is a danger of neglecting the possibility of existence of many lower-level leaders who do not see eye to eye with their visible top-level leaders. Maiese also argues that, for example, during the conflicts in Bosnia, Somalia, and Liberia, the power was far more diffuse and its hierarchical structure of operation was unclear. To rely solely on hierarchical leaders for their exclusive power can be misleading as it neglects the possibility that there exist many lower-level leaders who do not stand in line behind the more visible leaders (Maiese, 2003).

2.2.2 Middle-range Leadership

Level two represents middle-range leadership – highly respected members within the particular community, such as NGO leaders, academics, and religious leaders. These individuals often play an important role as they have access to both top-level and grassroots-level leadership (Warfield, 2006: 481).

Lederach is yet another scholar who supports this line of thinking. He also stresses the invaluable importance of the middle-range leaders in their ability to connect the top and bottom levels in the context of peacebuilding. Besides scholars, practitioners also believe that this middle-range leadership has the greatest potential to bring people together to build peace.

In many instances, leaders participated in broader networks within particular communities, thus they are well connected with various other religious groups, academic institutions, or humanitarian organizations. They typically enjoy respect of people from their own community, as they are well recognized and respected within this broader network. As they gain respect from both inside and outside their community, they display an enormous capacity to influence the decisions of policymakers. Their unique position within the whole leadership model predisposes the middle-range leaders for having a special advantage in comparison to top-level and grassroots level. Additionally, the middle-range leaders' power is not derived from military or political capabilities but rather from their relationships, which could be professional, formal, or simply a matter of friendship. As such, these leaders seldom appear in the public eye and they do not depend on visibility to exert influence. As a result, they enjoy the capability to act and move with much more freedom than top-level leaders. When compared with leaders at the grassroots level, the middle-range leaders observe the situations playing out at the grassroots level, but without being constrained by survival demands. Last, middle-range leaders are typically connected with many influential people and, due to belonging to a network of relationships, they may have preexisting relationships with those on the opposite side of the conflict. This provides them with a unique capacity to transform hostile relationships toward building peace (Maiese, July 2003).

2.2.3 Grassroots Leadership

Level three is occupied by indigenous NGO leaders, political leaders at the district level, and religious figures (Warfield, 2006: 481). Ordinary citizens represent the leadership at the grassroots level. Struggle for survival is one of the characteristics at this level in settings of protracted conflicts. Grassroots leaders are people who are actively

involved in local communities. As members of indigenous NGOs, health officials, or refugee camp leaders, they implement local relief projects. These leaders are extensively familiar with the ins and outs of local politics, knowing the local government leaders and their adversaries while at the same time understanding the suffering and fear experienced by the people. In many instances, what is happening at the local level is simply a reflection of the larger conflict. The people generally experience trauma and violence associated with war and they are forced to live in close proximity and interdependency with those who are perceived as enemies. Whereas leaders at the higher levels are typically removed from the daily tensions brought on by conflict, grassroots leaders experience hatred and hostility on an everyday basis (Maiese, October 2003).

Donais and Knorr in their article *Peacebuilding from Below vs. the Liberal Peace: the Case of Haiti* explore how to accomplish better coherence between top-down and bottom-up approach through a case study of one community-based peacebuilding project in Haiti (2013: 54). They argue that for individual grassroots initiatives to make a real difference in reducing violence they must be linked to top-down initiatives with broader national-level processes of peacebuilding, statebuilding, and reconciliation (2013: 56)

Multi-track diplomacy represents a very productive approach toward resolving conflicts, as it is able to establish and maintain communication channels between various layers within society affected by conflict. Furthermore, it serves as a broker of information strengthening trust and building long-term relationships between opposing parties. Experience within the field of *conflict resolution* proved that without a broad consensus among all layers within societies struck by conflict a long-term lasting solution could hardly be achieved (Waisová, 2005: 32).

2.3 Perspectives on Roles

"Conflict opens a path to revelation and reconciliation."

John Paul Lederach

Conflicts are an inevitable part of the human existence. Conflicts and disagreements are usually resolved without violence and often result in an overall

improved situation for all parties involved.   For the purpose of this thesis, the following working definition of conflict has been adopted from Fisher (2000): conflict is a relationship between two or more parties (individuals or groups) who have, or think they have, incompatible goals.

This chapter will analyze three roles religious leaders can play from a third-party intervention perspective: mediator/intermediary, inter-faith dialogue facilitator, and advocate.

2.3.1 Mediator/Intermediary

"Mediation is not only the ability to define and clarify, to separate and discern, to link and reconcile opposites; it is also the capacity to absorb tension, to suffer misunderstanding, to accept rejection, and to bear the pain of others' estrangement."

David Augsburger

Throughout the process of developing a conceptual framework of mediation, religious leaders have contributed in many ways. It was once assumed that if a mediator was successful, he must have intervened from outside the conflict situation. Ramsbotham, Wood and Miall (2011) point out that there has been a shift from seeing third-party intervention as the primary responsibility of external actors toward appreciating the role of internal third party. Besides Track I and Track II diplomacy, they propose Track III diplomacy conducted by indigenous peacemakers. Nowadays, both mediation theory and practice are dominated by two models of mediator types: *outsider-neutral* and *insider-partial.* The former model would fall within Track I and Track II diplomacy whereas the later model would most likely be placed within Track III diplomacy. Both models will be further analyzed in the following two sub-chapters.

2.3.1.1 Outsider-neutral

An *outsider-neutral* mediator is someone who is a third party not connected to the disputants. He gains legitimacy from his or her professional role, and has no investment

in the conflict except mutually acceptable settlement. The concept of impartiality is undoubtedly linked to this model. When interviewed about the role of Christian Council of Mozambique (CCM) in the ending of the Mozambican civil war, Bishop Dinis Sungulane emphasized the necessity of impartiality from religious leaders about politics. To ensure impartiality, the Anglican Church adopted a resolution saying that none of its ministers (i.e. priests, bishops, or deacons) can be associated with any political party. In case of the Mozambican civil war, the main actors were FRELIMO (Mozambique Liberation Front, Marxist-Leninist political party) and RENAMO (Mozambican National Resistance, anti-Communist party). Similar resolution stressing impartiality was later adopted by CCM, a national ecumenical organization of 24 Protestant denominations (Cooper 2009).

Faith-based diplomat is an example of an *outsider-neutral* mediator. Even though the position of a faith-based diplomat is located at the intersection of mediation and Track I diplomacy, it deserves to be included in this thesis. Johnston (2003) asserts that if a position of a faith-based diplomat were ever created within the Foreign Service, it might not have necessarily been filled by religious leaders. However, based on the working definition of a religious leader[13] used in this thesis, it is very likely that a position of a faith-based diplomat can be occupied by religious leaders. That is why faith-based diplomacy deserves to be mentioned in this thesis.

As one of the avid proponents of faith-based diplomacy, Johnston points out five basic characteristics evident in faith-based diplomats' actions. First, the faith-based intermediaries reflect a "conscious dependency on spiritual principles and resources" while conducting peacemaking activities. This particular characteristic is perhaps the most significant way in which faith-based diplomacy differs from the rational-actor model of decision-making. To further illustrate the difference between faith-based diplomacy and Track I (official) diplomacy, Johnston points out that faith-based practitioners can use an array of tools, which are unavailable to their secular counterparts. These spiritual tools can include: prayer, fasting, forgiveness, repentance, and a vast amount of helpful and inspiring references from sacred texts.

---

[13] See pg. 17 of this thesis

The second characteristic of faith-based intermediaries is that they possess a certain spiritual authority. As all intermediaries have to work on establishing legitimacy with all the parties of a conflict, faith-based practitioners gain their legitimacy in one or two ways: either through their connection with a credible religious institution or through the trust created by personal spiritual charisma.

The third characteristic of faith-based diplomats is having a pluralistic heart, which is deeply rooted in their own religious traditions, but which understands and respects the gist of other religious traditions. Faith-based practitioners are not seeking the lowest common denominator but rather appealing to those from different traditions on the basis of peacemaking techniques that exist within their respective religious traditions. If faith-based intermediaries fail to appreciate the differences within religious traditions, they can lose credibility. By the same token, faith-based practitioners whose approach is that all religions are fundamentally the same will risk offending the members of other religions.

The fourth characteristic is "transcendent approach to conflict resolution". Faith-based practitioners may be well trained in conflict analysis, mediation, and negotiation, but they might recognize more fully than their secular counterparts that there are limits to human understanding.

The final, fifth, characteristic of faith-based intermediaries is their "ability to persevere against overwhelming odds". A deep sense of religious calling is behind their motivation to work toward reconciliation and peacemaking. Because the faith-based peacemaker's perseverance is divinely inspired, it tends to be more lasting than of those who work toward peace as part of their profession (Johnston: 2003, 16-18).

In his 2013 article Fisher offers an analysis of a Salesian priest, Father Luis Bolla's role in a conflict setting between different tribes of Achuar people (indigenous people living in the rainforest in Ecuador and Peru). One particular instance of Bolla's mediation between two different Achuar clans serves as a suitable example of how a religious leader can play the role of a faith-based diplomat. Having lived and worked tirelessly among the Achuar people for fifty years, Father Bolla proved to persevere and did not give up even when held at gunpoint. He initiated and then nurtured long-lasting relationships with the Achuar people based on respect for their cultural traditions while

remaining faithful to his own religious faith and dedication to the work of peace. He even carried out a kind of a shuttle diplomacy between two disputing clans. Using one of the first models of voice-recorders he recorded messages from one warrior to the other resulting in peaceful resolution of their conflict.

2.3.1.2 Insider-partial

When working in the regional process of conflict resolution in Central America, Mennonite peacebuilders Wehr and Lederach further developed the profile of mediator to incorporate another mediation model - "*insider-partial*…the mediator from within the conflict (Appleby 2000: 219)." The insider-partial mediator is someone inspiring trust – *confianza*, a quality highly valued in Central American communities precisely because it is someone who is a well-known and highly respected member of the community.

What sets the *insider-partial* mediators apart from *outsider-neutral* mediators is that insider-partial mediators are not just temporarily present in the area affected by deeply rooted conflicts. As such they will have more at stake, for they have to live with whatever the consequences of the negotiations are. In traditional cultural settings where face-to-face interactions continue to describe economic, political, and social relations, insider-partial mediators can play particularly effective roles (Appleby 2000: 219).

Catholic Church religious leaders' mediation in Bolivia nicely exemplified the effectiveness and success of their role as *insider-partial* mediators. In 1968, they helped in their capacity as mediators "practically every major clash between the miners and the national government and in the many impasses that were produced by the elections for the presidency (Appleby 2000: 217)." Even though Appleby does not mention which model of mediation (i.e., *outsider-neutral* or *insider-partial*) the Bolivian church leaders followed, it can be assumed that in an asymmetric conflict, such as the one between the miners and Bolivian government, the Catholic leaders might have played the role of *insider-partial* mediators. Selecting this type of mediation model would enable the leaders to side with a weaker party – the miners to bring more symmetry to the nature of the conflict. Catholic bishops, for instance, on various occasions pushed both sides in the ongoing conflict to reach a consensus on particular points. Even though in the end

bishops' signatures on any compromise documents did not bear an official legal or political status, they bestowed the final documents with "what could best be described as moral legitimacy (Appleby 2000: 218)."

Whether religious leaders decide to call themselves *outsider-neutral* or *insider-partial* mediators depends on their own perception of identity. Within the context of the Arab/Israeli conflict, Gopin (2012) describes himself on one hand as an *outsider-neutral* because of his American citizenship but on the other hand as an American Jew, a rabbi and someone very much as an *insider-partial.*

Besides identity, a type of a role within conflict setting plays a role in perceiving himself as either *outsider-neutral* or *insider-partial.* Gopin's *outsider-neutral* position within the Arab/Israeli conflict stems from his role as a *conflict transformation* scholar whereas his *insider-partial* position by his role of a peacemaker/practitioners and a wounded and proud spiritual Jew placing himself very much on the inside of the conflict.

It has been previously suggested that two models of mediator types: *outsider-neutral* and *insider-partial* are dominant within both mediation theory and practice, but it does not mean that other models are not possible or a combination of both. Based on practice, there is another model that for the purpose of this thesis will be coined *outsider-partial.* Pastor Hope[14] was invited to serve as a mediator between Masai people and farmers. He found it very difficult to be impartial or neutral in spite of how crucial impartiality is when mediating a conflict. Even though impartiality had been expected from him, he ultimately sided with one party. In this particular instance mediation under his leadership was successful as the outcome was a win-win situation.[15]

2.3.1.3 Religious Symbolism and Mediation

Apart from description of two dominant models within both mediation theory and practice, it is important to explore the aspect of faith in connection with mediation. Faith can play a powerful role as a connector between adversaries seeking to reconcile or

---

[14] The pastor's real name could not be used. The author respected the pastor's wishes and chose a nickname "Hope" as the meaning of this noun appropriately reflects the pastor's commitment to serve people and bring hope.

[15] The author interviewed Pastor Hope on July 30, 2013 in Switzerland. He lives in Africa.

between mediators. In 1972, after the World Council of Churches (WCC) produced a fair-minded report on the background and contested issues in Sudanese civil war and sent a delegation to the Sudanese capital to discuss humanitarian aid, the Sudanese government requested Reverend Burgess Carr, the secretary-general of the All-Africa Conference of Churches, to play a role as a mediator of peace talks between the Christian and animist South and the Northern Muslim government. Early in the process of Sudanese peace talks, the WCC mediators outlined general religious concepts and beliefs as common ground. Prayers, sermons, Bible reading, and tears of regret among Christian and Muslim generals alike were included in negotiations. Reverend Carr commented, "The religious leaders [at the talks] provided space to discuss problems and a voice for those who did not have one (Appleby: 2000, 218)".

The use of religious symbolism (e.g. prayer or fasting) in the process of mediation can serve as a window of opportunity to develop deeper emotional and spiritual realities of parties involved in conflict as well as in the mediators themselves. To promote reconciliation among the parties in the Sudanese civil war in 1972, All Africa Conference of Churches contributed to the talks to end this civil war when the mediators offered prayers at critical moments and referred to Islamic and Christian texts (Bercovitch and Kadayifci-Orellana: 2009, 198).

Nichols points out another example of the effective use of religious symbolism during the negotiations in Nicaragua. The negotiation sessions would start with prayers and readings from the Bible. Additionally, a variety of Christian themes, either from the Bible or from the Moravian book of daily inspirational readings, were predominantly presented in the opening devotions of each negotiation session.

> "These readings included references to the vocation of serving rather than being served; Job's acceptance of evils visited on him despite his personal integrity, distinctions between worldly and divine wisdom and the harvest of righteousness awaiting those who sow in peace; and the example of Christ who, rather than exalting himself, humbled himself and became obedient unto death (Nichols, 1994: 75)."

A final example of how religious symbolism can be effective in the process of mediation is highlighted by the work of the Conciliation Commission of Nicaragua. This

Commission was formed by Protestants who were inspired by the Mennonite tradition and who quite frequently used a language of conciliation and the image of justice and peace from the Mennonite perspective during the course of mediation between the government and the Indians (Nichols, 1994: 75).

2.3.2 Interfaith Dialogue Facilitator

The title of this role itself suggests that religious leaders ought to be inherently involved in inter-faith dialogue. Before defining what interfaith dialogue is about, a general classification of dialogues will be useful in determining which type of dialogue will fit best within the schema of interfaith dialogue. Ropers suggests a classification of dialogues in inter-group conflicts be divided into four types:

- *positional*
- *human-relations*
- *activist*
- *problem-solving dialogue*.

First, the platform of a *positional dialogue* is one in which parties express their respective views in order to have their position and attitudes acknowledged. In this type of a communication, one argument is compared with another. This type of dialogue almost resembles a presidential debate, thus it is questionable whether it is considered a true dialogue or a debate. Second, in the case of *human-relations dialogue*, the differences of opinion are secondary as emphasis is put on a relational level with focus on causes of stereotypes and misunderstandings. Before engaging in this type of a dialogue, participants usually attend some type of training on group interaction and basic mechanisms of perception. The aim of this dialogue is to increase respect by each party for the other along with mutual acknowledgment. Third, *activist dialogue* takes participants a step further than human-relations dialogue. Here, the goal is to identify common ground by sorting and analyzing issues at stake. Ultimately, parties explore how they might restrain their dispute through joint activities. Last, Ropers considers the *problem-solving dialogue* as the most ambitious approach. Here the disputing parties exchange information in a manner to systematically work through their differences. A

third party (co-actor or initiator) will typically be required to aid the warring parties, especially where conflicts are highly escalated (Ropers, 2004: 3). Having described four types of dialogue, the *human-relations dialogue* format would fit the best for the purposes of interfaith dialogue at the grassroots level, for it focuses on relationships and the transformation of perceptions that participants will have of one another.

Besides looking at Ropers' model of dialogue types, it will also be useful to look at another template, complementary to Ropers, which has been adapted by the Proponents of the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Movement. They propose a template of four phases for responding to conflicts based on communication. The first phase has to do with formulating the *different points of view* of the parties as clearly as possible. To bring about mutual acknowledgement of the views and consequently identify the essence of the conflict is a desired accomplishment at this stage. The second phase focuses on the participants' *needs, fears, values, hopes* and *experiences of conflict*. What would be ideal to achieve at this phase is to secure participants' personal acknowledgement of and insight into the contradictory biographies of the other side. The objective of the third phase is to identify *shared interests* and *similar needs* and *fears*. During this phase, it could also be possible to initiate some form of practical cooperation dealing with less controversial issues. The fourth phase is devoted to discussing various approaches and ideas for *addressing the main issues* in dispute. The aim of this final phase is to explore different ideas and approaches for implementing practical measures for issues to be resolved. This phase usually requires long periods of preparation along with personal confidence building (Ropers, 2004: 3-4).

Smock in his 2002 *Interfaith Dialogue and Peacebuilding* presents a number of examples of conflict areas where interfaith dialogue can make a significant impact in building a bridge of reconciliation between warring parties. To define interfaith dialogue might not be that difficult, for at its most basic level, it is a conversation between people of different faiths. What is quite complex to define, however, is the purpose and character of the interfaith dialogue. Smock explains that interfaith dialogue is a conversation of adherents of different faiths brought together to speak about a common subject with the primary aim that each participant learns from the other in order to change and grow.

Additionally, Smock points out that dialogue is not a debate: "In dialogue each partner must listen to the other as open and sympathetically as she/he can in an attempt to understand each other's position as precisely and, as it were, as much from within, as possible. Such an attitude automatically includes the assumption that at any point we might find the partner's position so persuasive that … we would have to change (Smock: 2002, 6)". Furthermore, the interfaith dialogue works in three areas: (1) practical, in terms of helping people to collaborate, (2) spiritual, where the aim is to experience the other's religion from 'within', and (3) cognitive, with the aim of searching for the truth (Smock: 2002, 6).

2.3.3 Advocate

When it comes to advocacy as part of religious peacebuilding activities, a number of key points should be mentioned. The first is that the type of advocacy recommended by both Curle and Lederach, is nonviolent activism. Additionally, advocacy carried out by religious actors tends to be inclined more toward defending human rights and empowering weaker parties rather than taking sides on substantial issues in the conflict (Sampson: 1997, 278).

Apart from a predisposition toward empowering weaker parties, many religious peacemakers tend to be naturally inclined toward the work of reconciliation with focus on restoring relationships and community structure disrupted by war and relocation. Restoration of relationships and rebuilding communities are two aspects of conflict transformation seeking to build conditions that can aid in achieving and sustaining peace. They are peacebuilding dimensions appropriate to be implemented at every stage of conflict transformation, not only in the aftermath of signing and implementation of peace accord (Sampson: 1997, 279).

Laue and Cormick distinguished two adherent conflict intervention roles: the activist, who in an asymmetric conflict sides with the weaker party(ies), and the advocate, who is not directly aligned with one conflict party but supports its goals and thus is in a position to promote its causes to the opponents. Where the conflict is national in scope involving enormous social change, this dichotomy is especially useful, for it serves the

purpose of differentiating between the functions of internal and external religious actors. Internal religious actors play crucial activist roles as catalysts for change, whereas external religious actors play indispensable advocate roles in promoting the proponents' causes for change beyond national parameters, thus helping to internationalize the conflict with the aim of bringing pressure of world opinion on ruling governments (Sampson 1997: 279-80).

An example of an advocate is well demonstrated by combined efforts of Bishop Artemije and Father Sava who visited the United States in 2000 with support expressed by groups of other diverse religious leaders. The faith communities joined together in the healing process on February 8, 2000, when they issued a Shared Moral Commitment. In a historic event, Muslim, Serbian Orthodox, and Roman Catholic leaders jointly condemned violence and appealed to their shared moral values to 'serve as an authentic basis for mutual esteem, co-operation and free common living in the entire territory of Kosovo…" They further stated, "We call on all people of good will to take responsibility for their own acts." Shared Moral Commitment did not ask for forgiveness for past wrongs and for reconciliation – steps that Father Sava considered to be critically important (Little: 2007, 138).

This chapter's goal was to outline specific roles religious leaders can play in *conflict transformation* from a perspective of a third-party involvement. Due to space limitations, it did not offer an exhaustive list of religious leaders roles, but offered a deeper analysis of three considered to be the most frequent. A religious leader was defined as someone with a burden for the work of God, with followers who are involved with him in the work of God, and with a prayer directed toward the work of God. Besides these qualities, perseverance or 'stickability' was one character trait the religious leader working in *conflict transformation* must have. Lederach's model on leadership was chosen to explain leadership arrangements in protracted conflicts. The model suggested three levels of leadership: top, middle-range, and grassroots level leadership. Apart from listing a number of actors at each leadership level, Lederach's model paired up actors with specific approaches to building peace. Even though Lederach's model did not explicitly focus on religious leadership, examples of religious leaders at all three levels of his model were found. From a perspective of a third-party involvement, three

specific roles for religious leaders' involvement in *conflict transformation* were examined: mediator/intermediary, inter-faith dialogue facilitator, and advocate. Two dominant models of mediator types were analyzed in context of mediation theory and practice: *outsider-neutral* and *insider-partial.* Within the context of an *outsider-neutral* mediator, a role of a faith-based diplomat spearheaded by Johnston was introduced.

A closer look at the aspect of faith in connection with mediation was also included in this chapter. The use of religious symbolism (e.g. prayer or fasting) in the process of mediation was regarded as helpful in developing deeper emotional and spiritual realities of parties involved in conflict. Analysis of an inter-faith dialogue facilitator first offered classification of dialogues in inter-group conflicts designed by Ropers. Besides Ropers' model, another template adapted by the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Movement was used to further analyze the role of the inter-faith dialogue facilitator. To present one example of how religious leaders could be involved in non-violent activism, the role of an advocate was further analyzed.

3. Religious Leaders' Preparation for Conflict Transformation

Based on extensive research carried out in 2008, there are more than 400 programs of teaching and research in peace and conflict studies. The article, originally published in the *International Herald Tribune,* noted in particular those at the United World Colleges, The Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), the American University (Washington, D.C.), Notre Dame University, George Mason University (Virginia), Syracuse University, the University of Bradford (supposedly with the largest and most comprehensive university-based peace studies program), the UN-mandated Peace University (UPEACE in Ciudad Colón, Costa Rica), Lund and Uppsala Universities (Sweden), the Universities of Queensland and Sydney (Australia), Innsbruck and Klagenfurt Universities (Austria), Universitat Jaume I in Castellón de la Plana (Spain), and the Universities of Oslo and Tromsø (Norway). Other outstanding programs can be found at the University of Waterloo (Canada), University of Hiroshima (Japan), King's College (Department of War Studies, University of London), London Metropolitan University, Sabancı University (Istanbul, Turkey), Marburg University (Germany),

Sciences Po (Paris), University of Amsterdam (The Netherlands), the University of Otago (New Zealand), St. Andrews University (Scotland), and the Universities of Coventry and York (England) (Micucci, 2008).

About one half of the several hundred North American colleges and universities with peace studies programs can be found in church-related schools. About half of the church-related schools offering peace studies programs are Roman Catholic. Other religious denominations with more than one college or university with a peace studies program are the Mennonites, Quakers, United Church of Christ, and Church of the Brethren (Barash and Webel, 2014: 25).

For Johan Galtung, a Norwegian sociologist and a pioneer in the field of peace and conflict studies, "peace studies is about relationship repair on all levels, so it's crucial that these programs include both theory and practice (Micucci, 2008)". The following subchapters provide a tapestry of insights into the intersection of theory and practice in the context of *conflict transformation* practice. As a departure point, a definition, content, and format of training will be presented, followed by an exploration of two different approaches to training: *prescriptive* and *elicitive*[16]. Furthermore, Lederach's *transformative training model* will be introduced. The third subchapter presents a closer look into which specific training programs and courses exist for religious leaders engaged in *conflict transformation* practice.

3.1 Defining training

Prakashvelu in his essay *Conflict Transformation Training as Intervention* defines training as "the process, or art, of imparting knowledge and skills (2006)." He uses the word 'training' to mean pedagogy, helping participants in a group setting acquire both the knowledge and skills related to conflict resolution and transformation, while at the same time giving them the ability to use the gained knowledge, skills and experience with common sense and insight. Furthermore, he poses an important question: "Do we limit ourselves in teaching others or training others to what we know and are familiar with, or

---

[16] Ross (2000) explains that participants and their knowledge are seen as primary resources in *elicitive* training approach whereas in prescriptive training approach participants are rarely engaged in search of appropriate responses in conflict settings.

are we willing to explore all of what is needed to help bring about resolution or transformation of the conflicts? (Prakashvelu, 2006)." As Prakashvelu chose to further explore the second part of the question, he found out that "participatory workshops on conflict resolution do create opportunities for people to identify skilled facilitators from their own communities, as well as from other communities and in situations of tension between communities (Prakashvelu, 2006)."

When compared to academic programs, training differs in the sense that it emphasizes the application of knowledge rather than obtaining knowledge for its own sake. A primary goal of training is educational, which sets it apart from other types of conflict intervention. "Training is a skill-building exercise (Babbitt, 1997: 368)" and as such it makes trainees more effective than a negotiation, mediation, or problem-solving session would. In general, the content will include three general categories. First, a theoretical frame of conflict dynamics (i.e., the phases and sources of conflict and its escalation) should represent the point of departure. Second, joint cooperation where participants work together on skill building in negotiation, mediation, facilitation, consensus building, and/or problem solving should follow. Third, training can include topics of reconciliation and healing (1997: 371). An effective training program should definitely consist of interactive learning (i.e., learning by doing) modules, e.g., simulations, discussion, and case study analysis (1997: 368).

Having proposed how the content of trainings should be designed, looking at a format of trainings will complete the whole picture of designing training modules. Choosing a best suitable format should be a result of consultation with prospective participants. Babbitt suggests three formats: joint training, training the trainers, and integration (1997: 377). Joint training is about bringing the parties of a conflict together as opposed to working with them separately. Training the Trainers is about conveying conflict resolution concepts and skills to professional groups of trainees, who will in turn organize trainings to pass on the acquired skills and concepts to others within their respected communities. The third format, integration, incorporates training into dialogue or problem-solving workshops (1997: 379).

Besides content and format, training's impact evaluation presents an invaluable yet sparse component of an entire training make-up. It is important to not only evaluate

impact on participants but also to accurately address how the training influenced the dynamics of the conflict itself (Babbitt, 1997: 383).

In 1995 David Steele, a United Church minister with a Ph.D. in Christian ethics and practical theology, started directing a project to train religious actors of the former Yugoslavia in *conflict transformation* theory and practice. Steele's project was sponsored by CSIS and gained support from not only indigenous organizations, but also from individual members of religious communities. A dozen seminars were conducted from 1995 until 1998 in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia. More specifically, in Croatia, Steele led seminars focused on community building, interfaith dialogue, developing skills in cross-cultural communication and mediation. Participants were local religious actors in Zagreb and Osijek including Roman Catholics, Serbian Orthodox, Muslims, and Protestants (Lutheran, Pentecostal, Baptist, Seventh Day Adventist, and Church of Christ).

The seminars led by Steele produced positive outcomes; for example, at the end of a seminar in Bizovac (border of the Serb-controlled territory near Osijek) the participants agreed to cooperate in various trust-building projects, such as "an interfaith newsletter, an initiative to assist in the resettlement of refugees, ecumenical prayer services, public meetings to promote peaceful inter-ethnic coexistence, and a joint program of interfaith religious education in schools (Appleby 2000: 242).

Ultimately the CSIS-sponsored seminars led to the creation of a permanent training program at the Centre for Peace, Nonviolence and Human Rights in Osijek in 1997. Since 2000, the Centre has taken full responsibility and obligation to train local religious leaders (Appleby, 2000: 243).

The overarching goal of any training within the context of *conflict transformation* is to equip the participants with knowledge and skills in a format of skill-building exercises. Effective training should definitely consist of interactive learning (i.e., learning by doing) modules, e.g., simulations, discussion, and case study analysis. How to measure if training were successful, poses an important yet intricate question. For some, success could be a development of a permanent training program, such as the one in Osijek, or a successful training outcome can be measured more tangibly, e.g. an interfaith newsletter. Lastly, given the context of protracted conflicts, the fact that

leaders (at top-, middle-range-, or grassroots- levels) with various ethnic and religious backgrounds meet at a local training constitutes success. Meeting together in a public space presents an opportunity to break walls made out of stereotypes and prejudices, and this alone must be considered a tremendous success.

3.2 Training Approaches – Transformative Training Model

Based on extensive *conflict transformation* field experience, Lederach warns about taking a narrow approach toward preparing people to work with protracted conflicts (1997:107). Here, Lederach warns about an application of one type of training fits all. Prakashvelu supports Lederach's line of thinking as a result of deeper analysis of a design of training on mediation. Based on extensive practical experience, he warns about the danger of applying one model, i.e., North American model of mediation training (2006). He concluded that "the approach to apply a single model of mediation process with focus on particular skills to participants who came from very diverse backgrounds, cultures, power structures, institutions, age groups, interest groups, and organizations to be highly inappropriate and inadequate in most settings (Prakashvelu, 2006)." This experience led him and others involved in the project to develop a new mediation model, which then was widely prescribed and taught in many parts of Northeast India. Consequently, Prakashvelu joined other trainers in designing more participatory and *elicitive* (emphasis added) workshops.

In this regard, Lederach's view echoes that of Prakashvelu, as he brings to light that more emphasis has been put on "*prescriptive* models and techniques" as tools to handle conflict (1997: 107). In prescriptive types of trainings, participants are rarely engaged in seeking appropriate processes and responses to conflict at hand (Lederach 1997: 107). In *elicitive* workshops, on the other hand, participants are able to bring more knowledge and resources into workshops and other peace-based activities as they began intervening in situations and regions affected by violent struggles and actively working in ways that empowered people to bring about positive change. Knowledge in the context of *elicitive* approach "flows among participants and between participants and trainer (Babbitt, 1997: 372)." *Elicitive* workshops had, have and will have a tremendous

potential to bring together NGO leaders, social movement leaders, student union leaders, tribal and church leaders, and women's association leaders. For Lederach (1997), as one of the vocal proponents of the *elicitive training model*, linking different people working at different levels constitutes a desired objective of training model at hand.

Based on an *elicitive* approach, Lederach developed a training design labeled *transformative training model*. Under this model a permanent training course is not a "training process with a beginning and an end" but rather a "permanent venue for the development of peacebuilding practitioners in Columbia (1997: 126)". Linking a wide range of people working at different levels is one of the unique characteristics that further underline the strength of this design. The following principles contributed to the building of the design:

- Understand education as a process of action-reflection, in which people are invited to participate actively in the development and application of peacebuilding strategies and practices.

- Approach training as a process of linked events that provide a venue for reflection by the broader group and for the direct exchange of ideas among workshops.

- Develop the process as a venue for linking "not-like-minded" people and different levels of society, and make the development of ongoing relationships an explicit goal of the training.

- Provide thematic focus for the workshops so that each is immediately relevant to the developing practice of its participants, as identified from their context.

- Approach the overall design of training as a long-term form of intervention in the setting, not primarily as a single event (Lederach, 1997: 126).

The word *transformative* within the title of this training model suggests that one cannot restore what is lost, but rather can create something new through the process of transformation. As proposed by Lederach, this training model should create a venue for "not-like-minded" people. This alone, if leaving the other components of Lederach's transformative training model aside, poses a tremendous challenge for the facilitators to accomplish within the context of protracted conflicts. Bringing together members of parties in conflict will be no easy task. Yet, who else should attempt to do that if not facilitators who are religious leaders? They should be among the first seeking

reconciliation, at least those who practice Christianity, more specifically the Christian commandment of loving ones enemy.

Implementing this transformative design in practice, Lederach has facilitated and carried out numerous trainings, workshops, and seminars in many countries around the globe over the span of almost 30 years. The data summarized in Appendix 4[17] do not represent an entire overview of Lederach's training activities, but they intend to highlight his training activities tailored to members of faith-based organizations or initiatives, churches, and other religious actors and leaders. Three pieces of information from Appendix 4 deserve to be further analyzed. First, bold letters indicate that Lederach has played various roles throughout his career. As a trainer he carried out numerous trainings, seminars, or workshops. Depending on resources, purpose, and goal of particular training, he also wore multiples other hats, e.g. consultant/advisor, workshop leader/facilitator, or resource person. Second, in Appendix 4, information in bold and italics highlights the nature of participants/trainees. In seven training events, carried out in countries of North America, Latin America (specifically Colombia), the Philippines, and Burundi, the selected participants were religious leaders (specifically bishops among others), church employees, and church groups. Third, according to data in Appendix 4, Lederach cooperated in his capacity as a trainer or resources person with many different faith-based organizations, initiatives, or consortia who played the role of training facilitators or organizers.

Not all scholars/practitioners support the notion of only *elicitive* training approach advocated by Prakashvelu and Lederach. Babbitt explains that most *conflict transformation* training falls somewhere between the spectrum of *prescriptive* and *elicitive* training styles (1997: 372). The following example serves as an illustration of *conflict transformation* training including a mix of *prescriptive* and *elicitive* parts. In 1998 CELAM (The Regional Conference of Latin American Bishops) collaborated with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) to map out regional workshops on *conflict transformation*. These workshops were designed to include training participants to understand how conflicts operate, what the general patterns and concepts are, and finally they focused on how including Christian precepts and traditions based on scripture might

---

[17] See page 54

be used in mediating conflicts. Pastors, ministers, lay workers, and other religious actors contributed to the overall quality of the workshops by bringing negotiation and mediation skills acquired during the professional studies and further developed in their pastoral or service work (Appleby, 2000: 293). Appleby's research does not mention if the regional workshops were further designed after the Train the Trainer model. If not through further training, one of the ways in which workshops participants – especially pastors and ministers – could further pass on newly acquired skills and knowledge is to incorporate them into their weekly sermons.

Throughout this subchapter, training was defined as the process with an educational goal, a skill-building exercise of imparting skill and knowledge and as such fluid rather than static in nature. The overarching goal of any training within the context of *conflict transformation* is to equip the participants with knowledge and skills in a format of skill-building exercises. Even though elicitive training approach is preferable, most *conflict transformation* training falls somewhere between the spectrum of *prescriptive* and *elicitive* training styles.

3.3 Training for Religious Leaders

What training in *conflict transformation* is available to religious leaders? The following subchapter will provide a brief overview of what types are available. Training will be divided based on a criterion of who is a facilitator or educator. Within the context of this subchapter only, the terms 'training' and 'course' will be used interchangeably as the interpretation of meanings of both terms represents the same. Courses in *conflict transformation* are offered by educational institutions and secular or faith-based NGOs.

The first example of an educational institution is United States Institute of Peace (USIP), an independent nonpartisan institution funded by the United States Congress that offers an online course called Global Religious Engagement, is intended for international affairs professionals who anticipate engaging in issues of religious sensitivity in their work. The course will introduce best practices for interacting and working with religious peoples in conflict management settings.[18] Under its Education and Training in the Field

---

[18] http://www.usip.org/events/global-religious-engagement

program, USIP offered or offers through its Academy Online these trainings related to peacebuilding and *conflict transformation*: Peacekeeper Training in Africa and Dialogue and Negotiation Training in Haiti.[19] Besides online courses, USIP offers a number of on-campus courses from fall 2013 until summer 2014. Here is a list of on-campus courses related to *conflict transformation*:

- Mediating Violent Conflict
- Managing Intergroup Conflict Through Facilitation
- Local and National Dialogues: What Makes them Work?
- Winning Together: Multiparty Negotiations
- Governance and Democratic Practices in War-to-Peace Transitions.[20]

Just Peacemaking Initiative (JPi) at Fuller Theological Seminary represents the second example of an educational institution offering courses in *conflict transformation.* JPi was founded to encourage knowledge about and use of peacemaking practices and to promote research. Courses related to peacemaking at Fuller are:

- Faith and Politics
- Biblical and Practical Peacemaking
- Peacemaking in Israel and Palestine
- Jesus, the Church, and Violence
- Advocacy for Social Justice
- Music, Peacebuilding and Interfaith Dialogue
- A Christian Perspective on the Israel-Palestinian Conflict and a Theology of Reconciliation
- Current Trends in Islam
- Independent Study: Muslim-Christian Dialogue (based on experience in Lebanon)
- Forgiveness, Reconciliation, and Clinical Practice[21]

Finally the last example of an educational institution is TRANSCEND Peace University (TPU), founded by Johan Galtung as the world's first online Peace university. TPU offers 12-week or 6-week online courses with an average cost of €800 per course.

---

[19] http://www.usip.org/category/course-type/training-in-the-field
[20] http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/files/Academy_Course_Catalogue.pdf
[21] http://justpeacemaking.org/fuller-resources/

At TPU religious leaders can choose from the following courses related to *conflict transformation:*

- Advanced Conflict Transformation
- Conflicts at the Micro Level
- Peace-based leadership
- Just War/Just Peace
- Peace by African's Peaceful Means: Obstacles and Resources to Peace[22]

The Mennonite Central Commitee is one of the faith-based NGOs that has facilitated trainings in multiple parts of the world. As a response to an invitation by the MCC, Lederach worked on developing a pilot training course in conflict transformation for grassroots leaders in Central America. Early on in the project, he realized that his conflict resolution training was "too narrow, often out of context, and presumptuous (2000: 46)." MCC has also been very active in facilitating trainings in Africa. Pastor Hope[23] attended a ten-day interfaith training for middle-range religious leaders organized jointly by MCC and Nairobi Peace Initiative. Training in mediation skills and trauma healing were the main components included in this training[24].

KURVE Wustrow, a German-registered association, offers particular trainings for practitioners in the field of *conflict transformation*. The association's upcoming Spring 2014 Training Series offers the following:

- Security management for peace work in conflict zones
- Project management for peace work – planning, monitoring, and evaluating
- Counseling in trauma and stress for peace work in conflict zones
- Managing organizational change in non-governmental organizations[25]

Apart from taking a course at TPU, USIP, or JPi and participating in training workshops organized by MCC or KURVE Wustrow, religious leaders might have other options to equip themselves for their roles in *conflict transformation* as some roles were outlined in chapter two of this thesis. One of them could contact *conflict transformation*

---

[22] https://www.transcend.org/tpu/
[23] The pastor's real name could not be used. The author respected the pastor's wishes and chose a nickname "Hope" as the meaning of this noun appropriately reflects the pastor's commitment to serve people and bring hope.
[24] Based on an informal interview with Pastor Hope in July 2013 in Switzerland.
[25] http://www.kurvewustrow.org/282-0-practitioner-trainings-spring-2014b.html

practitioners, such as Lederach, with a request of designing a specifically needs-based workshop or participating in already crafted training modules with the following titles:

- Training seminar on conflict resolution
- Conflict transformation and conciliation training
- Mediation training for local and regional peace commissions
- Training for conciliators
- Introductory and advanced training in conflict transformation
- Training on peacebuilding and conflict transformation
- Training for trainers in the areas of mediation, culture, and conflict
- Workshop for training of trainers for peacebuilding
- Workshop on conflict resolution and peacebuilding
- Peacebuilding training seminar[26]

This last subchapter attempted to provide a brief overview of what training is available. It does not offer an exhaustive list of courses and educational institution or NGOs, but nonetheless leaves the reader an impression that training in *conflict transformation* for religious leaders does exist.

The third chapter provided a tapestry of insights into the intersection of theory and practice in the context of *conflict transformation* practice. First, training in the context of *conflict transformation* was defined as a skill-building exercise of imparting skill and knowledge that is fluid in nature. The overarching goal is to equip the participants with knowledge and skills in a format of skill-building exercises. Second, even though elicitive training approach is preferable, most *conflict transformation* training falls somewhere between the spectrum of *prescriptive* and *elicitive* training styles. Last, a closer look into what specific training opportunities for religious leaders was offered. As a result, religious leaders have an option to choose from specifically tailored training offered by practitioners like Lederach, educational institutions like USIP or TPU, or NGOs like Kurve Wustrow or MCC.

---

[26] Titles of trainings conducted by John Paul Lederach from 1985 until 2004.

Conclusion

The overarching goal of this thesis was to analyze the roles of religious leaders in the context of *conflict transformation.* The aim of chapter one, *From Conflict Resolution toward Conflict Transformation,* was to create a conceptual theoretical framework as a basic stepping stone for the process of outlining specific roles of religious leaders. Within the field of peace and conflict studies, the terms *conflict resolution* and *conflict transformation* are interchangeably and arbitrarily. In this thesis, *conflict transformation* was defined as actions and processes, which seek to alter the various characteristics and manifestations of conflict by addressing the root causes of a particular conflict over the long term. Based on comparative analysis of terms *conflict resolution* and *conflict management,* the former was defined as an approach which considers removal of causes in order to establish peace, whereas the former was a approach of intervention to end fighting.

Chapter two, *Defining the Role of Religious Leaders in Conflict Transformation,* attempted to outline specific roles religious leaders can play in *conflict transformation* from a perspective of third-party involvement. Due to space limitations, it did not offer an exhaustive list of religious leaders' roles, but provided a solid analysis of three considered to be the most frequent. A religious leader was defined as someone with a burden for the work of God, with followers who are involved with him in the work of God, and with a prayer directed toward the work of God. Besides these qualities, perseverance or 'stickability' was one character trait the religious leader working in *conflict transformation* must have. Lederach's model on leadership was chosen to explain leadership arrangements in protracted conflicts. The model suggested three levels of leadership: top, middle-range, and grassroots level leadership. Apart from listing a number of actors at each leadership level, Lederach's model paired actors with specific approaches to building peace. Even though Lederach's model did not explicitly focus on religious leadership, examples of religious leaders at all three levels of his model were found. From a perspective of a third-party involvement, three specific roles for religious leaders' involvement in *conflict transformation* were examined: mediator/intermediary, interfaith dialogue facilitator, and advocate. Two dominant

models of mediator types were analyzed in context of mediation theory and practice: *outsider-neutral* and *insider-partial.* Within the context of an *outsider-neutral* mediator, a role of a faith-based diplomat spearheaded by Johnston was introduced. A closer look at the aspect of faith in connection with mediation was also included in this chapter. The use of religious symbolism (e.g., prayer or fasting) in the process of mediation was regarded as helpful in developing deeper emotional and spiritual realities of parties involved in conflict. Analysis of an interfaith dialogue facilitator first offered classification of dialogues in inter-group conflicts designed by Ropers. Besides Ropers' model, another template adapted by the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Movement was used to further analyze the role of the interfaith dialogue facilitator. To present one example of how religious leaders could be involved in non-violent activism, the role of an advocate was further analyzed.

Chapter three, *Religious Leaders Preparation for Their Roles in Conflict Transformation,* offered one window into the realm of training opportunities for religious leaders. It stated that at least 400 programs focused on teaching research and practice in peace and conflict studies exist at various universities throughout the world and some even at church-related schools. Throughout the chapter, training was defined as a process or art of imparting knowledge and skills with emphasis on participatory workshops rather than prescriptive models of training. Training was also understood in the context of a skill-building exercise. Apart from defining training, chapter three offered two main models of training approaches: *prescriptive* and *elicitive*. Even though *elicitive* approach to training (drawing on local skill and traditions) was identified as the preferred training approach, most *conflict transformation* training included a mix of *prescriptive* and *elicitive* components. Lederach's *transformative training model* was mentioned as a development of *elicitive* approach training principles. Chapter three concluded with a vignette of specific up-to-date offers of training opportunities for religious leaders. Educational institutions and NGOs presented as examples of two main entities that specialize in designing and implementing training for religious leaders. A church-related entity offered courses such as Biblical and Practical Peacemaking or Peacebuilding and Interfaith Dialogue, whereas secular educational institutions offered courses within the family of mediation and *conflict transformation*.

Based on the findings in this thesis, it is evident that religious leaders not only played various roles in transforming protracted conflicts, but also have a tremendous potential to tap into and create an imaginary bridge on which both parties in conflict can walk. Throughout the process of literature review, it became evident that because of the absence of author's own fieldwork, the analysis of research topic will be limited to references found in scholarly books and articles. In July 2013, while attending a missions conference in Switzerland, the author had an ad-hoc opportunity to informally interview one Protestant pastor who carried out *conflict transformation* strategies in one African refugee camp. The pastor requested to hide his identity because of security issues and thus the author chose a cover name (Pastor Hope) for the purpose of this thesis. Because of a significant language barrier and time constraints, the information gained was limited; nonetheless, the author decided to include the findings from this interview under the role of a mediator/intermediary and training conducted by MCC. The author firmly believes that doing her own fieldwork, collecting data and further analysis would have undoubtedly contributed to a higher level of analysis applied throughout this thesis. Furthermore, the reason the author firmly believes in the importance of fieldwork is her conviction that there are many more stories of middle-range and grassroots religious peacemakers worthy of recording, however unfinished they might be.

From a perspective of gender identity, examples of religious leaders like Father Luis Bolla, reverend Burgess Carr, or others mentioned in this thesis were exclusively male. It was not the author's intention to focus predominantly on male religious leaders, but rather the lack of available data on female religious leaders involved in the process of *conflict transformation.* Therefore, there is a great need to fill this research gap. The need for increased women participation in peace processes and all peacebuilding-related activities has already been internationally recognized as the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security was passed in 2000. Future research could analyze obstacles and opportunities of female religious leaders' participation in peace negotiations and peace processes.

APPENDIX 1

Significant Publications and Events in the Growth of Conflict Resolution

1942 Mary Parker Follett, *Dynamic Administration*

Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*

National War Labor Board established

1947 Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service established as independent agency

1948 UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization initiates Project on Tensions affecting International Understanding

1952 Elmore Jackson, *Meeting the Minds: A Way to Peace Through Mediation*

1956 Lewis Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict*

1957 *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* based at the University of Michigan, begins publication

Karl Deutsch et al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*

Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs holds first meeting

1959 Center for Research on Conflict Resolution established at the University of Michigan

International Peace Research Institute (PRIO) founded in Oslo, Norway

1960 Lewis Richardson, *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels*

Thomas Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict*

1961 Theodore F. Lentz, *Towards a Science of Peace*

1962 Kenneth Boulding, *Conflict and Defense*

Charles E. Osgood, *An Alternative to War and Surrender*

1964 *Journal of Peace Research* begins publication, based at PRIO
International Peace Research Association founded

1965 Anatol Rapoport and A. Chammah, *The Prisoner's Dilemma*

John Burton and others organize a problem-solving workshop with representatives from Malaysia, Indonesia, and Singapore

1966 Muzaref Sherif, *In Common Predicament*

1969 John W. Burton, *Conflict and Communication: The Use of Controlled Communication in International Relations*

1970 Leonard W. Doob, *Resolving Conflict in Africa: The Fermeda Workshop*

Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED) founded

Program on Nonviolent Conflict and Change established at Syracuse University

1971 Adam Curle, *Making Peace*

1972 J. David Singer and Melvin Small, *The Wages of War, 1816-1965*

1973 Department of Peace Studies, awarding graduate degrees, established at the University of Bradford, England

Morton Deutsch, *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Process*

Louis Kriesberg, *The Sociology of Social Conflicts (Social Conflicts,* 1982 rev.ed.)

Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*

Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) holds inaugural conference

1979 P. H. Gulliver, *Disputes and Negotiations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*

1981 Roger Fisher and William Ury, *Getting to YES*

1983 National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (NCPCR) holds first meeting

1984 United States Institute of Peace founded

Robert Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation*

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation establishes a program to support work in conflict resolution theory and practice

1985   Saadia Touval and I. William Zartman, eds., *International Mediation in Theory and Practice*

I. William Zartman, *Ripe for Resolution: Conflict and Intervention in Africa*

The Network for Community Justice and Conflict Resolution established in Canada

1986   Christopher W. Moore, *The Mediation Process*

1987   Lawrence Susskind and Jeffrey Cruikshank, *Breaking the Impasse*

George Mason University begins offering a Ph.D. program in conflict resolution

1989   Kenneth Kressel and Dean G. Pruitt, eds., *Mediation Research*

Partners for Democratic Change founded, linking university-based national centers in Sofia, Prague, Bratislava, Budapest, Warsaw, and Moscow

1992   Instituto Peruano de Resolucion de Conflictos, Negociacion, y Mediacion (IPREEECONM) established in Peru

1993   Marc Howard Ross, *The Management of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*

1994   Anita Taylor and Judi Beinstein Miller, eds., *Conflict and Gender*

1995   John Paul Lederach, *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation across Cultures*

1996   South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission established

Fen Osler Hampson, *Nurturing Peace: Why Peace Settlements Succeed or Fail*

Michael S. Lund, *Preventing Violent Conflicts*

1998   Eugene Weiner, ed., *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence*

2000   Elise Boulding, *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*

Johan Galtung, Carl G. Jacobsen, Kai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen, and Finn Tschudi, *Searching for Peace*

Source: Kriesberg (2001)

APPENDIX 2
Principles of Conflict Transformation

1. Conflict should not be regarded as an isolated event that can be resolved or managed, but as an integral part of society's on-going evolution and development;

2. Conflict should not be understood solely as an inherently negative and destructive occurrence, but rather as a potentially positive and productive force for change if harnessed constructively;

3. Conflict transformation goes beyond merely seeking to contain and manage conflict, instead seeking to transform the root causes themselves - or the perceptions of the root causes - of a particular conflict;

4. Conflict transformation is a long-term, gradual and complex process, requiring sustained engagement and interaction;

5. Conflict transformation is not just an approach and set of techniques, but a way of thinking about and understanding conflict itself;

6. Conflict transformation is particularly suited for intractable conflicts, where deep-rooted issues fuel protracted violence;

7. Conflict transformation adjusts to the ever changing nature of a conflict, particularly during pre- and post-violence phases and at any stage of the escalation cycle;

8. Conflict transformation is always a non-violent process, which is fundamentally opposed to violent expressions of conflict;

9. Conflict transformation addresses a range of dimensions - the micro-, meso- and macro-levels; local and global;

10. Conflict transformation is concerned with five specific types of transformation, focusing upon the structural, behavioral and attitudinal aspects of conflict:

    a. *Actors* – modifying actors' goals and their approach to pursuing these goals, including by strengthening understanding as to the causes and consequences of their respective actions;

    b. *Contexts* – challenging the meaning and perceptions of conflict itself, particularly the respective attitudes and understandings of specific actors towards one another;

    c. *Issues* – redefining the issues that are central to the prevailing conflict, and reformulating the position of key actors on those very issues;

d. ***Rules*** – changing the norms and rules governing decision-making at all levels in order to ensure that conflicts are dealt with constructively through institutional channels;

e. ***Structures*** – adjusting the prevailing structure of relationships, power distributions and socio-economic conditions that are embedded in and inform the conflict, thereby affecting the very fabric of interaction between previously incompatible actors, issues and goals.

11. For conflict transformation to occur, tensions between parties to the conflict must be overcome – first, by ensuring all actors recognize that their respective interests are not served by resorting to violence; and second, by seeking consensus on what should be transformed and how;

12. Conflict transformation stresses the human dimension by reminding parties of the compatible nature of their needs, instead of emphasizing their opposing interests, and by rejecting unilateral decisions and action, particularly those representing a victory for one of the parties to the conflict;

13. Conflict transformation does not resort to a predetermined set of approaches and actions, but respects and adapts to the particularities of a given setting;

14. Conflict transformation looks beyond visible issues and is characterized by creative problem-solving, incorporating the perspectives a broad array of actors, including those typically marginalized from such considerations;

15. Conflict transformation invariably involves a third, impartial party, in order to help actors alter their cognitive and emotional views on the 'Other', thereby helping to break down divisions between 'Us' and 'Them';

Conflict transformation represents an ambitious and demanding task, which is better equipped to contend with the asymmetric, complex and protracted nature of contemporary conflicts than prevailing techniques and approaches.

Source: TransConflict

APPENDIX 3

Internet Resource Guide

Adherents.com	www.adherents.com
Association of Religion Data Archives (ARDA)	www.thearda.com
Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs	www.berkleycenter.georgetown.edu
Brookings Institution	www.brookings.edu
Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs	www.cceia.org
Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)	www.csis.org
Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy (CSID)	https://www.csidonline.org
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA): The World Factbook	https://www.cia.gov/library
Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)	www.cfr.org
Forum 18	www.forum18.org
Freedom House	www.freedomhouse.org
Grim and Finke International Religion Indexes	www.thearda.com
Institute on Culture, Religion, and World Affairs (CURA)	www.bu.edu/cura
International Crisis Group (ICG)	www.crisisgroup.org
The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies	kroc.nd.edu
The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life	www.pewforum.org
Pew Global Attitudes Project	www.pewglobal.org
Religion and the State Project (RAS)	www.religionandstate.org
Religion Monitor	www.religionsmonitor.com
United Nations: Office of the Special Rapporteur on Freedom	www2.ohchr.org
US Commission on Interreligious Freedom (USCIRF)	www.uscirf.org
US Department of State: International Religious Freedom Reports	www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/irf/
US Institute of Peace (USIP): Religion and Peacemaking Program	www.usip/org/issue-areas/religion
World Christian Database	worldchristiandatabase.org
The World Values Survey	www.worldvaluessurvey.org

Source: M. Christian Green and Nicole Greenfield in *Rethinking Religion and World Affairs* ed. by Timothy S. Shah, Alfred Stepan, and Monica Duffy Toft

APPENDIX 4

Lederach's Training Activities (1985-2004)

Year	Location	Type & Affiliation	Participants
1985-1992	N. America	**Trainer** in Mennonite Conciliation Service's Mediation Training Institutes	Not Specified (N/S)
1985-2000	L. America	**Trainer** of conflict transformation and mediation training workshops and seminars	**Church personnel**
1992-1998	Philippines	**Trainer/consultant** on the national peace process and the role of the church	**Church leaders**
1992-2000	Philippines	**Workshop leader/facilitator** for a Consortium of peace groups, the Coalition for Peace, Multi-Sectoral Peace Advocate, the Institute for Popular Education, and Leandro Alejandro Foundation	**Church groups**
1997-2000	N. America	**Consultant/advisor** to Catholic Relief Services (CRS) Justice Lens Initiative, Peacebuilding Program Development	N/S
1999	Ethiopia	**Trainer** for the Life & Peace Institute & EECMY project	**Religious Leaders**
1999-2000	Columbia	**Trainer** for Bishops' Conference of the Catholic Church of Colombia (BCCC)	N/S
1999-2000	Asia	**Trainer/consultant** with SE Asia Program of CRS with a focus on evaluation, practice-based theory building and strategic peacebuilding training	N/S
2000	N. America	**Facilitator** of a consensus building exercise with the World Conference of the RLDS[27] Church	N/S
2001	Colombia	**Facilitator/resource person** for seminars for the Pastoral Social of the Episcopal BCCC, in cooperation with CRS	**Bishops**
2001	Guatemala	**Facilitator** of strategic planning meetings for CRS	N/S
2002	Colombia	**Facilitator/resource person** for Caritas Internationalis, Latin American Regional Meeting on Reconciliation	N/S
2002	Colombia	**Workshop trainer** on peacebuilding and reconciliation at Episcopal Conference of the Catholic Church	N/S
2003	Colombia	Reconciliation **seminar facilitator** for the Social Pastorate of the Catholic Bishop's Episcopal Conference	N/S
2002	France	**Train the Trainer** workshop on peacebuilding with Caritas Internationalis	N/S
2003	Myanmar	**Workshop facilitator** with the Shalom Foundation, Ethnic Nationalities Mediators Fellowship, and Myanmar Council	N/S
2003	L. America	**Peacebuilding trainer** with Caritas Internationalis	N/S
2004	Burundi	**Seminar facilitator** hosted by CRS	**Bishops**

Source: Author based on J.P. Lederach's CV at http://kroc.nd.edu/sites/default/files/lederachcv.pdf

---

[27] (RLDS) Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (RLDS)

Bibliography

BOOKS/CHAPTERS

[1] Appleby, R. Scott. *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

[2] Appleby, R. Scott. "Religion as an Agent of Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding." In *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict* ed. by Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1997.

[3] Arai, Tatsushi. *Creativity and Conflict Resolution: Alternative Pathways to Peace.* Routledge, NY: 2009.

[4] Augsburger, David. W. *Conflict Mediation Across Cultures: Pathways and Patterns.* Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

[5] Avruch, Kevin. "Culture." In *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention* ed. by Cheldelin, Sandra, Daniel Druckman, and Larissa Fast. London: Continuum, 2003.

[6] Babbitt, Eileen F. "Contributions of Training to International Conflict Resolution." In *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques* ed. by I. William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1997.

[7] Banchoff, Thomas. "Interreligious Dialogue and International Relations." *Rethinking Religion and World Affairs* ed. by Timothy Samuel. Shah, Alfred C. Stepan, and Monica Duffy Toft. New York: Oxford UP, 2012.

[8] Barash, David P. and Charles P. Webel. *Peace and Conflict Studies.* California: Sage Publications, Inc., 2002.

[9] Barash, David P. and Charles P. Webel. *Peace and Conflict Studies 3rd edition.* California: Sage Publications, Inc., 2014.

[10] Bercovitch, Jacob, Victor Kremenyuk, and I. William Zartman. "Introduction: The Nature of Conflict and Conflict Resolution." In *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Resolution* ed. by Jacob Bercovitch, Victor Kremenyuk, and I. William Zartman. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers, 2009.

[11] Botes, Johannes M. "Structural Transformation." In *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention* ed. by Cheldelin, Sandra, Daniel Druckman, and Larissa Fast. London: Continuum, 2003.

[12] Brion-Meisels, Steven, Meenakshi Chhabra, David Cortright, David Steele, Gary Gunderson, and Edward LeRoy Long Jr. "Use Cooperative Conflict Resolution." In *Just Peacemaking: The New Paradigm for the Ethics of Peace and War* ed. by Glen Stassen. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2008.

[13] Carter, Judy and Gordon S. Smith. "Religious Peacebuilding." In *Religion and Peacebuilding* ed. by Harold G. Coward and Gordon S. Smith. Albany: State University of New York, 2004.

[14] Cheldelin, Sandra, Daniel Druckman, and Larissa Fast. *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention*. London: Continuum, 2003.

[15] Cliffe, Lionel and Philip White. "Conflict Management and Resolution in the Horn of Africa." In *Early Warning and Conflict Management in the Horn of Africa* ed. By C. Mwaura and S. Schmeidl. Lawrenceville: The Red Sea Press, 2002.

[16] Cordell, Karl, and Stefan Wolff. "Theories of Ethnic Conflict." *Ethnic Conflict: Causes, Consequences, Responses*. Cambridge: Polity, 2009.

[17] Fisher, S., Dekha Ibrahim Abdi, Jawed Ludin, Richard Smith, Steve Williams, and Sue Williams. *Working with Conflict, Skills and Strategies for Action.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

[18] Friesen, Duane K. "Encourage Grassroots Peacemaking Groups and Voluntary Associations." In *Just Peacemaking: The New Paradigm for the Ethics of Peace and War* ed. by Glen Stassen. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2008.

[19] Galtung, Johan. "A Theory of Conflict: Overcoming Direct Violence." Kolofon Press, 2010.

[20] Gopin, Marc. "The Inner Life of the Peacemaker and the Future of Global Change." *Bridges across an Impossible Divide: The Inner Lives of Arab and Jewish Peacemakers*. Oxford Scholarship Online (www.oxfordscholarship.com), 2012.

[21] Gopin, Marc. "Specific Steps toward a New Relationship." *Holy War, Holy Peace: How Religion Can Bring Peace to the Middle East*. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 2002.

[22] Graf, Wilfried, Gudrun Kramer, and Augustin Nicolescou. "Counselling and Training for Conflict Transformation and Peace-building." In *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies* ed. by Charles Webel and Johan Galtung. New York: Routledge, 2007.

[23] Jeffrey, Paul. *Recovering Memory: Guatemalan Churches and the Challenge of Peacemaking*. Uppsala: Life & Peace Institute, 1998.

[24] Jeong, Ho-Won. "Structure." In *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention* ed. by Cheldelin, Sandra, Daniel Druckman, and Larissa Fast. London: Continuum, 2003.

[25] Johnston, Douglas. *Faith-based Diplomacy: Trumping Realpolitik.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

[26] Johnston, Douglas. "Introduction: Beyond Power Politics." In *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft* ed. by Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.

[27] Kriesberg, Louis. "The Growth of the Conflict Resolution Field." In *Turbulent Peace: the challenges of managing international conflict,* ed. by Chester A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, and Pamela Aall. Washington, D.C.: USIP, 2001.

[28] Kriesberg, Louis. "The Development of the Conflict Resolution Field." In *Peacemaking in international conflict: methods and techniques,* ed. by I. William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen. Washington, D.C.: USIP, 1997.

[29] Lederach, John P. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies.* Washington, D.C.: USIP, 1997.

[30] Lederach, John P. "Journey from resolution to transformative peacebuilding." In *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding,* ed. by C. Sampson and J.P. Lederach. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

[31] Lederach, John P. *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995.

[32] Lederach, John P. *The Little Book of Conflict Transformation.* Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2003.

[33] Little, David. *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

[34] Little, David. "Religion, Violent Conflict, and Peacemaking." In *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

[35] Little, David. "Would You Shoot Me, You Idiot? Friar Ivo Markovic." In *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

[36] Luttwak, Edward. "The Missing Dimension." In *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft* ed. by Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.

[37] Mayer, Bernard. *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution: A Practitioner's Guide.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

[38] Merry, Saly Eagle. "Mennonite Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation: A Cultural Analysis." In *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding,* ed. by C. Sampson and J.P. Lederach. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

[39] Mitchell, Christopher. "The Process and Stages of Mediation: The Sudanese Cases." In *Making War and Waging Peace* ed. by David R. Smock. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1997.

[40] Nichols, Bruce. "Religious Conciliation Between the Sandinistas and the East Coast Indians of Nicaragua." In *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft* ed. by Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1994.

[41] Peachey, Dean F. "Choosing a Path for Conflict Transformation." In *Making Peace with Conflict: Practical Skills for Conflict Transformation* ed. by Carolyn Schrock-Shenk and Lawrence Ressler. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1999.

[42] Powers, Gerard. "Religion and Peacebuilding." In *Strategies of Peace: Transforming Conflict in a Violent World* ed. by Daniel Philpot and Gerard Powers. New York: Oxford UP, 2010.

[43] Ramsbotham, Oliver, Hugh Miall, and Tom Woodhouse. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011.

[44] Rubinstein, Richard E. "Institutions." In *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention* ed. by Cheldelin, Sandra, Daniel Druckman, and Larissa Fast. London: Continuum, 2003.

[45] Sampson, Cynthia. "Religion and Peacebuilding." In *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods & Techniques* ed. by I. William. Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen. Washington, D.C.: USIP, 1997.

[46] Sandole, Dennis J.D. "Typology." In *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention* ed. by Cheldelin, Sandra, Daniel Druckman, and Larissa Fast. London: Continuum, 2003.

[47] Schmid, A. P. *Thesaurus and Glossary of Early Warning and Conflict Prevention Terms*. Erasmus, The Netherlands: Synthesis Foundation, 2000.

[48] Smock, David R. *Interfaith Dialogue and Peacebuilding*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 2002.

[49] Špičanová, Lenka. *Komparativní analýza konfliktů v Acehu a na Východním Timoru*. Brno: Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury, 2011.

[50] Tesař, Filip. *Etnické konflikty*. Praha: Portál, 2007.

[51] Waisová, Šárka. *Řešení konfliktů v mezinárodních vztazích*. Praha: Portál, 2005.

[52] Wallensteen, Peter. *Understanding Conflict Resolution: War, Peace and the Global System.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003.

[53] Warfield, Wallace. "Managing Racial/Ethnic Conflict for Community Building." In *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Communication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2006.

JOURNAL/MAGAZINE ARTICLES (accessed online)

[1] Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. "Conflict Resolution, Culture, and Religion: Toward a Training Model of Interreligious Peacebuilding." *Journal of Peace Research* 38.6 (2001): 685-704.

[2] Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. "Religious Leaders in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: From Violent Incitement to Nonviolence Resistance." *Peace & Change* 36.4 (2011): 556-80.

[3] Babbitt, Eileen, and Fen Osler Hampson. "Conflict Resolution as a Field of Inquiry: Practice Informing Theory." *International Studies Review* 13 (2011): 46-57.

[4] Bercovitch, Jacob, and Ayse S. Kadayifci-Orellana. "Religion and Mediation: The Role of Faith-Based Actors in International Conflict Resolution." *International Negotiation* 14.1 (2009): 175-204.

[5] Botes, Johannes. "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* 8:2 (2003).

[6] DuBois, Heather. "Religion and Peacebuilding." *Journal of Religion, Conflict, and Peace* 1:2 (2008).

[7] Donais, Timothy and Amy C. Knorr. "Peacebuilding from below vs. the liberal peace: the case of Haiti." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 34.1 (2010): 54-59.

[8] Eliasson, Jan. "Perspectives on Managing Intractable Conflict." *Negotiation Journal* 18.4 (2002): 371-74.

[9] Gayer, Corinna C., Shiri Landman, Eran Halperin and Daniel BAR-TAL. "Overcoming Psychological Barriers to Peaceful Conflict Resolution: The Role of Arguments about Losses." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution.* 53.6 (2009): 951-975.

[10] Gopin, Marc. "Religion, Violence, and Conflict Resolution." *Peace & Change* 22.1 (1997): 1-31.

[11] Geoff, Harris. "Ministries of peacebuilding in sub-Saharan Africa: rationale, functions and establishment." *African Security Review* (2011): 122-135.

[12] Hancock, Landon E. "The Northern Irish Peace Process: From Top to Bottom." *International Studies Review* 10 (2008): 203-38.

[13] Harpviken, Kristian Berg, and Hanne Eggen Røislien. "Faithful Brokers? Potentials and Pitfalls of Religion in Peacemaking." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 25.3 (2008): 351-73.

[14] Harris, Geoff. "Ministries of peacebuilding in sub-Saharan Africa: rationale, functions and establishment." *African Security Review* (March 2011): 122-135.

[15] Johnston, Douglas M. "An Asymmetric Counter to the Asymmetric Threat." *American Foreign Policy Interests* 35 (2013): 9-14.

[16] Kriesberg, Louis. "Conflict Analysis and Resolution as a Field." *The International Studies Encyclopedia*. Denmark, Robert A. Blackwell Publishing, 2010. Blackwell Reference Online.

[17] Last, David. "Organizing for Effective Peacebuilding." *International Peacekeeping* 7.1 (2000): 80-96.

[18] Little, David. "Religion, Conflict, and Peace." *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 38.1 (2006): 95-103.

[19] Nepstad, Sharon Erickson. "Religion, Violence, and Peacemaking." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 43.3 (2004): 297-301.

[20] Ross, Marc H. "Creating Conditions for peacemaking: theories of practice in ethnic conflict resolution." *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 23.6 (2000): 1002-1034.

[21] Sandal, Nukhet Ahu. "Religious Actors as Epistemic Communities in Conflict Transformation: the Cases of South Africa and Northern Ireland." *Review of International Studies* 37 (2001): 929-949.

[22] Satterwhite, James. "Christian Peacemaker Teams as an Alternative to Redemptive Violence." *Peace and Change* 31.2 (2006): 222-43.

[23] Young, Douglas W. "Prescriptive and Elicitive Approaches to Conflict Resolution: Examples from Papua New Guinea." *Negotiation Journal* 14.3 (1998): 211-20.

ESSAYS/MANUALS/OTHER (accessed online)

[1] Arai, Tatsushi. "Art, Creativity, and Conflict Transformation: A Practitioner's Field Note." *Juanita Voices* (2013): 147-168.
http://www.juniata.edu/services/jcpress/voices/pdf/2013/jv_2013_147-168.pdf

[2] Berghof Foundation for Peace Support. "The Systemic Approach to Conflict Transformation: Concept and Fields of Application." 2006   http://www.berghof-peacesupport.org/publications/SCT_Systemic_Conflict_Transformation_Complete.pdf.

[3] Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation. "Glossary." 2004 http://www.berghof-handbook.net/all

[4] Caritas Internationalis. "Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual." Posted: 2002 http://www.caritas.org.

[5] Cooper, Ilan. "A Discussion with Bishop Singulane on the Role of CCM in the Ending of the Mozambican Civil War." 2009 http://berkleycenter.georgetown.edu/interviews/a-discussion-with-bishop-singulane-on-the-role-of-ccm-in-the-ending-of-the-mozambican-civil-war

[6] Fisher, Martina. "Recovering from Violent Conflict: Regeneration and (Re-)Integration as Elements of Peacebuilding." 2004 http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/fischer_handbook.pdf

[7] Kriesberg, Louis. "The State of the Art in Conflict Transformation." In *Advancing Conflict Transformation. The Bergof Handbook II.* Eds. B. Austin, M. Fisher, and H. J. Glessmann.   Opladen/Framington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2011. http://www.berghof-handbook.net

[8]   Lederach,   John   Paul.   "Conflict   Transformation."   2003 http://www.beyondintractability.org/bi-essay/transformationt

[9]   Lederach,   John   Paul.   "Curriculum   Vitae."   2013 http://kroc.nd.edu/sites/default/files/lederachcv.pdf

[10] Maiese, Michelle. "Elites." *Beyond Intractability*. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. 2003 http://www.beyondintractability.org/bi-essay/elite

[11] Micucci, Dana. "Peace and Conflict Studies Take Off Globally." 2008 http://cmsprod.uis.kent.edu/cas/polisci/cacm/news/newsdetail.cfm?newsitem=06AAAE91-F5A8-E36C-B9597552B23D50DD

[12] Reimann, C. "Towards Conflict Transformation: Assessing the state-of-the-art in conflict transformation". In *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation*. 2001 http://www.berghof-center.org/handbook/cf.html

[13] Ropers, Norbert. "From Resolution to Transformation: The Role of Dialogue Projects." In *Berghof Research Center for Constructive Management.* 2004 http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/ropers_handbook.pdf

[14] Said, Abdul A. and Nathan C. Funk. "The Role of Faith in Cross-Cultural Conflict Resolution." 2001 http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/pcs/ASNC83PCS.htm

[15] Spangler, Brad. "Settlement, Resolution, Management, and Transformation: An Explanation of Terms." *Beyond Intractability*. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. 2003 http://www.beyondintractability.org/bi-essay/meaning-resolution

[16]   TransConflict.   "Principles   of   Conflict   Transformation." http://www.transconflict.com/gcct/principles-of-conflict-transformation

[17] Woodward, Dick.   "The Profile of a Leader."   In *Mini Bible College Study.* http://new.minibiblecollege.org/index.php/study/lesson/English/OTS44/