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Assessing the impact of peacebuilding

Hal Culbertson
Associate Director

All peace processes are played out to a ubiquitous soundtrack of violence,” observes John Darby in the recently published volume, Violence and Reconstruction (Notre Dame Press, 2006). The continuation — or escalation — of violence after peace accords can lead to disillusionment and undermine support for the peace process. It can also confound attempts to assess the effectiveness of peace initiatives.

Is the continued violence a sign that peace efforts failed, or a reaction to their success by parties that benefit from conflict? How can peacebuilders demonstrate that advances have really been made, when a seemingly small incident can quickly escalate, undermining years of effort? These questions loom over peace agreements, but also peacebuilding initiatives taken by non-governmental organizations and civil society groups.

Kroc Institute faculty members are increasingly being called upon to wrestle with issues such as these. Sometimes, organizations with which we have longstanding relationships request our help in assessing their peacebuilding efforts. For example, Catholic Relief Services (CRS) recently asked Larissa Fast to document Catholic peacebuilding and reconciliation efforts in Rwanda since the 1994 genocide. Her reflections on this undertaking are presented on page 18.

Requests also come from the policy community. With support from the Japanese government and the Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations, George Lopez and David Cortright developed standards and a methodology for evaluating compliance with recommendations of the United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate.

With funding from the United States Institute of Peace, the Kroc Institute and the CRS Southeast Asia Regional Office are developing a toolkit containing resources that organizations can use to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own peacebuilding activities. The toolkit project team is led by John Paul Lederach, John Darby, and myself from the Kroc Institute, and Reina Neufeldt and Myla Leguro of CRS. Over the past several months, the team facilitated workshops on the toolkit in Cambodia and at the annual Kroc-CRS Summer Institute for Peacebuilding at Notre Dame. We will feature more on the toolkit in the upcoming issue of Peace Colloquy.

The evaluation tools being developed will be particularly beneficial to our graduate students. In 2005–06, the first year that Kroc students completed field internships, several students were asked to evaluate peacebuilding efforts as part of their internships with organizations around the world.

Looking for signs of improvement in conflicts that often seem intractable is a daunting endeavor. It requires a deep understanding of both complex local realities and scholarly methods of inquiry. Given the institute’s commitment to integrating scholarship and practice, this is a task we are uniquely suited to pursue.
The Politics of Sacred Space
Report on the Kroc Institute conference at Tantur, March 2006

Land is sign, symbol, and space — persistent elements of personal, religious, and political identity in Jerusalem, the place of origin and pilgrimage for the three great Abrahamic faiths. Now a wall knifes through the land, creating its own ominous sign and symbol of scarred space and mutual mistrust. The dynamics of exclusion, resistance, defiance, struggle, and advocacy for peace that define this “holy land” was the subject of an international conference held at Tantur Ecumenical Institute in Jerusalem on March 12–14, 2006. Titled “Whence the Heavenly Jerusalem? The Politics of Sacred Space and the Pursuit of Peace,” the conference explored religious and political contestation over holy sites in Palestine and Israel from a variety of Muslim, Christian, and Jewish perspectives.

Rashied Omar and Scott Appleby, co-directors of the Kroc Institute’s Program on Religion, Conflict and Peacebuilding, organized the conference. During the planning phase David Burrell, C.S.C., served as the University of Notre Dame’s and Kroc’s representative at Tantur, a world-renowned conference center administered by Notre Dame and the Vatican. Conference participants included a cohort of faculty and officers from Notre Dame, scholars and peace practitioners from other American and Canadian universities, Kroc alumni working for peace in the Middle East, and activists, politicians, and professors from communities and universities in Israel and Palestine.

On Sunday March 12, prior to the formal opening of the conference we toured Temple Mount/Noble Sanctuary and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, the Cave of the Patriarchs in Hebron, and Rachel’s Tomb in Bethlehem. Each of these contested religious sites was heavily fortified and guarded by the Israeli army, casting a pall over our pilgrimage and creating a sense of dismay in Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and secular pilgrims alike.

Now only Muslims may enter Al-Aqsa mosque and the shrine of the Dome of the Rock, although anyone may visit the mount itself, after passing through an Israeli security checkpoint. The mood is somber and tentative. A short walk away, the human traffic bustling in and out of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on a busy Sunday in Lent underscored the tension among its various Christian co-inhabitants. Most dispiriting, perhaps, were the sites on the Palestinian side of the wall. The now-partitioned Cave of the Patriarchs, where Abraham and Sarah are believed to be entombed, is entered through checkpoints, barbed wire, metal detectors, and a gauntlet of Israeli teen-soldiers sporting automatic rifles. One who would come to pray is distracted by the scene where Baruch Goldstein, a Jewish physician and irate settler, opened fire on Muslim worshippers in 1994 — 12 years to the day before we visited the site — murdering 29. Rachel’s Tomb is another heavily fortified bunker; the wall allows access for Israelis and tourists, and snakes nearby to create a space on the other side for a planned Jewish settlement.

With these site visits as a backdrop, the conference opened on Monday with the panel Myth, History, and Identity: Competing Narratives of Sacred Space. Kroc faculty fellow and anthropologist Patrick Gaffney, C.S.C., described the historical disputes among Christians, who have traditionally viewed the Holy Land as “the fifth gospel.” The millet system developed by the Ottomans, recognizing the internal Christian disputes over Jerusalem, established what came to be called “the status quo.” Under this arrangement, the Greek Orthodox, the Armenian Orthodox, and the Latin Christians were granted separate religious sovereignties over the city and its holy sites, particularly the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which was divided spatially and temporally among the ethno-religious groups. Nationalism complicated and exacerbated the intra-religious tensions throughout the 20th century. Recently, the unsustainability of the situation was crystallized in the struggles to repair the dome of the church. Aware that the status quo was eroding in the 1980s and 1990s under the force of Israeli (Jewish) expansion, Palestinian (Muslim)
radicalism, and the accompanying diminution of the Christian presence in the Holy Land, the main Christian groups signed an agreement of cooperation. The rebuilding of the dome became symbolic of a more profound shift toward collaboration in the face of external threats.

One such threat, Gaffney concluded, is the rise of millennial Protestantism, mostly from the United States. It views Jerusalem as the site of the endtimes drama, the fundamentalist version of which dooms Muslims to extermination, provides Jews a final opportunity to convert to Christianity or be slain, and places the erstwhile Orthodox and Latin status quo at a theological disadvantage, to say the least.

Motti Inbari, a sociologist at Jezreel Valley College in Israel, sketched the attitudes and behaviors of Israel’s religious Zionists toward Temple Mount. Internal diversity was again the theme, in this instance manifest in an intra-Jewish dispute over whether Jews might enter the Temple Mount area. While the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem has forbidden this practice as inviting sacrilege (with Jews trampling inadvertently upon the Holy of Holies, the inner sanctum of the Temple), the “settler rabbis” of Gush Emunim have permitted it, lest Jewish absence encourage Palestinian hegemony over the site. Inbari surveyed the corresponding spectrum of Orthodox and ultra-Orthodox Jewish attitudes regarding the appropriate role of Jewish agency and activism in rebuilding the Temple. One extreme counsels passivity and study in preparation for the restoration of Jewish rule. The other extreme provides scriptural grounds for revolutionary violence, thereby “taking destiny into their own hands.”

Mustafa Abu-Sway, a professor of Islamic studies at Al-Quds University in Jerusalem, examined Qur’anic and Hadith-based sources (or lack thereof) on Jerusalem, noting readings of the Qur’an that link entry to the holy lands to righteousness rather than religion or nationality. Who has kept God’s law? They shall inherit the holy lands. Of critical importance to the Qur’an, Abu-Sway noted, is the truth that genetic or biological descent is never sufficient in itself to merit such inheritance.

The status of Jerusalem itself is ambiguous in Islamic texts, barely rating a mention in some sources, but set on equal footing with Mecca and Medina in others. (Notably, Hamas’s charter follows and expands the latter tradition.) The miraculous Night Journey of the Prophet Muhammad from Mecca to Jerusalem more than 14 centuries ago forged a special relationship between the Noble Sanctuary and Muslims the world over, who are obliged by a Hadith of the Prophet to maintain Al-Aqsa Mosque both physically and spiritually. The obligation is fulfilled primarily through acts of worship, but the physical maintenance of the Mosque is also part of the responsibility of all Muslims. “The fulfillment of both duties will be impaired,” Abu-Sway noted,” as long as Al-Aqsa Mosque remains under
Muslims who are prevented from praying there and from supporting it are denied the ability to fulfill critical religious responsibilities.

According to Islam, people may receive divine punishment for evil acts but not for evil thoughts or ill intention. The one exception to this rule exists within the sacred precincts of Mecca, where ill intentions as well as ill actions are punishable. Accordingly, many Muslim scholars shortened their stay in Mecca after performing the pilgrimage in order to avoid the possibility of being held accountable for possible negative thoughts and intentions. This issue may lay behind the decision to keep political power at a distance from the holy cities of Mecca and Jerusalem, for politics may sully the righteousness of people and therefore the sanctity of religious sites.

Many other traditions extol the special merits of Jerusalem, including the view that praying at Al-Aqsa Mosque is far more efficacious than prayers in other locations (with the exception of the two mosques of Mecca and Medina). Numerous traditions celebrate and glorify Al-Aqsa, Jerusalem, and the entire Holy Land and highly encourage visitations there.

Yet caliphs have shown respect for the Christian presence in Jerusalem and for the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in particular. An exchange of letters about Jerusalem that took place between two prominent companions of the Prophet provides an illustration. Abu Al-Darda’ invited Salman Al-Farsi to come to Bayt Al-Maqdis (literally, the House of the Sanctified). Salman replied by saying that the Land cannot sanctify anyone. Only one’s good deeds may bring true sanctity (as recorded in Al-Muwatta of Imam Malik).

Patrick Mason, a Notre Dame historian, raised the issue of the universal religious appeal of Jerusalem. His test case was the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as the Mormons. When Brigham Young University, the Mormon intellectual stronghold in Utah, established an extension campus on Mount Scopus, university officials were forced to pledge not to proselytize. (The campus was closed with the onset of the second intifada.) Misunderstanding and misperception of Mormons stands behind the fear. Indeed, for Mormons, who consider themselves the second branch of the People of Israel, the actual Holy Land lies in America (Missouri), and the New Jerusalem will be established there. Jerusalem is the site of the House of Judah, the home of the Jews; America is the site of the ingathering of the lost 10 tribes of Israel. According to this sacred narrative, and by dint of their own status as a persecuted religious minority, Mormons believe themselves positioned to serve as mediators and agents of reconciliation between the Jews and the “lost tribes.” Hence their presence in Jerusalem: to bring peace, not to sow division through proselytism.

The keynote address — “Jerusalem: The Politics of Myth” — was delivered by Gershom Gorenberg, author of The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for Temple Mount (Free Press, 2000) and The Accidental Empire (Henry Holt, 2006), a new book on the political origins of the Israeli settlements. “The music of religion” is critical to understanding life and conflict in Israel/Palestine, Gorenberg declared, but “oddly, the politicians are tone-deaf to it.” He asked: Why is there a city here? Jerusalem has no port, no river, no clean water — only the site of a religious story,
the place of Isaac’s binding, the axis mundi, Mohammed’s ascent, Jesus’ crucifixion, the place of sin and final atonement. There is no neutral term for that site: by calling it Temple Mount or Haram al-Sharif, one declares oneself politically. The source of Muslim power, the irredentist Jews argue, is their control of the place of divine energy (Temple Mount); only through this power did they expel Jews from the Sinai.

With this frenzied religious context established, Gorenberg examined the dance of the Israeli and Palestinian negotiators around the question of the final status of Jerusalem in any viable peace settlement. Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak was playing with symbols he did not understand, Gorenberg charged, while Yasser Arafat, chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, claimed that “there is no Jewish connection to this site.” The intractability of the final status question, it is said, owes to the religious symbolism in which Jerusalem is drenched; e.g., Hamas could never abide shared sovereignty with Israel over Jerusalem because it is the Muslims’ holy city. This is nonsense, Gorenberg concluded, because symbols by their very character contain multiple meanings and readings, as Pope John Paul II demonstrated during his pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Bethlehem in 2000. It takes a religiously sophisticated political leadership, however, to prepare the ground for such a transformation of exclusivist readings.

After lunch, Joyce Dalsheim, a Rockefeller Visiting Fellow at the Kroc Institute, chaired a panel on diverse perspectives on the land. The session featured two Jewish settler women, Hadassah Froman and Hadar Bashan, and a Palestinian woman, Terry Boullata, whose community, Abu Dis in East Jerusalem, has been divided by the wall. Dalsheim framed the discussion by tracing the connection, in the minds of the inhabitants of the land, between its cultivation and beautification, on the one hand, and its sacralization, on the other. Froman delivered a poetic/metaphysical reflection on “The Land,” envisioned as the land of all peoples who have come into mystical union with Lord of the universe. Hadar Bashan showed a home video of her family being ejected from Gaza by the Israeli military, and shared her sense of anguish and betrayal.

For her part, Boullata noted with some bitterness that, while her family has resided in Jerusalem for generations, she must renew her residency there every seven years. A checkpoint, one of 605 erected between Israel and Palestine, stands in front of her home, not far from the wall, which denies Palestinians access to the road to Jerusalem, Jericho, and Bethany. In response to questions from Israelis in the audience — “How would you prevent terrorism?” — Boullata argued that Palestinian terrorism is a direct response to Israeli state terrorism: once the latter ends, the former will end. Palestinians would be happy to inhabit the 22 percent of the land promised Palestinians in the Camp David talks, she observed — a parcel that has been reduced to 12 percent by the wall and other expansionist moves.

In the subsequent session, Asher Kaufman, an Israeli scholar who joined the Kroc faculty and Notre Dame’s history department last fall, offered a reappraisal of the Israel/Palestine conflict based on the premise that the conflict has never really been a secular one, defined solely by a struggle over a piece of territory. In fact, Kaufman argued, from the beginning the conflict was rationalized in religious terms by both sides, even by the most secular components of the two communities. “Thus, when the two sides, Jews and Palestinian Arabs, argued about their right over the land, more often than not they have used religious arguments to strengthen their position and weaken the position of the other.” Israelis and Palestinians, to be sure, were not fighting over theological differences, but their respective religious identities were resources for mobilizing people to do violence against the other. “It is, therefore, essential to think about religion when we approach this conflict and to work on its resolution through this prism. Only then would we be able to deal with the easiest part — with territory."

Paul Cobb, Kaufman’s colleague in the history department, deconstructed the myth of “conflict perpetual and immemorial” in the Holy Land, noting that four-fifths of Jerusalem’s history, approximately 3,200 years, were eras of peace among its various peoples. Wars resulted from unjust policies and from unjust peace settlements. Modern nationalism, Cobb argued, has increased the sense of urgency, competition, and dissatisfaction with political settlements such as “the status quo.” History is a resource in peacebuilding, he offered, but the authenticity of the history is what moves people. To complicate matters, authenticity is not the same as accuracy.

Tuesday began with a lecture on faith-based diplomacy in the Middle East by Marc Gopin, a rabbi and author who has pioneered the study of religious resources, traditional and textual, for peacebuilding.
within the Abrahamic traditions. Agreeing with Gorenberg that progress toward a negotiated settlement is impeded by a lack of religious vocabulary and perception on the part of the chief negotiators on all sides, Gopin provided numerous examples of how religious and popular sensibilities mirror one another. What counts for secular negotiators is outcomes alone, he argued, while religious/popular values hold a privileged place for principles and responsibilities, including behavior in wartime, proper conduct in burial rituals, the practices of communal memory and atonement, and the treatment of the religious other. Non-state religious actors on all sides, Gopin explained, bring shared sensibilities — the integrity of tradition, the priority of the sacred, respect for the dead — across ethnic and national divides. “Radical empathy,” he concluded, is a path to sustained peace. Although suffering religious communities evince this virtue, it has not informed the political sensibilities of protagonists in the region. Sadly, perhaps, but realistically, direct personal contact among religious leaders on various sides in the conflict may need to occur elsewhere, allowing these transnational religious communities to gather apart from the distractions and immediate disputes of home.

The ensuing session focused on political perceptions of Jerusalem and its history. Notre Dame political scientist emeritus Alan Dowty found reason for hope in polling data indicating that Jerusalem becomes “demystified” in Israeli eyes the closer one gets to Jerusalem itself, its inhabitants, and neighborhoods. Negotiations over the final status of the city become viable, Dowty concluded, when they become neighborhood- and site-specific, that is, when they are distanced from the “Heavenly City” mythology and rhetoric. The polling data demonstrated that the vast majority of Israelis are in favor of a two-state solution, and are even willing to cede land inhabited by Palestinians.

Bernard Sabella, a professor of political science at Bethlehem University, lamented the plight of Palestinian Christians and excoriated the Israelis for constructing the wall and choosing separation over engagement. He thrice warned the Israelis and their American patrons that inattention to the economic plight of Palestinian youth would backfire terribly. “We have no hope in occupation,” he cried. “If you do not help us, all will pay a terrible price.” Interestingly, Sabella was protective of Palestinian Christian relations with Palestinian Muslims, their solidarity the result of oppression at the same hands.
Emmanuel Sivan, a historian and scholar of radical Islam at Hebrew University, followed with an argument, drawn from a historical comparison between medieval and modern times, that contemporary inter-religious interactions in Jerusalem are marked by an unprecedented form of intolerance — i.e., “you have no right to this place because your religion is inferior.” Among the religious extremists, Jewish as well as Muslim, a self-conscious “ultraorthodoxy” has fostered the attitude that there is nothing good or holy or defensible in the faith of the other — whether “the other” is a person of a different religion, or an insufficiently orthodox co-religionist. This modern development means that an operative divide exists between the tolerant and the intolerant. Ironically, the religiously tolerant must form alliances against the religiously intolerant.

The theme of cross-religious alliances for peace was developed in the subsequent panel by Mohammed Abu-Nimer (American University), Patrice Brodeur (University of Montreal), Ben Mollov (Bar-Ilan University), and David Neuhaus (Bethlehem University). Father Neuhaus, a biblical scholar, made the intriguing point that the bookends of the Bible—Genesis 1 and Revelation 22—suggest that God intended all the world as sacred space. Indeed, he continued, the Bible is reticent about specifying or delimiting sacred space for fear of idolatry and internecine conflict. This point reinforces the current emphasis in religious peacebuilding on providential plentitude as opposed to scarcity. There is sufficient “holy space” for everyone.

Brodeur explained that religious peacebuilding and faith-based mediation is particularly important in regions of the world where the majority of the population self-identifies religiously and where religious organizations play an important role in the life of individuals and families. In the case of Jerusalem, Brodeur contended, the old enlightenment dichotomy between religious and secular has been modified by the rise of exclusivist nationalist-religious discourses in both Israeli and Palestinian societies. This convergence of religious and secular worldviews is exacerbated by their codependency. Therefore, Brodeur concluded, peacebuilders must work assiduously to build a kind of inter-communal dialogue that bridges the religious-secular divide.

Mollov has facilitated dialogues in Bethlehem among Palestinian and Israeli students, seeking common elements on which to base discussion. Intriguingly, he found that religious students were originally the most negative towards those of different backgrounds, but that, after the conversations, their perceptions changed. Recent restrictions on movement in the vicinity have prompted Mollov to assess the possibilities of e-mail dialogues.

Abu-Nimer presented the major findings of an empirical research project that evaluated the effectiveness of the plethora of interfaith organizations in Israel and Palestine. A main dilemma facing Palestinians engaged in interfaith discussions is the need for a dialogue of life, not a dialogue of theology. The latter, many feel, is an excuse for inaction, and a luxury that their precarious circumstances do not permit.

The Tuesday afternoon sessions were given over to reports on methods of inter-religious peacebuilding by, among others, graduates of the Kroc Institute who work in conflict management and conflict resolution in the Holy Land. A panel organized by Kroc Alumni Affairs Director Anne Hayner included Josh Vander Velde (M.A. ’04) and Zoughbi Zoughbi (M.A. ’89), the director of Wi’am, a Palestinian conflict resolution center in Bethlehem.

Vander Velde, a U.S. rabbinical student in Jerusalem, described the “encounter tours” he has organized for American Jewish students in the West Bank, with the goal of helping them get past their fear of visiting the area. He wants to expose future Jewish leaders to Palestinian personal narratives, political narratives, and human interaction. He noted that the tours had a mixed impact. Some students lost the “pure” sense of Israel they had held, while others confirmed their perception that there is no Palestinian “partner for peace.”

Zoughbi offered an analysis of Palestinian perspectives on the recent elections that avoided the temptation to romanticize or demonize Hamas. The vote for Hamas, he explained, was not a vote for violent resistance or extremism. Rather, it was a vote for political reform, and a vote of frustration against ineffective Palestinian leadership and political corruption under Fatah, and against the peace process as it has unfolded. Now the Palestinians must prevail upon Hamas to recognize Israel and renounce violence, Zoughbi concluded.

This bare-bones summary does not do justice to the richness of the individual presentations, nor to the conference itself, the most interesting moments of
which occurred in the discussion sessions and off-the-record conversations over dinner and tea. The staff of Tantur was wonderfully accommodating, fostering a sense of intellectual and spiritual community among us.

A final word about the Palestinian participation, both Muslim and Christian, in the conference. Some worried that the relative lack of such participation, owing largely to Israeli restrictions, signals Tantur’s reduced effectiveness as a site of peacebuilding in the region. Yet peacebuilding is always vulnerable, and requires sustained presence across and through the “gaps” — the walls and restrictions and bombings. I came away convinced that we need more, not less, interaction among as large a circle as we can assemble. We recognize that the size of the circle will vary according to conditions on the ground.

But if not Tantur, where?

Scott Appleby is the John M. Regan Jr. Director of the Kroc Institute and a professor of history. His books include *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence and Reconciliation* (Rowman & Littlefield 2000).
Mapping Greater Syria
A historian explores “Boundaries, Identities, and Conflict in Syria, Lebanon, and Israel/Palestine”

Asher Kaufman

Political boundaries, those borderlines on maps and often literally on the ground that envelop state territories, have shaped much of sociopolitical history since the 17th century. What had started primarily as a European project gradually spread throughout the globe via colonialism to the point that we cannot think about our world — even in the era of globalization, borderless markets, multinational corporations, and a flow of capital and information — absent the prism of state territorial boundaries. Even in the post-Cold War era, the modern sovereign state continues to play a major role in the global system, despite the fact that some academics in Europe and North America have forecast the decline of the nation-state. We can speak today about the permeability of a few political boundaries (not surprisingly they are in Europe and North America), but by no means can we speak about their disappearance.

In short, the state still plays a major role in the global system, and state boundaries — one of the most visible expressions of state sovereignty — continue to be fundamental features in international, national, and regional arenas. There are more than 125 border disputes between sovereign states. Many are volatile, threatening regional and sometimes global stability. Lord George Curzon, in his famous 1908 “Frontiers” lecture, defined political borders as “the razor’s edge on which hangs suspended the modern issues of war and peace, of life and death to nations.” Even if borders today are not quite the razor’s edge of war and peace, border conflicts, many of which contribute to regional instability, deserve the close attention of peace researchers.

In the Middle East, boundaries and sovereignty still play prime roles at state and societal levels. Witness flashpoints such as Iraq and the Palestinian occupied territories. The 2006 war between Hezbollah and Israel added another trouble spot to a region plagued by instability and conflict. The roots and consequences of this war, which started on July 12 with a cross-border operation of the Shiite organization into Israeli sovereign territory, go beyond the Israeli-Lebanese border-line. Yet, it is the political boundaries separating Israel, Lebanon (and Syria) that served not only as the arena of the confrontation but also as an important pretext for the war.

While the Israeli-Hezbollah war attracted widespread attention, the borders shared by Syria, Lebanon and Israel have been in the spotlight since 1990. In that year, Lebanon terminated 15 years of gruesome civil war and started to reassemble its broken pieces. This required, among other things, re-gaining sovereignty from two occupying foreign countries, Israel and Syria. In May 2000, after almost 18 years of guerilla warfare conducted by Hezbollah, Israel finally withdrew from Lebanon. Five years later, it was Syria’s turn to withdraw from Lebanon, though this was done in a different context and on different terms. The withdrawal of Israel and Syria from Lebanon rekindled old border conflicts between these three countries and launched new ones. And so, since May 2000, contested matters of sovereignty, border demarcation, and the colonial legacy of Greater Syria — the area that roughly corresponds to modern Syria, Lebanon, and Israel — have resurfaced and preoccupied the minds and energies of the states involved, the international community, and communities along these political borderlines.

My current project, “Mapping Greater Syria: Boundaries, Identities and Conflict in Syria, Lebanon, and Israel/Palestine,” was inspired by these contemporary conflicts. I analyze them through a historical prism, going back to the beginning of the 19th century and to the introduction of modern cartography in the region. This was also when the term “Greater Syria” started to take shape, first in European colonial imagination and later within local elites. Both groups developed spatial perceptions about the “natural boundaries” of this Greater Syria and about the distinct ethnic uniqueness of its inhabitants. At the beginning of the 20th century the idea of Greater Syria began to be deconstructed into separate political entities, but it never disappeared from
intellectual and political discourse in the region. Borders may have a static image, but I explore them as sites at which, and through which, socio-spatial differences are communicated and contested. In other words, my study explores these boundaries not just as the political limits of Israel, Syria, and Lebanon, but rather as socio-territorial constructs that are constantly being shaped by the political centers as well as by peripheral and border communities of the three countries. Take, for example, the debate over the demarcation of the boundary between Syria and Lebanon. The Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon in May 2005 brought to the fore the fact that the boundary between these two states had never been officially determined. France, the creator and the mandatory power of the two states, did not bother to demarcate their shared border. The border remained unmarked even after Lebanon and Syria attained independence in 1943 and 1946, respectively, owing to Syria’s reluctance to officially accept Lebanese independence. In addition, the Lebanese state neglected the periphery of the country, including the border with Syria. In order to regulate the diplomatic relations between the states as Lebanon demands, the two countries need to establish a joint demarcation commission. Such a commission would determine their shared boundary and produce a long-overdue, internationally recognized border treaty. This Lebanese demand is strongly supported by the United Nations and has produced one of the few recent cases of U.S.-European diplomatic cooperation in the Middle East. But little in the Middle East is that straightforward. Additional factors make such a border demarcation project challenging. Most important is the border dispute between Israel, Lebanon, and Syria over the Shebaa farms. This small piece of land (about 16 square miles) was occupied by Israel in the 1967 war along with the rest of the Syrian Golan Heights. In May 2000, when Israel withdrew from South Lebanon, Hezbollah, the Lebanese Shiite organization, followed by the Lebanese government, declared that the Shebaa farms are Lebanese and demanded Israeli withdrawal from them. Israel, on the other hand, claimed that the area was part of the Golan Heights and could be negotiated only in the context of peace talks between Israel and Syria. The United Nations sided with Israel and concluded that the Israeli withdrawal from South Lebanon was indeed complete. The UN, however, acknowledged that it is impossible to determine sovereignty in the region for the simple reason that there has never been any border treaty between Syria and Lebanon. In the absence of a treaty, the UN relied on existing maps, which placed the Shebaa farms within the Syrian Golan Heights. The origin of this dispute dates back to the French colonial period. While France never bothered to demarcate the shared border of Syria and Lebanon, it did draw maps. A French colonial project in 1862 produced the first map of “modern Lebanon.” This map helped to facilitate the ideal of a separate Lebanese political
entity. This same map served as the basis for the delineation of the boundary line between Syria and Lebanon, causing many border irregularities, including the area of the Shebaa farms.

Subsequent maps created during the period of the French mandate in the 1920s and 1930s did not resolve these irregularities. The Syrian-Lebanese border was marked on these maps unprofessionally, using old data and without sending out surveying teams, as required by all modern border determination projects. The maps placed the Shebaa farms within Syria, while, for all practical matters, the owners and residents of the farms considered themselves to be Lebanese citizens. They conducted their administrative affairs in Lebanon, paid taxes to Beirut, and held Lebanese identity cards. During the 1950s Syria exploited this border anomaly and took control of this area, establishing military posts in the farms and, in a 1960 census, even registered residents as Syrian citizens.

This problem could have remained fairly limited in scope, but with the 1967 occupation of the region by Israel, the Shebaa imbroglio entered the orbit of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Since 2000, Hezbollah has used it as a pretext to continue its armed struggle against Israel. Adding to the complexity, since Syria was forced to leave Lebanon in May 2005, the Shebaa farms controversy has also been used by Damascus as a tool against its former protégée, Lebanon. Syria has refused to officially demarcate the border in that area and rejected the disarmament of Hezbollah. Keeping this conflict alive serves the interests of Syria by tying the fate of the Syrian Golan Heights, occupied by Israel since 1967, with the Shebaa farms. Additionally, having aspirations to remain relevant and dominant in the regional struggle for power, Syria has a clear interest to maintain its influence within Lebanese domestic politics through the support of Hezbollah’s struggle in the Shebaa farms.

The Shebaa farms border dispute highlights the role played by the territorial and political periphery in Lebanon in the construction of Lebanese national discourse and the impact of the borderline on border communities in the three countries. To examine these issues, I draw on the interdisciplinary field of Border Studies which, among other things, brings border communities and borderlands into the forefront of the discussion on state formation. From this perspective, I trace how the Shiite community, which had been politically and spatially marginalized by Lebanese elites, used a marginal piece of territory — the Shebaa farms — to dictate Lebanese national agenda and to assert its place within Lebanese society. In this way the Lebanese borderland, a neglected region since the country’s creation in 1920, has become central in defining Lebanese national discourse.

The recent war between Israel and Hezbollah added another dimension to my analysis. UN Resolution 1701, which ended the hostilities, refers specifically to the Shebaa farms border conflict and ties its resolution with a future political arrangement between Lebanon and Israel. This Resolution, together with UN Resolutions 1680 and 1559 (passed respectively in May 2006 and September 2004), relate to Lebanon and its relations with its neighbors and are imbued with references to the shared boundaries of Syria, Lebanon, and Israel. These political boundaries will be at the center of any future diplomatic arrangement. In order to have a lasting ceasefire, Israel and Lebanon must respect each other’s sovereignty. For this to happen, Hezbollah should be kept away from the Israeli-Lebanese border. The price of that could be an Israeli withdrawal from the Shebaa farms.

The Lebanese demand for sovereignty over this piece of territory does find some support in the historical record, even if the Lebanese state never bothered to exercise this sovereignty until Hezbollah made it the raison d’être of its armed struggle against Israel. With the right political atmosphere and the assistance of the United Nations, such an exchange between Israel and Lebanon could take place, as it was already implied in Resolution 1701. In addition, this UN Resolution calls for the delineation of the international boundaries of Lebanon as part of a permanent ceasefire and a long-term solution to this conflict. This long overdue demarcation could be the first step toward regulating Lebanon’s relations with its neighbors and could help stabilize a region that is otherwise plagued by instability.

Asher Kaufman joined the Kroc Institute faculty in August 2005. Prior to that, he taught at Hebrew University, Jerusalem, where he was a research fellow at the Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace.
The World Social Forum
An experiment in global democracy

Jackie Smith

On February 15, 2003, an estimated 12 million protesters gathered in more than 700 cities in 60 countries to protest U.S. plans to invade Iraq. In many major cities, these protests were the largest ever recorded. Although the world’s governments working together could not dissuade the United States from its plans for war, the world’s people, acting together, helped to undermine the legitimacy of President Bush’s actions and to deny the U.S. government the international allies it sought. The action was so successful that a New York Times column referred to global public opinion as the “second superpower.”

How did activists organize such unprecedented protests? The answer to this question is important not only to social change advocates, but also to scholars hoping to understand the ways global change impacts political participation. A rapidly growing number of researchers are turning their attention to the World Social Forum (WSF), as evidenced by the number of conference panels and journal articles devoted to exploring the movement’s significance.

The idea for a global day of action and early planning for the event developed in Porto Alegre, Brazil, during the third meeting of what has become an annual World Social Forum. Mobilizing around the slogan “Another World is Possible,” the WSF began as both a protest against the annual World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, and as a response to the challenge of critics: “We know what you’re against, but what are you for?”

As the largest political gathering in all of human history, the WSF may prove to be the most important political development of the 21st century. Whether it will fulfill its promise depends on how citizens and governments respond to its initiatives. The forum’s power flows from a recognition that globalization without democratization can yield a hybrid of imperialism, authoritarianism, and tyranny. As the Iraq war protests show, the WSF must do more than simply communicate world public opinion. It needs to promote and support international institutional arrangements that are more responsive and accountable to international public pressure.

The WSF is comprised of an annual global meeting, complemented by hundreds of regional, national, and local social forums. It all began in Porto Alegre in 2001, when some 15,000 activists — more than three times the number expected — gathered to promote alternatives to economic globalization. Since its origins in 2001, the WSF has met in Porto Alegre; Mumbai, India; Bamako, Mali; Caracas, Venezuela; and Karachi, Pakistan. It now draws more than 150,000 participants, while the proliferation of smaller meetings continues. Organizers see the WSF process as creating open space for citizens to explore the impact of global changes on their local and national experiences, while cultivating transnational dialogues and a social-movement network to address shared problems. Scholars are increasingly attentive to how the WSF might contribute to a democratization of global institutions.

In a global system where opportunities for citizen participation are rare, the WSF serves as a laboratory for democracy. Activists are testing new forms of participation and representation that can inform official efforts to democratize global institutions.

In its first five years, the WSF process has demonstrated a remarkable capacity for adaptation. Its pervasive culture of democracy encourages dialogue and respectful efforts to confront and address conflicts. It is mindful of the ways power operates to shape debates and to exclude some voices. In particular, the WSF has moved consistently in the direction of greater decentralization. This has expanded opportunities for people to be involved in global-level politics. It has also fostered new forms of networking among activists working on different issues, in different countries, and at different levels of action. And it has generated opportunities for people to learn and practice skills relevant to global advocacy.

Typically, 80 percent of participants in any social forum live within the host city’s region; thus the prolif-
eration of forums enables more local activists to participate. The main web site for the WSF (www.worldsocialforum.org) provides links to national social forums on virtually every continent. Regional forums have met in Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Americas. In addition, many cities have hosted social forums to bring together a broad range of activists who are increasingly aware of the interconnectedness and the global sources of the problems on which they work. The practice of holding “polycentric” global forums in multiple sites was tested for the first time this year, and the official World Social Forum was held in consecutive gatherings in Mali, Venezuela, and Pakistan.

The advantage of decentralizing the annual forum is that it expands the possibilities for poor people and other marginalized groups to participate effectively. There is evidence that the involvement of less privileged groups has helped shape the forum, even though significant inequalities remain.

The most active region is Europe, which drew half a million activists to its recent European Social Forum in Athens. Africa remains the least active in the WSF process, although organizers expect that the Bamako forum in 2006 and the 2007 World Social Forum in Nairobi will reinforce African organizing efforts. U.S. activists have been notably scarce at the WSF. Nevertheless, there are efforts under way to mobilize the first U.S. Social Forum in Atlanta next summer, and many U.S. cities have been sites of local forums. Chicago hosted its third social forum in May 2006, and several hundred activists gathered this summer at the Southeast Social Forum (Durham, North Carolina) and the Midwest Social Forum (Milwaukee, Wisconsin).

One important question that scholars are beginning to address is why there is such wide variation in WSF participation across different countries and regions. Few structures of modern life provide opportunities for people from different class, racial, and professional
As an expanding and inclusive political space, the WSF creates opportunities for individuals to cultivate the skills necessary for global citizenship.

The rise of terrorism, proliferation of political protest, and widespread decline in voter participation are all evidence that political institutions lack the popular legitimacy they need to effectively manage global problems. Although the WSF has largely escaped the attention of the U.S. mass media and many of those in power, the process is making global democracy happen from below by providing opportunities for people to engage in discussions about how to address the world’s most pressing problems. The WSF has become an important venue for nurturing democracy at local, national, and global levels. It helps to globalize civil society by nurturing transnational identities and dialogue. In doing so, it is a threat to the interests of the extremists on both sides of the “global war on terror” who thrive on political polarization, militarism, and war. Peacebuilders and peace scholars around the world should therefore be attentive to the World Social Forum movement and the possibilities it holds for shaping a more peaceful world order.

Jackie Smith is on the Kroc Peace Studies faculty and is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame.

For more information:
http://www.indymedia.org/or/2006/01/831615.shtml
http://www.choike.org/nuevo_eng/informes/1557.html

backgrounds to come together to talk politics. The WSF not only does that, but also enables activists to make better use of technologies that facilitate regular communication across vast distances. However, technology alone cannot generate the robust social ties required for sustained political work. As activists point out, “The revolution will not be e-mailed.” This sentiment echoes recent research in the social sciences, which is less optimistic than earlier research findings about the contributions of technology to enhancing social ties. The social forums provide lively, but also routine and predictable, spaces in which activists can come together, generating the mutual understanding and trust required for global democracy.

Finally, as an expanding and inclusive political space, the WSF creates opportunities for individuals to cultivate the skills necessary for global citizenship. There are no elections for global officials, and few international policies are subjected to public debate, particularly transnational debate. The foreign-policy-making processes in most countries severely constrain possibilities for national governments to consult with their constituents about important international policies. The WSF fills this vacuum by providing a politicized arena where people can learn about and articulate positions on global issues. They do so as part of a dialogue with diverse groups of people, thereby fostering appreciation for the needs and perspectives of others while cultivating skills for political negotiation and compromise. If we are ever to have a more democratic world, we will need far more people with these sorts of skills.
Researchers launch working group on World Social Forums movement

Jackie Smith attended the 2001 and 2005 World Social Forums in Brazil, and “more local and regional forums than I can count.” Each time she observes the eclectic, passionate proceedings as a sociologist, and also immerses herself as a social activist.

Smith, who is organizing a fall Kroc Institute workshop on the World Social Forums movement, believes this “participant observation research” enhances her scholarship. It also gives her a chance to make a difference in the world and to provide a role model for her students. “In our day-to-day work at the university, it’s hard to actually do anything about the problems we study. But to understand how social change happens, the researcher really has to try to do some of the work that activists and practitioners do.”

Smith earned both her master’s in peace studies and doctorate in international relations at the University of Notre Dame, where she is a member of the Kroc Institute faculty and an associate professor of sociology. She is known for her research on the transnational dimensions of social movements, exploring ways in which global economic and political integration has influenced how people engage in politics. Her forthcoming book is Changing the World: Struggles for Global Democracy. She has co-edited three books on the subject: Coalitions Across Borders: Transnational Protest in a Neoliberal Era (with Joe Bandy); Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements (with Hank Johnston); and Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State (with Charles Chatfield and Ron Pagnucco).

Smith is an active member of the group Sociologists Without Borders. At the recent Midwest Social Forum in Milwaukee, she co-organized a workshop to help develop an international and multidisciplinary network of scholars to promote the World Social Forum agenda.

She is organizing scholars from around the United States, Canada, and Mexico to expand WSF research. This Social Forums Working Group aims to build upon the research being done in Europe under the leadership of Professor Donatella della Porta (see http://demos.iue.it/). The European group has conducted surveys and focus groups to evaluate the impact of social forum participation in different national contexts and across time, resulting in the book Globalization from Below: Transnational Protest and Activist Networks. Smith’s research program will generate similar studies in North America. Initial findings will be presented at meetings of the International Studies Association and American Sociological Association in 2007.

The Social Forums Working Group will meet at the Hesburgh Center for International Studies this fall. Two public events are scheduled. On November 9, a panel of experts and local organizers will explore the challenges of connecting local organizing work to global analyses and political processes. On November 10, there will be a presentation on della Porta’s research, along with an analysis of the broader political ramifications of the World Social Forum process. Professor della Porta will participate via video conference from Florence, Italy, and one of her colleagues will be in South Bend to address questions about their research.

Details of the November events will be posted in the “events” section of the Kroc Institute web site, http://kroc.nd.edu.
Embracing paradox
Reflections on peacebuilding and reconciliation in Rwanda

LARISSA FAST

As the plane touched down at the Kigali airport in early October 2005, I watched eagerly for the familiar, quiet beauty of the Rwandan countryside, with its lush green fields and rolling hills. I had last visited Rwanda in 2000 as part of a multiyear project training local organizations in conflict resolution skills. This time I traveled to Rwanda to document the Catholic Church’s peace and reconciliation efforts since the genocide in 1994.

The 10-minute car journey from the airport to my hotel made it clear that much had changed in the capital city. The physical changes included new buildings, landscaping in the medians, and sidewalks that framed the main road. During the next few weeks, I saw deeper changes in the people. I found hope, progress, and paradox.

Rwanda is the most densely populated country in Africa. Its 8.5 million people share a space slightly smaller than Maryland. Ethnically, they are Hutu (the vast majority), Tutsi, and Twa. Hutu extremists and hardliners targeted Tutsi and politically moderate Hutu in the genocide, and the violence that engulfed the country left 937,000 people dead in 100 days, according to the Rwandan government. The suffering of and tensions among Rwandans remain, but appear to have eased with the passage of time. Despite the mountain of challenges they face, Rwandans have begun to rebuild their lives and their country.

My assignment, shared with fellow consultant Laura McGrew, was commissioned by Catholic Relief Services (CRS), together with the Catholic Church in Rwanda. According to the 2002 census, about half of Rwandans are Catholic. During the past century, the church has been a powerful influence in Rwanda, owning and running virtually all primary, secondary, and vocational schools, operating clinics and hospitals, and providing relief and development services.

During the genocide, many Catholic clergy were killed, and many churches and church-owned schools and clinics were damaged or destroyed. However, the church also lost moral authority and influence. Its most vehement critics have accused the Catholic Church of participating in, planning, and denying the genocide. They cite as evidence the actions of individual clergy, three of whom are on trial at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, and the mass killings that took place in many Catholic (and Protestant) churches. Others refute these charges, pointing to the clergy and other Catholics who risked and, in some cases, lost their lives protecting people during the genocide.

Instead of focusing on the past, Laura and I devoted our attention to what the church has done in the years since 1994 to promote peace and justice in Rwanda. We worked closely with CRS, in particular the Peace and Justice staff of CRS/Rwanda, and with the national-level Justice and Peace Commission staff of the Rwandan Conference of Catholic Bishops. We interviewed both supporters and critics of the church. We visited a prison and spoke with nongovernmental organizations, government officials, diocesan and parish peace and justice committees, and parishioners from across the country.

Our report concludes that, despite a scarcity of resources and trained personnel, “the Catholic Church in Rwanda is involved in an impressive array of activities that indirectly and directly promote peace and reconciliation in Rwanda. Virtually all interviewees felt that the church itself has evolved and increased its credibility in peace and reconciliation.”

My visit to Rwanda highlighted for me the complexity of building peace in a society emerging from the ashes of genocide. In particular, I struggled with the paradoxes of how to strive for and achieve reconciliation on the one hand and ensure justice on the other.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines a paradox as: “a statement or tenet contrary to received opinion or belief, especially one that is difficult to believe.” Most of us, especially those within a Christian tradition, consider reconciliation to be entirely positive, something for which we should strive. It is a word commonly used in
Rwanda by clergy, ordinary Rwandans, and government officials alike. The paradox lies in the conflict between our conception of reconciliation as a voluntary process and real-world pressures and dilemmas. If prisoners are given incentives, such as early release, to confess to their crimes, and if public discourse encourages, values, and eulogizes forgiveness and reconciliation, is reconciliation really a choice? The choices of many Rwandans, especially survivors, are limited by poverty and scarce resources. For women in particular, the struggle to survive is acute. One woman told me how the donor community jumps to fund projects that bring together groups of women survivors and women whose husbands are in prison accused of genocide crimes. Many such groups exist. It is difficult, however, to find funding for groups that do not bring together these “categories” of women as an element of their programming.

The justice of the “Gacaca jurisdictions,” the community-based trials for those accused of genocide crimes, is part of a long process that relies upon everyone — accuser and accused — to “dare to tell the truth” about what happened. Yet how do we define truth? Does a good deed of protecting individuals “cancel out” other instances of committing or abetting genocide? Where and how should we draw the line? Should we even try?

Some survivors or the families of those who died have genuinely reconciled with those who perpetrated crimes during the genocide. Yet the coercive nature of justice and peace after genocide is evident in the incentives for early release from prison, the commutation of sentences and public pressure to process the large numbers of individuals implicated in the genocide. One expatriate told me in the late 1990s that “every other person getting off the plane is a conflict resolution specialist. What Rwanda needs is development.” This is perhaps even more true today. A deeper reconciliation requires truth, justice, and mercy, but cannot neglect economic survival.

Defining success as achieving “reconciliation” only 11 years after genocide, as some have done, sets an impossible standard. Government and civil society institutions in Rwanda, such as the Catholic Church, and the people themselves face a long and difficult journey as they rebuild their country. It is impossible to find quick and easy answers. The challenge is to embrace these paradoxes of reconciliation, doing our best to tilt the scale away from coercion and lack of choice and toward a deeper reconciliation. Time, patience, and support for Rwandan peacebuilders will be necessary.

Larissa Fast is a Kroc Institute faculty member and visiting assistant professor of sociology.
I never anticipated the marketing of a student peace conference could be so challenging. Given that there were more than a dozen panels and presentations on topics ranging from action programs in South Bend to educational efforts in Rwanda, it seemed nearly impossible to capture the spirit of the 2006 event in one catchy phrase. As part of the conference organizing team, I wondered if the event would be doomed by weak attendance. Thankfully, it was not. The very diversity of the conference was its greatest strength.

"There was something for everyone," a student told me after leaving the last of the panels, one concerning economic development and peacebuilding. "It shows how no matter your interests or your major, there is always an opportunity to do something."

Celebrating this spirit, the March 31-April 1 conference brought together undergraduates, graduate students, and professionals from various walks of life and academic disciplines under the title “Voices of Today, Changes for Tomorrow.” The assorted speakers highlighted not only the problems that afflict our global society, but also empowered students with the knowledge that they have the ability to change it.

This was the Kroc Institute’s 14th annual peace conference planned by and organized for undergraduate students. Two hundred participants attended the event, held at the Hesburgh Center for International Studies. Students hailed from dozens of universities, from Columbia University in New York to the University of California-Berkeley. After enjoying an opening banquet, they were entertained by the Indian dance troupe Banghara and folk singer/peace activist Joe Tascheta.

Keynote speaker and Kroc graduate Jian Yi (M.A. ’98) spoke on the value of peacefully empowering those who have been marginalized and forgotten. Jian Yi has spent recent years documenting self-governance in rural China, where his work has helped villagers realize that they can create change through nonviolent means. His talk, “Documenting Self-Governance in China: Empowering Individuals Through Film,” highlighted student activism, youth leadership, and the role of youth in peacebuilding.

Others at the lectern spoke from their own experience in working with youth. The Rev. Jack McGinnis and Kim Overdyke (M.A. ’02) described their efforts as, respectively, creator of the PeaceKit for Kids and director of the Take Ten youth violence-prevention program. Kroc Institute Visiting Fellow Myla Leguro, director of the Mindanao Peacebuilding Institute in the Philippines, enriched her address with songs of peace written by Mindanao youth.

Perhaps the most rewarding aspect of the conference was the interaction of students who attended the panel discussions. Whether the topic was protection of human rights along international borders or the role of the arts in peacebuilding, these panels fostered lively and informative conversation. They attracted the largest and most diverse audiences. Among those attending were students who were uncertain of the usefulness of peacebuilding courses in their careers.

“I was quite encouraged to continue in this field by being able to participate in this conference,” commented Jason Millar, a junior attending from Cleveland’s John Carroll University. The conference aspired to strengthen and unite the voices of youth in order to create profound changes in the world, and responses like Jason’s were the best indicators that it reached that goal.

Kevin Walsh, second from right in front, with peace conference crew.

Kevin Walsh (B.A. ’06), majored in political science and peace studies. He will attend Villanova University School of Law.
Kevin Ranney ('91), from Canada, is managing partner of Jantzi Research Inc. (www.jantziresearch.com), which provides services to investors who consider the social, environmental, and ethical performance of the corporations in which they invest. Kevin oversees research and manages the development of the company's methodology and core product, a database of social and environmental profiles of Canadian corporations. E-mail: kevinranney@sympatico.ca

S. P. Udayakumar (Kumar) ('90), from India, founded and directs the South Asian Community Center for Education and Research (SACCEER) to carry out community work, education, and research ventures in Tamil Nadu, India. SACCEER projects include an elementary school, a vocational school, vocational centers for women in 12 coastal villages, and entrepreneurship training for young fisherwomen. In 2006 the elementary school has begun its fourth year providing low-cost, quality English education to some 100 rural children. In 2000 Kumar founded the Green Party of India. Kumar’s publications include “Presenting the Past: Anxious History and Ancient Future in Hindutva India” (Praeger, 2005). E-mail: spudayakumar@gmail.com

Ellen Ott Marshall ('92), from the U.S., is associate professor of ethics at Claremont School of Theology in California and associate professor of religion at Claremont Graduate University. She is particularly interested in issues of violence and peacemaking, ethical questions in literature and film, and the dynamic relationship among faith, history, and ethics. Ellen is the contributing editor of a volume of essays written by Claremont faculty, Choosing Peace through Daily Practices (Pilgrim Press, 2005). Her second book, Though the Fig Tree Does Not Blossom, which addresses the virtue of hope in the Christian tradition, will be published by Abingdon Press in the fall of 2006. E-mail: emarshall@cst.edu

Winnie Romeril ('93), from the U.S., is a paramedic in Corning, New York, and a nonviolence trainer with Peace Brigades International and other international peace teams, working primarily in Europe and Asia. She also serves as a volunteer with the American Red Cross during national disasters. Winnie continues to redirect part of her U.S. income tax to peaceful organizations, writing about her tax resistance in local papers and notifying the IRS each year. E-mail: wromeril@empacc.net

Nguyen Thai Yen Huong ('93), from Vietnam, is deputy dean of the Faculty of Mid-Career Training and Post Graduate Studies of the Institute for International Relations (IIR) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Vietnam. She is in charge of mid-career training courses for staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other ministries and also IIR’s M.A. Program in International Relations. Huong is also a lecturer of American Studies for B.A. and M.A. students. Her research focuses on the American political system, American foreign policy, and the U.S.’s bilateral relations with other major powers. Her most recent publications include Humanitarian Interventions and US Foreign Policy (Gioi Publishing, 2005) and The United States: Its Socio-cultural Characteristics (National Political Publishing House, 2005), based on her Ph.D. thesis. E-mail: NTYHuong@mofa.gov.vn

Sarah Brammeier McCrisken ('94), from the U.S., lives in England, where she is organizational development advisor for the Oxford City Council, providing advice and training in areas such as management development, managing conflicts in the workplace, and career counseling. She also works to support the use of peer and youth mediation to bring together victims and perpetrators of crime. E-mail: sbammmeier@oxford.gov.uk

Xabier Agirre ('95), from the Basque Country of Spain, is a senior analyst in the Office of the Prosecutor at the International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague. His job involves strategic analysis to identify the main areas of crime and plan the investigations of the most notorious leaders for war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Xabier is working on investigations related to Darfur, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as well as monitoring several other situations relevant to the ICC. E-mail: xabier.agirre@icc-cpi.int
Mimi Conradi Gerstbauer ('95), from the U.S., is assistant professor of political science and director of peace studies at Gustavus Adolphus College in Minnesota. She teaches international relations, Latin American politics, and introduction to peace studies. Her research focuses on forgiveness and reconciliation in international politics. E-mail: mgerstba@gac.edu

Kriszta Tihanyi ('98), from Hungary, is chief operating officer for Market Matters, Inc., in Ithaca, NY, a small nonprofit organization that has grown out of Cornell’s Emerging Markets Program. It works with small and medium-size agribusiness companies, located primarily in Southern and East Africa. Kriszta is also a visiting scholar at Cornell University’s Peace Studies Program, and author of Blending in the Rainbow Nation: The Racial Integration of Schools and Its Implications for Reconciliation in Post-apartheid South Africa (Lexington Books, 2006), based on her doctoral dissertation. E-mail: kzt1@cornell.edu

Hyekyung (Diana) Park ('01), from Korea, has been working as Programme Officer at the Partnership Schools Team for the Korean National Commission for UNESCO since 2002. She is in charge of cultural exchange and projects to foster intercultural understanding. E-mail: diana0618@yahoo.com

Charles Muwunga ('00), from Uganda, has been appointed a human rights officer with the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights in Nepal. He will monitor and report on human rights and international humanitarian law activities and abuses in the region. For the previous six years, Charles directed the Jinja office of the Uganda Human Rights Commission and served as national coordinator of the Interfaith Peace Network in Uganda. E-mail: Muwunga@hotmail.com

Maneesha S. Wanasinghe-Pasqual ('01), from Sri Lanka, is a lecturer at the University of Colombo, teaching conflict resolution to third and fourth year undergraduates “and loving it.” She also supervises masters-level students in their theses. Maneesha is completing work toward a Ph.D. from the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, Virginia. Her dissertation focuses on the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. E-mail: maneeshwp@msn.com

John Kleiderer ('02), of the U.S., has been named policy director of the U.S. Jesuit Conference in Washington, D.C. He is a co-editor of Just War, Lasting Peace: What Christian Traditions Can Teach Us (Orbis, 2006). Key contributors to the book include Kroc Institute Senior Fellow George Lopez and Faculty Fellow Michael Baxter. John has begun work toward a Masters of Nonprofit Administration at the University of Notre Dame. E-mail: jpkleiderer@yahoo.com

Elias Omondi Opongo ('04), from Kenya, is program officer at the Jesuit Hakimani Centre in Nairobi. He gives training workshops on peacebuilding, conflict resolution, and good governance to various communities, leaders, and organizations in Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania, and Kenya. In his book Making Choices for Peace (Pauline Publications Africa, 2006), Omondi calls for agencies to go beyond aid delivery, while expounding on field diplomacy, the psycho-social concerns of aid workers, and the spirituality of humanitarian work. The foreword is by John Paul Lederach, the Kroc Institute’s professor of international peacebuilding. E-mail: eliasomondi@yahoo.com

Burcu Munyas ('06), from Turkey, has been appointed an international development fellow with Catholic Relief Services, and will be posted for the coming year to Israel/Palestine. Burcu completed a six-month field placement with Catholic Relief Services, based in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, during her M.A. program. Her master’s project at the Kroc Institute was titled “Genocide in the Minds of Cambodian Youth: Transmitting (Hi)stories of Genocide to Second and Third Generations in Cambodia.” E-mail: bmunyas@gmail.com
Peter Wallensteen inaugurates Starmann professorship

One of the world’s leading peace researchers, Peter Wallensteen, joined the Kroc Institute faculty this fall as the Richard G. Starmann Sr. Research Professor of Peace Studies. Wallensteen’s inaugural address will be the keynote at a November conference on “Strategic Peacebuilding: The State of the Art,” which will mark the institute’s 20th anniversary.

The new chair is named in honor of a longtime friend of the institute. A member of the Kroc Institute Advisory Council since 2001, Richard Starmann has specialized in crisis management in the United States, Europe, Asia and the Pacific Basin for more than 25 years. As senior vice president of McDonald’s, he was in charge of worldwide communications and led the company’s global crisis management team from 1981 to 1998.

Professor Wallensteen will spend one semester each year in residence at Notre Dame, where he will consult and collaborate with Kroc faculty on institute research projects, supervise graduate students in peace studies, make a major presentation on research in progress, teach a graduate seminar, and offer a series of lectures to undergraduate students on the core concepts and methods of peace research.

He foresees linkages between his work at Uppsala and Kroc. “My ambition is to find connections between these two programs and research at the Kroc Institute — for instance, in the field of peace agreements and on sanctions.”

Wallensteen became the first holder of the Hammarskjöld chair in peace and conflict research in 1985, when Uppsala was recruiting its first Ph.D. candidates. The program grew into one of the best of its kind, known for tough competition for admittance (two to four students admitted each year) and for its focus on methodological strength. He arrives at the Kroc Institute as planning is under way for a peace studies doctoral program at the University of Notre Dame.

Wallensteen is the author of International Sanctions: Between Wars and Words, Understanding Conflict Resolution: Peace, War, and the Global System, and Making Targeted Sanctions Effective, among other titles. He has also led recent commissioned studies on the means of preventing genocide, international strategies for democracy, and the United Nation’s post-conflict peacebuilding capacity. His research interests also include the durability of peace agreements, and the impact of preventative measures on the dynamics of disputes and conflicts.
“Morality,” says Avishai Margalit, “is what we direct at strangers; ethics is what we direct to our near and dear.”

In March 2006, Margalit became the first Jewish scholar to speak at the Kroc Institute’s annual John Howard Yoder Dialogues on Nonviolence, Religion, and Peace. The lecture and ensuing conversation are named for the well-known Mennonite theologian and founding fellow of the Kroc Institute.

The Jewish model of relations keeps separate issues of ethics and morality, Margalit argued during the lecture. Christians, on the other hand, try the “very ambitious” approach of aiming to replace morality with ethics — that is, they believe the ideal is to treat everyone as they would treat relatives or friends, he said.

“John Howard Yoder tried to narrow the gap (between ethics and morality), which he thought was unnecessarily highlighted,” said Margalit, who is the Schulman Professor of Philosophy at Hebrew University.

Margalit’s talk was titled “The Kiss of Betrayal: From Family to ‘Friendship in Faith.’” It was a wide-ranging exploration of how different religions approach morality, and whether faith in God or belief in a cause should trump relationships with friends and family. He asked when friendship forged by faith — such as that shared by Jesus and his disciples — outweighs obligations to others.

Margalit’s references ranged from the poet Dante to the placards waved by angry British football fans upset when a player “sold out” to another team. The latter, he said, dealt with the most widely accepted definition of betrayal, which is represented by Judas: handing one’s friend over to the enemy in return for money.

“The kiss calls for proximity,” he said. “It is a sign of extreme trust.”

Among his other examples was that of British poet Iris Murdoch, whose husband decided, after her death, to reveal information to her biographers that she wouldn’t have wanted known. Margalit posed the question: “Is betrayal acceptable providing the betrayed can never find out about it?”

Margalit’s lecture in the Hesburgh Center auditorium was followed by conversation with the speaker over lunch. Among those present were members of the university and local community, including Anne-Marie Yoder, John Howard’s widow, and other Yoder family and friends. Margalit shared his perspectives on topics ranging from the Israel/Palestine conflict — “Transformation of political conflict into religious conflict is a disaster” — to pacifism: “Hitler eradicated all of my family. There are very few survivors. I am for resistance … A world that tolerates a Hitler is a very bad world.”

Margalit’s books include The Ethics of Memory and A Decent Society. He has published widely in philosophical journals on such topics as philosophy of language, logical paradoxes and rationality, social and political philosophy, and the philosophy of religion. He was the 2001 winner of the Spinoza Lens Prize, awarded for “a significant contribution to the normative debate on society.”
Kaldor: “Organized violence” replaces traditional war

Mary Kaldor

Afghanistan and Iraq each had authoritarian regimes that were on the verge of collapse when the United States invaded. In each case, the U.S. and its allies have faced loose networks of combatants rather than a standing army.

In those ways and more, the two Middle East conflicts meet Mary Kaldor’s definition of “new wars.” The author of *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* shared her perspectives when she delivered the 12th annual Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh C.S.C. Lecture in Ethics and Public Policy.

Kaldor is professor of global governance and director of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance, London School of Economics. She is highly regarded for her innovative work on democratization, conflict, and globalization. Kaldor argues that in the context of globalization, what we think of as war is becoming an anachronism. In its place is a type of organized violence that could be described as a mixture of war, organized crime, and massive violations of human rights.

Her March 28 talk was titled “The New Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.” She began with her perspective that President George Bush’s and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld’s vision of new war is actually updated old war, in which the latest technology is grafted onto World War II-era strategies of aerial bombardment and defensive maneuvers.

Typical of countries embroiled in new wars, both Iraq and Afghanistan had authoritarian regimes that were on the verge of collapse when the U.S. and its allies invaded in 2002-03, she said. Neither state could generate enough tax income to support itself. Both were experiencing a big rise in crime — the poppy trade in Afghanistan, corruption in Iraq. Since Saddam Hussein’s regime fell in Iraq and the Taliban lost to the United States in Afghanistan, battles have been fought not by regular armed forces, but by loose networks of state and non-state actors, such as religious party militias.

In both countries the primary victims of war have been civilians, mostly because of the inability to distinguish insurgents from civilians — another hallmark of new wars. “The United States has been dragged more and more into a new war,” Kaldor noted, “and the more it presents it as an old war, in which U.S. democracy is fighting Islamic terrorism, the more Islamic terrorists and the more new war it spreads.”

The situation in Iraq is especially depressing, she told her audience in the Hesburgh Center auditorium.

“The only alternative I see is creation of an international protectorate for both countries, authorized by the United Nations, in which you see a big increase not just...”
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of forces, but also policemen, reconstruction experts. Most importantly, they would see their primary job not of defeating insurgents, but protecting individuals. America would have to play a big role — it would need a huge rethinking of attitudes toward multilateralism and war.”

Kaldor put that suggestion into a global context in her March 29 lecture, “Just War and Human Security.” She began by saying that a transformation of global society is under way, driven by five changes:

- The emergence of a global consciousness, emerging in part from the ability to see the Earth from space, which underscored its fragility and people’s shared responsibility.
- Increased migration. “Most people belong to several overlapping communities.”
- Global interconnectedness. Many important decisions are no longer made by states, but by organizations such as the World Bank.
- The changing character of warfare. “Battles are really too destructive to be fought. We learned that in the Second World War.”
- The emergence of global governance. “I don’t mean a global state,” Kaldor emphasized. “Such a state would be very tyrannical. States would continue to be important, but they are one layer among many layers that affect our lives.”

In such a transformed society, she said, the goals of war would be protection of civilians, and stabilization rather than victory.

Kaldor contrasted this humanitarian “just cause” for war with the traditional “just war” theory, which she considers outdated. “It’s very easy to shift from just war as a kind of ethical guide to just war as a way of simply legitimizing murder.”

Nearly 100 Catholic Church leaders and specialists in peace and reconciliation convened in the Central African country of Burundi for the Third International Conference of the Catholic Peacebuilding Network (CPN), from July 24-28. Joining them were six faculty and staff members from the Kroc Institute.

The conference examined the church’s peacebuilding efforts in the Great Lakes region of Africa. Among the issues discussed were community-based reconciliation in Rwanda, trauma healing in Burundi, efforts to achieve political stability in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the role of the church in other countries in supporting these efforts.

The conference was held at a critical time for the church’s peace and reconciliation initiatives, according to Bishop Jean Ntagwarara of Bubanza, president of the Conference of Catholic Bishops of Burundi.

“The holding of this CPN Conference is a chance, or rather a grace, a gift from God for our sub-region, so often misdirected by repetitive and interminable wars,” he said. “We hope that it will permit the international community to become more familiar with our problems, the causes of our conflicts and the efforts undertaken by the Catholic Church in trying to contribute to peace.”

Church and state officials unveil a plaque honoring Archbishop Michael Aidan Courtney.
Kaneb awards honor Kroc-affiliated teachers

Five University of Notre Dame faculty members associated with the Kroc Institute were among the 47 people honored with Kaneb Teaching Awards at the seventh annual ceremony. The awards recognize excellence in undergraduate teaching, based in part on student evaluations, and include a case prize of $1,000.

The 2006 winners included Martha Merritt, associate director of the institute; Paul Cobb, assistant professor of history and Kroc faculty fellow; Frances Hagopian, associate professor of political science and Kroc faculty fellow, and Richard Pierce, assistant professor of history, chair of Africana Studies, and Kroc faculty fellow; and peace studies alumnus Mark Gunty (M.A. ’89), assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research and assistant professor of sociology.

The conference was sponsored by the CPN, in collaboration with the Conference of Catholic Bishops of Burundi and Catholic Relief Services, and with support from the Kroc Institute and the German Catholic aid agency, Misereor. It was dedicated to the memory of Archbishop Michael Aidan Courtney, the Apostolic Nuncio in Burundi whose work for peace led to his murder in 2003. Those attending from the Kroc Institute were Director Scott Appleby, faculty fellows Larissa Fast, Patrick Gaffney, Thomas McDermott and Robert Dowd, and events coordinator Colette Sgambati.

A full conference report will appear in the next issue of Peace Colloquy.

PRCP gets new coordinator; Omar stays on to teach

Patrick Mason has been named coordinator of the Program in Religion, Conflict and Peacebuilding (PRCP). Mason earned his doctorate in history in 2005 from the University of Notre Dame, with a dissertation exploring violence against Jews, African-American Protestants, Latter-day Saints, and Catholics in the late 19th-century southern United States. His research and teaching specialties include religion, race, and violence in U.S. history, and comparative religious violence and peacebuilding. He is a graduate of Brigham Young University (1999) and the Kroc Institute's M.A. in Peace Studies Program (’03).

Mason replaces another Kroc Institute alumnus, Rashied Omar (M.A. ’01). Omar will remain at Notre Dame as research scholar of Islamic studies and peacebuilding. He will teach Islamic ethics, among other subjects. A native of South Africa and former imam of a Cape Town mosque, Omar received a doctorate in religious studies from the University of Cape Town in 2005.

PRCP is an interdisciplinary, inter-religious program that explores the complex roles of diverse religious traditions in contemporary conflicts. It is entering its sixth year of activities, which include hosting Rockefeller Visiting Fellows.
Field experiences take students to six far-flung cities

Members of the M.A. in Peace Studies class of 2007 are spending this fall semester exploring the challenges of peacebuilding and serving as interns with organizations in six cities. The sites, host organizations, and students are:

**Cape Town, South Africa:**
- Catholic Parliamentary Liaison Office: Mark Fetzko of the United States
- Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation: Lisa Nafziger of Canada
- Institute for Democracy in South Africa: Lison Joseph of India

**Jerusalem/Bethlehem:**
- Israeli-Palestinian Center for Research and Information: Ramesh Prakashvelu of India
- Sabeel: John Filson of the United States
- Wi’am: Silke Denker of Germany

**Kampala, Uganda:**
- Amnesty International: Yatman Cheng of China
- Foundation for Human Rights Initiative: Patrick Tom of Zimbabwe
- The AIDS Support Organization: Alicia Simoni of the United States

**Davao City, Philippines:**
- Catholic Relief Services: Maria Lucia Zapata of Colombia and Tania Alahendra of Sri Lanka

**Phnom Penh, Cambodia:**
- Catholic Relief Services: Hala Fleihan of Lebanon

**Washington, D.C., United States:**
- Refugees International: Meedan Mekonnen of Ethiopia
- Henry L. Stimson Center: Denis Okello of Uganda
- Institute for Multilateral Diplomacy: Tatyana Shin of Uzbekistan
- George Washington University: Said Yakhyoev of Tajikistan

Sanctions expert advises congressional committee

Economic sanctions remain a useful and powerful diplomatic tool, a Kroc Institute sanctions expert told members of the U.S. Congress in May.

According to Senior Fellow George A. Lopez, the United Nations has sharpened that tool since the 1990s Oil-for-Food program that targeted Iraq gave sanctions a bad reputation. Sanctions reforms have been significant and are ongoing, he told members of the House Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International Relations. Lopez based his comments on 15 years of scholarly research and consulting for the UN and its member countries.

He listed the circumstances under which sanctions are most effective, including:

- The UN Security Council details a clear and limited number of demands in the sanctions resolution;
- The sanctions adopted by the council and its members are one component of a more multifaceted means of persuasion and/or coercion;
- The council has made provisions for humanitarian exceptions, as needed.

UN sanctions fail, Lopez said, when:

- They are excessively punitive and isolate a target from continued bargaining with the Security Council or member states;
- Leaders of the targeted country or party portray the UN as the offending party and deflect the focus from their own behavior;

George Lopez
• The Security Council or its members fail to recognize partial compliance:
• Successful application of economic coercion produces no change in political behavior or compliance.

The complete report prepared by Lopez for the subcommittee is available online at http://kroc.nd.edu/research/sanctions_oilfood.shtml.


Peace Studies major wins Scoville Fellowship

Julia Fitzpatrick (B.A. ’06), a political science and peace studies major, won a Scoville Fellowship, which Senior Fellow George Lopez describes as “one of the most competitive professionalizing and career-making opportunities” for recent college graduates.

The Herbert Scoville Jr. Peace Fellowship was established in 1987 to provide college graduates with the opportunity to gain a Washington, D.C. perspective on key issues of peace and security. Winners spend six to nine months in Washington, serving as junior staff members at the organization of their choice — in Fitzpatrick’s case, Citizens for Global Solutions. She will be doing research on U.N. reform and helping lobbyists who are trying to gain congressional support for international peace and security issues.

A native of Detroit, Julia focused her undergraduate studies on the Arab Middle East and Islam. In the spring of 2005, she studied at the American University in Cairo, Egypt, for which she received the National Security Education Program David L. Boren Undergraduate Scholarship. She spent the following summer working with Catholic Relief Services in Cairo. At Notre Dame, Fitzpatrick was active in social justice groups, served on the peace studies undergraduate advisory committee and peace conference committee, and was active in Campus Ministry.

“The care and guidance of my professors at the Kroc Institute provided me with the tools and insights necessary to engage conflict and conceptualize peaceful solutions,” Fitzpatrick said. “They encouraged me to develop my own skills and cultivate confidence in my ability to analyze and speak on issues of policy and international affairs. Most importantly, I understand my vocation as a compassionate and reflective practitioner in issues of peace and conflict due to the ways in which the Kroc Institute has shaped my world view.”

After her fellowship, Fitzpatrick hopes to return to the Middle East to become proficient in Arabic and further engage issues of peace, conflict, and social justice.

Scott Appleby receives third honorary doctorate

R. Scott Appleby, the John M. Regan Jr. Director of the Kroc Institute, gave the commencement address and received an honorary doctor of laws degree May 14 at Saint John’s University in Collegeville, Minnesota.

In awarding the degree, university officials specifically cited Appleby’s leadership at the Kroc Institute. They praised his “persistent voice for the role of religious understanding in building peace among peoples divided by religious and ethnic conflict.” The award also lauded Appleby’s work with Martin E. Marty on the five-volume Fundamentalism Project, a comprehensive resource on fundamentalism in major religious traditions.

A professor of history and member of the University of Notre Dame faculty since 1994, Appleby is a 1978 Notre Dame graduate and holds master’s and doctoral degrees from the University of Chicago. He is the author of The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation and Church and Age Unite: The Modernist Impulse in American Catholicism, and coauthor of Transforming Parish Ministry: The Changing Roles of Clergy, Laity, and Women Religious. He also is editor of Spokesmen for the Despised: Fundamentalist Leaders of the Middle East and coeditor of Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America.
Guggenheim program honors Paul Cobb

Paul Cobb, a Kroc Institute faculty fellow and an associate professor of Islamic history, was among 187 artists, scholars, and scientists awarded Guggenheim Fellowships in early 2006.

Cobb, who is also a fellow of the Medieval Institute, has a special interest in Muslims in the age of the Crusades. His latest book is a biography of an eyewitness to the Crusades, a medieval Muslim from Syria named Usama, whose memoirs Cobb first encountered as an undergraduate in an Arabic class. Titled Usama ibn Munqidh: Warrior-Poet of the Age of Crusades (Oxford: Oneworld, 2006), Cobb's book is the first biography in English of Usama.

Cobb says his research drew him further into Usama's life and inspired him to write an intimate history of Usama's clan, the Banu Muniqdh. Usama's memoirs were rich in details about family life and the family castle still stands in Syria. "The memoirs were tough to understand, but very funny and moving," Cobb said. "I subsequently learned that Usama, who was quite famous in his day as a poet and warrior, was from an aristocratic family of some notoriety in medieval Syria." Additional research took Cobb "into all sorts of fascinating texts and strange locales in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt."

Cobb's work is aided by his ability to use Arabic, Persian, Greek, Syriac, French, German, and "enough Turkish and Italian to sweet-talk the archivists." In addition to the family history, his research has spawned other projects including a new English translation of Usama's memoirs for Penguin Classics titled Islam and the Crusades: Usama ibn Munqidh and Ibn Jubayr. He will spend his fellowship year in South Bend, using the time to write.

Guggenheim Fellows are appointed on the basis of distinguished achievement and exceptional promise for future accomplishment.

A Kroc milestone: First two-year class completes M.A. program

In May, the Kroc Institute bid farewell to the Class of 2006, the first to complete the M.A. in Peace Studies program after it was expanded from one to two years. Those students were also the first to complete field experiences, which sent them to internships around the world.

In keeping with tradition, the Class of 2006 was honored at a special ceremony in the auditorium of the Hesburgh Center for International Studies, where the 13 graduates received diplomas and congratulations from the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., founder of the institute.

Several students presented reflections on their Kroc experiences. Tom Arendshorst, an American ophthalmologist who entered the class when he was newly retired, summed up the feelings of many as he paid tribute to his fellow students and faculty:

"Two years ago I hoped to acquire understandings that might help me be an effective advocate for social and economic justice in our American society, which guards privilege for some people while abusing many others. I hoped that being part of this Kroc program might energize my life's new direction.

"I had high hopes, but I was not prepared for the richness of the Kroc peace studies experience. I did not expect the abundant bounty of this diverse, tight community of fellow students. I could not have anticipated that my professors would not only be experts, but that they would all be dedicated, creative teachers. I was not prepared for the inspiring sense of vision and mission that the Kroc Institute faculty bring to their work."

Paul Cobb
Books

Usama ibn Munqidh (1095–1188) was a Syrian poet and warrior who was at the front line of some of the most dramatic moments in Islamic history, including the invasion of the Turks into the Middle East, the collapse of Shi’ite political power, and, above all, the coming of the Crusades. Stressing Usama’s literary achievements as much as his political adventures, Kroc Institute Faculty Fellow Paul Cobb examines the complete literary legacy of this famous “Arab-Syrian Gentleman” and offers a unique window into his life, times, and world of thought.

David Cortright, Gandhi and Beyond: Nonviolence for an Age of Terrorism (Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers, 2006).

Is there room for nonviolence in an age of terrorism? Kroc Institute Research Fellow David Cortright makes a strong case for the need for nonviolent action — now more than ever. Drawing on the legend and lessons of Gandhi, Cortright traces the history of nonviolent social movements. Gandhi and Beyond offers a critical evaluation and refinement of Gandhi’s message, laying the foundation for a renewed dedication to nonviolence as the universal path to social progress and antidote to terrorism. The author portrays Gandhi’s political strengths and weaknesses; shows how the lessons of Gandhi were applied by such 20th century luminaries as Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez, Dorothy Day, and Barbara Deming, and integrates Cortright’s personal experience with the peace movement.


In recent years, global institutions such as the World Bank have become increasingly conscious of the role that ethical reflection may play in leading towards more successful knowledge and policy for development. This key book, written by Kroc Faculty Fellow Denis Goulet (founder of the field of development ethics), gathers together his main contributions in three distinct parts, covering the early journeys of the author’s thinking, an exposition of the main themes he has explored, and the transition from early alternative development to alternative globalizations.


Over the last few decades, societies have been forced to confront past evil, including the injustices of communism, military dictatorship, apartheid, and civil war. Emerging from these efforts is the concept of reconciliation, whose meaning philosophers and social scientists have debated in the context of political transitions in countries as diverse as South Africa, East Timor, Guatemala, and the Czech Republic. Most of these debates share a secularism that is at odds with the beliefs of many of the participants in these transitions. By contrast, the focus is on theology in this volume edited by Daniel Philpott, Kroc peace studies faculty member and associate professor of political science. The book is a conversation among theologians, philosophers, political scientists, and historians. Alan Torrance, David Burrell, C.S.C., Nicholas Wolskerstof, and Philpott, draw on theology and philosophy for their theoretical perspectives; A. James McAdams, Mark Amstutz, and Ronald Wells chart the path of reconciliation in Germany, Argentina, South Africa, and Northern Ireland. The concluding essay is written by Scott Appleby, John M. Regan Jr. Director of the Kroc Institute.


In this book, leading international scholars map the trends in major-power warfare and explore whether it is waxing or waning. Is major-power war as a historical institution in decline? While there is some convergence in their individual conclusions, the authors are by no means unanimous about the trend. Their articles explore different causes and correlates of the waning of major-power warfare, including international structure, nuclear weapons, international law, multilateral institutions, sovereignty, and value changes. Editor Raimo Väyrynen, former director of the Kroc Institute, now directs the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, University of Helsinki, Finland. The first versions of the chapters were presented at a conference organized by the Kroc Institute in May 2001. Contributing authors are Paul W. Schroeder, John
Since 1990 there have been more than 30 major settlements of conflict, and dozens of partial ones, with a formidable increase in our knowledge of recent and contemporary peace processes. In this chapter, John Darby, Kroc Institute research director, discusses six propositions about peace processes. They are: Most ceasefires collapse in the first few months; a lasting agreement is impossible unless it actively involves those with the power to bring it down by violence; spoiler groups can only be neutralized with the active involvement of ex-militants; during peace negotiations, the primary function of leaders is to deliver their own people; members of the security forces and paramilitary groups must be integrated into society if a peace agreement is to stick; finally, a peace process does not end with a peace accord.


The authors seek to uncover the reasons why different European religions — the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, and Turkish Islam — take different attitudes towards the political unification of Europe. They look at two episodes in particular: the democratic revolutions of 1989 and the widening and deepening of European integration in the 1990s.

Articles

In 1968, fresh out of college, David Cortright was drafted into the U.S. Army, despite his qualms about the Vietnam conflict. In this article, the Kroc Institute research fellow describes a transformative experience: his participation in the GI antiwar movement, which shook the foundations of the American military. His involvement included protests, publications, and a notable lawsuit. His personal crisis of conscience, he writes, was rooted in the social crisis of war, and he ultimately committed his life to the struggle for justice and peace.


Research on Israel’s nuclear weapons policy is seen as a classic case of...
conflict between security constraints and the academic ethos of openness. However, the ambiguity of Israel’s declared policy has eroded considerably over time, first to “opacity” and now to simple non-acknowledgement, according to the author, a Kroc Institute faculty fellow and emeritus professor of political science. Furthermore, Alan Dowty argues, there have been vast changes in strategic circumstances: the initial rationale as a nuclear deterrent to conventional attack has been eclipsed by deterrence of other weapons of mass destruction. This rationale is potentially a more promising platform for arms control agreements, Dowty contends.


In what ways does intensified violence change attitudes in protracted conflicts? When does it harden attitudes, and when does it moderate them? This question is tested for two intifada periods (1987–1993 and 2000–05). The author notes that a clear distinction emerges between “expressive” issues — those with a short-term focus and a high emotive content — and the primary issues in the conflict. He illustrates how the first intifada accelerated dovish trends on primary issues, while in the second intifada attitudes did not moderate until a basic structural change occurred.


Senior Fellow Robert Johansen contends that the United States has undermined the effectiveness of the International Criminal Court in multiple ways. It has refused to join or support the court; withheld support for United Nations peacekeeping unless U.S. citizens are exempted from international enforcement arising out of such operations; pressed other countries to sign treaties exempting U.S. citizens from court proceedings; cut aid to selected countries unless they sign immunity agreements with Washington; and held victims of war crimes and crimes against humanity hostage to obtaining exemptions for U.S. citizens. Johansen argues that these policies make it more difficult to enforce the laws prohibiting genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.


In this piece written for an Italian missionary magazine, the author describes the nature, purpose, and challenges of the faith-based reconciliation he has worked for in Kashmir under the auspices of the International Center for Religion and Diplomacy.


This paper was part of a symposium sponsored by the journal in April 2006 on “The Future of Labor Unions.” The author, a Kroc peace studies faculty member and associate professor of sociology, summarizes the impact of globalization on worker rights. She argues that the future of labor unions will depend upon their ability to forge a wider array of ties to diverse national and issue-based constituencies. The contemporary movement for global justice provides opportunities for unions to expand their base, Smith contends, and it challenges labor unions to think globally about their work.


The UN Global Compact is a voluntary initiative designed to help fashion a more humane world by enlisting business to follow 10 principles concerning human rights, labor, the environment, and corruption. The author, a Kroc faculty fellow, notes that although the four-year-old compact has signed up more than 1,100 companies and more than 200 large multinationals, few major U.S. companies have joined. The article outlines the problems that the compact brings to the fore and offers insights from the ethical literature that may address company concerns or provide new ways of thinking about the issues. It further argues that the forum provided by the compact may be the most effective means to gain consensus on the role of business in society.
peace practitioners. That has helped us in defining our courses, in designing our services. We don’t want to be academic.”

Trust. When Catholic Relief Services turned its attention to peace and justice issues in the 1990s, Mindanao’s non-Christians were leery of its motives. But Myla and her colleagues found help in allaying those fears. “We were lucky to have Muslim partners who worked with us in the initial stages of the program, who became our champions. They explained in their own community what we were about as an organization. Then we did community visits. Once you are there, more people know you and understand you. Then you have trust.”

Follow-up. MPI doesn’t just train people in peace-building techniques. It provides support once they get home, so they can apply their knowledge to the needs of their communities — arranging dialogues, perhaps, or setting up conflict resolution mechanisms. “My dream is for MPI to become irrelevant — not because we’re going to achieve peace, but because we’ve trained people to do their work.”

Power. Peace practitioners wield power because they bring money and expertise into a community. Myla often reflects on MPI’s influence, and her desire that it not be dominant. She encourages grassroots peace-builders to claim power in trying to change their communities. She encourages MPI staffers to see themselves as mentors, facilitators, bridge builders, or companions, depending on local needs.

Myla uses another role to describe her work to her five-year-old daughter. “I tell her I am a peace teacher. I teach people how they can live together, how they have the capacity to decide on their own how to live together.”

Myla began her career doing development work. Her academic training was in neither education nor peace studies. She told me, with a laugh, that she studied agriculture. That seems fitting, given her ultimate career sowing seeds of peace.
Once, when he was describing a thorny ethical question posed by a teacher, my son scrunched his brow and said, “It makes my head hurt!” I felt a similar frustration as I tried to absorb the contents of several single-spaced pages, handed to me by Myla Leguro, describing the decades-long conflict on the Philippine island of Mindanao. The tangled roots of the struggle go back four centuries. Since the 1970s, government clashes with both Muslim rebels and communist groups have left 120,000 people dead, 1.5 million displaced, 71 percent living in poverty. Roads and schools lie in ruins. Drug trafficking thrives. Caught in the madness are 12 million Christians, 4 million Muslims and 2 million indigenous people — “the tri-people,” as Myla calls them.

Myla represents the flip side of the Mindanao conflict. In the face of its complexity, she maintains a single-minded determination to bring peace to her lush homeland. She is the Peace and Reconciliation Program manager for Catholic Relief Services in Davao City. Among her many responsibilities is directing the Mindanao Peace Institute (MPI), which has a growing reputation as a place to learn about effective, grassroots peacebuilding.

As the first person to receive a Kroc Institute visiting fellowship designated for employees of Catholic Relief Services, Myla spent part of the spring semester at Notre Dame. She brought with her a tropical smile, calm self-confidence, and a strong work ethic. Her main fellowship project was to reflect upon, and write about, a decade of peacebuilding work in the Philippines. She also lectured on the role of women in peacebuilding, addressed the undergraduate peace conference, and shared her experiences with graduate students in a course on the management of nongovernmental organizations.

Besides its annual peacebuilding workshops that have drawn 900 people from 30 countries, MPI has an ongoing training program for grassroots leaders in Mindanao. MPI has 10 staff members, and is collectively managed by Catholic Relief Services, the Mennonite Central Committee, and the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development. Myla’s goal is for the institute to be independent. That would allow it to expand services, get its own building, and eventually open centers outside of Mindanao.

One sign that the world has taken notice of Myla’s work was her inclusion in a group of 1,000 women nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2005. She is known for her management and evaluation skills. But what most impresses me most is her understanding of human relationships. That surely must be the basis of successful conflict transformation, “true north” on the peacebuilder’s compass. During a long conversation with Myla, I gleaned lessons about the value of maintaining focus in order to meet our goals, building trust with others, following through with commitments, and using power responsibly.

Focus. “We’ve always been very clear about our vision and mission,” Myla said. “MPI is for grassroots continued on pg. 34
Diana Batchelor of the United Kingdom (M.A. ’06) catches up with her reading during her field internship in South Africa.