KONFLIKTTRANSFORMATION UND FRIEDENSPROZESSE

Schwerpunktredaktion: Wilfried Graf
Gudrun Kramer

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Wilfried Graf, Gudrun Kramer, Augustin Nicolescou
Conflict Transformation Through Dialogue: From Lederach's Rediscovery of the Freire Method to Galtung's 'Transcend' Approach

The field of conflict transformation and peacebuilding has significantly developed over the past few decades. The first part of this article offers a critical evaluation of the field's development and the deficits which can be observed, referring in particular to the research of John Paul Lederach (1995, 2005) and his rediscovery of Paulo Freire's work for a critical approach to conflict transformation based on dialogue.

The second part gives an overview of the 'Transcend' approach and the integrative approach for conflict transformation and peacebuilding, which we are using in our own mediation project supporting the peace process in Sri Lanka. We have been working for several years with an influential dialogue group in the Sinhala dominated South (the 'Austria group'), at the same time with political leaders of the 'Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam', and on the grassroots level mainly with the Buddhist social organization Sarvodaya[1]. We are also using this approach in our workshops and training in conflict transformation and peacebuilding in Central Asia, the South Caucasus, the Middle East, Southeastern Europe and the African Great Lakes Region.

The 'Transcend' approach is based on the critical and constructivist peace research and peace work of Johan Galtung (2000, 2004, 1996) and in the framework of this article, we are focusing on the basic contribution of Galtung. However, in our own approach of 'Integrative Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding', we are aiming to integrate the 'Transcend' approach and several others, ranging from neo-Marxist to poststructuralist, postmodernist or transpersonal, and in particular the theories of Edgar Morin (1999), Cornelius Castoriadis (1987) and Fredric Jameson (2002), as

well as the praxeologies of Paulo Freire (1992), Claudio Naranjo (1993), Jacob Levy Moreno (1953) and Vamik Volkan (1999). The 'Integrative Conflict Transformation' approach which we are using is a work in progress, and is constantly being refined and developed for use in training, research, counseling and mediation. Comments and dialogues are highly appreciated.

1. The Failure of Diplomacy and the Development of Conflict Transformation Approaches

Far from ushering in a peaceful era with the end of the Cold War, the 1990s were marked by the new phenomena of postmodern wars, the majority of which have taken the form of 'ethnic conflicts' – intra-state wars based on the politicization along the fault-lines of nationality. The responses to these violent conflicts were based on a framework of 'humanitarian' intervention. Since September 11th and the onset of the 'global war on terrorism', politicization along religious and civilizational fault-lines has emerged into the foreground. The new postmodern war, in which the killing of civilians is the main strategy for all sides, surpasses the classical modern war in complexity and has proven resistant to traditional approaches of resolving armed conflicts.

Even in the case of peace negotiations in which traditional agreements were discussed or eventually reached, violence has on occasion broken out again. This has happened, for example, in Angola, Rwanda, Palestine/Israel, and at the moment, in the case of Sri Lanka. In the cases of Angola and Rwanda, there were more deaths after the agreements were signed than during the preceding civil war (O'Toole 1997). In the new context of the 'global war on terrorism', the new constitution has failed to bring peace to Afghanistan, the war against Iraq is possibly turning into a civil war, and the failure of the Israel/Palestine peace processes since Oslo has opened a new cycle of retaliation and war in the Middle East. The issue of the final status of Kosovo is raising the prospects of renewed violence; while in Bosnia the Dayton Accord's complex political system imposed by the outside forces of the International Community has not lived up to expectations.

One of several reasons for these failures of negotiations and agreements lies in the lack of a complex conflict analysis. These new forms of direct vi-

olence are only the tip of the iceberg of the new structural and cultural conflict formations in the new phase of 'global, multinational world capitalism' (Jameson 1991), which cannot be reduced, in a very simplifying manner, to conflicts between 'globalization' and 'anti-globalization'. Capitalism is only one basic social formation in the social 'deep structure', existing in contradiction with much older and relatively autonomous social formations like militarism, state tyranny or patriarchalism.

Galtung (1998) has focused on four complex global conflict formations, now overlapping all over the world, interlinked with the social conflicts and contradictions on the local and regional levels (class, gender, generation, race, normal/deviant, nation, territory, and environment):

- the geo-economic conflict formation (the World Economic Crisis);
- the geo-military conflict formation (the NATO Expansion into Eastern Europe and Central Asia and the geo-military reactions from China, India, Japan);
- the geopolitical conflict formation (the State/Nation controversy, new nationalism and separatism);
- the geo-cultural conflict formation (the revival of the Christian-Muslim Antinomy).

1.1 The Rise of a Multi Track Approach to Conflict Resolution

The traditional approach to negotiation is based on a win-lose understanding of conflict, where there is a definite and fixed amount of resources that must somehow be allotted. Parties have goals, and the parties must give in on some points in order for the goals to be compatible with each other. The language of this approach is 'win-lose', 'zero-sum', 'pure conflict', 'competitive', 'legalistic', with tactics including 'carrot and stick', 'power-coercive', 'threats, bluffs, concealment', and 'compromise towards the middle'.

The need for a different, more complex approach, not only for a more complex conflict analysis, but also for a more complex praxeology, made clear by the persistence of violent conflicts over the past decades, has led to the development of alternative, civil, dialogical approaches of conflict management, conflict resolution or conflict transformation, which have gained prominence since the end of the Cold War (Purkarthofer 2000).

The arena of multi-track initiatives is unofficial and the activities take place outside of government offices and through NGOs, rather than embas-

sies. It offers a space for the participants to think creatively without being held accountable for what they discuss in these closed sessions. This is especially important when the issues are too sensitive to be discussed publicly. The interactions can furthermore help overcome some of the trust issues, which are inherent between conflict parties (Chigas 1997). As such, it can have an impact on the 'ripeness' of the conflict for a negotiated solution, allowing for official negotiations much sooner than would otherwise be the case.

In our approach, we incorporate the integrative approach of the Ethiopian peace researcher and mediator Hizkias Assefa. He differentiates between approaches based on the level of mutual participation of the conflict parties (ranging from conflict suppression to conflict management, conflict resolution and conflict transformation), and the different methods used (ranging from force to arbitration, negotiation, mediation and reconciliation) (Assefa 1999).

The first analytical problem solving workshops in which high level representative of conflicting nations met on an unofficial basis began to take place in the 1950s (Rothman/Olsen 2001). This approach aimed at international conflicts developed further for application in intra-state conflicts in the late 1960s, emerging from diplomatic and law related circles. These led to 'Track II' initiatives (Lumsden 1996), such as the efforts of Roger Fisher (Harvard Negotiation Project), Herbert Kelman (Problem Solving Workshops), Harold Saunders and Vamik Volkan (The Tree Model) and others. The approach has since developed into more complex 'multi-track initiatives' and 'systemic' conflict transformation and peacebuilding, supporting official peace processes with informal civilian diplomacy, problem solving workshops, dialogue projects and development counseling (Ropers 2004). The role of NGOs and academic groups in assisting in the resolution of intra-state conflict has been particularly important with these approaches.

Although there are no calls for Multi-track efforts to replace Track I efforts, a strong multi-track initiative can make a difference when the parties officially meet at the negotiating table (Rothman/Olsen 2001). And they can even create the possibility of having negotiations in the first place.

1.2 Gaps in Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding

Even with the new approaches to conflict transformation and peace-building, there are important deficits which must be addressed so that these new approaches can lead to a 'positive/sustainable/just' peace, aiming for more than a simple ceasefire and the absence of violence.

Addressing this, sociologist, mediation trainer and conflict transformation expert John Paul Lederach has developed a transformative, dialogical approach to conflict transformation and peacebuilding with specific reference to the school of popular education in Latin America and Africa, and particularly of the school of Paulo Freire. "The work of Paulo Freire and my own direct contact with many efforts at popular education in Latin America and Africa are perhaps the most important influences on my thinking and training activity" (Lederach 1995: 25f.). He focuses on the following points: First, popular education is never neutral. It is centered on the concept of *conscientization*, "the process of building awareness of self-in-context that produces individual growth and social change. Second, popular education is a process of mutuality. […] Third, people and their everyday understandings are key resources. […] Finally, posing problems relative to real-life situations and challenges rather than providing prescriptions about those situations is an important pedagogical tool." (Lederach 1995: 26)

"Conscientization," Lederach writes, "believes that people are knowledgeable about, capable of naming, interacting with, and responding to their own realities in dynamic ways. In regard to multicultural settings, this principle is based on several fundamental ideas. First, the elicitive principle suggests that people in a community are capable of identifying and naming the realities of the conflict they face. […] Second, it suggests that the most useful, transformative and constructive critique of the problems, strengths, and weaknesses related to handling conflict within a given cultural group emerges from that group. […] Conscientization […] invites a particular group to reflect within itself on the strengths and weaknesses of its own heritage, knowledge, and modalities related to conflict – in contrast to reflecting on the threat or modalities of others or adopting a posture that members must initially learn from others because they have no resources." (Lederach 1995: 112f.)

The conflict worker is no longer there to be the expert, to lecture *to* the participants and impart certain content, but rather to be a facilitator, in dialogue *with* the participants, who together are engaged in a process oriented activity.

In his latest book, *Pedagogy of Hope. Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire describes this potential of a peace process as a 'learning process', on the basis of his experience in a 'culture circle' session with armed activists in El Salvador, after the peace accord of 1992: "A learning process might appear whereby the powerful would learn that their privileges, such as that of exploiting the weak, prohibiting the weak from being, denying them hope, are immoral, and as such need to be eradicated. It might be a learning process, at the same time, for the crushed, the forbidden-to-be, the rejected, that would teach them that, through serious, just, determined, untiring struggle, it is possible to remake the world. The oppressed may learn that hope born in the creative unrest of the battle, will continue to have meaning when, and only when, it can in its own turn give birth to new struggle on other levels. And finally, it may be learned that, in a new democratic process, it is possible gradually to expand the space for pacts between the classes, and gradually consolidate a dialogue among the different – in other words, gradually to deepen radical positions and overcome sectarian ones. In no way, however, does this mean, for a society with this sort of living experience of democracy, the inauguration of a history without social classes, without ideology, as a certain pragmatically postmodern discourse proclaims." (Freire 1992: 173ff.)

For Freire, a peace process, with a peace agreement achieved, is a moment in the struggle, not the end of the struggle. When the peace process is not addressing the deeper roots of violence, the core issues, the justice gap, the peace process will probably fail. Violence will continue in structural and cultural forms and sooner or later, direct violence may re-emerge.

On the basis of this Freirian paradigm, Lederach identifies three gaps in conflict transformation in the context of many peace processes in the last 15 years, not only in El Salvador 1992. He points to an interdependence gap, a justice gap and a process-structure gap (Lederach 1999). In his latest work, *The Moral Imagination*, he has pointed out a deeper deficit, the 'authenticity' gap (Lederach 2005). Addressing these gaps is a critical concern for the further development of peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

1.2.1 The 'Interdependence' Gap

Usual approaches to conflict resolution have meetings or negotiations between conflict partners on equal levels – generals with generals or the equivalent (para-)military position, leaders with leaders, grassroots with grassroots. Efforts have tended towards these kinds of horizontal relationships, with the idea of fostering interdependence, building relationships across the major line of social cleavage along which the conflict is formed. There have been, for example, numerous projects which have brought Palestinian and Jewish Israeli youth together.

However, the vertical links *within* a conflict party are overlooked. The relationship between the elite level, the midlevel leaders and the grassroots level has not been addressed, and there is a gap in the interdependence between these vertical levels, which is what Lederach is referring to.

1.2.2 The 'Justice' Gap

A second gap emerges most prominently when some sort of agreement, which is supposed to bring an end to the conflict, is signed. It is clear that there is generally a significant decrease in direct violence once this happens. Yet the original structural and cultural contexts of the conflict formation often remain unaddressed. In an asymmetric conflict formation, direct violence is often (or can rapidly become) the response of one group to the structural violence which is perpetrated by another group. When a peace agreement, or even a ceasefire, is signed, there is an expectation that the decrease of direct violence will also be accompanied by a decrease in structural violence, that the population will experience the benefits of a peace dividend. However, as Lederach writes, "the expectations for social, economic, religious, and cultural change are rarely achieved, creating a gap between the expectations for peace and what it delivered" (Lederach 1999: 5).

1.2.3 The 'Process-Structure' Gap

A further gap, which Lederach identifies is between peace process and peace structure and it has much to do with the confusion between whether peace is an end product or a process. The 'process-structure' gap can occur when a peace process focuses too much on attitudes (the process) or too much on finding a solution (structure). Therefore, it is important not to focus too heavily on a linear approach of ceasefire, then negotiation, then

agreement and then reconciliation. The process should start where there is the best opening and if possible, on multiple levels.

This gap is markedly visible after a negotiated peace agreement is signed. A peace process will often lead to the creation of a new political structure (positions, institutions, constitutional changes). These are important changes, but they are only the beginning of the post-war/post-violence phase of a peace process. A sustainable peace also needs attitudinal changes, new relationships need to be fostered, a new social structure and culture of peace needs to be developed and the entire way in which conflicts are approached needs to change.

What these peacebuilding gaps have in common is that they arise from an incomplete vision of what peace work entails. One can attribute this in part to the legacy of the traditional approaches of conflict resolution through military, diplomatic and legal means, which long predate the systemic contexts of modern warfare, capitalism, secularism and the modern nation state system. This legacy, hammered into the deep psyche of most societies over a period of millennia, has left us with the notion that once an agreement is signed, however it may have been settled, it is final and the problem is resolved. The result is an overemphasis on elite negotiation and interdependence between elites, while neglecting the elites' need for interdependence with the people they aim to lead and govern. It also results in an over-emphasis of a peace or ceasefire agreement, while the complex processes necessary for peace and the transformation of conflict are neglected. The final result is a superficial peace without roots or chances for development.

1.2.4 The 'Authenticity' Gap

Beyond the techniques of negotiation, mediation, and intervention approaches, something more, albeit less tangible, is needed. What is missing is peace as an organic process fuelled by the creativity, dedication and vision of those who live in conflict. Peace must be organic. This means that it must be developed from within as opposed to imported or imposed from without. There should be ownership of the peace by those who have to live with it. This corresponds to what Lederach refers to in *The Moral Imagination* as the 'authenticity' gap (Lederach 2005: 49).

Lederach argues that a specific 'moral imagination' is needed in order to transform conflicts. This is what we refer to as the potential to 'transcend'

a conflict, the capacity to go beyond the existing reality and to jump into a new reality.

Conflict transformation and peacebuilding approaches usually seek to impart knowledge and skills, a specific method that can be used to resolve conflicts. Lederach points out that in the process of professionalizing the field of peacebuilding, the emphasis on technique has overshadowed the fact that peacebuilding is also an art (Lederach 2005).

The role of the peace and conflict worker should therefore be to support a process of self-reflection, to strengthen the capacity for empathy, to awaken the creative potential for imagining a new reality and to empower non-violent strategies, through a dialogue with all conflict participants – while continuously engaging in a critical reflection of their own approach, combining different methods like feedback, self-evaluation or supervision. In the case of our dialogue project in Sri Lanka, we are using all these methods, including nonverbal supervision through 'systemic structural constellations' (Varga von Kibed 2002).

2. A Complex, Integrative Approach to Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding: An Overview of the 'Transcend' Approach

Developed over the past 50 years, beginning with the groundbreaking work of Johan Galtung, the 'Transcend' approach seeks for answers not only to how to stop direct violence, but also how to transform structural and cultural violence. Over time, it has developed through the research and practices of many peace practitioners and has incorporated the work of several researchers and practitioners from a wide range of backgrounds. Today it consists of a philosophy, a set of values continuously re-evaluated through critical self-reflection, a set of theories (but not a new grand theory) continuously re-evaluated through empirical research, and a praxeology, a set of various methods and tools for dialogue continuously adopted to the practical lessons learnt in the field.

'Praxeology' refers to human action, and in the 'Transcend' approach, praxeology refers in particular to dialogue processes, starting with dialogue with each conflict party separately. This is done in order to prepare each con-

flict party for conflict transformation, from prevention to negotiation/mediation to (re)conciliation, through a process of self-reflection and exploration of the deeper, collective unconscious dimensions of the conflict formation, similar to the process of *conscientizacão* in Freire's educational work.

"Mechanistically or idealistically it is impossible to understand what occurs in the relations prevailing between oppressors and oppressed, whether as individuals or as social classes. Only in a dialectical understanding […] is it possible to comprehend the phenomenon of the introjection of the oppressor by the oppressed, the latter's 'adherence' to the former, the difficulty that the oppressed have in localizing the oppressor outside themselves. Once again the moment comes to mind when, twenty-five years ago, I heard from Erich Fromm, in his house in Cuernavaca, his blue eyes flashing: 'An educational practice like that is a kind of historico-sociocultural and political psychoanalysis. This is what dogmatic, authoritarian, sectarian mechanists fail to perceive, and nearly always reject as 'idealism'" (Freire 1992: 89f.).

Transcend work is also comparable with 'historico-sociocultural and political psychoanalysis' – like other approaches such as those of Paulo Freire's emancipatory pedagogy, Jakob Levy Moreno's sociodrama or Augusto Boal's emancipatory theatre work. Galtung was a very good friend of Paulo Freire and they had many fruitful dialogues in the late seventies in Geneva. However, Transcend focuses more on conflict transformation, not only on the micro and meso levels, but also on the macro and mega levels of peace, development and civilizations.

The following section is meant as a brief overview of the 'Transcend' approach to peacebuilding and conflict transformation, and is the basis for our integrative approach to conflict transformation in mediation, counseling, training and research.

From a Transcend perspective, the goal of peacebuilding and conflict transformation is to enable people to be self-reliant in dealing with conflicts using peaceful means. Especially when working in foreign societies, the aim of a Transcend conflict worker is to intervene as little as possible. Peace workers from the outside, who move to and then live in the country of conflict, often become part of the conflict themselves. They are often no longer able to distance themselves from the conflict; they perceive the conflict as their conflict, becoming 'conflict thieves'. This provokes counter-productive dynamics. On the one hand, the conflict workers start competing with each

other, on the other, confronted with deadlocks or backlashes, they themselves feel helpless and become frustrated and cynical. Therefore the 'Transcend' approach focuses primarily on building and strengthening local capacities through counseling and training.

When working directly with conflict parties (within the framework of conflict counseling, facilitation or mediation), the 'Transcend' approach stresses the importance of working with the conflict parties separately, in order to facilitate a process of critical self-reflection. Self-reflection enables the conflict parties to better understand themselves, the others and the conflicts, which divide them. In doing so, conflict parties are better able to formulate and/or reformulate their goals, and to come up with better, non-violent strategies in order to achieve their goals. In the best case scenario, the conflict parties do not need third party mediation anymore, but are able to engage in a genuine autonomous dialogue and agree on solutions to their common problems.

The 'Transcend' approach is a complex 'integrative' approach to peacebuilding and conflict transformation, integrating actor-oriented approaches (transforming strategies, actions, behaviors), structure-oriented approaches (transforming goals and contradictions) and culture-oriented approaches (transforming values, attitudes, assumptions). Although the 'Transcend' approach is also in favour of integration, consensus, cooperation, mutual learning and creative collaboration, the aim is for equity, equality, and symmetric power structures. Therefore it does not exclude 'dissociative peace strategies' (non-violent struggle, *satyagraha*), as a way to empower the exploited or oppressed conflict party, with the deeper goal of (re)creating the conditions for 'associative peace strategies' (negotiation, mediation, conferencing and reconciliation).

2.1 Philosophy

The 'Transcend' approach is grounded in a complex epistemology of scientific research focusing on value-oriented fields like peace and development, a social anthropology focusing on basic human needs, and a social philosophy of 'positive/sustainable/just' peace.

2.1.1 Epistemology

The 'Transcend' approach is based on a tri-lateral concept of science, consisting of empiricism, criticism and (social) constructivism, which allows for the integration of realism, idealism and art (Galtung 1977). Empiricism is confronting the data (what is observed) with the theory (what is predicted). This focuses on the past. Criticism is confronting the data (what is observed) with values (what is desired). It is an exploration of the present. Constructivism is exploring the possibilities for the future, confronting values (what is desired) with theory (what is predicted) (Galtung 2002). Empiricism helps us to distinguish between correct or incorrect. Criticism helps us distinguish between better or worse, and constructivism between adequate or inadequate. Such an approach leads to a new concept of science, integrating theoretical complexity and participatory action research, allowing the combination of critical value-orientation and pragmatic solution-orientation, based on the focus of basic human needs.

2.1.2 Philosophical Anthropology

The philosophical anthropology of the 'Transcend' approach puts the human being at the center of social development and peaceful conflict transformation. Human beings have basic human needs, shared by all, and at the same time universal (regardless of one's biographies, cultural meanings or social structures) and particular (embedded in one's biographies, cultural meanings or social structures).

In the debate about universality or particularity of such human needs, it is interesting to remember the critique of Edward Said on Michel Foucault, referring to a debate between Chomsky and Foucault on Dutch television in 1974 (Said 1983; Chomsky 1981). Both agreed to the task of analyzing the forms of power and violence in current societies, in order to promote the political struggle for social emancipation. Beyond such an analysis, Chomsky also stressed the necessity for a vision of a future society, which would fulfill the needs of human beings. Foucault was against such a vision, like the idea of a just society, because such visions would only be inventions of one's own civilization, the result of one's own class system, and the expression of a power struggle. In that debate, the 'Transcend' approach would search, like always, the complex position of 'both – and something more than that'.

Basic human needs are what define us as human beings. Using Ken Wilber's terminology, one could also refer to them as physiological, social, spiritual and psychological needs (Wilber 1995). But contrary to idealistic (Wilber, Maslow) or materialistic (Marx, Heller) hierarchies of human needs, Galtung's concept of basic human needs, like that of Max-Neef's (1991), assumes that there is no hierarchy in basic human needs. Galtung distinguishes four categories or classes of basic human needs: 'survival', as opposed to death; 'wellbeing', which refers to what we need to live from, such as food, clothes, shelter, access to a healthcare system, access to an educational system; 'identity', which means a sense of life, something to live for, not only to live from; and 'freedom', meaning having equal choices (Galtung 1996). All needs are interdependent and interrelated.

As Peter Lawler points out, this is a highly controversial approach: "The defenders of different types of social formations would argue that it is only within their preferred society that human needs are best understood and satisfied. In order for a theory of human needs to have critical effect, it must therefore be able to distinguish between true and false needs, a fact acknowledged by many needs theorists. Beyond identifying the most basic needs – the prerequisites for human existence – needs-talk is necessarily contingent upon a whole host of culturally and ideologically specific categories. Connected with this are difficulties with distinguishing various needs from the closely related category of wants." (Lawler 1995: 140f.)

But these controversies can only be transformed through a permanent dialogue about basic human needs. All four classes of basic human needs are involved in programming the many concrete psychological ego-needs, social interests and cultural values. Identity, in the sense of a basic human need, is the form, not the content, and in that understanding neither a concept for any pre-modern cultural essentialism nor any post-modern cultural relativism. Freedom, in the sense of freedom of choice, is not the same as the value of individualism, as in the western ego-culture (in relation to the we-cultures in other regions and civilizations) or as the ideology of liberalism, neoliberalism or libertarianism. Basic needs are neither psychological ego-needs nor values, but are defining the non-negotiable needs of social human beings and as such an anthropological approach to discuss, evaluate, deconstruct, reconstruct, criticize, democratize, integrate or mediate cultural values (and intercultural value conflicts). In that regard, the four classes

of basic human needs are at the same time integrating and transcending the civilizational-specific values of the French revolution and the western approach of Modernity.

Although there is no objective hierarchy, human beings and societies tend to prioritize basic human needs, and tend to base collective values or political ideologies on this prioritization. Marxism puts the basic human need of (material) wellbeing at the center of its ideology, liberalism puts the need for (political and economic) freedom at the center, nationalism puts the need for (national) identity at the center, while militarism puts the survival (of the state) at the center. In deep-rooted conflicts, one can often observe a pathological fixation on one of the basic needs. People are known to sacrifice their lives for their religious and cultural identity (such as the right to use their own language), while wellbeing and survival are often sacrificed in the struggle for freedom or identity.

The Transcend approach aims to deconstruct and reframe these ideologies or pathological fixations. It assumes that all basic human needs are equally important and that, if there is to be a sustainable solution to a conflict, all of these basic human needs must be fulfilled. There are no basic human needs for systems, states, institutions, organizations or political parties. The latter represent cultural values and social interests, and these values and interests can be translated and reframed according to basic human needs. This allows for a critical differentiation between basic interests/values and specific group-centered or ego-centered interests/values.

2.1.3 Social Philosophy

The social philosophy of the 'Transcend' approach recognizes that the dominant paradigms in the studies and politics of International Relations – such as the conservative 'peace through balance of power' or the liberal 'peace through law', are insufficient in order to transform conflicts in a sustainable manner. (We are referring here to a few meta-theoretical paradigms, not to the many theories like neo-realism, neo-institutionalism or social constructivism). The 'Transcend' approach is in search of 'conflict transformation with peaceful means', beyond the mythical assumptions of postmodern peace like 'democratic peace', 'humanitarian intervention' or 'comprehensive security'.

The same can be said for the dominant paradigms and myths in the studies and politics of development, modernization or civilization. "Galtung's evolving perspective on human development aimed to go beyond a political economy of development and explore how a particular worldview and development goal, the 'bourgeois way of life', permeated the globe. This global telos was seen to incorporate both underdevelopment on the global periphery and overdevelopment in the global center." (Lawler 1995: 151)

On the basis of the social-ecological and neo-humanistic paradigm of 'basic human needs for all', it follows a complex paradigm of 'peace by peaceful means', what could become concrete only through a dialogue with all conflict partners in a specific conflict constellation.

Inspired at the same time by oriental *bakhti* yoga (Gandhi's *satyagraha*) and occidental conscientización (Freire's Christian personalism), the 'Transcend' approach aims not only for non-violent behavior, but also structural symmetry (through equality, autonomy, integration and participation), cultural pluralism and individual self-realization.

When it comes to the philosophy of practice, the core concepts of the Transcend approach are *creativity*, *empathy* and *non-violence*. Non-violence is the corner stone of the approach, as violence only serves to further escalation to an endless cycle of retaliation.

The way out of violence is through creativity and empathy. Creativity, in all its forms, is what distinguishes human kind from other living beings. It is the mental capacity to see something that does not exist, and to then achieve it. Going from a structurally and culturally violent condition where the basic needs of many are unfulfilled, and imagining and fulfilling the achievement of basic needs for all, within a culturally and structurally peaceful system, requires that individuals (and groups) make use of their full creative potential. The work of conflict transformation must be less technical, less legalistic, and more creative in order to overcome the limitations of what has been done, to go beyond and create something new.

Empathy with the other ensures that the creative power is used for peaceful purposes rather than violent ones. As in Moreno's psycho-, socio- and axio-drama, it is putting oneself in the shoes of the other, reversing the roles to which one is accustomed (Graf 2006). This should not be confused with sympathy, which involves an affinity for the other or their actions. Th-

rough compassion and empathy one can understand the other, even if the others' ideas and actions are anathema to one's own.

2.2 Theories

2.2.1 A Complex Social Theory: Action, Structure, Culture and the Tri-Lateral Unconscious

Comparing the work of four major social theorists (Peter Berger, Norbert Elias, Michel Foucault and Anthony Giddens) Roger Sibeon explores their underlying concepts with regard to their distinctions between action- and structure-levels and between micro- and macro-dimensions, and is engaged in a critique of four long-standing deficient modes of social scientific thought – reductionism, essentialism, reification and functional teleology. He refers to new multi-level research strategies, especially that of Layder (1997). Layder identifies four social domains, two *subjective* and two *objective* dimensions of society: "These are psychobiography, the largely unique, asocial components of self and behavior; *situated activity*, which refers to face-to-face interaction and inter-subjectivity in situations of co-presence; *social settings*, that is, the locations in which situated activity occurs; and *contextual resources*, consisting of macro-distributions and ownerships of resources (relating, in particular, to social class, gender, and ethnic divisions) and widespread cultural meanings, discourses, and social practices." (Sibeon 2004: 187) Each domain has relative autonomy but overlaps and influences the others.

The theoretical basis of the 'Transcend' approach is very similar to this approach. It focuses on a deep understanding of the complex interdependencies of human interactions, structural relationships and cultural meanings and the unconscious. The unconscious means latent or implicit dimensions of all of these levels ('deep action', including deep behavior and deep psychology, 'deep structure' and 'deep culture'). At the deeper level of the conflict formations, there are collective behaviors of groups, including unconscious behaviors, which have the aim of fulfilling one's basic needs, with implications for the fulfillment of the basic human needs of the others. There is also the context of social structure, including unconscious (latent) contradictions (deep structure) and the context of cultural meaning, including unconscious (implicit) assumptions and attitudes (deep culture).

Galtung's tri-lateral concept of the unconscious is transcending the concepts of psychological unconscious of Freud, Adler or Jung. In future research, it should be integrated with other concepts, like the concept of large group identities (Volkan 1999), the 'political unconscious' (Jameson 2002) or the societal imagination (Castoriadis 1987).

Pathologies of Deep Structure

Deep structure can be defined as the unconscious or latent patterns of relations between the segments of society – between the old and the young, men and women, between races and ethnicities, between the powerful and the powerless, along every social cleavage. A deep structure is structurally violent when there is an asymmetry of power between the different segments of society resulting in the violation of the basic human needs of a group. It is then linked with discrimination and exploitation. Violent deep structures include slavery, colonialism, and patriarchy. Deep structure influences every aspect of a society's organization, and the patterns of power relations are often recreated in the family, workplace, and government.

Deep Structure can exhibit certain pathologies, and Galtung identifies these as the PSFM Syndrome (Galtung 1996). PSFM stands for Penetration, Segmentation, Fragmentation, and Marginalization. *Penetration* is the extent to which those with power are able to condition those without to accept the structure. *Segmentation* is the extent to which information is controlled by the elite, and where the average individual does not have access to the whole picture. *Fragmentation* is the extent to which those without power are isolated along the different fault-lines and therefore do not have contact with each other. *Marginalization* is the extent to which a segment of the population is prevented from interacting in society and the world at large.

There are remedies to PSFM, often found in the deep history of social organization of a given society, which is the basis for a peaceful deep structure. The counterpart to PSFM is autonomy instead of penetration, integration instead of segmentation, solidarity instead of fragmentation and participation instead of marginalization.

Pathologies of Deep Culture

The deep structure can be observed by looking at what the major societal fault-lines are, and which groups are favoured over others. For the analysis of the deep culture – for example ethno-nationalistic deep culture – it is important to look at the national anthems, street names, national myths, literature, sagas, music, statues, specific proverbs, and other similar carriers of the deep culture, and to reflect with the conflict party about the meanings that come with these symbols. It is also important, at this stage to reflect on collective trauma and glory and how this influences the conflict constellation on the surface. It might be also useful to start reflection on religious and cultural values and frameworks and how these influence the way how the conflict parties interpret the reality, how they make peace and war.

If assumptions and attitudes are on the surface, then below them are deeper attitudes and assumptions, the operating paradigms which form the deep culture, the sum of unconscious (usually forgotten or unspoken) practices, codes, discourses, directives, rules, stereotypes and prejudices about the self and the other. More specifically, deep culture is composed of the 'social cosmology' of a society. It is "a web of notions about what is true, good, right, beautiful, sacred' (Galtung 2000: 33).

In conflicts, and in particular in protracted conflicts, these deep attitudes and assumptions often work to impede a peaceful end to the conflict, and are the raw materials for the dynamics of escalation and polarization, which are in turn exacerbated by populist and fundamentalist policies. Throughout culture (in religion and ideology, language and art, empirical and formal science) such deep-cultural meanings can be used to legitimize direct or structural force, and are transferred from one generation to the next.

Lederach suggests a set of embedded circles that flow toward the past, starting with a circle that includes recent volatile events. "The circle of recent events lifts out the most visible expressions of the political, military, social, or economic conflicts." (Lederach 2005: 141) The circle of recent events phases into the wider sphere of 'lived history'. A third, wider circle of time is the context of memory, or 'remembered history'. Vamik Volkan is exploring this circle of time, particularly from the discipline of psychology, as remembered events that create a 'chosen trauma' (Volkan 1999). Finally, the deepest history, is the 'narrative', "the understanding of how people come to see their place on this earth, in a figurative sense and their place as tied to a

specific geography, in a literal sense" (Lederach 2005: 143). That is exactly the dimension Galtung characterizes as 'deep culture' (Galtung 1996).

Deep culture has its own pathologies. Galtung identifies the cognitive pathology of 'Dichotomy, Manichaeism, and Armageddon' (the DMA Syndrome) and an emotional pathology of 'Glory, Chosenness and Trauma' (the CGT syndrome). The DMA syndrome reduces each conflict constellation to only two conflict parties (Dichotomy), about which there is one good side, with an apposing bad or evil other (Manichaeism), so that a final decisive encounter becomes inevitable (Armageddon). Nations with a CGT syndrome suffer from heavy traumata (multiple traumatic events), and dwell on injuries and defeats that were perpetrated by enemies. They maintain and publicize myths, which tell of their past and future glory. And they believe in a political religion, believing that they are chosen by transcendental forces for political missions.

In times of crisis, when a group is faced with a complex situation yet needs to maintain consensus in order to (re)act effectively, these deeper dimensions of conflict assert themselves on the surface level. The way in which the situation is understood, and the ensuing reaction will be guided on the group level by the pathology of the deep culture. A basic hypothesis of Transcend is that a just, sustainable solution can be only achieved if the deeper dimensions are addressed and brought into the consciousness of the conflict parties. It is then that new, transformed attitudes and assumptions, goals and strategies, and behavior can be realized.

2.2.2 Peace, Development, Civilizations – and the Tri-Lateral Theory of Violence

The complex social theory allows the construction of a critical-constructivist peace theory, on the basis of a complex tri-lateral theory of violence: direct, structural and cultural violence and in the following a theory of peace, a theory of conflict transformation, a theory of development and a theory of civilizations (Galtung 1996). It encompasses what is violence, what is the conflict formation underlying the violence, what is the perspective of a peaceful solution and what is the way to conflict transformation and peacebuilding.

Direct, structural and cultural violence as a theoretical model for violence goes beyond the common understanding of violence. A riot/revolt/re-

volution with the accompanying violence remains puzzling without a deeper understanding of violence. Mass violence does not erupt without a reason, although the reason is not a justification. This type of direct violence is an event. To understand the event one needs to understand the process that led to it.

Structural violence is the difference between the potential and the actual. Although the potential and the actual can in practice never coincide completely, it is more the enormous gulf between the two which is worrisome. A violent structure impedes the development of the group and the self through a structure (sometimes visible, usually not). Cultural violence is the hardest to change, it is the deep-rooted constant that generates and legitimates structural and direct violence, especially when there is a reaction (violent or not) against the structural violence by those who are victims of it.

From this point of view, 'development' can be defined as the process of structural conflict transformation, in search of the fulfillment of basic human needs, with the possible outcome of more structural violence or more structural peace; and civilization as the process of cultural conflict transformation, with the possible outcome of more cultural violence or more cultural peace towards 'the other'. Peace, development and civilization are interrelated.

The majority of approaches dealing with conflict are limited to the understanding of violence as direct violence. At best, the result can be a compromise that brings an end to direct violence. In general the conflict is put on ice, until at some point it re-emerges. In the worst cases, of which there are a number, the violence is worse than before. There is, in any case, no sustainable peace to be had. The 'justice' gap therefore needs to be addressed; the violent structures and cultures need to be transformed.

2.2.3 Conflict and Conflict Transformation

In the 'Transcend' approach, conflict is seen as having three main components- attitudes, behaviors, and contradictions. Conflict is not the same as violence. Conflict is a challenge. The outcome, whether it is creative, constructive and peaceful, or whether it is violent and destructive, depends mainly on behaviors, attitudes and goals. The behavior is the visible element of the conflict. Often, as the cycle of animosity and violence spirals, the contradiction (the incompatibility of goals) is eventually forgotten. This is espe-

cially the case of protracted violent conflicts, in which violence creates a self-perpetuating dynamic, and the violence obscures the real contradiction.

A Complex Model for Conflict Dynamics

Human beings, in order to fulfill their basic human needs, become part of a group, and develop specific individual as well as group goals. In the outside world, these goals meet the goals of others, and when the goals are incompatible, a contradiction occurs and a conflict emerges. If the contradiction is perceived negatively and no solution can be found, it is likely that it will lead to an act of violence. This act does not resolve the contradiction. To the contrary, violence has the effect of worsening the contradiction. Violence then often leads to counter-violence, further polarizing the attitudes and assumptions about the others, setting in motion a process of de-humanization.

Experiencing large scale violence is always a traumatic event. When a society is exposed to that, it needs to come up with coping mechanisms. Myths are created and passed on from one generation to the next. In this way, collective traumas can endure for centuries. They are stored within the deep culture and are often reactivated in situations of crisis, once again influencing the actions and goals of the individual or group.

Similar dynamics can be analyzed with regard to the structures. The experience of collective trauma through war and violence and the inability to resolve the contradiction(s) lead to the creation of structures that only serve the purpose of achieving the fulfillment of basic needs of one's own people, excluding the needs of the others. Since the others are perceived as an obstacle to achieving their goals, this leads to discrimination, exploitation and in the worst case, an attempt to destroy the others – even if this leads to self-destruction.

A Complex Model for Conflict Transformation: Diagnosis, Prognosis and Therapy

The conflict transformation process follows the model of 'diagnosis', 'prognosis' and 'therapy' as developed in the centuries of medical sciences and practices. This is a metaphor of course, and especially a metaphor for soft or alternative medicine and for soft or alternative psychotherapy. If someone does not like this metaphor, it could be easily changed to the model

of 'systemic therapy' (with the concepts of 'observation' instead of 'diagnosis and prognosis', 'solution-orientation' instead of 'therapy').

The aim of conflict counseling and peace dialogue is to empower participants to be able to escape vicious cycles of violence by fostering a more complex understanding of conflict dynamics, the conscientization of the deeper contexts, and the reframing of goals. This should take them from operating on the basis of positions, to that of interests, then values, and finally to engage the other on the basis of basic human needs as the common human ground for all conflict parties, working to overcome the incompatibility of goals.

2.3 Praxeology

The 'Transcend' approach's praxeology is based on deep dialogue, or trans-cultural and trans-civilizational *poli-logue* (Wimmer 2002), as a method for delving below the superficial level, and into the 'collective unconscious'.

The praxeology of the 'Transcend' approach stipulates that each conflict party should be worked with separately in order to develop their understanding of their own goals as well as developing vertical interdependence (in order to prepare the conflict parties for creative negotiation and mediation).

This, however, cannot be achieved at the negotiating table. Therefore the transcend praxeology does not start with a roundtable. It does not wait for the readiness of the oppressor for a dialogue, but starts the dialogue within each conflict party, especially within the civil society. There is always someone within a conflict party who is in search of a creative solution.

This means bringing together a broad range of individuals, from the same conflict party, but with different backgrounds, like government officials, NGO representatives, local leaders, military personnel, journalists, religious leaders and intellectuals. This has been the approach in our own project in Sri Lanka too.

Each segment of the population represented brings in insights that would not normally be shared with those from such different backgrounds. It allows the process to go along vertical lines rather than horizontal ones, and like this vertical interdependence is fostered. Each participant on their return can act as multipliers, and their efforts within their segment of the population should be assisted by the conflict workers. Such activities are es-

pecially important at the grassroots level, empowering them as well as conveying the insights developed during dialogue seminars.

The participants of such seminars take part in their personal capacity and the sessions are carried out under the Chatham House Rule. The unofficial private nature of the meeting allows for individuals to express ideas and explore possibilities, which would be against the stated position of their respective organizations. It also helps build a collegial and trusting atmosphere necessary for an honest and deep dialogue. As well, if possible, it is best to take the participants out of the context of the conflict and into a third country which is not party to the conflict. Participants have often commented that this has allowed them to gain a different perspective on the issues.

The praxeology also includes a multiple-orientation approach. Attitudes, behaviors and contradictions must be worked on simultaneously. On the attitude/process level, the stress is on developing empathy for the other parties. On the behavior level, the stress is on non-violence. On the level of the contradiction, the solution is elaborated based on the principle of creative conflict transformation and the attainment of basic human needs for all.

The goal of the conflict worker is the achievement of the basic human needs for all. It also reassures the conflict parties that the conflict worker will not sympathize with one conflict party more than another. When a conflict party may have committed a disproportionate amount of the violence, they know it, and become very defensive, sensitive to criticism. The reference to basic human needs as the clear partisanship of a conflict worker allows the conflict parties to understand that criticism is not against them as individuals, nor coming from a moralizing standpoint.

A further characteristic of the praxeology is that the conflict worker may put forth their own ideas and proposals for possible solutions, especially when there is an impasse on an issue. This must be done carefully, and with the clear message that this is a proposal for consideration, not an imposition. It should always remain up to the conflict party to decide whether to follow that proposal or reject it.

3. The Deep Dialogue Process: Four Phases, Seven Steps

Galtung structures the 'Transcend' approach along four phases (with four methods):
- The first phase is to understand the goals of the conflict parties.
- The second phase is the reframing of illegitimate goals into legitimate goals, with the criteria of the fulfillment of basic human needs of all conflict parties.
- The third phase consists of the elaboration of an overarching formula for a sustainable solution on the basis of the integration of these legitimate goals.
- The fourth phase is the process of (re)conciliation.

Complementary to Galtung's four phases for conflict transformation, the authors of this article have developed over the past four years the practice of a six step process for a 'deep dialogue process' (plus a seventh step for reconciliation), applicable in different forms of conflict transformation from conflict training or education to conflict counseling and conflict moderation (facilitation, conferencing, negotiation, mediation), at the micro, meso or macro levels, either before, during or after violence. Each of these seven steps addresses a particular concern for conflict transformation, alternating according to a double dialectic between analysis/observation and therapy/solution, and between past and future, with both dialectics being anchored in the present.

The aim of Phase I (which is composed of Steps 1 and 2) is to go from antagonism to empathy, and develop a more complex understanding of the conflict formation. Step 1 is a form of analysis of the present. The goal is to develop an understanding of all actors, their behaviors/strategies and relationships, and of the contradiction. The guiding question is: What is the conflict about? Step 2 is the analysis of the past, a diagnosis geared towards understanding the assumptions and attitudes of the conflict parties and how they interact with the contradictions and the goals. Here the main question is: How did the conflict occur?

In Phase II, the process is one of going from empathy to creativity, to differentiate between 'just/legitimate' and 'unjust/illegitimate' goals. The goal is the transformation of illegitimate goals into legitimate ones that respect the basic human needs of all conflict parties. Step 3 is a therapy of

the past, a form of social constructivism in which there is an exploration of the collective unconscious of the conflict formation. The leading question is: What is the context (obstacles and resources) of the conflict? Step 4 is an analysis of the future, a form of 'prognosis' through the analysis of the basic needs constellations, and the fixations or 'pathologies' which are present. This can be achieved by asking: How will it continue, if nothing is changed?

Phase III is the process of going from creative invention to nonviolent action. It entails the construction of an overarching formula that fulfills all legitimate goals and the creation of a new reality between the conflict parties. In Step 5, the therapy of the future, new attitudes, assumptions and goals are constructed, integrating the basic human needs of all conflict parties. The guiding question is: What can be done? In Step 6, the therapy of the present, an action plan is constructed and new practices are elaborated. The leading question is: What are the next steps?

Phase IV with Step 7 is closing the conflict transformation process of Phase III and opening the process of (re)conciliation; the building of new peaceful relationships between each of the conflict parties.

It is important to stress that this whole process of deep dialogue(s) is not a sequential process. The seven steps were elaborated for didactical purposes and serve the purpose to make conflict workers, counselors and facilitators aware of the different dimensions and dynamics of conflict formations, and to provide them with a mental map for finding the right questions in the right time, when working with each conflict party separately. It is not about getting from Step 1 through to 7, and thinking that the process is complete. The process goes from one phase to the others and back again. All seven steps can occur within a day, yet not be achieved after a period of years. It is the mental map, but not the landscape of a conflict formation.

4. Conclusion: Beyond Neutrality

As we have tried to show, the 'Transcend' approach – open to an integration of many other approaches like the Freire Method (1992), the Moreno Approach (1953), the Tree Model Approach (Volkan 1999), the Te-

tralemma Approach (Varga von Kibed 2002) and others – should allow the conflict worker to refer to a philosophy, a critical social theory (not only of society but also of world society) and a comprehensive praxeology for conflict transformation through (deep) dialogue. The tools and methods should come out of such a philosophy, theory and praxeology, and should be guided by them.

In the 'Transcend' approach there is also the basis for a new legitimacy of the intervention of the conflict worker, beyond classic neutrality or all-partiality. Especially in the case of representatives from the hegemonic Western world working in other parts of the world, training and constant further education in self-reflection of their own civilizational values, social interests and basic needs hierarchies, is crucial. In this approach, legitimacy for any kind of intervention is based on the dialectic relationship between a conscious partiality of the conflict worker for the basic human needs for all and the practice of an all-partial and self-reflective dialogue with all conflict partners.

So equipped, the conflict worker may be able to grasp the moment of 'serendipity' (Lederach 2005: 113f.) and may, further more, be able to actively work towards the *kairos* points in history that enable radical social change with peaceful means. Serendipity means the making of discoveries by accident, while in pursuit of something else, like the discoveries of The *Three Princes of Serendip*, which refers to an old name for Sri Lanka. As Lederach writes, "[S]erendipity, it seems, is the wisdom of recognizing and then moving with the energetic flow of the unexpected. It has a crablike quality, an ability to accumulate understanding and create progress by moving sideways rather than in a direct linear fashion." (Lederach 2005: 115)

[1] More information about our projects, workshops and trainings are available on our website at www.iicp.at. With regards to our dialogue project in Sri Lanka, see the article of Brigitte Voykovitsch („Österreichische Friedensbrücken", Die Gazette) and several articles of Ralf Leonhard (Südwind), available on the IICP website.

References

Assefa, Hizkias (1999): The Meaning of Reconciliation. People building Peace: 35 Inspiring Stories from Around the World. Utrecht: European Center for Conflict Prevention.

Castoriadis, Cornelius (1987): The Imaginary Institution of Society. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chigas, Diana V. (1997): Unofficial Interventions with Official Actors: Parallel Negotiation Training in Violent Intrastate Conflicts. In: International Negotiation 2 (3), 409–436.

Chomsky, Noam (1981): Sprache und Verantwortung. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Fisher, Ronald J. (1997): Training as Interactive Conflict Resolution: Characteristics and Challenges. In: International Negotiation 2 (3), 331–351.

Freire, Paulo (1992): Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Galtung, Johan (1977): Empiricism, Criticism and Constructivism: Three Aspects of Scientific Activity. In (same, ed.): Methodology and Ideology 1. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 160-189.

Galtung, Johan (1996): Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace, Conflict, Development and Civilization. London: Sage.

Galtung, Johan (1998): 21st Century Conflict Formations: Diagnosis, Prognosis, Therapy. Working paper. Right Livelihood Award.

Galtung, Johan (2000): Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the Transcend Method). United Nations Disaster Management Program. Geneva: United Nations.

Galtung, Johan (2002): The Epistemology and Methodology of Peace Studies. Center for Peace Studies at the University of Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway. http://uit.no/getfile.php?PageId=3324&FileId=37, 20.3.2006.

Galtung, Johan (2004): Transcend and Transform: An Introduction to Conflict Work. New York: Pluto Press.

Graf, Wilfried (2006): Soziometrie, Friedensforschung und kreative Konfliktbearbeitung. Einladung zu einer Begegnung zwischen J. L. Moreno und Johan Galtung. In: Zeitschrift für Psychodrama und Soziometrie 2 (5), o.S.

Hill, B. J. (1982): An Analysis of Conflict Resolution Techniques: From Problem-Solving Workshops to Theory. In: The Journal of Conflict Resolution 26 (1), 109-138.

Jameson, Fredric (1991): The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Durham, NC: Duke UP.

Jameson, Fredric (2002): The Political Uncounscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act. Cornell University Press 1981. London: Routledge Classics 2002.

Lawler, Peter (1995): A Question of Values: Johan Galtung´s Peace Research. Boulder, Colorado: Kynne Rienner Publishers.

Layder, Derek (1997): Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions. London: UCL Press.

Lederach, John Paul (1995): Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

Lederach, John Paul (1999): Just Peace: The challenges of the 21st Century. People building Peace: 35 Inspiring Stories from Around the World. Utrecht: European Center for Conflict Prevention.

Lederach, John Paul (2005): The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Lumsden, Malvern (1996): The Evolution of the Problem-solving Workshop: An Introduction to Social-Psychological Approaches to Conflict Resolution. In: Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology 2 (1), 37-67.

Max-Neef, Manfred (1991): Human Scale Development. New York: The Apex Press.

Moreno, Jakob Levy (1953): Who shall survive. Foundations of Sociometry. New York: Beacon House.

Morin, Edgar (1999): Homeland Earth; A New Manifesto for the New Millenium. First French edition Paris 1993. New Jersey: Hampton Press.

Naranjo, Claudio (1993): Gestalt Therapy: The Attitude and Practice of an Atheoretical Experientialism. Nevada City, CA: Gateways Books and Tapes.

O'Toole, Kathleen (1997): Why peace agreements often fail to end civil wars. Stanford Report Online. http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/1997/november19/civilwar.html, 26.3.2006.

Purkarthofer, Petra (2000): Verhandlung und Mediation: Permanenter Dialog als Weg zu dauerhaftem Frieden. In: Bilek, Anita/Kramer, Helmut/Graf, Wilfried (Hg.): Welcher Friede? Lehren aus dem Krieg um Kosovo. Beiträge der Friedensforschung. Münster: agenda Verlag, 62-75.

Ropers, Norbert. (2004): From Resolution to Transformation: The Role of Dialogue Projects. In: Bloomfield, David/Fischer, Martina/Schmelzle, Beatrix: The Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation. www.berghof-handbook.net, 30.8.2006.

Rothman, Jay/Olson, Marie L. (2001): From Interests to Identities: Towards a New Emphasis in Interactive Conflict Resolution. In: Journal of Peace Research 38 (3) (Special Issue on Conflict Resolution in Identity-Based Disputes), 289-305.

Said, Edward W. (1983): The World, the Text, and the Critic. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Sibeon, Roger A. (2004): Rethinking Social Theory. London: Sage Publications.

Varga von Kibed, Matthias (2002): Ganz im Gegenteil. Heidelberg: Carl Auer System Verlag.

Volkan, Vamik D. (1999): Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism. Boulder: Westview Press.

Wilber, Ken (1995): Sex, Ecology, Spirituality. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.

Wimmer, Franz Martin (2002): Polylog – interkulturelle Philosophie. In: Schmied-Kowarzik, Wolfdietrich (Hg.): Verstehen und Verständigung. Ethnologie – Xenologie – interkulturelle Philosophie. Wurzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 303-324.

Abstracts

Der erste Teil dieses Artikels evaluiert kritisch die Entwicklungen und Defizite von Konfliktbearbeitung und Friedensentwicklung. Der Artikel bezieht sich dafür hauptsächlich auf die Forschung von John Paul Lederach und seine Wiederentdeckung des Werkes von Paulo Freire, das einen kritischen Ansatz zu Konfliktbearbeitung auf der Basis von Dialog ermöglicht. Der zweite Teil gibt einen Überblick über das *Transcend* Verfahren von Johan Galtung, ein integratives Verfahren für Konfliktbearbeitung und Friedensentwicklung, das ebenfalls auf Dialog fokussiert und versucht, die aufgezeigten Defizite in Konfliktbearbeitung und Friedensentwicklung auf der Grundlage einer umfassenden Philosophie, Theorie und Praxeologie zu überwinden.

The first part of this article offers a critical evaluation of the field's development and the deficits which can be observed, referring in particular to the research of John Paul Lederach and his rediscovery of Paulo Freire's work for a critical approach of conflict transformation based on dialogue. The second part gives an overview of Johan Galtung's 'Transcend' approach. Focused also on dialogue, it aims to overcome the mentioned deficits in conflict transformation and peacebuilding on the basis of a comprehensive philosophy, theory and praxeology.

Wilfried Graf, Gudrun Kramer, Augustin Nicolescou
Institute for Integrative Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding
Guglgasse 8/4/4/18
1110 Wien
iicp@iicp.at