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On March 15 and 16, 2007, Coexistence International (CI) and the International Center for Ethics, Justice, and Public Life sponsored a two-day conference, *Pieces of the Coexistence Puzzle: Democracy, Human Rights, Gender and Development*, at Brandeis University. The conference was presented in cooperation with the Programs in Sustainable International Development at the Heller School for Social Policy and Management, the Department of Politics, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences with support from the Martin Weiner Lecture Fund.

*Pieces of the Coexistence Puzzle* examined the relationships that exist between coexistence, democracy, human rights, gender, and development. Coexistence is defined as achieving peaceful, positive, and equal relationships among groups of people. While each of these disciplines represents a distinct area of work with particular frameworks and strategies, they share a commitment to peaceful, just, and sustainable societies. Resolving conflicts and creating lasting peace in divided societies requires the collaboration of specialists working in a variety of fields. These disciplines must interact and cooperate, or peacebuilding efforts risk falling short of their goals. During the conference, practitioners and scholars with a range of regional and thematic expertise reflected on conflict situations and coexistence initiatives from around the world and discussed the challenges and possibilities presented by a more integrated approach to coexistence work.

CI was pleased to have the conference opened with a keynote address by Senator Mobina Jaffer of Canada, the former Special Envoy for Peace in Sudan. A leader committed to equality for women and the promotion of human rights, Senator Jaffer argued that true coexistence is only possible when basic human rights are fulfilled. To Senator Jaffer, living in peace despite differences requires that resources be shared and that more equal access opportunities be created for women, men, and children, illustrating the need for complementarity between coexistence, development, gender equality, and other related issues. Senator Jaffer’s keynote address set the tone for the subsequent sessions on Friday, which revealed our panelists’ strong commitment to a more peaceful, just world, regardless of the language they use to describe their work.

The conference was organized around five critical questions:

- What is the potential for a complementary approach to building sustainable peace?
- What are the legacies of violent conflict in developing democratic societies?
- In the aftermath of human rights abuses, what roles do judicial initiatives play in both strengthening and complicating coexistence?
- How do principles of gender equality factor into post-conflict reconstruction?
- Do our academic programs equip students with the knowledge, skills, and capacities to work in a holistic manner?

While each conference panel was unique in its focus, some consistent themes emerged from the presentations and discussions that followed. Throughout the day it was clear that practitioners and scholars employ a range of terms to discuss their work in pre-conflict, conflict, and post-conflict situations. But despite the use of distinct language and approaches, the participants shared a vision of a world where groups recognize their interdependence and actively pursue equality. The participants acknowledged that to move in the direction of such a world, we need to educate future practitioners and policymakers in a more integrated way that imparts a holistic, interdisciplinary lens.

Participants also raised questions about what constitutes a field, and whether there is, in fact, a coexistence or peacebuilding field. Most participants agreed that peacebuilding does exist as a field, but that it has fluid boundaries since it is working towards a broad goal. This means that the efforts of a coexistence practitioner, a human rights practitioner, and an environmental conservationist all...
have an impact on the success, or lack of success, of the others who are working towards related goals. To make these relationships productive and useful, conference participants agreed on the importance of reflecting on, and learning about, how these fields interact. Those who were more skeptical about the coexistence or peacebuilding field argued that this work is a confluence of many things: history, political science, and language, among others. They contended that it is premature and unnecessary to define these distinct areas of work and strategies as a “field.”

Panelists constantly highlighted some of the challenges to achieving coexistence. These included:

- **Attitudes**: Conflict and unequal relationships are often driven by fear or a quest for power. This includes the thinking that “my ideas must prevail over your ideas,” or zero-sum thinking.
- **Structures and Institutions**: National and foreign policy agendas that do not create incentives for promoting human security and development, as well as inefficient institutions, can harm efforts to achieve more peaceful societies.
- **Historical and Cultural Context**: Religious, sectarian, racial, ethnic, nationalistic, and ideological differences can make people and groups feel afraid and isolated; so instead of moving closer, we move apart.
- **Gaps in Access and Opportunities**: Inequalities based on gender, economics, race, etc. inhibit the possibility of achieving coexistence. A key message of many participants was that until there is increased economic justice and more equal opportunities, coexistence cannot be achieved.

Ideas also surfaced about how to overcome some of these challenges. The most important ideas included addressing gaps in access and opportunities by collaborating with other fields. This may mean using a gender lens in peacebuilding so that women are invited into policy-level discussions and gain the status and resources to become less vulnerable to violence. It could also mean infusing a democratization process with more conflict-sensitivity so that it is participatory and inclusive, and advocating human rights options that have the potential both to hold people accountable and help restore societies, bridging what is sometimes constructed as a peace versus justice dichotomy.

Participants also advocated the importance of prioritizing local knowledge, experience, and capacity in the quest for coexistence. Engaging national governments and exploring the strengths and approaches of local communities is critical. An entire panel focused on how developing knowledge and capacities through education and training is also a channel for improving coexistence. Programs and curricula that balance the academic and the practical, and encourage students to think and act in a more complementary fashion are critical to establishing the building blocks for an integrated approach. Panelists also stressed the need to infuse coexistence curriculum into other academic programs so that students in public policy, sustainable development, conflict resolution, and other programs are familiar with the theories and models of coexistence – and vice-versa.

The important ideas, themes, and questions brought into focus by *Pieces of the Coexistence Puzzle* continue to inform the work of Coexistence International in bringing together practitioners and scholars from a range of levels, regions, and related fields in order to explore the nexus of coexistence and other areas of work. As a follow-up to the conference, in October 2007, CI convened *Pieces of the Coexistence Puzzle: Part II*, a day of problem-solving workshops examining creative approaches to specific conflict situations, including ethnic divisions in Sri Lanka and Serbia, transitional justice in West Africa, peacebuilding in East Africa, security of immigrant communities in Waltham, MA, and relations among Iran, Israel, and the United States. CI believes that conversations like these are the key to understanding the issues that prevent us from realizing the world we all envision. With more knowledge, integration, and cooperation, and with the help of practitioners and scholars like the ones who participated in this conference, we hope that CI can contribute to changes that will bring this shared vision closer to reality.

We thank the participants, sponsors, and all who attended the conference and shared invaluable insights and experiences. Most of all we thank the Alan B. Slifka Foundation, whose generous gift and support enables CI to carry out important programs such as this one.
It is still very dark. Fatima cannot see around her hut. She wants to walk to the well to collect water. It will take her two hours. Light appears in her hut. She gingerly leaves, being careful not to wake up the rest of her family. She places two pots on her head and she walks, and walks, and walks. She continues walking until she finds some water. She makes it back in time to cook her family breakfast. She prepares her children for school and then goes to the market to sell her crafts. She has a good day at the market, so she is able to buy a few vegetables and some meat for her family. She picks her children up from school, walks home, cooks her family a meal, cleans, puts her children to bed, and continues making her crafts until it becomes dark again.

Susan has just heard the alarm. She rushes downstairs to try to fit in some exercise. She prepares lunch for her children. She hurries them to school and rushes to work. There’s a lot of traffic and she will be late. Susan has a very busy day at work. She gets some takeout, and her children, her husband, and herself eat around the television. She prepares her children for bed and cleans the house while it is quiet. She works late on the tasks she didn’t finish at the office.

Both Fatima and Susan have full days in very different parts of the world. Both of these are very strong women, but they have very different realities. So I am going to say to you today that when we talk about coexistence, I think we have to talk about how we exist with each other. We have not yet reached the stage of the existence. I don’t have any of the answers. I am hoping that we can create some over the next few days. Since I was given this opportunity it has made me think about what my personal experiences have been, and I’m hoping that for the next two days you will challenge me, and I’m hoping that we can exchange a lot of gifts and ideas.

So what is coexistence? CI’s beautiful brochure says that coexistence means peaceful and positive relationships between groups that are different from one another. My dictionary definition is to live in peace with one another despite difference, especially as a matter of policy. For me, coexistence means to live in harmony. But harmony doesn’t just mean not to have conflict. For me, it means that there needs to be a sharing of resources. Then I think that we can talk about coexistence. I’ve been very fortunate to represent the Canadian government in Sudan and I will share with you a few of my experiences there. For me, coexistence is when my friend Amina’s life will be the same as our children’s lives. Let me tell you about my friend Amina. She is two years old. I met her in Darfur in a refugee camp. Amina’s mother was raped by the militia. She was abandoned by her family. Amina lives in the camp, with war waging around her. Her chances of receiving an education are limited. Whether she will have any access to a job, or opportunity to improve her life, will depend on all of us in this room, and others, who can help resolve the dispute in Darfur.

In Canada and the US, how can we use our democracy to tell our governments that we want to share our resources, and that we want basic human rights and gender equality for all? Coexistence means that Amina will receive an education, access, and experience like our children. Presently, Amina just exists. In this room, I have complete conviction that we can start asking these questions about coexistence and about how we are using our resources. We can change the lives of people. Let me tell you something about the realities that I have been seeing lately. When I first went to Darfur, I was very naive; I expected there to be UN tents when I arrived. I expected there to be some type of resources for the people in Darfur. But the reality was that Darfurians are very poor; they are working all day to collect firewood and meanwhile they are being attacked. This is the reality of people who exist in Darfur.
I believe that the path to coexistence, even though it is not as straightforward as we may like, is one that we all have to walk so that our children and Amina will have some of the same advantages. The differences that we can make are in how we approach being a part of our own democracy. It makes me angry when people say that we go abroad and bring democracies to other countries, because in our own countries we do not actually exercise our rights. We need to vote. We need to lobby our government and use the power of influence so that our government can decide how we prioritize our resources. Do we use our resources to bring stability to a country, or do we use them to bring instability? I’m a politician and I stand in front of you and say: “I feel that I have failed, because I have not been able to convince my own government to use resources to change people’s lives.” That, for me, is what democracy is: to control your own environment to make change; to use our resources to create basic human rights in other countries.

In 1972, for a very short time, I became a refugee. I am almost embarrassed to tell you, because it was nothing like what the Darfurians or other refugees are facing. But for a short time, I had no home. I was being fed by very generous governments. I had a little baby and I would say to everybody, because I was breastfeeding: “I have the milk. I need the diapers.” It was so difficult because people would say things like: “But we gave you diapers yesterday, why do you need them again?” What it taught me is that when you really get everything taken away from you, God does it for a reason so that you can understand the realities of other people. So I believe that when you talk about coexistence, you should first talk about the right to eat, the right to clean water, and the right to shelter. There are 16,000 children around the world today who die from hunger every day, more than from any other cause. That is one every five seconds. 400 million children around the world today have no access to safe water. That is one in five children around the world. 640 million children each year do not have adequate shelter. That is one in three children in the world. So I say to you that for coexistence, we need to use our democracies to make sure people have basic human rights, to food, water, and shelter.

We also have to make sure that gender is a part of that equation of human rights. We have to work towards equality of women. When I was in Southern Sudan, a woman said to me “I want you to go back to Canada and tell people that I want to be equal like you are and have the same resources you have.” I want to share with you a poem that an Afghan woman wrote about gender, called “Speechless”:

At home, I speak the language of the gender that is better than me.
In the mosque, I speak the language of the nation that is better than me.
Outside, I speak the language of those who are the better race.
I am a non-Arabic Muslim woman who lives in a Western country.
The human rights that you and I need to work on are to make sure that people reach equality. If we do not look at peoples’ basic human rights, we cannot speak about development. Think about it: the days that you go hungry, do you really work at developing your mind, or are you all the time thinking about how you can feed yourself?

I want you to challenge me on this. I look at development very differently. The only reason I can stand in front of you, and why I have made the progress I have in my life, is because I have an education. When Idi Amin sent me out of Uganda, I only came with my baby and my husband to Canada. Amin even destroyed my certificates, but he could not take away my education. That was fortunate. So therefore I say that when we look at development, we need to promote education so that people can stand on their own two feet. But education on its own is not enough. We need to work at access and then experience. I was already an adult when I came to this country from England. And when I came here I saw that, in the law firm I worked for, men were getting all the access to cases and to other events while I was always the research person. And because of the access they got, they were able to get experience. So when people say “why aren’t women advancing as far as men are?” it is because we still have not reached access and experience. They go hand in hand. That’s what fosters individual rights, and that’s what fosters coexistence: when you provide education, access, and experience to people.

In Canada, we look at the challenges faced by women and minorities. We have reached a stage of education, we have even sometimes reached a stage of access, but we haven’t quite reached the stage of experience. So then I want you to think about how much worse it is in the rest of the world. There’s one situation I would like to share with you because, as a Canadian, I feel very responsible. My nation (and I think yours to a certain extent) is a consumer of trafficking. In the Senate I was the person that sponsored a bill to fight trafficking. One of the reasons we introduced it is because it was something great the United States had done. The government of the United States had created a system of report cards, to grade different countries on how they were dealing with the issue of human trafficking. To do my homework, I went to a detention camp in Nigeria. When I arrived there I was taken to a camp where forty little 7 year-old girls had been brought from northern Nigeria because a United States office was set up in Nigeria to make sure that girls were detected before they disappeared to Europe. To see forty 7 year-old girls sitting there not having any idea of what they were going to face, you feel so responsible because we in Europe and North America are the consumers of trafficking. I stand here before you and say that, in my country, millions of women are coming from Asia and they’re being trafficked across Canada. These little girls, what have they done to deserve the horrible challenges that they faced? I believe that we in North America have the opportunity to change the lives of these children.

But first, we need to start here in our own countries. I get very frustrated when people think that bad things happen outside North America, and they do not look at things in their own country. When I first became a Senator in 2001, I was very shocked that women who would never accept men to speak for them suddenly took upon themselves to be the voices of Afghani women. We decided that we knew what was good for Afghani women. I found that very offensive. I went to my prime minister and I said, “We have 40,000 Afghani Canadians. Don’t you think we should ask them what they think should happen in their own country?” Because they are integrated into our society, should we not ask them what should happen in theirs? The Stone in the Water Report, which came out of a roundtable of Afghani-Canadian women discussing applications of UN Resolution 1325, was so named because if you put a stone in the water, the ripples go on and on. We need to stop that circle. We need to stop that circle within our countries to empower communities there, to use our human rights in these communities because that is where we have control. That’s where we first need to empower women. Let me share with
you another poem by an Afghani woman called “The Blind Bird”:

The thunder of missiles
blows away the Burqa
from my face
The veil I had on from shame and sorrow
Do you remember me as a bride
who was supposed to be unveiled by a proud groom?

At that time my eyes were closed from shyness
but now my eyes are closed because of the bareness of the truth
For the fire of shame that is burning

The Burqa is blown away
from a faceless body
How am I supposed to keep a face in front of the world
when you have denied me my dignity?
How should I claim my dignity when all parts of it are destroyed
by your wrongdoings?

Let me touch the walls
to find my way home
Let me find my way by the brightness of the explosions
Let me search for my children in neighbouring countries
Let me cry and scream
for the years we have lost at being apart
Let me learn how to live in peace by peacekeeper troops
Let me eat from thrown food packages to survive

I am the Blind Bird
with a destroyed nest
My eyes need time to be familiar with the light
Let me touch my surroundings to know what I have lost

So I talked about how for coexistence we need to use our democracy to look at basic human rights and to empower women. Then look at the communities that we live in to see what should be happening there before we run and try to make a difference in other communities. We have a very large Sri Lankan community in Canada. The Sri Lankan community taught me that when you educate a man, you educate an individual, but when you educate a woman, you educate her family and her nation. These women have tried very hard to give to the peace talks, and yet they are not included. So we have a lot of work to do within our governments to make sure the women are in power. One of my most amazing experiences in the Sri Lankan community was when a gentleman at the back of the room wanted to speak to me, and he realized I would never speak until I had spoken to a woman first. So one of the things that I highly suggest is that when we send delegates we make sure that we “walk the talk” and that half of the delegates are women. When you have a mix of men and women at the peace tables, and also from other countries, it can make a difference.

So I leave you with this talk today that for coexistence we need to use our own democratic rights to get our government to prioritize how we are going to use our resources. How are we going to empower women? Are we walking the talk? Are we doing the same thing within our own communities? Are you going to believe that we have arrived at coexistence? I think we are just existing. So I ask tonight, who will sleep comfortably? Right now we can create coexistence in our communities by using our democratic rights so that we can give secure human rights to people around the world and empower them. Then we can develop equal rights in education, access, and experience. When I was little in Uganda, my mother always told me to practice piano. I’m sure many of you had a similar experience. And to make her angry I would sometimes just play on the black keys, and sometimes I’d only play on the white keys. I encourage you to try that; it doesn’t really bring harmony when you only concentrate resources in one part of the world. To have real coexistence, you have to be able to play on the black and white keys. Thank you very much.
Participants in the opening panel on Integrating Coexistence, Democracy, Human Rights, Gender and Development broadly introduced the possibilities and challenges of coexistence and related fields, setting the tone for the subsequent panels. Robert Ricigliano, Director of the Institute of World Affairs and the Peace Studies Program at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, moderated the panel and provided some cautionary words that as the coexistence field moves from the periphery into the center, practitioners and scholars need to be prepared to translate words into action to ensure that the meaning, and not just the terminology, of coexistence is wholeheartedly adopted.

Theodore Johnson, of the MA Program in Coexistence and Conflict at Brandeis, provided the audience with his thoughts on the barriers and opportunities to coexistence work. First, Johnson reiterated the definition of coexistence advocated by Coexistence International: peaceful and positive relationships between groups that are different from one another. This definition allows for a broader understanding of coexistence as involving not just social inclusion or integration, but also peace, justice, equality, security, and respect. Taking this definition as a starting point, Johnson detailed three barriers to realizing coexistence. The first barrier is attitude, particularly a “zero-sum worldview,” which divides people into “us versus them” and contributes to structural inequality and competition for power and resources. Fear or a quest for power motivates people to marginalize others through violent means. Second, there is the barrier of structures and institutions. Structural barriers crowd out the voices of the marginalized and make all actions dependent on the institutional policy agenda. The third barrier is historical and cultural context enables us to further marginalize those who we think are different and therefore threatening. Johnson then laid out some ways to meet and overcome these barriers: education and practice, developing conflict-sensitive skills, and mainstreaming coexistence. These approaches prepare practitioners and scholars in the field to challenge the barriers to achieving coexistence. Johnson further illustrated his points by using the example of Iraq, where he has worked on coexistence and conflict resolution issues since 2001. He warned that, in Iraq, “there is an opportunity for people to trust each other outside of their communities that isn’t being addressed,” but that could perhaps be managed with a coexistence lens.

Next, Madhawa Palihapitiya, a Sri Lankan student in the MA Program in Coexistence and Conflict, presented on human rights abuses and ethnic conflict between the Tamil and Sinhalese groups in Sri Lanka, which have been going on since 1976. He began by highlighting the amount and types of violence that have been occurring in Sri Lanka recently. Since the presidential elections in November 2005, there have been over 3,000 people killed, as well as hundreds of people who have been “disappeared.” Civilian casualties are extremely high because of aerial bombardment
and indiscriminate shelling. In terms of human rights abuses, there has been a wide government crackdown on private media and non-governmental organizations. The Prevention of Terrorism Act, passed in 1982, allows police and security forces to arbitrarily arrest civilians and detain them up to 72 hours. Palihamipitcia stated that both the government and the LTTE (Liberation Tigers of the Tamil Eelam) nationalist group have been guilty of ignoring international humanitarian laws and recruiting child soldiers. He painted a grave picture of the conflict in order to highlight the challenges in the field of coexistence today. He urged the audience to “spread the radar” by covering all conflicts in the world rather than just focusing on the newest or most visible. The challenge for the field is to continue, in the midst of new violence, to devote resources to long-running conflicts that it is in danger of forgetting.

The final presentation of the panel was given by Senator Mobina Jaffer of the Parliament of Canada, who gave the previous night’s keynote address to open the conference. Senator Jaffer first talked about the challenges of the global war on terror, and what this has meant for coexistence efforts in Canada. In the context of the Sri Lanka conflict, the Canadian government’s perspective is now dominated by “how do we stop the terrorism?” rather than trying to negotiate with all parties to the conflict, including guerrilla groups, in order to promote peace. Senator Jaffer also talked about the challenges of addressing diversity, both in terms of respect for culture and respect for local structures. Using the example of the International Criminal Court’s process in Sierra Leone, the Senator questioned the assumption that “the solution to all horrible crimes is to take people to the ICC.” In Canada, she pointed out the success of integrating healing processes of the aboriginal community, advising that this strategy should be used in all conflict resolution in terms of looking at the processes that are already in existence locally and adapting them. However, using the example of the debate around female genital mutilation, she also cautioned that sometimes culture needs to be questioned when it comes into conflict with non-negotiable international values of equality and rights. Even in this case, however, the Senator warned that the process of challenging cultural practices should be done in a respectful and inclusive way.

The question and answer session brought out further challenges and opportunities. One participant advocated for earlier education on conflict resolution as well as improving the overall access to education, so that the younger generation can be given what Johnson called “a new secret weapon...the power of communication.” Panelists agreed that this is important, particularly since one possible cause of conflict is the lack of educational opportunity. [The education of coexistence practitioners and scholars was further addressed in the last panel of the day, Implications for Education and Training.] A lively discussion also emerged around the question posed by one audience member about “who is the ‘we’?” i.e. with the numerous hats that a person wears as well as numerous personal, moral, and organizational considerations, what are the real, rational possibilities for an individual to effect the type of change the panelists are discussing? Johnson responded to this by positing that the challenge to practitioners is to realistically assess whether they have the skills, capacity, and resources to do something, and, if not, whether they have connections and partnerships with someone who does. He added that “the more that we educate, and the more that we have these kinds of discussions, the more sophisticated and nuanced that analysis can be.” Other discussions related to engagement vs. intervention as the proper framework for describing coexistence work, subconscious racism in the development and coexistence fields stemming from inability to relate to the “other,” economic exploitation as a source of conflict, and cultural relativism versus “deliberative universalism.” The panelists also discussed certain ways that related fields can undermine the others, with one example being humanitarian or military intervention undermining peace and coexistence efforts. At the end of the panel, participants were encouraged to also think about “we” as a discipline or a field and the implications for this type of branding.
Breakout Session:  
DILEMMAS OF PEACE AND DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE
Moderator: Steven Burg
Participants: Maja Catic
Allen Kassof
Gay Rosenblum-Kumar

What are the legacies of violent conflict for states seeking to achieve democratic norms? What is the relationship between peacebuilding and democracy-building? Under what circumstances does democracy-building contribute to intergroup tensions? Panelists in the breakout session Dilemmas of Peace and Democratic Governance addressed these and other questions about the intersection of democracy-building and coexistence work. Steven Burg, Chair of the Politics Department at Brandeis University, structured the session according to the following topics: 1) engaging local political elites in a conflict situation, 2) the process of achieving agreement on contentious policy issues, and 3) the role of external actors in facilitating and training local actors to carry out these processes.

Allen Kassof, President Emeritus and Senior Advisor to the Project on Ethnic Relations (PER), spoke about his experiences in the Balkan states with that organization, working with political elites to reach agreements to manage inter-ethnic conflicts. Rather than the increasing diversity that was talked about in the earlier panel, Kassof noted that the region has been characterized for most of the past century by separation and ethnic cleansing, and has therefore become less diverse. In Romania, where it began its work in 1991, it took PER about half a year to convince the political elites of the Romanian majority and Hungarian minority even to sit down to the table and begin a dialogue. Once it was launched, however, it became a permanent feature of Romanian political life that continues to this day and that has significantly altered the approach to inter-ethnic relations in that country. The key to success was in understanding that, while political leadership is motivated above all by self-interest, they often lack an accurate picture of where their self-interest actually lies in dealing with a competing ethnic group. The PER-initiated dialogue in Romania has educated each side to recognize that opportunities for cooperation can sometimes better serve their self-interest than continuing confrontation.

In Montenegro, the conflict was between the majority Montenegrins (Slavs) and the minority Albanian community. Here, the process of accommodation lay in persuading the Albanian leadership to move from reiterating general demands for a special status, which the majority Macedonians were unwilling to grant, and breaking down their program into specific and practical requests (a regional maternity hospital, Albanian language faculty at the university level, additional border crossings to Albania, participation in appointing local officials, etc.) When Montenegrins understood that such requests were moderate and non-threatening, they soon accepted and implemented them, greatly easing tensions between the two sides. Kassof observed that, in these cases, the effort to promote democracy and justice was made at the level of political elites, while grassroots approaches were either ineffective or absent. He raised the question of the comparative effectiveness of working top-down or bottom-up, and suggested that top-down efforts may be more useful in highly organized modern states, while bottom-up efforts are appropriate in societies that are decentralized or community-based. In any case, he said, it is obvious that “the advent of democracy does not, in fact, resolve
these conflicts.” In some cases, democratization can make ethnic conflict worse because majority groups find themselves wielding electoral power that perhaps they did not have before. Democracy-building efforts must therefore include additional measures to ensure that the majoritarian state does not become abusive of minority rights. Finally, Kassof stressed that disputants engaged in a dialogue must address the real, practical problems; it is not sufficient just to have them talk to each other about principles of equity. He pointed out that “inter-ethnic disputes are not... only about ethnicity,” but are about real, tangible claims. Kassof expressed some skepticism about whether to consider “peacebuilding” to be a field in its own right, saying “I think it’s a confluence of many things: it’s history, it’s political science, it’s language, it’s diplomacy. There is no such thing as ‘peacebuilding.’” He advised students of peace and conflict to immerse themselves in the relevant countries and listen to what the people there really want, and then to develop their own techniques for addressing the problems in a common sense way.

Maja Catic, Board Member of the Community of Bosnia, spoke briefly about her study of ethnic divisions in Bosnia since the 1995 Dayton Peace Agreement. “The challenge of achieving agreement on contentious issues rooted in a legacy of violent conflict is nowhere more obvious than in the constitutional realm,” she said. In the case of Bosnia, more than ten years after the signing of the peace agreement, there is still the challenge of achieving consensus on constitutional issues, especially as groups such as the Bosnian Muslims frame the issues in a moral light. Bosnian Muslim groups wish to re-negotiate the state structure put in place by the Dayton Agreement, claiming that it institutionalized and territorialized ethnic divisions by creating separate entities: one federation governed mainly by the Bosniak and Croat ethnic groups, and one republic governed mainly by Serbs. The Bosnian Muslim elite, Catic said, are claiming that the state is illegitimate and wish to reconstruct it as a centralized state such as it was before the conflict. Catic used this example to pose a question to the audience members about “the role of external actors in settling and negotiating the claims that are cast in moral terms.”

This question was picked up by the final panelist, Gay Rosenblum-Kumar, Senior Public Administration Officer at the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Speaking thematically, and from the perspective of a large external actor that is beginning to see the value of complementarity between democratization and peacebuilding, Rosenblum-Kumar claimed that both fields have similar challenges and need to have complementarity in order to create the best outcomes. “Democratic practices like elections,” said Rosenblum-Kumar, “are competitions that can get violent and often do. Opportunistic politicians or ethnic entrepreneurs sometimes heighten the level of conflict by using that ethnic card to bring votes towards them.” For this reason, the UN is beginning to change to a much more integrated approach to democracy-building, realizing that “politics does not stand alone.” The UN’s integrated approach means fewer reactive responses coming after the fact and more long-term proactive interventions; fewer elite-centered approaches and more approaches dealing with both elites and the grassroots civil society. “Democracy-building and confidence measures,” she said, “...need to be infused with a certain conflict-sensitivity... So that a) the process of how they’re done is participatory and inclusive, and b) what they come up with really reflects a new culture.”

On the role of external actors, such as the UN, Rosenblum-Kumar thought that “we can do very little.” The role of external actors should not be to come in and give answers, but to share lessons learned from other places, as well as
training in relevant skills such as communication, mediation, and negotiation, and then to see how it is applicable in the local context, by local actors. “Indigenous solutions are the only sustainable ones,” she said, citing the example of South Africa. External actors must be humble and realize that local actors have the most stake in peaceful solutions. Institutions like the UN can help to institutionalize the agreed-upon local solutions to help them become sustainable. These pieces may “not end the conflict that’s raging today, but hopefully it will lay the foundation of what will sustain peace tomorrow.”

The panel was followed by a very fruitful discussion period that was opened up for questions from the audience. The first question dealt with how to arrange the “hierarchy of issues” that the panelists were talking about in any given conflict: the moral, principled, and practical issues. Kassof opened the discussion with his opinion that “you have to start by doing what you can,” and claimed that “creative opportunism” (meaning one’s level of access, institutional capacity, and resources) is involved in deciding what can or will be done. “I’m not sure there’s a systematic way of saying where and how we should intervene, because a lot of it is really accidental.” In the case of Darfur, political attention was not fully engaged until New York Times columnist Nicolas Kristof focused public attention on the issue. Rosenblum-Kumar also weighed in with the concept of “the dilemma of the urgent versus the important.” In the context of the Dayton Agreement, the urgent need was to stop fighting, but should it have been done at any cost? Rosenblum-Kumar again stressed the need for local structures and approaches, as well as long-term engagement, in order to ensure that both the urgent and the important needs are addressed. The panelists agreed that, while not a panacea to conflict, democracy can open the possibility of resolving difference, especially when done with a peacebuilding perspective “so that people see democracy as a collaborative, tolerant way of operating…and so that structures are in place to channel conflict nonviolently in the future.”

One important question was asked about what the panelists have seen that has been effective in addressing root causes of conflicts. This brought about a discussion on the successes of peacebuilding, which Kassof pointed out were few and far between. “Now, why bother with them?” he asked, answering: “Because the payoffs for the few successful cases tend to be very, very large.” Burg offered one approach likely to bring success: “Persistence and presence. You have to be there, you have to be there for a long time. And you have to listen.” Rosenblum-Kumar ended on a positive note by remarking that “success takes a long time, and we have to measure it in incremental ways.” She cited the struggling UN project in Zimbabwe by saying, “But there are several hundred people who have been touched by this project who are inspired and skilled and united, and who are sticking together in various ways, and they’re going to be there longer than any one elected official. And things are going to change in the future.”

“Democracy-building and confidence measures...need to be infused with a certain conflict-sensitivity...so that a) the process of how they’re done is participatory and inclusive, and b) what they come up with really reflects a new culture.”
Past injustices that are not addressed can become a source of renewed violent conflict. How can societies emerging from violence and divisions effectively move towards reconciliation while at the same time confronting the egregious wrongs of the past? In the roundtable on Finding Justice and Reconciliation, seven experts grappled with how to deal with these often competing concepts in post-conflict societies. The purpose of the roundtable was to move away from simplifications and dichotomies, to a more nuanced and complex understanding of justice and reconciliation.

Eileen Babbitt, a Professor of International Conflict Management Practice at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, chaired the panel. She framed the discussion by reviewing some of the strongly held convictions on these issues. The first is that “if you want peace, work for justice.” On the other side is the conviction that in order to obtain a cease fire, “justice must be postponed or even ignored.” According to this school of thought, saving lives in the present is a higher priority than dealing with issues of the past. And a third view is that the type of justice being pursued matters, and has a big impact on peace and the achievement of coexistence and reconciliation. She then underlined that the purpose of the panel was to explore the complexities of, and relationships among, these various points of view.

The first speaker was Abdul Wahab Musah, a Program Officer for the Ghana Center for Democratic Development. Musah began by highlighting the differences between the often-oversimplified concepts of retributive and restorative justice. For him, retributive justice focused more on punishment. He warned that this path may be counterproductive, as it “fosters a hostile accusatory environment [where] prosecutions may be put ahead of support of victims.” Rather, he argued for the need for restorative justice in post-conflict societies. Restorative justice attempts to bring the parties together to find the truth about the past and develop ways to achieve future coexistence. When restorative justice prevails, Musah argued, the perpetrators are more likely to admit to past wrongs and apologize.

Louis Aucoin, Associate Research Professor of the Fletcher School in the Institute for Human Security, then spoke, drawing on his extensive experience in East Timor with the United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor (UNTAET). Based on that process, he argued that reconciliation with justice was possible. He advocated a two-tiered process. In East Timor, a truth commission was set up in conjunction
with formal courts. Truth commissions offer something not easily available in courts. They actively engage community through consultation. There are significant psychosocial benefits to large-scale testimony of victims and perpetrators. Special panels reviewed the cases of individuals who were accused of committing crimes. Those who were deemed to have committed “serious crimes” were referred to the courts, while the truth commission handled others with less serious offenses. The truth commissions used local customary law and drew legitimacy from the elders in the community. The accused that came before the tribunals could ask for forgiveness from the elders. Often, the accused were instructed to take some action in order to atone for their wrongs. Aucoin stressed that the process was for the whole society, as even those who were not formally accused of wrongdoing had to appear before these commissions. He believed that this process ensured that the courts dealt with the most egregious offenses.

Tim Phillips, Co-founder of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition at Tufts University, addressed the value of institutions in bringing societal reconciliation. Phillips explained that integration of inter-community institutions could greatly enhance the prospects of coexistence. He referred to this as “bridging capital.” In El Salvador after the civil war, he related, a decision was made to recreate a police force made up of former police and guerillas who were not implicated in human rights abuses, with the idea that the police department itself could be a vehicle for coexistence and reconciliation. This new police force encouraged the sides to work together and also to better understand each other. He warned against pressuring for consensus: “To promote enlightened dissent is a means to build trust and establish firm communication.” Reconciliation, he argued, requires that the sides be free to voice their interests without fear.

Two students of the MA in Coexistence and Conflict Program at Brandeis University also participated in the panel. Romain Rurangirwa, a student and a Roman Catholic Priest from Rwanda, addressed the use of the traditional gacaca courts to obtain justice and reconciliation after the genocide. The gacaca court is an institution of community justice that was inspired by Rwandan traditional methods. Similar to the two-tiered process in East Timor, the gacaca system was not mandated to handle the organizers of the genocide, but those accused of less egregious crimes. Nevertheless, the gacaca courts had the jurisdiction to handle serious offenses, including murder. The purpose of gacaca was to find truth and promote reconciliation. On a practical level, it was a less cumbersome procedure to handle the large number of cases that were waiting for review. However, despite good intentions, Rurangirwa argued that the preparation of those adjudicating the cases was not always sufficient. He believed that, “there was no understanding of real justice.” He argued that the gacaca courts could have been more effective if there had been greater investment in capacity-building for their leaders. Further, he argued that despite good intentions, the gacaca were not a comfortable or accommodating venue for women testifying about rape and other abuses that took place during the genocide.

Ashad Sentongo, another master’s student with extensive experience in Uganda, addressed current peace efforts in that country. He argued for a more enhanced notion of “justice” for the people of Northern Uganda, to embrace and address development, health, education, and housing as integral parts of restoring peace and reconciliation in the region. When one talks of justice, Sentongo argued, it is necessary to tie this to human rights, economic rights, security, good governance, and access to resources. Regarding the indictment of Joseph Kony by the International Criminal Court and its effect on peace negotiations, Sentongo said that Ugandans do not believe that Kony’s trial is necessary for
peace. Those affected by the violence want progress through social and economic recovery and good governance, but also have traditional approaches capable of healing the effects of crimes perpetrated by Kony and his men.

Roberto Varea, Associate Professor of Theater and Chair of the Performing Arts and Social Justice Program at the University of San Francisco, talked about the role of the arts in promoting reconciliation in Argentina and Peru. Through the arts, he argued, it may be possible to imagine coexistence. He related that theatre can be used to present complex ideas that are difficult to articulate. The arts provide space to reflect on behaviors and prejudices about others, while “speaking the unspeakable” in the aftermath of violent conflict. In Peru, the Yuyachkani theatre group was formally invited by the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) to perform outreach work in the communities where public hearings were to be convened by the Commission. Indeed, the TRC understood that Yuyachkani’s history of over 30 years of socially engaged work would legitimize the Commission in the eyes of a suspicious population, and lend the power of performance to the arduous task of reconstructing and remembering the traumas of the war. It was hoped that the group’s presence would raise awareness of the Commission’s purpose and facilitate public access to its community hearings. It was also expected that the power of theatre, when combined with the ritual nature of the event, might help mark the postwar transition, dignify its victims, honor the dead and disappeared, and thus prompt people to come forward and speak publicly to the Commission without fear.

After the presentations, the panelists addressed several questions from the audience. One important question involved how to better involve the victims in reconciliation processes. Musah believed that it was essential to consult victims when trying to design a reconciliation strategy. He believed that a nationwide poll would be particularly useful to get “buy in.” Rurangirwa reinforced this point by stating that large-scale participation of the victims can assist the healing process.

Another question concerned what is “truth” in the process of reconciliation. Several panelists addressed this issue. Sentongo warned that people sometimes need to be prepared for the truth as it may be at odds with their beliefs. Aucoin stated that sometimes there is not one truth but “multiple truths.” The populace may have to “understand various versions of the truth in each community.” Phillips believed that truth is difficult to attain and that the real focus should be on the process of the search.

Drawing from the experience and observations of all the panelists, the implementation of rigid “cookie cutter” justice mechanisms are unlikely to advance reconciliation. In order to design an appropriate strategy for addressing the wrongs of the past, solid context analysis, consultation, and active participation of the parties is essential. This includes attention and sensitivity to local priorities and practices rather than imposing a standard set of norms. The sequencing of strategies and mechanisms is also vital to the achievement of justice and reconciliation.
As is common in other fields, in coexistence and conflict work, both in theory and in practice, the discussion of gender and conflict is often mistakenly seen as focusing on women. The three presenters in the session *Examining Gender and Conflict*, Martha Thompson, Program Manager for Rights in Humanitarian Crises at the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee; Honorable Amongi Betty Ongom, Member of the Ugandan Parliament; and Sanam Anderlini, Gender, Peace, and Security Specialist from MIT, emphasized the importance of, and difficulty in, promoting a gender analysis that moves beyond this impasse. A consequence of mistaken focus on women is the failure to include a gender perspective that examines the relations between men and women, which has seriously weakened the nature of the analysis and, consequently, impeded the efficacy of the work at all levels: on the ground, on a national level, and in multilateral organizations, particularly the UN.

Thompson began the session by pointing out that the dynamics of war have changed since the 1980s and 90s. It had been increasingly recognized that women shoulder a tremendous cost of war but it was also noted that in previous conflict situations gender relations often changed dramatically, allowing women to enter spaces that had previously been occupied exclusively by men. The changes were often challenged after the conflicts ended, but Thompson pointed out that recent conflicts are not even generating these kinds of opportunities. To the contrary, they are increasingly erasing the status that women have achieved before the war. Waging war “on the cheap” is another new characteristic of conflict. The use of non-state actors to fight wars is increasing. Surrogate armies do not work within the norms of government laws or international conventions. Relations between the governments, opposition forces, and the military forces on the ground often lack transparency, which makes it impossible to hold them accountable or to negotiate conditions which provide security for non-combatants. In addition, illegal means to finance the conflicts including trading in arms and drugs, and trafficking humans, especially women, have become more prevalent.

The importance of the role of women as peacemakers, the challenges that women face in taking that role, and the invisibility of women’s contributions to peacemaking were themes that were raised by all of the speakers. Thompson began the discussion by providing an overview of the changing nature of conflict worldwide and the gendered implications of these changes. Ongom described the situation in her region of Africa and the challenges she faced as a woman and parliamentarian actively involved in peace processes. Sanam Anderlini concluded with a discussion of the difficulties in mainstreaming gender-sensitive approaches into all aspects of working with conflict.
to provide security to civilian populations must be looked at through a gender lens. While the recruitment of child soldiers is not a completely new phenomenon, non-state actors and newer types of insurgencies are relying more heavily on boys and girls to provide a range of support to the armed forces under exceedingly brutal conditions. Finally, Thompson pointed to the impact of the “overarching paradigm of the global war on terror,” which has reframed the way that conflicts are seen and fought.

The next presentation was given by Ongom, who as a Ugandan parliamentarian during a time when her country was involved in four conflicts, has faced many of the issues raised by Thompson. She described how responsibilities that women have had to assume during the conflicts have exposed them to more risks. While men in villages were susceptible to being kidnapped and forcibly inducted into combat, women were vulnerable to other kinds of abuse. During attacks they were more likely to be kidnapped because they not only protect themselves but their children. In addition to being raped, women were abducted to be used as sex slaves or sold in exchange for weapons or money. When families fled their villages to the camps for internally displaced people (IDPs), where many still remain, women faced other risks. Because of fears that men will be abducted or killed, it is women who take risks leaving the camps to go back to their villages for food or to look for water or firewood. The lack of healthcare in the villages and camps is another problem that disproportionately affects women. Complications with pregnancies and delivery are major causes of death among women. In the IDP camps, humanitarian aid agencies failed to understand the nature of the family structure in these communities. For instance, they would identify men as the head of a household. But when, as is the custom, men have four or five wives, the rations they received were inadequate.

Distribution of rations must go through the women and each woman must be recognized as her own household. When agencies provide services, more must be done to ensure that they address gender inequalities, rather than reinforce them. For instance when they put up learning centers in the IDP camps, more boys were enrolled in the programs while girls were compelled by their families to look for food. Interventions are needed to ensure equal access. Women and girls must also be protected from abuse by the soldiers who are supposedly there to protect them.

Ongom also described the challenges of involving women in the peace processes. When she proposed in Uganda that there should be equal numbers of women on the committee, she was told to identify potential female candidates. But when she put forward the names, they were rejected. She was told “this one, his husband called and said he cannot allow his wife to go. This one has a 3-month-old baby.” However, the husband of the woman with the 3-month-old was chosen to be part of the delegation. Another woman was rejected because she had been a leader in an earlier round of peace negotiations and, as a result of her prominence, there was concern that if she was included she would become a viable challenger for the presidency.

During post-war reconstruction other issues arose. The Peace Rehabilitation and Development Program in Uganda did not have a psychological-social component, which meant that women who were raped had little or no treatment. When Ongom examined the reconstruction plan, it became clear that it lacked a gender perspective, so she met with World Bank officials and convinced them to reassess how to include a gender component in their approach. The other issue that they faced in the post-war reconstruction was women whose husbands had died being denied their land. Traditionally women do not own land and when a husband dies, his land and his children go to his family while the women are supposed to return to their families
of origin. Ongom advised that the system must change so that these women’s right to their land is secured.

Anderlini took up the question of how women are treated in the post-conflict period by pointing to the treatment of women who have been raped. Husbands, families, and societies fail to recognize that being raped is no different than being shot. “The cheapest weapon of war is the penis,” she pointed out, so if there is no shame in having a wife or daughter who is killed, there should be no shame if they have been raped. Addressing the question of whether gender mainstreaming in coexistence and conflict is being done effectively, her simple answer was no. The passage of Resolution 1325 by the Security Council in 2000 recognized women’s roles in peacebuilding and pointed to the differential protection needs of women. While the framework exists, governments have yet to enforce it. Without pressure, it is unlikely that this will be done.

Anderlini identified the problem as institutional, what she calls “the three A’s syndrome”: apathy, amnesia, and ad-hockery. Apathy is the “cafeteria” approach, i.e. “today is international women’s day so let’s make a statement.” Kofi Annan, former Secretary-General of the United Nations, made tremendous statements; but he left office with zero of his eighteen special advisors being women. Amnesia occurs when instead of paying attention to case studies of disarmament processes that went well, we ignore them and make the same mistakes again and again. Lessons are not translated and we keep reinventing what we do. The third A stands for Ad-Hockery, a word that Anderlini invented to refer to the process of doing a project here, a project there, and failing to systematically replicate or attempt to adapt what works.

There was little time left for discussion but the comments of the session participants echoed the points that the speakers had made about the differential impact of conflict on women and men and on the invisibility of women in conflict resolution processes.
IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Moderator:  Attila Klein
Participants: Mari Fitzduff
            Barbara Nelson
            Steven Burg
            Robert Ricigliano
            Diana Chigas

The ambitious agenda set for the roundtable on Implications for Education and Training was to assess the success of various approaches to the preparation of coexistence workers. Among the difficulties encountered by this area of study is the relatively recent origin of the field, as well as the need to simultaneously evolve a theoretical framework for the academy, and a practical “field guide” for engaged professionals.

The world at large assumes that professionals tackling complex social tasks, such as peacemaking, will have been trained in the skills and insights such tasks demand. The contributions of panelists to our roundtable made it immediately obvious, however, that selecting topics, devising frameworks, and incorporating field experience in the education of coexistence workers is a tall order.

At the outset, Mari Fitzduff, Director of the MA Program in Coexistence and Conflict at Brandeis, introduced a brief history of how training programs were shaped in Northern Ireland. Starting in 1983–1985, parties to that conflict began looking for alternatives to failed peacemaking attempts that had focused on increased security, economic development, or guarantees of equality. Such approaches simply did not work, but what efforts could? Mobilizing academic “experts” (those scholars who had attempted to structure a body of thinking around topics of peace and coexistence) had started the shaping process. To facilitate exchange of these ideas a semi-independent funding agency was created and staffed. While the considerable research output of this agency was valuable, the format and language of the published work that emerged put it out of the range of policymakers. A translation, or rather a new avenue of communication, was needed that could link academics with those designing and implementing policies. These new multi-talented professionals would be aware of both research findings and theory based on them, but would also know what it is like to be a practitioner facing stubborn opposition. It was Fitzduff’s view that masters-level graduate programs are the most useful for preparing such professionals avoiding the narrow specialization of Ph.D.s.

This brief history brought the development of professional training programs to their present state where the academic/professional debate continues, but many experts are “straddling that divide.” At the heart of the dilemma is questioning which specific knowledge, skills, and values needed by practitioners are to be included in effective training programs. Fitzduff suggested that in the final analysis, a successful program also needs to stay in touch with national, international, and private agencies that fund coexistence initiatives, in order to assess their needs in terms of theory, initiatives, and engagement possibilities. Her recent paper on competencies summarizes the guiding philosophy of the Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict at Brandeis University.

Barbara Nelson, Dean of UCLA’s School of Public Affairs, described an additional approach to preparing professionals for careers in coexistence and social cohesion: graduate and undergraduate training that nurtures these skills and then integrates them into well-known degree programs with additional skills and knowledge platforms. Nelson suggested that one way to scale up coexistence education was to promote coexistence and social cohesion concentrations in graduate-level professional degrees in public policy, social work, and urban planning. Such degrees have a recognized audience and career
route, and students can use their degrees in a lifetime of coexistence work in different settings. They also provide professional-level skills in applied economics, statistics, policymaking and implementation, counseling, geographic information systems, international and local economic development, health policy, and the like.

Such an approach to coexistence and social cohesion education is being considered at the UCLA School of Public Affairs. This graduate school is distinctive for having three professional departments within one school (public policy, social welfare, and urban planning) and nine research centers. The overall effort is aimed at scaling up coexistence and social cohesion education to meet multi-level student demand. There are 1,400 undergraduate students enrolled in the various minors, and 500 graduate students, about 70 of them in Ph.D. programs. Many of the students attracted to coexistence programs are “profoundly concerned about inter- and intra-communal violence.” A second realization motivating training in these fields is the need to learn to deal with communities possessing deep historic divisions. Experience and precedent shows that people so divided can continue to disagree but manage to live together in what Nelson calls “democratic accommodation” or “effective pluralism.”

Nelson considers such scaling up of training capacity to be the equivalent of constructing a “long lever” with which to solve big problems. Further, she commented on the question of “fields,” which she considers remnants of 19th-century German university structures. Her position is that not only is a new field being invented, but the notion of a “field” itself is being redefined. Instead of fields being almost “geographical” with fixed borders like national boundaries, fields today have much more fluid boundaries and are organized around sets of questions, groups of concepts, and areas of practice. An example of flexible field boundaries is the combination of coexistence-related courses including political, economic, sociological, and psychological knowledge and practice. Finally, to make the lever even longer, there are plans for 11 universities (8 in the US, 3 outside) to include a coexistence and social cohesion concentration in their public policy master’s degree offerings, and also to form the International Coexistence Policy Curriculum Consortium. Ultimately, the institutions will be connected by a research center and by an Internet gateway.

Next, Steven Burg, Chair of the Politics Department at Brandeis, described the role of the academic scholar-specialist. Although he is a Balkans specialist long experienced with ethnic conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, he constantly sees confirmation from far-flung trouble spots of the value of generalizations derived from experiences in one region but applicable to many others. For a scholar to be useful and effective in the training of professionals, Burg’s prescription is to have actual experience in the field and then to act as a “translator” of complex social-sciences models into accessible language without abandoning their essence, the concepts, and, most importantly, the causal relationships between pieces of the models. He thinks the role of the scholar embedded in a training program for practitioners is to serve as a guide or scout into the literature. If both the teaching and the learning take place as advertised, the young professionals will arrive at their field assignments with a tool kit of tested models with which to describe and evaluate situations they need not have encountered before. In addition, they will also recognize deviations from the familiar models and will thus be prepared to recognize novel relationships. As Fitzduff pointed out earlier, however, not all specialized academics have the motivation, or even the vocabulary, to act as guides and translators for the enlightenment of professionals in training.

Next, Robert Ricigliano, Director of the Institute of World Affairs and the Peace Studies Program at University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, returned to the question of whether peacebuilding is a field or not, particularly as it touches on the work of this roundtable. The answer to this question will depend upon the kind of education practitioners

“To the empirical question, does peacebuilding look like a field, the answer is no. To the normative question, should peacebuilding be a field, the answer is yes. We need to know how to organize knowledge in the service of a fractious world if we wish to assist peaceful, just, and sustainable societies.”
will receive. He then proposed a distinction between two forms of the “field” question: defining it as an empirical or a normative question, since each requires a different answer. To the empirical question, does peacebuilding look like a field, the answer is no. To the normative question, should peacebuilding be a field, the answer is yes. We need to know how to organize knowledge in the service of a fractious world if we wish to assist peaceful, just, and sustainable societies. Coexistence as a field would allow us to contribute to the success of widespread human efforts by organizing and knitting these efforts together in a conscious manner. At present many sub-fields impact each other in haphazard and random ways thus rendering them potentially (or even actually) counterproductive. By being organized into a “field” we could anticipate how topics will interact, we could collect best practices, success stories, setbacks, and build theory on how to achieve productive interactions.

Evolving an organized system for defining and teaching this new field of coexistence, Ricigliano continued, will also allow us to tailor presentations to those with varied preparations: undergraduates, practitioners, government officials, graduate students. For example, we could sequence the teaching of general vs. specialized knowledge and alert potential employers of our students (the policymakers, NGO leaders, and donor organizations) to what they might expect. This way we could aim for improving the capacity of field workers by providing them with interdisciplinary competence rather than limiting them to just a programmatic specialty. Finally, we need to make the experiences, theories, tools, and desirable competencies broadly available to potential beneficiaries of such knowledge and skills, from undergraduates to senior diplomats.

The last contributor to our analysis of peace worker training was Diana Chigas, who shared with the group some of her frustrations with existing approaches to teaching field interventions. Referring to a large, three-year project she led with Collaborative for Development Action, Inc., she commented on the contrast between the dedication and talent of the workers involved in seemingly well-planned projects, and the relatively modest contributions that resulted from these efforts. She pointed to two factors that may be at work. One is the limited integration and synergy exhibited by the various sub-projects; the other is the assumption that since “everything is connected to everything else,” we may assume that whatever positive effect is achieved, it will somehow add up to peacebuilding. She called for more rigor, more “glue” between components, more technical and professional knowledge, and more joint analysis done out in the field. The aim would be to create the whole picture of what led to the conflict, and a systematic analysis of interacting factors that may lead us out of it. Chigas’ emphasis was on integration of thinking and of training, including the training of donors (governments, NGOs, UN agencies), of field workers, and of theorists. Such training should result in solid linkages from which both academics and practitioners would benefit.

A vigorous general discussion followed in which many of the points put forward by the panelists were supported. Agencies are looking for effectiveness in the field. Identification of core vs. ancillary issues would be most helpful. There should be sensitization of client agencies to both field and core theoretical issues, perhaps under the leadership of “champions” of coexistence found in their ranks. The utility of options to be tried out in recalcitrant situations so the parties could emulate solutions successful elsewhere. There were also warnings against allowing coexistence scholars to develop an opaque language so familiar in other recognized “fields.” The diversity of emphasis, the desire to be effective, and the commitment to continue working on important but difficult conflict areas bodes well for the near term advance of coexistence as an academic as well as practical discipline.
Professor Theodore Johnson of the MA Program in Coexistence and Conflict offered the closing remarks for the conference, reviewing key themes and questions. The following is an abbreviated version of his remarks:

It falls to me to try to put some bookends on the day, and it feels a little bit overwhelming because this last session was so rich, and my sense is that we could have probably spent the whole day talking about those issues. And even at that point we wouldn’t necessarily be any closer to agreement on it. But then again, maybe our goal isn’t to come to agreement, maybe our goal is to have a rich discussion about these things. In these last few minutes as things begin to really get an elevated sense of angst and passion, let us not forget some of the things that we have done throughout the day and yesterday.

There are a lot of themes that came out of yesterday and today. I’m certainly not going to try to rehash everything, but just a few that I recall: one was language. How are we using language? Is our vocabulary clear? What are the definitions that are important to us as we approach this important work? What is a field? What is peacebuilding? Are we able to approach it with a new lens or are we stuck in our thinking about it? What is coexistence? We have dictionary definitions of it; we’ve talked about it from a variety of different standpoints. Who is “we”? All these are just some of my thoughts that came up around the issue of language.

Another theme was gaps. Senator Jaffer said that we’re not yet at coexistence. Well then if we’re not, why not? What does it take for us to get there? Does it take the kinds of discussions that we’re having this evening just now or does it take more scholarship? What is the cause of the gap? What are some of the things that we can do? Maybe those are discussions that can be brought forward in future sessions. Senator Jaffer also talked about sharing resources. When I first heard her talk about it, it seemed like she was talking about just financial resources, but as we look deeper and as we begin to explore some of the things that came out, we need to explore other resources: our intellectual resources, our passions, the things that extend us. We need to get to another level of reaching out to those that so desperately feel a need of our services. Another gap is in inclusion around gender, race, and equality. I loved the Senator’s metaphor last night about playing the piano. That sometimes to anger her parents she would just play on the white keys and sometimes just on the black keys. But that limits the music you play. You need to play on the black and the white keys to be inclusive.

Barriers was another theme that we talked about. Mindsets, dysfunctional institutions - a lot of that came up in some of the panel discussions today. International organizations, state systems, and so on. Practical realities was another set of barriers that took us to another level of distinction. Another theme was sensitivity: the value of recognizing local knowledge, local capacity, and local experience. I remember as I was trying to rush through my presentation this morning – one of the Iraqis I work with said, “We want democracy in Iraq, but we want Iraqi democracy. We get to decide what it will be; we get to decide how it works. Thank you very much for your models but let us have the decision on that.” This ties in with another wonderful example from the panel on justice and reconciliation about restorative justice, where in some instances people would come to the local elders and would talk about how to go through a process of forgiveness and reconciliation. So recognizing the value of local experience and of how peacebuilding is connected with a broader set of issues.

We just concluded a stimulating discussion on education, training, and competencies for new professionals. The concept is extremely valuable but it does take leverage. I see that as part of our opportunities to build relationships through the academic world, through the world of organizations,
through the world of practitioners, and so on, and that’s part of the leverage that we need to have. Linking solid scholarship with practical realities. Differences in practice interacting with each other and having things that impact what we do in the practice being palpable and visible leading to this holistic peacebuilding process that Rob Ricigliano talked about. The importance of recognizing that just because now peacebuilding is mainstreamed that everything we do isn’t necessarily peacebuilding. We really need those boundaries to make sure that we define the things that are in fact peacebuilding or not. That’s of course a larger discussion. But discourse over whether another field is needed is healthy and I think it must continue.

My observation is that peacebuilding is something more than a lot of the defined fields that we have already. It involves academics but it involves practitioners, it involves technical specialists, it involves organizations, it involves institutions. All of the current models of academics and practice it seems still haven’t yet brought us to peace. So maybe we need to expand what we’re doing. Maybe what we have in place isn’t yet enough. Maybe this is the point of departure: we need to find another way, and be open to other approaches. Those are my observations. I think it’s been a wonderful conference.
**Pieces of the Coexistence Puzzle:**
*Democracy, Human Rights, Gender and Development*

Questions for Discussion

- Is peacebuilding/coexistence a field? Should it be?
- What should be the role of local actors, mechanisms, and values? How can coexistence workers best take these into account when working in different situations?
- Who is the “we”? With numerous individual, organizational, and moral considerations, how do you assess the possibilities for action?
- What is the language of coexistence work? Are we using it in the most effective way? How do we avoid getting bogged down by terminology?
- What can coexistence and related areas of work contribute to the sharing of resources and filling of gaps in education, access, and experience?
- What are the barriers to coexistence work? How do we overcome them?
- What are the opportunities available for coexistence work? How do we take advantage of them?
- What is the best way to educate and train future coexistence workers in a holistic way?
- What individual skills and qualities are needed to be an effective coexistence worker?
- How do we address and overcome subconscious racism in coexistence and related areas of work?
- How can we integrate different related fields and different levels of work (local, national, regional, and international) to foster complementarity?
- To what extent should coexistence be integrated into related fields (and vice versa)? How can this be done?
- How do we learn from our successes and mistakes in coexistence work?
- How can we learn from the similarities in conflicts and approaches while acknowledging the importance of contextual differences?
- What should the role of external actors be in democratization, peace, and justice processes?
- How should we determine what approach to take to a given conflict?
- What is the relationship of peace to justice? How do we achieve both?
- How can we mainstream gender concerns into coexistence work?
- What are the potentials and limits of a complementary approach to building sustainable peace?
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CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Thursday, March 15, 2007

Location:
Rapaporte Treasure Hall, Goldfarb Library

4:30 – 6:30 p.m.
Keynote Address and Reception
By Senator Mobina Jaffer, Parliament of Canada

Born in Uganda, Senator Jaffer was the first East Indian, first Muslim, and first African appointed to the Canadian Senate. From 2002-2006, she held the position of Canada’s Special Envoy for Peace in Sudan and was a member of the Prime Minister’s Special Advisory Team focused on the implementation of the peace process. From 2002-2005, Senator Jaffer was also Chair of the Canadian Committee on Women, Peace, and Security. Senator Jaffer is a remarkable leader, committed to equality and justice for women of color and the promotion and enforcement of human rights.
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  Jessica Berns
  Program Manager – Coexistence International at Brandeis University
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  Sanam Anderlini
  Gender, Peace, and Security Specialist; MIT Research Affiliate

• Keynote Address
  Senator Mobina Jaffer
  Parliament of Canada

7:00 p.m.
Honorary Dinner
Location: Faculty Club Lounge
By invitation only
Friday, March 16, 2007

Location:
Levine-Ross, Hassenfeld Conference Center

8:15 – 8:45 a.m.
Registration
Breakfast (panelists only)

8:45 – 9:00 a.m.
Welcome

• Mari Fitzduff
  Director – Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University
  Chair of Advisory Board – Coexistence International

9:00 – 10:30 a.m.
Panel Discussion:
Integrating Coexistence, Democracy, Human Rights, Gender and Development

What is coexistence? Should coexistence concerns and values be integrated into work in complementary fields such as democracy, human rights, and development? To what extent? What are our common goals and approaches to building diverse, equitable, and peaceful societies? What are the potential and limits of a complementary approach for building sustainable peace?

• Senator Mobina Jaffer
  Parliament of Canada

• Ted Johnson
  Assistant Professor – Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University

• Madhawa Palihapitiya
  MA Student - Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University

Moderated by Robert Ricigliano, Director, Institute of World Affairs and Peace Studies Program – University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

10:45 – 11:55 a.m.
Discussion Groups

1. Dilemmas of Peace and Democratic Governance
(Gellar Classroom, Hassenfeld Conference Center)
What are the legacies of violent conflict on achieving democratic norms? What is the relationship between peacebuilding and democracy-building? Under what circumstances does democracy-building contribute to tensions?

• Maja Catic
  Member, Board of Directors – Community of Bosnia
2. Finding Justice and Reconciliation (roundtable)
(Levine-Ross, Hassenfeld Conference Center)

Where have different collaborative approaches to justice worked, and where have they failed? What are the key issues to consider in relation to restorative and retributive justice? What are the tools for each of these approaches? What role do justice initiatives play in building coexistence?

• Louis Aucoin
  Institute for Human Security Associate Research Professor – Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

• Abdul Wahab Musah
  Program Officer – Ghana Center for Democratic Development

• Timothy Phillips
  Cofounder – Project on Justice in Times of Transition, Tufts University

• Romain Rurangirwa
  MA Student - Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University

• Ashad Sentongo
  MA Student - Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University

• Roberto Varea
  Assistant Professor – Performing Arts and Social Justice, University of San Francisco

Moderated by Eileen Babbitt, Professor of International Conflict Management Practice – Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Rapporteur: Clementine Clark, Independent Consultant

3. Examining Gender and Conflict
(Feldberg Lounge, Hassenfeld Conference Center)

How do various players grapple with assumptions that “women are more peaceful than men”? How does armed conflict affect gender roles and postconflict reconstruction? How has gender been mainstreamed in the various fields working toward peaceful and equitable societies?

• Sanam Anderlini
  Gender, Peace, and Security Specialist; MIT Research Affiliate

• Hon. Amongi Betty Ongom
  Member of Parliament, Uganda
• Martha Thompson  
  Program Manager, Rights in Humanitarian Crises –  
  Unitarian Universalist Service Committee

Moderated by Kelley Ready, Associate Director of Academics -  
Sustainable International Development Program, Brandeis University  
Rapporteur: Mariama Khan, MA Student –  
Sustainable International Development Program, Brandeis University

Noon – 1:00 p.m.  
Plenary Session, Reporting Back  
Facilitated by Cynthia Cohen, Executive Director -  
Slifka Program in Intercommunal Coexistence, Brandeis University

1:15 – 2:30 p.m.  
Lunch Break  
Please refer to on-campus lunch options

2:45 – 4:00 p.m.  
Roundtable:  
Implications for Education and Training

Do changing practices in the field demand different approaches to educating and training students? What are the possibilities and limitations of interdisciplinary education? Do our academic programs equip students with the knowledge, skills, and capacities to work in a complementary fashion?

• Steven Burg  
  Adlai Stevenson Professor of International Politics and Chair –  
  Politics Department, Brandeis University

• Diana Chigas  
  Project Codirector, Reflecting on Peace Practice –  
  Collaborative for Development Action, Inc.

• Mari Fitzduff  
  Director – Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University

• Barbara Nelson  
  Dean, School of Public Affairs - UCLA

• Robert Ricigliano  
  Director, Institute of World Affairs and Peace Studies Program –  
  University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Moderated by Attila Klein, Adjunct Professor and Professor Emeritus of Biology -  
Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University

4:00 – 4:30 p.m.  
Conclusions and Closing Remarks
SANAM ANDERLINI
Gender, Peace, and Security Specialist; MIT Research Affiliate
Sanam Anderlini is an independent researcher, trainer, adviser and analyst working with the UN, World Bank, and bilateral donors on issues of gender, peace and security. As director of the Women Waging Peace Policy Commission from 2002 to 2005, she developed and edited a series of case studies on women’s contributions to peace processes. Between 1998-2000, she was the senior policy adviser at International Alert, leading advocacy efforts to attain UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace, and security. Ms. Anderlini has written extensively on these issues, including Women at the Peace Table: Making a Difference (UNIFEM 2000), and Negotiating the Transition to Democracy and Reforming the Security Sector: The Vital Contributions of South African Women (Hunt Alternatives Fund 2004). In 1996, she co-authored Civil Wars, Civil Peace: An Introduction to Conflict Resolution. She was editor and lead contributor of Inclusive Security, Sustainable Peace: A Toolkit for Advocacy and Action (Women Waging Peace/International Alert 2004). In 2005 she was appointed as Research Associate of MIT’s Center for International Studies. She is currently involved with coexistence and democracy efforts in the Middle East. Her new book Women Building Peace: What they Do, Why it Matters will be published by Lynne Rienner in 2007.

LOUIS AUCOIN
Institute for Human Security Associate Research Professor - Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Louis Aucoin is currently Associate Research Professor at the Institute for Human Security, Tufts University. He was previously Program Officer in the Rule of Law Program, United States Institute of Peace (2000-2003); Supreme Court Fellow, United States Supreme Court Judicial Fellows Program (2001-2002); and Consultant, Justice in Times of Transition Project (March 2002-present). He has also taught at Boston University School of Law (1984-2000); ESSEC (Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Economiques et Commerciales); Université de Poitiers, and Ecole des Hautes Etudes Internationales, Paris. He is Co-founder, The Mekong Delta Regional Law Center and Member of The Association of American Law Schools, Section on International and Comparative Law and The American Society of International Law.

EILEEN BABBITT
Professor of International Conflict Management Practice - Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Eileen F. Babbitt is Professor of International Conflict Management Practice and Director of the International Negotiation and Conflict Resolution Program at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. She is also a Faculty Associate of the Program on Negotiation at the Harvard Law School and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Her research interests include identity-based conflicts; coexistence and trust-building in the aftermath of civil war; and the interface between human rights concerns and peacebuilding. Her practice as a facilitator and trainer has included work in the Middle East, the Balkans, and with U.S. government agencies, regional inter-governmental organizations, and international and local NGOs. Before joining the Fletcher faculty, Professor Babbitt was Director of Education and Training at the United States Institute of Peace in Washington, D.C. and Deputy Director of the Program on International Conflict Analysis and Resolution at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University. Professor Babbitt’s latest publications include the forthcoming book, Principled Peace: Conflict Resolution and Human Rights in Intrastate Conflict, University of Michigan Press; and Negotiating Self-Determination, co-edited with Hurst Hannum and published by Lexington Books. Dr. Babbitt holds a Master’s Degree in Public Policy from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, and a Ph.D. from MIT.
Jessica Berns
Program Manager - Coexistence International at Brandeis University
Jessica joined Brandeis in 2005 as Program Manager for Coexistence International (CI). As Program Manager she oversees all activities and programming conducted by CI and is responsible for program administration, fundraising, communications, supervision of staff and students, reporting to the Coexistence International Advisory Board, and liaising with CI’s learning and evaluation partners. Jessica also serves as the Convener for two specific areas of work: Strategic Networking and Donor Engagement in Building a Complementary Approach to Coexistence Work. At the start of her tenure, Jessica led the participatory strategic planning process from June - September 2005 that created the framework for CI’s work. Before coming to CI, Jessica spent five years in Berlin, Germany at Transparency International, the international anti-corruption non-governmental organization. While there, she worked closely with the Latin American civil society network and in the production of communication and advocacy tools. Jessica developed and edited the Corruption Fighters’ Tool Kit. Jessica holds a Master’s Degree in Law and Diplomacy from The Fletcher School and a B.A. in Spanish from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. She speaks Spanish and German and has lived and worked in Latin America and Europe. Jessica is a Board Member of the Alliance for Peacebuilding and sits on the Advisory Board of the 3D Security Initiative. Jessica is the Chair of the Board of the Children’s Center of Brookline.

Steven Burg
Professor of International Politics & Chair - Politics Department, Brandeis University
Steven L. Burg is Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics and Chair of the politics department at Brandeis. His most recent book, co-authored with Paul S. Shoup, The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention, was awarded the year 2000 Ralph J. Bunche Prize of the American Political Science Association for “the best scholarly work in political science which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism”. Burg is the author of more than 40 published articles and more than 50 papers on Soviet, Yugoslav, and post-Yugoslav politics and on ethnic conflict. He is also the author of several books, including Conflict and Cohesion in Socialist Yugoslavia, and War or Peace? Nationalism, Democracy and American Foreign Policy in Post-Communist Europe (A Twentieth Century Fund Book). He is co-author, with the late Roy Macridis, of Introduction to Comparative Politics: Regimes and Regime Change. He served as co-chair of the 1993 International Workshop on Peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He served as the principal consultant to the project on the South Balkans of the Center for Preventive Action of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, and was the principal author of Toward Comprehensive Peace in Southeast Europe: Conflict Prevention in the South Balkans, the report of the South Balkans Working Group, edited by Barnett Rubin. Currently, Burg is participating in efforts to foster inter-ethnic accommodation and prevent further ethnic conflict in the Balkans through his association with the Project on Ethnic Relations, and has documented these efforts in a series of reports available from the Project. Burg teaches graduate and undergraduate courses on West European, East European, and Balkan politics; on ethnic conflict and conflict management; and on regime change and democratization. He received his B.A. from the State University of New York at Stony Brook, his M.A. in Russian Area Studies from Hunter College of the City University of New York, and his Ph.D. in political science from the University of Chicago.

Maja Catic
Member, Board of Directors - Community of Bosnia
Maja Catic is a Ph.D. candidate at the Politics Department at Brandeis University. Her dissertation - a case study of Bosnia-Herzegovina - focuses on legitimization debates in the context of externally-sponsored state building in a deeply divided society. From 2005-2006 she was a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Fellow in Bosnia. Since 2004 she has been a member of the Board of Directors of the Community of Bosnia, currently a Sarajevo-based NGO. Her research interests include nationalism and ethnic politics; state building and external intervention; peace implementation, return, reconciliation, reconstruction, and reintegration.
Diana Chigas

**Project Co-Director, Reflecting on Peace Practice – Collaborative for Development Action, Inc.**

Diana Chigas is currently Co-Director of the Reflecting on Peace Practice project at CDA-Collaborative Learning Projects since 2003, working with non-governmental and inter-governmental agencies to improve the impact of peace programming and development and humanitarian assistance on peace and conflict. She was previously a Fellow at the Fletcher School’s Center for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution (2002-2003). Prior to Fletcher, she was a Senior Associate and Regional Director for Europe and the former Soviet Union for Conflict Management Group (CMG), advising international organizations, non-governmental organizations and governments in peacebuilding, negotiation and conflict resolution. Director, program on Preventive Diplomacy in the OSCE at CMG (1989-1992); program on Conflict Management in Cyprus (1993-2003); facilitated “track two” discussions and provided training and advice to the negotiating teams of the government in El Salvador and the FMLN, and with negotiators in the South African constitutional negotiations and in the Georgia/South Ossetia peace process.

Cynthia Cohen

**Executive Director - Slifka Program in Intercommunal Coexistence, Brandeis University**

Cynthia Cohen is Executive Director of the Slifka Program in Intercommunal Coexistence and director of Coexistence Research and International Collaborations, provides intellectual and administrative leadership for the components of the Slifka Program and manages the development of research and action partnerships with coexistence organizations around the world as well as projects on the Brandeis campus. She oversees the work of Coexistence International and is principal investigator in an ongoing inquiry into Creative Approaches to Coexistence and Reconciliation. She previously directed the international fellowship program Recasting Reconciliation through Culture and the Arts. She teaches at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Cohen was the founding director of the Oral History Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and has facilitated coexistence efforts involving participants from the Middle East, the United States, Central America, and Sri Lanka. She holds a Ph.D. in education from the University of New Hampshire, and a master’s in City Planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Cohen is the author of Working with Integrity: A Guidebook for Peacebuilders Asking Ethical Questions. She writes on the ethical and aesthetic dimensions of reconciliation and has published related chapters and articles in conflict resolution, women’s studies, and education; and manages the virtual resource center Creative Resources for Coexistence and Reconciliation, where working papers, portfolios and other publications emerging from Brandeis programs can be accessed.

Mari Fitzduff

**Director - Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University**

Mari Fitzduff is currently professor and director of the international MA program in Coexistence and Conflict at Brandeis University. From 1997 to 2003, she held a Chair of Conflict Studies at the University of Ulster where she was director of UNU/INCORE, which addresses the management of ethnic, political, and religious conflict through an integrated approach using research, training, policy, program, and practice development. From 1990 to 1997, she was chief executive of the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council, which works with government, statutory bodies, trade unions, churches, community groups, security groups, ex-prisoners, businesses, and politicians, developing programs and training to address issues of conflict resolution in Northern Ireland. She has also worked on programs addressing conflict issues in many countries -- including the Basque Country, Sri Lanka, the Middle East, and Indonesia -- and is utilized as an international expert by many governments and international organizations on issues of conflict and coexistence. Her publications include Beyond Violence: Conflict Resolution Processes in Northern Ireland (2002), published by the United Nations University Press/Brookings, which was winner of an American Library Notable Publications Award; Community Conflict Skills, which was first published in 1988 and is now in its fourth edition; and NGO’s at the Table, published by Rowan and Littlefield in 2004. Her most recent publication is The Psychology of Resolving Global Conflicts, a three-volume series which she co-edited with Chris Stout, published by Praegar Press in spring 2006.
Senator Mobina Jaffer  
Parliament of Canada

Born in Uganda, Mobina Jaffer was educated in both England and Canada, earning her bachelor of laws degree (LL.B.) from London University in England and going on to complete the Executive Development Program at Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia. The first East Indian woman lawyer in British Columbia, Mobina has an extensive record of achievement in the areas of equality and justice for women of colour and the struggle to end violence against all women. Appointed to the Senate in 2001 as the first East Indian, first Muslim, first African, she continues to bring issues of human rights and other important issues to her colleagues in the Parliament of Canada. From 2002-2006 Senator Jaffer held the position of Canada’s Special Envoy for Peace in Sudan. As the Special Envoy, Senator Jaffer worked with the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Sudanese Community and the Diplomatic Community to assist the people of Sudan in the search for peace. Senator Jaffer travelled to the region many times representing the Canadian Government. From May 2005 to March 2006 she was also a member of the Prime Minister’s Special Advisory Team focusing on the implementation of the Peace Process in Sudan. Senator Jaffer’s long-time advocacy of enabling Sudanese women to participate in the Peace negotiations was finally achieved for the first time in the fall of 2005. Senator Jaffer also took on the role as the Chair of the Canadian Committee on Women, Peace & Security from 2002-2005. Her belief that the key to peace is the inclusion of women in the peace process, was outlined in the United Nations 1325 (2000) Resolution. As Chair of the Canadian Committee of Women, Peace & Security she held roundtables on racial profiling, finding peaceful solutions to Middle-East warring, and the plight of Afghani and Iraqi women. Mobina has been very involved with the Liberal Party of Canada in various roles. She served as the Vice-President (English) of the Liberal Party of Canada, as the President of the National Women’s Liberal Commission, on the board of Liberal International, and as the Chair of the management board of the International Network of Liberal Women. Within the community Senator Jaffer is a supporter of a vast array of local community-based organizations, firmly believing that it takes the concerted efforts of a community to achieve our collective goals.

Theodore Johnson
Assistant Professor - Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University

Theodore A. Johnson is an assistant professor of conflict and coexistence in the Slifka Program for the 2006-07 academic year. In the fall, he will be teaching a course in International Mediation as well as a short course on Research Methodology. In the spring, he will be teaching a short course on Conflict and Development and a short course on Trends in Diversity Management. Prior to his appointment at Brandeis, Mr. Johnson was a Senior Program Manager and in-house legal counsel with Mercy Corps and Conflict Management Group managing the organization’s work with UN humanitarian organizations including WHO, FAO, UNCTAD, and UNEP. In his work at Mercy Corps, he also served as a consultant and trainer in numerous negotiation and dispute resolution programs in various conflict areas including South Africa, Cyprus, the Caucuses and the Middle East. In South Africa he assisted in building community mediation processes in post Aparthied South Africa, in Cyprus, he assisted in a Track II capacity-building process as well as with the Cyprus American Scholars Program. In the Middle East, he has done extensive work in Iraq working with Kurdish universities to design and implement conflict resolution programs, and with regional and local leaders from Shi’ite communities in South Central Iraq. In each of these programs, the aim was to build negotiation, communication, and problem-solving capacities. In the Caucuses Mr. Johnson worked with young leaders from several communities in Armenia to develop negotiation and leadership skills. Mr. Johnson has designed a nationally recognized community-based youth conflict resolution program which has been used extensively in Boston and Chicago. Johnson holds a Juris Doctor degree from Western State University, a Master’s in International Law and Diplomacy from the Fletcher School at Tufts University, and is an ABD for his PhD also from the Fletcher School at Tufts.
Allen Kassof
President Emeritus and Senior Adviser - Project on Ethnic Relations

Allen Kassof is President Emeritus and Senior Adviser at the Project on Ethnic Relations (PER), which he established in 1991 and where he served as President until 2005. PER works in Central and Eastern Europe to promote the peaceful resolution of ethnic conflicts and is a leading U.S. private organization mediating ethnic disputes in the region. Among his PER duties, Kassof chaired the roundtable talks between representatives of the Romanian government and the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania. He also chaired the Slovakia roundtable, which conducted the discussions between the ruling coalition, opposition parties, and the Hungarian ethnic parties of the Slovak Republic. He headed the roundtables on Albanians and Their Neighbors, a key regional forum bringing together political leaders from the Western Balkans and the international community, and chaired the discussions between representatives of the Montenegrin government and leaders of that country’s Albanian community. He currently chairs the Mavrovo Roundtables, a series of discussions between ethnic Albanian and Macedonian political leaders. Kassof was founding director of the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX), a position he held from 1968 until 1992. He was on the faculty of Smith College from 1957-1961 and was a Princeton University faculty member from 1961 to 1973. He graduated from Rutgers University in 1952. In 1954 he received the A.M. degree in Regional and International Studies, and in 1960 the Ph.D. in Sociology, both from Harvard University.

Abdul Wahab Musah
Program Officer - Ghana Center for Democratic Development

Abdul Wahab Musah is a Program Officer at the Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana). He has been at the forefront of the Center’s programs on promoting National Reconciliation. A product of the University of Ghana, Legon, he specialized in Political Science and Sociology. He has a M.Sc. in International Relations and Development from the Aalborg University in Denmark. He has received strong training in social science and has a keen interest in democracy and governance issues particularly transitional justice and human rights issues. He is a transitional justice fellow and has a Diploma in Transitional Justice from the University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Barbara Nelson
Dean, School of Public Affairs – UCLA

Barbara J. Nelson was named the first permanent dean of the UCLA School of Public Affairs (formerly the School of Public Policy and Social Research) on November 1, 1996. Prior to her appointment as Dean and Professor of Public Policy, she was Vice President and Distinguished Professor of Public Policy at Radcliffe College where her portfolio included academic program and strategic planning. Dr. Nelson’s fields of expertise include conflict mediation in civil society, social and economic policy, organizational theory and behavior, and social movements. Dean Nelson has worked or done research in 24 countries, and has made major contributions to policy making and civic life in the United States and abroad. She is the founder of The Concord Project, which conducts research and provides executive education on building bridging social capital—the human and organizational resources that span social differences. She is the Co-Director of the National Commission on Reducing Infant Mortality, sponsored by the Health Policy Institute of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. Dr. Nelson is the 2004 recipient of Harry Scoville Award from the Los Angeles Chapter of ASPA, for her academic and leadership accomplishments in starting the UCLA policy school. Dr. Nelson was a founding member of the Minnesota Supreme Court’s Task Force on Gender Equity in the Courts. She consulted with the Swedish Government on its Parliamentary Commission on Power and Democracy, and has worked with several United Nations organizations on questions of economic development and political participation. Before her appointment at Radcliffe, Barbara Nelson served on the faculties of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, where she was Director of the Center on Women and Public Policy. She earned her B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in political science at Ohio State University, where she was elected to Pi Sigma Alpha, the political science honorary society.
Hon. Amongi Betty Ongom  
Member of Parliament, Uganda  
Active in both her nation’s parliament and its peace process, Betty Amongi-Ongom has served Uganda in a variety of ways. She is the chair of the Uganda chapter of AMANI, also known as the Great Lakes Parliamentary Forum on Peace; and she chairs the observer mission to the Juba peace talks between the government and the LRA. She is also Uganda’s delegate to the African Caribbean and Pacific-European Union Joint Parliamentary Assembly (ACP-EU-JPA). As an opposition member of parliament, Ms. Amongi-Ongom was one of only five women who agitated for the Ugandan constitutional change from one-party system to a multi-party system, which was introduced in Uganda in 2005. She is a women’s rights advocate, a peace builder, and a critic of the current government policies in Uganda. She is an independent member of parliament. Ms. Amongi-Ongom has also served as the coordinator of the Northern Uganda Women’s Forum since 2004. She has been Uganda’s expert on democracy, good governance, and gender in the UN/African Union Conference on Peace and Security in the Great Lakes Region since 2004. From 2001 to 2004, Ms. Amongi-Ongom was the publicity secretary for the Uganda Women Parliamentary Association; as of 2006, she is the finance secretary for the Network of African Women Ministers and Parliamentarians. Ms. Amongi-Ongom holds a master’s degree in international relations and diplomatic studies.

Madhawa Palihapitiya  
MA Student - Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University  
Madhawa Palihapitiya is a native of Sri Lanka, where he works with local populations in order to build communities, settle conflicts, and cope with natural disasters. He is presently employed by the Foundation for Co-Existence (FCE), where he is a Programs Manager responsible for an Early Warning and Early Response system for preventing conflicts, a Land Rights program, and many other peace building and relief efforts. He earned his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Colombo, where he majored in English while minoring in International Relations, Economics, Demography, and Journalism.

Tim Phillips  
Cofounder - Project on Justice in Times of Transition, Tufts University  
Timothy Phillips is a founding co-chair of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition at Tufts University, a project recognized globally for its significant contributions to the field of transitional justice, the Northern Ireland peace process, reconciliation in El Salvador and Nicaragua, and the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. Mr. Phillips has served as a consultant to non-governmental and governmental organizations in the United States and abroad, including USAID and the Council of Europe, on democratization, conflict resolution and human rights initiatives. Mr. Phillips is a member of the Board of Directors and Advisors of the Foundation for a Civil Society, the University of the Middle East, the International Rescue Committee, Club of Madrid, and the Institute for Global Leadership at Tufts University. Mr. Phillips is also co-founder of Energia Global, Ltd., a pioneering developer and owner of private renewable energy facilities in Central and South America. He served as an advisor to the Government of Sri Lanka in the design and implementation of its peace process and has worked closely with leaders in several countries on conflict resolution and reconciliation initiatives. He presently serves as an Advisor to the William J. Clinton Foundation.

Kelley Ready  
Associate Director of Academics -  
Sustainable International Development Program, Brandeis University  
Kelley Ready is Associate Director of Academics at the Sustainable International Development Master of Arts Program. Professor Ready is an anthropologist and human rights activist who has worked on issues of gender and sexuality in Central America. She has taught at a variety of universities in the CUNY system as well as Northeastern University and Holy Cross College. Her work with women and social movements has centered on Central America. She writes and speaks on human rights and women in El Salvador. Recently Kelley has been monitoring the Central American recipients of a
small grant program of the Women in Development Office of USAID. These grants were provided to organizations working to improve women’s labor rights in export industries. Her essay “La Ciguanaba y el espíritu de las relaciones de género en El Salvador” was published by Plumstock Mesoamerican Press and UNIFEM in 2002 in Mujeres, Género e Historia: América Central Durante los Siglos XVIII, XIX, y XX” edited by Eugenia Rodríguez Sáenz.

Robert Ricigliano  
**Director, Institute of World Affairs & Peace Studies Program – University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee**

Robert Ricigliano is the Director of Institute of World Affairs, and the Peace Studies Program at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee where he teaches International Mediation and Negotiation through the Department of Communication. Mr. Ricigliano was a founding Board member of the Alliance for Peacebuilding, a consortium of leading U.S.-based conflict resolution NGOs and academic centers. Mr. Ricigliano has worked most recently with political parties in the new Iraqi Parliament and on the peace process in the Democratic Republic of Congo. He has been involved in peacebuilding interventions in Russia, Georgia, Colombia, South Africa, and elsewhere. Mr. Ricigliano served on the first U.S. team ever to teach negotiation at the Soviet Foreign Ministry’s Diplomatic Academy in Moscow and has trained diplomats and other government officials from Africa, Europe, Asia, and North America. He was also selected by the Secretary of the Interior to lead a first of its kind mediation of a land dispute. He was Executive Director of the Conflict Management Group and Associate Director of the Harvard Negotiation Project. He has developed core programs in diplomatic and governmental negotiation, preventive diplomacy, and inter-group conflict management.

Gay Rosenblum-Kumar  
**Senior Public Administration Officer - UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs**

Gay Rosenblum-Kumar is a senior public administration officer in the Governance and Public Administration Branch of the UN Secretariat’s Department of Economic and Social Affairs. She works with government officials and their civil society counterparts in divided societies to enhance their understanding of and capacities for mitigating and managing conflict constructively. The purpose of this work is to empower local stakeholders who would benefit from the peaceful resolution of conflict by imparting: skills to analyze, anticipate and respond to crisis; insights into how to defuse tensions in conflictual environments; and the ability to strengthen their country’s development and governance with conflict resolution tools and techniques. This is done primarily by imparting skills for dialogue processes, consensus-building, participatory problem-solving and by organizing specific training in facilitation, mediation, negotiation and conflict transformation. Such capacity-building projects focus on: creating a cadre of skilled individuals; strengthening governance institutions in public Ministries or in the major branches of government such as the Parliament and the judiciary; and, promoting conflict-sensitive development practice and democratic governance. Ms. Rosenblum-Kumar is currently advising on UN conflict prevention/transformation projects in Bangladesh, Ghana, Guyana, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan, and Zimbabwe. Prior to joining the United Nations in 1989, she worked with several international NGOs on anti-apartheid and development issues.

Romain Rurangirwa  
**MA Student - Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University**

Romain Rurangirwa is an ordained priest for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Butare in his native Rwanda. Romain was the Chancellor of Butare Diocese and Secretary to the Bishop, where he had the opportunity to meet with various political and religious leaders in Rwanda. He also organized the 2000 Year Jubilee of the Church. Romain became involved in the field of coexistence and conflict through his work with prisoners who were perceived as perpetrators in the genocide that took place in Rwanda in 1994, and widows and orphans who were victims of the genocide. Romain graduated from the Nyakibanda Major Seminary and the Weston Jesuit School of Theology.
Ashad Sentongo
MA Student - Coexistence and Conflict, Brandeis University
Ashad Sentongo has spent his professional life working as a teacher, peace activist, and community builder in his native Uganda, as well as in South Africa. For the last six years he has been a partner with Community Development Consultancy Co. Ltd., which works with various organizations on peace and educational development. In the past, Ashad also worked for the Africa Education Agency and the Southern Africa Dawa Network, and has been a consultant for various forums, including the Peace Education Forum and the Government and Political Parties Consultative Forum. In 2004, Ashad organized a national conference and five seminars on democracy and human rights, one in each of the five regions of Uganda. In 2005, Ashad worked with schools in Entebbe Municipality to generate knowledge and promote skills in resolving conflicts among teachers, students, parents and governing bodies. He was educated at Islamic University in Uganda and at the Dameline School of Management.

Martha Thompson
Program Manager, Rights in Humanitarian Crises - Unitarian Universalist Service Committee
Martha Thompson is program manager for Rights in humanitarian crises for the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee. She works on programs in Aceh, Sri Lanka, Darfur Pakistan and the US Gulf Coast. UUSC is developing a strong focus on how gender affects access to aid in conflict and emergency. She has taught in the Sustainable International Development at Brandeis University, on Development in Conflict Situations and Cuba as a Development Model. Thompson has lived and worked in Central America for 13 years, working in conflict situations there, specifically with displaced, refugees and population in the conflict zones. She spent four years working in Cuba for Oxfam Canada, setting up and implementing the Oxfam International Cuba program. She has done work on comparing and analyzing NGO experiences in conflict situations in Latin America, Southern Africa, and Asia and has published on work in conflict, gender issues in conflict situations and on various aspects of the Cuba development model. She received her B.A. from University of Toronto and her M.P.H. from the University of Hawaii.

Roberto Varea
Assistant Professor - Performing Arts & Social Justice, University of San Francisco
Roberto Varea began his career as an actor and director in his native city of Córdoba, Argentina. Upon receiving his MFA in Theater/Directing from UCSD in 1992, he moved to San Francisco where he makes his home. His research and creative work focuses on issues of performance and its relationship to state violence and resistance movements, issues that he has presented and lectured about in the US and abroad. He has directed numerous productions and workshops associated with new play development and community-driven issues and projects, particularly in the Latino - Chicano community. His directing work, which includes world or west coast premieres of works by Cherrie Moraga, Migdalia Cruz, Jose Rivera and Ariel Dorfman, has been presented at Braval, Campo Santo / Intersection for the Arts, The Lorraine Hansberry Theater, the Magic Theater and El Teatro de la Esperanza to name a few Bay Area venues. Roberto is the founding artistic director of Soapstone Theatre Company, a collective of male ex-offenders and women survivors of violent crime, and of El Teatro Jornalero!, a performance company that brings the voice of Latin American immigrant workers to the stage. He is a professor of theater at the University of San Francisco, where he is co-founder of the Performing Arts and Social Justice Major, and teaches theater to incarcerated women at the San Francisco County Jail’s Sisters Project. He also serves on the board of the Yerba Buena Gardens Festival and The Consortium on Latin American Immigration, and is an Associate Editor of Peace Review an international journal on peace and justice studies, published by Routledge Press.
About the Conference
Resolving conflicts and achieving sustainable coexistence in divided societies require the integrated, complementary efforts of professionals in relevant fields. Working across various disciplines such as democracy, human rights, gender, and development allows the many facets of a conflict to be addressed. Without such cooperation, key players often work in isolation from one another, which can lead to missed opportunities or unsustainable responses to conflict and to societal or global coexistence needs.

Democracy, human rights, gender, and development are just some pieces of the puzzle that must be assembled in order to form a more complete picture of equality and respect for difference. In this two-day conference at Brandeis University, Coexistence International and its cosponsors explored the ways in which these pieces can interact and cooperate and the extent to which complementarity is a useful approach to peacebuilding work. The conference provided the opportunity to reflect on how these conclusions affect the way we should train and educate the next generation of coexistence leaders.

Convening a distinguished set of panelists representing an exceptional range of scholarly and field-based work, “Pieces of the Coexistence Puzzle” provided an opportunity for reflection on, and in-depth analysis of, the potential for cooperation in building a more peaceful, just world.

Coexistence International
Based within the Slifka Program in Intercommunal Coexistence and Brandeis University since 2005, Coexistence International (CI) is an initiative committed to strengthening the field of policymakers, practitioners, researchers, advocates, organizations, and networks promoting coexistence at local, national, and international levels. CI promotes a complementary approach to coexistence work through facilitating connections, learning, reflection, and strategic thinking between those in the coexistence field and those in related areas.

International Center for Ethics, Justice, and Public Life
The International Center for Ethics, Justice, and Public Life exists to develop effective responses to conflict and injustice by offering innovative approaches to coexistence, strengthening the work of international courts, and encouraging ethical practice in civic and professional life. The center was founded at Brandeis University in 1998 through the generosity of Abraham D. Feinberg.

Coexistence International is funded through a generous grant from the Alan B. Slifka Foundation.