

Christie, D. J., Wagner, R. V., & Winter, D. A. (Eds.). (2001). ***Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century***. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Note: Copyright reverted to editors (2007). Permission is granted for downloading and copying.

SECTION III

Peacemaking

Introduction by Richard V. Wagner

In the second half of this volume, we present a series of chapters dealing with ways of responding to violent conflict, real or threatened. We have distinguished between direct and structural violence, the former being episodic and direct from aggressor to target, the latter being indirect and embedded in the social, political, and economic fabric of society. We also distinguish between two major forms of response: *peacemaking* and *peacebuilding*. Peacemaking, the focus of this section, refers to various means of handling direct, episodic violence. Peacebuilding, the focus of the fourth and final section of the book, refers to ways of handling structural violence.

There is a third type of response to violence—*peacekeeping*—which we consider in one chapter in this section. Both peacemaking and peacekeeping refer to procedures that reduce the likelihood that people will engage in violent actions. In peacemaking, however, we try to establish mechanisms that preclude the need for future violence between parties, at least with respect to the particular issues in dispute. Such is the case

when a mediator, for example, helps battling parties reach an agreement allowing each to attain an acceptable goal. The next time a dispute arises, they may have learned not to repeat the process of battling to satisfy their respective interests. Of course if they have not, then peacemaking will be necessary again. In peacekeeping, on the other hand, the effort is confined to preventing the parties from engaging in continuing violence, essentially by containing them, keeping them from coming together violently.

Peacekeeping can have constructive long-term results: keeping parties apart may give them time to consider the advantages of alternate, nonviolent ways of handling their conflict. But, often the antagonism remains: with the destructive activity suppressed, the pressure to find solutions is removed, leaving the antagonisms in place. Such has been the case in Cyprus: a U.N. peacekeeping force has provided a buffer between Greek and Turk Cypriots since 1964. Neither side has taken the opportunity to find ways of peaceful coexistence, so the peacekeepers must remain to prevent future violence between the adversaries.

Positive and negative approaches

Peacekeeping as a response to episodic violence has sometimes been referred to as a negative approach to peace: only the peacekeeper's presence prevents the violence from recurring. Peacemaking is a more positive approach: building mechanisms that lead people to cooperate in positive, peaceful interaction (Kimmel, 1985). The difference is important because of its implications for peace, be it peace in the family, in the neighborhood, or in the world community (Wagner, 1988). The negative goal, peacekeeping, is essentially reactive and limited by the necessity to operate in a context

defined by the adversaries. The ways of keeping peace are few and concrete (Plous, 1988): keeping the parties apart and if possible, disarming them, figuratively or literally. The positive technique of peacemaking, on the other hand, is not so limited and can be innovative. A mediator as peacemaker may help a couple battling over custody of their children to recognize that as permanent co-parents, they share a concern for their children's welfare. The mediator, then, is in a position to work with the couple to create a cooperative agreement that maximizes the children's access to both parents, rather than constantly worrying about how to keep the battlers from sabotaging each other's contact with the children.

Conflict resolution, management, and transformation

Conflict resolution, a theme that pervades much of the theory and practice of peacemaking, should be distinguished from conflict management and conflict transformation, terms used in several chapters. Sanson and Bretherton define conflict resolution as a process that "provides techniques to deal with disputes in a manner which is nonviolent, avoids dominance or oppression by one party over the other, and, rather than exploiting one party, aims to meet the human needs of all" (this volume, p. 193). Conflict management may refer to more economic, negotiated procedures for handling disagreement and is sometimes used in the sense of peacekeeping, that is, containing the overt display of conflict without the parties actually ever reaching agreement. Conflict transformation, which appears in several chapters, generally refers to a process of guiding

the disputants to a new vision and understanding of the conflict, one in which they not only attain their goals but develop a new, constructive relationship with one another, boding well for the peaceful resolution of future disagreements. Conflict transformation is a basic aspect of the process of peacebuilding. Nevertheless, at times in this section on peacemaking, we will find authors referring to conflict transformation in recognition of the fact that peacemaking often provides only temporary relief from hostilities. Many of them present a vision for the twenty-first century in which conflict is transformed and parties no longer see one another as obstacles to their own goal attainment but rather as partners in the effort to provide a sustainable existence for all.

Culture

It is noteworthy that almost every chapter in this section contains an explicit discussion of the cultural relativity of peacemaking techniques. Cultural differences can be seen, for example, on the grand scale comparing Western and non-Western approaches to peacemaking (Pedersen, this volume; Wall & Callister, 1995). They can be seen regionally, for example, within Europe (Shapiro, 1999) or within Latin America (Comas-Díaz, Lykes, & Alarcón, 1998; Lykes, this volume). They can be seen within a single society, such as the different ethnic responses to conflict in Bosnia (Agger, this volume) or the differences in the laws governing violence in the ex-slave states and other southern and western states in the United States (Cohen, 1996).

The discussion of culture and peacemaking in this section is rich and varied.

Pedersen, for example, presents an extensive discussion of how Western and non-Western peacemaking differs on certain critical dimensions and how these differences can affect

the resolution of conflict between people from diverse backgrounds. Sanson and Bretherton agree and note that the conflict resolution processes they describe are predominantly Western. But rather than seeing the cultural difference as *restricting* peacemaking efforts, they argue that the differences should become an integral part of the resolution process, informing the parties about alternate ways of reaching agreement. Coleman and Deutsch, in their proposal for introducing conflict resolution procedures into schools, come to a similar conclusion. They acknowledge that theirs is a Western, male model and recommend that we explore how universal such techniques are and frame our proposals accordingly. Wessells and Monteiro note that Western methods pervade many international efforts to handle conflict, often undermining effective indigenous ways of responding to violent conditions. Similarly, Agger describes the deep ethnic divisions in Bosnia and how inappropriate traditional Western therapeutic procedures have been in the treatment of trauma caused by the war in that nation. All of these authors, then, emphasize that peacemakers should be sensitive to cultural differences in handling conflict. Only in the context of such an understanding can they be truly effective in preventing violence and promoting the peaceful resolution of conflict.

Organization of the section

The chapters in this section on peacemaking can be divided into three groups: peacekeeping, conflict resolution, and post-war reconstruction. Harvey Langholtz and Peter Leentjes' chapter on U.N. peacekeeping describes the traditional peacekeeping role of the United Nations, i.e., serving as a buffer between warring entities, sometimes between nation states (Egypt and Israel in the Gaza region) and sometimes within states

(Greek and Turk Cypriots). However, they continue with a discussion of the additional agendas that have emerged in the past decade, agendas that sound much more like peacemaking: taking an active role in efforts to implement agreements and settlements.

More specific proposals for peacemaking appear in the succeeding four chapters, all of which consider means of resolving conflict constructively. Paul Pedersen's analysis of the cultural context of peacemaking provides a valuable framework for evaluating the generalizability of processes described in succeeding chapters. Pedersen focuses on important differences between Western and non-Western approaches to conflict and its resolution and suggests some non-Western procedures that might be appropriately applied in Western peacemaking. In the next chapter, Ann Sanson and Di Bretherton provide an excellent, detailed overview of principles and processes of conflict resolution as they have evolved in the Western world. The juxtaposition of the Pedersen and Sanson and Bretherton chapters allows for an interesting comparison of procedures used in vastly different cultural settings.

Johan Galtung and Finn Tschudi's chapter on the "transcend" approach to conflict proposes certain strategies for improving quarreling parties' communication, thereby increasing the chances that they will be able to resolve their conflict constructively. While much of their discussion deals with the conscious, cognitive processes involved in dialogue between combatants, they remind us that emotive and subconscious processes can strongly affect the outcome of efforts to reach a satisfactory, nonviolent resolution of conflict.

Recently, Nelson, Van Slyck, and Cardella (1999) concluded from their review of a

variety of school programs that “peace education curricula ... have a potentially significant role to play in the development of peaceful people” (p. 170). In their chapter, Peter Coleman and Morton Deutsch provide a model for introducing such programs into schools. They argue that, for the greatest success, programs must be implemented at five different levels of the educational system: the student disciplinary process, the curriculum, pedagogy, the school culture, and the community. They provide excellent illustrations of how such programs can be realized.

The final three chapters in this section consider how peace psychologists can contribute to reconciliation and reconstruction in the aftermath of violent conflict. Inger Agger describes many of the difficulties confronting the well-meaning psychologist in her captivating chapter on reducing trauma under war conditions in Bosnia. Cheryl de la Rey calls on her experience and understanding of reconciliation, describing the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. Both authors highlight the importance of relationships in the process of reconciliation. Agger describes the seemingly irreversible loss of trust among members of different ethnic groups in Bosnia and de la Rey argues that re-establishing relationships must be at the core of any successful attempt to further reconciliation in a society that has endured protracted violent conflict.

Michael Wessells and Carlinda Monteiro echo many of the points made by Agger and de la Rey. They discuss the value of integrating Western and traditional psychosocial interventions to heal the deep wounds caused by over three decades of war in Angola. The task is daunting, given the competing demands of rival militia factions and of

citizens traumatized and impoverished by endless bloodshed. Wessells and Monteiro describe a number of reconstruction programs and ultimately focus on the task of reintegrating child soldiers, who have been socialized into a system of violence. Reestablishing relationships is the crux of attempts to reconstruct a society devastated by war.

To summarize, Section III covers a variety of methods for peacemaking and delineates many of the difficulties that the peace psychologist will confront in attempting to help people resolve their conflicts and rebuild relationships. We reiterate our caveat that the principles described should not be applied without giving due consideration to limits in their applicability in different cultures and at different levels of analysis. When successful, peacemaking can set the stage for the more arduous but essential task of building a peaceful society in which the structural institutions are designed to promote human welfare, the theme that will be considered in the fourth and final section of this volume.