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It is a great privilege to write a foreword for this exciting new training guide, *Peacebuilding in Divided Communities*. The Karuna Center for Peacebuilding, under the inspired leadership of its founding director, Dr. Paula Green, and current director Olivia Stokes Dreier, has pioneered creative and successful processes for the transformation of violent conflict and post-conflict community peacebuilding in a wide range of violently divided societies.

What makes Karuna Center and this training guide different from a large number of other organizations working in similar areas, and many other training manuals, is that Karuna Center combines the insights and wisdom of psychology, sociology, and politics in a holistic fashion. This approach generates respectful and effective dialogue, reconciliation, and collaborative problem solving between warring parties.

Over the last 18 years, the Center has generated an enviable reputation for developing and maintaining creative working relationships with a wide variety of official and unofficial actors in more than 25 different conflict zones. It works with these actors to generate hope and creative possibility in situations where many are pessimistic and stuck.

Karuna Center training teams know from experience that when trust is replaced by mistrust, security by insecurity, and hope by fear, it is critical to focus attention on processes that will foster trust and clear communications between groups in conflict. These efforts will only be successful, however, if the process designers and facilitators themselves are committed to creating non-violent solutions to violent problems. One of the primary and deep values within Karuna Center is a strong commitment to building cultures and structures of peace, and to exploring and exhausting all non-violent responses to conflict. That the organization has been able to work with government and non-governmental entities alike in this endeavor is testimony to a universal popular yearning to achieve peace by peaceful means, and to create robust, non-violent institutions capable of preventing and containing violence.

In my own research and writing, I have been concerned with how we enlarge “Boundaries of Compassion,” and I am very pleased to note that this concern lies at the heart of much of the work described in this training guide. This too is another reason why the organization and this guide fill an important gap in the development and peacebuilding field. Far too often, development and conflict resolution experts view the existential dilemmas of working in conflict environments as technical problems demanding narrow technical solutions. To its credit, Karuna Center refuses to treat direct and indirect violence as technical problems. By imbedding the work in a very firm “compassionate” frame, its trainers are able to work with individuals afflicted by conflict in order to help them see their problems in relation to others. In this way they stimulate higher levels of empathetic consciousness, appeal to altruistic impulses, and generate genuine understanding of the dynamics that have impelled people to divide themselves from and dehumanize others. These processes of rehumanization, which lie at the heart of much of Karuna Center’s work, are a very distinctive feature of it.

The principles that undergird this engagement were developed through work in a wide variety of contexts. Karuna Center, along with other groups working in diverse areas, has established approaches that generate environments conducive to effective peacebuilding. Its staff and trainers work with local partners, for example, and encourage those partners to set agendas suitable
for their local conditions. Karuna Center training teams focus on the constructive side of conflict, utilizing the positive elements of conflict incompatibility to suggest new ways of framing and re-framing old problems. They understand the wisdom of elicitive techniques and processes in their teaching and conflict transformation work, and most of all, they value the central role of respectful and deep dialogical processes to break cycles of revenge and to start thinking more hopefully and creatively about the future. They know the power of a positive vision, and much of their work is aimed at getting those in broken relationship to envisage new futures together.

The other distinctive feature of Karuna Center’s work is a commitment to work with parties through time. They understand well that conflict transformation is a marathon, not a sprint, and commit themselves to working with those in broken communities for as long as it takes to enable them to reconnect shattered relationships. They could not do this work if they themselves were not coming from a position of groundedness and personal integration. This has meant that much attention is paid at Karuna Center to the personal qualities of facilitators, so that they can deal with individual and collective damage and pain with sensitivity, empathy, and humility. These are all critical characteristics of effective conflict transformers.

The principles and practices that are articulated in this training guide have all emerged from a deep humanitarian commitment to do no harm, and more hopefully, to do what is right and feasible in very complex and challenging environments. Karuna Center’s concern to promote better understanding of human interdependence, its acknowledgement of the transformative power of peaceful pedagogy, and the priority given to justice, non-violence, and collaborative problem-solving have a particular dynamic edge in its work. These core values are linked to high levels of compassionate responsibility and a strong commitment to non-violence and reconciliation, as well as to a genuine celebration of social diversity.

In all this work, the people in Karuna Center understand the importance of working at all levels of society, from the top down, the bottom up, and the middle up and down. The interventions described in this guide speak truth to power while ensuring that those who are relatively voiceless and powerless also have knowledge of non-violent techniques for negotiation, struggle, and transformation. They are successful in this work because they understand that peace, justice, and reconciliation will not flow from the rich and powerful making concessions to the poor and powerless, but from processes which are radically inclusive. These processes need to be aimed at generating higher levels of accountability and responsibility on the part of the whole population. They should enable those without voice to find their voice, and in deeper conversation and dialogue, to generate catalytic spaces aimed at ensuring that everyone’s needs for recognition, welfare, and security are satisfied.

The fact that Karuna Center has designed and delivered processes that have facilitated individual, social, and collective healing in the aftermath of violence is an achievement in itself. Their training guide is a powerful indication, however, that there is no desire in the organization to rest on its laurels. The guide offers a powerful collection of lessons learned from a range of different conflicts and an invitation to all of us to join Karuna Center in the next 20 years in the creation of a non-violent, just, and peaceable world. I commend *Peacebuilding in Divided Communities* to everyone as a model of how we might individually and collectively begin making a different world from wherever we are right now.

Professor Kevin P. Clements
Director, National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
University of Otago, New Zealand
Preface: Founding Vision of Karuna Center for Peacebuilding

Stirrings of Conscience
In the 1990s, I felt the stirrings of conscience calling me to new action. The particularly dreadful travails of ethnic conflict in the last decade of our past century pulled me out of my comfort zone and toward new thinking about war, with its continual presence in our lives and its tenacious contribution to our collective suffering.

I wondered how I might use my decades of experience as an educator, psychologist, activist, and Buddhist student to foster positive intergroup relations, increase mutuality and respect between identity groups, and stimulate thinking about nonviolent solutions to conflict. One individual may not be in a position to encourage peaceful responses to conflict, I thought, but perhaps an organization with a clear vision might make a reasonable contribution. I found myself no longer willing to be a passive witness to the suffering caused by armed conflict and the unbridled misuse of power and privilege. I wanted to develop peacebuilding initiatives based on my skills and experiences.

As my attention to the larger world beyond the United States increased during those years, my professional life as a therapist and professor in counseling psychology reached a natural and wholesome close. Serving as a board member of several international peace and engaged Buddhist organizations, I became increasingly compelled by the world beyond the narrow confines of nation and region. My lifelong commitment to supporting nonviolent solutions to egregious problems of war and injustice, honed by decades of anti-war activity and human/civil rights advocacy, needed a new voice. These activist proclivities, integrated with Buddhist practices of compassion and interdependence, and fueled by the mayhem in Yugoslavia and Rwanda, pulled me to find new vocation and direction. This would come quickly, and would soon draw me not only to Yugoslavia and Rwanda, but to Auschwitz and Burma as well.

Burma
Burma became my first learning opportunity as a budding peacebuilder. A once-successful rice bowl of Asia and a profoundly beautiful land of river, jungle, mountain, glittering Buddhist pavilions, and diverse ethnic traditions, Burma has been laid waste by a series of military dictatorships intent upon selling the nation’s riches to the highest bidder and silencing all opposition. Great harm and oppression have come to this lovely land and its people, and its fate has haunted my heart since meeting Burma in 1989, a year after a brutal military crackdown on the democracy movement. Invited with others to investigate conditions on the Thai-Burma border, my first trip there set in motion years of engagement along that border in service to struggling populations and on behalf of their liberation movements. Colleagues and I began to explore strategies of nonviolence with Burmese and Thai activists, and to build a movement in the United States and other countries that would support those inside Burma struggling for freedom and dignity. Unknowingly, this work in Burma became a path toward a new chapter in my life, one that next took me to the darkness of Auschwitz.
Auschwitz
To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of WWII, the tragedy of the Shoah, and the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a Japanese Buddhist order of monks and nuns, the Nipponzan Mjohoji, proposed a yearlong peace walk. It began with a convocation at Auschwitz in December 1994, which they asked me to organize and facilitate. There is perhaps no more provocative place on earth to bear witness to human malice and misery. For one week, participants meditated on the tracks, stumbled through the barracks, prayed at the sanctuaries, and engaged in dialogue at the house of reconciliation built by a German organization. Deep bonding took place between Christians and Jews, and among Germans, Japanese, Americans, and other Europeans. Music arose from the encounters, along with tears, anger, mourning, rituals, and pledges of solidarity. Through all of this, I was finding my way to my life calling.

From 1992-95, agonizing civil wars transformed the pastoral countryside and medieval cities of the former Yugoslavia into a landscape of devastation. At the same time, in 1994 in Rwanda, the rivers ran with blood in an ethnic genocide that we thought the world would never again witness after Auschwitz. The post-Cold War peace dividend did not arrive, and war remained the primary response to problems of human greed and grievances. In 1994, I founded Karuna Center, a sincere and modest response to the unfolding horrors.

Rwanda
The International Fellowship of Reconciliation, on whose board I served, received an invitation from the Archbishop of Goma, Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo) to teach nonviolence in the huge Rwandan Hutu refugee camps that sprung up as the Hutus fled Rwanda after an army of Tutsi refugees from Uganda ended the genocide. I traveled in 1995 with a colleague and a translator to the UN-supported Mugunga Refugee Camp of 200,000 Rwandan Hutus, including both the innocent and some genocidaires, as they were called in French. Although the assignment seemed absurd, we taught nonviolence each day to surprisingly large audiences for two weeks, and when we returned the following year there were 17 new centers for the study of nonviolence established in the camp.

Bosnia
Shortly after this, a videographer from the Auschwitz Convocation went to Bosnia, where she spoke to Bosnians about our dialogues at Auschwitz. This led to an invitation to facilitate healing circles for Bosnian Muslim women who had been grievously harmed by communal violence and the destruction of their homes, families, and way of life. Bosnia became my focus from 1997-2002. As the circles of Muslim women expanded to include their former Serb neighbors, the women advised that we turn our attention to Bosnian educators for “the sake of Bosnia’s future.” Over the years, we touched the lives of hundreds of people in the northern Bosnian cities of Sanski Most and Prijedor and left a cadre of trainers who could carry on the work.

Thus was Karuna Center launched in the last decade of the 20th century in response to the cauldrons of violent conflict on three continents: Asia, Africa, and Europe.
Simultaneous to founding Karuna Center, I was invited to join the faculty of the School for International Training (SIT) Graduate Institute in Brattleboro, Vermont, where I continue to serve as a professor of Conflict Transformation for graduate students. Two years after my teaching at SIT began, colleagues and I founded the Conflict Transformation Across Cultures Program, known by its acronym, CONTACT. The opportunity to practice peacebuilding through Karuna Center, to teach it at SIT, and to engage with increasingly diverse global communities through CONTACT, has provided a rich and rewarding professional life where each effort and program interfaces and nourishes the others.

Now, in the 21st century, we are faced with diminishing resources on a finite planet: the depletion of water, agricultural land, and oil; burgeoning populations of youth with rising expectations and limited futures; new conflicts, hot and cold wars; and unhealed wounds of past violent conflicts that threaten to erupt and ignite once again. Peacebuilding has become a bona fide field, offering training programs, solidarity, and external support to beleaguered populations. But without massive shifts of consciousness, our fear-based greed for more resources will exacerbate a rising global inequity that is certain to create more conflict.

For our mutual survival, we are summoned to change both our institutions and the worldviews that created them. It is time to let go of the delusion that we are independent individuals and disconnected nations, in order to embrace the global interdependence of persons and sys-
tems. War as a way of problem solving is outdated. Our failing ecosystems require restoration. The prophetic words of Martin Luther King, Jr. that “we will either live together as brothers and sisters or die together as fools” guide the work of Karuna Center as we foster renewal of shattered relations and honor our intertwined humanity.

In publishing this training guide, we invite the reader into the philosophy behind our peacebuilding efforts, as well as share the details of workshop designs, the countries in which we taught them, and useful materials for the tasks of teaching and learning. The tools for building peace need to be disseminated widely, so that skills for transforming conflict can be taught worldwide to current and future generations. We offer the work of Karuna Center to this common vision.

Paula Green, Founder
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, 2012

Discussion on gender and peacebuilding among Pakistani participants
Introduction: Partners and Programs in the Search for Peace

The Karuna Center for Peacebuilding is committed to the development and implementation of innovative, sustainable, and relational strategies for community peacebuilding and reconciliation in societies where ethnic, religious, and sectarian conflicts threaten the possibility of stable democracy. Since 1994 we have pioneered effective multi-sector training programs that promote genuine dialogue, reconciliation, cooperative problem solving, and nonviolent solutions in twenty-five conflict-ridden or war-torn countries. This training manual represents a sample of the kinds of trainings we have created, making them available to the general public and helping those who seek our services to understand our approach and the values that frame our work.

How and Where We Work

Working by invitation and in partnership with in-country organizations, the Karuna Center for Peacebuilding leads training programs specifically designed to foster trust and communication between groups in conflict and to promote intercommunal projects that can advance a healthy civil society capable of supporting viable democratic institutions and sustaining cultures of peace. Our presence in a particular country or region generally begins in response to a specific invitation and then expands by invitation to other organizations and institutions within the country. While most of our partnerships are with local or international non-governmental organizations (NGO’s), we also work with governments, educational groups, religious leaders, academic institutions, and other organizations.

For example, in the 1990s in Nepal, we led programs for women’s empowerment and cultural preservation. Karuna Center returned to Nepal in 2006 through an invitation from a Nepali human rights group; we arrived as protests escalated and led to the end of the monarchy. The success of our workshop led to other NGO invitations, the formation of a partnership with a Nepali NGO, and finally to work with the Nepali Parliament on the myriad challenges and obstacles to negotiating a mutually acceptable constitution and new government.

Karuna Center engaged for many years with educators in Bosnia and Macedonia, and with civil society groups in Kosovo and the Caucasus. In Africa, we have had a steady presence in Rwanda and Senegal, and worked in other African countries more briefly. In the Middle East, we continue a commitment to peacebuilding programs for Israelis and Palestinians. In Asia, we have trained peacebuilders in Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal, Burma, and the Philippines. We have enjoyed creating a mentoring program for Tibetans in India, and joined organizational networks in Thailand and Cambodia. We commit ourselves to working long-term with the same NGOs and group members in sequenced programs that endure over enough years to create change as well as to transfer knowledge and skills.
Who We Are and Who We Meet
As Karuna Center neared the end of its second decade, I stepped away as the founding director to become a Senior Fellow, and Olivia Stokes Dreier became director. Adding new energy and program direction, Dreier has also developed peacebuilding programs through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), U.S. Department of State, and multilateral institutions such as the World Bank. These initiatives have allowed us to expand our impact while remaining true to our mission, principles, and strategies for peacebuilding. Whether working through larger NGOs or by the invitation of local organizations, we consistently meet visionary people in the most difficult of circumstances. It is a privilege to accompany our partners in their courageous search for peace and justice. Their remarkable capacity for resilience keeps hope alive in dark times.

Enlarging Circles of Compassion
Mother Teresa observed that “the problem with the world is that we draw the circle of our family too small.” These small circles separate and divide populations, restricting our sense of care and compassion to an inner circle defined as “us.” Those beyond the circle are labeled “other,” and may come to be seen through narrow stereotypes that dehumanize, disenfranchise, render invisible, and objectify. As peacebuilders, our relational model encourages participants to become aware of this partly unconscious and often media-manipulated process. We invite participants in our programs to explore the possibility of encountering these “identified others,” no matter how terrible the history between them.

This vision of creating bridges within divided communities informs and structures each program mission and design, which takes shape in accordance with local circumstances and

*Juba, South Sudan, 2012: women leaders sharing hope in their new nation*
stages of conflict. We may be working with political leaders in Nepal, educators in Bosnia, or rebel groups in Senegal. In such settings of protracted conflict, dominated by stress, fear, and loss, the elements of compassion and empathy are in short supply. The road to healing war-weary and fractured communities is long and arduous, but essential if we are to prevent future cycles of mass violence.

Good peacebuilding programs demand flexibility of design and nimbleness of mind to adapt to rapidly changing conditions and alliances. Whether at the community, institutional, or political level, our peacebuilding processes are based on expanding the circles of empathy described by Mother Teresa and supporting the restoration of relationships poisoned by war. Karuna Center believes that because there are no vacant countries where entire populations might resettle after armed conflict, those who have harmed and those who have been harmed must find their way back to respectful communication, if not trust, with former neighbors, colleagues, and compatriots. When invited by local partners or international organizations to lead programs in communities experiencing protracted conflict, we find our presence as outsiders useful because we are able to be both caring and multi-partial, serving as an intermediary across the gulf of distrust and enmity. We also carry understandings hard-won from peace-building in other conflicts. The welcomed news from afar is that wars do end and that former adversaries can become partners for rebuilding their societies and creating sustainable peace.

The dialogues we incorporate throughout our programs create a container or platform through which relationships can be explored, tested, and strengthened. The most urgent questions we hear in communities recovering from mass violence revolve around how the war started and how ordinary citizens became brutal to others. “Whose fault is this?” “How shall blame be apportioned?” “How did our neighbors become killers and destroyers?” “How do we live with the shame and guilt we suffer?” “What do we tell our children?” “How do we go forward?” These are haunting questions. They are at the heart of dialogue, launching the halting journey toward empathy and a larger circle of inclusion.

Karuna Center’s Strategies for Peacebuilding

Karuna Center’s training programs engage courageous members of war-torn communities who step forward to repair and reconstruct what has been lost, or to add what has never been included in the social, political, and economic fabric of their society. We facilitate a deeper and more critical understanding of the causes of conflict, so that reconstruction can include systemic changes that provide the conditions for peace, paying particular attention to unmet needs. The quest for justice is inextricably linked to the search for peace. We firmly believe that there is no sustainable peace when injustice prevails. While dialogue experience builds empathy, our intention is to help participants translate their newfound understandings into societal transformations that foster increased political, economic, and social justice.

Partnering: We create peacebuilding programs through invitations from organizations. We do not impose ourselves on the lives and concerns of others without their invitation. We first engage those members of the community who are ready for dialogue, and reach outward through their networks to potential new participants. We maximize the building of local capacity by engaging those who have the broadest and most significant impact in their particular
communities, collaborating with them to design trainings that are specifically suited and appropriate to the given local situation as well as to our areas of expertise. Our goal is to contribute to creating well-trained peacebuilders in their own countries.

**Conflict Transformation:**
Conflict is inherent in human life, and if harnessed in a constructive manner, can be an opportunity for insight, growth, and positive social change. It is the violent, often fear-based response to conflict that all of us must redirect in our personal and communal lives. Frequently, conflict arises when old forms or habituated responses are no longer addressing current realities, and where a shift in policy may be required. Change threatens current arrangements, privileges, and access to power, and thus meets stiff resistance. Conflict transformation seeks to guide the energy of conflict away from violence and toward positive structural and relational changes that meet emerging needs and increase benefits more broadly.

Our peacebuilding trainings and workshops carefully interweave experiential learning with pivotal conceptual material on conflict analysis as well as skill-building strategies for responding to conflict. We are committed to training the next generations in the theories, practices, and skills of nonviolence. We build a learning community through structured activities designed to establish trust, curiosity, and confidentiality. These encourage participants to probe in-depth the multiple and interlocked causes of mass conflict. Since the participant community often includes parties from various sides of the conflict, it is important to surface and explore prejudices and stereotypes between them, using the group as a learning laboratory. We always remain fully engaged with the immediacy and pain of lives deeply impacted by conflict, violence, and trauma. The dialogue experiences in the workshop increase trust, humanization, and understanding, expanding opportunities for future intercommunal collaboration and progress.

Our intention is to support participants to take responsibility for their own past and present behaviors, and the effects of these on others and on themselves. Throughout the workshops, we work to model compassion, connection, and the valuing of diversity as building blocks for community reconstruction. We encourage participants who are divided by antagonism to experience and acknowledge the depth of their interdependence and to identify common needs and aspirations.

As facilitators, from initial preparation and throughout our engagement, we work to create multi-partiality within ourselves, being open to the perspectives and experiences of all parties to violent conflict. We understand that societies develop elaborate and often competing narratives, each with a different version of truth, all of which must be acknowledged and considered for any settlement to endure.
**Elicitive Teaching:** Most of us received our education in prescriptive mode. Our teachers filled our presumably empty minds with facts to be memorized and repeated back for exams. Little opportunity existed for interaction, creative thinking, divergence, or alternative experiencing. Current research proves that adults learn best from elicitive teaching, where their life experiences, particular realities, and wisdom can be shared, where they take responsibility for their learning, and where their opinions have equal value with those of workshop leaders. Karuna Center practices elicitive methodology in our programs, encouraging participants to draw from the wisdom of their own cultures and life experiences and empowering them to have faith in their own capacities to take on the great challenges of building peace in divided societies.

**Dialogue:** Central to the work of Karuna Center is the skillful use of facilitated, structured dialogues. In the communities where we work, relationships between identity groups have often been severed by war and enmity, leaving former friends and neighbors embittered and mistrustful. In our programs, participants from these groups engage in very carefully designed dialogues to rebuild lives and relations. We focus on norms to create safety within the group setting and suggest dialogue be used as an opportunity to have a new conversation on familiar and difficult topics. We practice listening skills to develop the discipline to hear other perspectives that may threaten one’s own views, and encourage genuine inquiry and respectful exchange. We work slowly and with great care, fostering insight, understanding, and the common ground of hope for a better world.

Our trainings invite participants to engage a set of carefully crafted generative questions with the hope that in the responses to those questions lie the seeds to prevent the next round of violence. While the facilitators may initiate the process with questions culled from experience in similar situations, our hopes are that participants will begin to pose their own questions and attempt to carry the practice of dialogue into the multiple contexts of their lives.

People often enter our trainings carrying deep hurts, resentments, feelings of enmity, and desires for revenge toward another community or group whose members may themselves be co-participants in the program. During well-facilitated dialogues, participants can arrive at a profound recognition of the essential humanity of the other, a sense of mutuality and common purpose, and a willingness to move forward together. We see dialogue not as an end in itself but as a means toward building cultures of peace based on shared needs for communal stability and safety.

**Dissemination/Cascade Model:** Most of our programs last three or more years so that we can co-create with our participants a meaningful shift in how conflict is understood and mitigated. We conclude with a “training of trainers” in which the strongest group members are given intensive training in peacebuilding curriculum design and facilitation skills. We mentor participants as they develop their own peacebuilding trainings and projects, so that they may build on their skills and confidence as they engage in ongoing conflict transformation work in their home country. Former participants of Karuna Center programs not only bring social healing to their communities, but also facilitate dialogues and teach peacebuilding skills throughout their countries. This cascading model builds a critical mass of people committed to promoting peace and justice and preventing future violence. Some NGOs, such as the Center
for Peacebuilding and Reconciliation in Sri Lanka (CPBR) and the Center for Peacebuilding in
Bosnia, have been created by graduates of our programs and remain vital Karuna Center part-
ner organizations.

The Peacebuilding Facilitator: Learning the art and soul of peacebuilding is a life-
time endeavor. Serving others whose life circumstances are frequently different from our own
requires sensitivity, empathy, and humility. Designing workshops calls for creativity, adaptabil-
ity, and non-attachment, as that which is prepared may not meet emerging needs of partici-
pants. Knowing the self and one’s biases is critical to being present with others as they struggle
with their own learned attitudes and assumptions. A commitment to nonviolent methods for
resolving conflict is core to this profession, which eschews war as a means of problem solv-
ing. Respect, love, and compassion
are in short supply in the lives of
many participants and will be
welcomed, along with wisdom,
solidarity, open-handed guidance,
knowledge of conflict transfor-
mation skills and theories, and a per-
sonal commitment to wage peace
in one’s own life and country.

Evaluation: Karuna Center
employs a variety of data collec-
tion instruments and methods to
assess the immediate effective-
ness and long-term impact of its
trainings. In addition, our evalu-
ations include a participatory process whereby all involved, whether as trainers, trainees, or
other key stakeholders in the community, can learn how to do the following: a) reflect on the
past and on personal and societal changes relating to the project; b) generate knowledge from
lessons learned; and c) identify project strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for
future action.

To evaluate our programs, we look for evidence of our trainings’ effectiveness using three
benchmarks of success: 1) attitudinal and behavioral change, 2) length of participation, and 3)
the development of participants’ own peacebuilding projects and commitments. During our
trainings, particularly in the facilitated dialogues, observable shifts occur as participants move
from suspicion and hostility to understanding and cooperative relationships. These shifts are
key to the conflict transformation process and become the basis for behavioral change. We
expect a high percentage of participants to sustain participation throughout a two to three
year program. We monitor the extent to which mentored participants carry out significant and
well-designed peacebuilding projects and trainings in their own locales.

Guiding Principles
In summary, there are five guiding principles we use to develop programs and partnerships: 1)
awaken communities and individuals out of the narrowness of nationalism and ethnocentrism
to a broader recognition of our interdependence and shared longing for peace; 2) build learning communities that investigate the causes, consequences, and prevention of mass violence; 3) prioritize justice and promote nonviolent problem-solving at home and abroad; 4) advocate self-awareness, compassion for others, and social responsibility; and 5) encourage the values and practices that celebrate diversity, foster social healing, and promote reconciliation and forgiveness where there has been hatred and war.

Peacebuilding trainings and dialogue workshops are not a panacea and do not create peace. These contributions are part of a larger strategy that must also embrace massive mobilization of the grassroots population and simultaneously receive support from those in power within and beyond the conflict region. We believe that peacebuilding is a top-down, bottom-up, and middle-out lifetime endeavor, one that requires all voices and a wise mix of strategies. The contributions of organizations like Karuna Center inspire, educate, and capacitate activists from all levels of society who may join together to shape the future in their own countries and beyond through their determination to defend justice and to create the conditions for peace.

How to Use this Training Guide

The six chapters below will focus on conflict analysis, peacebuilding interventions, intercommunal dialogue, social healing and reconciliation, preparing peacebuilding facilitators (training of trainers), and creating learning communities for peacebuilding in a global context. Each chapter begins with “Key Generative Questions” to stimulate broad thinking about the topic at hand. At Karuna Center, we probe such questions introspectively as we prepare to engage with communities in conflict, seeking wisdom and guidance about how we can best serve. Next, there is an overview of the chapter topic that speaks to our understanding of where it fits in the arc of violent conflict, from arising to cessation and prevention. Following that comes a “Story from the Field,” which uses an actual training experience as a case study to exemplify the theme of the chapter. And finally, we present a training design, tested and refined in the field, on the specific topic. Each chapter ends with tools for experiential exercises used in the specific design, and a sampling of suggested resources for articles, books, websites, and videos. For ease of use, we offer a paginated listing of all tools on page 71.

Caveat on Use of Workshop Designs and Training Exercises

Workshop Designs: Karuna Center for Peacebuilding believes in an interactive, creative, and elicitive design model. What we present here are frameworks upon which a workshop might be built. We may start out with some of the elements described in the design, but through listening carefully to the members of the group, we construct a design that is responsive to their particular needs. A curriculum will emerge that resembles, but does not follow precisely, a design put to paper ahead of time. A pressing issue may take the group in a different direction. In an “elicitive” model, trainers and participants co-create the curriculum based on the compelling interests and urgent needs of the group members, so that the frame of the initial planned curriculum is flexible enough to be set aside as new concerns emerge.

In this training guide, we offer designs as they actually developed, but which may not have been what we originally envisioned. Each group has its own set of dynamics and shifting priori-
ties that we are committed to serve, and we have learned not to attach ourselves to preconceived designs or even outcomes. A more prescriptive approach to training may feel safe for new trainers, but elicitive training contains greater relevance, energy, and usefulness. Please use these models as guides to stimulate your own and your participants’ creativity, always being sensitive to the needs and cultures of the particular group members.

Training Exercises and Tools: Karuna Center recommends that the teaching tools in this manual be used with judicious restraint and careful preparation. Each tool includes objectives and suggested means of presentation. Training exercises exist to enhance the quality of instruction and highlight problems, theories, and potential responses. Too frequently, trainers, especially those with fewer years of experience, use exercises as an anchor of their program, rather than as aids to teaching. Peacebuilding programs and selected tools should be rooted in the goals of the training and based on the stated needs of the communities in which the training will be offered. Please use these tools with discernment for local particularities and group needs, in the spirit of creating programs that address the causes and consequences of mass violence and contribute to peaceful means of responding to conflict in communities that for too long have suffered from the wounds of war.

It is important to note that English-speaking facilitators from countries in the Global North (often called the West) developed most of these tools, which are primarily used in the Global South in contexts of mass violence. We acknowledge this with our participants, encouraging them to not only translate the tools, but to adapt them to fit their cultures and norms and to invent new tools appropriate to their situation. Cultural respect and preservation is especially critical after mass violence, where the survival of local traditions is threatened and the fear of dissolution of identity and way of life may indeed have contributed to the conflict. Facilitators will hopefully remember that not all tools are appropriate in all cultural contexts and will check with colleagues and translators, modeling respect and full inclusion of all participants’ cultures and norms in the training process.

While the focus of Karuna Center’s work is on societies recovering from and preventing the return of violent conflict, much of the material in this guide is appropriate for conflict management in seemingly peaceful societies, which may indeed be less just and harmonious than they appear. Conflict analysis and many of the tools for intervention, dialogue, and reconciliation may be applied to national-level conflicts, community conflicts, or to the kinds of difficulties that arise in organizations and groups. Adapt these concepts and tools readily, wherever they might prevent violence and promote peaceful communities.
Chapter One: Conflict Analysis

Key Generative Questions —

How do we help workshop participants gain insight into the multiple, systemic, partly invisible, and interlocked national and international causes of violent conflicts in their country and region?

What are the structural, psychological, political, economic, environmental, resource, and global factors that cause a conflict to escalate, or not escalate, from a manageable dispute into mass violence in a given community?

Why is it essential to understand war from the perspectives, motives, and core needs of all involved parties, both direct participants and those with external influence?

Who are the significant actors engaged in conflict escalation or active in de-escalation and prevention?

Where do participants’ own organizations, institutions, and personal actions fit in the analysis of conflict and its mitigation?

How do we keep hope alive when conflict analysis enables participants to recognize the overwhelming forces that lead to seemingly endless warfare?

Overview

Conflict is a healthy aspect of human existence, and in its benign forms, conflict expands options, promotes diversity of thought and vision, and challenges outworn traditions. Violence is the expression of conflict in a way that threatens human life or the quality of life. Violence may be direct or indirect, and may occur through unjust political, cultural, or economic structures, or through physical, verbal, psychological, or sexual abuse and violation. Structural violence exists where the institutions of government and society repress, subjugate, and deny the just aspirations of some of its members. The negative impact of institutional violence causes further harm, resulting in secondary forms of violence, as persons and groups respond to their constrained circumstances with harm to self, other, and society. Violence is intrinsic to all armed conflict, whether inflicted by government or opposing militia forces, and creates its own cycles of enduring harm.

Violent conflict can arise from unmet or competing needs, values, and desires, or from unequal access to resources and power. Violent conflict can be motivated and aggravated by manipulation by demagogic leaders, unbridled greed, fear, shame, historical narratives and wounds, oppression, exploitation, deprivation, dehumanization, revenge, opportunism, extreme crises, and many other factors. In order to kill others, members of an identity group must come to accept the inherent inferiority or untrustworthiness of the other and perceive them
Rwandan Suzanne Rubonka presents a conflict analysis during Karuna Center’s 3-year peace leadership program for ProFemmes Twese Hamwe, a consortium of 58 Rwandan women’s NGOs as a threat. These beliefs are often augmented by propaganda spread by self-serving leaders and biased media.

The purpose of analyzing conflict is to comprehend more deeply the complex, intertwined, systemic issues and trends that have led to mass violence, in order to create feasible and timely conflict mitigation strategies. As participants in peacebuilding programs reflect on the causes of violence, they become aware that many of these causes are not visible on the surface, but are rooted in the historic context and “chosen memories” of the groups in conflict. Some purported causes may be oversimplified by media headlines or promoted by government actors for their own interests. An analysis of conflict needs to grapple seriously with the systemic connections and underlying patterns between various root causes and conditions that generate violent conflict.

Entrenched conflict never has a single or simple cause, but is always multi-determined and nuanced. Conflict analysis requires studying the history of a conflict from multiple perspectives. It seeks to understand all the actors and structures, visible and unseen, which impinge on a given conflict, and to identify which proximate or distant parties might undermine attempts at conflict cessation and transformation. The issues and interests of all parties must be considered, and peacebuilders should analyze the situation both broadly and deeply to discern patterns and conceive possible approaches and interventions that might positively alter the current context.

Such a nuanced analysis is necessary in order to forge interventions that address root causes and contribute to a sustainable peace. The intentionality and community built by a group gathered to study conflict transformation gives rise to hope for support and solidarity on the journey toward change. For the peacebuilding program described below in the Philippines, we brought together members of the dominant factions engaged in the struggle for peace and justice in Mindanao so that they could build trust with each other and engage jointly in ending violence in their communities.
Story from the Field: Philippines

Working with a newly constituted group of development workers representing a variety of ethnicities and religions in the conflict-ridden Mindanao area of the Philippines, we chose to begin with an analysis of the region’s long-term violent conflict. For this diverse group to coalesce and form working alliances, it seemed important to gain common understandings of the complex roots of the violence that plagued their lives and communities. We will begin with historical background, which peacebuilders must study for each context before embarking on new programs.

Mindanao is the second largest of the 7,107 islands in the Philippines and one of the three major island groups in the country. The region is home to the country’s Muslim, or Moro, populations, comprising many ethnic groups including the collective group of indigenous tribes known as the Lumad. For five centuries, Mindanaoan Muslim groups have waged an independence struggle against successive occupiers. Due to decades-long land-grab schemes and the subsequent influx of non-Muslim settlers brought to the region, the majority of Mindanao’s population is now predominantly Christian. Population transfer, perceived as a deliberate government action, fuels the anger and fear of poor and displaced Mindanaoan Muslims, and escalates the separatist movements they have been fighting for hundreds of years.

Today, Mindanao faces an additional challenge based on growing pressure to develop, extract, and tap into the island’s abundant natural resources. This is creating tensions between the central government and Mindanaoan residents, as well as among ethnic groups struggling for control of vital natural resources. Karuna Center makes efforts to promote conflict management skills among resource development workers in violence-prone regions, since development workers are frequently members...
of the groups in conflict and have direct access to local communities. This focus on peacebuilding and development is likely to become more relevant as societies feel the impact of competition for the earth’s diminishing natural resources, including the land and water vital for life.

In January 2006, Karuna Center partnered with the Department of Agrarian Reform of the Philippine government in the violence-prone region of Mindanao to deliver a ten-day conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding training program. Thirty lively and engaged participants, representing national and local government units and NGOs, attended the program: 11 women and 19 men comprised of members of the 3 communities in conflict, who are Moro Muslim, Christian, and indigenous peoples. We co-facilitated the training with Karuna Center Associate Baht Latumbo of the Philippines. Our work was supported in part by the International Fund for Agrarian Development.

Sample Training Design: Conflict Analysis and Dynamics
This 10-day training had two 5-day modules with a day off between them. The overarching goals of the program included relationship and trust building among activist members of disputing groups, shared conflict analysis, and joint problem solving resulting in specific peacebuilding interventions within their communities. The first module, described below as it actually emerged from the give-and-take of curriculum design and the needs of the group, focused on conflict analysis and community building. The second module, which is not included here, focused on interventions, the topic of the following chapter of this training guide.

DAY 1
Morning
• Opening Traditional Ceremony
• Introductions
• Training Objectives and Curriculum Review
• Ground Rules and Logistics
Afternoon
• Conflict Free-Association: As a warm up exercise, participants free-associate to the word “conflict,” examine our largely negative perspectives on conflict, and surface positive aspects of conflict without violence.
• “Iceberg Model: Causes of Conflict” (tool 1.1): Plenary presentation on the theme of multiple, interconnected, and often hidden origins of conflict, followed by small group work to discern underlying causes of conflict in participants’ own contexts.
DAY 2
Morning
• “Tree Model: Roots and Impact of Conflict” (tool 1.2): Plenary presentation that describes the inter-related flow of roots and consequences of violent conflict, followed by small group work where participants identify these knots of mutually reinforcing causes and effects in their own communities.

Afternoon
• “Conflict Mapping” (tool 1.3): Facilitators lead a plenary session to develop a community map of the parties in the conflict, their relationships, relative power, dynamics, and issues. Small groups then discuss the implications of problems revealed by mapping and possible points of future intervention based on these revelations.

DAY 3
Morning
• “Pillars Model: Factors that Sustain Conflict” (tool 1.4): Small groups focus on particular conflicts in their community settings to identify the structural pillars that uphold the status quo and keep the conflict alive. Groups discuss which pillars might be weakened and list strategies to facilitate that outcome. Groups then present their findings to plenary.

Afternoon
• “Dividers and Connectors” exercise (tool 1.5): In plenary, the group focuses on the Mindanaoan conflict to determine the issues and interests of the major parties to the conflict and what factors divide and connect each party to/from the other. Small groups then strategize about how the connectors between groups can be strengthened (e.g. cross-cutting identities, overlapping needs) and how the dividers can be weakened (e.g. increase exposure to the other parties).

DAY 4
Morning
• Simulation Exercise: The plenary divides into groups of 6-7. Each group’s task is to utilize all the approaches taught thus far in preparation for designing interventions that are based directly on the analyses. To do this, each group reviews all the activities and creates its own summary of the overall situation. Small groups prepare their summary of conflict analysis in Mindanao for presentation to the large group in the afternoon, simulating a presentation to a community meeting.

Afternoon
• Facilitators use experiential teaching methods (explained further in tool 5.7, “The Experiential Learning Cycle”) to engage participants as each group presents its simulation to the plenary and receives feedback on the depth and breadth of their analysis.

DAY 5
Morning
• “Cycles of Revenge and Reconciliation” (tool 1.6). Facilitators lead a plenary presentation followed by small group discussions that help participants identify their own
place in this cycle. The inner cycle points to possible explanations for the repetitive and cyclical nature of conflict within groups or nations, while the outer cycle suggests interventions to interrupt cyclical warfare and to work toward a sustainable peace. The presentation is done slowly to allow time for questions and discussion. (The use of this model is discussed further in Chapter 2).

Afternoon

- Application of Cycles: Plenary discussion focused on identifying stages of the cycles of violence and of possible paths to reconciliation in the Mindanaoan context.
- Reflections, evaluation, and closing of the first week of the course.

“The various tools made learning and critical conflict analysis easier. My mind was opened by the techniques and methods, so now my impact as a peacebuilder can be wider.”

—Filipino participant

Additional Reading and Resources


Chapter Two: Peacebuilding Interventions

Key Generative Questions

How can both insiders and outsiders begin to understand the complexity of a culture and its conflicts?

How can external organizations work together with local partners, and with the humility appropriate as outsiders?

What can outsiders offer that is value-added and useful for the host community?

How might we encourage community members to share with each other their perspectives, experiences, and reflections about the war and its impact?

How do we ensure that we address the multiple and interlocked factors that contributed to the conflict while remaining aware of possible risks to participants?

How can we use our role as outsiders to bridge the differences that exist among our participants, and help identify core issues of re-humanization, safety, and justice that must be addressed for sustainable peace?

How do we make sure that our methods and models are culturally appropriate and clear enough to be adapted by local peacebuilders?

How do we negotiate an exit strategy that keeps participants confident and secure about their capacity to carry on the work?

What kind of saturation is required for national systemic change and how do peacebuilders reach the sources of power that control systemic change, especially when change may not be in the interests of those in power?

Overview

What happens when the guns of war are silenced? Generally the country is in a ragged state of disrepair, both physically and emotionally. People are dead, missing, displaced, disrupted, violated, and filled with raw emotions. Their predictable ways of living may be gone, their livelihood no more, their supports demolished. There may be little remaining infrastructure, no government or police, no schools or transportation. Mistrust and fear must be addressed, as must all the issues of structure and support. We want to avoid repeated cycles of revenge, as those who have lost so much are tempted to retaliate against those they see as responsible for their losses.

The cessation of violence is an important marker in the conflict history of a given country.
or region. However, the end of armed conflict is by no means the end of conflict or enmity between the disputants. This section focuses on the period after armed conflict, exploring what measures can be employed to open communication and foster cooperation among former neighbors and colleagues, while simultaneously reducing the divisions and closing the gaps between individuals and communities destroyed by war.

The burden of suffering falls on all parties in war zones. Given the levels of atrocity and betrayal, we are frequently awed by the fact that so many people do recover from mass violence, discovering over time their own resilience and capacity for non-retaliatory behaviors and attitudes. Resilience is variable among people in shattered communities, and in fact even within families we see varying degrees of recovery. Rebuilding trust is the work of a lifetime, if not generations. External peacebuilders can support, encourage, and create appropriate containers for both internal and intergroup exploration, knowing that all measures toward community renewal are critical steps in establishing a viable future on the ashes of the past.

Karuna Center has developed a “Braid Model” (tool 2.1) with strands representing social, political, and economic peacebuilding. We believe each of these are equally important in establishing peace and justice after mass violence, as harmony cannot be restored without massive investment in revitalized social, political, and economic structures. Our work tends to focus on the psychosocial or relational aspects of postwar peacebuilding, although we do sometimes engage politicians in training programs and we support conflict-sensitive approaches to economic recovery. Generally, we leave the tasks of economic and institutional development to other organizations, and focus on the human dimension of postwar recovery at all levels and with all sectors of society, from grassroots activists to political leaders.

Since the work of Karuna Center focuses on education and training, the interventions described below are appropriate for peacebuilding training programs. Because of our founding experiences, especially in Bosnia and later in other multiethnic Balkan countries, Karuna Center has developed a particular capacity and interest in working with divided societies. In Chapter 5, we will describe a Training of Trainers program for members of Sri Lanka’s various ethnic communities, and in Chapter 3, we will explore intercommunal dialogue as a method of fostering understanding among identity groups in conflict. In this chapter, we will examine a design for community-level peacebuilding training in Nepal that allowed us to meet with the same diverse group of civil society participants repeatedly for three or four training events during one year. We will also discuss programs in Nepal that Karuna Center has conducted for members of Parliament and government ministries.
One model we use extensively with divided communities and in the CONTACT Program is called “Cycles of Revenge and Reconciliation” (tool 1.6), which was originally developed by Olga Botcharrova during her years in Croatia working with the tragic breakup of the former Yugoslavia. The model, now expanded by Karuna Center and colleagues elsewhere, posits an inner cycle where victims and perpetrators continue to harm each other over decades and even centuries, each side retaliating against the other in an unending attempt to “get even.” We have seen this pattern in Rwanda, in Israel/Palestine, and in many other communities. There are no winners in such a cycle, but instead just endless destruction and grief for all parties.

Another cycle is suggested in the model, however, and that is a cycle leading toward recognition, responsibility, re-humanization, reconnection, and possible reconciliation. We spend a great deal of time teaching and sharing personal stories with this model in each of our peacebuilding seminars as well as in our CONTACT Program, and always find resonance with participants’ lived experience. We encourage people to speak about the stages of loss, to grieve openly, and to explore ways they might reconnect with those in the room from the “enemy” community. As people speak emotionally about their wounds and sadness, empathy for suffering develops in the group, and members are seen more accurately as victims and bystanders rather than as violators. The cycle gives hope that another world is possible, that structured attempts at recovery matter, and that revenge can be interrupted and replaced with far more productive responses to violent conflict. Heartfelt reactions to these cycles become one of the more emotional and bonding experiences in our trainings, and play a critical part in the development of compassion and trust within the group.

Since identity markers play a significant role in violent conflict in many regions of the world, we have developed a number of workshop tools to probe identity thoroughly in order to discern its complexity, multiplicity, and variability over a lifetime. We ask participants to draw a “Wheel of Multiple Identities” (tool 2.2) on which they note their many and varied identities. We encourage them to explore cross-cutting or bridging identities with those from the “other sides” of the conflict, hopefully finding common ground as educators, parents, soccer players, or budding environmentalists. We next explore what we label “Wounded Identity” (tool 2.3), that part of the self that has been oppressed and violated by others, looking at how these targeted identities can distort perception, lead to alienation, and result in internalized inferiority and/or aggression against self or others. Wounds to a person’s identity remain salient even where overt violence is less conspicuous. Racism and homophobia are classic examples of attitudes and behaviors that lead to wounded identity. We stress the necessity of developing new institutions to ameliorate future identity discrimination, especially efforts to eliminate social injus-
tice and secure equal treatment and rights through legal and economic means.

In this work with identity, we hope to focus attention on the perverse impact of identity-based oppression, the over-simplification and harmful delusion of a singular and fixed identity, and the distortion that occurs when complex individuals are discriminated against for one of their multiple identities. These psychosocial interventions require patience, as members of both victim and perpetrator communities resist speaking about their wounds or acknowledging their destructive behaviors, possibly out of their need for self-protection and their fear of disclosure. Individuals who are ready to risk and reflect, however, offer courage to the group and may expand their notions of themselves and others as they explore their own multiplicities, their cross-cutting identities, and the common ground of our humanness. Out of such risks and insights, empathy, compassion, and renewal arise.

**Story from the Field: Nepal**

*We have selected Nepal as a case study to illustrate Conflict Interventions because in this post-armed conflict period of their history, Nepali NGOs and Members of Parliament are engaged in the great tasks of reconstruction and renewal. This moment in Nepal’s history demands great innovation and entrepreneurial spirit to reunite and re-create their country. Conflict intervention trainings encourage this spirit of collaboration and foster skills for leadership.*

Nepal is a dramatically beautiful country replete with Himalayan mountains, remote villages often inaccessible by road, flat plains spreading to the Indian border, a busy capital city of Kathmandu, and myriad ethnic groups steeped in ageless traditions. A kingdom for hundreds of years, Nepal is now a republic, recently emerging from a ten-year civil war that pitted Maoist insurgents against government troops. It is a time of transition, as Nepal drafts and ratifies a new constitution, prepares for Parliamentary elections, and establishes itself as a fledgling democracy. It is a historic moment of both promise and fragility.

Karuna Center has enjoyed a long relationship with Nepal, dating back to the 1990’s and renewed in 2006 after the cessation of armed conflict. Currently, we work as trainers and consultants with a wide variety of Nepali actors, including members of the parliament and government ministries, NGO leaders, women’s and human rights organizations, the monastic community of Lumbini, and multilateral organizations such as the Asian Development Bank and World Bank. After ten years of armed conflict, we believe that the violence has deeply impacted all the residents of Nepal and that community healing is essential for sustainable peace. Additionally, many Nepalese ethnic and regional groups, and Nepali women more generally, have suffered
from hundreds of years of social exclusion and marginalization along with abject poverty and lack of basic education. All of these issues must be addressed in this period of transition to democracy. To engage with these concerns, Karuna Center develops programs for members of government and civil society who understand the need for such initiatives to heal historic rifts and respond to contemporary demands for social inclusion of women and minorities.

Early in 2007, Karuna Center began our multi-year partnership with the Institute for Conflict Resolution, Peace, and Development (ICPD), a Nepali organization focused, like Karuna Center, on education and training in peacebuilding. Our partnership resulted in a 2007-2010 series of Peace Leadership Seminars, consisting of 3-4 sequential trainings spread throughout the year, and attended by an on-going group of participants who constituted a mix of Nepali activists in human rights and development, government ministry personnel, educators, media, community leaders, and others engaged in social change and peace processes. The participants worked in teams between sessions on peacebuilding projects throughout the country, which they documented and presented at a culminating meeting for Nepali and international guests. Their projects focused on such initiatives as national media broadcasts to foster tolerance, cooperative programs for women from opposing sides of the conflict, human rights advocacy, education about parliamentary issues, and training in community-based conflict man-
agement skills. Our participants reported that skills have been augmented, understanding deepened across divisions of ethnicity and gender, and commitments increased, making the multi-part training seminars an inspiring experience and model for future work.

In 2010-11, Karuna Center received a grant from the U.S. Department of State to develop a program for members of the Constituent Assembly (CA), who act as the temporary parliament while the country develops its new constitution and government institutions. We have trained about 75 CA members and worked intensively with a smaller backchannel group of influential political leaders. We have conducted videoconference meetings, brought a group to Boston for a program in partnership with faculty from Fletcher School of Tufts University, and met with CA members in many configurations with a focus on peacebuilding, negotiation, and leadership. Our local partners for this program were also our partners in the 2007-2010 Peace Leadership Seminars for civil society, which are described below.
Sample Training Design:  
Leadership Training for Sustainable Peace in Nepal

In this section, instead of offering a sample detailed training design for a single workshop, as we do in other sections, we take the opportunity to delineate the themes for creating sustainable peace taught in a three-part Leadership Training Seminar in Nepal. This training consisted of three sequential seminars, offered over a nine-month period. In other sections of this manual you will find more detailed descriptions of activities and tools that are utilized in this curriculum.

Description of Leadership Training Seminar invitation for referring organizations:

**Leadership Training Seminar: Key Components of Sustainable Peace in Nepal**

**November 2009, February 2010, April 2010**

The peaceful people’s movement of April 2006 and the Constituent Assembly (temporary Parliament) election of 2008, while exceedingly important, were only first steps on the path to building a healthy democracy in Nepal. Many countries beset by internal wars have seen a return to violence when underlying tensions have not been sufficiently resolved. Nepal is currently facing such challenges, and a secure future is not yet in sight.

This three-part training seminar for staff of relevant government ministries, NGO personnel, and concerned members of academic and private sectors, will explore issues and enhance skills essential to addressing the root causes of long-standing conflict in Nepal, and will contribute to bridging divides and building more sustainable peace. Members of this program, who will represent multiple sectors and communities of Nepali society, will be expected to implement initiatives within or across sectors and to assume leadership responsibilities.

Using a participatory approach, each of the three days will build on the contents and process of previous ones in a cyclical fashion. Each training event will include the opportunity for deep dialogue among participants in order to increase sensitivity and understanding to the needs and concerns of the diverse communities represented in the program and the importance of including women at all levels of leadership and decision making, thus modeling the development of a pluralistic, democratic culture in Nepal.

**Seminar I, November 2009:**

**Foundations of Conflict Management and Inter-Group Relations in Nepal**

In this 3-day seminar, we began to build group relations among members and with trainers, establish group norms, review the agenda and participant expectations, and then proceeded with examining current issues in Nepal. Participants engaged in assessing potential interventions to address current tensions and considered initiatives appropriate to the mandates of their professional affiliations. We also attended to issues of marginalization and discrimination, which have been triggers for violence in Nepal, and to how those issues impacted group members from both majority and minority communities. Concerns about gender and ethnic equity were addressed both through dialogue and by evaluating participants’ own community efforts toward inclusion.
DAY 1
- Conflict Analysis and Current Trends in Nepal (see Chapter 1 and conflict analysis tools): We believe that a thorough conflict analysis should precede any decisions about interventions or programs. We thus begin with a thorough examination of the parties in the conflict, core dynamics, driving forces of conflict, historic grievances, unmet needs, and other salient issues.

DAY 2
- Appraising and Developing Interventions in the Current Context (see tools 2.4, 2.5, 2.6): Following a thorough analysis, we examine the current programs intended to reduce violence and create conditions for peace, examining the relative success of these programs and suggesting improvements or new initiatives.
- Addressing Long-Standing Patterns of Separation and Marginalization (see tool 2.7 and tools for social healing, reconciliation, and forgiveness): In Nepal, as in many longstanding conflicts, marginalized identity groups are demanding basic rights, fulfillment of core needs, and equal opportunities in society. In this segment of the program, we address these issues, usually by having participants who come from marginalized groups talk about their own and their community’s experiences.

DAY 3
- Fostering Inter-Group Relations through Dialogue (see tools for intercommunal dialogue): Using dialogue in these programs builds community among group members, increasing their empathy and compassion for those who have been denied rights and privileges by the government and other ruling bodies. We include women among the marginalized in Nepal, and thus engage in gender dialogues that are often profound for both men and women.

Seminar II, February 2010:
Skills and Practices in Conflict Interventions and Peace Leadership
In this second seminar, we started with a review of current conditions, as well as accomplishments and obstacles to interventions our group members used in their fieldwork. We used the connectors/dividers exercise to build on previous work in exclusion and marginalization in order to help participants conceive programs that can reduce divisions among diverse Nepali populations and increase ties that bind and encourage mutual concern. We presented the cycles of revenge and reconciliation slowly to the plenary, allowing time for questions and feelings. After presenting the inner cycle, we suggested small group discussion for impact of this cycle on participants’ lives, then proceeded with the outer circle explanation and more small groups. As the dialogue in Seminar I was on ethnic relations, this one was to be on gender relations, which is a potent topic in Nepal.

DAY 1
- Reflections and insights from previous seminar in small group and plenary discussions
- Strengthening connectors and reducing dividers in Nepal (tool 1.5): Participants
work in small groups to identify which ties bind Nepalis, no matter their economic, political, or social standing, and what issues and structures divide Nepalis. Participants then engage in brainstorming what programs might increase connections among Nepalis and what changes might reduce divisions.

DAY 2

- Cycles of revenge and reconciliation (tool 1.6): These cycles invite participants to identify their own current state of mind on a continuum from revenge to reconciliation. The presentation and discussion usually increases intimacy in the group.
- Increasing leadership skills for transition and peace in Nepal (tools 5.3, 5.4, 5.5): In this segment we offer perspectives on leadership as well as tools to encourage leadership behaviors.

DAY 3

- Fostering gender relations through dialogue (see tools for intercommunal dialogue): We used gender as a lens to explore mainstream/marginalization issues and their impact on men, women, and society. Again, such an experience increases closeness among participants and encourages changes in attitudes and behaviors.

Seminar III, April 2010:

Transitional Justice and Reconciliation

In the final seminar of this series, the focus was on healing and reconciliation, processes that are underway interpersonally but not yet officially. We presented international case studies from South Africa, Rwanda, and other regions that have had public reconciliation processes, as well as studies of countries like Bosnia that have so far not engaged in national healing. We also spoke of psychological insights about community recovery and introduced concepts of restorative justice. Our dialogue this time focused on social healing in relation to group members’ experiences. The program ended with plans for future peacebuilding work by members and ways to build coalitions to support peace and justice in Nepal.

DAY 1

- Reflections and insights from previous seminar in small group and plenary discussions
- International practices in reconciliation and transitional justice (see Chapter 4 for discussion and tools on these topics): Here we review best practices and talk deeply about impact on victim groups, violator groups, intergroup relations, and future generations. Participants share personal experiences from times in their own lives where they have engaged in reconciliation, which we explore for relevant insights.

DAY 2

- Psychological issues and strategies for social healing and reconciliation in Nepal: This work takes the group into learning about recovery, resilience, restoration of shattered relationships, and the role of the media and political leaders.
- Truth and reconciliation commissions and restorative justice processes as models
for Nepal: Using video and documentation, we explore lessons learned from international experiments with truth and justice.

**DAY 3**
- Exploring social healing through dialogue (see tools for intercommunal dialogue)

"The Peace Leadership program increased my capacity for tolerance towards those with different ideologies and developed my curiosity to investigate why people behave as they do. Also I am a happier person today.”

— Chhaya Sharma, Nepal

“The learning and sharing during the Karuna Center programs has been a great asset for me to perform my peacebuilding work better and train a large number of civil society leaders working in varied situations and contexts in Nepal.”

— Ramji Neupane, Nepal

---

**Additional Reading and Resources**


Chapter Three: Intercommunal Dialogue

Key Generative Questions

Under what circumstances is intercommunal (or intergroup) dialogue appropriate?

What motivates people on both sides of violent intercommunal conflict to pursue dialogue with participants from the “other side” of the conflict?

What environmental provisions and group processes make it conceivable for group members from opposing sides to engage in productive dialogue together?

Under what circumstances would facilitators choose to work with each side of a conflict separately rather than use intercommunal dialogue?

What particular skills and sensitivities should dialogue facilitators develop?

What are the hazards of intercommunal dialogue?

How can intercommunal dialogue contribute to structural changes that build sustainable peace?

Overview

Why we value intercommunal dialogue as a tool in peacebuilding: We believe that the legacy of war must be thoroughly explored and that a secure future can only be built through an honest reflection on the past. We do not believe that the past can be erased, nor should it be denied. We have seen that cycles of revenge can be replaced by tolerance, enabling both individuals and communities to heal and move forward with their lives. Revitalizing communities requires acknowledgment of past wrongs and mutual commitment to a shared and just future. Intergroup dialogue is one step toward that future.

Karuna Center has a deliberate and structured approach to intercommunal dialogue, designed so that participants will feel safe, and through which trust and understanding can build slowly and steadily. In each dialogue, we encourage participants to confront the hatred, myths, and stereotypes that fuel intergroup violence and to speak honestly about their experiences. We encourage group members to explore the complexity of their relationships with each other and the emotional challenges of being together in dialogue. We have seen that all parties suffer from armed conflict, that all suffering is not equal, and that parties often bear vastly different levels of responsibility.

To explore these delicate issues, we facilitate sequenced conversations with the full group and sometimes work in small groups and pairs, where it may feel safer to disclose intense feel-
ings of grief, anger, or disagreement. We apply no pressure toward achieving reconciliation, and are content with small steps of acknowledgment, recognition, apology, and taking responsibility for one’s own behaviors. We believe that reconciliation is a long process that develops slowly over many years and is based on the continual testing of safety and acceptance.

As facilitators of these dialogues, we try our best to be loyal to truth and to acknowledge the suffering caused by violence and war. We know that each individual and each community has different perceptions and a complex cultural narrative, and that many people face divided loyalties that are very painful. We do not take sides in talking about war. We are on the side of peace and justice, of nonviolent responses to conflict, of learning new skills for managing differences, and of building a viable, safe, and reconciled future. We believe that intergroup dialogue across divides helps us move a bit closer to that future.

Our Practice of Intercultural Dialogue: Using dialogue for peacebuilding has become one of the most powerful and transformative tools in the work of Karuna Center. Because our backgrounds in mental health have given us the skills to build safe environments for emotional self-disclosure and interpersonal exchange, we are comfortable in encouraging participants to explore difficult issues in a group setting. We find time and again that such sharing vastly increases the bonds of empathy and makes relationships between members of opposing groups not only possible, but also productive, loyal, and enduring.

We consider dialogue to be an invitation to a new conversation, often on a topic fraught with meaning and conflict among participants. We create an environment where group members are guided in listening with openness and speaking respectfully, in expressing themselves in terms of their own experience, in disciplining themselves to contribute to a safe environment, and in being willing to be changed by the experience of shared exploration and reflection. We ask participants to honor confidentiality and to enter dialogue in a spirit of genuine inquiry so that new insights and understanding might emerge from the encounter. Most often, the rich conversations of dialogue result in new meaning, increased tolerance, and more nuanced relationships.

Our dialogues are usually embedded within a peacebuilding training program, but sometimes stand alone as dialogues between conflicting communities or as dialogue training. Within a 3-5 day peacebuilding training program we will have at least one dialogue, generally midway through the program and for half a day. In our on-going training programs, where we meet the same group of participants for 3-5 days many times each year, we include one day of dialogue in each gathering. More than any other group activity, the dialogue experience surfaces common ground, re-humanizes the identified other, creates trust and mutuality within
the group, and fosters a commitment to work together for a more just and equitable future. Participants volunteer to attend these workshops and are thus not usually direct perpetrators. However, perpetrators are likely to be found among their families and neighborhoods, and participants are urged to take what they learn into their homes and workplaces to stimulate conversation and reflection.

We select the topics for dialogue based on experiences that are real to participants, as dialogues on concepts or theories too often devolve into debate and do not lend themselves to interpersonal understanding. We consciously calibrate the topics so that the most sensitive experiences of war and loss are not introduced before the group has built sufficient trust. Dialogue questions are carefully crafted to encourage personal responses, foster mutual understanding, and avoid blame. Depending on the context, we might suggest dialogue questions such as: “How have your experiences as a member of your ethnic or religious group shaped your perception of the other?” Or “What experiences in your life encouraged you to participate in this dialogue?”

Participants in dialogue discover that the process leads to less polarized thinking and opens places of uncertainty, internal dissonance, and mixed feelings. These more nuanced explorations often lead group members to perceive the common human dilemmas and demons faced by all of us, as we open ourselves to the human issues of longing, suffering, and fear. Humanization increases as we recognize, as one Sri Lankan participant observed, that we are all “in one pot of suffering.”

We are very clear with our participants that dialogue is one among many tools in peace-building, and that it is not a panacea or a cure-all for conflict. If not skillfully managed, dialogue can prematurely close issues that need attention, create the mistaken notion that both sides have equal power in the world, or ignore core issues of political and economic justice. Dialogue in our eyes is not a substitute for action but often a useful prelude to actions that confront oppression. We consider it essential that as facilitators we attend to controversial issues by naming them explicitly so that we are not accomplices to silencing topics or feelings that must be addressed.
Stories from the Field: Utilizing Dialogue in Israel/Palestine and CONTACT Program

This section will include two different applications of dialogue for peacebuilding: Israeli/Palestinian Dialogue and International Dialogue at the CONTACT Program. We selected Israeli/Palestinian dialogue because each side holds such non-nuanced and distorted views of the other and the need for shifting these beliefs is so intense. We also included dialogue training at the CONTACT Program because of its centrality in building relationships across the vast diversity and myriad stereotypes present in an international program.

Israeli/Palestinian Dialogue:

In the years between the two intifadas in Israel/Palestine, from 1993-2000, Karuna Center worked with a local organization called Rapprochement to facilitate dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians living in the West Bank. Although at present there are no crossings allowed between Israel and the West Bank, before the second intifada it was possible for Israelis to cross the borders. Since Rapprochement had a connection with colleagues in Nablus, the West Bank’s largest city, Israelis traveled to Nablus for two intense days of dialogue. Israelis were given home stays for two nights by Nablus participants in the dialogue or by their neighbors, and the home stays became profound experiences for host and guest alike, augmenting the formal dialogue sessions.

Karuna Center facilitated the dialogues, which were conducted in English. Language use is never neutral, and the greater comfort of the Israelis with English sometimes handicapped the Palestinians, reinforcing prejudices of Palestinian subordination and inferiority. Since many Palestinians speak some Hebrew as well as their native Arabic, small groups would use a combination of Hebrew and Arabic. Only rarely did we find an Israeli participant capable of speaking Arabic in our dialogues, as there is no political demand or economic need for Israelis to learn Arabic. We aimed for both ethnic and gender balance in the dialogues, as well as a range of ages and occupations. In our programs in the Middle East, we have often found a preponderance of Israeli women and Palestinian men. Our participants were mostly engaged in various forms of social service or educational work.

There had been very few opportunities for Israelis and Palestinians to converse with each other, and each side held many negative perceptions about the other. Much of the dialogue involved shattering rigidly held stereotypes, discovering common goals and dreams for the
future, and acknowledging participants’ suffering, despair, humiliation, and helplessness on all sides of this tragic conflict. During the dialogues, Israelis did not argue about the need to end Israel’s occupation of the Palestinian Territories, as they had come to the program already aware of the injustices and suffering it has caused for Palestinians. Everyone was on the side of peace and non-oppression. A great deal of headway was made in building a caring community. Israeli and Palestinian participants discovered that they genuinely liked each other as individuals, and many have remained connected by phone and email over the years, offering support in times of personal or political struggle. Both groups carried these positive experiences to their workplaces, homes, and communities, in this way promoting the humanization of the other beyond the dialogue circle.

Israelis and Palestinians did, however, have very different motivations for attending such dialogue, and these different hopes and aspirations could create obstacles for the group. Israelis who attended bi-communal dialogue wanted to feel that they were making a small contribution to peace by visibly reaching out to Palestinians who were oppressed by the occupation. Many wanted to have their own humanity validated by the Palestinians and to feel separate from those Israelis responsible for oppression and injustice. Palestinians also wanted to be seen in their full humanity and to be recognized as equally worthy by the Israelis. As occupied people, they understandably had an agenda related to political freedom, and they were seeking help from Israeli counterparts in this search. But many Israelis in our dialogue groups were unwilling to take overt political action on behalf of the Palestinians.
In one instance, the Israelis refused the Palestinian request that they engage in street protests together after the dialogue sessions, disappointing Palestinian hopes that they would find allies in their political struggle. No doubt this would have been higher risk behavior than going to Nablus for dialogue, which in itself felt like a stretch for the Israelis. This circumstance illustrates the limits of dialogue and the dissatisfaction to those who are oppressed; their needs for visible political solidarity may be understood but may not be met. Nonetheless, dialogues between Israelis and Palestinians contribute to a change of perception, promote a bit more tolerance back in the home community, offer tangible support for those in the struggle, and keep alive an authentic and meaningful connection severed by walls, checkpoints, and occupation. The lack of contact altogether, on the other hand, contributes to an increased susceptibility to ideological manipulation, a deterioration of good will, and further dehumanization, making future peacebuilding that much more difficult.

Sample Training Design I: Dialogue with Israelis and Palestinians
Note: In dialogue workshops, it is particularly important to follow the flow of the group rather than a preconceived design that might stifle or sidestep important emotional issues held by group members. The agenda below is offered as a model of elements that facilitators might find useful.

DAY 1
Morning
- Introductory go-round: each participant shares their reasons for participating in dialogue
- Introduction to dialogue principles, goals, and practices in plenary and pairs: “Dialogue: An Invitation to a New Conversation” (tool 3.2), “Fostering Dialogue through Good Communication” (tool 3.3), and “Ground Rules for Dialogue” (tool 3.4)
- Hopes and fears for the dialogue: Small group discussions
- “Debate versus Dialogue” (tool 3.5) exercise: Pairs debate a contentious issue, taking assigned sides, and then the pairs dialogue about the same issue. End with plenary reflections on the different aims and outcomes of dialogue and debate.
- Group dialogue question: “If this dialogue is successful, what will be different for you by Sunday night?” (Note that this is a non-threatening and hope-producing question to begin what might be perceived as a frightening process)

Afternoon
- History Time Line exercise: Israelis and Palestinians meet separately to create a history of their people, going as far back as they wish. Major events are written on a scroll of newsprint with dates. Each group then walks the other through their time line.
• Group dialogue question: “What insights and feelings arise for you from the history timeline exercise?”

DAY 2
Morning
• Reflections/questions about yesterday
• Group dialogue question: “What would you like people in this circle to know about you? What do you want to know about them?”

Afternoon
• Series of dyads with different partners: “How is this experience impacting you? What has been most important to you in these two days? What are you learning about yourself? About the “other side?”
• Dialogue question: “What challenges do you face in sharing this experience with your family, workplace, and community?”
• Next steps: Plenary discussion on commitments and activities to be taken as a result of the dialogue and home stay/hosting experience.
• Closing round of appreciations and reflections

Sample Training Design II: Dialogue Facilitation Training for CONTACT

The structure of the CONTACT Program (Conflict Transformation Across Cultures) includes two days of mini-electives, with each student electing to engage in mediation/negotiation, active nonviolence, or intercommunal dialogue. The dialogue elective is an experientially based course for a very mixed group of participants from around the world who are peacebuilders-in-training. Our intention is to offer a positive experience of intercommunal dialogue and core skills in dialogue facilitation. We do not expect them to be facilitators after two days, but many enter the program with years or decades of previous experience, which this mini course supports and expands.

This agenda has been honed from many years of teaching the dialogue mini-elective, and is in a form that works well for our structure and participants.

DAY 1
Morning
• Introductory go-round: Why participants chose this training and their previous experience with participating in or facilitating dialogue
• Introduce basic principles of dialogue: “Karuna Center’s Philosophy of Practice for Peacebuilding Dialogues” (tool 3.6) and “Dialogue: An Invitation to a New Conversation” (tool 3.2)
• “Debate versus Dialogue” (tool 3.5) exercise: Pairs debate a contentious issue, taking assigned sides, and then the pairs dialogue about the same issue. End with plenary reflections on the different aims and outcomes of dialogue and debate.
• Practicing active listening and authentic speaking in dyads: “Fostering Dialogue through Good Communication” (tool 3.3). Sample practice question: “What life experiences most influenced your choice to come to this program?”

• Practicing communication in small groups (6 members each, plus one observer). Groups should be mindful of the communication principles highlighted above while exploring the practice questions: “How do you hope this workshop experience will deepen and change you? What do you anticipate will be your biggest challenge in this process?” This exercise gives participants a chance to work in small groups to further develop their listening and speaking skills. The observers receive practice in noting various communication styles and the dynamics of the group. (30 minutes in the groups)

• Large group reflection on dyadic and small group experiences, including reports from observers

**Afternoon**

• Group develops its own communication guidelines: “Ground Rules for Dialogue” (tool 3.4).

• Small group dialogue experience: “How do the power relations between your nations affect your presence, participation, and power here at this training?” (We find this to be a very thought-provoking question in an international setting).
  ° Form into small groups of 4 with those who have different experiences and backgrounds. Participants should feel free to ask about each other’s lives and perceptions, following guidelines for good communication.
  ° In plenary, explore how the small group dialogues deepened participants’ understanding of the experiences of others. Ask, “What did it change in you?” Process and analyze insights and feelings from this dialogue experience.

**DAY 2**

**Morning**

• “Fishbowl dialogue” with the guiding question, “How has your adult experience in life and work been affected by gender?” This question is selected because gender conditioning is something we all have in common.
  ° Break into separate male/female circles, each facilitated by a participant, who guides the group as they explore this question.
  ° Reconvene in a “fishbowl” or double-circle format with the women in an inner circle speaking on this same dialogue question, surrounded by an outer circle of the men, who will listen without comment. After the women have shared, the men have an opportunity to offer their reactions and reflections. Then, the circles will shift, allowing the men to share in the inner circle and the women to form the outer listening circle.

• Process the fishbowl dialogue experience in the larger group to uncover significant learning.

**Afternoon**

• Review “Role of Facilitator in Peacebuilding Dialogues” (tool 3.7) and “Phases of Dialogue” (tool 3.8) in plenary discussion.
• “Crafting Dialogue Questions” (3.9): Small groups next develop questions that could be used in dialogue. Their questions are written on flip charts and evaluated in plenary discussion. Questions are examined for their effectiveness as dialogue stimulators that can lift up core issues and also for their open-endedness, fairness, and lack of bias or accusation. We also encourage questions that open up feelings of ambivalence that might help dislodge polarized thinking.

• Small group dialogues are then led by participants using one of the questions developed by group members in the previous exercise.


• Closing

“The word ‘peace’ has become hollow. It has lost its meaning,” said one of the participants. “That may feel like the case,” said another, “but we cannot let the voice of despair and violence reappropriate our language for the world we hope to build. Giving up is not an option.”

— Dialogue between Israeli and Palestinian participants

“The personal relationships I am forming with my group members in dialogue are so practical in building tolerance, connection, and growth in my global citizenship; it strengthens the call to be part of this field.”

— CONTACT dialogue participant
Additional Reading and Resources

**Dialogue**


**Online Resources**
Karuna Center for Peacebuilding: www.karunacenter.org
  - Reports on programs in Macedonia, Sri Lanka, and Bosnia

National Center for Dialogue and Deliberation: www.thataway.org

Public Conversations Project: www.publicconversations.org

Study Circles Resource Center: www.studycircles.org

**Israel and Palestine**


Chapter Four: Social Healing, Reconciliation, and Forgiveness

**Key Generative Questions**

1. How do individuals heal from profound war trauma and loss? How, when, and through whom does that healing, if it occurs, spread to communities and impact structural change?

2. Recognizing the need for acknowledgement of harms done, how do we make it possible for members of the violator community to move beyond self-justification to genuine acknowledgement and remorse?

3. How do we as outsider facilitators manage our own “multi-partiality” in the face of war crimes? How do we express our care for both sides while at the same time guard against collusion with the denial of perpetrator groups?

4. What elements of intrapersonal, interpersonal, communal, and structural change are required to interrupt and replace generational cycles of revenge and counter-violence?

5. How will our work with hundreds of educators in intercommunal dialogues influence and shape their work with students and communities? How will they develop enough safety and power to change school policies and systems?

6. What structures need to be in place for communities to undertake reconciliation initiatives?

7. What would be the ideal relationship between community social healing workshops and the political work of truth commissions?

8. Is it generally true, that as Nobel Peace Prize winner Desmond Tutu claims, that there is no future without forgiveness?

**Overview**

The emerging concept of “social healing” can be defined as the reconstruction of communal relations after mass violence. Less familiar than the more common phrase “reconciliation and forgiveness,” the term is broader, more spacious, and perhaps more appropriate in scope for what is realistic in the immediacy of postwar recovery. Reconciliation and forgiveness may be years or decades in the making, more demanding than many victims can manage early in their recovery process, and counterproductive if pushed on societies too quickly by outsiders.

Social healing can be seen as a process that invites postwar communities to begin the steps
of restoring relations so that they can coexist, make decisions together, and rebuild their destroyed commons. Often a prelude to reconciliation and forgiveness, social healing can emerge through initiatives that re-humanize broken relations, rebuild trust, normalize daily life, and restore hope. These initiatives are often the provenance of NGOs engaged in postwar humanitarian and development efforts. Third party interventions from organizations skilled in psychosocial peacebuilding, such as Karuna Center, can serve as an early bridge to help antagonistic communities join in common reconstruction tasks, shared aid delivery, and other physical, economic, or social activities that become the building blocks of re-engagement and social healing.

Reconciliation among those in divided and war-torn societies, like conflict itself, is fundamentally about relationships: among people, and also between a shattered past and the envisioned future. Reconciliation, from the Latin root conciliatus, which means drawing together a council, is a sustained process that, at its best, rekindles community and restores harmony where violent conflict has set people against each other. Reconciliation also requires intentionality and perhaps even generosity. Of all the steps in peacemaking, intercommunal reconciliation may be the most demanding. It requires those who participate to surrender hatreds passed on for generations, release chosen narratives, relinquish fantasies of vengeance, and re-establish relations shattered by betrayal and brutality.

Forgiveness is frequently an inward spiritual decision made by a victim to let go of the burden of pain and hate, not in order to forget, but to release heart-constricting grief and loss. Forgiveness, which promises no exemption from punishment for the perpetrator, can remove a crippling burden of hatred carried by the victim and offer release as well to the violators and community. Like reconciliation, forgiveness requires courage, commitment, and compassion. Each step in the passage entails deliberation and reflection, and cannot be rushed or demanded by others.

Because of the sensitive nature of this process, Karuna Center is respectful in our approach to reconciliation and forgiveness. Readiness to reconcile with those who have caused
harm, or to offer forgiveness, occurs in its own time of ripeness in the individual heart. The impetus for these brave acts sometimes arises through public truth commissions and related structures, and at other times by dialogue groups and positive exposure to the other side. We have witnessed deep healing between former enemy participants, and consider each such moment an act of grace and a gift to violator, victim, and their communities. Wherever such work exists to help heal the human soul and broken communal connection, the rewards are beyond measure.

Story from the Field: Bosnia

At the center of the dissolution of the breakup of the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, Bosnia was caught in a brutal war that destroyed its proud multiethnic heritage. Croats, Serbs, and Muslims (now called Bosniaks) were pitted against each other as the leaders of Serbia and Croatia scrambled to gain territory and dominance in Bosnia. Neighbors, friends, and even intermarried families turned against each other, demolishing homes, mosques, communities, manufacturing, agriculture, and human beings. In northern Bosnia, where our work was centered in the formerly mixed cities of Sanski Most and Prijedor, 58,000 Bosniaks were expelled from their Prijedor homes in 3 days, scattered as refugees or captured for camp imprisonments. Most Bosnians now live separately, with very little return of Serbs and Bosniaks to their former homes in northern Bosnia. The country, now called Bosnia-Herzegovina, is currently divided into two political entities: the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska. The structure functions poorly, with a great deal of ethnic tension.

We chose Bosnia to illustrate our work with social healing and reconciliation because in Bosnia we learned, witnessed, and were humbled by the enormity of this task. Perhaps we can ask no more of human beings than they live as neighbors again after mass violence. We honor those who build such relational bridges toward a shared future. Our workshops were small contributions toward that end in two Bosnian cities.

Karuna Center’s first large peace-building endeavor holds significant memories for our organization and particular lessons for understanding the process of social healing. Our experiences working in northern Bosnia from 1997-2002 have informed our work for more than a decade, and continue to be present in our practices and lessons learned. In those postwar years, Karuna Center facilitated intercommunal dialogues between Bosnian Serb and Bosnian Muslim residents of two cities in northern Bosnia. Far from Sarajevo and isolated by mountains and destroyed
infrastructure, Prijedor and Sanski Most were the scene of some of Bosnia’s most brutal fighting. Before the war, these two cities with a combined population of some 200,000 were ethnically mixed and well functioning. Neither the cities nor the residents have yet recovered.

In 1997, Karuna Center received a call from a Bosniak woman, Emsuda Mujagic, inviting us to meet with women refugees temporarily residing in the Sanski Most area. These women had lost immediate or extended family members, been removed from Prijedor and its satellite villages where their ancestors lived since time immemorial, and had often been imprisoned and raped. They felt battered, bruised, dislocated, and dispirited.

Our approach was to guide a process for these women to regain a sense of themselves and their dignity, as well as to create a safe place to mourn their losses, bond with each other, and begin to heal. Although the Bosniak women were deeply harmed by the violence and dislocation they had suffered, after our first year together they surprised us by requesting that we identify Serb women to join with them in inter-ethnic meetings. In many instances, the Prijedor Serb women had been their close friends, neighbors, and colleagues; they were now separated by war, enmity, displacement, and militarily guarded borders.

Our first inter-ethnic dialogues were extremely difficult and fragile. We facilitated them with as much love and care as possible, making space for stories of suffering and honest expression of feelings on both sides, while at the same time trying not to allow the truth to be censored or the reality sanitized. For the Serb women, listening created internal dissonance: either they had to deny the experiences of the Bosniaks or acknowledge to themselves the violence perpetrated by members of their own community or family. We provided space for the Serbs to reflect on their own suffering in this chaotic war and on their lack of knowledge about the full extent of the violence. We explored the role of the bystander, with its concomitant shame, guilt, and helplessness.

Our role as facilitators was to maintain a strong and positive container for the feelings to emerge and the relationships to develop, allowing both groups to trust us as outsiders. We were present as peacebuilders, directing the dialogues toward community issues, educational initiatives, violence prevention, and efforts toward reconciliation, as well as supporting an honest reckoning of the past upon which to build a secure and peaceful future. Since our facilitation teams did not speak Serbo-Croatian and our participants did not speak English, all of our programs were translated by two Croatian women translators from Zagreb whose consistent presence, warmth, and openness were critical to building an environment of trust.

As the process expanded and deepened, the participants urged us to initiate a similar program with educators. Allowing our direction to be guided by the wishes of the group, we successfully petitioned the Ministers of Education in both entities of divided Bosnia, now recognized as the Bosnian Federation (Muslim and Croat) and the Republika Srpska for Serbs. Thus began Project DiaCom, the Project for Dialogue and Community Building for Educators.
Those teachers and school directors who found the courage to participate wished to communicate with each other across the ethnic divisions and to prepare their schools for the arduous tasks of educating severely damaged and uprooted pupils and families.

We led training seminars for mixed ethnic groups three times yearly for three years, reaching hundreds of teachers from both sides, and adding special seminars for school directors, counselors, and administrators. Most had not spoken to each other since “ethnic cleansing” had begun in Prijedor eight years previously. These workshops, generally lasting three days, were as fraught with pain as the previously described programs for women. The Bosniak teachers felt they had been betrayed by their Serb colleagues and blamed them for complicity in the war. The Serb educators saw themselves as helpless bystanders and also wanted recognition for their suffering. Everyone was fearful and emotions were raw. The physical environment of postwar Bosnia, with its shelled buildings, shabby meeting rooms, destroyed infrastructure, and abandoned homes, added to the gloom and grief. We worked slowly, supporting the educators as they explored the past in order to build a future.

Each of the trainings included inter-ethnic dialogue as well as conflict analysis sessions to identify the multiple roots of mass conflict. We attended to the particular role of the educational system in the promotion of tolerant behaviors and conflict resolution skills. The educators brought these concepts and values back to their colleagues and communities, sometimes putting themselves at risk by breaking the silence that hovered over both Sanski Most and Prijedor after the war. The women’s groups also continued to meet and organize across ethnic lines, providing more opportunities for cross-border exchange and re-humanization.

To consolidate our work and to ensure continuity, we invested three more years in the region, developing a Training of Trainers group composed of the strongest educators on both sides who...
learned the skills of group leadership and conflict transformation to carry this work forward in both cities. We worked closely with these twelve trainees, and almost all of them have continued to engage actively in social healing and educational programs over the decade since our project ended in 2002. One of these trainees, Vahidin Omanovic, formed an NGO called Center for Peacebuilding. Vahidin and his colleagues work with great sensitivity and commitment to rebuild ethnic relations throughout northern Bosnia. They also link up internationally, bringing delegations to Sanski Most to learn about peacebuilding in this community that was so recently shrouded in darkness and death.

Emsuda Mujagic, the Bosniak woman who first invited Karuna Center to Bosnia, created the Srećem do Mira peace center in Kozarac, a small village near Prijedor that had expelled its Muslim population and destroyed its homes and institutions. She and other Bosnian Muslims, many of them members of our women's and educators' programs, returned to this village, which is once again alive with children, gardens, and a vibrant center for peace. However, Bosnia remains divided politically and in many ways unhealed from the ravages of war, especially as there has been no public accountability for war crimes or any truth and reconciliation process. There is a great need for social healing and reconciliation, but the national leaders remain resistant and there has been no groundswell to demand social reconstruction. The cities of Prijedor and Sanski Most rebuild slowly, struggle with a sluggish economy, and continue modestly with intercommunal connections and joint educational projects.

Most likely, forgiveness and reconciliation, if they develop, will grow out of a nation-wide journey of rebuilding trust and restoring relations. We believe that communities should not wait fifty years for the second generation to undertake the healing process, and that postponing reconciliation places a heavy burden on the new generation. Wounds pile upon wounds and the healing becomes even more difficult. We sense that national public rituals are needed to bind this divided nation, as well as the implementation of community programs in each city and town to strengthen collegial bonds and encourage collaborative development. It is difficult but not impossible to interrupt the cycle of blame, hatred, and revenge, and to balance out the needs for punishment and compassion. Our commitment to inter-ethnic peacebuilding rests in the hope that transformation will emerge through structured initiatives on all levels that foster connection and caring.
Sample Training Design: Social Healing Workshop for Bosnian Educators

Social healing workshops should include time for attending to the fragile relational and trust issues between participants. In this design, we allow space for participants to express their hopes and fears, to explore overlapping identities and common ground in the face of separation by identity group, to discover the barriers to tolerance in themselves and their communities, and to plan for a jointly envisioned future. In a workshop with strong emotional content such as this one, it is important to build slowly, not to rush through a design, and to understand that certain agenda items may need to be surrendered for the sake of honoring concerns arising in the group.

DAY 1
Morning
• Introductions and reasons for participation
• Dyads: Hopes and fears for this workshop
• Small groups: Perceptions and feelings about who is present/absent in terms of ethnicity and gender
• Review objectives and establish ground rules, especially to promote emotional safety, respectful listening, and confidentiality. See “Ground Rules for Dialogue” (tool 3.4)
• Exercise to deepen relationships within this group: “Journey of My Life”
  • Each person draws a lifeline and includes highlights of their life, which in this case will likely include painful war memories. (Use this only if your group is ready and if you are ready as a facilitator to manage emotions that will arise)
  • Share in dyads (for emotional safety) and then discuss in plenary (plenary discussion should only include highlights)

Afternoon
• Risks and obstacles: Participants write about each of the following in notebooks first to stimulate their own thinking, and then have small mixed group discussions followed by plenary reflections:
  • Being part of this group
  • Acceptance of each other
  • Repatriation
  • Current political conditions in Sanski Most and Prijedor
• Intergroup relations learning:
  • Presentation on “Cycle of Socialization” (tool 4.1), which focuses on how we learn intolerance early in our lives, followed by small mixed group discussion on how each was socialized regarding attitudes about the other ethnicity. (Facilitators can model honesty by sharing from their own socialization and learning about others.)
  • Reflections on first day’s learning in plenary
DAY 2

Morning: Stereotypes, Prejudice, and War
- “Exercise on Discrimination” (tool 4.2) This was adapted for the Bosnian context to raise awareness of one’s own and others’ behavior. It is first done in dyads, and then a discussion is held in the plenary
- “Exercise on Identity: ‘Where Do We Belong?’” (tool 4.3). Plenary exercise on issues of inclusion and exclusion based on group identity
- Teaching definitions; “Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Oppression” (tool 4.4) with reflections on Bosnia and how these lead to war

Afternoon: Tolerance
- “Continuum on Being an Ally” (tool 4.5): Small groups reflect on the past and consider usefulness for classrooms and school policies
- “Ladder of Tolerance” (tool 4.6): Placing self and Bosnian society on the ladder and planning for the future of tolerance education in Bosnia
- Reflections and insights

DAY 3

Morning: Grief and Mourning Processes
- “The Grieving Process” (tool 4.7) and “Stages of Grief” (tool 4.8):
  - Plenary presentation of concepts
  - Small groups or pairs in own ethnicity share personal experiences of stages of grief in their own lives and their communities
  - Plenary reflections on grieving within each ethnic community

Afternoon: Social Healing and Reconciliation
- “The Long Journey Towards Reconciliation” (tool 4.9):
  - Plenary presentation reviewing stages toward reconciliation
  - Participants explore their own experience and growth in these stages in dyads, independently, or in small groups as appropriate. Take time for silent writing, pair sharing, silence if appropriate, and peer support as needed.
- “The Five R’s of Post-Conflict Peacebuilding” (tool 4.10): plenary presentation relating to Bosnia’s future, followed by small group work.
- Small groups discuss issues in “The Place Called Reconciliation” (tool 4.11)
- Closing reflections, next steps.
Karuna’s project DiaCom brought me back to life. I was able again to trust people and believe that humanity still existed. The work opened my heart and made me able to transform the hate and anger that was eating me up for years, to love, to have compassion and understanding. It taught me that this beautiful transformation was possible not only for me but for anyone who is brave enough to allow him or herself to be vulnerable and go through a healing process. The reason why I started an NGO is to help others experience the transformation that the Karuna Center provided for me.”

— Vahidin Omanovic, a participant in Karuna Center programs in Northern Bosnia for five years and subsequent founder of The Center for Peacebuilding, an NGO committed to rebuilding trust and fostering reconciliation among the peoples of Bosnia-Herzegovina

Additional Reading and Resources

*Reconciliation and Forgiveness*


Continued on next page
Resources, cont.


*Bosnia*


Karuna Center for Peacebuilding. (2004). *Communities in dialogue: healing the wounds of war* [DVD]. Amherst, MA: Karuna Center for Peacebuilding.


*Online resources*

The Center for Peacebuilding in Sanski Most (Centar za izradnju mira): http://www.unvocim.net/
Chapter Five: **Preparing Peacebuilding Facilitators: Training of Trainers**

**Key Generative Questions:**

- What is the purpose of training trainers? What level of field experience, teaching skills, knowledge about the topics, and self-awareness do trainees need to transmit peacebuilding substantively?
- How do we deal with the concern that successive generations of participants in workshops are quickly becoming trained to be trainers, but do not yet have sufficient knowledge or experience on the topics they are teaching?
- What are the salient qualities of skillful group leadership?
- What particular capacities of mind and heart are necessary for success as peacebuilding facilitators?
- Can one be a successful facilitator, as well as a member of one of the parties in conflict?
- How does a facilitator manage both process and content, as well as attend to his/her own needs and feelings?
- How do peacebuilding facilitators deal with strong emotions of anger or grief in groups?
- How should facilitators manage such behaviors as resistance, dominance, denial, threats, or challenges to the authority of the trainer?
- What are the challenges and advantages of co-facilitation?

**Overview**

As outsiders to the conflicts we work in, we are aware that our years in a given region are limited. We wish to see the fruits of our efforts continued and transmitted. Where we have had a long-term presence, we thus embark on training local personnel to carry on with peacebuilding education, but also realize the challenges of this endeavor. While there are some participants in our programs who will make fine trainers in the future, most of them have not yet had the years of field experience or depth of knowledge that would prepare them to train others. Although this concern would indicate the advisability of waiting many years, we find ourselves in war or postwar crisis situations where many hands are needed for conflict management and mitigation. Thus long postponement is not an option. With these caveats, we train the most conscious and aware members of our programs with as much care as possible, selecting a small number from the hundreds we have worked with in basic conflict transformation programs.
When selecting participants to train as trainers, we look for sensitivity toward those who are oppressed, for expressions of compassion, capacity to manage emotions, good communication skills, maturity, self-reflection, and experience with group process and fieldwork. We encourage those with special talent and English fluency to attend the annual CONTACT Program of the School for International Training in the United States or in Nepal, giving them a solid international experience in peacebuilding and a tremendous boost of self-confidence and inspiration.

Our training of trainer (TOT) programs always include members of all the identity groups in conflict, as much of the training aims to increase skills within groups that have contributed to the mass violence. TOTs include on-going intergroup dialogue, opportunities for raising awareness about the self and one’s impact on others, emotional self-disclosure, lessons in group dynamics, plus facilitation and design skills. Our TOT programs extend over several years with two to four meetings per year for continuity. This has been our average for Bosnia, Macedonia, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Rwanda, and elsewhere where we have had a consistent presence, and we recommend no less for the successful transmission of training skills.

Some of our trainees have gone on to do wonderful work as peacemakers, setting up NGOs of their own, joining reputable international organizations, and often pursuing further graduate education. Through this process of training, most of them deepen their identity as peacebuilders, so that in the years during and after their TOT experience they accumulate more field exposure and therefore have more resources to draw upon as trainers.

We strongly encourage them to practice intergroup co-facilitation in order to insure checks and balances in perceptions, to model intergroup collaboration, and to make the training as safe as possible for participants from marginalized or oppressed ethnic identities. We also make sure that the dialogue facilitation skills of our TOT participants are strengthened, and caution them not to step into overly deep dialogue waters as new facilitators. In ideal situations, we monitor their training designs and delivery as they begin to train others, offering feedback and support for their journey ahead. So far we have had excellent experiences with our TOTs, and remain cautious and vigilant about whom we train and for what end. Periodically we have been able to offer forums for previously trained facilitators to share their work and its challenges, helping them to connect with larger networks.
Story from the Field: Sri Lanka

We have selected Sri Lanka for a case study on Training of Trainers because of our long experience in this island nation and its long experience with decades of civil war. NGO activists, human rights teams, and development workers skilled in peacebuilding leadership have crucial roles to play in the repair and restoration of shattered relationships and broken dreams.

Country Overview: Off the southern coast of the Indian subcontinent, Sri Lanka is an island nation endowed with great natural beauty and riches, but burdened by an ethnic history that has been at the heart of its recent war. The Sinhalese Buddhist community forms an approximate 80% majority of the population; Tamils, who are concentrated in the north and east of the island and are generally Hindu or Christian, form the largest ethnic minority, with about 13% of the population; and Muslims make up another minority of about 7%. Issues of Sinhalese dominance and a lack of minority rights for Tamils have plagued the island since independence from Great Britain in 1948, and resulted in a war that lasted until 2009, with a cease-fire in place from 2005-08.

After three years of cease-fire and despite the good offices of Norwegian facilitators, the government and the Liberation Tamil Tigers of Elam (LTTE) were unable to forge a mutually acceptable peace agreement. Instead of rebuilding their country and its fractured ethnic relationships, government troops re-invaded Tamil areas in the north/northeast of Sri Lanka, LTTE cadres attacked government institutions and personnel, and citizens on both sides continued to suffer grievously. In January 2008, the government of Sri Lanka officially abrogated the cease-fire, resulting in further escalating cycles of violence and retaliations. After more than one year

Trincomalee, Sri Lanka 2012 inter-religious dialogue in the aftermath of war

Participants in Jaffna, a city so deeply impacted by decades of armed conflict that no one could visualize a peaceful environment
of bitter fighting and extensive loss of life and resources, in May 2009 the Government of Sri Lanka declared a victory over the LTTE separatists, and announced the death of the LTTE leader, Prabhakaran.

The 2008-09 phase of the war left 300,000 homeless civilians living in dismal camp conditions in the north of the country, increased Tamil-Sinhalese animosity, led to the disappearances or harsh prison sentencing of Tamil activists, medical doctors, and journalists, and resulted in an estimated 7,000 civilian deaths and 10,000 civilian injuries. So far, there has been little family reunification, resettlement, compensation, or accountability by the Government of Sri Lanka. The non-governmental organizations operating in Sri Lanka are proceeding carefully due to the risks of censure or government interference, and as of late 2011 there are no public processes of national healing or reconciliation underway.

Additionally, the tsunami of December 2004 caused immense destruction in Sri Lanka, with all sides experiencing profound loss of life, livelihood, and home. Many tsunami survivors remain traumatized, poorly sheltered, and unemployed to this day, and many who suffer from the tsunami aftereffects are also victims of war and displacement. Added to this were floods in 2011, increasing the harm in this already plagued region. Thus, the anguish in Sri Lanka is wide and deep, especially for the Tamil minority and for those Sinhalese who care about democracy and human rights.
Karuna Center in Sri Lanka: Karuna Center began leading seminars in Sri Lanka in 1994, working throughout the country with a variety of civil society organizations to teach the skills and practices of conflict resolution, increase mutual understanding between identity groups, foster social responsibility, and encourage communal harmony. We returned frequently throughout the 1990s and early this century, building strong relationships with civil society activists from all ethnic groups and conducting deeply transformative inter-ethnic dialogues.

From 2003-05, Karuna Center led a two-year training-of-trainers program, Preparing for Peace: Leadership Training for Dialogue and Reconciliation, for 25 experienced participants who were leading their own reconciliation projects. This program was supported in part through a grant from the United States Institute of Peace. During the course of the program, participants created projects that they led in multi-ethnic teams throughout Sri Lanka. Participants also worked with Karuna Center staff to develop a peacebuilding training manual that has been translated into Tamil and Sinhalese and widely distributed. Our participants, representing all ethnic and regional groups in Sri Lanka, are now actively engaged in their own NGOs, implementing what they have learned to promote sustainable peace, protection of human rights, and justice for all Sri Lankans.

In 2008 we returned to partner with a Sri Lankan NGO on a seminar for women leaders from civil society and government that combined peacebuilding and gender issues in war and peace. In 2010 Karuna Center was awarded a grant from USAID to work until 2012 with religious leaders from all the faiths residing in the troubled northeast of Sri Lanka. The scourge of decades of ethnic warfare, a one-sided victory, and the subsequent government oppression of activists and members of minority communities continues to plague the island, and a positive future for this “pearl of the Indian Ocean” is tragically not yet in sight.

Sample Training Design: Sri Lanka Training of Trainers

Note: This program was the second in a series of 4 trainings held over 2 years with the same participants. We located each training event in a different region of the island and provided a day of exposure to local conditions for participants, as they were unaware of the impact of war, oppression, and poverty in various regions outside their own communities. The design that follows represents the 3 days of TOT training and does not include the exposure day and reflections on that experience.
Goals for this particular training included teaching models of community building exemplified through building this community, further experience in increasing dialogue skills as participants and facilitators, and exploration of leadership and facilitation. Other training events built on these skills and topics but also included issues of reconciliation and healing, conflict analysis, and interventions, all with the purpose of training peacebuilding facilitators.

This design, with its goal of preparing facilitators, has more than the usual number of handouts, which we make available for the future needs of participants as they move into facilitator roles. We would not have time to use all of them in a 3-day program.

**DAY 1**

**Morning: Community Building and Reflection on Peace Process**

- Check in: Describe one aspect of your work that has an impact on the peace process and Sri Lankan future
- Review of your motivation and expectations, plus TOT structure and curriculum
- Begin to explore feelings about the peace process and stumbling blocks, using the “Spectrum Activity” (tool 5.1)
- Discussion about peace process in mixed groups after spectrum activity: feelings about Sri Lanka’s future and perceptions in communities in which participants work
- Evaluation process for TOT: small groups work on developing questions to measure changes in their attitudes, knowledge, skills, self-change and applications of learning over the course of this two-year TOT.

**Afternoon: Dialogue Training (see chapter 3)**

- Exercise on “Debate versus Dialogue” (tool 3.5); small groups practice debate and dialogue on controversial topic of inter-ethnic marriage in Sri Lanka
- Reflections on debate/dialogue and how facilitator’s active presence can keep groups focused on dialogue and away from debate mode
- Review handout, “Crafting Dialogue Questions” (tool 3.9). Groups work to craft questions on difficult topics for Sri Lankan dialogues.
- Karuna Center discusses experiences using dialogue in different parts of the world.

**Evening: Color of Fear video** (on dialogue and racism in the U.S.) and exploration of insights applicable to Sri Lankan context

**DAY 2**

**Morning: Dialogue Experience**

- “What are your experiences as a Colombo-based or non-Colombo-based peacemaker, and as a member of your ethnic group? How do these experiences and identities shape your relations to others in this program?” (Residency is an issue of contention and resentment in Sri Lanka, with its concentration of power and privilege in Colombo.) This is first discussed in mixed triads, giving equal time to each participant, and encouraging participants to listen without interruption.
- Then a fishbowl or inner/outer circle method is used. First non-Colombo residents sit in a circle, surrounded by a larger circle of Colombo residents.
- The inner circle is given a chance to share their experiences, while the outer circle listens closely. Then the inner and outer participants change places and the non-
Colombo residents listen carefully while Colombo residents share their experiences. Facilitators serve as listeners unless it becomes necessary to intervene, and facilitators manage the time process.

- Plenary reflection on dialogue and what has been learned through listening, using “The Process-Content Iceberg” (tool 5.2) to guide the reflection and to create awareness about group process dynamics.

**Afternoon: Leadership in Peacebuilding**

- In small groups, participants share their observations about previous experiences of styles of leadership and their effectiveness in programs they previously attended. Then the small groups return to the plenary and summarize and discuss their findings.
- Discuss handouts on “Three Types of Power” (tool 5.3) and “Leadership” (tool 5.4); elicit examples of each. Small groups then explore concepts, methods, and styles of leadership, offering examples and reflection on the efficacy of each leadership style.
- “Collaborative Leadership” (tool 5.5): review handout and practice collaborative leadership in small groups, each with a designated leader. Task for groups is to make decisions about sites for our future TOT sessions

**Evening: Working groups** meet to discuss application and adaptation of training processes and models for Sri Lankan teaching/learning context and populations.

**DAY 3**

**Morning: Training Delivery**

- Report back from evening working groups on adapting the training for Sri Lanka
- Allow time for participants to read the tools used in this session
- Plenary review of “How Adults Learn” (tool 5.6) and “Experiential Learning Cycle” (tool 5.7). Explore personal experiences with learning styles in small groups.
- Dyads discuss “Conditions for Group Learning” (tool 5.8) to prepare for their roles as facilitators.
- Present and then explore in small groups “Creating Participatory Groups” (tool 5.9).
- Use “Best Practices for Facilitation of Peacebuilding Workshops” (tool 5.10) to focus plenary discussion and explore other experiences with facilitation
- Review the handouts “Developing Peacebuilding Trainings” (tool 5.11) and “Elements of Good Training Design” (tool 5.12) and explore in small groups.

**Afternoon: Training Design**

- Small groups design a 2 day training for college students representing all ethnic groups
- Groups present their training design; plenary critiques each design
- Closing of workshop: evaluations, reflections, commitments to further experiences and learning
My work with Karuna Center gave me the confidence that I could do more than manage logistics for development projects and inspired me to start my own organization in 2003. Karuna Center was the first organization to work with us as a partner. Today we provide facilitation, program development, and consultation for grassroots groups as well as international organizations.”

— Dishani Jayaweera, Director, Programs for the Centre for Peacebuilding and Reconciliation: Home for Diversity, an NGO in Sri Lanka that she co-founded after participating in Karuna Center programs

### Additional Reading and Resources

**Facilitation and Training in Groups**


**Online Resources**

Group facilitation – skills to facilitate meetings and training exercises to learn: [www.riverhousepress.com](http://www.riverhousepress.com).

Training for Change: [www.trainingforchange.org](http://www.trainingforchange.org)

The World Café: [theworldcafe.com](http://theworldcafe.com)

**Sri Lanka**


**Online Resources**

Karuna Center’s programs in Sri Lanka: [www.karunacenter.org](http://www.karunacenter.org)

Chapter Six: Creating Learning Communities for Peacebuilding in a Global Context: CONTACT Programs

Key Generative Questions

- What are the opportunities and unique challenges of creating regional and international peacebuilding training programs?
- What particular insights, behavioral changes, and transformation does a heterogeneous regional or international learning community afford?
- How do participants manage their vast differences in power and privilege?
- Which intergroup issues in a global learning community are most sensitive and difficult to address?
- What are the outcomes and enduring impacts on participants?
- How can the benefits of learning extend beyond the participants’ communities?

Overview

The earlier curricula we described were suited to situations of peacebuilding within particular local and national contexts. The curriculum described below is suitable for a heterogeneous group of peacebuilders from across an inter-country region or from diverse contexts across the globe. The common focus of the participants is not on one particular conflict, but on conflict transformation approaches and skills that can be adapted to multiple contexts. Such a regional or international approach affords the participants opportunities to think more broadly and systemically about conflict transformation, to network with fellow peacebuilders, and to explore a wide range of conflict-sensitive approaches that have found utility in specific locations.

In my role as a professor at School for International Training (SIT) Graduate Institute, I founded the Conflict Transformation Across Cultures (CONTACT) Program at SIT’s Vermont campus in 1997. Over the years, CONTACT has expanded the original summer peacebuilding institute with the African Peace and Development Initiative (2003-05) as well as CONTACT South Asia (2010-present) for members of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) economic region. We also added a year-long distance-learning certificate program (2000-present) for those who wish to deepen their knowledge of conflict transformation theories and practices. Approximately one-third of our annual summer program students continue with the certificate, which includes a midyear week of exposure in Rwanda to study the complex environment of a post-conflict country. Karuna Center and SIT work
CONTACT provides education and training for peacebuilders from around the world. The mission of CONTACT is to increase cultures of peace through positive intercommunal connection, compassion, and commitment. Participants of the CONTACT international learning community deepen their understanding of the multiple and interlocked root causes of conflict, develop strategies and skills to prevent and resolve intercommunal violence, and engage in the healing of communal relationships shattered by war and enmity. The international CONTACT faculty members create an experiential teaching methodology that fully engages participants’ experiences and provides a learning laboratory for self-reflection, personal development, and intergroup encounter.

Each June, we teach a class of 50-60 participants who come to Vermont for a three-week period from all continents, many countries, and most of the world’s major religious traditions. Participants range in age from young adults to elders, bringing their experiences as lawyers, educators, social workers, NGO and UN staff, academics, psychologists, clergy, doctors, graduate students, journalists, and more. In many cases our students are from opposing sides of a conflict, such as Israelis and Palestinians; Serbs and Bosnians from the Yugoslav successor states; Sri Lankan Tamils and Sinhalese; Rwandan Hutus and Tutsis; Indians and Pakistanis; Muslims, Christians, and Jews from around the world whose countries are in conflict; and Iraqis, Afghans, and Americans who usually have no other opportunity to deepen their knowledge of each other. Our task is to build a sturdy learning container where these students can safely explore their differences, test their prejudices against the reality of meeting those they have been taught to hate, air their religious and cultural worldviews, and investigate their impulses toward violence and revenge. Faculty members structure these learning opportunities through academic and interpersonal exchange, experiential exercises, case studies, and community-building experiences.

Students learn that the “other” is not the enemy and that religious and cultural identity seldom, if ever, cause armed conflict, but are frequently exploited to foment conflict. They see that the enemy is injustice and structural violence, which in turn is rooted in negative, fear-based human qualities we share, such as greed,
malice, and selfishness. Eager to explore the dynamics underneath the labels of extremism and fundamentalism, students may come to understand that religious or cultural fundamentalism often masks a deeper fear of annihilation. Many cultural and religious groups today are troubled by a sense that global homogeneity, aggressive commercialism, and diminishing resources will displace their centuries-old practices and patterns of culture. CONTACT participants’ intellectual and interpersonal forays into the major issues of our day, taken together in a multicultural, multi-religious, and thoroughly international community, make for rich learning and support the transformation of deeply ingrained thought patterns and modes of being.

Philosophy of education: For transformative peacebuilding education, the experience of our kinship and common ground must be lived and internalized. Conflict transformation education seeks to educate peacebuilders who will influence their own communities, work cross-culturally with the identified “other” in their region, and/or serve globally in conflict prevention and management through governments, non-governmental organizations, religious and secular institutions, the academy, media, the private sector and elsewhere. Their training should be relationship-focused, process-oriented, self-reflective and empathic. Such education promotes self-awareness, inner development, skill building, and a theoretical understanding of the characteristics and structural sources of war and violence within conflict-habituated regional, national, and global systems.

Self-awareness or consciousness involves recognizing and monitoring the flow of thoughts and emotions in the mind so that one’s behavior is ethical, principled, and clear, rather than dictated by negative thought-forms or conditioned feelings. Skill-building includes learning competencies beneficial to managing conflicts, such as multicultural communication expertise, dialogue and group facilitation, problem-solving, consensus process, negotiation, and mediation. Conflict theory includes understanding the multiple and inter-related sources of contemporary armed conflict, developing the ability to analyze the needs and motivations of
stakeholders in a particular conflict region, recognizing repetitive cycles of vengeance or escalation in deep-rooted conflict systems, and using these analytic tools to apply appropriate and timely interventions to prevent or check violence and warfare.

**Story from the Field: CONTACT**

*CONTACT is our contribution to the essential development of a globally diverse community of those who pursue peace and advocate for justice. We hope that the thousand or more participants who have graduated from our programs maintain a lifelong commitment to spread the skills and values of nonviolent responses to the conflicts that will inevitably arise with increased frequency in a world of shrinking resources, climate disruptions, and mass migration.*

Each CONTACT group brings its own miracles. For several years in the late 1990s, we had a grant from the Abraham Fund that enabled us to bring groups of Israeli and Palestinian participants to CONTACT who could not meet in their home region. Working together, with participants from the international community as witnesses, they participated in an exercise of “sculpting” the Middle East conflict to demonstrate the civil society, political, and military players in the conflict within and beyond the region, their interactions, proximity to each other, and relative power. They took on unaccustomed roles, building empathy by standing in the shoes of the other, and creating bonds that have lasted more than a decade. In 2010 I met with them again for a consultation to explore a Middle East CONTACT Program, and found that their ties were so strong that they were able to engage immediately in positive discourse despite a decade of regional hostility and violence.

Shortly after CONTACT opened its doors in 1997, a Rwandan student appeared at SIT, speaking little English but appearing distraught and stressed. We soon learned that this student, Joseph Sebarenzi, had been Speaker of Parliament in Rwanda, and was forced to flee his country due to persecution. Joseph became a CONTACT participant and graduate student. We watched him work with the teachings on reconciliation and forgiveness, wrestling with a lifetime of suffering in the Rwandan ethnic violence that finally resulted in genocide, through which Joseph lost most of his beloved family. Joseph stayed true to the tasks before him, finding his own way to a deep understanding and compassion, and writing a beautiful book documenting his journey, *God Sleeps in*
Rwanda: A Journey of Transformation. Joseph then completed his Ph.D. with a thesis on reconciliation and forgiveness, and now works for the U.S. Department of Justice. Joseph has been a CONTACT faculty member for many years, inspiring others who have been deeply wounded by war and hatred to turn away from revenge and find their own path to inner peace.

---

Sample Training Design: Teaching and Learning in the CONTACT Program

Imagining and creating a large, international peacebuilding program called forth the wisdom and energy of many colleagues at SIT. The program expanded slowly, so that we had time to adapt to changing conditions and to accommodate the waves of students who apply for CONTACT annually. Over the past 15 years, we have welcomed approximately 1000 participants from nearly 100 countries, representing more cultures, languages, contexts, and geographies than the mind can envision. Our skilled and loyal international faculty offers the rich harvests of their own peacebuilding experiences around the world, merging theory and practice in conjunction with the particular histories and issues brought by each student cohort.

Our international summer program in Vermont follows the curriculum described below, with adaptations made annually in response to changing international circumstances and emerging global concerns. While our African and South Asian CONTACT programs have been tailored to focus on particular conflict issues impacting their regions, the curriculum foundations are similar for all our programs. The four fundamental building blocks of the curriculum are: 1) peacebuilding theories and skills, 2) international case studies, 3) community life, and 4) self-reflection and application. We balance these foundational elements so that students absorb theory and practice, scrutinize successes and challenges in the struggle for peace and justice worldwide, build community within the full panoply of diversity, and reflect on their own developmental journey and the application of peacebuilding in their home situation.

Although many program designers make curriculum choices based on a series of elective courses, leaving little time for structured community relations, we chose a format that allows...
for frequent plenary teaching to the entire group, wherein much of the world is represented. We have created a two-week core course for all our Vermont summer program participants to experience together, and offer elective choices during two days of that period and throughout a third week. This decision is motivated by our commitment to engage a truly international, multicultural, inter-religious diverse learning community, based on the belief that the most significant learning occurs between those in the room. Our experiential teaching style includes small group work on a daily basis. Evenings are devoted to community building, featuring speakers, films, music, workshops, special events, and excursions that orient students to the surrounding culture and locale.

Many years ago we devised a morning ritual that is very popular with participants and which engages each student in sharing the peacebuilding traditions of their home country. Each day a group or individual from a particular culture, nation, religion, or identity group leads the ritual with a faculty member, teaching the class to pronounce their language’s word for peace and to sing a song of peace from their country. After a relevant quotation from their culture about peacebuilding, we dim the lights, sit in silence together, and name the hardships and challenges facing that country or community. Next we name the strengths and resources of that country that can contribute to positive change. After a short silence, we close by singing the song of peace taught at the beginning. The ritual expresses a commitment to the pedagogy of empowerment, whereby the teacher in each student is invited forward and appreciated. We have found this to be a very moving and bonding way to open each day and to build community. The morning ritual has become a cherished aspect of CONTACT.

Note: Below is a typical two-week outline for our CONTACT (Conflict Transformation Across Cultures) program at the School for International Training. This design is adapted each year according to the faculty present, the needs of participants, and emerging critical global issues of war and peace.

WEEK ONE
DAY 1
Morning: Building our Learning Community
- Morning Ritual (described above)
- Introductions of all participants, faculty, and staff, with each placing stickers on a wall map indicating their birthplace, current home, and workplace.
- “Milling and Mingling: An ‘Ice-breaker’ Exercise” (tool 3.1) to find common ground and meet new people.
- Overview of 3 week program
- Establish ground rules (“Ground Rules for Dialogue,” tool 3.4)
- Present “Experiential Learning Cycle” (tool 5.7)

Afternoon: Conflict Analysis Tools
- Plenary presentation on analyzing hidden causes of conflict using “Iceberg Model: Causes of Conflict” (tool 1.1), followed by each student using the iceberg model to analyze a conflict of their region, and then small groups of students from different regions sharing their analysis with each other.
- “Conflict Mapping” (tool 1.3): Plenary presentation on how to map conflict, followed by regional or national groups developing and presenting a conflict map.
DAY 2

Morning: Psychosocial Issues in Peacebuilding

- Morning Ritual
- Beginning on this day, we allow about 10 minutes after the ritual for one faculty member daily to present his/her life journey, each of which is quite unique and offers inspiration to participants.
- Role of identity in conflict and peace: Faculty leads a plenary presentation and experiential exercise where individuals create personal wheels of identity and share in dyads. Same pattern repeated for teaching on wounded identity (see “Wheel of Multiple Identities” (tool 2.2) and “Wounded Identity” (tool 2.3).
- Recognizing and transforming prejudice and oppression: Faculty present a PowerPoint defining prejudice, stereotypes, discrimination, and oppression (see “Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Oppression” (tool 4.4), followed by small groups sharing personal experiences of the impact of these harmful attitudes and behaviors on their own lives.
- Plenary exercise on uncovering prejudices within the group and using the CONTACT learning community for overcoming stereotypes and intolerance. Based on understanding the phenomenon of prejudice and stereotypes, class members talk in small groups and then in the plenary about attitudes they have been raised with that relate to other members of the group, such as homophobia, anti-Islamic prejudice, anti-Semitism, or stereotypes about women, Africans, Americans, etc. We find that all of these feelings are in the group each year and that it is worthwhile sharing them honestly, thus discerning the impact of prejudice on our communities and on global conflicts.

Afternoon

- “Role of Human Needs, Rights, and Justice Issues in Peacebuilding” (tool 6.1): Faculty PowerPoint presentation followed by plenary discussion to gather examples from participants about denial of human needs/rights/justice and consequent violent conflict.
- Class and gender consciousness at CONTACT and beyond: Role-plays conducted by faculty and teaching assistants that highlight campus and classroom issues, followed by plenary discussion. We focus on issues of class to illustrate insensitive behaviors between students and service staff on campus, and on issues of gender because of frequently misunderstood cultural cues about gender relations among students. A thoughtful discussion of gender and social class-consciousness follows the role-plays and illustrates the previous presentation on human needs and rights.

DAY 3 AND 4

- Morning Ritual
- Mini electives: Participants select two-day skills workshops in one of the following: Intercommunal Dialogue, Active Nonviolence, Negotiation and Mediation, Peace Education
DAY 5: RECONCILIATION AND FORGIVENESS

Morning
- Morning Ritual
- “Cycles of Revenge and Reconciliation” (1.6) Faculty presentation, followed by discussion in small groups and plenary. The inner cycle points to possible explanations for the repetitive and cyclical nature of conflict within groups or nations. The outer cycle suggests interventions to interrupt cyclical warfare and to work toward a sustainable peace. The presentation is done slowly to allow time for questions and discussion, which becomes very sober as group members recognize familiar patterns and their consequences.

Afternoon
- “The Long Journey Towards Reconciliation” (tool 4.9). Faculty and selected guests or participants who have survived war-related grief and loss present personal testimonies. Facilitators need to build a strong and secure environment for listening to these stories.
- An alternative afternoon activity is for participants to share their personal experiences of reconciliation and forgiveness in dyads or small groups.

WEEK TWO
In this week, late afternoons are set aside for country presentations by participants to present the causes, multiple perspectives, and consequences of armed conflict in their regions as well as the initiatives being taken to build coalitions to end war and solve issues of peace and justice without violence. Students choose to attend 1 of 3 presentations running simultaneously.

DAY 6: Global Context
- Morning Ritual
- In this day, we review current critical global issues and examine the state of the world through a faculty presentation, followed by discussions in regional groups. The regional groups are tasked with relating the global context to their particular challenges. For example, climate change, human trafficking, and arms trade are global crises but impact each region of the world differently. Regional groups report back to plenary, engendering lively discussion about globalization’s benefits and difficulties as well as about perceptions, priorities, advantages, injustices, etc.

DAY 7: Global Context
- Morning Ritual
- The Global Peace Index is presented in plenary. The Global Peace Index is an annual survey that measures the relative peacefulness of nations, currently ranking 153 countries on external indicators such as military expenditures and domestic indicators such as crime, imprisonment, and protection of human rights. More information is available at http://www.visionofhumanity.org
- This is followed by mixed groups from different regions of the world who work with the Global Peace Index materials to discern how the advantages and policy choices of the high-ranked and most peaceful countries might be applied to countries ex-
periencing more violence. Students find the Index challenging and the ensuing plenary discussions thought provoking.

DAY 8: Nonviolence Simulation
Morning
- Morning Ritual
- Simulation of a fictional case study of a violent national war involving resources, poverty, ethnic dominance, gender discrimination, warlords, international interests, corruption, lack of economic development, colonial history, and many other themes that have been explored in the course. Participants select which of the designated roles they wish to play and the entire plenary engages in the simulation. A few of the roles are for international monitors who make it possible for the warring groups to exchange communication.

Afternoon
- Debrief of the simulation and further teaching on nonviolent strategies, theories, practices, and needed skills. Faculty and students relate outcomes of this simulation to actual nonviolent campaigns throughout history.

DAY 9: Case Studies
Morning
- Morning Ritual
- Faculty presents two actual post-conflict case studies from different regions of the world, either from their own practices as peacebuilders or from the literature. Students analyze the root causes of conflict, issues and interests of conflicting groups, and dividers and connectors among groups in conflict (see “Tree Model: Roots and Impact of Conflict,” tool 1.2, and “Dividers and Connectors,” tool 1.5). Case studies vary by year. Group members then suggest program initiatives that might address the underlying issues that contributed to the conflict and interventions that might heal shattered relationships and prevent future conflict.
- Participants divide into mixed groups to analyze the first case study given to them. In late morning the groups return to plenary where analyses are shared on a master list of root causes, issues, etc. as described above.

Afternoon:
- Second case study is introduced, groups are divided again, and process of analysis and collection of data repeated, followed by plenary reflections.

DAY 10: Open Space Technology, Visioning, and Class Closing
Morning:
- Morning Ritual
- Open Space Technology (OST): this is a form of program organizing where the participants themselves set the agenda and run the sessions, allowing for autonomy, creativity, coverage of multiple issues simultaneously, and a high degree of participant satisfaction. OST can be used with small or large groups for a half day or many days. Resources about OST are available online on Wikipedia.org and at www.openspaceworld.org.
Afternoon:

- Visioning exercise of a peaceful and just world: This exercise stretches the imagination and encourages participants to envision the world they struggle to create. See Elise Boulding’s article, “A Journey into the Future: Imagining a Nonviolent World, retrieved from http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/pcs/EB83PCS.htm.
- Closing reflections from participants and faculty, ending with music and rituals.

WEEK THREE

In the third week, participants are divided among 3 electives. These electives rotate over the years, but frequently include three of the following:

- Training for Change
- Peacebuilding and Development
- Women and Men as Partners in Peacebuilding
- Fundamentals of Fundraising
- Religion and Peacemaking
- Social Healing and Reconciliation
- Mediation and Negotiation

“As I look back at my professional career of almost four decades in various fields, especially as a trainer/resource person in hundreds of workshops in Pakistan and abroad, I admit that CONTACT South Asia was the best interactive exposure of my life. The content material was exceptional and it developed the pace very methodically and progressively, day by day. The most pronounced aspect was that it brought a cross cultural bouquet (participants) to a deeper place of understanding and perception of the prevalent environment in the region. For many days I have been wondering why anyone didn’t think of such a program much earlier with such an unequivocal impact across cultures, and how we have lost years and years in contemptuous bitterness of internal/external conflicts and mistrust.”

— Shafqat Mehmood, Retired military officer and Chairperson, PAIMAN Alumni Trust, Pakistan
Time together with my fellow peacebuilders enhanced my understanding of our common humanity and who we are and where we come from as individuals. This experience enabled me to feel part of something larger than my current work and to join the international family of those striving to replace violence with tolerance, justice, and peace.”

— Bisrat Abebe Bisrat, Ethiopian participant

Additional Reading and Resources


Online Resources

Global Peace Index:
www.visionofhumanity.org

Open Space Technology:
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Space_Technology
and www.openspaceworld.org

Visualization Exercise:
Afterword: A Nonviolent Future

Waging Peace Peacefully

All of our work as peacebuilders in conflict resolution, transformation, mitigation, management, healing, reconciliation, and all the other descriptors, carries the common theme of nonviolence. Building sustainable peace requires that we find non-warlike and non-harmful ways to solve the problems that inevitably arise between human beings at all levels of interaction, from bedroom to boardroom to battlefield.

War is a failure of imagination, a failure of communication, a failure of insight and compassion. Violence arises when we do not know how else to respond to threat, fear, or runaway emotions. By now, with all our knowledge, war and its corollaries should be obsolete. But war is a hard habit to break. National armies and militia groups frequently gain popular support by magnifying the sense of peril and providing the illusion of protection. Military, government, and business hierarchies grant their elites opportunities for power and wealth. The U.S. military budget, now estimated at about one trillion dollars annually and rising, remains out of bounds for significant budget reductions. Japan and Costa Rica stand virtually alone among nations with their peace constitutions and refusal to wage war. Despite the collected wisdom of our societies, the goodwill of so many individuals and organizations, and the profound damage caused by armed conflict since time immemorial, a massive change of direction in global conflict management has yet to be achieved.

Creative nonviolent methods of conflict resolution exist in all cultures, but unfortunately, historians and media focus more attention on war than on peaceful resolution of conflict. Our contemporary legacy of nonviolence, inspired in part by Gandhi as well as Martin Luther King, Jr. and the U.S. civil rights movement, includes countless nonviolent revolutions around the world that overthrew dictators and monarchs, from the Philippines to Nepal, Serbia, Chile, and more recently Egypt and Tunisia. The young revolutionaries of Tahrir Square in Cairo in 2011 translated and studied the works of Gene Sharp, the foremost American expert on the practice and tactics of nonviolence, whose work has been translated into forty languages. They disciplined themselves to remain nonviolent despite physical attack, much as Americans practiced during our own civil rights movement. Nonviolent responses to oppression and injustice, such as mass mobilization and citizen protests, are a dramatic and visceral form of conflict transformation. The practice of nonviolence, along with globalized communication links and the skills of conflict transformation, offer models for nations and communities to bring about a new era in human relations.

Managing Conflict Consciously

The best tool a peacebuilder has is her/his state of consciousness. Albert Einstein famously remarked that we could not build peace from the same level of consciousness that brought us to war. This insight about consciousness calls us to “change our minds,” increasing our power of self-reflection and our capacity to penetrate the true nature of inclusiveness and interdependence. In our globalized and resource-threatened world, thinking and behaving inclusively has acquired new urgency. Without a transformation of consciousness and a new approach to
problem solving, we are doomed to ever more war as climate change, resource depletion, and severe inequity threaten an already heavily populated global community.

Those of us who identify as peacebuilders are challenged to develop such consciousness within ourselves so that we may share these insights with participants in our programs. Even while focused on healing war-ravaged intercommunal relationships and fostering peace in deeply divided societies, Karuna Center programs foster a sense of connection to global movements and promote social responsibility. Many of our participants take on the mantle of peacebuilder, enlarging their circles of compassion and promoting values of conflict transformation and social inclusion beyond their own workplaces and communities. They become part of an unbroken chain of people throughout history raising their voices to protect human life and the natural world, committed to justice and peaceful management of conflicts. Out of such a web of arising consciousness and response, we weave the future. Each of us has a part to play and a promise to keep. Together, we wake up.

Additional Reading and Resources


**Online Resources**
Nonviolent Peaceforce: www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org
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The *iceberg* represents the visible and hidden causes of conflicts. The positions and conclusions that are at the surface of a given conflict are only the tip of the iceberg, while deeply held values, wounds, assumptions, etc. remain underneath. Like an iceberg, the deepest and most dangerous sources of conflict may not be visible.

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To understand the visible, hidden and interconnected causes of conflict.

**Method:** Draw a blank iceberg on a flip chart. Explain why conflict is like an iceberg. Ask participants to suggest visible and invisible causes of a particular conflict. Write all suggestions on iceberg. Ask participants to reflect on the connections between causes, and what this diagram implies about the effectiveness of different approaches to resolving conflict. Explore sweeping and incorrect generalizations such as “religion causes conflict” and encourage more in-depth examination.
Training Activity

**Objective:** To examine the roots (causes) and impact (consequences) of a particular conflict.

**Method:** Plenary or small groups identify the many roots of a particular conflict and then explore all the effects that arise from the roots. Write these on branches, then drawing twigs and leaves to show the further ramifications of the conflict. Group can talk about how the effects/leaves drop from the tree and feed the roots of the conflict, demonstrating the cyclical nature of causes and consequences of violent conflict.

Conflict Mapping

**Objective:** To illustrate graphically how the parties to a complex conflict relate to each other and to the central issue in the conflict.

**Method:** This model may be used in plenary to map a key conflict faced by the whole group, or as a small group exercise. First, review the model. Next, trainer elicits guidance from the group while mapping out conflicting parties’ relationships, using size, distance, and mapping lines. Alternatively, trainer divides participants into small groups, which each illustrate a conflict of their choice or their perspective on a given conflict. With any of these approaches, participants may then discuss in small groups the implications of problems revealed on the map and possible opportunities for future intervention.

Pillars Model: Factors that Sustain Conflict

**Objective:** To examine the factors that support the continuation of structural violence or the central problem in a conflict. A situation of injustice, represented as an inverted triangle, cannot stand by itself but requires pillars of systems, institutions, and habituated beliefs to prop it up. If we remove enough of the pillars that prop up unjust structures, the sources of violent conflict will give way, creating space for conflict transformation.

**Method:** After explaining the model, invite small groups to select a problem to place in the center of the inverted triangle and to consider what factors in society perpetuate this problem. Participants should examine ways to help weaken or dismantle specific pillars.

Dividers and Connectors

In all societies, communities are connected through common needs and interests while simultaneously divided by competition to satisfy these concerns. Peacebuilders hope to increase connections for the sake of cooperation and mutual understanding, while decreasing attitudes and behaviors that undermine good will and further escalate tensions.

Training Activity

Objective: To create participant awareness that effective peacebuilding programs should be designed to focus on strengthening connectors and weakening dividers between those in conflict. Further work would then consider possible activities and programs that focus on increasing connections and reducing dividers.

Method: Divide participants into small groups. Ask groups to discover those connectors that currently exist between opposing groups, and to then name dividers that weaken intergroup ties. Explore which identity groups in society might be most amenable to connections with the “enemy” and which groups would find this most difficult. Next, lead a plenary brainstorm of specific interventions that could be implemented by their own organizations to build on the connectors and minimize the dividers. Draw on participants’ resources from their own life and work experiences, and offer stories from various conflict regions.

Note: This is adapted from a model found in “Do no harm: how aid can support peace — or war,” by M. Anderson, 1999. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
Cycles of Revenge and Reconciliation

**Objective:** To understand the ways conflicting groups get caught in cycles of revenge and the necessary steps to break this cycle and move towards reconciliation.

**Method:** Present the stages of the inner and outer cycle. The inner circle represents the cyclical nature of conflict and the emotional realities that fuel it, while the outer cycle suggests interventions to escape this cycle and move toward sustainable peace. Allow ample time for small group work on how these stages have shown up in the participants’ own contexts. In a bonded and safe group, the model may then be placed on the floor with masking tape and sheets of paper. Ask participants to find the spot where they would place themselves in terms of their own experience and feelings. Invite those who wish to share their reasons for choosing a particular place on either inner/outer cycle. Remember that emotions are not static like a diagram, but move constantly.

Braid Model

**Political Peacebuilding**
- Constitutional reform
- Transitional Justice
- Creating democratic political institutions
- Mechanisms for human rights protection

**Economic Peacebuilding**
- Economic stimulus programs
- Infrastructure reconstruction
- Jobs for former combatants
- Promoting peaceful relations through economic ventures

**Social Peacebuilding**
- Dialogue for mutual understanding
- Programs for tolerance and reconciliation
- Interventions for trauma and social healing
- Peace education

**Sustainable Peace**

---

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To demonstrate the cooperative relationship needed between various societal institutions and innovative programs for post-conflict peacebuilding.

**Method:** Examine diagram for examples of how to encourage institutional change and proactive programming in each sector after mass violence.
2.2 Peacebuilding Interventions Tools

Wheel of Multiple Identities

Multiple Identities Within the Individual

- Mother
- Religious Identity
- Human
- Teacher
- National Identity
- Ethnic Identity
- Woman

Training Activity

**Objective:** To emphasize that all of us have multiple identities, which enable us to experience multi-layered connections with others. To show how these identities can become subsumed by just one identity given to us by others in times of conflict.

**Method:** Each participant draws his/her wheel to discover and illustrate his/her numerous identities, the changes over time, and the commonality with others across many of these identities. Discuss in dyads and plenary.
Wounded Identity

The Effects of Violence and Oppression on Identity

When a person is targeted for one of their identities, such as race or religion, several things happen:

a. The targeted identity assumes an importance disproportionate to all other identities;

b. The targeted identity’s disproportionate importance makes the other identities, such as worker or mother, seem less important;

c. The targeted identity’s disproportionate importance makes it harder for the person to shift easily between his/her many identities, and harder to connect along identity lines with different people and groups;

d. The targeted identity begins to shape the person’s worldview as a victim. The person begins to feel alienated, less able to engage in dialogue, less able to see others as human.

continued on next page
Peacebuilding Goals when Identities have been Wounded or Distorted

1. Discuss the sources of the wounded identity such as:
   - History of injustice
   - Prejudice
   - Conflict

2. Address ongoing causes:
   a. Structural injustice – provide equal rights in education, politics, economy
   b. Past oppression – offer affirmative action
   c. Class privilege, racism – create awareness
   d. Find ways for people to list common needs and goals and work together

Training Activity

Objective: To examine the impact of violence and oppression on one singular targeted identity in times of conflict, and discuss the kinds of institutional structures that could prevent such targeting.

Method: Participants pair off and discuss times in their lives when they were oppressed or discriminated against based on one of their identities. Plenary group considers experiences of pairs willing to share. Group brainstorms the kinds of measures that could be taken to prevent such destructive manipulation of identity.
Intervention Check List

1. Know Your Place in the System
   • Inside Partial or Outside Neutral
   • Advocate, bridge builder or skills trainer
   • Top down, bottom up, or middle out

2. Do No Harm
   • Consider how your activities might increase tensions, put people at risk, or otherwise add to the conflict situation

3. Define Your Focus
   • Know the intention of your intervention, how it will help build peace, what it will add or change in the system

4. Build for Sustainability
   • Build Capacity – skills and wisdom
   • Build Relationships – individually, inter-group, inter-agency, etc.
   • Build Institutions – develop peacebuilding infrastructure: organizations, alliances, networks
   • Build Evaluation Mechanisms – best practices, lessons learned; disseminate

Training Activity

Objective: To engage participants in a discussion of elements of peacebuilding – peacebuilder roles, potential risks, possible partners, reflection mechanisms.

Method: Divide participants into small groups. Ask the groups to review the handout, to reflect on peacebuilding missions with which they are familiar, and to assess those missions using the intervention checklist.
Program Strategies: Reflecting on Peace Practice Matrix

Programs that work at the *individual/personal level* seek to change the attitudes, values, perceptions or circumstances of individuals, on the belief that peace is possible only if the hearts, minds and behavior of individuals – of people – are changed.

Programs that concentrate at the *socio-political level* are based on the belief that peace requires changes in socio-political, or institutional, structures. These programs aim to support creation or reform of institutions that address the grievances that fuel conflict and to institutionalize non-violent modes of handling conflict within society.

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To communicate that effective peacemaking must take place on several different levels in society and to encourage participants to begin to think about peace “pressure points” in their own communities and societies.

**Method:** Divide participants into small groups and distribute the handout. Ask participants to populate the fields of the matrix with the programs they work on, seeing which sectors and levels they impact and where improvements could be made in their delivery and effectiveness. Encourage participants to consider how to reach key people and how to influence the socio-political level where structural decisions are made.

*Note: This is adapted from the model found in "RPP participant training manual" by CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, 2009, as part of the Reflecting on peace practice project. Retrieved from www.cdainc.com.*
Criteria of Effectiveness Worksheet

**Rating:** 0 = no impact on this factor; 5 = major impact on this factor

**Big/Fast/Sustained:** Mark Y/N and why

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The effort contributes to stopping a key driving factor of the conflict or tensions</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The effort results in the creation or reform of institutions or mechanisms that address the specific grievances or injustices that fuel the conflict</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The effort causes participants and communities to develop independent initiatives that decrease dividers, increase connectors or address causes of conflict</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The effort prompts people increasingly to resist violence and provocations to violence</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The effort results in an increase in people's security and in their sense of security</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Activity

**Objective:** To introduce the concept of progressive initiatives along a spectrum of conflict cessation to sustained peace, and to help participants to identify and recognize relevant indicators.

**Method:** Divide participants into small groups. Ask each group to choose a post-conflict situation to consider. Distribute the handout. Ask each group to identify and assess events and/or initiatives which contributed to the peacebuilding process in their chosen situation.

*Note: This is adapted from the model found in “RPP participant training manual” by CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, 2009, as part of the Reflecting on peace practice project. Retrieved from www.cdainc.com.*
Who is in Your Community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Beyond Your Reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to reaching this group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for approaching this group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Activity

**Objective:** To demonstrate a mapping technique to help peacebuilders identify potential allies.

**Method:** Distribute the handout with the following instructions:

List the various groups in your work region: Which of these groups are you already connected to? Which groups are currently beyond your reach, and why? Work on strategies for approaching groups currently beyond your reach, and discuss possible ramifications of leaving out certain groupings in your society.
Milling and Mingling:  
An “Ice-breaker” Exercise

This exercise is often used as a means of building a new group who will be working together.

Training Activity

**Objective:** To encourage participants to meet new people, to energize a group, and/or to promote mixing among participants who are hesitant to talk to each other.

**Method:** Ask participants to stand and move throughout the room, speaking briefly with as many different participants as possible. Offer discussion topics and instructions, such as:

- Find 5 people you do not know well and discover something you have in common with each.
- Talk to 3 different people about your hopes for this workshop.
- Identity 4 people from the “other side” of your region’s conflict and learn how to say “peace” in their language.

After about 5 minutes, bring the group back together and ask them to share what they have discovered.
3.2 Intercommunal Dialogue Tools

Dialogue: An Invitation to a New Conversation

Dialogue avoids:
- Predictable debates on contentious issues
- The polarization and hardening of fixed positions
- Premature solutions

Dialogue invites:
- Genuine inquiry
- Developing the discipline to hear other perspectives that may at first appear to threaten one’s own
- Expanding one’s capacity for tolerance
- Participants to be changed by the process

Dialogue develops:
- A deepening of human relationships
- New insights and understanding through the creative tension of tolerating difference
- New and unexpected responses to complex problems

Training Activity

Objective: To help group members understand the unique value of dialogue and to feel reassured that the risks of dialogue lead to positive outcomes.

Method: Use when introducing dialogue procedures. Review with group, respond to questions and concerns.
Fostering Dialogue through Good Communication

The dialogue process is about practicing a new kind of speaking and a new kind of listening.

**Active Listening:** *Hearing and understanding the truth of the experience of others*
- Give the speaker your full and undivided attention
- Listen to learn, not to verify existing assumptions or expectations
- Listen with empathy, to see the problem from the other person’s point of view, to walk in their shoes
- Ask question to clarify or expand your understanding, not to challenge or engage in debate

**Authentic Speaking:** *Telling the truth of your own experience*
- Speak for yourself, not for a group or position
- Speak to communicate your own experience, not to persuade others
- Distinguish your opinion or belief from fact or ‘truth’
- Acknowledge the experiences and assumptions that have shaped your views and opinion
- Speak from your heart

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To practice focused listening and clear speaking to increase understanding and connection.

**Method:** Assign participants a topic and divide in pairs. Dyads take turns with roles of listener and speaker. Speaker talks for 5 minutes; listener listens intently and then repeats what was said. Speaker indicates whether listener repeated accurately. Reverse.

**Alternative:** Divide participants into triads with a listener, a speaker, and an observer who gives feedback at end of exercise.
Ground Rules for Dialogue

The dialogue process requires practicing understanding and creating ground rules.

Constructing the boundaries of the conversation—the limited context and manner in which it will take place—is a big part of what allows it to open and deepen into new awareness.

Establishing ground rules by group consensus involves the whole group in creating optimal conditions for freedom of expression and exploration. The ground rules express the spirit of the discussion, which is based on listening respectfully and without argument while discussing issues that may tempt us to argue. The ground rules provide a container which encourages everyone to take an active part, even those who tend to hold back.

The group creates the ground rules; the facilitator makes sure that there is agreement, that the list is complete, and the rules are followed.

Basic ground rules to include:

- Honor confidentiality
- Respect differences
- Speak in the first person and from individual experience, not as a representative of a group
- Describe experiences, not opinions
- Do not try to persuade or change others
- Listen openly and without interruption
- Respect air time; be aware of those who are more quiet, or have a language barrier
- Avoid cross talk and side conversations

Training Activity

Objective: To develop a safe container in which to experience dialogue.

Method: Ask participants to brainstorm possible rules. Remind participants that group must approve rules before they are added to the list. This insures that participants will own the ground rules and help monitor them. Remind participants to keep lists short and post them where they are visible to all.
Debate versus Dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Goal is to win</td>
<td>• Goal is to discover common ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involves listening to find the opponent’s weak points</td>
<td>• Involves listening to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involves criticizing other points of view</td>
<td>• Involves openly considering all points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assumes one right answer to a question or problem</td>
<td>• Assumes that many different ideas can contribute to a fuller solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comes from a position which one defends</td>
<td>• Expresses feelings, concerns, fears, and uncertainties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exposes faults in the positions of others</td>
<td>• Demonstrates strengths on all sides of an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Looks to strengthen a predetermined position</td>
<td>• Uncovers brand new possibilities and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further polarizes antagonistic positions</td>
<td>• Builds bridges of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes competition</td>
<td>• Promotes collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Activity

**Objective:** To give participants an actual experience of these two forms of communication so that they can appreciate the distinction.

**Method:** Before sharing this handout, divide participants into pairs, and assign them a controversial issue to debate. Give each partner an opportunity to argue for and against the topic. After 5 minutes, stop debate and ask pairs to switch to a dialogue. Bring participants back to plenary to reflect on the differing aims of debate and dialogue, and review handout.
Karuna Center’s Philosophy of Practice for Peacebuilding Dialogues

We have a deliberate and structured approach to inter-communal dialogue, so that participants will feel safe, and through which trust and understanding can build slowly and steadily. We believe that the legacy of war must be thoroughly explored and that a secure future can only be built through an honest reflection of the past. We do not believe that the past can be denied or erased. We have seen that cycles of revenge can be replaced by tolerance and that both individuals and communities can heal and move forward with their lives. To create new communities requires acknowledgement of past wrongs and mutual commitment to a shared and just future. Inter-communal dialogue is one step toward that future.

In each dialogue, we encourage participants to confront the hatred, myths and stereotypes that fuel inter-communal violence and to speak honestly about their experiences. We encourage them to explore the complexity of their relationships with each other and their feelings of being together in dialogue.

We facilitate structured conversations with the full group and sometimes work in small groups and pairs, where it is safer to manage intense feelings of grief, anger or disagreement. We apply no pressure toward achieving reconciliation, but are content with small steps of acknowledgement, recognition, apology, and taking responsibility for one’s own behaviors. We believe that reconciliation is a long process that develops slowly over many years and is based on the continual testing of trust and understanding.

As facilitators of these dialogues, we have tried our best to be loyal to truth and to acknowledge the suffering caused by violence and war. We know that each individual and each community has a different experience of truth, and that many people face divided loyalties that are very painful. We do not take sides in talking about war. We are on the side of peace and justice, of nonviolent responses to conflict, of learning new skills for managing differences, and of building a viable, safe and reconciled future.

Training Activity

Objective: To understand the underpinnings of our practice and our cautions about dialogue.

Method: Facilitate an elicitive conversation with group about responsible dialogue practices and cautions.
The Role of a Facilitator in Peacebuilding Dialogues

The overarching role of the dialogue facilitator is to create, protect, and maintain a safe space for open communication throughout the phases of the dialogue. This can be achieved by attending to the following:

1. Clarify purpose of dialogue
   - Listen and speak about difficult topics with openness and respect
   - Increase the ability to see a problem from other participants’ points of view
   - Practice the honest expression of one’s own experience without attempting to persuade or change others

2. Establish and monitor ground rules
   - Help group to develop and follow ground rules
   - Model observance of ground rules through own behavior

3. Model effective group behavior and communication
   - Respect all perspectives
   - Provide verbal and non verbal support
   - Listen actively and empathetically
   - Learn and use participants’ names
   - Encourage hesitant members
   - Work smoothly with co-facilitator

4. Oversee Process
   - Manage the time, monitoring individual speaking time and overall schedule
   - Keep group focused on the topic
   - Encourage full participation
   - Attend to stages of group process and what is needed in each stage
   - Monitor emotional tone; challenge if too safe/protect if too intense
   - Watch for power dynamics within group; prevent dominance of a single view or faction

Training Activity

Objective: To introduce the concept that dialogues require focused facilitator attention to guide participants through each specific phase.

Method: Identify and discuss facilitator roles experienced by participants in this and other programs.
### Phases of Dialogue

1. **Opening Phase**
   - **Goal:** Build trust and safety
     - Establish ground rules
     - Find common ground
     - Surface expectations
     - Practice communication skills
     - Explore what a dialogue is and is not
   - **Challenges:** Inadequate trust may lead to
     - Superficality
     - Reverting to debate, argument, or problem solving

2. **Heart of the Dialogue**
   - **Goal:** Reach new understanding of self and other in relation to the conflict
     - Encourage expression of personal feeling and experience
     - Allow participants to tell relevant aspects of own story
     - Cultivate the kind of listening that enables participants to develop new understandings of different perspectives
     - Provide opportunity for personal reflection
   - **Challenges:** Incomplete shifts in understanding may lead to
     - Dominance by single perspective or faction/"silencing" of minority views
     - Pressure to conform to group norms/ discomfort with differences
     - Moving toward debate, problem-solving, or action to avoid difficult issues or emotions

3. **Closing Phase**
   - **Goal:** Consolidate learning and experience; develop plans for action
     - Engage head, heart, and hand in integrating experience of dialogue
     - Articulate new vision and insight, understand impacts
     - Plan how to put new learning into action
     - Evaluation of dialogue process
     - Prepare for re-entry into own community
   - **Challenges:** Incomplete consolidation may lead to
     - Pressure to conform to group decisions
     - Moving toward actions that are unrealistic or premature
     - Too many ideas/loss of focus

### Training Activity

**Objective:** To examine the phases that a successful dialogue goes through, and to look at the goals and challenges of each phase.

**Method:** Discuss phases in plenary session and use as a guide to evaluate the group’s dialogues.
Crafting Dialogue Questions

The middle, core phase of a dialogue is usually launched with a question. The nature of the question and how it is phrased will profoundly affect the tone and shape of the ensuing dialogue.

A question designed for a debate helps to sharpen and differentiate positions. A question designed for a dialogue will allow for differences, but also helps illumine unexplored common ground.

A good dialogue question:

• Is open-ended and cannot be answered with a yes or no, I agree or disagree response
• Takes participants deeper than the level of opinion or position
• Encourages participants to delve into their experience and to explore their thinking in a fresh manner
• Allows for ambiguity or ambivalence
• Calls forth new, unrehearsed responses

Training Activity

Objective: To teach the art of creating questions that lend themselves to good dialogue.

Method: Review the handout. Divide participants into small groups and invite each group to develop questions for a given dialogue topic (or invite each group to choose its own topic). Bring the groups back together and ask the plenary group to review and evaluate each individual group’s questions in light of the guidelines.
The Pitfalls of Dialogue
By Jonathan Kuttab

My experience in dialogue has been in the context of the Palestinian-Israeli or Palestinian-Jewish exchange. I am presumptuous enough to consider that my comments are more general in application. It is a rarely understood phenomenon that members of oppressed groups are generally ready and eager for dialogue, but it is only when members of the oppressor or dominant group find it in their interest to engage in dialogue that it moves very rapidly and fruitfully. However, it was only after engaging in years of attempts at dialogue with Israelis and Jews that I began to understand why so many Palestinians are reluctant to engage in dialogue. Hopefully by being aware of these pitfalls, one can move boldly ahead in pursuit of peace and reconciliation through genuine dialogue.

1. Assumption of symmetry:

There is an assumption of symmetry between oppressor and oppressed; occupier and occupied; powerful and weak. The meetings are seen as one being more or less an open and free meeting between individuals. Yet the reality of the situation stimulates major differences. Even simple matters as traveling to a place of dialogue and finding a proper date and setting for dialogue will reveal this asymmetry. In our context, a Palestinian can be prevented from coming to the place of dialogue by a roadblock or curfew or other travel restriction. An Israeli may be prevented because he is called to military service. Even the same activity, joining a demonstration, may be an expression of the privileged right to dissent or a dangerous, terroristic criminal activity.

2. Ignore basic conflict issues:

Individuals engaged in dialogue are prone to be very reasonable, sensitive wonderful people, and they feel a desperate urgency to have everybody agree with everyone else. Therefore, they exert tremendous effort to reach agreement on as many issues as possible. They have a natural tendency to avoid situations that are tough and rough, in which there are genuine deep conflict differences. Instead they emphasize issues such as image, perception and outlook. What is the image of Palestinians in an Israeli society? Vice versa? They talk about sharing folk songs, home visits, dances and smiles and avoid the true issues of the conflict of land, water resources, national rights, boundaries, flags.

3. Accept the status quo:

There is a tendency to accept the status quo and take for granted the presumptions prevailing generally. Dialoguers are not revolutionary individuals. They are not out to turn the world upside down. Therefore it is only natural that they tend to accept, at least to begin with what is rather than what ought to be. They tend to begin by accepting many assumptions of the oppressor, concerning for example, who is an extremist? What is possible to do or achieve in a certain situation? What is reasonable?

In many dialogues with Israelis, certain very basic issues never come up because they are not allowed to come up. One begins by accepting the legitimacy of the Jewish state because it is there. In fact that is usually one of the stated or unstated conditions before dialogue can begin. More important than these political positions is the acceptance of unspoken assumptions about what is possible: what is right.
4. Pressure to compromise genuine principles:

Dialoguers are often pressured to compromise genuine principles, to accept much moral evil, and be willing to abandon positions generally popularly held within their own community. Of course, it is important not to be dogmatic or seek to be “ideologically pure.” It is important to be open-minded and willing to change their position.

Yet within dialogical meetings tremendous pressure is exerted, in the name of realism, pragmatism, and moderation, to accept things that perhaps from the moral point of view should not be accepted. This may result in the dialoguers losing moral power and credibility within their own community.

5. Dialogue as substitute for action:

There is a tendency to make dialogue a substitute for action aimed at empowering the weak and oppressed and at the elimination of injustice. Many dialoguers see dialogue as an end in itself. When dialogue becomes a substitute for action it assuages the conscience of members of the oppressor group. It becomes a safety valve for venting the oppressed group’s frustrations. In both cases it becomes a measure of the enforcement of the existing oppression and therefore serves the continuation of oppression.

6. Pressure on oppressed group to ease the task:

There develops pressure on members of the oppressed group to act or say those things that ease the tasks of the members of the oppressor group in their own community. Now how does this pressure manifest itself? It can be done very aggressively as members of the oppressor group challenge their partners of the oppressed group to take a certain position. “Why don’t you denounce a particular activity?” Or it can be pleading: “If only you could make such a statement publicly, wouldn’t that be wonderful, wouldn’t that make it much easier for us in our own community?”

7. Co-option:

Authorities watching dialogue taking place can often successfully co-opt and misuse it to serve their own purposes. How? By delegitimizing the accepted, established leadership of the oppressed group or by setting up those individuals involved in the dialogue as an alternative leadership to divide the oppressed community.

Those involved in dialogue risk lending themselves to be used by the authorities to subdivide the oppressed community. Yet, on the other hand it is constantly denied that they are at all representative of the oppressed group or that the authorities of the oppressed group owe them anything. There is no obligation to them. They are, on the one hand, placed as alternative leaders, but on the other hand, no concessions are made towards them because they are not viewed as being representative.

What then is a proper model for dialogue?

1. Seek truth.

Seek truth rigorously without pretence, falsity or attempts at accommodation. Those who are so desperately seeking peace and justice but are willing to ignore the truth and hide it will end up accomplishing none of three virtues, any more than those seeking peace without justice. A corollary to that may be the need to seek real en-
1. Avoid adversaries, not adversaries.

Emote to dialogue with, not moderates or people who are like-minded.

2. Avoid panaceas.

Do not try to find the magic formula for solving the whole problem. Often the model is for the moderates from both sides to sit together and work out a whole grand solution to which they agree, then go and try to sell it to their respective communities. Individual moderates from both sides generally represent minority views within their own communities.

It would be a different matter if they were leaders charged with the task of negotiating a settlement. However for individual dialoguers a little humility is in order. Emphasis must be given to limited, specific issues and matters that they can affect and influence, whether individually or jointly with others.

3. Never attempt to manipulate the other partner.

Resist the temptation to force the other partner to make statements or alter its position simply to please you or even to further the process of dialogue.

4. Keep your whole society in mind while you dialogue with members of another society.

This means that individuals have to be willing to move out of their own narrow, limited perspective however enlightened. For Palestinian dialoguers this means they should be conscious that there are other Palestinians living in other geographic areas with different outlooks and interests. For Israelis, while they may consider themselves to be holding very liberal views, they must never forget they are part of an entire Israeli society that is oppressive to the Palestinians and they cannot escape bearing some measure of responsibility for that.

5. First step.

Individuals who engage in dialogue must do so with full acknowledgement that dialogue must only be a first step towards action, joint or separate action aimed at empowerment of the oppressed and opposed to injustice.

I have written some harsh words about dialogue and its pitfalls; yet I am still a firm believer in it. Peace, justice and reconciliation can be advanced tremendously by an open dialogue between members of the oppressed group and those who are willing among the oppressor society. In the process both sides benefit, and both sides advance. Groundwork can be laid for true co-existence, as the two sides move from the dialogue of empty words into dialogue of the hands and feet together for justice and peace. This is the proper path. Let us walk in it.

Training Activity

Objective: To help participants understand that dialogue is not a panacea and that it has limits as a peacebuilding tool.

Method: Ask students to read this handout before class and engage in a full discussion about the important issues raised by the author. Elicit examples from participant experience illustrating pitfalls and problems of dialogue.

Note: This article is excerpted from “An exchange on dialogue,” by J. Kuttab and E. Kaufman, 1988, in Journal of Palestine Studies XVII, no 2 (winter): 84-108.
Cycle of Socialization

**Training Activity:**

**Objective:** To understand that intolerance and prejudice are learned attitudes that are transmitted through institutions of socialization. These attitudes can also be changed through moral development.

**Method:** After the diagram is presented, participants identify and discuss in small groups their own learning and development process.
4.2 Social Healing, Reconciliation and Forgiveness Tools

Exercise on Discrimination

Discussions about discrimination include examining one's own experiences from multiple perspectives.

Questions
1. Can you think of a time in your life when you’ve treated someone differently because of ethnicity, religion, gender, or sexual preference? (Or, if you can’t think of a time when you have treated someone differently because of one of their identities, can you think of a time when you’ve witnessed such actions by someone else)?
2. Can you think of a time in your life you’ve been treated differently because of who you are?

Training Activity

Objective: To create awareness on three levels: of the factors that influence discrimination; of the fact that all people discriminate even if unwittingly; of the pernicious effects of discrimination.

Method: Divide participants into pairs so that they can share responses to the questions on the handout. Convene the full group to reflect on responses. Facilitate discussion to include an examination of the social factors which enabled one person or group to treat others differently.
Exercise on Identity: “Where Do We Belong?”

Communicating the concept of identity grouping can be done effectively through simulation.

Training Activity

Objectives: To communicate that people often live in neighborhoods that are organized according to particular identities; to simulate the experience of being accepted or not accepted; to underscore the strengths and dangers of identity groups.

Method: Explain to the group that they represent three different groups belonging to three different identities. Tell them to close their eyes; then, put stickers of red, blue, or green on their foreheads. On the forehead of one participant put a black sticker. Tell the participants to open their eyes and notice that the three corners of the room are marked with the three different colors representing three different identities. Without speaking they must find where they belong. The one with the black sticker will find no home. After everyone has found a place and the group has grappled with how to treat the person with the black sticker, ask group members to return to their seats to discuss the exercise.

Discussion: Ask the group to discuss their experience. You may want to use some of the following questions: How did you feel when you were not sure where you belonged? How did you discover where you belonged? Did anyone help you? How did the person with the black sticker feel when it became apparent that he or she did not belong anywhere? Was that person rejected from the other settlements or invited to join? How did that feel? Why do you think people tend to gather in groups defined by identity? Is belonging to such groups essential for our well-being? Why do we reject those from other groups?
Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Oppression

For groups which have achieved a modicum of trust and have demonstrated that they can discuss sensitive subjects calmly, clarifying definitions and applying them to participants’ lived experiences can reinforce the danger and power of identity judgments and actions upon those judgments.

**Stereotype**
A stereotype is a commonly held perception about members of a group that represents an oversimplified opinion, a generalization, or a judgment of that group.

**Prejudice**
Prejudice is a discriminatory attitude against members of a group.

**Oppression**
Oppression is the convergence of power and prejudice. Oppression takes place on an individual, cultural, and institutional level when one group has more power than another and can act on prejudice. Examples include sexism, racism, nationalism, and religious oppression.

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To demonstrate how perceptions of the “other” arise, gain currency, and are used in painful ways.

**Method:** Use this activity with a solid and experienced group only. First, review the definitions of the 3 words which people often confuse. Then ask the participants to divide into their ethnic groups. Have each group come up with 8 or more stereotypes that they think others hold of them. Write them on large paper. Have each group talk about which stereotypes are most painful, which are inaccurate, and which are understandable. Return to the plenary session. Ask each group to present their list to the other groups. Then ask: Which stereotypes are most painful, inaccurate or understandable? What stereotypes do you have about other groups? Where do these stereotypes come from? Brainstorm how communities and nations can address stereotyping, prejudice and oppression.

*This should be adapted as needed for programs with many identity groups.*
Continuum on Being an Ally

1. Scapegoat
   Hostile behavior toward the targeted group by word or action

2. Discriminate
   Maintain barriers that exclude or limit the potential of targeted groups

3. Use Offensive Language
   Use insulting language toward or about targeted groups

4. Deny
   Deny target group the privileges given to dominant group
   Deny the existence of systematic and institutionalized aspects of discrimination

5. Tolerate the Targeted Group
   Take no active part in active discrimination

6. Educate Oneself
   Learn about history of exclusion and the culture of targeted groups
   Probe one’s own attitudes

7. Interrupt Hostile and Discriminatory Behavior
   Respond to hostile interpersonal behavior towards targeted groups

8. Educate Others
   Help others to learn about targeted groups and issues of discrimination

9. Demonstrate Support and Appreciation
   Work to champion the rights and inclusion of the targeted group
   Initiate and join organized responses

Training Activity

Objective: To illustrate the spectrum of behaviors ranging from mistreating a targeted group of people to embracing a targeted group. To point out opportunities for intervention by people who wish to be pro-active in support of those who are being harmed by discrimination and oppression.

Method: Create a large mock-up of the continuum and have each person stand where they think they belong in terms of their history as an ally. Follow with discussion focused on increasing ally behavior within/beyond the training group.

Note: This is adapted from a model found in "Readings for diversity and social justice" by M. Adams et al., 2000. New York: Routledge.
Objective: To demonstrate how intolerance and the denial of rights can lead to mass violence and to explore what is required to build a truly tolerant society.

Method: This model may be used to stimulate group dialogue and generate ideas for developing programs that could address and change harmful behaviors. As a plenary activity, the group may discuss where they believe their society is on the ladder and what interventions could move it up a step. Participants may also reflect on their own evolution through the positions on this ladder in small groups.
The Grieving Process

Stages of Grief

- Shock
- Acceptance
- Realization
- Anger
- Guilt
- Apathy and Hopelessness
- Physical Reactions
- Anxiety
- Fear (multiple)

Training Activity

**Objective:** To illustrate visually the predictable stages of grief that affect people who have experienced violence, and the central role played by fear in each of these stages.

**Method:** Use the model to provide a context for understanding people’s progressive responses to violent conflict. Encourage group members to reflect on the model with respect to their own experiences and those of the people they serve in regions impacted by violent conflict.

*Note: This is adapted from a model found in "On death and dying" by E. Kubler-Ross, 1969. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.*
4.8 Social Healing, Reconciliation and Forgiveness Tools

Stages of Grief

1. Shock, denial and numbness
   - Can’t believe it really happened. Unreality, waiting to wake up from a bad dream.
   - Possibly senses the presence of the deceased.

2. Realization
   - Intense feelings of loss and longing. Treasuring objects belonging to the deceased. Deep sadness. This may last for years.

3. Anger
   - Against those who caused the death, if it was a killing.
   - Against doctors, police or soldiers who didn’t do more.
   - Against God for allowing it to happen.
   - Against the deceased for leaving them. (Though they know it is irrational)
   - Against self. Feelings of guilt.

4. Guilt and remorse
   - “If only…”
     - I had done more
     - I had reacted more quickly
     - I had been there when it happened.
   - I had been a better partner, son or daughter.
   - I had been able to say “goodbye” properly, etc.
   - Survivor guilt. “Why should I still be alive and they are not?”

5. Anxiety
   - Inability to cope emotionally without the deceased.
   - Inability to cope materially without the deceased.

6. Physical Reactions
   - Fatigue, exhaustion – no energy for anything
   - Poor concentration and difficulties with memory
   - Sickness, lower resistance to disease while grieving.

7. Apathy and hopelessness
   - Future looks bleak. “What’s the point of anything?”
   - No motivation.

8. Acceptance and readjustment
   - Finding inner strength through prayer or through friends.
   - Can begin to pick up the threads of life once again and make adjustments where necessary.

Training Activity

Objective: To communicate that the stages of grief are predictable, that they typically include strong, inconsistent emotional responses, and that these resolve over time.

Method: Commence with a plenary discussion of the stages of grief. Divide group into dyads or small groups. Ask them to share their own experiences of grief in the context of the stages of grief. Then ask them to expand their reflection to communities in the aftermath of violent conflict.
The Long Journey Towards Reconciliation

Acknowledgement of Guilt and Responsibility
Speaking honestly and openly about harm to others committed by one’s self or in one’s name

Apology
Sincere apology for the harm done and the losses suffered

Atonement
Genuine remorse, commitment to refrain from harm in the future

Reparations
Willingness to compensate for damages and to offer support to victims and communities

Social and Structural Justice
Commitment to address past injustices and to insure just social, economic, and political structures

Acceptance
Letting go of anger and hatred resulting from the conflict

Forgiveness
Recognizing the humanity of the other

Reconciliation
Rebuilding relationships out of mutual understanding

Training Activity

Objective: To demonstrate that reconciliation is not a single act but rather a long process which evolves over time and includes many stages, gestures, opportunities, and challenges.

Method: Review the stages slowly and deeply, reminding the group that the mind is less orderly than a paper chart. Take time for silent writing, pair sharing, silence if appropriate, and peer support as needed.
The 5 R’s of Post-Conflict Peacebuilding

In peacebuilding after conflict, programs in the 5 R’s should include opportunities for people to build relationships across divides, to re-humanize “the other,” and to recognize common needs and bonds.

I. Reconstruction:

Physical Reconstruction:
- involves repairing physical infrastructure, i.e., housing, hospitals, schools, factories, offices, transport, communications
- includes removing landmines and other explosives
- ranges from addressing immediate short-term needs, i.e., restoring safe water supplies to longer-term economic development
- caveat: managed well, can foster cooperation; managed carelessly, can lead to competition and blame

Political Reconstruction:
- re-establishes representative civilian authority after military or authoritarian rule
- establishes the rule of law and an independent judiciary and police force (which may not have existed before), as well as constitutional reform
- caveat: ranges from provisional elements early to longer term civic education

Social Reconstruction
- focuses on building trust, foundation of communal life
- includes dialogue to help acknowledge injustice and grief
- relies on economic joint ventures to help re-build social ties
- counts on educators and journalists to present information that fosters mutual understanding rather than fueling divisions.

II. Rehabilitation

- provides special services and training for those who have been maimed or handicapped
- addresses psychological trauma of civilians and combatants, especially vulnerable populations, such as child soldiers and rape victims
- responds to increase in domestic abuse as well as drug and alcohol use after violent conflict
- includes vocational training and jobs for former combatants and unemployed youth

III. Reintegration

- seeks to support refugees, internally displaced people, and de-mobilized soldiers to return to their communities
- recognizes gradual nature of process and seeks to build cooperation rather than aggravate divisions and wounds

continued on next page
includes provision of adequate housing, training, and employment opportunities

caveat: preferential treatment of refugees and ex-combatants may be problematic: are combatants “rewarded” for fighting?

IV. Reconciliation

- involves acknowledging losses suffered as well as losses inflicted on others
- includes examination of root causes of the armed conflict
- recognizes need to grieve and heal
- includes creation of public memorials and/or community rites
- often requires some form of justice
  - compensation for victims
  - community service and/or trials for guilty parties
  - political reforms addressing injustices
- caveat: this is a gradual process to which there will be resistance from those previously engaged in violations of human rights

V. Restorative Justice

- seeks to help heal the relationships between victims and offenders
- may include amnesty to promote truth-telling and acknowledgment of human rights abuses
- may include victim compensation and community service
- seeks balance between punishing wrongdoers and fostering reconciliation.
- caveat: issues of “fairness” will be experienced differently by victim and violator communities

Training Activity

Objective: To provide a broad overview of immediate and long-term processes from reconstruction to reconciliation.

Method: Divide participants into small groups. Ask them to discuss reconstruction activities in post-conflict regions and to compare what is actually taking place to the optimum stages as outlined on the handout.

Note: This is adapted from materials developed by the Peace Operations Training Institute, www.peaceopstraining.org.
The Place Called Reconciliation

Training Activity

Objective: To highlight 4 critical elements essential for a sustainable reconciliation process.

Activity: Divide class into 4 groups and assign one element of the diagram to each group. Groups prepare and present why their element or characteristic is necessary for reconciliation, and what will be missing if it is omitted.

Note: This is adapted from a model in “Building peace: sustainable reconciliation in divided societies,” by J. P. Lederach, 1997, Washington, D.C.: USIP Press.
Spectrum Activity

Asking participants to move around the training space to indicate their beliefs provides a welcome opportunity for physical activity as well as for an illustration of the group’s diversity.

Training Activity

Objective: To illustrate the range of opinions within the group, to highlight the learning opportunities from diversity, to inject movement and liveliness into the group process.

Method: Before this group session, organize the room into two sections using a line of tape. Designate one side of the room as “Agree” and the other side as “Disagree.” Ask participants to listen to a statement and then move to the side of the room where they feel they belong and to stand anywhere along the spectrum. Read a statement, such as “Violence does not result in peace” or “war is a bad choice in all circumstances” or “affirmative action in education and career opportunity is essential for the health of society.”

Ask participants to observe where others are standing and if there are clusters in particular points of the spectrum. Invite participants standing at various points to comment on why each chose that spot.
Facilitators must manage both content and process.

A facilitator needs two sets of eyes and ears: one to manage process and another to manage content. **Process** consists of “how” things are communicated and experienced: what lies beneath the surface. It includes:

- relationships
- feelings
- body language
- group dynamics
- group flow

**Content** consists of “what” is communicated: what surfaces from the process. It includes:

- presentations on topics
- discussion
- sharing of experiences

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To communicate that a facilitator must pay simultaneous attention to process and content issues in all groups.

**Method:** Select observers from the plenary to serve as process and content watchers and to report back their observations.
Three Types of Power

**Vertical Power** is *power over others.*
With vertical power, force, punishment, and manipulation can be used to make people do things that they would not otherwise choose.

**Horizontal Power** is *power with others.*
With horizontal power we use cooperation and influence to make joint decisions and take action with others.

**Internal Power** is *power from within.*
By getting in touch with our internal power we develop clear vision and the courage to act according to our convictions.

“The spirit of democracy cannot be imposed from without. It has to come from within.” — Mahatma Gandhi

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To review in simple and accessible form the ways power is used.

**Method:** Brainstorm various leaders throughout history and the type of power used in each. Explore results of each form of power on their constituencies.

*Note:* Graphic model to illustrate types of power developed by Rose Tannenbaum, Berkshire TypeGraphic
Leadership

Attitudes, methods, and styles of leadership range along a spectrum from self-promoting to supportive of others.

Conceptions of Leadership
Leadership can be about:
- Exercising power
- Gaining and exercising the privileges of high status
- Being the boss
- Getting the job done
- Taking care of people
- Empowering those you lead to become leaders

Methods of Leadership
Leadership can be achieved through:
- Political scheming
- Using relationships
- Setting an example
- Persuading others
- Sharing power
- Relying on charisma
- Involving followers in the goal
Four Leadership Styles for Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics:</th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of Leader</td>
<td>Do it themselves</td>
<td>Rely on intimidation</td>
<td>Focused on running the organization</td>
<td>Recognizes the importance of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Decision-making</td>
<td>Quick No arguments</td>
<td>Efficient, but lacking vision</td>
<td>Invites participation and may include others’ opinions.</td>
<td>Relies on discussion and consensus-building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Organization</td>
<td>Fear and mistrust</td>
<td>Reasonably pleasant place to work if lacking sense of purpose</td>
<td>People may feel valued and heard, but may lack a sense of ownership.</td>
<td>Relies on all members to create vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Activity

Objective: To help groups explore their ideas about leadership and to then evaluate various approaches to leadership.

Method: Small groups reflect on and evaluate examples of leadership in their organizations, communities, institutions, and government. Plenary discussion defines and examines outstanding skillful leadership and reflects on the impact of various leadership styles and methods.

Note: This is adapted from a contribution from Phil Rabinowitz to The Community Tool Box (cpt.ku.edu), a service of the Work Group for Community Health and Development at the University of Kansas. Retrieved from http://ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/sub_section_main_1122.aspx
Collaborative Leadership

Collaborative Leadership is:
• leadership of a process, rather than of people
• focused on collaborative problem-solving
• open-ended

Advantages of Collaborative Leadership include:
• Buy-in
• More involvement in implementation
• Trust building
• Elimination of turf issues
• Access to more and better information and ideas
• Better opportunity for substantive results
• Generation of new leadership
• Community or organizational empowerment
• Fundamental change for the better in the ways communities and organizations operate

Major Difficulties with Collaborative Leadership include:
• It’s time-consuming
• It demands the ability to face conflict directly
• It may mean trying to overcome resistance to the whole idea of collaborative leadership
• It can lead to groups taking what seems to you to be the wrong path
• It demands that leaders subordinate their egos

Collaborative Leadership is Appropriate when:
• the timing is right
• problems are serious and complex, and both affect and require attention from a number of individuals and groups
• there are a number of diverse stakeholders
• other attempts at solutions haven’t worked
• an issue affects a whole organization or a whole community
• inclusiveness and empowerment are goals of the process from the beginning

Collaborative Leadership is practiced by:
1. Helping the group set norms
2. Assuring that everyone gets heard
3. Encouraging and modeling inclusiveness
4. Fostering real connections between people
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5. Mediating conflicts and disputes
6. Helping the group create and use mechanisms for soliciting ideas
7. Maintaining collaborative problem-solving and decision-making
8. Guiding the group toward effectiveness
9. Helping the group choose initial projects that are doable
10. Helping the group identify and obtain the necessary resources to do the work
11. Insisting on and protecting an open process
12. Keeping the group focused on collective rather than individual priorities

Training Activity

Objective: To communicate the advantages, challenges, and appropriate opportunities for practicing collaborative leadership.

Method: Divide participants into small groups. Ask them to review the definition, strengths, weaknesses, and uses of collaborative leadership as explained in the handout. Then ask them to reflect on leaders they have worked with. Have they ever experienced collaborative leadership? What were their personal experiences of its plusses and minuses?

Alternatively, have small groups practice collaborative leadership by designating a member of each group as leader and tasking the groups with a decision. Then, ask them to reflect on their experience of the process and the plusses and minuses of collaborative leadership.
How Adults Learn

Adults remember:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Technique</th>
<th>Retained After 3 Hours</th>
<th>Retained After 3 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taught Told</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Shown</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Told/Shown</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned Told/Shown/Shown (With Feedback)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned Continuous Application</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Activity

Objective: To teach adult learning theory in order to improve capacity of participants in becoming trainers.

Method: Small groups discuss their own positive and negative experiences as adult learners.

The Experiential Learning Cycle

Training Activity

Objective: To demonstrate a model of education in which participants learn based on their own experience and reflections, rather than being presented with an abstract concept first. This model is the basis of experiential education, which is the method used in training programs and therefore important for trainers to understand.

Method: Virtually any learning activity may be used to demonstrate this process. First, lead the group through an experience. Then, guide them through a process of observation/reflection from the experience. Facilitate a discussion of the concepts they derive from their reflections and explore how these may be tested. When training trainers, identify and explain each stage of the learning cycle to the group as they experience it.

Note: this model is from "Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development," by D. Kolb, 1984. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. learningfromexperience.com
Conditions for Group Learning

1. An Environment of Active People:
   People learn when they feel they are personally involved with others in a learning process.

2. A Climate of Respect:
   When a high value is placed on individuals and a sense of caring prevails.

3. A Climate of Acceptance:
   Accepting a person means that he can be himself and express his beliefs without fear.

4. An Atmosphere of Trust:
   When people have a feeling of trust in themselves and in others.

5. A Climate of Self-discovery:
   When learners are helped to find out about themselves, and to meet their own needs, rather than having their needs dictated to them.

6. A Non-threatening Climate:
   So that people can confront each other and ideas can confront ideas without fear.

7. A Climate of Openness:
   When personal concerns, feelings, ideas and beliefs can be expressed and examined openly.

8. An Emphasis on the Uniquely Personal Nature of Learning:
   When each individual knows that his values, his beliefs, his feelings and his views are important and significant.

9. A Climate in which Differences are thought to be Good and Desirable:
   When differences in people are as acceptable as differences in ideas.

10. A Climate which Recognizes the Right of Individuals to Make Mistakes:
    Learning is facilitated when error is accepted as a natural part of the learning process.

11. An Atmosphere that Tolerates Ambiguity:
    When alternative solutions can be explored without the pressures of having to find an immediate single answer.

Training Activity

Objective: To learn how to set a proper environment for maximum learning in a group.
Method: Small groups or pairs are assigned 2-3 of these conditions to present in depth to plenary.
Creating Participatory Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Groups</th>
<th>Conventional Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone participates, not just the vocal few.</td>
<td>The fastest thinkers and most articulate speakers get more air time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People give each other room to think and get their thoughts all the way out.</td>
<td>People interrupt each other on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing viewpoints are allowed to coexist in the room.</td>
<td>Differences of opinion are treated as conflict that must either be stifled or “solved”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People drew each other out with supportive questions. ‘Is this what you mean?’</td>
<td>Questions are often perceived as challenges, as if the person being questioned has done something wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each member makes the effort to pay attention to the person speaking.</td>
<td>Unless the speaker captivates their attention, people space out, doodle or check the clock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are able to listen to each other’s ideas because they know their own ideas will also be heard.</td>
<td>People have difficulty listening to each other’s ideas because they’re busy rehearsing what they want to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each member speaks up on matters of controversy. Everyone knows where everyone stands.</td>
<td>Some members remain quiet on controversial matters. No one really knows where everyone stands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members can accurately represent each other’s points of view – even when they don’t agree with them.</td>
<td>People rarely give accurate representations of the opinions and reasoning of those whose opinions are at odds with their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People refrain from talking behind each other’s backs.</td>
<td>Because they don’t feel permission to be direct during the meeting, people talk behind each other’s backs outside the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even in the face of opposition from the person-in-charge, people are encouraged to stand up for their beliefs.</td>
<td>People with discordant, minority perspectives are commonly discouraged from speaking out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A problem is not considered solved until everyone who will be affected by the solution understands the reasoning.</td>
<td>A problem is considered solved as soon as the fastest thinkers have reached an answer. Everyone else is then expected to “get on board” regardless of whether s/he understands the logic of the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people make an agreement, it is assumed that the decision still reflects a wide range of perspectives.</td>
<td>When people make an agreement, it is assumed that they are all thinking the exact same thing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Activity

**Objective:** To examine traditional and participatory groups in workplaces and training events.

**Method:** Participants evaluate their own organizations for high/low participation and discuss advantages of each form of group life.


This tool is part of the Community at Work curriculum: [www.communityatwork.com](http://www.communityatwork.com) (415) 282-9876
Best Practices for the Facilitation of Peacebuilding Workshops

Building the Group
• Attending to introductions
• Sharing the agenda
• Developing the ground rules
• Preparing the group for experiential, participatory learning

Managing Group Process
• Paying simultaneous attention to content and process
• Varying methodology, format, and group discussion techniques
• Keeping flexible and re-designing to accommodate changing group needs

Stages of Group Life
• Working with the daily bio-rhythms of groups
• Forming, norming, storming, performing, and mourning

Roles and Functions of Facilitators
• Overseeing the logistics for smooth functioning
• Maintaining neutrality (or multi-partiality) as group moderators
• Modeling of respectful behavior
• Managing time
• Developing a good working relationship with co-facilitator
• Encouraging new learning

Working with Challenging Group Dynamics
• Managing dominating behavior
• Encouraging equal participation from everyone
• Maintaining full attendance
• Keeping the material relevant to all group members

Training Activity

Objective: To review the essential elements of a facilitator’s responsibility.
Method: Small groups each take one element and develop skits demonstrating its value and what happens when a particular element is ignored, such as a group feeling unsafe, out of control, unaware of time, dominated by an individual, etc.
Developing Peacebuilding Trainings

Attending to the following building blocks increases the likelihood of successful training:

1. **Definition of the Issue and Goals:**
   - What is the issue or problem that your organization is being asked to address with peacebuilding trainings?
   - What are your goals/objectives and hoped for results or outcomes?

2. **Gathering Information/Needs Assessment:**
   - What is the history of the problem, and what are the current needs and concerns?
   - How can you learn more from a variety of perspectives?

3. **Identifying the Participants:**
   - Who will the participants be?
   - What is their experience?
   - What is their relationship to the problem?
   - Do they represent more than one side of the conflict?

4. **Determining the Content:**
   - What skills, concepts, information will help the participants address the problem?
   - What are the sensitive issues?

5. **Choosing a Structure:**
   - Plan tentative length, number and frequency of trainings.
   - Determine location – residential or not.

6. **Designing the Workshop:**
   - Each workshop should be tailored to meet the particular needs, interests, sensitivities, level of education and previous experience of each group of participants.

7. **Implementing the Workshop:**
   - Delivery should be creative, flexible, interactive, experiential, and responsive to changing needs.

8. **Planning the Logistics:**
   - Attend to appropriate room arrangements, supplies, daily schedule, translation (if needed), and training binders.

9. **Evaluating the Workshop:**
   - Develop and implement appropriate evaluation tools to determine participant satisfaction, impact, and success in meeting goals and outcomes.

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To introduce all of the components necessary to plan effective peacebuilding trainings.

**Method:** Review handout with participants. In small groups, each participant should focus on a specific training event they have led or attended, evaluating the attention paid to each aspect.
Elements of Good Training Design

**Base Design on Clearly Defined Goals:** Always start with a clear definition of the specific goals of each new workshop. These will and should vary with the particular context and target group.

**Build Design around Experiential Learning:** Overall design should incorporate an experiential, interactive approach to learning. Include ample exercises and opportunity for group discussion and interaction.

**Make Each Design Unique:** Avoid recipes. Each workshop should be individually tailored to meet specific goals, community needs, and skill and experiential level of the participants.

**Create Responsive Designs:** Training designs are never more than tentative drafts which should be continuously adapted to meet changing needs and interests.

**Important Design Elements:**
- **Determining the content:** What skills, concepts, and information would help the participants address the issues? What are the sensitive issues and how directly can they be addressed?
- **Deciding on the structure:** Determine appropriate length, continuity (single or series), location and size.
- **How to use exercises:** While exercises are important for experiential learning, make sure the exercises used really serve the objectives. Do not simply string exercises together, and be sure to allow ample time to process each exercise for maximum group learning.
- **Building on traditional practices:** Be sure to find out about, and if appropriate, build upon traditional or established practices for addressing the problem.
- **Training materials:** Develop pertinent training materials to help participants visualize key concepts and remember skills.
- **Creating a learning community:**
  - Bring each voice into the room through introductions
  - Create ground rules with the group
  - Get agreement for agenda
  - Do group building activities that build trust and establish common ground
  - Collectively clarify the problems, issues, and major challenges to be addressed
- **Rhythm of the day:**
  - Open with review or reflections of the previous day
  - Morning best for presentations
  - Afternoon good for experiential exercises
  - Include some form of evaluation at the end of each day
- **Varying the methodology over the day and the course of the training with:**
  - Group work in groups of varying size, as well as inner and outer circles
- “Brainstorming”
- Role plays and simulations
- Balance of presentation (through brief lecture, power point, video, etc) and group processing
- Games that enliven the group

**Flow of the week:** The level of discussion in the workshop and the understanding of core, sensitive issues should deepen as trust develops.

**Closing phase of workshop:** In the final phase of the workshop (whether it is day-long, several days, or sequential) allow time for:
- Integration of learning and changed perceptions and understandings
- Concrete action plans
- Reflections on challenges of bringing new learning back to home, community, and work-place
- Evaluation
- Closing ceremony

---

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To deepen participants’ awareness and understanding of the multiple levels of preparation necessary to design an effective training.

**Method:** Small groups develop a training design on a specific topic relevant to their professional responsibilities, such as a gender or multi-cultural awareness program or a conflict analysis workshop.
Role of Human Needs and Rights in Peacebuilding

**Training Activity**

**Objective:** To illustrate the sets of core human needs/rights, the significance of meeting human needs/rights in order to secure a sustainable peace, and the fact that human needs/rights are indivisible.

**Method:** Divide plenary into 3 groups, one for each core set of needs/rights. Each group speaks for the necessity of their rights and the dangers of ignoring a particular subset of human needs/rights.
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