

PEACEMAKER 101

Careers

Confronting

Conflict

PEACEMAKER 101

Careers Confronting Conflict

Edited by
Roy J. Eidelson
Jena Laske
Lina Cherfas

Solomon Asch Center
for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Copyright © 2007 by the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict, University of Pennsylvania. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

Published by:
Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict
University of Pennsylvania
3819-33 Chestnut Street, Suite 305
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
<http://psych.upenn.edu/sacsec>
215-898-3510

Copies may be ordered from the Solomon Asch Center

Cover Design: Lars Mylius, voodoopop studios, Berlin

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
Peacemaker 101: careers confronting conflict /
edited by Roy J. Eidelson, Jena Laske, and Lina Cherfas

ISBN-13: 978-0-9791763-0-2

ISBN-10: 0-9791763-0-1

*This volume is dedicated to the Solomon Asch Center's
founding directors Paul Rozin and Clark McCauley,
and to peacemakers of yesterday, today, and tomorrow.*

Contents

Introduction by Roy J. Eidelson	1
SECTION ONE Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding	
1 War Has Defined Humanity's Existence. What Can Be More Radical Than to Seek Peace? by Miriam Coronel Ferrer	7
2 Out of The Press Box and into Peacebuilding by Thomas Hill	13
3 A Winding Road: Physics, Ethology, Conflict...Peace? by Carolyn A. Ristau	23
4 On the Road from Academe to Conflict Resolution by Alan E. Gross	35
5 Visual Art in Conflict Resolution: Commemoration, Narration and Pro-Active Practice by Elizabeth Hoak Doering	47
6 Friends from Enemies: One Israeli's Perspective by Adina Friedman	59
7 Conscious Politics by Diane Perlman	69
8 Working on the Peace Puzzle by Julie Chalfin	79
9 Mediatize Peace by Georgios Terzis	87

SECTION TWO Working with Survivors

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 10 | Psychosocial Work in a Refugee Camp
by Rebecca Horn | 97 |
| 11 | If a Path Doesn't Exist, How about Making One?
by Champika K. Soysa | 107 |
| 12 | Waging Resilience
by Serena Chaudhry | 115 |
| 13 | In The Footsteps of Great-Great Uncle Moritz
by David Goodwin | 123 |
| 14 | This Place in the Ways
by Shanee Stepakoff | 129 |
| 15 | Disaster Psychology: An Interesting and Rewarding
Challenge
by Teri L. Elliott | 141 |
| 16 | Giving Voice to the Voiceless: Working on Behalf
of Refugees
by Lorraine Majka | 151 |

SECTION THREE International Development
and Human Rights

- 17 Disability and International Human Rights: 163
Sisyphus Reconsidered
by Daniel Holland
- 18 Can We Leave This World Better Than We Found It? 173
by Eugene K. B. Tan
- 19 HIV/AIDS Prevention, Violent Conflict, and 181
Health Policy in Africa
by Adedayo Adeyemi
- 20 Sharing Knowledge 187
by Elodie Hugon
- 21 Ethnic Diversity, International Law and Conflict 193
Research: A Swiss Perspective
by Tina Kempin
- 22 Adventures in International Development 199
by Molly Inman
- 23 In Our Own Small Way We Can Change This World 207
by Malika Mistry
- 24 International Development and Ethnopolitical 217
Conflict: Peaks and Pitfalls
by Jill Carty
- 25 Peace Work in Sri Lanka: Reflections on 223
Past Activism
by Sumanasiri Liyanage

SECTION FOUR Academic Perspectives on
Peace and Conflict

- 26 A Few Laps around the *Non*-Tenure Track 233
by Mikhail Lyubansky
- 27 Stop the World, I Want to Make Peace 245
by Ephraim Tabory
- 28 Researching the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly 253
by Hanna Zagefka
- 29 An Accident of Birth? 263
by Catherine C. Byrne
- 30 Ethnicity and Politics: An Outsider's Perspective 271
by Britt Cartrite
- 31 Fathers, the Dinner Table, and Ethnopolitical Conflict 279
by Donald G. Ellis
- 32 A Cultural Psychologist Searching for Meaning 287
by Adam B. Cohen
- 33 Serendipity 295
by Christian Leuprecht

SECTION FIVE Conducting Conflict Research

34	Fragments of Conflict Research by Maria Koinova	303
35	Researching the Effects of Political Detention: Some Thoughts from South Africa by Ashraf Kagee	311
36	The Courage of Despair: Fragments of An Intellectual Project by Alejandro Castillejo-Cuéllar	321
37	Field Research in Post-Conflict Scenarios by Inma Serrano	333
38	In Need of Conflicts: Central European Experiences by Gábor Eröss	341
39	Research at the United Nations by Tina Nebe	351
	Contributors	359
	Editors	369
	Acknowledgments	371

Introduction

Roy J. Eidelson

The essays in this volume are the personal narratives of a very talented and diverse group of individuals. To my good fortune, one thing the contributors share in common is that each of them spent a summer participating in an intensive course on ethnopolitical conflict at the University of Pennsylvania's Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict. It is through this program that I had the opportunity to meet and get to know each of them, and to subsequently persuade them to contribute an essay to *Peacemaker 101: Careers Confronting Conflict*.

A brief introduction to ethnopolitical conflict, the Solomon Asch Center, and its summer institutes provides some useful background to the collection of essays that follow. Broadly construed, ethnopolitical conflicts involve groups that differ (or appear to differ) along identity dimensions such as ethnicity, race, religion, language, or nationality. These conflicts can result from disputes over tangible resources, such as land or legal rights, or intangible goals, such as power or status.

Regardless of the particular underlying causes, ethnopolitical conflicts are often profound in their consequences. When violence erupts, the fighting typically takes place within and around communities. There are no well-defined battlefields. Neighborhoods are turned into war zones; the vast majority of casualties are noncombatants, mostly women and children. Beyond the loss of life and property, the psychological and social damage wrought by these intergroup

conflicts is also devastating: chronic exposure to stress becomes debilitating, families are broken apart, bonds of communal trust are dissolved, youth are immersed in systems of violence, communities are infected with memories of victimization, neighbors are dehumanized as demons, and social structures supporting psychological well-being are dismantled. In addition, intergroup violence often creates waves of refugees and internally displaced persons who flee unprepared toward whatever place appears safer than the war zone. Once separated from their homes, these individuals—currently numbering in the millions worldwide—are likely to spend long periods of time in camps or other unfamiliar and difficult circumstances.

The Solomon Asch Center was created in 1998 to address the severe problems posed by ethno-political conflicts by advancing education, research, best practices, and enlightened policy analysis. The center is named in honor and memory of Solomon Asch, one of the great social psychologists of the twentieth century, in recognition of his crucial contributions to illuminating the psychological underpinnings of individual and group behavior.

The Asch Center's interdisciplinary summer institutes, held during alternate summers from 1999 through 2005, have been one of the center's keystone programs. They have brought together scholars and practitioners from around the world to learn from leading experts and from each other about the causes, consequences, and possible amelioration of ethno-political conflicts. Overall, 75 "summer fellows" from 28 different countries have participated in the program. The countries represented have included Australia, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Israel, Mexico, Moldova, Nigeria, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone,

Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States.

I write today as executive director of the Asch Center, but in 1999 I was part of the first summer institute cohort. After ten intensive weeks together, my new colleagues scattered to the four corners of the earth (almost literally) to return to their important work. I stayed on at the Asch Center, shifting my own professional activities from psychotherapy and research with individuals and couples to a new job helping to build the Asch Center and studying conflict on a much larger scale. For me, this career change was not the first. In fact, the constancy in my professional life has been a progressively widening interest in understanding and addressing questions of why people behave the way they do and so often find themselves in conflict with one another. Over time, my focus has shifted from models of interpersonal relationship development (my doctoral dissertation), to the “irrational beliefs” that contribute to marital difficulties (my postdoctoral fellowship and early academic years), to the mob psychology that governs the financial markets (a decade’s detour in many ways best forgotten), to my current focus on five core beliefs and collective worldviews—about issues of vulnerability, injustice, distrust superiority, and helplessness—that often contribute to group conflict.

Returning to the essays in this volume, I am very pleased that 39 former summer institute participants responded affirmatively to my invitation to write a personal narrative touching upon what they do, how and why they became interested in this type of work, the special challenges and rewards of their professions, and suggestions for others who might want to pursue similar careers. The group of contributors spans a very broad range in many ways. For example, at the time of this writing they were living in over 20

different countries. In terms of professional experience, they vary from individuals relatively early in their careers to those whose careers now cover decades. Many have struggled with ethnopolitical violence in their home countries. The academic disciplines in which they were trained include psychology, political science, sociology, anthropology, economics, social work, public health, communications, conflict resolution, law, and art. Each essay is unique, but my co-editors and I have tried to provide a loose structure by grouping the essays into five sections: Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding, Working with Survivors, International Development and Human Rights, Academic Perspectives on Peace and Conflict, and Conducting Conflict Research. These distinctions are somewhat arbitrary; many contributors are engaged in work that spans two or more of these categories.

The contributors and editors of *Peacemaker 101* hope that this collection proves to be of interest to many people, but especially to students wondering how to make a difference in a world that suffers greatly from tragic and violent group conflict. We recognize that often it is not easy to see, as a high school or university student, how to move from concern to effective action. One valuable step can be to learn how others have moved forward. The personal essays in this book offer a broad range of examples from which to draw inspiration and direction.

SECTION ONE

Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding

War Has Defined Humanity's Existence. What Can Be More Radical Than To Seek Peace?

Miriam Coronel Ferrer

I entered the University of the Philippines (UP) in 1977, when martial rule was in full force. Political power was concentrated in the hands of then President Ferdinand Marcos. Newspapers were taken over by government cronies. The state was unleashing its arsenal against Moro (Filipino Muslim) separatists in the South and the communist-led New People's Army. Displacement, killings and various other forms of human rights violations marked those dark years.

I joined the student newspaper, which became our medium for reporting on courageous acts to defend freedom, and exposing irregularities. As soon as I got my college degree, I worked full time in the resistance, writing for underground newspapers and organizing teachers and students in different parts of the country. As a cadre of the Maoist-inspired Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP), I supported guerilla warfare, although I was largely involved in political organizing in the cities.

In 1986, people power and a mutiny in the armed forces forced Marcos and his family to leave the country. Free elections and an independent congress were restored. Peace processes to find a just settlement of the conflict between the state and the Moro and communist organizations were begun. However, politics remained turbulent. Powerful blocs from among the landowning classes, the old political elites, and the

military resisted the reforms. Political violence continued. Today armed conflict persists in various parts of the country.

I left the CPP in 1989 and began my own quest for alternative modes of social and political change. Peace processes in different parts of the world were capturing the imagination of those searching for ways to achieve and consolidate nonviolent democratic transitions. At the same time, communal and racial strife were erupting in many places, even as the Cold War ended. I became a peace advocate. I pursued this track as a writer, NGO worker, as a postgraduate student, campaigner and organizer, and teacher at the UP Department of Political Science.

At the 1992 International Program on Conflict Resolution of Uppsala University in Sweden, my co-participants from India, Peru, Nigeria and South Africa and I wrote an exploratory paper on the various dimensions of the ethnic conflicts confounding our societies. In 1997, I collaborated with colleagues from the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam on a book project called *Sama-sama, Facets of Ethnic Relations in Southeast Asia*. *Sama-sama* is a Malay word meaning all together. It is an apt word to describe the shared fate of people in the same global neighborhood.

In 1995, my friends and I started the Philippine Campaign to Ban Landmines (PCBL), a country campaign member of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), which won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997. Together with Southern country campaigns in the ICBL, we developed approaches and strategies to engage armed groups to commit to mine bans and peace processes. Our ICBL mission to Nepal in 2003 brought us in contact with the different political parties, including the armed Maoist communist leadership who was then jointly observing a short-lived ceasefire with the government. The PCBL has also successfully convinced the Moro Islamic

Liberation Front operating mainly in Central Mindanao in Southern Philippines to stop its use of antipersonnel land mines.

Recently, we began a new global initiative called the South-South Network for the Engagement of Armed Groups to pursue constructive and participatory means to bring non-state armed groups into peace processes, and under human rights and international humanitarian law regimes. Many of these non-state armed groups are in Asia, Latin America and Africa where ethnopolitical and other types of conflicts dot the social and political landscape. At home, we established a citizens' network promoting the observance of human rights and international humanitarian law by the state and the its armed challengers, notably the CPP and its armed wing, the New People's Army.

The combined role of activist, academic and so-called public intellectual is not a career that one pursues for security or comfort. Pay in a state-owned university, to begin with, is below market rates. My 25-year old son, who works for a private corporation, is paid almost twice my salary. The changing currents in university and national politics do not offer foolproof physical security. One can become an open target, given the vicissitudes in our national politics, or a random victim in the crossfire of our many wars at home and elsewhere. Legitimacy as a professor in the country's premier university is earned only by meeting the multiple responsibilities of teaching, producing solid academic research, and taking on administrative functions in various programs and centers within the university. One of my greatest blessings is to have a husband who loves and cares for the family and lets me be all of these.

My involvement in the field of ethnopolitical conflict can best be characterized as an engagement rooted in the need to

grapple with our national and global complexities. It is both a product of choice and circumstance. I believe in following the road where it leads me, and every now and then I decide to turn or stop, to rest or go on full speed. Sometimes I choose my traveling companions. Sometimes they just happen to be fellow travelers.

The best part of this type of work is going on field research and missions in the highland and lowland, inland and coastal communities of our archipelago. I treasure the personal encounters with leaders and followers, the elite and downtrodden, the spiritually-oriented and the hardcore political realists of all sides of the conflict equation. Being with them, I see their world from where they are, and appreciate better what seem to be coherence and disjunctions in their articulations. I enjoy books and spending time plowing through texts, maybe even crunching numbers. But these methods without the face-to-face encounters can produce only black-and-white pictures of a field drowning in colors.

A dominant contention in academy is that one must first have solid training in one discipline before going into area studies -- geographic areas or thematic pursuits like peace and conflict studies. This is true insofar as it recognizes the need to eventually go beyond one's discipline. Various perspectives and diverse methodologies are required to grapple with deep-rooted conflicts. My own disciplinal training is in qualitative political and philosophical analysis, and it can hardly be considered solid. I have relied on my own intuitive political experience to guide me in my current advocacies. Both intuition and training have served me well. But as I move on "to follow" the conflict, I realize I have to draw on various other resources and wisdom to navigate my way. I found my own research tracks and approaches diversifying and departing from my base in sociological and political analytical

approaches. In particular, I now find literature, anthropology and psychology as important sources for understanding and responding to ethno-political conflicts. These fields (and their practitioners) will have to be summoned to illuminate the numerous threads that we are both unraveling and weaving.

Advocacies, I believe, should always be founded on well-researched, analytical approaches. I've always felt a discomfort with formulaic prescriptions and dogmatic framing. My years as a Marxist were fortunately tempered by some kind of existentialism that always made me question the means and the ends of any undertaking. I consider orthodoxy in thinking and exclusivist articulations of reality as the greatest threat to humankind. Their bearers tend to forcibly impose their views on others. Therefore, for me, the greatest challenge is creating an inclusive synthesis of our histories and future as peoples in a living planet.

For the good number of faculty members active in various advocacies (gender, environment, culture and the arts, etc.), our university has become a major source of institutional support, albeit not without disagreements and compromises with authorities and colleagues. The university, in turn, is made robust and relevant by the energy and passion brought about by its engaged and productive members.

At UP, there is a running contention over the best way to transform our problematic state and unjust society. Like our generation, a good number of the present crop of students are taking up arms, frustrated by the corruption of our leaders, the greed of the propertied class and the inequities of the global order. Those who advocate revolution with the requisite violence earn the honorable sobriquet of being revolutionaries. Radicalism has become associated with militancy and violence.

We need to challenge this notion despite its noble intention. For, what could be more revolutionary than to

confront the sword of war with acts of peace? What can be more radical than to stash a cache of goodwill, and to use this bounty to build rather than to destroy?

The world today is frightening. As I write this, thousands have been forced to flee Lebanon as Israel continued its shooting war with Hezbollah. North Korea has totally rejected the UN Resolution against its missile launches. Both soldiers and civilians face cruel deaths in large numbers on a daily basis in Iraq. The Philippine government is accused of complicity in the politically motivated killings of activists and journalists. The use of force has become a convenient policy lever of state leaders and of state challengers. The language of rights, democracy and freedom have been appropriated by all to serve one-sided ends. In this situation, we must continuously hone our capacities to discern what is just and unjust, and to come up with alternative policies, processes and mechanisms.

The study of ethnopolitics requires mapping new terrain: diversifying spatial and political arrangements, engendering new social norms, and evolving ways and means for the coexistence and flourishing of living cultures. It demands fresh perspectives on power, and redefinitions of relationships among individuals, genders, groups and states. From retrieving oral histories to drawing up formulas for proportional representation, from community healing to international courts of justice – all these need input from all of us stakeholders in this troubled planet.

More people need to get on board this quest -- and try to make a difference.

Out of the Press Box and Into Peacebuilding

Thomas Hill

I never was a great sportswriter. That much I know. For years, I spent my afternoons and evenings standing around professional baseball clubhouses, restlessly shifting my weight from one foot to the other, reluctantly participating in idle conversations with players I barely knew and impatiently waiting for something interesting to happen.

Sometimes I smirked at the players' schoolboy humor. Sometimes they indulged my musings about domestic politics or world affairs. We usually agreed on only one point: I needed to be somewhere else, doing something else, and the sooner, the better for everyone.

Like a student who has lost interest in his lessons, I spent my time searching for distractions. If I couldn't find them, I created them. With my notebook, pen and laptop, I became a provocateur. I coaxed players to make comments that would cause a stir. I persuaded coaches and executives to share that extra tidbit of information that would heighten tension around their team. And then I weaved it all into stories worthy of big, bold headlines.

I pursued a career in sports journalism not only because I loved sports (which I did) or because the power of journalism intrigued me (it still does), but also because it offered me an opportunity to observe (and sometimes actually participate in) some of New York's most public conflicts. I see that clearly now. Professional sports is nothing without its conflicts: team vs. team; player vs. player; city vs. city; player vs.

coach/manager/executive. Add to that list the conflicts that top-notch sportswriters experience on a daily basis with competitors and even their own editors. Is it possible to be a sportswriter for a major daily newspaper and not become an on-the-job expert in conflict? I don't think so.

Not many people understood my decision when I opted to leave the high-octane life of New York City sports journalism for an uncertain future in international affairs. I'm not sure even I did. It was more about following a feeling than a well-thought-out plan. I knew I had a knack for understanding conflicts, and wasn't averse to being part of them. I felt passionately about exploring the world outside America's ballparks and learning about differences – and how to address them – rather than experiencing only sameness.

So here I am today. What am I and what do I do? Those are not easy questions. Even though I've spent the majority of the past six years working on conflict issues in Iraq, some of my most difficult moments occur on airplanes, in doctors' offices and at border crossings when I am asked to write my profession on a form, usually in a small box with room for only one or two words.

For a while, I said I was a conflict resolution practitioner, but that suggested that I spent my days like a plumber, going from place to place with a set of tools to solve people's problems. That isn't what I do. At times, I've called myself a researcher, scholar-practitioner, program director and project manager. While those all are accurate descriptors, they don't tell anyone much about the substance of my work.

Finally – for now – I've decided I am a professional peacebuilder. As impossibly broad and ridiculously ambitious as that may sound, it is the closest I can come to the truth. Almost everything I have done professionally during the past six years has been focused on building peace in Iraq. I can't say

what the impact of my work has been. I only know the objective and some of the outcomes, and I am confident that building peace – and helping others to do the same – is what I have been doing.

How does one go about trying to build peace? Well, it's easy and it isn't. When I speak of peacebuilding, I definitely do not mean the well-defined step in a formal peace process that former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali described in "An Agenda for Peace." To me, peacebuilding does not occur exclusively in postconflict settings, and certainly does not consist only of activities that support formal peacemaking and peacekeeping. I prefer the broader conceptualization of peacebuilding, offered by John Paul Lederach and others, as the full range of activities and processes needed to transform violent conflicts into relationships that are constructive and sustainable. The type of peacebuilding I envision includes all initiatives that address root causes of conflict that may be social, economic or political and may involve interpersonal, inter-group and/or international relationships.

Relationships lie at the heart of successful peacebuilding because it is those same relationships that provide the foundation for most conflicts. That is why I have undertaken the types of initiatives that I have in Iraq – community-level workshops, dialogues or simple consultations that encourage parties involved in conflict to consider critical questions about their own needs – and why I reject the widely accepted idea that peace can be built or ensured by political leaders alone.

Of all the initiatives with which I have been involved in recent years, one stands above the others in terms of embodying true peacebuilding. I spent a significant portion of 2005 working with a remarkable group of Iraqis who came together because they wanted to make a contribution to build a

more peaceful country. The 17 people that I and two extremely dedicated colleagues from Columbia University worked with included people from Kirkuk, Mosul and Tikrit, and included Sunni Arabs, Turkmen, Caldean Christians, Kurds and one Shia Arab.

My contribution was bringing them together in the same place, at the same time, finding an organization that would support their efforts, and making it possible for my two colleagues to develop and deliver three specially-designed training workshops in Iraq during a turbulent seven-month period. (One reality I am learning is that the sometimes obvious but challenging act of matching well-meaning individuals, appropriate institutions, needed financial resources and the proper supportive environment is a sub-profession unto itself without which peacebuilding is barely possible.) We supported them in learning about conflict as a phenomenon and also about effective pedagogical approaches that could help other Iraqis learn about peace and conflict.

The group – now known informally as the Iraqi Peacebuilders Network – has astonished and inspired me. Two of the original members are gone – one was attacked and killed and another moved his family out of Iraq because of security concerns – but the remaining 15 have undertaken a wide range of ambitious initiatives.

Mariam, one of the peacebuilders, trained the Tikrit City Council in peaceful conflict resolution skills at a tense time when its largely tribal membership was considering taking revenge for the killing of one of its members. A Kirkuk-based group of the peacebuilders conducted workshops on principles of peaceful conflict resolution for young adults affiliated with three Kirkuk-based civil society organizations, and for university students and instructors in their city. Most recently, Sameer, one of the bright young peacebuilders in Kirkuk,

facilitated a day-long Open Space Technology event for members of a newly-formed Council of Notables that was formed to try to stop ongoing violence and prevent more of it as the city faces a highly-charged referendum in 2007 about whether it will join the autonomous Kurdistan Region of Iraq (Open Space Technology is a self-organized communication process that allows groups of five to several thousand people to set priorities and make critical decisions. More information is available at: <http://www.openspaceworld.org>).

Aside from the high degree of difficulty associated with each of these interventions, they all share another common central element. They approach peacebuilding as a change process that encourages reflection and learning. They reach beyond the popularized notion of conflict resolution as political negotiation about deeply-held positions. I do not mean to suggest that political negotiations are unimportant, but rather that “peacebuilding through learning” is a critical component of any peace process and should be prioritized if high-level political processes are going to succeed.

These interventions offer participants opportunities to consider the nature of conflict and ways of analyzing it and to examine and question their own tendencies in responding to conflict. These workshops also provide a safe environment in which to address these critical issues, at times in the presence of individuals from rival groups or organizations. Such interventions tend to be intense and consequently seem to achieve best results when they are three-to-five days long. Although local culture and tradition are the best determinants for the proper structure of a workshop, very few people have enough energy to remain meaningfully engaged with such challenging material for more than a few consecutive days. My own experience in Iraq indicates that a minimum of two or three days are needed for members of a mixed group to

develop enough comfort to probe deeply enough within themselves and each other so that a real change process may begin.

This type of peacebuilding unfortunately is neither well-known nor very well supported by top policymakers. Governments and international organizations provide very little funding for it, intensifying the strain on already overstretched peacebuilders. Policymakers are not completely to blame for failing to see the obvious benefit of “peacebuilding through learning.” Part of the responsibility lies with practitioners in this field such as myself. Faced with skepticism about the outcomes of our work, we have failed to build a sufficiently convincing case for the depth and range of our successes and for the consequent need to support the field.

People often ask me how I know if I am doing something useful. I usually confess that I can’t actually prove the effectiveness of “peacebuilding through learning.” My hypothesis is that by promoting education and learning around conflict to increase the range of options people see for themselves in conflict, changes in attitude about conflict will occur, and, ultimately, participants will choose more peaceful behavior. To skeptics, I acknowledge two things: not nearly enough rigorous evaluation of peacebuilding interventions has occurred, and, a lot more time will be needed before any of the initiatives I have worked on really can be evaluated.

For now, I move ahead in partial blindness, drawing preliminary conclusions based on my own observations and other anecdotal evidence. I know that achieving real change is a long, slow process, but I have seen enough to believe that it is possible. I have watched some Iraqis arrive at workshops I have helped to facilitate with rigid views about communities other than their own, and I have seen those views begin to soften. I have seen Kurds who would not entertain the

possibility of living peacefully with Arabs because of extremely harmful acts that certain Arabs had committed against Kurds in the past. I have seen Arabs who were deeply fearful of retribution by Kurds. And I have seen these attitudes begin to shift not only because of contact between the two groups, but because of increased understanding about the nature of conflict and the range of possible responses to it.

I am not alone in my belief in the power of “peacebuilding through learning.” I make several trips to Iraq each year, with each field visit lasting three weeks or a month. The rest of the time, I am based in New York City, where my Internet connection provides most of my contact with the field. My own experience tells me that, at least in Iraq, the hunger for more learning about conflict and possible peaceful responses to it is on the rise. I occasionally receive emails from Iraq like this one from a U.S. government official whom I had never met:

“I will be working...on the idea of a conflict resolution...project bringing together leaders, most likely religious leaders, from different groups in the same area or areas to look at various approaches to the subject in the U.S. And I’d like to explore the possibility of working with you a bit further. I’d be very interested in more details about your trainers and about other possible projects. Conflict resolution is a difficult subject to quantify – sometimes even to describe – but clearly needed.”

How can we, as peacebuilding practitioners, help policymakers better understand the potential power of what we do? I think the answers lie in education and institutions, and in combining them. Because I see peacebuilding through learning as such a promising field, and because I recognize the power of institutions to determine whether these efforts succeed or fail, I am planning to focus the next phase of my work on the

power of universities in conflict zones. I would like to imagine a moment when universities throughout the world would bring some of their enormous resources to bear on the task of increasing global understanding of conflict and developing and promoting peaceful and rational responses to it – much in the way that research universities have contributed to addressing societal challenges around public health, economic development, communication and transportation. Peace should be considered a needed public good worthy of serious and widespread academic inquiry and commitment.

Reaching this point of relative clarity has been a gradual but steady process for me. As I write this essay in the summer of 2006, I am only seven years removed from a time when I was still a full-time sports journalist without any clear intention of becoming a peacebuilder.

How did I actually move out of the pressbox and into peacebuilding? My first and biggest step involved returning to school. Eleven years after I completed my undergraduate degree, I enrolled in a master's degree program at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. I knew I needed to learn much more about the world, and to begin interacting with people directly involved in changing it. The formal education route made sense for me, in part because I knew an abrupt career shift like mine would invite professional skepticism, and I figured that a degree from a well-respected university would confer some of the legitimacy I needed.

The second big step I took seemed small at the time. I enrolled in a course at Columbia called "International Conflict Resolution I." The professor, Dr. Andrea Bartoli, inspired me with a blend of genius and madness, to believe that I actually could make a meaningful contribution in the field of conflict resolution. Less than a year after we met, he invited me to participate in a project working with Iraq's Kurds at the center

he founded at Columbia. It was just the opportunity I needed, providing a foundation for everything else I've done professionally in this field.

Simple, right? Well, not really. Along the way I've encountered plenty of challenges. I've also experienced my share of rewards. By far, the greatest of those is the genuine gratitude expressed by my Iraqi colleagues. Just the other morning, I sat in my apartment, hot mug of coffee in hand, and read an email from one member of the Iraqi Peacebuilders Network that read, in part, "[W]e appreciate what you did for us, it was and [is] still [a] great achievement." My sincere hope is that there will be many more to come.

A Winding Road: Physics, Ethology and Conflict ... Peace?

Carolyn A. Ristau

Images that linger, some that haunt:

My father, William Ristau, is a young man during the Great Depression of the 1930's, working in a New York City bakery to support his widowed mother and younger sister and brother. He is a bright student, and his favorite teacher had asked if the family could afford to send him to college. Indeed not, rather he needs to support the family. The teacher's advice had been to leave high school and get a job, "while there are still jobs to be had." My father thus works in a bakery and becomes a labor union organizer, in those days, a hazardous role. I'm proud of my dad's activities.

In 1961, President Kennedy decrees the creation of the U.S. Peace Corps. Adventure, an opportunity to do something truly useful, or so it seems to me. Will I join when I graduate college? I mull it over. No, for I might not go to graduate school when I return, and that is unthinkable. Today the logic of the decision escapes me. And since that time, I have met remarkable people who had once joined the Peace Corps or the European equivalent, and subsequently went into noteworthy careers in the diplomatic corps or social service professions – with or without graduate school.

I'm waiting, an hour, more, in the hot African sun. I'm fortunate – I have a sunhat. A woman offers me a seat under the shade of her stall and I buy a cool coke from her. There's some mix-up. Our driver, it turns out later, is at a different place, also waiting. A few feet away, while I am merely sitting, young muscular men are hauling sand on their heads, basin by basin, up from the riverbank to a huge pile at the top. Other young men dive into the river, dredging up basins of sand from the river bottom to dump into dugout canoes, which are then emptied onto the riverbank. The sand from the pile at the top will later be manually loaded onto a truck and hauled to a construction site. Sweat is pouring down a young man's face and glistening on his body as he works the whole time I wait. I know he can't afford the 30 cents for a coke. I want to offer him one, but I know I can't, for I would then need to give one to all the other workers. I don't know what other upheaval such an act would cause. It's completely inappropriate to photograph this scene, so it remains burned in my memory. Men kill each other to get such jobs; they can earn a dollar, maybe even a dollar and a half a day from this work. Are these the "lazy youth" one overhears the expatriate "oilies" (employees at any level within the oil industry) speak of?

One of the couples who work in the Akassa Development Foundation (in the Niger Delta of Nigeria) have a baby boy. He is an astonishing baby. I have never seen one so young who is so curious and alert. He always seems far more mature than his age. Typically he is snuggled in his mom's "wrapper," carried to all the community meetings. He appears repeatedly in photographs, handsome and big-eyed. He is on several pages of the calendar produced by the company that donates much of the program funds. He's a fortunate child, for his parents are intelligent and hardworking, strong believers in

education, and with sufficient income to send the boy to school later on. And then...we hear that they went to the father's village, the home, too, of the father's ex-wife. The baby dies. "Witchcraft," we are told. But it was most likely the foul water available for drinking in most of the Niger Delta. "We Africans have powerful stomachs!" I have heard said. Perhaps. Perhaps, an ongoing evolutionary process is creating "strong stomachs" and losing the next Einstein.

* * * *

Now I am both a consultant and a volunteer for an NGO in the Niger Delta. The images reveal some of the motivations that led to my present work. I also currently study primates, chimpanzees, in a preserve in the mountains of Nigeria, and I still write the occasional article about animal cognition.

How did these choices come to be?

As an undergraduate at Vassar College, I majored in physics, minored in math and took a fair number of philosophy courses: fascination, "truth," some relation to my Dad's unrealized aspirations to be a radio engineer? Simultaneously, I befriended some graduate students in psychology who loved what they were doing. I also had a summer government internship in physics. During the internship, I realized that the only persons with whom I wanted to identify, the ones who seemed truly engrossed in their work, were the male, absolutely brilliant heads of programs. Almost no women physicists were employed. I decided there was little chance of such a "brilliant male" future for me.

So, after adding as many psychology courses as possible to my remaining undergrad days, I went on to get a Ph.D. in psychology at the University of Pennsylvania. My intention was to include substantial coursework in anthropology. Though not the usual path, the supportive faculty agreed. However, having left “real science,” I was dismayed by the complexity in the scientific study of human social behavior. I decided I needed a background in evolution and animal behavior if I was to have any hope of understanding people. And somehow, I remained in the field of animal cognition for a few decades, not a year or two of “background.” Along the way, I studied children’s concept formation, the neurophysiology of learning in fish, communication by human and non-human infants, primate communication and cognition, and bird cognition and social behavior.

I had the good fortune of being associated with superb researchers at Penn and then at The Rockefeller University in New York City. Most of my years at “the Rock” were in the laboratory of Donald R. Griffin, the founder of “cognitive ethology,” an effort to study the minds of animals, particularly as they lead their daily lives in their natural world. Attempts to study animal consciousness were anathema to many scientists (they still are), but we asked questions many other researchers did not, and found answers they likewise did not. My own efforts involved the study of purposeful behavior of birds, such as plovers, which do broken-wing displays, so-called “injury feigning,” to lure a predator from the nest. But can a bird have a “purpose?” Perhaps being on the “outskirts,” or the “forefront” of the field as we saw it, made me more inured to the frustrations of my present work in the Niger Delta. One simply keeps at it.

During my years at Penn and Rockefeller, I had gradually shifted out of the lab into observation and experimental

fieldwork, believing I could better understand the animal when in his own world. But always, during these times, whether I was in the Arctic or less exotic sites, I remained intrigued by people's interactions. How differently from Americans the Arctic Inuit children play. How cooperative and inclusive the Inuit are from a very early age. How does that come to be?

Also during these years, the tension continued between spending a lifetime as an academic, versus the desire to contribute to some socially useful undertaking. I worked on a federal project to improve home day care in rural West Virginia. I had likewise married and begun raising a family of three. West Virginia was, to me, a domestic attempt at the Peace Corps, and did indeed involve working in a mining area and in a place called "Cabbage Town." My position was director of research and evaluation. But in a small firm, I could also contribute to program development, brochure design, even photography.

At the project's end, a stint developed with Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., a consulting firm in Washington D.C. I loved working within a team of bright people with different talents. Also, I considered our work to be socially significant. We reviewed research on the impacts of various models of day care on children's development. This was to advise the U.S. legislature for a national program to fund and set standards for widely available day care. That program never came to be.

I did a few other consultancies, but some aspects were particularly frustrating. I became concerned about the possible outcomes; I cared what happened next. But as a consultant, there was no follow-through, simply on to the next job. I saw political machinations determining outcomes, when science and good sense would deem otherwise. I saw a head office purchase expensive furniture while the day care centers it

administered had no proper supplies. So, a return to more abstract pursuits: to Rockefeller University and animal cognition.

The rest is happenstance, choice and now history. I painstakingly wrote review papers on the laboratory investigations of ape cognition and artificial “language” capacities. And then I began a new phase after a dinner conversation with Don Griffin and his wife, Jocelyn Crane Griffin. She posed a question: suppose you had a million dollars for research, what would you do? Don would study insects, and I would study great apes in the field. But the question nagged at me. Did I need a million dollars? I applied for a grant, but I simply went to the field, mostly through my own financing. And one day, as I was paying for research fees to the Nigerian national park, fees for my guide and cook and porters, and food for us all, I realized that I was doing this all on less than it cost me to travel each day in New York City from my home to work.

On one of my returns from Africa, as I related my experiences, a friend and colleague remarked, “Hmm, you seem more interested in the people there than the animals.” He suggested that I might be interested in the Solomon Asch Center Summer Institute. I applied and was accepted. We, in the Summer Institute, were from diverse disciplines, countries and experiences. It was outstanding – reading, learning, arguing, and befriending each other. Afterwards, I was awarded a grant to study in the field for two years. Actually, single again, with grown children, I was fortunate also to be at a time of my life when I could accept a relatively small stipend. Realizing I could follow only one path, I went forward with the field project funding.

Though I had thereby “left” the study of animal behavior, I continue “back burner” cognitive studies of a group of chimpanzees in an enclosed rainforest area of Nigeria. And, in fact, there are remarkable similarities in the study of human and non-human animals. “Territory” is highly significant and may be strongly defended by both. For humans, a related concept may be that of “ownership”; in community development, the sense of ownership, often engendered through participation and contribution, is critical to a program’s success. “Dialects” apparent in animal communication seem to define membership in a specific group, often one that inhabits an ecological niche. In humans, one’s native language/dialect can reveal the site of early childhood rearing, and can imply social status and/or ethnic identity or group membership. Concepts from evolutionary theory can be applied to genetic traits, but are also useful when discussing the transmission of *memes*, so-called units of culture – certainly in humans and, many would say, in some non-human animals.

* * * *

The “field” for my human studies was to be the Niger Delta of Nigeria, where I would study conflict from the vantage point of a remote coastal village, in an area wracked by conflict over oil resources. I had become acquainted with this site during my forays to study chimpanzees. My hosts were the community of Akassa and the NGO Pro-Natura International-Nigeria (PNI), with which I am still affiliated. And on a personal note, all kinds of affiliations were fostered, leading to my recent marriage to Bill Knight, the British expatriate director of that NGO.

Beginning in 1999, I lived for a substantial part of a few years in Akassa. The Akassa clan is a community of 19 villages of fisher men and women, who fish in the sea, swamps, rivers and creeks. The area is part of the largest mangrove swamp in Africa. The ocean beaches are postcard pretty, with palm trees whose fronds sway in the breezes. There are brilliant purple-flowered dune plants, and even nesting sea turtles. Fishermen ply the water in dugout canoes. The area is also without running water or electricity or roads, or, in those days, a functioning health center or any public communication system other than the town crier. (Today, there is a working health center, the mobile telephone and, amazingly, the Internet!) The king of the Akassa clan or “nation” gave the NGO use of his short-wave radio that allowed linkage to the city office at scheduled times. The NGO had a generator, but it was turned off early at night. To be the only building blazing with light was unseemly, given Pro-Natura’s goal to promote the community’s participatory development. These days, with the somewhat improved economic conditions in Akassa, a loud and growing chorus of generators drowns out the once dominant night sound of the frogs’ loud chorus.

But the terrifying problem is the conflict arising from impoverished peoples engaged in struggles over control of resources, namely oil and the benefits accrued from being termed a “host community” by a resident oil company. During my time, two wars were fought with machetes and AK-47s, as neighboring communities attacked villages of the Akassa clan that were designated as or considered potential “host communities,” and as Akassa youth retaliated. In both intercommunal wars, villages on both sides were destroyed, inhabitants fled, and people died. In the first instance, the neighboring clan on the west claimed the ruined “host” village as their own and demanded that the resident oil company

assign all future payments and benefits to them. The company refused. In the second instance, attackers from the east laid claim to a vast area, encompassing far more than Akassa. At the time, none of the destroyed villages were “host communities.” The underlying machinations still remain murky, though recent explorations for oil and gas in eastern Akassa suggest that some influential individuals may have had advance knowledge of such plans and wanted to ensure territorial ownership (which was not achieved).

Now, since Pro-Natura’s work has expanded into several regions, we live in a more central place, Port Harcourt – the “oil capital” of the Niger Delta. In addition to my “participant” investigations in the villages, I collect academic data pertinent to the conflict. That data suggest results quite different from those that can be gathered in the lab using undergraduate subjects. The intensity of injury, death and destruction experienced by an individual villager appears (reasonably enough) to impact on feeling both more “like” others in the group and yet more antagonistic than others towards the “adversary.” More analysis and data are required to substantiate these preliminary findings.

I also occasionally give workshops on conflict management and carry out risk analyses and conflict mapping. I sometimes help conduct internal monitoring of projects and of the NGO itself. All that involves trips to rural villages, where my Nigerian colleagues and I attempt to “dig beneath the surface” to understand the conflict history that could impact development efforts, both communal and corporate. Houses in cinders and armed military are among the obvious surface manifestations.

On a voluntary basis, between consultancy and research, I discuss policy and practice with PNI staff members, attend

meetings with Nigerian and international donors and institutions, and do “whatever needs doing” at the NGO. Sometimes this entails being an informal “ombudsman” for staff or community members, who may feel more at ease venting their concerns with me than some others, rightly believing that I will pass on their comments. Sometimes I am a mentor. Other times I organize the budding library, and teach staff how to do the same. I – along with my personal digital camera – have helped provide Pro-Natura with photos of villagers’ “self-help” projects for reports and power-point presentations. The sight of an enthusiastic group of youths laboring to build a jetty does much to dispel the media image of armed and dangerous Niger Delta militants, though they do exist as well.

In short, I am engaged in most interesting and hopefully useful work with Pro-Natura. The NGO is having an amazingly strong positive impact on the people’s well-being in ever more areas of the Niger Delta and is a force toward improving policies and practices of oil companies in the region. Interest and support grows daily from the Nigerian government and from international embassies and donors. One hopes that endeavors by governments and corporations to promote equity, reduce corruption and relieve poverty will be the adopted strategy, rather than militaristic attempts at solution of the “Niger Delta situation.” Indeed military efforts are unlikely to be successful against either local idealistic militia or local armed criminals who can hide out and attack from the maze of creeks.

I do not work full time in the Niger Delta. I spend time with friends and family in the U.S. I deeply appreciate my university colleagues. I enjoy New York’s museums and concerts and incredible *mélange* of people. I am grateful that

New York's traffic lights work and that drivers attend to them. I am grateful that the electricity stays on, the water is potable, and the occasional loud cracks are some illegal fireworks or a car backfiring and not gunshots from youths celebrating a good party...or worse.

May such amenities and peaceful times be available to all.

On the Road from Academe to Conflict Resolution

Alan E. Gross

Today, when strangers ask me what kind of work I do, my standard reply is that I work in conflict resolution. That wasn't always the case. Like many youngsters growing up in Midwestern USA in the 1940s, I had no confident response to the frequent query "So what are you going to be when you grow up?"

When I reached my early teens without clearly determining my occupational future, my anxious parents dragged me to the University of Chicago vocational testing center. There, I was subjected to an entire day of interest tests. My interests were then compared with standard interests of people who had attained "success" in various occupations such as doctor, lawyer and mortician. Unfortunately for my parents and for me, no clear pattern emerged from the Chicago test batteries, so as high school graduation approached, I employed less scientific means to decide on a college and a major.

After seeking advice from a guidance counselor and perusing a few catalogs, I applied to a handful of colleges. Because I had been named valedictorian of a large high school and scored high on a competitive test, I was soon accepted to Harvard, Michigan and Purdue. With many of my high school friends choosing to become engineers and because I had excellent math grades, I chose Purdue! To say that Purdue was an academic wasteland for me would be understatement. I

soon discovered that I had little engineering aptitude, obtained housing in an anti-intellectual fraternity environment and basically flunked out of college in less than two years. At that point, my father insisted that I enlist in the Army.

In the Army, peer influence was a powerful force, but its effects were beneficial. Faced with the choice of being assigned to make dentures, interpret Morse code or take neuropsychiatric training, I chose the latter and was assigned to work on a Texas psychiatric ward for almost two years, in close contact with several psychologists and sociologists. Largely due to their influence and a flexible work schedule, I was able to enroll as a full time student at nearby Texas Western University, where I completed some social science courses and was introduced to the concept of conflict.

After discharge from the Army and obtaining a degree in sociology, I enrolled in the Stanford Graduate School of Business. However, social influence (a benign variety from two respected professors) diverted me from a business career. These two teachers were affiliated with the business school but had recruited me to work on their organizational and psychological research. After a year in the business doctoral program, my behavioral interests predominated so strongly that I transferred into the psychology doctoral program.

After completing a Ph.D., I pursued academic interests for the next 20 years, holding a number of university positions and publishing dozens of articles and chapters, mostly in the field of social psychology. My research and publications reflected interests in social service delivery, group structure, helping behavior and attitude change, but little specifically in the area of conflict resolution. However, my teaching material often included concepts such as styles and types of conflict. During those two decades as a scholar, I continued to struggle with two basic value conflicts of my own.

One conflict pitted academic intellectual activities against the sometimes more exciting and lucrative action of the business world. I finessed this problem by keeping one foot in each world. I was able to direct some of my managerial proclivities into academic administration, serving as a director at the American Psychological Association and as department chair at the University of Maryland. More importantly, while maintaining a full time university position in the late 1970s and early 1980s, I began to organize businesses that created profitable secondary markets for various coupons and certificates. Although I am no longer involved in these enterprises, the income I derived provided many benefits, including the freedom to pursue unpaid volunteer work, mostly in the area of conflict resolution, for the past 15 years.

I found the second conflict – between pure intellectual scientific interests and pragmatic application – more difficult to bridge. Some academics proclaim this dichotomy false and preach the practical value of good basic theory. But despite attempts to merge practice with theory, and the fact that some university social science departments exist that tolerate or encourage applied research, the values of the academy fall strongly on the theoretical side of the divide. One of the attractions of academia, even for me, was the freedom to pursue questions of intellectual interest, even when useful applications were not obvious or foreseen. Pure science is often justified by arguing for “knowledge for its own sake” and by documenting unintended applications that have eventually resulted from scientific discoveries. But for me, it was becoming more difficult to defend pure research in potentially applied areas like conflict resolution because results were unlikely to have an immediate measurable impact. Perhaps the most popular argument for pure descriptive or explanatory science – one that even those outside the ivory tower can

accept – is that complex social and psychological phenomena must be understood before related problems can be solved. But as I continued along my academic path, even this truism of “understanding before solving” became increasingly insufficient by itself to justify the study of social psychological phenomenon guided only by theory.

After only a few years on the academic track, I began to devote much of my thought and energy to applied research. One such effort led my social work colleague Irving Piliavin and me to apply for a federal grant to study the effects of various arrangements on how much effective service was delivered to a population of welfare mothers. An extensive three year field study yielded results that clearly identified a means of service delivery that greatly benefited the recipients compared to the standard method. Subsequently, we prepared the results for publication in a major social work journal, and we sent several copies to the U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare. We anticipated that it would be difficult to obtain the attention of busy policy makers, but surprisingly we found that our results were read and understood. Naïvely and sadly for us, however, we had failed to recognize that our interests and values differed from those with power to implement and act. We had delivered a template that allowed bureaucrats to determine how they could conserve funds, mainly by retaining the programs *least* likely to result in more aid for the needy target group.

Because this and other attempts at applied research failed to have a desirable impact on various social problems, I came to recognize that academic research without opportunity to implement results was usually inadequate to affect real world phenomena. In a society where division of labor is common, basic researchers may believe that the most they should offer is description or explanation. Prescription and action are usually

left to others. Unfortunately many of those others are not solidly grounded in fact, theory, or evaluation techniques. This often ineffective disjunction between research and practice argues that those who seek to reduce negative conflict, like Asch Center scholars, should seek access to those who possess sufficient power and skill to achieve positive change outside of the lab and classroom.

When disputes escalate and result in war and human suffering, the impact on humanity is unusually immense and costly. Personal, group, national and international conflicts have the potential to affect all of us and cry out daily for urgent amelioration. That is why institutions like the Asch Center must meet a different and higher standard for their work. Unlike approaching a mathematical puzzle whose intrinsic properties are intriguing, or a work of art that inspires aesthetic theories, dealing with conflict calls for problem-driven work. Work that is conceived as problem-driven, even at the planning stage, can eventually inform real world actors about potentially effective strategies. Although I had some limited opportunities to apply social psychological concepts and techniques to real world ventures, especially in the political arena during my two decades in academia, real immersion in practice was delayed until after my formal retirement from teaching and research in 1986.

In the late 1980s, as I was attempting to extricate myself from a business venture with offices in five cities, I relocated to New York City as part of a consulting commitment to my business partner who had agreed to purchase my share of the enterprise. Perhaps because of my social psychological background, he had assigned me to deal with some of the most difficult negotiations, often with aggrieved complaining clients. In addition to dealing with business conflicts, living in densely populated New York provided frequent opportunities to

observe other kinds of disputes, including violent ones. On one occasion my partner observed me intervening and successfully pacifying two well-dressed men threatening to attack each other physically in the lobby of a major financial institution. Shortly thereafter, having read a newspaper article about alternate dispute resolution, he recommended that I apply to arbitrate disputes at the American Arbitration Association (AAA) in midtown Manhattan.

My arbitration assignments at AAA were often interesting and included relatively minor disputes as well as major business conflicts. Although I enjoyed serving as arbitrator, a role roughly equivalent to a judge that allows considerable discretion in managing the process of presenting evidence and argument, I soon was attracted to another dispute resolution technique called mediation. To that end, I began to volunteer at a nearby community mediation center located in a Hell's Kitchen settlement house, first as an apprentice and later as a mediator who specialized in neighborhood disputes. Much later, I discovered that the term "mediation" encompassed a number of different techniques and philosophies, but that most practitioners shared common skill repertoires.

Mediation, like arbitration, was designed as an alternative to litigation, and its most important quality is that it involves the participants themselves in exploring possible resolutions for their conflicts. Whereas an arbitrator or judge listens to and evaluates evidence before rendering a decision, a mediator assists the disputing parties in understanding each other's interests and then discovering any common ground that can lead to a mutually satisfactory agreement. Even when agreement is not reached, a goal of the mediator is to assist the parties in listening to each other and in communicating their messages and feelings to each other effectively.

In many ways mediation was more challenging for me than arbitration. It was difficult to accept that the process called for me to suppress my own advice and suggestions. Intellectually I knew that people are more likely to comply with an agreement of their own making than with an order issued by a third party, but emotionally it required a great deal of discipline to serve as a neutral non-judgmental facilitator. I observed that mediation achieved desirable results in a large majority of cases. Some battling parties actually embraced or shook hands, and most disputants reached acceptable agreements which allowed them to move on with more important aspects of their lives. Because of my gratifying experience as an informal “street” mediator in Hell’s Kitchen, I sought formal training as a mediator.

While I was wait-listed for mediator training at a center in Queens, I began to host and fill-in at radio talk shows in the NYC metro area. My approach involved exploring issues from different perspectives, using Socratic dialog and promoting my show with the tag line: “The Voice of Moderation,” all of which insured I would never compete successfully with the popular ideologues who sat in most talk show host chairs. On occasion, I received evidence via phone calls or fan mail from my radio audience that I had “de-polemicized” an issue or conflict, but whatever impact I had on the anonymous listeners was largely unmeasured and unknown.

At about the same time, drawing on my experience as employee ombudsman at the American Psychological Association in the mid 1970s, I began to volunteer at the NYC Mayor’s Action Center and later at the Office of the NYC Public Advocate. Both of these operations required me to respond to citizen complaints, often from frustrated people who had been rebuffed or ignored by various city agencies, landlords, neighbors, or co-workers. In contrast to the limited

feedback from my radio advice and sermonettes at the government venues, I was able to interact directly with aggrieved citizens, either on the telephone or personally in the field. On some days, I was able to successfully resolve or refer as many as a dozen cases from people who were then freed to devote their time and energy to more enjoyable activities. After such long intense days, I often returned home with a distinct feeling of achievement and satisfaction.

However, while honing my direct conflict reduction skills at the city offices, it became increasingly obvious that many of my civil service colleagues were less than empathic when dealing with complainants. They exhibited a number of ineffective styles, including blaming callers for involving themselves in various predicaments, and failing to listen before offering standard general advice. In response to these inappropriate behaviors, I offered my services as a skills trainer. The relatively progressive managers embraced this offer and allowed me to teach several sessions that featured role-playing to emphasize good practices. Unfortunately, a few required mini-classes were no match for years of burn-out and entrenched habits that included defensiveness and limited motivation. Although my return to teaching had limited impact on the civil service employees, this experience led me to plan much more effective training sessions that have become a major component of my current volunteer service.

Because Queens was distant from my home, I eventually connected with mediation centers in Brooklyn and Manhattan operated by a large victims' service agency, Safe Horizon. During my tenure as a Safe Horizon volunteer, I gradually assumed additional responsibilities, including serving as acting senior director, training coordinator and lead trainer for conflict resolution. I also mediated and arbitrated for a number of other organizations including the New York City Civilian

Complaint Review Board, National Association of Security Dealers, Fee Disputes for the New York Civil Court and various non-profit agencies. When Safe Horizon responded to the 9/11 attacks, I helped to recruit and train several thousand volunteers to assist victims of the disaster, managed a residential outreach program for people displaced from their homes and set up a family mediation program to assist families in conflict about such matters as financial awards and child visitation. This work was recently recognized with an award from the national Office for Victims of Crime.

Somewhat surprisingly, many of the communication techniques that I learned in mediation classrooms and applied in varied conflict situations were already available to me and to most others. However, hands-on experience convinced me that some of our most effective tools were seldom used because other less productive and often emotional reactions are produced more naturally and easily. For example, some of the critical communication tools used to promote conflict resolution are employed in active listening. One important active listening tactic prescribes that parties to a dispute or a mediator reflect or repeat back what has just been expressed to make sure the other party feels understood before responding. The more natural tendency, even for professionals, is at best to offer advice and at worst to react defensively/aggressively or run away. When I train professionals such as school guidance counselors and child protection social workers, my main goal is to raise consciousness about effective ways to communicate, especially in tense conflict situations. After introducing basic communication strategies, we usually devote the remainder of the session to practicing via role-playing situations suggested by the audience – situations that the group is likely to encounter in their everyday work.

I am aware that many of the other contributors to this volume have been involved in research and writing that can be applied to major conflicts among and between ethnic groups, nations, and other large collectivities. Although my career in conflict resolution has been largely limited to inter-personal, intra-group and inter-group disputes, it is clear to me that the same basic principles and skills that are effective interpersonally can be effective in resolving major conflicts. Sometimes such interpersonal relationships are obvious at the conference table or in public dialog; other times the work of conflict resolution proceeds in the background with the assistance of neutral peacemakers. The same negative processes and patterns that escalate and inflame personal conflicts can apply to international conflicts. Common examples of negative stimuli include characterizing, labeling or demonizing the other party instead of specifying acts and behaviors, using accusatory “you” statements, and rehashing of history, especially alleged past wrongs.

On the brighter side, it is equally true that the same positive strategies that allow interpersonal disputants to find common ground and resolve problems can apply to major international negotiations. Even national leaders can learn and practice active listening, expressing their feelings, showing respect, focusing on the present and the future, attempting to see the situation empathically, and avoiding threats.

If you have followed the circuitous career path that led me to volunteer in the field of conflict resolution you will recognize how personally gratifying I have found this work. It’s not always easy to place myself in the midst of disputants or even combatants whose emotions are running high and whose egos are on the line. Nonetheless, the satisfaction gained from assisting people to find common ground, resolution, and peace is often profound. The psychologist

Abraham Maslow created a well-known hierarchical pyramid of human needs in which “self-actualization” could only be achieved after other more basic needs such as survival and security had been accomplished. Self-actualization for Maslow represented the pinnacle of human needs – a person's desire to fulfill his or her potential. I am grateful to have had the opportunity and good fortune to pursue a self-actualizing career in conflict resolution.

Visual Art in Conflict Resolution: Commemoration, Narration and Pro-Active Practice

Elizabeth Hoak Doering

I am a visual artist. My work has always dealt with the human condition; in the most general sense, it makes reference to human existence. I was an anthropology major in college, and that intellectual framework still shapes the way I approach the cultures that I work with. My main area of interest is the Republic of Cyprus, where I went on a Fulbright scholarship in sculpture after graduate school. At that time, when I took my Master's of Fine Arts, I was convinced that the human figure needed to be featured in work about the human condition. I studied realistic figure sculpture and human anatomy. But now, as my work becomes more heavily influenced by ethnographic research that I have conducted, I am more interested in abstraction. The reason for this shift is that I have changed my focus to the way that the work is discussed, and how it is represented in the media. I am interested in mounting exhibitions that may change for the better the way people think about their neighbors, even if just for the evening in a gallery, or for a moment while reading a review in the newspaper.

The problem with commemoration

Traditionally, sculptors have made a living by competing for commissions to make public sculpture and by carrying out

commissions for individuals (portraiture). I was initially interested in public commemorations, where I met with an interesting conceptual problem: in the 20th century, people began to see themselves as individuals in relation to collective efforts. They began to ask for individual representation, and in Western culture people began to emphasize individual rights and the advancement of diversity. While this shift in perspective is a massive humanitarian achievement, it makes things difficult for sculptors who take on the responsibility of describing an event: how many different faces can be included in a group of individuals? Whose special interest group is represented, and whose is submerged in the assumption of 'group effort'?

Two sculptural paradigms emerge in commemorative public sculpture. One is the traditional sculpture of a hero, or of the average soldier, where both images stand for a larger set of meanings. The other is the less often used cairn, or obelisk: a symbol of a historical event, not realistic and not usually accompanied by inscription. Commemorative works that depict heroes are usually committed in such formal terms that the meaning is richer than a portrait: it is a historical biography. For example, the Daniel Chester French sculpture of Grant (1897), mounted on his horse with hooves firmly planted in the base plainly describes more than a mounted military man. At that time, sculptors were able to depict individual contributions to the Civil War much more generally and patrons were more interested in public, rather than individual, representation. Now there is a dilemma because of the contemporary public's developed sense of individual participation, and the necessity to represent all features of a group. One might have thought this solvable by way of abstraction, or symbolism, but that is not the case.

One striking example of this problem is the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (1982) in Washington D.C. Maya Lin's work is an abstraction fitted into the landscape: a half interred, black stone cenotaph. The controversy began when, in response to veterans' groups that protested the abstraction, Frederic Hart was commissioned to create a traditional heroic piece that features three realistic bronze military figures and a flagpole. It was installed about 300 feet away from her work. In 1993 there was another realistic addition to the Vietnam War Memorial: Glenna Goodacre's Vietnam War Women's memorial. The problem is that abstract art does not suit the needs of everyone. In the 20th century, abstraction had the potential to overcome this dilemma of representation, but it conflicted with the emphasis on individuals and special interest groups.

* * * *

In graduate school for sculpture, I took the opportunity to read and observe widely about how issues of diversity had been addressed by sculptors. Anthropology informed my interest in collective efforts, individuals in societies, and socio-cultural differences, while at the same time I was involved with the study of geometry. I found that there was a connection between ancient and modern times, where numbers are used to depict society: then, there were numerical canons of ideal proportions that were applied to architecture and to sculpture. Now, we use statistics and demographics to describe our societies: a worn-out example of this is "the average American family with 2.5 children." I decided to look closely at the island of Cyprus in the Archaic Period (600-400 BC), when it was dominated by two regional powers – Greece and Egypt – and when there was also significant overseas trade. Since Egypt and

Greece had established different canons of numerical ideal proportions, I wondered how the contrasting ideal systems of numbers would have worked out in temple statues (devotional figurines), at the crossroad of Cyprus. What did the Cypriot sculptors make? What did the Egyptian sculptors in Cyprus make for the Egypt-dominated Cypriots? Agency is difficult to assess, but regional styles are plain to see: the sculptures of the Archaic Period in Cyprus are an amalgam of regional influences. The sculptures' dress, their poses and how they were made, or disposed of, helped answer some questions about choice of canon and individual representation. In this time of mixed populations, the styles are accommodating, personalized, and inexact. I observed that stylistic choices seem to be contingent on a wildly varying set of possibilities, including the medium in which the sculpture was made, personal taste and market availability as well as the apparent status of the person who the statue represented.

To inspire the work that would fulfill a commitment as part of the Fulbright scholarship to exhibit my own sculptures, I worked on archaeological excavations that included the Archaic Period. Eventually, because I was digging down through recent history in order to get to the past, I became interested in other, more recent ways that the intersections of cultures had affected the people of Cyprus. The sculptures I made for an exhibition in Nicosia were done in a technique called *assemblage*, where I used objects from local trash piles and second hand shops, and cobbled them together to make small figurines. I wanted to depict Cyprus by "using" Cyprus. Finally, after living there for almost two years and learning Cypriot Greek language, I was commissioned to make a tomb carving for a family living near the UN Buffer Zone, and this is when my education in conflict resolution began.

History, politics and visual art

The Turkish Army invaded the north of Cyprus in 1974, ostensibly to protect the Turkish Cypriots (at the time, 18 percent of the population). The invasion, which resulted in occupation of roughly one-third of the island, was precipitated by a Greek-backed coup, which aimed to overthrow the Makarios government that was in place since independence from the British in 1960. Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot social struggles had begun well before 1974; the UN was brought in to keep inter-communal peace in 1963. Now there is the Green Line – an UN-patrolled division between the north and south sides of Cyprus. It varies in width and in the ways it is demarcated. Some places are narrow, bordered with sandbags and cinderblocks; some are wide mine fields. Since 2003 it has become easier to cross, with multiple checkpoints and access for Greek and Turkish Cypriots on both sides. When the invasion occurred, more than 150,000 Greek Cypriots were displaced from their homes in the north. They lived in camps until refugee housing was built to accommodate them. Approximately 51,000 Turkish Cypriots living in the south took refuge in the north after the invasion. Where I lived, in Paphos District, I was far from the Green Line, and it seemed to me at the time that there were few refugees. Some lived in a part of the town I never frequented, and others simply did not talk to me about their past.

It took a long time to discover the most essential, contemporary part of my original questions. I had come to Cyprus to learn about the Archaic Period. I was studying the images of people as they were represented in temples in the 5th century BCE, and I looked at how people identified themselves both as individuals and with cultural ideals of the time. It was my first sculptural commission that opened my eyes to modern Cyprus. In modern terms, it turned out that the contemporary

church, the autocephalous Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus, made many of my original points of interest salient in an otherwise very complicated political spectrum.

* * * *

To return to the commission: I was asked to carve a memorial for the tomb of a Greek Cypriot man, who had fought in the 1974 invasion and who had been disabled since. His family invited me to learn more about him, and to learn about what I could carve for them. We agreed that I would make a large double-headed eagle, the symbol of both Byzantium and the Cypriot Army, and I would carve it in high relief from stone before the first anniversary of his death. We worked out the details, and then ate dinner together. At dinner I noticed two older women dressed in black sitting at the end of the table. They took me aside later and spoke to me at length about their lives before 1974: about the churches that they had to leave behind, and their gardens and homes that were lost overnight. Later, I remembered how Greek Orthodox families are buried together, sometimes bones mixed with bones in the same earth. A new carving for a grave is a rather strange situation, especially in a place like Cyprus where people stay local, and I suddenly understood that it was strange for the family I had just visited, too. Burying a family member in a new grave indicated a crushing recognition that they would not go “home” any time soon. This link between earth, family, religious tradition and state prompted me to think differently about the role I could play as a visual artist in Cyprus, and I began reading political science literature about the Cyprus Problem. I realized that the way I was thinking about sculpture as a commemorative act was limited, and that the format of sculptural installation had more narrative potential. I

could tell local, contemporary stories, which I increasingly wanted to do. Now, almost ten years later, I think of my work not just as commemorative or narrative but as pro-active: in the sense that it is intended to cultivate – gently – a dialogue. These stages become increasingly linked as the ethnographic element of my working as an artist has expanded. But the pro-active angle is where conflict resolution becomes relevant.

Narrative sculpture

Two years later, I returned to Cyprus and made a two-part kinetic installation of abstract sculptures that was based on over 100 taped oral interviews. The ethnography compiles memories of churches left behind in Cyprus, either as a result of emigration or internal displacement. The *Church of Memory* project began with the two women I'd met that night at dinner. It became an exhibit about memory, and how memory is a changing abstraction that shapes and gives dimension to our biographies and politics. I abstracted visual images from peoples' individual, personal testimonies. The project gave me the opportunity to exercise one way in which I think visual art can make a contribution in conflict resolution. In some contexts, the implicitly elite overtones of presenting visual art in an art gallery can be off-putting. But in a politically charged place, the gallery can serve as a level ground on which no one has a political, intellectual or perceptual advantage. Everyone except the exhibiting artist meets the gallery with a sense of wonder and sometimes humility. I hoped, therefore, that I might elicit some unexpectedly symmetrical thoughts about the Cyprus Problem, and that these would come out in the newspaper and television reviews, as well as in the micro-dialogues in the gallery. The reviews indicated the exact results I had hoped for. In the gallery and in the papers afterward, people were able to talk about the past in a way that was not

injected with nationalist language, but that was instead comfortable, nostalgic and humorous. There was conversation about how the church acted as a reinforcer of in-group and out-group identities, and about the role of the church in the psychology of post-war Cyprus. The show also kindled interest in alternative points of view. Generating grassroots changes of opinion takes a long time, of course, but the first step in that process is to make sure that effervescent, positive dialogue is happening on the local level, and that the media is covering that effervescence.

At the time, my colleagues and I thought about the importance of individual voices – their intonation, voice quality, and sometimes song – and we began work on a CD of the interviews that included Cypriots living abroad and refugees on both sides of the island. But in the end, this kind of linguistic and cultural intersection was limited to a very narrow audience. This aspect of the project reinforced the idea that memory is a common human territory, but also revealed that visual abstraction really does represent that territory more comprehensively than words. Since the *Church of Memory*, I have worked on other projects in and outside of Cyprus, with the lessons about abstraction and individual voices in mind.

Not propaganda: pro-active visual art

Now I focus on making visual art that opens up new perspectives on conflict at two specific nodes of dissemination: in individual dialogue and in the media. I am interested in generating abstraction from observed reality for the purpose of fracturing cultural norms, which is almost the inverse of the use and generation of political propaganda. This summer, I was in the north of Cyprus and visited one of the churches that a participant in the *Church of Memory* project had described to me. It was in the village of Skylloura (now called Yilmazkoy),

and the church had been converted into a mosque, with the bell-tower serving as the place from which the muezzin calls. This structure – the four-cornered bell-tower – had undergone a very interesting transformation because the megaphone that is there now has the same overall shape as the bell once had. I am thinking about a work of visual art based on the abstract representation of a bell/amplifier shape in a four-posted tower, which might become an agent for dialogue about religions, among other topics. The tenor of the dialogue could be significant depending on the location of the art and the extent to which it is locally recognized.

* * * *

Conflict resolution necessarily involves a variety of fields; at the least it is necessary to understand what is happening “on the ground” as well as at the state and international levels in an area of conflict. The inter-relationships of these three levels can be studied in many ways: by looking at, for example, voting behaviors, or linguistic differences, or – as with my approach – perceptual similarities. Policy-making, and grassroots efforts to change the status quo can only come about after a balanced effort to understand the conflict intimately, through a variety of methods and at different levels. Conflict resolution is about finding analytical ways to cross-cut a situation for the purposes of learning and education. Those multiple readings, by many people at once, of a situation may combine to form a tenable approach to resolving or avoiding conflict.

Working between fields has been challenging in my case because neither anthropology nor visual art particularly recognizes the other. In other words, not having a Ph.D. in anthropology and yet working and writing as if I do is difficult from the standpoint of finding funding and positions for

professional work. However, the anthropological research drives topics behind my artwork. Similarly, in the gallery setting, culturally specific work is difficult to present unless the culture represented is, for some reason, interesting to the place where it is situated. Most people, when they go to look at artwork, do not want to read a paragraph of history about its meaning. So it takes some fine-tuning to keep people interested and yet informed at the same time. It can be done, though, especially in museums where commercial value is less of a priority than concept. When I visit new places where I think I might want to work, however, it is relatively easy for me to sink into the fabric of life because I do so with my connections as an artist, not outwardly as a social scientist. As an artist, I can find a peer group rather rapidly and work from there. This means that I am in regular contact with cultural consumers as well as working class people. I am not sure why it is the case that people tend to open up to artists quickly, but I sometimes think it's because many people know other artists or craftspeople. I like to think it's because we all know that we hit our thumbs when we're hammering, and we can make that kind of connection quickly and with humor and resignation. This openness helps my ethnographic work.

* * * *

Conflict resolution overlaps in some simple ways with visual art, most obviously because both fields pose the challenge of effectively representing agendas of individual actors within larger events and policies. If looking at commemorative sculpture might plausibly demonstrate anything here, it is that nothing inspired by mixed interests and needs is easy to carry off. But there are times and places where abstraction must, out of necessity, be cobbled together with

tradition as the only way to go forward, and where effective inter-group communication can be the result of an unusual combination of style.

Making Friends from Enemies: One Israeli's Perspective

Adina Friedman

My parents immigrated to Israel when I was five years old, and settled in a small desert town in the southern part of Israel. I was always aware of the Arab-Israeli conflict at large, though I now know how limited my knowledge and perspective were at the time. Like most human beings, I considered myself to be a peace-loving person, though I was never forced to seriously introspect and examine what peace actually meant, why it had not yet been achieved, and what my “contribution” might have been – individually and collectively (as a Jewish Israeli) – to the absence of peace.

In elementary and high school I was fortunate enough to study Arabic as a third language, which increased my affinity to the culture and my curiosity about my neighbors and “enemies.” During my last years of high school the Israeli-Egyptian peace accords were being signed, and I joined a project entitled “Education for Peace” in which Jewish and Bedouin teenagers met and later traveled together to Egypt. This was my first real immersion in an Arab culture in a country that had previously been “the enemy.”

Immediately following my three-year compulsory military service (during which, I might add, I never encountered a single Palestinian or Arab) I traveled to California to pursue my undergraduate degree in biology. Soon after my arrival in late 1987, the first Palestinian Uprising (Intifada) broke out.

For the first time in my life I was forced to view the conflict in real-time through the lens of foreign media. The pictures I saw on the TV screens were disturbing, to say the least. On the one hand I could not ignore or deny what I was seeing; on the other hand, I could not accept that Israeli soldiers were as monstrous as they seemed to be presented on TV. After all, I had just been one of those soldiers myself, and many of my friends were still soldiers at the time. Moreover, the Israeli army epitomized to me (and still does, to many Israelis) the Israeli national ethos, and the criticism of Israeli politics and of the actions of its military resonated on a personal level and was hard to deal with.

It is hard to describe the emotional turmoil I went through during those five years in California. I clearly remember the physical pain I felt every time I encountered information that was difficult to digest and accept. Having to question everything I had grown up believing was Truth felt – literally – like having a rug pulled out from beneath my feet.

In 1990 I moved into an international student house in California, and there I met my first Palestinian friend (who was not an Israeli citizen), Samer. Samer and I spent hours and hours talking, arguing, explaining and listening to one another. Finally, the “enemy” had a face and a name. The months we spent living under the same roof and exchanging our thoughts, ideas and feelings were an important opportunity for each of us to learn about the “other” and at the same time to learn about ourselves.

Following my friendship with Samer I met more and more Palestinians, Arabs and Muslims from other countries. Most of them have remained my friends to this day. Each of these friendships has been unique, and each has constituted another building block in my life experiences and personality.

I had lived the Arab-Israeli/Israeli-Palestinian conflict all my life, but it took a serious re-examination of the “enemy,” the “truth” and myself for me to understand my life and the conflict more deeply. And every time I thought I finally knew, I learned something new and understood another nuance, which showed me again how little I had really known.

As my personal experiences grew so did my intellectual curiosity. While I did graduate with a bachelor’s degree in biology, I managed to take many classes on the Middle East or on war and peace in addition to my science classes. By the time I was ready to return to Israel in 1992 I was already determined to pursue academic and professional work that would enhance Arab-Jewish relations in the region.

My return to Israel coincided more or less with the beginning of the Oslo peace process, and many of the “maturation” processes on the national level paralleled some of the processes I was undergoing on a personal level. For a few years I worked in different organizations and institutions, some that dealt directly with the conflict and others that dealt with it tangentially. In all cases I remained true to my commitment and inserted my passion and ideas into the various “job titles.” For example, I worked for a while on environmental issues and sustainable development in Israel, Jordan, Palestine and Egypt – a position that allowed me to combine my biology and nature background and my Middle East interests. On other occasions, while working with international students, I made sure to introduce programs about the peace process and interactions with Palestinians; while working on cultural projects I built relations with Palestinian artists; and while working on academic programs I developed relations with Palestinian and Middle Eastern institutions and advanced scholarships for Palestinian students to study with Israeli students. In other words, regardless of the exact job title I held, my personal

commitment to the overall enhancement of Jewish-Arab relations overrode any narrow job description.

I worked to improve my Arabic skills and took some extra undergraduate courses. Between 1997 and 2000 I simultaneously completed two graduate programs: a master's in Middle East history at Tel Aviv University, and a master's in peace and development studies (a joint Israeli-Palestinian-Scandinavian program) through Goteborg University, Sweden.

The more I studied and learned, the more I wanted to learn, and so in the summer of 2000 I once again embarked on a trip to the U.S. – this time to pursue Ph.D. studies in conflict analysis and resolution. I was determined to somehow make a difference, and I thought that academic expertise would complement my professional and personal experiences, and give me the necessary knowledge, “legitimacy,” and voice.

Unfortunately, soon after beginning my Ph.D. studies the second Palestinian Uprising erupted, and once again the conflict became more poignant than ever. This time around I was more knowledgeable than before, and I had many more Palestinian and Arab friends than I had had in the late 1980s. By this point I had worked for quite some years on issues directly related to the conflict and to Arab-Jewish relations at large and I was emotionally and professionally invested in the work. This made the escalating violence harder to bear, on the one hand, but on the other hand it made my determination to continue my work even greater.

In my Ph.D. cohort was a Palestinian student, Ibrahim, who had also been active politically and professionally in the West Bank during the Oslo years. We began giving joint presentations on the conflict and on the importance of building bridges across the divides. Each presentation led to others. But the conflict seemed to be escalating and persisting rather than dwindling. The more time elapsed, the dimmer the

light at the end of the tunnel grew. Nevertheless, the fact that I had Palestinian friends and colleagues working with me in the same field, pursuing similar academic and professional goals, and caring about the same issues served to strengthen my resolve.

I soon discovered that another Palestinian friend, Osama, with whom I had studied in Israel/Palestine, was also studying conflict management in the U.S. It was reassuring to reconnect with friends from the past and see that our friendships had persevered in spite of the harsh realities. Osama and I put our heads together to think of positive ways in which to channel our energies. We decided to bring together more people from the region and provide them with opportunities to interact with the “other” and learn more about the conflict and themselves, to build relationships across national divides and to, ideally, become more involved in order to bring about positive change in the region.

In 2003 Osama and I began working with others committed to positive change in the Middle East, by running intensive weekend workshops about the conflict. These workshops had two main target audiences. The first were students on American university campuses who were interested in the Middle East, conflict resolution or related topics. Our three-day workshops provided an intensive learning environment in which students could become emotionally as well as intellectually engaged in issues at the core of the conflict. The second were “primary parties” to the Arab-Israeli conflict; in other words, Arabs and Israelis who were either studying or working in the U.S., but whose formative experiences in life had been in the Middle East. For these participants, the workshop usually served as their first opportunity ever to encounter, on a personal level, members of other parties to the conflict.

The workshop activities soon produced a number of cohorts of participants, which grew into a community. While the workshop experience is very important, it is merely a stimulus for more inquiry, introspection and relationship building. Workshop participants often stay in close contact and create a social network, out of which many other initiatives are born. Not only do people have a meaningful experience on an individual level, but the relationships that are built are invaluable, and they give added meaning to the work and determination of all those involved. Our circle of friends from throughout the Middle East is not limited to those who have participated in workshops, but the workshop experience is nevertheless an important “rite of passage” and uniting factor for some. For me, the main motivating force behind conducting such workshops and similar work is to provide people with opportunities to encounter “others” on a meaningful level, to build relationships, and hopefully to eventually put ideas into practice and have some sort of impact on the bigger political and social picture.

I have always taken myself as a case study and have learned from my own experiences and insights. While no one person’s experience can represent all experiences, even within the same national, religious or cultural collective, there is nevertheless much to be learned. Growing up in Israel in the context of a protracted conflict has been a formative experience in my life. Likewise, having the opportunity to step aside, look at things from a distance (in this case primarily from the U.S.), and re-examine the truths I had held has been another significant experience which has had a major influence on my perspective, my worldview and my actions.

I have had many “epiphanies” over the years that have been both the culmination of and the trigger for more prolonged processes of learning and growth. When I work

with others who have had less experience encountering the “other,” I can easily identify and empathize with the processes they are going through. Osama can do the same, which is one reason we make a good team. We have both lived the conflict and worked in its contexts, we both have relevant academic and professional knowledge, and we are both highly committed to making a difference. We try to instill in the people with whom we interact the same commitment to listen, learn and re-examine, and hope that they too choose to work towards making a difference. Thankfully, there are many Israeli, Palestinian, Lebanese, and other partners in the Middle East and in the U.S. whose friendship has been invaluable and with whom I have had the privilege to work.

One of the many “epiphanies” I have had over the years was realizing that all my life the Palestinian experience of 1948 and thereafter had been almost totally invisible to me, in spite of my best intentions and my general peace-loving nature. I partially rectified this situation by devoting my master’s thesis and Ph.D. dissertation work to related subjects. Not only have I conducted research I believe is valuable on these important subjects, but I can write, teach and otherwise disseminate knowledge on topics about which I had known very little during much of my own life and which I believe are crucial for others to know. Thus, while my academic work stands in its own right, as academic work should, it is inextricably linked to my life experiences and insights. Each of the realms of my life (personal, professional, “political” and academic) informs and is informed by the other realms. And while the field of my work is not bound geographically to the Middle East, it is my own experiences in the Middle East that have affected my choice of academic and professional work.

* * * *

I write these lines after having recently completed my Ph.D. studies. I have been teaching conflict related courses and am working on some new syllabi. At the moment I am in Israel, following the daily news about the renewed violence in northern Israel and in Lebanon. I see violence on TV daily – usually between Israelis and Palestinians and now between Israelis and Lebanese (not to mention other regions of the world). The situation is difficult for most people in this war-torn region, but for those who have invested their hearts and souls in peace work, and of course for those who have suffered direct loss, it is much harder. In my small town in southern Israel there are hundreds of Israeli families who have come to stay here to escape the missile attacks launched on northern Israel. At the same time, my Lebanese friends and their families have had their lives severely disrupted. Many are in grave danger; others have been forced to flee their homes. Over one thousand Lebanese and Israelis have died in one month. This situation is heartbreaking and depressing. Unfortunately, it seems that decision and policy makers – who should be listening to other voices and ideas – are the last ones willing to listen. In such times of great despair it is often hard to continue believing in the academic and professional work I do, yet it is precisely these times that heighten my feeling of determination and conviction that this is what I should be doing, and that through academia, professional work and interaction with people a change for the better may someday be possible.

Thus, while a few decades ago I did not have nearly as much knowledge and understanding as I do today, nor did I have any idea what my exact career path would turn out to be, where I am today makes perfect sense. It is my life experiences of living with conflict and the cognitive dissonance I

experienced when looking at things from afar that triggered my intellectual and academic interest. And it is the personal stake I have in the resolution of a particular conflict that has provided the incentive for me to learn, teach and act in the context of this conflict and others.

I cannot imagine doing anything else.

Conscious Politics

Diane Perlman

My lifelong interest in survival issues is inspired by a sense of the irony of inevitability, and my intuition is that if we can be conscious enough, it has to be possible to predict and prevent holocausts. Most human suffering is not inevitable. Rather, human suffering is the result of ignorance, manipulation, passivity, stupidity, fear and intimidation, which allow domination by destructive forces. If we are aware enough, we can figure out how to proactively create better outcomes. My training in family systems theory, psychoneuroimmunology, Jungian and intersubjective psychoanalysis, trauma theory and collective psychology, deeply inform my approach to politics. I have come to think in terms of “political therapy.” My approach to historical and current events is highly informed by my training and practice in clinical psychology, in analysis of problems, designing of strategies, and a therapeutic, healing attitude toward interventions. I supplement this approach with interdisciplinary collaboration with conflict studies and other social sciences for increased credibility, effectiveness, and power.

My strongest interests are in the psychology of the nuclear threat, terrorism, replacing war, and conflict transformation. I moved to Washington, D.C. in the fall of 2003, when my kids were out of the house, realizing that D.C. is where I can do the most good. I am immersed in the political culture and public discourse. I am struck by the dangerous ignorance and absence of awareness of the most relevant bodies of knowledge in

psychology, conflict studies and other social sciences among members of the media, think tanks, Congress, activists, NGOs, and even academics. I attend many meetings where I am the only psychologist/social scientist, and I raise these dimensions and ask questions. I am frequently spotted in the audience on C-SPAN, with questions and comments about how policies are based on false belief systems that are psychologically incorrect and create unintended consequences that are predictable and preventable. I remind that there are bodies of knowledge in the social sciences and conflict studies than can guide wiser policies toward tension reduction, violence prevention and conflict transformation.

I am in the process of creating a think tank in Washington, D.C., the Paragon Institute for Enduring Security, to apply knowledge from psychology, conflict studies and other social sciences, to organize interdisciplinary conflict experts to channel relevant bodies of knowledge to policy design, media, think tanks, and educating congressional staff.

My sense of preventing inevitability began in my youth, when I first came to learn about the Nazi Holocaust, despite my parents' attempts to protect me from this intolerable knowledge. I was simultaneously horrified and intrigued by how human beings could do such a thing. I asked my mother how the U.S. allowed this to happen. She said, "We didn't know." That awareness has motivated my work and my sense of the concept of inevitability. During major crises, I contemplate what can be done to make things not inevitable. Ignorance is unacceptable. It is not okay not to know what is happening. I felt the responsibility and necessity to speak up, and the sin of silence. In the face of escalation of the nuclear threat, and in the months building up to the Iraq invasion, I engaged in thought experiments, imagining being in Germany before the Holocaust, knowing what was coming, wondering

what people could have done to prevent it.

During my senior year in high school, Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy were assassinated. I was disillusioned and decided that it was not fair to bring children into this world, but with my strong maternal instincts, I would adopt children already here to make life better for them. I have since changed my mind and did give birth to three children, but I committed to do everything in my power to make this world a better place.

In my sophomore year in college, I was part of the Columbia-Barnard Experimental College – one of the best and most formative years of my life. We created a community and our own courses. This was at the height of the Vietnam War protests and the strike of 1970. One of our members grew up with one of the students murdered by the National Guard during a peace rally, known as the Kent State Massacre on May 4, 1970, and we all marched down Broadway for his funeral. Since the Experimental College was the most organized community on campus, we managed the strike information center. It was a time of idealism, the Age of Aquarius, belief in possibility, dashed hopes. I majored in psychology and minored in education. There was a revolution in progressive education at the time inspired by *Summerhill*, *Walden 2*, *Death at an Early Age*, open classrooms, cooperative games, and our own experimentation and critique of the educational system.

We believed that much was possible, but also that there were relevant bodies of knowledge to inform social change. I wasn't exactly a hippie; though I had long hair, I refused to wear blue jeans. Although I was attracted to the “oceanic feeling” of mass movement events, I felt there was more serious and intellectual work to be done, beyond protests and being “anti.” I became interested in the study of the dynamics of social change and was committed to applying my knowledge

of psychology to understanding the psyche of the perpetrator, and the escalation and reduction of violence cycles.

I spent my junior year at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, in 1970-1971. Although we had some propaganda seminars, I was not very aware of the plight of the Palestinians. But I did attend the first meeting of the “Pantarium HaShchorim,” the Israeli Black Panthers, the Sephardic Jewish immigrants, and their campaign for economic justice and political equality. I then traveled to the Soviet Union to visit with refuseniks, Jews who were denied exit visas, put under surveillance and harassed. We were picked up by the KGB and expelled on a train to Romania. I was tuned into the pain of political oppression and the universal desire for freedom.

After three years of teaching at my parents’ nursery school, I went to graduate school in clinical psychology where I conditioned rats, was turned off by Freudian psychoanalysis, and became attracted to family systems theory, which I mostly learned outside of graduate school. I discovered general systems theory and the work of Gregory Bateson, Ludwig Von Bertalanfy, and Virginia Satir, which informed my thinking about political dynamics. I was influenced by Milton Erikson and some of the creative schools, including family therapy, hypnosis, communication, double-bind theory, second order change, and paradoxical intention. I learned structural family therapy from Salvador Minuchin, and generational transmission of patterns from Murray Bowen, Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy and James Framo. I differentiated myself from my family of origin, studying generational forces and liberation from repeating unconscious patterns. The psychological techniques of reframing and identifying origins of conflicts are applicable to ethnic conflict.

A major political awakening occurred in October 1981, at a University of Pennsylvania symposium by Physicians for

Social Responsibility (PSR) on the Medical Consequences of Nuclear Weapons. I am one of the many people awakened by Helen Caldicott, and others. Shortly after the birth of my first child, Rachel, the awareness that there were the equivalent of four tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on the planet, and that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. – the “Evil Empire” – had tens of thousands of nuclear warheads targeting cities on hair-trigger alert (thousands remain today), I felt responsible for the future of the planet. I was shaken out of ignorance and what Robert Jay Lifton calls “psychic numbing,” going through despair to empowerment, a path navigated by Joanna Macy. The physicians developed a body of work on the medical aspects, and a professional ethic, “No Cure, Only Prevention.” I committed myself to working out the psychological dimensions of nuclearism and war.

The following year, I attended a PSR speakers training workshop, with no intention of becoming a speaker because I was too shy. Eventually, I remembered my adolescent injunction of the sin of silence and the danger of ignorance, and became a speaker for PSR, speaking on my first panel in April 1983, three days before giving birth to my second child, Jeremy. Later, in response to a call for papers from the American Orthopsychiatric Association, my colleagues Rob Garfield, David Greenwald, Wendy Forman and I formed Peace Research Associates (PRA). We first studied children’s fears of nuclear war. We collected data, interviewed and filmed three generations of families and presented at conferences and community meetings. Physicians for Social Responsibility asked us to do a workshop on “the image of the enemy.” This introduced me to a body of work by Jerome Frank, Sam Keen, Carl Jung, Mort Deutsch and others on the psychology of enemy creation, projection, archetypes of enemy images, the use of enemy images, the mirror image of the enemy, and the

resistance of enemy images to change. Enemy imaging, an extremely important body of knowledge, is manipulated by politicians, magnified in the media, and played out in the collective unconscious at our great peril. The enemy of choice at the time was the Soviet Union/Evil Empire, which has since morphed into rogue states and now the “axis of evil.” The imagery, language, tone and feeling are constant.

In 1984, I joined a delegation of the Association of Humanistic Psychology as a citizen diplomat in track II diplomacy to meet with our Soviet counterparts, and to humanize ourselves to each other. I did research on misperceptions and became conscious of my American psychology: naïve, well-intended arrogance, the belief that we are wonderful and can show everybody the way to do things best. I received a call from the KGB on our last night in Tbilisi, as they discovered that I had been expelled in 1971, and was a *persona non grata*. In a climate where guides were trained to turn in tourists, Anna Hazizova, our group leader, took responsibility for me, which surprised and relieved the KGB officials. After this trip, PRA explored doing a satellite TV “space bridge” between Philadelphia and our sister city, Leningrad, with two families, three generations. This time the KGB refused me a visa, but my colleagues went. U.S. officials were not interested in humanizing the enemy, and did not support our project, despite the desires of the Soviets.

After the birth of my third child, Mirah, I “unintentionally” entered Jungian analysis, not realizing what I was getting into. Fascinated by my discovery of the unconscious, I began analytic training at the Jung Institute of New York. I found this work to be valuable to my political understanding of projection of the shadow (related to enemy imaging), archetypes, myths, collective psyche, law of opposites, and the role of consciousness as a work against

nature. Through my work on the psychology of war, violence, and the image of the enemy, I had gained insights into developmental themes, starting from birth – survival and fear of annihilation, attachment, fear of separation and stranger anxiety, a sense of belonging to a group, conformity, and “us against them,” a need to be superior and dehumanization. I also participated in a research and study group on Holocaust survivors, their children and grandchildren – the Transcending Trauma Project at Penn Council on Relationships. The more I learned about the consequences of such trauma, which was recurring in spades globally, the more committed I was to working on prevention of violence and healing trauma.

In my private practice I developed a specialty in psychoneuroimmunology, mind-body medicine, with an interest in patterns of exceptional healing. I consulted and supervised interns at the Center for Advancement of Cancer Therapy, and collaborated with natural health care practitioners using complementary medicine, biological repair, nutrition, and detoxification. There are similarities between the military industrial complex and the medical industrial complex, which violently attacks the symptom, rather than healing the system. Eventually I chose to focus my professional life on the political work, which I felt was more needed.

I am attracted to the global perspective and international meetings. In 1995 I presented on gender and violence at the UN Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. I was touched by the human suffering and underlying dynamics of gender imbalance that generate problems in health, education, violence, environmental destruction and other areas. The thread of development, trauma, punishment and violence led me to study human development further, and to put forward a model called Eros Development. I was also inspired to conduct research on moral heroism – about people who take

risks for truth and justice. I interviewed people, including Eyad El Sarraj, Director of the Gaza Community Mental Health Program. I began my work on the psychology of terrorism with a presentation in Gaza on “The Psychoanatomy of Political Terrorism” in 1997. In 1999 I presented my slide show on “The Nuclear Mystique” at the Hague Appeal for Peace, on a panel with the Nobel peace prize winning group International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Since 2000, I have further elaborated my work on nuclear psychology through NGO meetings at the UN Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review conferences. I am usually the only psychologist, and the only social scientist raising these issues. It took years of persistence and hard work to get this material into the field. In 2005 I led a delegation for Psychologists for Social Responsibility to the UN Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference, and was part of a panel of NGOs presenting the psychology of nuclear proliferation for the first time to the official delegates (I was introduced as “and now for something completely different”). In August of 2005 I attended events for the 60th anniversary of the Hiroshima/Nagasaki bombings and I was a delegate at the 2005 World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, bringing in the psychological dimensions. Many people find the work on the psychological effect of nukes and conflict new and refreshing, offering direction for resolving issues.

As a pilot project for my new think tank, I initiated a collaboration with colleagues in conflict studies on a scientific strategy for Iraq. After analyzing various plans and articles, and dealing with disagreements, I decided to focus on underlying principles of conflict transformation. I solicited my colleague Rich Rubenstein, who teaches conflict resolution at George Mason University, to write on principles of conflict resolution as a basis for an Iraq strategy (also applicable to the

Israel/Gaza/Lebanon crisis), including how violence cannot work, how the dynamics of occupation skew all relationships, create divisions, provoke violence and make problem solving impossible, the necessity of bringing all parties to the table, including the most extreme (like Hamas and Hezbollah), the need for expert facilitation from impartial, highly trained, credible experts, and the need for long term healing and reconciliation processes. I received more input from Johan Galtung, Founder and Co-Director of TRANSCEND, and endorsements from other leaders in the field. The resulting document was given to an Iraqi Ambassador and to several Congresspersons; it is being used to support the Declaration of Peace and was sent to Jordan with a delegation meeting with the Iraqi parliament to discuss a peace plan. It is being used as a model for the next project to design a strategy for Israel/Palestine/Lebanon, as it relates to wider regional and global conflict and nuclear proliferation.

My intention is to raise consciousness of sound principles – based on social science, robust research, history and observation – to demystify the public, media and Congressional staff from false, dangerous claims, and to describe in a non controversial, self-evident manner ways of proceeding that are thoughtfully designed to produce intended consequences. I am applying principles from Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Gladwell's *Tipping Point*, and Gramscian theory, on the science of how to make a paradigm shift. The dominant dualistic, violent paradigm is not survivable. There is a science of how to make the shift. I hope it works.

My strong, lifelong interest and commitment to developing an integration between psychology and politics has had many periods of interruption and disruption. As Jung said, "The right way to wholeness is made up of fateful detours and wrong turnings." My road to wholeness remains to be seen.

Working on the Peace Puzzle

Julie Chalfin

I first learned about the Holocaust in Hebrew school when I was seven years old. Even at that young age I was aware of the enormity of what I was being taught, and felt fortunate to have been born Jewish in New York in the 1970s rather than in Europe in the 1930s. How could this tragedy have happened? Why had no one prevented it? I remember being disappointed that no one could give me an answer. The need to answer these questions, I believe, started me on my path.

In college I studied psychology, anthropology and international relations where I learned about universal human tendencies, culturally specific rituals, and historical accounts of the way people and nations interacted over time. My decision to pursue a doctoral degree in social psychology seemed logical, since I felt that I needed to delve deeper into understanding human behavior and the conditions that might lead people to commit atrocities against one another. If only I understood how something like the Holocaust happened, I thought, perhaps I could work toward preventing anything like it from happening again.

I enrolled in the Applied Social Psychology Ph.D. program at Claremont Graduate University (CGU) and began my quest to gain a theoretical understanding of the impact of the social environment and relationships on individual and group behavior. When I arrived at graduate school I was interested in understanding behavior and relationships, and

preventing the devastation caused by war, but I wasn't sure how to focus these into an area of research. Early in my first semester, a discussion with a professor led me to meeting with a second professor who invited me to attend his law and psychology class later that day. He had invited the director of the Claremont Dispute Resolution Center (CDRC) to speak to his class and thought that I might be interested. It was there that I was introduced to the field of conflict resolution.

As the director spoke about bringing individuals together to discuss their disputes, I thought of the possibilities for applying to the international arena the models for improving interpersonal relations that he was presenting. I wanted to learn more, so I enrolled in several mediation training courses through the CDRC. Subsequently, I became a certified mediator and worked part time at the CDRC mediating interpersonal disputes. As a mediator, I learned about the causes and consequences of interpersonal conflict, and observed tendencies and challenges that surface when people argue.

As I learned about the dynamics of interpersonal conflict and conflict resolution through my work at the CDRC, I was also exploring the academic literature on conflict resolution and, specifically, the contributions of social psychology to the field. Nowadays conflict resolution courses and programs are widespread. However, at that time conflict resolution was not that popular a field of study; there were only a few conflict resolution courses and programs being offered through U.S. academic programs, and only a handful of social psychologists were applying their theories and models directly to resolving international conflict. I found that social psychology offered valuable theories on intergroup relations, such as the role of identity and the role of leadership, and intergroup relations was

an important element for understanding international conflict, interethnic conflict and the conflict management process.

To gain real world experience in conflict resolution at the international level I accepted an internship position with the Conflict Resolution Program at the Carter Center in Atlanta, Georgia. My primary responsibility as an intern was to monitor conflicts and events in several countries and provide weekly status reports of my assigned countries to former President Carter. I was assigned to monitor Nigeria and, because of this assignment, I was invited to join a delegation on a fact-finding mission to Nigeria on behalf of former President Carter to assess the legitimacy of their upcoming elections. Our delegation met with the Nigerian election commission and various Nigerian politicians, journalists, human rights activists, academics and clergymen. The highlight of this trip was when General Abubakar, the president of Nigeria, invited our delegation to the presidential palace for a meeting.

The outcome of the trip was positive, and for me the experience was life changing. An important lesson I learned on this trip was the value of multiple perspectives for assessing a situation. It was not only the perspectives of the people we met that were deemed valuable. My assessment of each encounter and of the overall situation was frequently requested for two main reasons. First, I was the most junior member of the five-person delegation and had never been to Nigeria prior to this visit. My perspective was considered fresh and unbiased. Second, I had the distinction of being the only woman on the delegation. I was the only member of the delegation that was welcome to participate in discussions amongst Nigerian women, as well as Nigerian men. This access to both male and female conversations allowed me to gain a more holistic understanding of the sentiment of the Nigerian people and the situation. This experience empowered me as a woman and

demonstrated the significant role a woman can play in international diplomacy.

Before leaving the Carter Center, I had the opportunity to ask President Carter whether there was something he would have liked to have been told early on in his career that would be valuable for those of us starting out in the peace-making field. After a thoughtful pause, President Carter said with certainty that he wished that someone early on had underscored the value of going directly to the people to learn their views, their needs and their fears. I was grateful for this guidance and have since made a conscious effort to incorporate this in my work.

I returned to Claremont even more passionate about studying international conflict resolution. I began working on my dissertation, where I examined factors that affect the success of managing international conflict (i.e., preventing or ending violence). Specifically, I applied a social psychological model for improving intergroup relations to predict the outcome of international conflicts. My research was intended to determine the conditions in the environment and the dynamics between those involved that were necessary to result in a positive outcome.

Concurrently, I was granted funding by my university to work at an international non-governmental organization in Los Angeles called the International Rescue Committee (IRC). The IRC provides humanitarian assistance to those fleeing conflict and human rights violations, and assists refugees and asylum seekers to resettle in cities all over the world. In this position I worked directly with victims of conflict who were resettling their families' lives in Los Angeles, and I was exposed to the devastating toll that conflict takes on the lives of innocent people.

The University of Pennsylvania's Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict played a significant role in my transition from formal education to my professional career. After receiving my Ph.D., I was invited to participate in the Asch Center's summer program. This program provided me with a comprehensive understanding of key historical, political and psychological factors that cause and affect ethnopolitical conflict, and introduced me to a network of dedicated people working on similar issues around the world.

After the Summer Institute I returned to the Asch Center as a post-doctoral fellow. I was involved in a range of initiatives to provide psychosocial support to victims of conflict. With this position I traveled throughout South Africa and Sri Lanka on fact-finding missions in order to inform the Asch Center of the social and political climate of these countries, assess the effectiveness of psychosocial work taking place, and foster relationships with local organizations.

A turning point in my career was when the Asch Center offered to support me to work in Washington, D.C. at Save the Children, an international humanitarian and development non-governmental organization. This opportunity allowed me to begin applying my education, research and experiences directly to alleviating and, potentially, preventing suffering caused by conflict. My task at Save the Children was to develop an easy-to-use, reliable and culturally adaptable way to monitor the psychosocial well-being of children participating in their programs. I traveled to Save the Children's programs in the West Bank, Darfur, Sudan, and Tbilisi, Georgia to pilot the method I developed and to better understand the contextual challenges for gathering data in conflict affected areas. While my experience in each of these places had a unique impact on me professionally and personally, my experience in Darfur was especially significant.

When I arrived at the displacement camp in West Darfur, smiling children ran up to greet me. I was surprised that they were filled with so much love and joy despite the horrendous conditions where these children lived. They sang songs to me and welcomed me into their lives. After completing interviews, I had to say goodbye to the children. I was painfully aware that the situation in Darfur was worsening and, if not from the violence, the lives of many of these children would be taken soon by preventable diseases. To my dismay, I found myself asking the same question I asked when I was seven years old. How could a tragedy like this have happened? This time I asked myself what *I* can do to prevent it.

I decided to explore the role of policy for preventing and responding to conflict. Following my work at Save the Children, I received a diplomacy fellowship with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to work at the U.S. State Department. As an AAAS Diplomacy Fellow, I worked in the State Department office that coordinates the U.S. government in its efforts to help countries prevent or emerge from conflict. Within the office, I worked in the division that identifies drivers of conflict and places at risk for instability, and develops plans to address the drivers and triggers of conflict in order to prevent or mitigate conflict. Following this placement I transferred to the State Department's Africa Bureau, where I now focus specifically on Africa's conflict and post-conflict regions, and areas at risk of conflict or instability. In this new capacity I work directly on issues and U.S. policy to improve conditions in places such as Darfur and prevent future atrocities from occurring in Africa and around the world.

With each experience in this field, I become more passionate and committed to preventing and responding to conflict. Although the news headlines upset and remind me

that conflict is ubiquitous, I am comforted to know that there are many exceptional people doing their part everyday to help this cause, including the other contributors to this book. There is plenty of room for more exceptional people to get involved, and I encourage anyone interested to find a path to contribute. I assure you, the reward for doing so is great; you will put smiles on children's faces and you will meet incredible people along the way working toward the same goal: peace.

Mediatize Peace

Georgios Terzis

Introduction: Media after September 11th

It all started in 1997. The Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines in recognition of the power of the Internet in mobilising and enlisting worldwide support. From the small town of Putney, Vermont, Jody Williams used her e-mail account to coordinate the more than 700 organisations in over 60 countries that make up the coalition. The same year at a conference in Brussels, Nicholas Negraponte was arguing that the 'Internet will bring world peace by breaking down national borders.'

I had just moved to Brussels myself that year, to work as an EU and NATO correspondent for the Greek State Radio and to finish my Ph.D. in international communication. It was my first major post abroad and I was determined and enthusiastic. I believed in my job and I was very proud of the function of journalism in society. But soon I was very disappointed. Consecutive crises between Greece and Turkey turned me and my Greek colleagues into government spin doctors at a European level. Again and again we would agree with our Turkish colleagues in Brussels that 'our' government propaganda was one-sided, but we nonetheless continued to broadcast it almost unquestionably. Like Don Quixotes we would pretend to fight for our independence but were 'forced' to self-censorship and wished to be like our Anglo-Saxon colleagues.

Ten years later, two World Trade Centre towers down, and two mass scale wars still raging, the use of mass media by state and non-state actors even in the Anglo-Saxon world seems quite different. The majority of the U.S. and U.K. journalists were the first to become 'patriotic' at the end of 2001, at the expense of their professional identity and performance. And although truly objective journalism has never existed outside the elitist minds of a few media professors and policy makers, the current state of affairs in the journalism world portrays a very unbalanced and indeed nationalistic picture, many steps backwards from our position in 1997.

At the same time, politicians around the world were given a free hand to pass legislation to abolish journalists' rights, under the excuse of 'anti-terrorism' measures, and they also got a free hand to attack the media when they did not follow the official government line. A prominent U.S. Republican Congressman has called on the Bush Administration to seek criminal charges against *The New York Times* for publishing details of a secret programme to monitor the financial transactions of thousands of Americans. Peter King, chairman of the House of Representatives' Committee on Homeland Security, said that he was asking the attorney general to prosecute the reporters, editors and the publisher of the paper. 'We're at war, and for the *Times* to release information about secret operations and methods is treasonous,' he said. Under these conditions, it is not surprising that even the best U.S. newspapers and major television networks self-censored [and still do] their coverage of the war in Iraq.

Media and Ethnopolitical Conflict

The causes of the eruption of ethnic conflicts are numerous. Alexander Costy and Stefan Gilbert observed that

the main causes are: ‘structural factors,’ including economic, social, and political issues relating to wealth distribution and inter-ethnic relations; ‘facilitating factors,’ including the degree of politicisation and ethnic consciousness; and ‘triggering factors,’ including sharp economic shocks, inter-group tension and the collapse of central authority.

The media play a central role in the negotiation of all these factors. Although ethnic and national media cannot be blamed [at least not directly] for the creation of ethnopolitical conflicts, one can easily argue that they play an important role in their conduct. Daniel Goldhagen pointed out the historical function that the media had for the German nation in shaping the ‘Other’ (Jews) into an evil figure that needed to be exterminated. Recently, the conflicts in Yugoslavia and Rwanda have generated significant literature regarding the media’s role. In former Yugoslavia, the national media distinguished among the population the abusers – members of one ethnic group – and the victims – members of the other. The Hutu-led Radio Television *Mille Collines* became an instrument for the escalation of the conflict by broadcasting extreme messages of hatred against the Tutsi population and informing Hutus where they could find Tutsis to kill them during the genocide in Rwanda. These messages included threats along the lines of, ‘You cockroaches must know you are made of flesh. We won’t let you kill. We will kill you.’

Media and Peace

Given the above discussion, what can journalists themselves actually do? The UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan himself recently stated: ‘By giving voice and visibility to all people – including and especially the poor, the marginalised and members of minorities – the media can help remedy the

inequalities, the corruption, the ethic tensions and the human rights abuses that form the root causes of so many conflicts.’

For many journalists, though, the very idea of media-based intervention in situations of conflict is against the ethos of ‘objectivity’ and ‘neutrality’ fundamental to their profession. However, as argued by Hans Van de Veen, the issue is not about taking sides in reporting conflict, since journalists are already a third party in any conflict they are covering. Constant subjective decisions that are necessarily made at every stage of a journalist’s work make it apparent that assumptions of objectivity need to be taken with serious criticism and scepticism. These decisions include how one chooses the topics to be reported, the particular elements of the story that ‘ought’ to be stressed, which interviewees are chosen and the particular parts of interviews quoted, the photographs to accompany the text, the overall presentation of the text, and finally the editorial decisions themselves. All of these point to the ways in which journalists can only subjectively report events, and the fact that this subjectivity will be partly defined by their perceived role and stance in the conflict in question.

Even by choosing to report or not report a particular situation, journalists may impact its outcome. The immense human toll caused by conflicts in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Haiti, Chechnya, and northeast India are among the ‘top ten’ most under-reported humanitarian stories of 2005, according to the international humanitarian medical aid organisation Medecins Sans Frontiers. The eighth annual list also highlights the lack of media attention paid to the plight of people trapped by chronic wars in Colombia, northern Uganda, Ivory Coast, and the unrelenting crises in Somalia and southern Sudan.

My Experience: Cyprus-Greece-Turkey and Peace Media Intervention

Turkish, Greek and Cypriot relations have long suffered from chronic tension. This tension has intermittently increased in reaction to internal instability and/or external issues including territorial disputes in the Aegean, questions of minorities in both countries, and the military occupation of Cyprus. In addition to larger issues, smaller everyday incidents continue to embitter relations.

Considering the fact that 95 percent of Turkish people feel that Greeks are not to be trusted, although 93 percent have never actually met a Greek and that, at the same time, 73 percent of the Greek people feel that Turks are not to be trusted, although 70 percent of the Greeks have never actually met a Turk, it is obvious that much of the tension lies in mutual suspicion and fear, promulgated through social institutions such as education, religious communities, schools, families and – last but not least – the mass media. To address this problem of distrust, the NGO that I was working with, Search for Common Ground, realised four different programmes to facilitate improved communication between the two sides through the media. One of the programmes focused on the creation of specific radio and TV documentaries. Several issues pertinent to the conflict were explored.

One documentary dealt with the so-called ‘children of Lausanne,’ third generation refugees. After the ratification of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations of July 1923, the first generation, who underwent the ‘exchange of populations,’ was trying to survive and the second generation was occupied with settling and building up a decent life. The documentary took a closer look at the third generation and their ways of life in Greece and

Turkey. The extent of adaptation, the notion of being immigrants and their future perspectives and expectations were the central subjects of the film.

Another film examined the everyday lives and human rights of women among the minorities of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. This production aimed to investigate into the daily lives of a Cypriot, a Greek and a Turkish woman belonging to the minorities of the 'other.' Their position in the family and public life, their role as mothers, the idyllic side of their lives, as well as moments of inner-family brutality that they usually suffer, their ways of spending free time in small villages without facilities of entertainment or leisure activities, wedding ceremonies and the system of dowries, were all considered.

Yet another subject of scrutiny was school history textbooks. Biased, or purportedly biased, history textbooks in these countries have been a reason for friction in the past. Today there is an effort in both Greece and Turkey to revise these books. Reporting and thus publicising widely these efforts was our main goal.

Three documentaries dealt with cultural activities and representations. We considered the common musical traditions of the two countries from the Byzantine and Ottoman times until today. A mixed group of Greeks, Armenians and Turks based in Istanbul 'travelled' with the audience through the centuries of musical influences and developments in the region. We also looked at important religious festivals and modes of celebration in Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. The project showed various festivals in the three countries and then moved on to habits and festivity days that have also been adopted by 'the other'. One example was the celebration of St. George day in Turkey that is attended by some 40,000 Muslims every year. Also shown were the Eastern Sacrifice, and the Christian liturgy in Turkish in the Italian Church in Istanbul.

Finally, the Patriarch in Istanbul and the religious leaders of Turkey were invited to discuss issues of the past conflicts as well as possible ways for religious tolerance today. In addition, we presented a portrait of mixed Greek-Turkish and Greek and Turkish Cypriot marriages and their families. The project dealt with the lives and experiences of mixed Turkish-Greek families in both countries: the prejudices and stereotypes they meet, their difficulties in giving their children a bilingual education, acceptance of their lives by their families, friends and authorities.

Overall, our experience showed that the ‘design’ of media content toward constructive communication, breaking the cyclical nature of communication prevalent in ethnic conflicts, could be summarised in ANC leader Andrew Masondo’s words: ‘Understand the differences; act on the commonalities.’ For this to materialise through the media content we followed two general principles.

First, *in order to understand differences*, individuals belonging to groups in conflict need to mentally revisit those moments when wounds to self-respect occurred. According to Joseph Montville, this process helps the peoples of the ‘opposing’ parties reactivate the mourning process to a point of reasonable completion. It is only from that point that these peoples may become able to trust again in their relationships with former enemies and to regain some faith in their common future. Of course, there are critiques of such an approach, with scholars of international relations, history, and social psychology as well as practitioners questioning the value of revisiting the past, the definition of wounds, and the issue of trust and whether that is a necessary part of any reconciliation effort.

Second, *in order to act on the commonalities*, the media content should promote identities other than ethnicity. There should

be an attempt to build trans-ethnic identities. Such identities can assist the audience in finding common ground and developing ties based on common interests. Media content that reveals different groups of the societies in conflict – women and youth, environmentalists and business people, academics and ravers – can contribute significantly to the creation and strengthening of alternative identities and understanding of commonalities among the ‘enemies.’

Conclusions

Cees Hamelink argues that society needs diversity to maintain itself, just like an ecosystem. With the extermination or suppression of one ‘species’ [e.g., peace activism], others become free to multiply too fast at the expense of some [e.g., extremists], decreasing diversity and reducing the complexity of the system, and making it less defensible against destruction.

Through our experience working with the Greek and Turkish media, we noted that an apparent lack of pluralism restricted diversity and the emergence of new cultural movements, such as the peace and rapprochement movements. Central to the existence of these cultural movements is the right to freedom and access to public communication, and the transformation of the media to a more pluralistic state. In order for such a transformation to materialize, the positive role of peacebuilding media interventions like our documentaries becomes imperative.

SECTION TWO

Working With Survivors

Psychosocial Work in a Refugee Camp

Rebecca Horn

For the last three years I've been working for the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) in Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya. Kakuma Refugee Camp is in the north-west corner of Kenya, very close to the border with Sudan. That part of the country is extremely hot and dry, with almost desert-like conditions. The camp was originally established for 12,000 Sudanese minors who arrived in 1992, and since then they have been joined by refugees from Somalia, Ethiopia, Congo, Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda, as well as thousands more Sudanese. The camp is now home to 96,000 refugees.

The life of a refugee in Kakuma is difficult. They are not allowed to travel freely, cannot keep animals because it would cause conflict with the local Kenyans (the Turkana people), and the semi-arid environment is not conducive to growing crops. Some have established small businesses, but the market is finite because Kakuma is very isolated and the only customers are other refugees, NGO staff and local Kenyans. Refugees can work for NGOs in the camp, but due to Kenyan laws prohibiting employment of refugees, they are engaged on a voluntary basis and then paid a small "incentive." It is very difficult, therefore, for a refugee living in Kakuma to improve his or her standard of living, or to be self-reliant.

I work as part of a team of five Kenyan and international staff, and around 150 refugee staff, in the JRS Social Service programme in Kakuma, following the ethos of JRS to provide services to the 'most vulnerable.' We run a day care centre

programme, which provides therapeutic activities for adults and children with chronic mental health problems, learning difficulties, and emotional and behavioural problems. We also have a community counselling programme, which I manage. It consists of around 40 refugees who are trained in basic counselling skills and who provide counselling services to members of their own communities. In addition, a very experienced refugee counsellor and I developed a 24-session course in basic counselling skills, which we, and some counsellors who we have trained as trainers, deliver about six times a year; any member of the refugee community can apply for these courses. We also provide training to NGO staff (both refugee and Kenyan) when requested.

I'm also responsible for a refuge for women and children who are at risk of violence/abduction in the camp. The refuge is called the 'Safe Haven' and provides a temporary safe place to live for up to 40 people at a time. Women who are referred to the Safe Haven may be suffering from extreme domestic violence; they or their children may be threatened with abduction by their own family members, or a woman may be at risk of being forcibly married or beaten, again by her own relatives. If their own communities are unable or unwilling to protect them, they can stay in the Safe Haven while staff from our partner agencies work to find a solution. Whilst in the Safe Haven, JRS staff provide emotional and practical support, as well as material assistance.

In addition to these two programmes, I have responsibility for an 'alternative healing' programme, which provides massage and reflexology for those who have tension-related aches and pains, and a programme for single teenage mothers who have been rejected by their babies fathers and, in many cases, by their own families as well. So many problems in Kakuma stem from traditional dowry practices; when a girl

becomes pregnant outside marriage, the amount of dowry her family can expect to receive when she marries decreases substantially. Therefore, a young girl who finds herself pregnant and rejected by the baby's father is at risk of being beaten and/or thrown out of the family home, and she usually drops out of school as well, so reducing her chances of being able to provide for herself and her baby. The aim of our programme is to assist single teenage mothers to return to school or to a vocational training course, or to start a small business. Our staff provide emotional support to the girls, advocate for them where necessary, organise training on issues such as reproductive health, and provide some basic education. They also assist the girls to plan for their immediate future in terms of education and training.

I have other, non-programme responsibilities. I am the JRS focal person in Kakuma for the inter-agency 'Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse' (PSEA) initiative. This involves training our staff in PSEA issues, working with each programme to develop guidelines to reduce opportunities for sexual abuse or exploitation within that programme, and monitoring the implementation of these guidelines, as well as investigating any allegations of sexual abuse or exploitation made either by a beneficiary of our programmes, or against a member of our staff. I also act as JRS Social Service project director when the project director is away, and assist in the management of other programmes when the responsible staff are out of Kakuma. I work closely with other agencies on working groups and attend inter-agency case conferences.

The living conditions in Kakuma are difficult. The camp is in a very isolated and insecure part of Kenya. It is a long journey on a bad road to get to the next major town in Kenya (Kitale), so when we are in Kakuma there is nowhere to go for a break. The Turkana people have easy access to guns, but a

shortage of food and water, so armed robberies and ambushes of vehicles are a constant risk. The refugees bear the brunt of this risk, because NGO vehicles travelling outside Kakuma do so in convoy with an armed escort (unlike the public transport vehicles that refugees and local Kenyans use), and most NGO staff live inside a guarded compound. We have a 'curfew'; we are not supposed to be outside the compound after 6.30pm. We spend our whole lives in Kakuma living and working with the same 400 staff from various NGOs who live inside the compound. This, combined with the heat, the difficult nature of our work and the overwhelming needs of the refugees, makes life here very intense. Because of this, we are entitled to 'R&R' as well as annual leave. In JRS, for every week we spend in the camp, we are entitled to one day's R&R, so after seven or eight weeks in the camp, we are flown to Nairobi for a week's R&R.

* * * *

Until a few months before I came to Kakuma, I never had any intention of working abroad, or working in the field of ethnopolitical conflict, but the field of interpersonal conflict always interested me.

I initially trained in the U.K. as a forensic psychologist. Following my degree in psychology, I studied for a Ph.D., researching the relationship between the police and women offenders. After this I spent five years lecturing at a university in Liverpool. This was an invaluable period of formation. During this time I learnt to prepare (at speed) and deliver lectures and seminars to groups of 5-250 students. I learnt to work as part of a team. I continued to carry out applied research for probation services, police forces and prisons, but without the luxury of time I had enjoyed as a Ph.D. student. I

learnt to focus quickly, switch from one task to another, and, most of all, to work fast.

However, the academic life didn't suit me entirely; I felt somewhat of a fraud teaching forensic psychology when I had never actually practised. So, in 1999 I went to work in a high security male prison. This job gave me the opportunity to develop my interpersonal as well as professional skills. It's a real challenge trying to build good working relationships with people who don't particularly want to work with you (both prison officers and prisoners). Much of my work was with life-sentenced prisoners who had often been in prison for close to ten years already, had very little control over their current situation or their future, and had no idea when or if they might be released from prison or how their situation would be if they were released. This was good preparation for working with refugees in Kakuma.

When I had worked in the university, I had accompanied a group of 17-18 year old students on a field trip to Kenya. This was my first trip to Africa, my first trip outside Europe in fact, and I was stunned. This experience gave me the confidence to visit a friend who was working in Uganda and during this trip I met several people who were working as volunteers there. I had always imagined such people to be especially confident, experienced, fearless people – nothing like me. But when I met them I found that actually, they were like me, and this was when I first began to think that maybe I could work in Africa.

When I got home I began to contact volunteer agencies, but quickly found that my services as a psychologist in a developing country weren't required. This isn't surprising; to work as a psychologist depends on an ability to communicate and understand, and this is hard if you don't speak the local language and you don't understand the culture. Just as I was about to give up, I came across an agency called the Volunteer

Missionary Movement (VMM). Trying not to be put off by the 'Missionary' part, I found that this organisation sees potential volunteers not as job titles but as 'whole people', with particular sets of skills, qualities and experiences, and they find placements based on those factors. After going through the selection process I was accepted, and then I had to wait for VMM to find me a placement. In my case, JRS contacted VMM asking for someone with a psychology or counselling background to manage the psychosocial programmes in Kakuma. I accepted the job on an initial two-year contract.

* * * *

There are many challenges involved in working in Kakuma. The heat takes a while to get used to, and drains one's energy. The two things I found most difficult at first were not being able to meet the needs of the refugees (constant requests for me to find them scholarships or to arrange for their resettlement in the U.S.), and feeling that I wasn't working as a psychologist anymore. It bothered me that I had nobody to supervise me, or even to discuss issues with, and I had no access to research that would help me work more effectively. It took a long time before I accepted that I would just have to do my best in the circumstances, and to stop feeling guilty for working in a way that went against what I had been taught. I clung to my identity as 'a psychologist' for a long time, because that had been part of who I was for fifteen years. But slowly I've learned to let go of that, and to see myself as a psychosocial worker – a much more flexible and realistic, but somehow less 'credible' identity.

In terms of my day-to-day work, the inter-agency aspect of the work, especially the bureaucratic nature of UNHCR, is frustrating. Priorities change quickly, and it is difficult to plan

long-term. Observing some humanitarian agencies has been very disillusioning. There is a high turnover of staff in Kakuma, which means that work can end abruptly when an individual leaves, and has to begin again with his or her successor (or is shelved completely if his or her successor has a different set of interests).

High turnover also occurs amongst our refugee staff, and this is likely to become an even bigger problem as Sudanese refugees repatriate in increasing numbers. As high-skilled people repatriate or are resettled, we are constantly recruiting and training more staff, and in a programme like Community Counselling, the turnover results in a reduction in the overall skills-level and quality of the service.

Personally, I've been quite lonely during my time in Kakuma. Although I live with a large number of people in the compound, and we have a good social life, all the others are Kenyan and there are many things it is difficult to share. My Swahili is still terrible, and many times I find myself having a beer with a group of people and not understanding anything that's being said, because it's either in Swahili or in one of the local Kenyan languages. There are also differences in experiences and culture that make it difficult for people to understand my concerns. I had never been lonely before I came to Kakuma and had always feared it, so although I have really struggled, I also feel that it's been good for me to experience loneliness and learn that I can cope with it.

The parts of the work I enjoy the most relate to programme development. When I arrived there had been nobody with psychosocial qualifications working in JRS Social Service in Kakuma, so there were great opportunities for me to develop the programmes. As an example, I have recently completed a research project, with the community counsellors, to identify the main psychological and emotional problems

affecting people in the camp. This was then used to develop a questionnaire that the counsellors can use to assess the problems experienced by their clients, and the ways in which these problems impact on their daily life. I hope that this assessment tool will enable us to provide more effective supervision to counsellors and enable the counsellors to identify more readily the problems their clients have and the areas where they are failing to make progress. In addition, the assessments can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the community counselling programme as a whole, and the information gathered about the psychological and emotional problems in the camp can also be used to plan services based on need. Such work is extremely rewarding, since I'm able to use my professional skills, and there are so many positive outcomes.

The most rewarding part of my work, however, has been training the community counsellors. I plan the weekly training sessions based on the needs I observe; we spend a lot of time doing role plays and skills practices. There is a wide range of abilities amongst the counsellors; there are some who could easily cope with a university-level course, whilst others struggled to finish school. Inevitably, some counsellors don't benefit greatly from the training and don't really have the interest. But there are others who thrive on it, and seeing them take such pleasure in learning new ways to assist a client, and in the improvement of their skills, is so rewarding. Those who are most competent, and who have the necessary confidence and interpersonal skills, are invited to become trainers of the Basic Counselling Skills course. This group of around 10 counsellors are a real pleasure to work with. Their commitment and professionalism is astounding. They have the same problems as other refugees, yet they manage to prepare for the training sessions thoroughly and to deliver the sessions in a

very professional way. The money they receive doesn't increase when they become a trainer, but they take on all these extra responsibilities not only willingly, but gratefully. This group of people have inspired me and their almost desperate desire to learn has made me think twice when I've been on the verge of giving up. If I left without anybody here to replace me, how would these people, who have given so much in the most difficult circumstances, feel? I know they deserve better than that, and that's kept me going in the most difficult times.

* * * *

I found myself working in this area by accident, almost, and I still wouldn't say that I have a 'career' in the field of ethnopolitical conflict. I don't know whether I'll continue in this area when I leave Kakuma. However, I'm glad that when I came to Kakuma I already had more than ten years of professional experience as a psychologist behind me. This meant that, although I had much to learn, I also knew that I had something to offer and I had the skills I needed to do something constructive. If I'd come here straight from university, I'm sure I would have learned a lot personally, but I don't feel that I would have been able to contribute very much other than just accompanying the refugees and being with them. I don't believe that a refugee camp is a place to learn one's skills – they have enough problems already, without people coming from the West to practice on them. Of course, nobody coming from the West to work in such a situation is 100 percent prepared, but I feel it is important to only come to such a place when one has something concrete to offer.

As I'm writing this, I'm disagreeing with myself because I know that despite my experience, it was six months before I did any useful work in Kakuma. And maybe one of the most

beneficial things I've done is, in fact, accompanying and being with the refugees. I suppose I feel uncomfortable making suggestions for a 'career' in this area because I don't feel people should have careers in this area. Refugees and internally displaced people know when people are working with them for the sake of their 'career' and they have no respect for such people. I would say that if you want to work in a refugee camp as a career, then find something else. But if you want to work in a refugee camp because you believe you can improve the circumstances of people who are homeless and struggling, and if you're ready to find a new 'career' when you're no longer needed in the camp, then train in some profession and go and offer your skills.

If A Path Doesn't Exist, How About Making One?

Champika K. Soysa

I am sorting through rubble on the floor of what used to be my sister's home, looking for things to retrieve. Tiny objects now have enormous significance, because they are all we have left. I look up at the concrete pillars that used to support a house. Now they stand alone against the skyline, looking like ancient ruins in an archeological site, except that the metal is still smoldering and the blackness of the soot is too fresh. We find one of her drawings – an original. We are so happy to have it that we allow ourselves to cry about all that is lost. It is July 1983, and Sri Lanka is amidst ethnic riots. My sister's home has been burned by a mob, and poor neighbors stole most of what survived. But everyone in the family is alive, despite some close calls. Many others were not so fortunate.

I am scheduled to take my A-Levels in August 1983, one month later. These are (rather horrible) national exams that are taken after 12th grade for university entrance and other apparently important matters. I was in the pre-med track in high school (studying zoology, botany, physics, and chemistry) and had lost interest in all of it. I already knew I didn't want to study medicine, but I had been on that path for so long that I could not think of an alternative. The ethnic riots sealed the deal. My bad attitude towards the education system became worse, along with my fury at the political situation. My preoccupation with issues of social justice became an obsession.

My dilemma was unfolding in a tiny country off the southern coast of India. Sri Lanka is an island that is a little larger than West Virginia. Despite its small size, the population of the country is about 20 million. Sri Lanka has a multi-ethnic, multi-religious society, and we have so many religious and cultural holidays that in some weeks of the year, it is hard to find a working day! The three main ethnic groups are the Sinhalese (74%), most of whom are Buddhist; Tamils (18%), most of whom are Hindu; and (7%) are Muslim, and follow Islam. (Sri Lankan Muslims are called 'Moors' in census data that identifies ethnic groups, but in colloquial language the word 'Muslim' is used.) Some Sinhalese and Tamils are Christian, following successive colonization of the country by the Portuguese (1505-1658), Dutch (1640-1798), and British (1796-1948). Since independence from the British in 1948, Sri Lanka has remained a sovereign state.

Although Sri Lanka had experienced intermittent ethnic riots, the riots of July 1983 were the worst since independence. Civilians of the Tamil ethnic minority were killed by Sinhalese mobs in many parts of the country. My sister is Sinhalese, but her home was burned because her husband is Tamil. Given the emotional valence of the mob, association with anyone from the minority ethnic group was sufficient to make one a "traitor." In that same week, my sisters and I were attacked by a mob of Sinhalese men because we refused to give them petrol from the gas tank of our car, which they demanded for the purpose of setting fire to Tamil people and their property. Again, although we are Sinhalese, the rage of the mob that was seemingly fueled by ethnic hatred, was easily directed at anyone, if there was reason for disagreement.

In a country where the majority identifies themselves as Buddhist, ethnic prejudice and war are incongruent with tolerance, an important principle in Buddhism. As in many

other countries, the practice of religion took a back-seat, since the waging of war violated the fundamental principles of Buddhist religion. The 1983 riots threw Sri Lanka into an ethnic war that has since decimated the country for more than 20 years. While the official figure of war-related deaths now stands at around 60,000 people, unofficial reports quote much higher numbers. The primary conflict is between the government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). The human cost, however, has extended to civilian populations of all three ethnic groups – Sinhala, Tamil, and Muslim. The LTTE cadre are fighting for a separate state (Eelam) comprising the North and East provinces where Tamils comprise the majority in the North, but all major ethnic groups share the East. The war zone is restricted to the North-East province for the most part, but battles break this boundary in multiple ways. In February 2002 a ceasefire was declared, and a tentative and fractured peace prevailed until late 2005. Since then, although the ceasefire continues theoretically, as I write today, a relatively low-intensity war has resumed.

To return to my high school woes: it was 1984, and my parents and teachers were aghast about my turning away from academia, because they thought that I was a good student. Even I had begun to get a bit alarmed about what I might do next. In one of many conversations with friends (we talked about the future of the world more often than our own futures), I managed to articulate my interest in studying what people do, why they do it, and whether all this can be predicted, and why the medical model (as I knew it) just didn't cut it. This sounded suspiciously like psychology, but I hardly knew of the field. That didn't stop me from deciding that I needed to investigate the subject. Unfortunately, psychology was not offered as a subject of study in any university in Sri Lanka. I would, of course, have impossible ideas. I was saved

from academic misery by my favorite uncle, a veteran socialist politician. He helped me to get into college in Delhi, India, where I could study psychology, amongst other things. That was a compromise I was willing to make.

Fortunately, despite my doubts, I took to college like a fish to water. I enjoyed my classes and the reading, as well as being a part of a politically active student body. I missed home, being so far away, but got over it as I developed friendships. A few months later, Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, was assassinated by Sikh militants, and Delhi erupted in Hindu-Sikh riots. I participated in relief efforts and went on peace marches where I shouted slogans in Hindi, a language of which I knew less than fifty words. I guess I had learned the important ones! Having experienced ethnic/religious riots in two countries in consecutive years, I was convinced that ethnic tensions had to be addressed everywhere, through all possible avenues, including politics, education, and social practice.

While I loved being in college, I still hated studying for comprehensive exams, retaining my exam trauma from A-Levels. I escaped mid-year exams by contracting chicken-pox (really), and at the end of my 'freshman' year, I scrambled and did very well in my exams, mostly because I had been a consistent student throughout the year. My own success was a huge motivator, and I was very excited when I was accepted as a transfer student at an American college. I needed lots of funding because the U.S. dollar was so much higher in value compared to the Sri Lankan rupee, but I was fortunate to get significant financial aid. I arrived in Massachusetts as a psychology major at Mount Holyoke College, and I was thrilled. I loved the place, the course content, the style of teaching, and the semester system. No more annual exams! I gobbled up psychology with glee, eventually learned to criticize

it, discovered transcultural psychology, and kept up a parallel interest in women's studies. The debates and discussions over long dinners in the dorms sharpened my thinking and broadened my knowledge base. What a luxury it was to study with a fantastic group of women, in a context that challenged our intellect, and with faculty who supported our embryonic ideas. As much as I was invested in the field of psychology, as a realist I wanted to see how I could apply this new knowledge in the Sri Lankan context, and decided to return to Sri Lanka for a while before going on to graduate school.

By the time I graduated in 1988, the ethnic war had gained momentum in Sri Lanka, and I quickly joined peace groups and engaged with a host of issues intersecting ethnicity, class, and gender. The Indian-negotiated Peace Accord of 1987 had brought some groups that had taken to militancy into a more democratic framework, but the LTTE continued its struggle for a separate state and the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) was still in Sri Lanka. I worked as a researcher for a while, and then got a job at the University of Peradeniya, when they started the first undergraduate degree program in psychology at a Sri Lankan university. When I first began, I was the only one in the department with a degree in psychology. I taught in two languages (Sinhala and English), developed the curriculum, worked too many hours, and loved it. I wanted to create a niche for the academic discipline of psychology within the Sri Lankan university system. Grandiose? Why not?! When the first class of students with a B.A. in Psychology was ready to graduate, I returned to the U.S. for my own graduate studies.

In graduate school at Clark University, I searched for ways to integrate my study of psychology with my personal values and political commitments. This was not easy in a clinical psychology program that was demanding in itself. I struggled

with this balance for a while, until I could do independent research. I can be tenacious, if necessary. Gradually, across classes, independent study, and endless conversations with friends, I was able to pursue my interests in gender and culture, and how they intersected in the manifestation of psychopathology. I had a particular interest in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), especially when it occurred in response to a collective stressor such as war. Clinical psychology addresses pathology at the individual level, but is less clear when distress occurs at the collective level, as happens when an entire community shares the experience of violence. In preparation for my dissertation, I read extensively on psychological responses to extreme stressors, cultural features in the expression of distress, and factors such as coping strategies that might ameliorate the negative effects of exposure to such events. In this manner, I was able to combine my many interests into a single pathway.

Currently, I work with children and adolescents who have experienced war in Sri Lanka. On occasion, I work with their mothers as well. Sri Lanka has about 30 psychiatrists and less than 10 clinical psychologists, insufficient for its population even at the best of times. Recently, children who had experienced protracted war suffered further loss with the Tsunami of 2004. The depth of their sadness can hardly be described. It is a privilege to have a child share the intensity of his or her feelings with me. In those moments, I resonate with their feelings to the degree that is humanly possible, through what they say in words, and what they share through their eyes. Often, their life stories stay with me, and continue to resonate within me. I do action-research, where the researcher contributes to the community in return for the community participating in the research. Sometimes this requires several months of working in the community before doing any active

research. At other times, I volunteer my time and resources and don't do any research at all. The work is wrenching in almost every way, but the situation is wrenching whether I do this work or not. The rewards of the work are enormous, in the event that any one child feels marginally better over time. There are immediate rewards as well, such as the appreciation of communities that are otherwise abandoned and often without psychological resources of any kind.

I do what I do because I try to create a sense of consistency in my values, beliefs, and actions, across my personal, social, and occupational spheres, so that I feel consonant with who I am and with what I do. It is a work in progress. There are always new aspects to examine, fresh challenges, obstacles across the path, and sometimes no path to follow. Opportunities for humility abound in range and number. Does any of this apply outside my own experience? I'd say yes. Many countries participate in wars either against their own inhabitants or against those outside. Inequalities in social justice prevail both within and outside our countries. Too many of them are based on ethnopolitical issues. Our responsibility doesn't decrease with distance or national boundaries, with membership in majority groups or the minority. We can choose our stance, but being uninformed or choosing to do nothing does not absolve us of responsibility. Neutrality is an active position, in that our disregard has consequences for others wherever they are. Our individual dreams exist within a broader context, and unless each one of us contributes towards sustaining that larger picture, it may not exist when we most need it. I do what I do because I believe in the ideal, and I am willing to take a tiny step towards it within my lifetime, wherever I am. If more of us take such a step, the path will be easier, and much, much, shorter.

Waging Resilience

Serena Chaudhry

Dat and Minh transformed into ninja fighters every morning in math class. They simultaneously agitated and entertained their fellow students and me – their teacher. They kicked and blocked and shouted ha-yah! Once calm, they were able to recite their multiplication tables like masters. They had learned math, ninja fighting and what little English they knew, in a refugee camp.

Ninjas became a constant theme in my initial attempt to keep Dat and Minh engaged in their work. As a first-year teacher, I came up with what I thought was a brilliant idea. I built lessons around their interests. As long as their daily journal entries contained complete sentences, I allowed them to write about fighting ninjas. If they needed to hold the ninja stance to tell me that 12×12 equals 144, I allowed it. I bought Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle stickers. I evolved my vocabulary to include ninja terminology.

Halfway through the year, the school hired a part-time Vietnamese aide who worked one-on-one with Dat, Minh and my other Vietnamese students. The aide and my other colleagues helped me to better understand the circumstances from which Dat and Minh had fled. What I know now, that I didn't know then, is that to kids, refugee camps are similar to big playgrounds. Dat and Minh had spent years at recess and I was trying to make them conform to a classroom. They never sat at desks, had their own book or the luxury of writing journal entries. They most likely sat on a dirt floor, under a tent

with a hundred other refugee children in school, learning from rote memorization.

I spent much of my time in the classroom *not* teaching. One third of the students in my first-year class were refugees who shared stories similar to Dat and Minh. They never attended a formal school prior to coming to the United States. They sat alone at night because their parents worked two or three jobs to make enough money to pay for food. They came to school hungry. Their parents didn't speak English and couldn't help them with their homework. My students served as interpreters and cultural mediators for their parents. They needed help.

After two years in the classroom I clearly saw the overwhelming magnitude of the refugee scenario in Houston. I made a conscious decision to shift gears and work outside the classroom to pursue policy change and service delivery in an effort to help refugee students succeed in the classroom.

In the Community

Resettlement agencies help refugees establish themselves in the U.S. They provide housing, case management services, job training and English classes. My next job was to coordinate the Health Care Interpreter Program at a resettlement agency. I trained refugees who were fluent in English to be health care interpreters for newly resettled refugee families – such as Dat and Minh's. I also advocated and succeeded in getting Medicaid Managed Care to pay for interpreter services. I met the most amazing people working at the resettlement agency. I was witness to courage. I felt hope daily. I left inspired.

My inspiration eventually took me back to school to pursue a dual master's degree in public health and social work at the University of Michigan. My focus was health education and community organizing. I learned more about the

intricacies of psychosocial programming and participatory action research within the context of global health and social welfare. I honed my analytical skills – both qualitative and quantitative.

I had the opportunity to apply these lessons while working in an Afghani refugee camp in Pakistan. With the assistance of NGOs such as the International Catholic Migration Commission and Doctors Without Borders, I implemented a version of PhotoVoice, a participatory action research strategy that put cameras in the hands of refugees and allowed them to photograph their world as they see it. The magic that happened when the refugees were given the opportunity to tell their own stories was powerful. With their permission and guidance I transformed their photo documentary into an advocacy piece that raised money to enhance services for refugees in the Pakistani camps.

I graduated from the University of Michigan as a public health social worker. Admittedly, this is a broad term. Public health social work can have many faces. My expertise pertains to psychosocial programming and displaced people. Since graduation I have been fortunate to have used my broadly-defined profession to work in a myriad of capacities.

Putting it All Together

Solace

I got the perfect job after graduation. After pursuing several informational interviews in New York I found my way to the Safe Horizon/*Solace* Program for Survivors of Torture and War Trauma. I was hired as the Director of Health & Community Services charged with the task of building a citywide refugee health consortium. I was slated to utilize my

graduate degree to the maximum by organizing and educating refugee and immigrant communities around health care.

I wore several hats while directing health and community services for this torture treatment program in New York City. One hat was that of a clinical social worker. I had the privilege of working one-on-one with torture survivors. I listened to many stories. One that stuck with me was that of an Albanian rape survivor. We worked together, over the course of two years, to establish an action plan for her to pick up the shattered pieces of her self-esteem, visit a doctor and testify in court about her most horrifying moment. I had the privilege of listening to her tell the court her story and the larger privilege of testifying on her behalf. She won her political asylum case. Hers is just one of numerous victories won by asylum seekers at *Solace*.

The strength of this torture treatment program was that it acknowledged the bio-psychosocial needs of displaced people and communities and served these needs via a multidisciplinary team. We worked at the micro- and macro-level to address these needs with the ultimate goal of empowering people with skills to help themselves. We were able to maintain a presence in ethnic enclaves by working from satellite offices across New York City. Our presence helped us to build trust, an integral component to surviving emotionally post-conflict.

Katrina

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, I worked with Save the Children U.S. to facilitate and evaluate a psychosocial training program for teachers, counselors and other child-care providers. We trained local people in Psychosocial Structured Activities (PSSA), which use activities such as music, art and rhythmic movement to help children process their feelings and reestablish a sense of trust, security and self-esteem. Ultimately,

these training sessions were a side-door approach to group therapy. When given permission, adults played, allowed themselves to be vulnerable, and grieved. A single mother talked about losing her home, including wedding photos, the only tangible remnants of her late husband who was murdered twelve years ago. A school board president admitted that Katrina pushed her to the edge, daring a policeman to arrest her so that she could have “three hots and a cot.” One of the greatest unintended consequences of this training program was healing for the child-care providers themselves.

Liberia

Most recently, I built upon my years of work in the West African community and implemented the *Coming Home* Project, an arts initiative aimed at enhancing social support for older Liberians living in Staten Island, New York. *Coming Home* used photography and film to connect older Liberians in the diaspora with friends and family at home. A group of elders on Staten Island met for several weeks to discuss the challenges they face as older immigrants and to create messages for me to carry to friends and family in Liberia. I delivered the messages, filmed responses and returned them to the Staten Island community. The photographs and video clips are rich with emotion and hope. The next phase of the project is to create a multimedia exhibit that will educate the public about post-conflict Liberia—specifically, family separation, peace building and the physical and mental health needs of elders in the Liberian diaspora.

Next Steps

The breadth of public health social work is wide and the potential is great. My commitment and energy are constantly fueled by the people and communities with whom I work. The

courage and perseverance I witness on a regular basis is my biggest reward.

The unfortunate reality of pursuing this work within the current political climate is that funding is limited. Since September 11, 2001, refugee admissions to the U.S. have dropped precipitously. This period has seen a rise in the number of people seeking political asylum accompanied with a rise in asylum seekers being detained. Refugee resettlement agencies are receiving fewer funds from the U.S. government and money for the Torture Victims Relief Act (TVRA) is continuously being slashed. As crucial as this work is, funding continues to fluctuate.

Funding fluctuations can lead to poor management. After September 11th, money flowed into not-for-profits to provide counseling and support services to New Yorkers, more specifically, immigrant communities targeted by anti-immigrant sentiment. Recipients of 9/11 funding grew overnight, hiring new staff and expanding services. Many of these agencies neglected to expand their infrastructure. Without a solid infrastructure, agencies were unable to adequately handle funds and hired beyond their means. This scenario presented itself at the torture treatment center where, within three months of doubling program staff, they realized that they had miscalculated the funds and were forced to lay off veteran workers. A number of programs were curtailed prematurely because of staff layoffs. This does not bode well for building trust or continuity of services.

Aside from funding fluctuations and the influence of politics on funding streams, I do believe that we are somewhat responsible for our plight. Though our work is well-intentioned it is often broad, grey and intangible. We must be more specific in our missions, more lucid in our discourse and more tangible in our service provision. We must find a way to

accurately assess and measure what we do. How do you assess whether an asylum seeker is empowered? Numerous studies have been published on empowerment and displacement. We must keep abreast of current findings, evaluate successes and build programs on research as opposed to good intentions.

We must integrate academia with service provision. We must integrate activism with advocacy. We must research and evaluate the services we provide. We must insist that psychosocial well-being is as important as physical well-being. We must be business savvy when operating our non-profit organizations. We must professionalize the work we do. We don't have to lose our heart or our cause in the course of professionalizing. We simply have to be smarter about the work we do.

The Peace and Justice Center (PJC) in Burlington, Vermont, where I recently started working, is one success story. An independent, non-profit organization of 27 years, the PJC uses advocacy, non-violent activism, education, training and community organizing to address the interconnected issues of economic and racial justice and peace and human rights. The PJC conducts and publishes research, organizes in the streets, advocates at the state level and presents in classroom settings. They make the connections between local and global issues. The PJC is moving this work in the right direction.

As I write this paper, a genocide is being waged in Darfur. Lebanese refugees are fleeing from Israeli bombings. Women are escaping structural violence in Central America and filing for asylum. Our work is not done. The need for advocacy and effective programming for displaced people persists. We must rise to the challenge.

In the Footsteps of Great-Great Uncle Moritz

David A. Goodwin

I was recently excited to learn that I had a famous relative, an intellectual heavyweight of his time, whose work I had known nothing about. My great-great uncle was Moritz Lazarus (1824-1903), born in Filehne in the Prussian province of Posen. He was a German philosopher, psychologist, and a vocal opponent of the anti-Semitism of his time. He was chair of psychology at the University of Bern and on the occasion of his 70th birthday he was honored by the German emperor, the University of Bern and the Hebrew College of Cincinnati. He is considered the founder of national psychology (“Volkerpsychologie”) and he devoted himself to the application of the laws of the psychology of the individual to the nation and mankind. He established the *Journal of National Psychology and Linguistics* in 1860. So my family has some legacy in this area (which perhaps validates the notion of a collective unconscious!), and a century and a half after Dr. Lazarus, I find myself wrestling with similar questions and pursuits.

At present I work as a clinical psychologist at a teaching hospital in Philadelphia. I treat patients and also train clinical psychology interns and psychiatry residents. I am currently involved in forging relationships with local NGOs that are assisting refugee populations. These refugees are treated at our clinic when they are suffering from psychological concerns. This treatment is extremely complex and involves cross-cultural understanding of “mental” concerns, knowledge of a person’s culture and history, understanding of the workings of

immigration and naturalization in the U.S., theoretical models of refugee phenomenology, and expertise in working with issues of displacement, trauma and torture. Work with different cultures also involves awareness of one's own operating assumptions and of the dominant discourses within clinical psychology and psychiatry.

In my work I am also involved in formal education with trainees about these issues and instruct that valid "treatment" rests on an understanding of the refugee experience. This understanding may be advanced or hindered by constructs presently dominant within clinical psychiatry. For example, much has been written about the tendency to view the refugee population as suffering trauma symptoms, rather than considering their enduring resilience and competency. This involves teaching the work of the major critics of the dominant trauma discourse (e.g., Derek Summerfield) and also the proponents of the validity of trauma symptomatology (e.g., Richard Mollica). It involves instruction in the fact that our theoretical paradigms are socially constructed.

Given that narratives can always be exploited for political gains, I teach that effective treatment rests upon a broad incorporative definition of mental health and that the experience of individuals and collectives cannot be assumed but must be heard and understood in sociocultural context. Trauma and healing are configured within local cultural practices and historic beliefs. In this regard, if we are to be healers we must draw upon the fields of cultural anthropology, sociology and social psychology long before we apply our psychiatric tools. The theoretical models that we develop must be inclusive, and non-reductionistic; that is, they must not invoke explanations by inferred "disease states." This approach also informs both my treatment and supervision related to working with an inner city African-American population.

Issues such as the sociology of race and urbanization, the politics of poverty, and the “code of the street” described by Elijah Anderson are all essential components of informed service delivery.

I am also interested in teaching the psychology of ethnopolitical conflict in doctoral clinical psychology programs. It is my aim to make this area of study an essential part of core curricula within clinical psychology, as I feel that this discipline is well-positioned to make valuable contributions to this emerging specialty. Components of my proposed curriculum include the psychology of group identification, specifically with regards to national and ethnic identity, psychocultural theories of ethnic conflict, origins of ethnicity, psychodynamics of group regression, function of ideology, psychology of scapegoating and prejudice, refugee phenomenology and impact of war and displacement, and mechanisms of healing and resolution. My approach is informed by psychodynamic theory woven with essential contributions from the fields of social and experimental psychology, sociology, political science and conflict management. I hope to encourage clinical psychology graduates to apply their training to careers within the broader arena of ethnopolitical conflict, be that working in diplomacy, running refugee camps, informing effective government, or any of its many possibilities.

My own work has clearly been informed by my own psychocultural roots and represents active engagement with my own family’s history. My parents’ lives were deeply affected by war, displacement and prejudice, through which their identities shifted as they settled in foreign cultures and consolidated their own viewpoints of the world and conflict. My father Gerhardt Guttmann was born in Beuthen, Silesia into a well-established, prominent Jewish family in 1929. Most of the extended family

were able to flee Nazi Germany in 1939 and scattered to Great Britain, Palestine and America, though many also perished in the death camps. My paternal grandfather was interned as an enemy alien by the British government during the war; my grandmother and her two sons enjoyed relative safety and community in South Wales, though their town was bombed during the Battle of Britain.

My mother Ruth Benke was born in Breslau, Silesia, into a Protestant family that was devastated by the war. She was a refugee and lived under Russian and American occupation; she survived numerous bombings and witnessed massive destruction, death and disease. She was born in 1931, so her earliest memories include a nation mobilizing for war motivated by a virulent ideology. Her father, a colonel in the German army, was taken prisoner by the Russians and remained in a Russian concentration camp for many years after the war, until his eventual release. My mother's family was able to make it to the West. However, her grandparents remained in the East because they were too frail to make that journey. Her family was deeply affected by the war and all of the four siblings left Germany to try to rebuild their lives. They all suffered significant psychological consequences from their war experience. My mother moved to England after the war and worked as an au-pair and then enrolled in nursing training. She met my father when working as a nurse at a British military hospital, where he was a physician completing his national service. My older sister was born in Hamburg, Germany and I was the first from both families to be born outside of Central Europe in 1961 in Cardiff, Wales.

My mother converted to Judaism; we were members of a Reform synagogue in Cardiff that was quite heavily dominated by European exiles. My parents' Jewish friends all had endured harrowing experiences. This one had been in

Auschwitz, this one was on the “Kindertransporten,” this one had lost his family. I felt very different from my classmates and did my best to assimilate, to hide my Judaism and my parents’ German background. As a child I felt ashamed of all this and afraid of both the xenophobia and the anti-Semitism I encountered. For high school, I attended Clifton College, a boarding school in Bristol, England and interestingly, the setting where the Allies planned the Normandy Invasion. I was in the Jewish boarding house called Polack’s House with 70 other boys. We ate kosher and attended synagogue and were loyal to our fellow Polackians but were also integrated with the remaining 90 percent of the school for academics, culture and sports. It was at Clifton that I first learned pride in my Jewish identity and unique background but also the importance of integration and appreciation of different perspectives. This was the culture and it has served as a template for much of my professional and personal life.

My own academic interests and pursuits have to some degree oscillated between macro and micro phenomena; societal and individual; inter-group and intrapsychic – all in an attempt to synthesize and advance understanding of the complexities of conflict. This was not always a conscious act but the data certainly point to this as a valid conclusion, likely rooted in my own psycho-history and the context of the cultures and times of my own life. After studying sociology and social psychology as an undergraduate in England, I pursued my doctorate in clinical psychology in the U.S. Subsequently, I have received formal education in psychodynamic psychotherapy and most recently in the psychology of ethno-political conflict at the Solomon Asch Center. This academic journey and events in my own life have also resulted in departure from my native country, Wales, to citizenship and new roots in America.

My own background and experiences have helped to cultivate in me some capacity for empathy and perspective. I certainly have my prejudices and take positions on global conflicts that impact my own identity, though I often maintain that the nation's victory invariably is humanity's defeat. Individuals have salient group identities that get intensified and more narcissistic under threat, real or imagined. This is a very powerful process when it occurs at a national level. At such times the suffering of the Other is ignored or rationalized. It seeks expression in mourning, distrust and revenge in the hope of its eventual recognition. As Israel Charny stated, "It is entirely natural to care most deeply about one's self and one's own people...but ultimately the challenge of human development...for the benefit of humanity, is for more people to care about all human life."

All of which leads to some inadequate words about healing. In a therapist's office healing occurs with a patient's sense that his or her conflicts are understood and while it is certainly erroneous to extrapolate such observations to the group level we should be reminded of the imperative of true dialogue. Dialogue is the encounter between what Martin Buber calls an I and a Thou, and is the authentic medium that conveys what it is I have to say — and hear what it is that the Other wishes to convey to me. According to Leonard Grob, "Such dialogue is a not a mere "means" to arrive at a philosophical truth: it is rather the fundamental *enactment* of philosophical truth-as-process. There is no way to dialogue; dialogue is the way...Without dialogue..."discourse" becomes at best the attempt by the mightier of intellect to impress their static "truths" on the weaker. And...what began as a diatribe can easily end as a thrust of the sword." In truth it is only in our responsibility to the Other that we recognize our shared humanity.

This Place In The Ways

Shanee Stepakoff

The title of this chapter is derived from a 1948 poem of the same name, which was written by the activist poet Muriel Rukeyser in the middle of her life. In the poem, she expresses a sense of mysterious continuity between the passionate humanitarian impulses of her youth and the politically committed path she embarked on thereafter, and on which she intends to remain. Her idea that there was an essential thread that ran through the myriad transformations and upheavals in her life holds a special resonance for me as I attempt to reflect on my years of international work with survivors of torture and war.

My great-grandparents immigrated to New England in response to anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia, and my paternal grandmother fled the Ukrainian pogroms of 1918-21, in which over 100,000 Jews were killed. My maternal grandmother was a travel agent, and brought me keepsakes from distant lands. These aspects of my family background stimulated in me a curiosity about faraway cultures and peoples, and led me to develop an early awareness of the existence of ethnic persecution and an identification with immigrants and other marginalized groups.

I was born in Boston in 1963. My family moved to the suburb of Newton a year later. During my elementary school years, the civil rights and women's movements were in full force, and the Vietnam War was a subject of growing controversy and protest. The increasingly virulent expressions

of racism that characterized Boston's school busing crisis of the 1970s left an indelible impression on me.

Despite the lack of guidance or coherent explanations from the adults in my environment with regard to issues of racial violence, from a very young age I had an instinctive sense of moral indignation when vulnerable people were treated unfairly, and a strong empathic response to human suffering. I also had a naturally inquisitive mind, and questioned situations that others around me seemed to take for granted. In addition, whereas many people in my suburban milieu seemed repelled by difference, I was fascinated by the unfamiliar.

As a young girl, my perspectives on ethnopolitical conflict were informed by stories of the Holocaust. At age 13 I wrote a novella about a girl who survived a concentration camp through a combination of resilience, ingenuity, others' assistance, and luck. Throughout my childhood, I noticed magazine advertisements for NGOs such as CARE and Save the Children, requesting sponsors for poverty-stricken children. I felt moved by the images of these children, and yearned to find a way to connect with them on the other side of the globe. As I transitioned from childhood to adolescence, my passion for justice and the alleviation of human suffering, and my interest in other cultures, began to ripen. In the late 1970s, I encountered newspaper reports about the Khmer Rouge genocide in Cambodia. I wrote letters advocating for Cambodian refugees, and organized an educational event about the genocide for my synagogue youth group.

At Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, I sought to integrate my interest in individual/personal healing and transformation with my belief in the importance of social change, justice, and liberation. I majored in psychology, and earned a second degree in urban studies. I began to participate in workshops offered by the National Training Laboratories

Institute (NTI), an organization that has pioneered the field of cross-cultural human relations training; these served to deepen my understanding of the dynamics of oppression.

My father's tragic death when I was 12 and my having been kidnapped at gunpoint at age 19 were personal experiences that led me to peruse the scholarly literature on traumatic grief, orphaned children, hostage-taking, captivity, and the psychological consequences of violence. Thus, the development of my interest in the intersection between psychology and ethno-political violence was the combined result of life events, moral and political values, and aspects of my basic nature or constitution – what the Jungian analyst James Hillman has referred to as “the soul's code.”

After completing my undergraduate education and working in social and community services in Worcester and San Francisco (where I volunteered in a program for Cambodian refugee women), I became part of a network of organization development (OD) professionals who were studying nonviolent large-system change. Through this network, I enrolled in a non-traditional master's program which used a student-designed, tutorial approach. My advisor was Jack Gibb, a pioneer in the field of human relations training who had particular expertise in group and organizational dynamics. Initially, I had planned to study community development and social change. As part of this plan, I made arrangements for a variety of international internship, volunteer, and learning experiences, beginning with a proposed three-week trip to South Africa.

One night in a San Francisco theater a few months before this scheduled trip, I saw a documentary film about the Highlander Center, an organization in Tennessee which had played a crucial role in the civil rights movement – in fact, it was the place where Rosa Parks had completed an interracial

workshop shortly before refusing to give up her seat on the bus in Montgomery. I was so inspired by this film that a few weeks later I went to spend a week at Highlander and met its founder, Myles Horton, who was then in his 80s. Myles had spent his whole life opposing racism and working for social and political change. Unbeknownst to me until after I arrived there, Myles had just returned from a journey to South Africa, hosted by the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre, and he encouraged me to visit there during my upcoming trip. More importantly, he reached out to his contacts so that they would welcome me in spite of the atmosphere of tension and mistrust that permeated the South African liberation struggle during the mid-1980s.

Wilgespruit was an ecumenical center near Johannesburg founded in the 1940s to resist the policies of apartheid by conducting interracial workshops and supporting programs that promoted social justice and human rights. In 1986-87, when I lived and worked there, Wilgespruit was overseeing a variety of community empowerment projects, and was also serving as a refuge for ex-detainees. Some staff and participants were aligned with the African National Congress and its newly formed affiliate, the United Democratic Front, but the center was also heavily influenced by the Black Consciousness movement, which emphasized psychological liberation, self-definition, community self-reliance, and mutual support.

I was assigned to the Urban Community Organizing and Development division, where I helped to coordinate workshops for young people who were in training to become community leaders. Additionally, other staff and I established a coalition of organizations concerned about the increasing numbers of homeless city-dwellers which resulted from the apartheid government's increasingly harsh enforcement of

racist legislation. This organization, which we called the Witwatersrand Network for the Homeless, was selected by readers of the *Indicator* newspaper for the 1987 South Africa Human Rights Award.

My colleagues and supervisors in South Africa helped me develop a political consciousness and a familiarity with Marxism, African nationalism, and anti-colonialism. This period was the height of the apartheid government's violence against activists, and many of my co-workers had been harassed and tortured. A few months before my arrival, the police had raided Wilgespruit, and had detained many of the children who were in refuge there. As a result of the formative experience of living and working in that context, I changed the focus of my master's studies from organization development to the psychological effects of political violence. My thesis was an analysis of the experiences and coping strategies of South African political detainees.

Besides South Africa, I also spent four months traveling through Southern and Eastern Africa. Then, my deepening interest in the psychological effects of political violence led me to Nicaragua, where I learned Spanish and completed an intensive study program about the Sandinista revolution. I went on to spend four months traveling through Latin America, where I met with survivors' groups, and the mental health professionals working with them. Among the most influential countries for me were Argentina, Chile and El Salvador. The men and women I met during this period, from many different countries and of varying ethnicities, taught me much of what I know today about integrity and courage.

After completing my first master's studies, I went to Asia. There, in addition to personal travel in several countries, I completed a three-month volunteer position at the Children's Rehabilitation Center in the Philippines, an agency that

provided psychosocial care for children whose parents had been imprisoned or killed in state-sponsored violence. I also completed a volunteer position with an NGO in Bangladesh that worked to create “conscientization” groups among the poor.

A Bengali colleague of mine was facilitating feminist consciousness-raising groups. She and her associates gave me books about gender oppression, and taught me about the dismal living conditions of the vast majority of Bangladeshi women. More importantly, they shared their own personal stories – stories in which themes of wasted potential, lost opportunities, and gender-based violence were pervasive.

While traveling in Asia, I came to realize that I wanted to be a healer, that although I cared deeply about political action and social change, I also wanted to learn how to heal people who had been psychologically wounded as a result of systematic violence. Eventually I decided that a graduate program in clinical/community psychology would be a good way for me to synthesize my interest in larger contextual issues, my calling to work with the poor, and my desire to become a psychotherapist.

While awaiting admission to graduate school I spent six months as the kindergarten teacher in an Arab-Jewish cooperative village located halfway between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, called *Neve Shalom/Wahat al-Salaam*, and visited my paternal relatives in the Soviet Union. A cousin accompanied me to our ancestral town of Slutsk, and led me to the mass grave in the forest where nearly all of the town’s 9,000 Jews were killed during the Nazi occupation.

After three years overseas, I returned to the United States and earned a graduate certificate in women’s studies and a master’s degree in clinical/community psychology at the University of Maryland, and went on to complete my Ph.D. in

clinical psychology at St. John's University. In New York, I was exposed to contemporary psychoanalytic theory, and became interested in the role of unconscious forces – such as projection, displacement, splitting, and identification with the aggressor – in ethnopolitical violence. Through my contact with the psychoanalytic community, I became interested in empathy and intersubjectivity, and came to appreciate the importance, in conflict transformation, of a capacity to recognize the subjective reality of the other.

Throughout my doctoral studies, I had sought practicum placements that allowed me to work with trauma survivors from underserved, ethnic minority backgrounds. I did my clinical internship in child and adolescent psychology at a community mental health center in Newark, New Jersey. I went on to complete a one-year post-doctoral fellowship at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center in Denver, focusing on clinical interventions with traumatized young children. Concurrent with my graduate studies, I had become a registered poetry therapist through the National Association for Poetry Therapy, trained to use poems and expressive writing to promote insight, empowerment, and healing. Through this work, I had become part of the larger creative arts therapies community, in which drama, visual arts, storytelling, and dance are used as therapeutic tools.

After receiving my psychologist license, I spent eight months traveling through Africa and Asia, a time for reflection and reinvigoration after nearly a decade in graduate school. I visited West African sites connected with the Atlantic slave trade, and made a documentary film about the Khmer Rouge genocide and the experiences of Cambodian refugees. I returned to the United States to begin a position directing a creative arts therapy clinic in a low-income urban neighborhood in Boston.

I arrived in Boston on September 10, 2001, and was horrified by the events that unfolded the following day. Soon after, I enrolled in a one-year postgraduate certificate program in Trauma Studies conducted by the Boston Trauma Center. The same year, I completed a postgraduate fellowship in contemporary psychoanalysis. The following year, I obtained a position at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (a major teaching hospital of Harvard Medical School), as the primary clinician in a program that provided psychotherapy for people who had lost loved ones in the September 11th attacks. In the summer of 2003, I completed a summer postdoctoral fellowship in ethnopolitical conflict at the University of Pennsylvania's Solomon Asch Center.

In early 2004, I was offered a job with the Center for Victims of Torture, a Minneapolis-based NGO which has been working in West Africa for several years. The job was as a psychologist/trainer for Liberian survivors of torture who were living in the refugee camps of Guinea. I had first learned about CVT's work in West Africa during my fellowship at the Asch Center, because Jon Hubbard, who had been the primary developer of CVT's West Africa programs, was one of our instructors. So, in April of 2004, I left my position at Beth Israel Deaconess, put my possessions in storage, rented out my Cambridge condo, and set out for Guinea. As I landed in Conakry and then traveled 10-hours by road to Kissidougou, in the forest region, where the CVT program was based, I felt a deep sense of revitalization. This initial intuition turned out to be prescient, because my year in Guinea was a period of tremendous personal and professional renewal.

The program provided trauma counseling services and capacity building for Liberian refugees. I was part of an international, interdisciplinary team, and there were innumerable opportunities for mutual learning. The 30

Liberian paraprofessional counselors whom we were supervising were extraordinary people who were grateful to have been selected and exceedingly eager to learn. They were role models of dedication and resilience, and I drew inspiration from their example. The Liberian clients with whom we worked were remarkable people. Their stories were filled with tragedy and loss, as well as a capacity to endure. Their lives represented the reality of the indestructibility of the human spirit. Their love of singing, dancing, ritual, and prayer enriched my understanding of the process of healing.

We also provided training for the wider refugee community, thus I had contact with community and religious leaders, health-care personnel, teachers, and cultural workers. In addition, we conducted community sensitizations on a variety of social problems, such as rape, torture, and war trauma. Hence, I was able to integrate my work as a clinician and trainer with my background in community psychology. In Guinea, I also managed to fulfill my longstanding goal of learning French. My six colleagues from CVT-Guinea and I were presented with the 2006 American Psychological Association's International Humanitarian Award in recognition of our work.

Though my primary work was as a psychotherapist, clinical supervisor, and trainer, I also felt a moral imperative to refer refugees for resettlement in a third country if they were genuinely at risk. For example, I had several clients who had given birth to children as a result of war-time rape; these children were labeled "rebel babies" and both they and their mothers were often threatened and physically assaulted. I submitted referrals that resulted in 25 of these families – comprising over 100 people in total – being accepted for resettlement in Western countries.

As the UNHCR implemented a mass repatriation of the Liberian refugees, CVT-Guinea closed. A few months later a new CVT center was launched in Liberia, and I provided several weeks of training for counselors in this program. During the period when CVT-Guinea was preparing to close, I obtained a position as the psychologist in the UN-backed war crimes tribunal in neighboring Sierra Leone.

The Special Court was created jointly by the UN and the Sierra Leonean government to try those who bear the greatest responsibility for war crimes and crimes against humanity committed on Sierra Leonean territory during the country's brutal civil war. My job, which I began in May 2005, involves providing psychosocial care for witnesses before, during, and after their testimony. I train and supervise the Court's 10-person psychosocial support team. Before witnesses testify, we conduct a psychosocial assessment and courtroom briefing, so that we can be aware of their potential vulnerabilities and so that they know what to expect in the courtroom. During their testimony, we have counselors available to offer emotional support. After they testify, we provide debriefing as well as follow-up regarding further psychosocial needs.

The Court exemplifies a turning of the tables, in which leaders who at one time presumed their omnipotence and impunity are at last being held accountable, and individuals who were once helpless victims now command the attention of the courtroom and the world as they tell their stories of violence, loss, and perseverance. The witnesses are exceptionally courageous individuals. Among the many valuable lessons they have taught me is that protecting human rights requires a willingness to take risks and a mixture of compassion and indignation. Perhaps this is what Muriel Rukeyser meant when she wrote, in the poem mentioned

earlier, that after years of working for justice and human rights, she found both “love and rage.”

In recent years, my interest in writing and literature has become a more central feature of my personal and professional identity. Through a grant provided by the Asch Center, I conducted a study of literary and artistic responses to the Cambodian genocide, in which I interviewed Cambodian poets and performing artists who are using their creative work to bear witness to atrocities. I am now a senior instructor in the graduate program in expressive therapies at Lesley University, an institution based in Cambridge, Massachusetts which also offers degree programs in Israel. Through a program Lesley established in July 2006, as ethnopolitical violence swept the Middle East, I led workshops for Palestinian graduate students at Al Quds University in the West Bank, on the utilization of poetry and the creative arts in healing traumatized communities. Currently, I am exploring new ways of honoring the part of my self that wants to write. This chapter represents an important step on that path.

Disaster Psychology: An Interesting and Rewarding Challenge

Teri L. Elliott

Although not all catastrophes are preventable, many are or should be. At an early age, I found myself drawn to the idea of peace and cooperation. I wanted everyone to win and often felt sad for the “losers.” While participating in team sports I found myself apologizing to those I tagged out and although competitive, I preferred competing against myself or an arbitrary score, rather than against others. I wanted the best idea to win through a heated debate where each person learns from the other. I feel these passionate exercises can move an issue forward without damaging the individuals involved. Moreover, while I do not feel the need to please people, I am steadfast in my belief that people should not have to suffer needlessly. Even as a child, I was drawn to protecting the underdog. Not surprisingly, I gravitated towards the field of psychology. I liked the idea that individuals could move beyond their troubles and I liked the idea of being the one to help them grow and obtain some relief.

In this pursuit, I entered graduate school to become a clinical psychologist. I thought that as a psychologist I could help people overcome their traumatic histories and take pleasure in joyful and fulfilling lives. I soon came to realize that this was a lovely fantasy, but that reality was much more complicated. People who had struggled throughout their entire lives needed more than an hour or two a week with a therapist

in order to change the course of their future. Their personalities were so deeply embedded in their traumatic pasts that moving forward was exceedingly difficult. While I was helping people, it was not the huge impact I had hoped for or imagined. To put it another way, these individuals were slogging through a lifetime of refuse and as a psychologist in training I was handing them a small shovel with which to dig.

I came to believe that there might be more opportunities for growth if the individual had not lived with the traumatic events for so long. In this vein, I began focusing on children and ultimately became a clinical child psychologist. I soon realized that in order to more fully help children I needed to both understand and be able to alter, or at least alter their participation in, the larger communities within which they lived. Most of my clientele were from multicultural, multilingual, impoverished neighborhoods, with all the inherent stressors. These neighborhoods were systematically discriminated against, poorly educated, and flooding over with drugs and violence. In many respects, these children were living in a war zone. Consequently, my clients' guardians were often overwhelmed with their own traumatic histories and the ever-increasing stressors on their lives, and so these children were left searching for basic support systems. I found myself escorting children to doctors, teaching remedial academic skills, visiting schools, meeting teachers, principals, and parents, holding family therapy sessions, bringing in their friends and relatives, all in an attempt to help them have healthier, more in-the-moment lives.

I was able to evoke the larger, more all-encompassing changes that these children desired and deserved, but there were still severe limitations. For example, one of my clients explained how our work together had made her want to get an education and get out of her gang. I was overjoyed. Not

surprisingly, this elation was quickly crushed when she asked for my help and I realized how inadequate my interventions were. While she had made the emotional and cognitive changes necessary to desire, and participate in, a more satisfying life, the environment she was living in was omnipresent. Even if I were the best child psychologist in the world, how could I possibly help her get safely out of a gang without also helping her acquire a completely new life in a new community? Moreover, if by some miracle (which occasionally happens), these resilient children managed to get out of their destructive environments, what about all the other obstacles (i.e., limited educational opportunities, limited or nonexistent job options, resistant family or friends) in their path? What type of a life were these children able to have? What about the children left behind? This was not an isolated incident and while some clients did make better lives for themselves, many others were swept away by the overwhelming forces within their battered communities. I had to wonder; how ethical was it to help children desire and strive for another type of life and yet for many of them have the option remain tantalizingly out of reach?

While I still struggle with this ethical dilemma, my response was to create a career focused on preventative training to alleviate some of these conditions and to provide services in the aftermath of critical events in order to ameliorate the negative consequences. For the most part, children are only able to grow as far as their guardians and communities will support them. I again realized that I was reaching only the tip of the iceberg. In order to evoke real meaningful change I had to look at the larger society as a whole. This included economic, social, political, and religious aspects. They are all interrelated and true change cannot be made without a thorough understanding of their interrelationships and meanings, to both the individual and the

community. Ethnopolitical violence, whether at home or abroad, had to be addressed.

I knew intellectually and academically that impoverished neighborhoods looked very similar to war ridden communities, but I chose to travel through Bosnia i Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia towards the end of the war, to understand the similarities and differences on an *emotional* level. While I was able to learn more about the effect of war, I was also very fortunate to be merely an observer and so did not have to experience the true impact.

I lived in a neighborhood where the generic image of war held true. Tanks continually rumbled down the street sighting their barrels at you, soldiers were everywhere, the parks had been converted to graveyards, open landscape was unsafe due to mines, and there were signs of destruction everywhere. Destroyed homes, amputees, ravaged landscapes, mourning families, and an aura of desperation, fear, and helplessness were the norm. There were also pockets of opportunism being filled by those willing to profit on the pain of others. Gangsters and the mob had moved into a previously healthy neighborhood. While it is impossible to truly convey what I experienced, just as it was impossible for me to accurately understand these conditions without experiencing them, I feel that a couple of incidences epitomize the similarity of the situation to many impoverished neighborhoods.

One incident occurred while I was talking to a group of parents about how their children were handling the aftermath of the war. Unanimously, the parents talked about how their children were doing fine and did not seem to be experiencing any negative effects. While the adults were talking, the children appeared to be playing contentedly by the side of a river. Poignantly, when I looked closer I saw that the children were playing a game that I later learned they called “graveyard.” This

involved digging little graves and putting suitable religious symbols over each one. This incident demonstrated my belief that regardless of where you live, a parent's desperate need to see their children as "OK" often blinds them to the turmoil their children may be feeling.

Another circumstance which struck me was that while many adolescents had been sent away to live with relatives or even strangers during the major part of the conflict, many had remained at home either out of loyalty or lack of opportunity. These now young adults, many who had fought in the war, were feeling frustration, resentment, and anger when they compared their circumstances to those who had left. They talked about loyalty and having stayed to support their homeland, families, and friends and yet they felt as if their only reward was a lack of education and hence job opportunities. In contrast, their friends who left were able to continue school and so came back with more skills and options. A sense of injustice was rampant and similar to that I had seen repeatedly in impoverished neighborhoods.

Obviously living in an environment rife with violence and with little or no economic or academic opportunities can create an overwhelming sense of despair and futility. These sickening circumstances can tear the fabric of communities to such an extent that they become destructive environments with generational transmission of hopelessness and a general feeling of degradation. My experiences made it apparent that the most direct way of assisting people is in preventing these destructive situations in communities from developing. This is not a profound thought, but it does come with the rather grandiose plan of helping communities prevent or at least prepare for natural and human-made disasters. Instead of helping individuals and families only in the aftermath of some traumatic situation, why not work towards prevention? This

was my new plan and what led me to further specialize my training and become a “disaster psychologist.”

I had the extraordinary opportunity to participate in the first Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict summer program. This was a unique, profound, rewarding, exhausting, and often bewildering experience. It is exceedingly rare to work, eat, play, learn, teach and argue with an array of different professionals from a wide range of fields, backgrounds, and cultures and try to *hammer out* what ethnopolitical violence is and what options are available for its avoidance and healing. I use the term *hammer out* because that is what it felt like. As professionals from very different fields, we often spoke in very different languages (literally and figuratively) and had very different ideas of what it means to work for peace. This Petri dish-like experience was indicative of the larger problem: how to get very diverse groups with diverse experiences and goals to communicate and work toward a common goal. While I do not think we found a solution, I do think we made progress in understanding the topic and the experience was well worth the sleep deprivation.

It is hard to define my career. Am I a clinical child psychologist who specializes in disasters or am I a disaster psychologist who specializes in children? Is the distinction relevant? Regardless of my title, my job is to prevent those disasters that are avertable by focusing on education, preventative training and planning, and to have a role in ameliorating some of the negative effects of those disasters that were not avoided.

A disaster psychologist assists in preparing for, responding to, and recovering from natural or human-made critical events. Perhaps the most important part of the disaster psychologist’s job is to help individuals and communities incorporate the traumatic event into a manageable part of their lives. Traumatic

events force us to (consciously, or unconsciously) reevaluate who we are and how we relate to the world. For instance, when asked to describe yourself, you may refer to the roles you hold, such as sociologist, student, sister, or brother. What happens if these roles are no longer available to you? A woman in her thirties may describe herself as a supervisor, wife, and athlete. If she loses her husband, will she still consider herself a wife? If she loses a limb, will she still consider herself an athlete? How will she and her community view and treat her now? I believe that a primary goal of disaster psychology is to help individuals and communities see themselves not as victims of, or even survivors of, a traumatic event, but rather as having *experienced* the event. The event will certainly remain a powerful experience, but hopefully will become just one aspect of their history; not an all-encompassing dictator of their lives.

Disaster psychologists are often distinguished from other psychologists by their tendency to study and carry out their clinical interventions in the field. This usually means going into an area hit by a critical event, whether it be a flood or a war zone, and attempting to provide assistance to those in need. While this is often difficult to do, it also allows one to provide the most immediate and possibly only psychological care these individuals may receive. You can provide hope to those most in despair. You can create opportunities for the community to come together and help themselves. You can provide education about what emotional experiences may lie ahead and this knowledge can alleviate many people's fears about going crazy or responding in an inappropriate way. In addition, since disaster psychologists tend to focus on the impact of critical events rather than peoples' overall identity or development, you are able to work with emotions and thoughts that are more readily available to the individual. You have a clear sense of your goals. You are there to help relieve distress and to help

these individuals put the critical event into a manageable context. You want to help people see themselves not as victims of an event or even survivors of the event but rather as individuals with a wide range of characteristics, wants, needs, and strengths who have experienced the event. You want to help them move beyond the event so they can make the most of the rest of their lives.

It is difficult to describe the career of a disaster psychologist. Unlike the traditional clinician who has regularly scheduled clients, a disaster psychologist has little or no schedule. The job is constantly evolving and changing. Boredom is not an issue. There is often an adrenaline rush when you are headed out to a scene and a let down upon return. Being able to adapt and work in chaotic and draining conditions is essential.

Working in physically and emotionally difficult situations such as flood zones, refugee camps, terrorist attacks, or with organizations where psychologists are neither desired nor respected is commonplace. Many of the field environments are taxing. Long hours, poor environmental conditions, and health risks are common. You are often exposed to grisly scenes or physically endangering situations. In addition, you will hear, repeatedly, stories of fear and horror. Your intervention options can also be severely limited by the imperfect resources available. For example, you would not want to assess a community for depression or post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) if the environment lacks the necessary resources to manage these diagnoses. This seems like common sense, but there may be pressures on you from funding sources or academic institutes to do things that are not necessarily in the best interests of the community. Your expertise may be more productive in creating a plan to allow safe access to water. You have to be able to think beyond what is traditionally considered

“psychology” and advocate for these options. A large part of a disaster psychologist’s role is to be the communities’ advocate, which can often be quite difficult.

Another challenge for the disaster psychologist is the ability to remain in the field when it is clear that there is no solution. For example, if you are working in an inner city ghetto or a large refugee camp, the feeling that there is no cure for the pain and suffering you are witnessing can be difficult to handle. It is also very common that the affected population is not only struggling with the current crisis, but also with a host of preexisting problems such as poverty, community violence, sexism, prejudice, punishing regimes, and so on. Being able to remain engaged and productive in these circumstances is paramount to being a good disaster psychologist. As a result, the personal requirements necessary to be a disaster psychologist (both physical and mental) are perhaps more difficult to master than the professional.

Even given the many hardships, I find that disaster psychology is a wonderful profession that continually provides opportunities to challenge oneself intellectually and emotionally. The individuals you will be training, working with, learning from and helping are remarkable. You will be amazed by their resilience and bravery. You are also able to travel to some of the most impressive and isolated places in the world. In addition, although it is true that you may not be able to fix everything, you do make significant and noticeable changes in people’s lives. This is endlessly rewarding. You will never forget the time you help a parent understand their traumatized child, or help a frightened family look to the future with hope. By bringing your training and expertise to troubled communities, you are fostering the ideas of equality, peace, and cooperation.

Being part of a large-scale humanitarian effort can also be an antidote to the often violent and demoralizing nature of our world. With ethnic and prejudicial conflicts, poverty, terrorism, AIDS and famine epidemics running rampant, being even a small part of the prevention and recovery response is a unique and rewarding experience. Watching people from all types of cultures *hammer out* their differences at least long enough to work together for a short-term common goal is revitalizing and brings hope to all those involved.

Giving Voice to the Voiceless: Working on Behalf of Refugees

Lorraine Majka

I lead a bipolar life. I maintain a scholarly affiliation with the University of Chicago. In this position, I study, research, and write articles on African, Asian, European, Middle Eastern and Latin American refugee populations, and the community groups, mainstream organizations, and systems that attempt to cater to their needs in various countries. Through the San Francisco Asylum Office, I also work in the U.S. Asylum Corp. In this position, I meet with, interview, and grant asylum to asylum seekers and their families, who have fled to the Western region of the U.S. (San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, Reno, Anchorage). I have also interviewed and granted refugee status to various refugee populations in overseas locations, such as Kenya (Kakuma Refugee Camp, Dadaab Refugee Camp, and Nairobi), and Ethiopia (Dierdawa and Addis Ababa). The individuals and families to whom I grant asylum or refugee status have origins in various ethnic and racial groups, and have experienced past persecution or have a well-founded fear of future persecution due to ethnic or political conflicts in their regions of origin.

* * * *

My present involvement with refugee work resulted from the fact that I always wanted to give a voice to the voiceless,

fight for social justice, and open blocked opportunity structures for particularly powerless racial and ethnic populations in the world. How I arrived at my present refugee positions is a combination of historical background, unique and routine opportunities, beneficial circumstances, a large amount of luck, and a proactive attitude and approach. Specifically, my interest in the refugee field began when I was a child and a young adult. I am a descent of immigrants. Although no one would ever directly speak about the matter, I am possibly also a descendant of refugees. Although my parents were neither educated nor tolerant, I grew up in a family that had strong connections to the labor union movement, which struggled to acquire, maintain, and enhance rights and benefits for lower middle class and working class individuals and their families. I also grew up in a household that supported strong democratic ideas, values, traditions, and parties.

I attended private religious primary and secondary schools, where instructors placed a strong emphasis on the importance of equal rights and equal opportunities for all races, nationalities, ethnic groups, and vulnerable populations. I also attended small private colleges, where I had minors in psychology and philosophy, and a major in sociology, with a particular interest in the study of ethnic and race relations. While I was an undergraduate, I also worked during the summer in Appalachia assisting black and multiethnic white and other populations living in poverty.

Later, I obtained an M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology, with concentrations in ethnic and race relations, organizations, and research methods. One faculty member on my Ph.D. committee secured a research consultant position for me with the United Nations Decade for Women Project at the UN in New York City. While in this position, I reviewed and made

methods and programming recommendations on reports written by academics and experts from around the world on the state of women's (including refugee women's) education, health, literacy, and employment in over 150 UN member countries. This was one of my first experiences in dealing with the lives of refugee women in various local, national, and international contexts.

After completing my Ph.D., my first job was as a research associate on a project analyzing comparative data on black and minority ethnic women's and men's health and living situations. After this project was completed, I noticed a position opening in the *Chicago Tribune* for a research manager/program analyst at the Illinois Refugee Resettlement Program. Through a combination of background, previous experience, luck, and my and the program director's common individual connections, I was successful in securing this relatively high level position. For the next five years, my assistants and I guided approximately 70 interviewers in 25 mainstream secular and religious organizations and grass roots associations, through the collection of monthly demographic and outcome data on 10,000 refugees from diverse countries who had entered Illinois and used the refugee resettlement program. I also analyzed these data, and wrote quarterly and annual reports on the resettlement system for members of the Illinois Refugee Resettlement Consortium, organizational aid givers, and members of the U.S. Congress.

While working in this position, I formed ongoing linkages with local refugee organizations' directors, their refugee staff, and refugees themselves. I also actively worked to establish linkages with a variety of academic institutions working on refugee issues at the local, national, and international levels. In addition, I attended, and made presentations related to refugee

work at regular and midterm meetings of international and national professional associations.

In the late 1980s, while still working with the Illinois Refugee Resettlement Program, I noticed an advertisement for a newly formed refugee studies program and documentation center at the University of Oxford. I believed that the Oxford Refugee Studies Programme (RSP) could be a valuable source of contacts, publications, and other information for the Illinois refugee resettlement system, and I wrote to its director. Shortly afterward, while I was on my way to India to present a paper, I stopped in Oxford and visited with scholars, staff, and students affiliated with the RSP. The program's director suggested that I apply for a Fulbright Grant so that I could spend a longer amount of time there, which I did. Over the next two years, I spent my vacation time at the RSP examining materials, and talking to staff, academics, and experts in residence about the United Kingdom and other nations' models of refuge.

The following year, I was awarded a Fulbright Grant to conduct a comparative study of refugee systems and refugee system evaluation models in the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland) and the United States. I spent two years as a research fellow at the RSP carrying out the Fulbright research, attending seminars, and meeting scholars and professionals in the refugee studies field. I met another research fellow, who introduced me to the comparative work on refugee resettlement in Europe conducted by a leading Swedish academic and researcher. Subsequently, I made contact with this researcher and wrote several proposals on the Swedish refugee resettlement system. In addition, while at Oxford, I met lead academics and researchers in the refugee studies field who resided in the U.S., as well as the director of the refugee reception center in Auckland, New Zealand. I also

traveled to Madrid, Geneva, and Amsterdam, and collected information on these nations' refugee systems.

Refugee reception and resettlement systems in various nations are similar in that in each location, government agencies, mainstream organizations, and/or refugee grassroots initiatives cater to, and offer at least some basic provisions for refugees. That is, they provide assistance in the areas of protection, legal status, housing, health, welfare, employment, English as a second language, socio-psychological matters, cross-cultural issues, religious concerns, adjustment services, special assistance for women and children, and so forth. Most nations also have organizations involved in advocacy and referral on behalf of refugees, and self-development and community development operations.

However, nations and organizations serving refugees within them vary in many ways. Resettlement systems differ in history, primary objectives, administrative structure (centralized vs. decentralized), primary clientele, human and financial resources, assistance schemes, aid capacities, activity levels, interest areas, and degree and variety of provisions and programs offered to various refugee populations. While the full social, cultural, economic, and psychological privileges and benefits of the welfare state are available to refugees originating from various ethnicities, races, and nationalities who arrive and settle in Sweden, a far less generous and welcoming system exists for refugees who arrive in the United Kingdom and many other countries in "fortress Europe." The principal goal of some European systems is to keep out refugees or return them to their countries of origin.

In the 2000s, Australia also has placed primary emphasis on keeping asylum seekers and refugees out of their mainland. However, at the same time Australia and New Zealand have made their resettlement systems for "acceptable" refugees

more compassionate and coherent. They offer many social, economic, linguistic, and cultural provisions. In comparison, the U.S. falls somewhere in the middle among the European and Australasian refugee systems. The U.S. relies on a generous, but imposing and tailored bureaucratic system for receiving and resettling refugees. In the U.S. refugee model, more emphasis is placed on material concerns (e.g., rapid employment) and the quantity of individuals accepted and assisted rather than the quality of provisions and assistance. While many refugees are interviewed and receive assistance in the U.S., and it now receives the most asylum seekers of post industrial nations, some of the neediest refugees also are abandoned by the U.S. system.

* * * *

After completing my comparative refugee systems project at Oxford, I became a lecturer in ethnic relations (refugee studies) and research methodology at Latrobe University in Melbourne, Australia. While in Australia, I conducted research on Southeast Asian and African refugees in Melbourne, and on the Australian refugee system. I also undertook a comparative examination of Australia's and other nations' refugee reception systems and studies of New Zealand's and Thailand's refugee reception systems. In 1993, the University of Oxford asked me to write a "State of the Art Review of Research on Refugees in the Australasian Region." I presented the review at a meeting of the International Research and Advisory Panel in Oxford, and I was elected a founding member and regional representative of a new Oxford refugee studies organization, the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration.

After my teaching and research in Australia, and the research in New Zealand were complete, I returned to Oxford for six months as a research fellow. Subsequently, I became affiliated with the University of Chicago, and joined an international working group on globalization and migration. During this period, I continued to write articles on the Australian, New Zealand, British, and U.S. refugee systems. In 2000 and 2001, I collaborated on studies of refugee women and children in the U.S., Spain, Australia, and New Zealand, and on psychosocial responses to refugees in emergency situations.

I secured my present Asylum Corp position because of my previous work with various academic and professional institutions in the refugee field. Currently, I am also in the process of becoming a partner in a new organization, Asylum Access, led by academics and experts in the refugee area. This organization seeks to raise funds for legal assistance for asylum seekers in the developing world.

* * * *

There are many challenges and rewards to leading a bipolar life in the field of working with refugees. A bipolar life, which involves both the academic and practical aspects of refugee work, poses the challenge of being able to walk the middle line on refugee issues in a world characterized by competing ideologies, divisive boundaries, and the consequences of globalization. As an academic, I often have to listen to, and absorb, critiques by fellow academics about potential and actual problematic agendas and operations of the state and mainstream organizations in a global context. Currently, the world prioritizes national security concerns over human rights issues, and refugee assistance rather than refugee

protection. As a practitioner, at times I cannot grant as many individuals asylum or refugee status as I would like to, because of concerns of the state, changing country conditions, or a lack of pertinent case law. In the asylum field, many of my co-workers are lawyers who have varying degrees of psychological, cultural, sociological, or political knowledge and training about refugees' issues and situations. Many asylum seekers that I work with on a daily basis have experienced major personal, familial, communal, and national losses, and some are extremely upset during their interviews. In overseas refugee work, the geographical location, environmental surroundings, and political issues at interview sites also may pose challenges.

Yet the rewards of a bipolar academic and practitioner life in the refugee field far outweigh the risks and challenges. At the academic level, maintaining a link with academic actors and institutions allows one to stay informed of recent trends and developments in refugee and migration theory. It also provides an overall viewpoint, and the opportunity for establishing, maintaining, and enhancing links with principal individuals and institutions at the local, national, and international levels. At the level of a practitioner, working in the Asylum Corp gives one the power to have an immediate and direct impact on the lives of many individuals and families, who have experienced, or have the possibility of experiencing, persecution. In an instant, an asylum or refugee officer's stamp of approval on an asylum or refugee application rescues the asylum seeker or refugee and her or his family from a situation of past or future persecution. It also transfers the asylum seeker or refugee and her or his family from daily situations characterized by terror and war to living conditions filled with new psychological, cultural, educational, social, economic, and medical opportunities in a new safe country. Other than medical doctors, judges, or military personnel,

there is possibly no other profession that has the ability and power to save so many lives in so many countries.

* * * *

This has been a brief portrait of some of my work on behalf of refugees. While not everyone may have the opportunity to work on as many projects or in as many countries as I have, some procedures and approaches can facilitate the opportunity to work in the field. First, love working with, on behalf of, and for refugees. Second, begin with the end in mind, namely to advance theory, education or research in the refugee studies field, or to make life better on a daily basis for refugees. Third, be proactive in attitude and approach. In this regard, always push forward, extend beyond your limits in knowledge and practice, and seize the moment. Seek out and take advantage of any opportunity that might increase your academic or practical knowledge of refugees. Fourth, synergize. That is, connect with actors, institutions, and organizations that have an interest in refugees. In this regard, joining, attending meetings of, or presenting papers at local, national or international organizations dealing with refugee issues, would be beneficial. In addition, consider taking courses in the refugee field. Even attending one related short course would be helpful. It would be particularly useful to acquire at least a brief background in some social, psychological, cultural, political, legal, and/or development issues related to refugees. Numerous academic institutions offer both short and long-term courses, programs, or degrees related to refugee issues. Fifth, knowledge of another language can be beneficial in many refugee-related settings. Sixth, doing volunteer work at a local, national, or international refugee serving organization may provide valuable experience, linkages,

and contacts. Finally, and most importantly, always strive to seek out, establish, maintain, and enhance connections with as many refugees and grassroots refugee organizations and initiatives as possible. In the end, refugees themselves are the only true experts in the refugee field, and on the refugee experience.

SECTION THREE

International Development and Human Rights

Disability and International Human Rights: Sisyphus Reconsidered

Daniel Holland

Getting Here

Over the past 20 years, I have spent my career focusing on the clinical, social, and political implications of disability. Much of this professional focus has arisen from my personal experience as the son of two parents with neurological disabilities. Most people do not realize that individuals with disabilities represent one of the largest minority populations on the globe. There are roughly 600 million people on the planet with a disability. The majority of these people are in developing countries and live in extreme poverty and experience various forms of segregation, isolation, and compromised civil and human rights as a result of their disability. Unlike many other human conditions that serve as a marker for minority status, like ethnicity or skin color or sexual orientation, disability is an entirely porous condition: a person might join this minority at any point in his or her life. Indeed, two-thirds of people globally who live beyond the age of 65 will have a disability. Not only are people with disabilities one of the largest minority groups in the world, then, but they also constitute a minority group that is among the fastest growing and that will one day very possibly include you and me, if it doesn't already. My work focuses on this growing minority, on understanding the many experiences of disability across different cultures and political contexts, and on identifying

ways in which the rights of people with disabilities can be promoted.

I didn't always plan to work in this area. My first career aspiration was to be a professional boxer. I had pretty quick hands and a long reach for my diminutive size. I grew up in Detroit, an American boxing mecca that, along with Philadelphia and Brooklyn, has repeatedly turned out some of the sport's most impressive American champions, and therefore serves as a promising place for a fighter to be from. I imagined myself the next lightweight champion of the world, taking on menacing challengers whom I planned to befuddle with strategies I had learned by studying old fight films of Willie Pep and Ray Robinson, over and over. Plus, I had met Joe Louis once. After a series of remarkably inauspicious training trials, however, the outcomes of which I do not entirely remember but was later told were decidedly poor, I was strongly advised to attend college.

As the son of two parents with disabilities, I wanted to pursue a career after college that addressed disability issues. I knew something about the obstacles people with disabilities confront. I also knew these obstacles are complex. Disability often creates physical and psychological pain for the person who experiences it, and I spent the first portion of my career addressing these intimate aspects of disability. Following a Ph.D. in clinical psychology and a residency in clinical neuropsychology, I became a faculty member in a medical school and the director of a brain injury rehabilitation program, where I worked with people who were transitioning back into the community with a severe disability. I knew from my own experience, however, and then saw through my professional work, that far too many of the obstacles people with disabilities face are not limited to these intimate and personal adjustments. Broader social and political forces are often the greatest

barriers to the inclusion of people with disabilities in their communities, in civic life. A person with a disability can, in essence, be denied full citizenship as a result of having some kind of functional difference, like an inability to see, or walk, or solve complex problems. Legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990, or the European Union's Amsterdam Treaty in 1997, improve the situation for some disabled people in the United States and Europe, but even progressive policy accomplishments like these often fall short because of a failure of implementation for those with the greatest need. Furthermore, the vast majority of people living with disabilities are in transitioning and developing countries where the implementation of even well intended international policies is an even greater difficulty. The more aware I became of this global problem, the more interested I became in addressing it. I therefore left my position in academic medicine in order to become involved in human rights approaches to disability issues.

This involvement in disability as a human rights issue eventually resulted in my current work in post-communist countries where there was a long history of institutionalization and segregation of people with disabilities under former political regimes. Much of my current effort involves working with the disability activists, government officials, and non-governmental organizations in these formerly communist countries to discover ways of promoting de-institutionalization and community living for people with disabilities there. Much like my initial career plan, then, I do indeed find myself frequently engaged in a series of battles, though the opponents in this line of work are most often spurious ideologies and infrastructures that persist in segregating and warehousing, rather than supporting, children and adults with disabilities. Unlike boxing, however, I fortunately seem to have more

aptitude for this endeavor, even if the stakes now are higher and the headaches sometimes worse.

What Am I Doing Here?

One might ask what disability issues have to do with a book on ethnopolitical conflict. It's a fair question, since my particular area actually manages to fall awkwardly on the margin of the otherwise remarkably expansive and inclusive focus of this book. I like to think that this position on the margin, however, somehow helps confirm the vast relevance that such a volume can already easily claim. This is my minor contribution.

Work in disability issues, however, does indeed belong here, even if on the margin. The economist and Nobel Laureate, Amartya Sen, has said that "People with physical or mental disability are not only among the most deprived human beings in the world, they are also, frequently enough, the most neglected." As such, disability, while not an ethnopolitical construct, is increasingly recognized as a sociopolitical one. This shift in perspective has moved disability solely from the private realm of medical and social care, to the sociopolitical realm of human rights. This is not to say that people with disabilities, or certain disabling conditions, do not require individual medical or psychological care. What this new perspective does emphasize, however, is that the primary barriers to inclusion for people with disabilities are ultimately social and political. Using a wheelchair for mobility, for example, is not inherently a limitation unless the physical environment is constructed in such a way that it does not accommodate wheelchairs. The extent to which public physical environments are constructed to facilitate users of wheelchairs is a matter of human design, and this human design can be directed by laws and policies that protect the

rights of those who get around in some way other than walking. Similarly, the fact a child has the condition of Downs Syndrome does not, in itself, prevent participation in his or her own community school. Such participation is prevented, however, by the absence of legislation, educational policy, and properly allocated resources that would support the inclusion of these children. It is often the case that people with more severe disabilities are perceived as incapable of living in the community. But it is frequently the existence of extensive institutional settings, constructed for the purpose of housing people with disabilities indefinitely, that shapes this perception in many parts of the world. So, in an impossibly circular pronouncement, a person with a disability may be said to belong in some form of institution because that is what institutions for the disabled were constructed for.

Institutional infrastructures for disabled people are, indeed, human constructions, created by specific values and beliefs, and supported by broader sociopolitical and economic priorities, all of which can be changed if enough counter-pressure is applied at multiple levels. Disability, then, must be conceptualized not only as a personal and intimate issue, but a social and political one. And people with disabilities must be perceived, not simply as individual medical or psychological "patients," but as marginalized citizens, and as a minority group with a growing political consciousness. Therefore, issues and concepts relevant to ethnicity and ethnopolitics often do have great relevance to disability issues, and much of the scholarship on ethnic conflict regarding minority rights, group identity, polarizing beliefs, disenfranchisement, constitutionalism, and the need for inclusive political participation are very useful for people working on disability issues.

So What Exactly Is It That I Do?

My work in disability rights constitutes a sort of hybrid. I conduct research on how disability non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operate, succeed, or fail, within the broader political and human rights landscape of various countries. But I also work with the NGOs to help connect them with resources, like North American foundation money or fellowships, so that they might pursue their mission. I therefore do not only document or describe some of the NGOs and activists I study, but also often get involved in their cause. Over the past five years I have been doing this work primarily in post-communist Eastern Europe, where many countries established massive networks of institutional care for people with disabilities under communism, and are now beginning to address the implications of these institutions due to pressure from human rights groups and international bodies like the United Nations, European Union, and European Commission. The process of exploring alternatives to institutions in these countries, however, has been slow, with periods of stagnation and even regression depending on which political parties are in power in a given country at a certain time, the strength of the evolving civil society organizations devoted to disability issues, and the influence of the international human rights mandates.

Much of my work involves locating people involved in disability issues in the countries of post-communist Europe and traveling to meet with them. I meet with people with disabilities, with parents of children with disabilities, with physicians and psychologists, activists, members of parliament, and municipal government leaders. I interview these people to gain their perspectives. I then combine information from all of these interviews with information I gather about the broader social, political, economic, and public health conditions within

the country, and put this all together in a sort of “portrait” that hopefully captures the most pressing needs of disabled people there and identifies some ways in which these needs might be addressed.

Some of what I do is more like investigative reporting than academic research. I have snuck into mental institutions, gone into small and remote social care homes for the developmentally disabled, and approached people in cafes or on the street to ask for an interview. I have tracked down photojournalists whose work has included photographs from inside certain institutions about which I hope to learn more. I have taken many trains and buses to what seems to be the middle of nowhere in order to meet with someone who has an important perspective on the experience of disability in his or her country. I have gotten lost a lot and have slept in some pretty lousy places and some really nice ones.

In the end, I am doing one tiny piece of what needs to be a massive effort. But I am frequently comforted by the words of Marian Wright Edelman, President and Founder of the Children’s Defense Fund, who pointed out that “You just need to be a flea against injustice,” and suggested that enough committed fleas, biting strategically, can make even the biggest dog uncomfortable. While not a particularly flattering image, I actually take it to be very encouraging, as it doesn’t set the bar too high for me to feel somewhat effective.

Sisyphus and the Rolling Rock

In order to spend one’s life work addressing the human rights of people with disabilities, there are two personal conditions I have found to be prerequisite. One is a tolerance for solitude. The other is a tolerance for the absurd. The tolerance for solitude is necessary because one is often working in foreign places without any comrades, in the isolated

locations where mental institutions or orphanages or social care homes are often placed, and with a general sense of alienation wrought from confronting an issue about which relatively few people seem to care. Tolerance for the absurd is necessary because the motivation to do this work often seems to emerge from something other than the wholly rational, and once engaged in it, the effects of one's effort can be plagued with a nagging sense of confusion.

Now, the above paragraph may cause this particular line of work to lack immediate appeal. A realm of endeavor with core competencies in solitude and absurdity, bearing a high risk of confusion, may seem dangerously close to Sisyphian. Unlike the case of Sisyphus, however, rolling his big rock up the mountain over and over for eternity, a career spent even in the most obscure areas of human welfare likely remains a personal choice for those who do it and is probably not, at least for most us, a condemnation from the gods. On the other hand, maybe quite like Sisyphus, many of us satisfy ourselves by extracting some kind of intimate meaning from performing the effort itself, despite how desperate it looks from the outside.

There's a reality about humanitarian or human rights efforts, however, that any newcomer needs to consider before committing to such work. The fact is that working in this realm requires one to work in the shadows. Even if one addresses some of the most urgent human needs or takes on dire social issues, people who do not have those needs, or are not affected by those issues will often not care very much. For example, it is much easier to meet a stranger in America who knows what "DKNY" represents than who knows that "UNHCHR" represents the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. It's also true that many more people, regardless of their national context, read *People*

Magazine than *Foreign Affairs*. The website Gawker.com, devoted to celebrity gossip, gets about 208,000 hits per day, whereas the website for Human Rights Watch gets a fraction of that. Complex humanitarian issues don't tend to be featured on Oprah. News stories about Martha Stewart and Michael Jackson received four times more broadcast coverage on U.S. news channels than those about Darfur. Even *The New York Times* has an ever-expanding "Style" section, but no conspicuous "Human Rights" section to complement it. To put it another way, a friend of mine recently saw a Louis Vuitton hand bag priced at \$20,000, and someone was actually buying it. Even more remarkable, an assortment of others who witnessed this act seemed highly impressed by it.

There is no point in bemoaning these observations or railing against this reality. People have always been particularly fascinated by the frivolous, at least from what I can determine from a limited review of the history of private life. The Swedish economist and another Nobel Laureate, Gunnar Myrdal, noted that "The big majority of Americans, who are comparatively well off, have developed an ability to have enclaves of people living in the greatest misery without almost noticing them." While this is certainly a tendency common in the U.S., it is obviously not exclusive to it. I have witnessed it in many other places, too, but Swedish economists don't like to criticize those places as much as they do America, often for good reason. The message here, though, is that work on most humanitarian issues, like marginalized people themselves, tends to garner little attention or value from most people in the main.

So this is what I mean when I say one must have a tolerance for solitude and the absurd, and a preference for the shadows, in order to work in the realm of humanitarian causes. We have all noticed that the general order of things in the

world often seems to lack common sense, and frequently even comprehensibility. Deciding to do humanitarian work, at least in my experience, does not bring greater comprehension. In fact, it might even necessitate embracing the incomprehensible. This can be conceived as good news, though. As the existentialist playwright and former President of the Czech Republic, Václav Havel said, “Modern man must descend the spiral of his own absurdity to the lowest point; only then can he look beyond it. It is obviously impossible to get around it, jump over it, or simply avoid it.” Embracing the incomprehensible, then, may indeed be the best option.

In the End...

In the end, this kind of work is what I find I need to do. There is a certain pleasure, even joy, in doing work that somehow touches on issues of fairness and justice; a joy that, in my own experience, is not found in corporate endeavors or consumerism, and one that endures despite, or maybe because of, the absurdity and the solitude required. I yearn to do more of this work, and have no interest in other kinds of careers. My hope is that I might approximate Havel’s spiral descent and Edelman’s flea. Maybe like Sisyphus, I like to harbor the belief that one day the rock just might stay put.

In the meantime, the prospect of continuing this work is energizing, not discouraging. The simple purpose behind the work has a way of lending meaning to even some of the minor tasks that have to be confronted, and even the occasional headaches. I am not working towards lofty goals or utopian visions, but to simply join others in improving the basic conditions and rights that people with disabilities, people like my own family, deserve. It is a concrete mission with a very simple purpose. I am grateful for this meaning and purpose and the simplicity of it. So I look forward to pushing on.

Can We Leave This World Better Than We Found It?

Eugene K. B. Tan

Out of the Chasm, a New State

At the confluence of the Indian and Pacific Oceans lies Singapore, an island city-state just north of the equator, at the crossroads of one of the busiest shipping routes. To our north is Malaysia and to our south is Indonesia, the largest Muslim state in the world. At no more than 700 square kilometers in size, this makes Singapore about three-and-a-half times the size of Washington, D.C. But we have almost 4.2 million people living here! It is also amazingly diverse. The ethnic Chinese, whose forbearers hail from China, constitute almost 77 percent of the population. The indigenous Malays, whose ancestors come from the Malay archipelago, comprise 14 percent, while the Indians, originally from the Indian sub-continent, make up 8 percent of the population. This ethnic diversity is made more complex by the linguistic and religious diversity. The religious make-up comprises Buddhist 42.5 percent, Muslim 14.9 percent, Taoist 8.5 percent, Hindu 4 percent, Christian 14.6 percent, other 0.7 percent, and almost 15 percent not subscribing to any particular faith.

Singapore is a relatively young nation having gained independence in 1965. Between 1819 and 1963, Singapore was in essence a British colony founded for the purposes of being a trading hub. Between September 1963 and August 1965, Singapore merged with Malaya and Sarawak and Sabah to form

the Federation of Malaysia. However, this union was short-lived due to significant differences between the Singapore government and the federal government. Differences in the way the newly merged entity was to be organized had resulted in racial riots and the belief was that should the union continue, more violence, bloodshed, and deaths would result. Separation was thus a means of survival.

The federal government wanted a system of governance in which the Malay *bumiputeras* (literally, sons of the soil) would take precedence over the other races in jobs, education, and politics – in short, an ethnic *Malay* Malaysia was envisaged. Singapore pushed resolutely for a civic conception of the state, a *Malaysian* Malaysia, but to no avail. And so, the baptismal fires of a nation born out of a commitment to multiracialism were seared into the national psyche. Indeed, the national pledge exhorts Singaporeans to pledge themselves as ‘one united people, regardless of race, language or religion.’

Building One United People

The policy of ‘multiracialism’ requires that no race is privileged or disadvantaged by state laws and policies. Multiracialism, in its full expression, includes the practice of multi-religiosity and multi-lingualism. The multiracialism discourse in Singapore is understood as the equal support and recognition of all races by the state and is reflected in its laws, policies, and institutions. One of Singapore’s five Shared Values (a putative national ideology) is ‘racial and religious harmony.’ A corollary of multiracialism is the commitment to meritocracy.

Singapore is a classic example where ethnic differences and relations are strictly regulated. The premise is that ethnic harmony is not pre-ordained and so nothing is left to chance. There are many laws, institutions and public policies in place to

ensure that Singapore does not descend into ethnic conflict. For Singapore, ethnic harmony is not a 'noble ideal' but a prerequisite to our survival. We have an elaborate and careful management of policies dealing with race, language and religion. So growing up in this environment makes you conscious of the ethnic climate and political context that underlie it. Yet, relative peace and prosperity since independence in 1965 have also lulled some of my countrymen into thinking that ethnic relations are at an even keel.

Stumbling into the Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict

I am a law academic at a local university in Singapore. One of my active research areas is the management of ethnic relations in post-colonial states. Having lived much of my life in Singapore, the lived reality here has often challenged me to think about the role of the state, the effects of laws and policies, and the international political economy in relation to the change and development of ethnic identities as well as the management of ethnic relations. My research focuses very much on Singapore, although I maintain a keen interest in the regulation of ethnic conflict in other Southeast Asian countries. Of late, in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States, the interest has grown to include the study of Muslims living in non-Muslim states.

As a law student, I was required to study constitutional law. I learnt about the various arms of the government and, in Singapore's context, became aware of the various institutions and laws that are in place to maintain ethnic stability and harmony. Besides the usual constitutional safeguards, we have a wide variety of legislation, non-enforceable codes and declarations, and institutional mechanisms that attempt – but not always successfully – to develop better understanding among Singaporeans of various races and faiths. Singapore's

commitment to multiracialism has resulted in substantive constitutional and institutional engineering in the late 1980s to ensure the sustainability of such a core value in Singapore society. I began to appreciate the role of institutions and how the values and norms they engender can mean a world of difference for societies trying to get out of the cycle of conflict.

I suppose my interest in the regulation of conflict was first aroused when I felt that the overarching framework, while comprehensive in coverage, did have some flaws from an academic perspective. For instance, one of the roles of the constitutional organ known as the Presidential Council for Minority Rights (PCMR) was to ensure that laws passed by the legislature did not contain discriminatory provisions. The constitutional intent is admirable. However, the members of the then (and current) PCMR also consisted of legislators who would have passed the legislation in the first place and so would be unlikely to rule subsequently that the said legislation was discriminatory. It's a small point, but it pushed me to consider the nature of ethnic relations and how they are handled in my country and in other countries.

My interest in ethnic relations was further piqued and developed when I pursued a master's degree in comparative politics at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). In a series of related courses ranging from nations and nationalism to ethnic conflict regulation, I was exposed to new ideas, concepts, literature, and perspectives on nationalism, ethnic conflict and its management. It was my time at the LSE that encouraged me to probe further in this area of study and made me realize that we need to adopt an inter-disciplinary approach in this genre of study to better understand the dynamics and nuances at play.

One of my current research interests is examining the post-colonial state's role in ethnic conflict regulation and the

development of nationalism, from a multi-disciplinary perspective. This necessitates an examination of the interplay of law, politics, economics, culture, history and religion in the molding of a putative national identity. The process by which laws, the legal system and state policies mold identities and inculcate nationalism have not been seriously explored in studies on ethnic conflict. In particular, the examination of the constitution, laws, the legal system and the state can help us understand the complex process of the development of ethnic identities in the construction and enforcement of institutional boundaries of ethnicity. In studying the tension between maintaining control and maintaining sustainable ethnic harmony, a multi-disciplinary examination of the development of a national identity and the subsequent reification of ethnic identities is necessary.

Some Challenges and Rewards

As one of my research areas deals with ethnic relations in Singapore, some of the challenges include writing about my findings. Even as the space permitted for public (including academic) discourse on matters of race and religion gradually enlarges, the Singapore government continues to treat it with lots of care, and rightfully so. However, by keeping faithful to the techniques and protocols of academic research as well as the valued tenets of impartiality, objectivity and substantiation, I believe that I have been able to research and discuss ethnic relations meaningfully. For sure, I have to be mindful of nuances in how my arguments are presented and the use of evidence. But I am also fortified by my conviction that my research is driven and motivated by the concern for Singapore's experience of multiracialism to work and for it to be sustainable. We have had to cope with the threat of home-grown terrorism and, with it, prejudice, fear, and

discrimination. So even in the best case scenario, Singapore and Singaporeans have much to do to enhance our social cohesion and resilience.

Some rewards include the ability to participate in the policy discourse on ethnic relations in Singapore. With knowledge comes the obligation to serve. Being a student of ethnic politics has made me also appreciate the values and vulnerabilities of my country. At the same time, it has sensitized me to the areas where the Singapore model can be improved or where the policy intentions may not have the effect that they were meant to have. Since publishing a couple of academic pieces related to ethnic politics in Singapore, I have also been privileged to have the opportunity to speak to different groups of young people, and the public at large (through my op-ed pieces in the local newspapers) on ethnic relations in Singapore. The intent is to participate as an involved citizen, marshalling my training and expertise in the service of the public good. When I teach undergraduate courses on business ethics and social responsibility, I am mindful also to incorporate in my seminars the importance of non-discriminatory work practices and how our racial attitudes affect the way we think of people at work and how we interact with them.

The scope of possible career opportunities for anyone interested in issues of ethnopolitical or other types of conflict is vast. When I was a summer fellow at the Solomon Asch Center, I joined a network of people with similar concerns and interests acting on them in a variety of professions and practicing their craft in far flung corners of the globe. There were academics, mediators, refugee workers, and psychologists. The list of what one can do to help understand, manage, and prevent conflicts is endless. One thread runs through all these different vocations: the motivation and commitment to

bettering the lives of others. I found that both inspiring and humbling. What also struck me was how conflict remains a facet of life no matter where one lives. And how conflict can tear societies apart but can also urge people to work together to build a better life for everyone. Indeed, conflict is probably inevitable but I believe that it can be managed and can even be resolved. We may never remove the divisions that divide us but we should remember that within each of us lies the power of being an agent of change and that there is a ripple effect caused by our actions. I remember the Boy Scout motto I grew up with: 'Leave this world a little better than you found it.' A tall order indeed but, in this age of rage and conflict, it is certainly something worth striving for.

HIV/AIDS Prevention, Violent Conflict, and Health Policy in Africa

Adedayo Adeyemi

As a physician with a public health orientation, I have a desire to work to prevent conflicts, support peace building initiatives and control and prevent HIV/AIDS. I am projects director of Healthmatch International, a research and outreach non governmental organization (NGO) based in Lagos, Nigeria. Currently, I work on HIV/AIDS prevention, control and treatment. My focus is on peace building initiatives and HIV/AIDS control in conflict and post conflict settings. Conflict prevention and HIV/AIDS prevention must go together in Africa.

I became involved with this work in the year 2000 as a result of witnessing the health needs of people displaced by communal clashes. During my time in northern Nigeria, I was privileged to provide care for victims of ethno-religious conflict. I have also been a strong advocate of improving the quality of reproductive health and HIV/AIDS service provision in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, a region that is conflict-prone and has a high level of deprivation and neglect.

During conflict, people suffer injuries and often lack access to medical attention. My interest is to manage health crises in conflict situations and at the same time study how to prevent and manage conflicts. I have worked in designing programs and building capacity to improve HIV/AIDS prevention and reproductive health at the community level. I

have also advocated for strengthening the provision of reproductive health services for Liberian refugees in Nigeria.

My research work in the Niger Delta gave me the opportunity to understand the suffering of the people and to see the need for government commitment to develop the region. It has also been encouraging to note that when I worked in communities I was well accepted into the community as a resource person. My work in this field is really challenging but my commitments to help people, prevent the deterioration of healthcare systems and prevent the spread of infectious diseases have been great motivators. My medical knowledge has been an advantage and has assisted me to intervene in solving many health problems. Victims of conflicts or abuse are usually grateful despite one's limitation to offer broad or comprehensive service.

Conflicts and displacement of people are psychological and physical health stresses that may lead to crisis for affected people. There is a need to study the link between public health and conflicts, and a need to study conflict prevention and management from public health perspectives. In this way I hope to assist in the development of health policy that is capable of preventing diseases and improving health of victims of conflicts. Health policy is the mechanism an organization or institution uses to drive or influence health priorities and outcomes of research for action. I strongly believe that the practice and teaching of health policy should incorporate the emerging challenges of conflict management. Furthermore, health policy should seek to provide improved quality of care in conflict settings and should correct health disparities existing among internally displaced people and refugees.

I have a strong interest in women's health. Women are seriously threatened with increased risks of HIV infection in gender-specific ways and as a result of social inequalities. For

example, women are raped or sexually abused and face domestic violence. Often they cannot negotiate condom use as they have little say in sexual relationships. Economically, women rely on husbands to provide their livelihoods, as social stigmas do not allow them to work and they have responsibilities of child rearing. Young girls are married off at 13 years of age without any say about who to marry and when to marry. To that end, I design sexual and reproductive health programs for refugees and provide psychosocial support for sexually abused girls and women.

This work is not easily undertaken because many health workers and volunteers lack the training to effectively counsel these women. In addition, there is poor reporting of sexual abuse by victims due to shame or stigma associated with these abuses and weakness in the implementation of law to deal with perpetrators of sexual violence. Some communities are difficult to work in. The difficulty may be due to suspicion and a communication gap within the community and thus misinterpretation of one's mission.

Primary health care must be strengthened to minimize disease morbidity and mortality associated with conflicts. Conflict is one of the risk factors that leads to the spread of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases (STDs). In conflict situations, women are vulnerable; they are often raped, sexually abused or become sexual slaves of captors. Rapists are not concerned about safe sex but rather inflicting injuries, human degradation or death to their victims. This has led to the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS in some African countries. As a result, HIV/AIDS has been a serious health challenge in sub-Saharan Africa during the last 20 years, and Africa has been characterized by various forms of conflicts: communal, national, and regional. One of the consequences of violent conflicts is the destruction of health care systems. When

caregivers and hospital workers leave an area due to fighting, when hospitals are destroyed, governments are unable to provide health care for those with HIV/AIDS. Additionally, conflict zones are chaotic and educating the public about HIV/AIDS and its prevention falls by the wayside in times of war.

Not all conflicts are between regions or communities. There are domestic conflicts in which women and girls are abused in their own homes. Therefore, it is imperative to work in the area of preventing gender based violence, gender discrimination, and to promote healthy behavior for victims of sexual assault and peace in areas affected by conflict. We need more research into interventions that will assist towards preventing conflicts and HIV/AIDS. The capacity of women in conflict or refugee situations should be increased to help them protect themselves from HIV/AIDS so that they will not move from the realm of conflict crisis to health crisis. In addition, more programs are needed on economic empowerment for youths and women in conflict zones of Africa. More people with the ability to provide psychosocial support are needed in this field to provide service to victims of conflicts. Peace building initiatives that are designed should be such that there is community input in the form of community-driven initiatives and active community participation.

Anyone interested in conflict management and health policy should avail himself/herself the opportunity of undergoing short courses or skill building workshops to be equipped for this field. The field of conflict and health is broad. It is important to identify your area of expertise and contribute to make a difference. Also, keep in mind to work closely with the community you are trying to serve. I have seen programs fail due to program personnel neglecting to acknowledge community leaders. It is also necessary to work in

collaboration with civil society groups that are involved in conflict management or peace building as they have a lot to offer to newcomers. It is important to have passion for this type of work. Moreover, whatever conflict management program that anyone is designing for Africa must have an HIV/AIDS component that entails prevention, control, care and provision of psychosocial support with adequate education.

I encourage anybody interested in this work to come to Africa. One way to do this might be to volunteer to work with refugees and help build lasting peace in areas that are conflict prone. In addition to working in this field, it is necessary to be security conscious. One should ensure that one observes basic safety rules. It is also important to be friendly with people that you are working with and appreciate their culture and try and integrate into their system. Finally, respect people who are enduring conflict situations. Treat them with dignity, as they need care, love and support.

Sharing Knowledge

Elodie Hugon

I arrived in the southern Mexican state of Chiapas five years ago to conduct my master's thesis research on Tzotzil women's empowerment as a consequence of structural changes. I have been a non governmental organization (NGO) worker since I arrived in Mexico, working mainly with rural indigenous women, but also with non indigenous rural groups known as *campesinos*, on implementing social projects which aim to improve people's ability to control the circumstances of their life.

Back in 1994, the actions of the Zapatista Liberation Army put Chiapas and the conditions of poverty of the local indigenous population on the front page of global mass media. As a result, national and international organizations arrived en masse in the region in order to help people modify the local people's conditions of life through empowerment and development programs. The term empowerment is used here to illustrate the ways in which a person becomes capable of controlling the circumstances of her or his life. The definition embodies at least three levels: the relationship with oneself, which could, for example, include health, self esteem and control over one's body, the relationship with relatives and friends, and the relationship with the community in terms of work opportunities, religion, and citizenship rights. Empowerment is a central issue for any person professionally involved in development, as we believe in the capacity of ordinary

people to modify their environment. I have in mind a saying which is often used by Mexican social workers in order to illustrate what they do: "Give a man a fish and he will eat on that day. Teach a man how to fish and he will eat everyday of his life."

It seems important to mention that social projects, in areas where people struggle in their everyday life to fulfill their basic physiological needs due to the lack of food, water, descent shelter and hygiene, must go together with productive projects which will help them to improve their economic standards because poverty is a barrier to human development. People with an empty stomach and a dehydrated child cannot perceive literacy and education as priorities. Physical needs must be met first.

I started as an observer, with very few responsibilities, working on a reproductive health project with traditional birth attendants in the Tzotzil community of Chalchihuitan. The project aimed to reduce the high maternal mortality rate (death during pregnancy) of indigenous women within the community, as well as to help women through labor and up to 40 days after delivering. The methodology consisted in organizing workshops with the local birth attendants in order to learn from their work and experience. It was then possible to learn about local customs, culture, traditions and resources, and to formulate practical solutions to problems of reproductive health that would correspond not only to the reality of the community but also would be locally welcomed because they respected the communities' shared vision of the world. We operated as an interdisciplinary team composed of anthropologists, doctors, and a bilingual nurse, using mainly participatory tools like role playing, mimes and drawings with which the women would be able to communicate their experiences and feelings.

While spending time in Chiapas, I came across some local initiatives carried out by social workers who were trying not only to improve but also to create social knowledge about the indigenous populations' living conditions. Most of these persons were engaged in campaigns which aimed to sensitize civil society about the reality of marginalized populations and to reconstruct the social fabric between divided groups by disseminating life stories and testimonies that had been collected within the communities. On a personal level, it was the opportunity to value popular knowledge as a gold mine of information and the key to reconciliation, which would mark a decisive turning point in my professional career.

Over the last year, together with social workers from the state of Querétaro in central Mexico, we have been looking at the possibility of implementing socioeconomic projects with information and communication techniques (ICTs) within an Otomí community of the state. Information and communication techniques such as documentaries, multimedia exhibitions, and radio programs comprised of local contents in marginalized areas are a way of giving voice to the voiceless. ICTs not only help marginalized people to increase their self esteem which – due to the living conditions – is generally low, they are also used as alternatives to mass media in order to promote dialog between different groups. The first “needs” to be identified by the members of the local community that we interviewed were related to the necessity of improving family incomes and fighting extreme poverty. There was a high level of interest in a handicraft quality improvement project which would improve the competitiveness of the community on the local market.

The first meetings took place with a group of 12 local women. Several months later, the group became involved in a Photovoice project which consisted of giving people cameras so they could photograph their reality. In this way, participants were able to use ICTs to express what they thought was important about their everyday lives. Photographs represent a precious tool which fulfills different purposes. Notably, in this instance, they support group discussions and thematic sessions allowing for participatory diagnostics to be elaborated with the authors of the pictures. Additionally, the project aimed to improve communication within the community. The people who were photographed showed interest in the project and the project itself established communicative channels outside of the community by reaching policy makers. In this way it created social knowledge and consciousness of cultural differences and living conditions of the marginalized Otomí population.

In addition to the fieldwork I previously described, I teach for a university. It has been very important for me to remain linked to an academic institution. I believe that applied work and theoretical knowledge are deeply complementary and shouldn't be dissociated. Teaching in the international relations department of the Tecnológico de Monterrey gives me the opportunity to use concrete examples from my fieldwork to illustrate the content of the lectures, and allows me to share experiences with my colleagues and students. I also hope to generate an interest from the academic community in applying its skills to social development. Teaching also provides me some time and space away from fieldwork and fundraising to analyze and document the work that is being done within the civil sector.

It is difficult for social workers to find the time to document processes and generate qualitative and quantitative analysis of their projects, which remain a blind spot in academic research. They spend most of their time on the ground, working with communities or looking for funding which, from an international perspective, has been significantly reduced since 9/11, and which is nationally subject to some scandals that have been linked to certain organizations. On a personal level, working in the area of social development has been a constant exercise in flexibility. It means that I navigate between serving the local population and securing institutional funding and private donations. At the same time, I am witness to social changes resulting from successful local initiatives: agricultural workers organizing to propose alternatives to the free trade market or women promoting alternatives to face maternal mortality within their communities. These social achievements I witnessed have influenced me greatly.

There have been a number of other influences on my career development. For example, pursuing a master's in Latin American studies at the University of Salamanca gave me the opportunity not only to meet a wide range of scholars from Spain and Latin America, but also to conduct fieldwork research – which became decisive in my professional orientation. Additionally, the human experience – when people open the door to their lives and share their knowledge with me – has been most rewarding and transformative. In the Tzotzil community of Zinacantan, a family gave me the privilege to share their food, their house and their rituals during the course of a year. They took the time to explain to me what every candle on the altar meant, where the spirits of the community were hiding. They explained that in order to

become a healer, children had to dream they were capable of curing others. They expressed that they did not want to be left aside from modernity due to their beliefs and culture.

Among other influences on my professional itinerary, I need to mention the Summer Institute I attended at the Solomon Asch Center. My participation as a fellow strengthened my theoretical knowledge and I learned about inspiring work from different parts of the world. I was able to exchange perspectives and discuss other realities with a team of 18 fellows, and establish long-term professional relationships that I can turn to, now-and-then, for advice and interaction.

The interdisciplinary approach used at the center, as much as the experiences described in this essay, have been a source of richness which have allowed me to forge my opinion on local initiative processes and to raise my expectations on the role of civil society as a bridge capable of reconciling divided sectors. As a consequence, I am at the moment putting my hope in witnessing the achievement of concrete local initiatives, emerging from the Photovoice project, which will make a sustainable difference for the Otomí community of Toliman, and in pursuing similar activities in the region.

Ethnic Diversity, International Law and Conflict Research: A Swiss Perspective

Tina Kempin

Growing up in Switzerland entails early experiences and sensitization toward the “fact that we are all different,” the potential and problems of ethnic societies, and the tensions and innovations multiculturalism can create. Switzerland is one of the smallest countries situated in the heart of Europe; it unifies various linguistic and religious communities in its tiny territory. Swiss-German, the native language of about 64 percent of all Swiss peoples, includes a variety of French and Italian words. French is the native language of 20 percent, Italian of 6.5 percent of the population. Rumantsch, the fourth official language, is spoken by only 0.5 percent of all Swiss peoples. Aside from the different languages and cultural traditions, diverse religious communities shape the religious landscape of Switzerland, particularly the Protestant and the Catholic churches.

Despite the presence of so many different groups, (modern) Switzerland is known as a very peaceful country. In the last centuries, Switzerland never experienced civil wars, except for the civil unrest created by the independence struggle of the French-speaking, Catholic canton of Jura in its attempt to separate from the German-speaking, Protestant canton of Bern in the late 1970s. Living peacefully amongst each other does not imply that there are no prejudices between the groups – the Bernese are said to be slow, the people living in Zurich

arrogant, and the citizens of the original cantons that founded Switzerland in 1291 are viewed as stubborn and conservative. Despite its small size, Switzerland is a country of local traditions – languages and cultural traditions can vary from town to town. One reason could be that the Swiss people are, as compared to other countries such as the U.S., very immobile and actively strive to preserve their local settings. Additionally, with Switzerland’s geographical location in the heart of the Alps, it is not surprising that local traditions play such an important role. Traveling is (still) rather difficult as small, curved roads are the rule rather than the exception and some mountain valleys are very isolated. Driving one or two hours in each direction brings one into a different world – people speak another language, eat different foods, and have their own traditions, depending on the structure of the region and the landscape.

Usually, Swiss people approach these differences among themselves in a very pragmatic way, following the motto “here, we do it our way, and there, they do it their way.” “Live diversity in unity,” as the preamble of the Swiss constitution states, is the “mission statement” of the multicultural state.

Against this background, I have always been sensitized regarding smaller and larger differences in culture, language, and religion between towns, cantons, and states. As I became more and more interested in national and international history and politics over the years, I started to wonder why Switzerland is such a peaceful place whereas ethnic diversity leads to bloody civil wars in other parts of the world. Of course, the creation of my small homeland involved some armed and unarmed struggles over the past centuries, but in “modern Switzerland,” established in 1848, armed civil war seemed to be alien and uncommon. But why? How is it possible that Switzerland is a peaceful country despite its

ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and religious diversity? Why does ethnic diversity create tremendous human suffering, long lasting wars, and economic collapse in other regions? I decided to study the issue of ethnic diversity, conflict, and conflict resolution more carefully.

From the beginning of my studies at the University of Zurich, I was again confronted with these issues. I majored in general history, which meant the opportunity to develop a broad understanding of Europe's and Switzerland's histories and politics, both of which are shaped by ethnic and cultural conflicts, wars, intrigues, peace agreements, alliances, and breakups. Switzerland has always been in the middle of turmoil, fighting on one or the other side, and since the early 13th century fighting for independence or the preservation of its neutrality. Its geographic and political position in Europe has predestined Switzerland to play an active role in conflict resolution, mediation, and developing a humanitarian tradition. Based on this background and in the Swiss tradition, I decided to specialize on conflict analysis, with a particular focus on ethnic conflict.

I wrote my master's thesis about the conflict in Northern Ireland, combining a historical approach with international law, economics, and international relations. It was interesting as well as challenging to study an ethnic conflict in a European country, as some preconditions in the Northern Ireland case seemed to be similar to the Swiss situation. As a consequence, the 1998 peace agreement in Northern Ireland contains several clauses that have been inspired by the Swiss tradition and the Swiss constitution. The way in which the (now suspended) Northern Irish government was supposed to work is based on the notions of collaboration, consensus, and power-sharing between the different parties and ethnic groups – three elements that constitute the cornerstones of the Swiss

governmental system. The study of the interactions of current politics, history, and law and its practical application is in my view the key to a peaceful, multicultural solution to ethnic conflicts. Conflict resolution necessitates an interdisciplinary approach to be effective.

Consequently, my Ph.D. dissertation is interdisciplinary in nature and focuses on the question of how law can contribute to conflict resolution. I am particularly interested in the relationship between international law and conflict resolution. Law is, in my opinion, one of the oldest conflict resolution tools, as it regulates how people live together and, in case of a conflict, how it is solved. International law originated as a means to regulate international relations among states. In the last decades, the meaning of international law was broadened and gained importance also in shaping the rights and duties of individuals (human rights), regulating trade, protecting the environment, and combating social issues such as poverty and the consequences of diseases, with the United Nations being the most important global international organization involved in these efforts. These developments, in connection with major United Nations engagement in managing and settling internal and ethnic conflict, led to the question of how international law, institutions, and means could be used in ethnic conflict resolution. There is no straightforward answer to this question, but my dissertation analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of international legal and multilateral approaches to ethnic conflict today and provides some recommendations about how these measures could be improved.

Through my research, it became clear to me that Switzerland is, in fact, a very special case – both regarding the tremendous richness of its multiculturalism but also concerning its way of addressing potential problems. Switzerland's peacefulness originates in two important factors.

First, Switzerland has a narrative of “being attacked” from the outside, not the inside. Throughout the country’s history, the Swiss have had to defend themselves against foreign rulers, most importantly against the house of Habsburg (Austria) and the French during Napoleon’s time. To be able to face this outside threat, Swiss people had to unite, harness their strength, and overcome their ethno-linguistic and cultural differences. It is against this background that in the early 16th century Switzerland decided to become a neutral country and was, as a consequence, spared by both the First and the Second World Wars. As a neutral country, Switzerland also has a very long and outstanding international legal tradition, having hosted the headquarters of both the United Nations and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and offering “good offices” and negotiation in many ongoing conflicts throughout the world.

The second reason for the stable peace can be found in the internal structure of Switzerland. It is common for many ethnically divided societies that their political structure follows ethnic lines – e.g., a political party comprises only members of one ethnic group and is very much influenced by the group’s ethnopolitical perspectives, or in the case of regionally concentrated ethnic groups, the division of political districts matches the ethnic composition of the country. This is different in Switzerland: political parties cross linguistic and religious barriers and exist as one party throughout the whole country. Furthermore, the political entities – the Swiss cantons – usually unify more than one confession and in some cases, even more than one language. The canton of Graubünden, for example, has both Protestant and Catholic regions and combines as many as three languages (Swiss-German, Italian, and Rumantsch) on its territory. The Swiss system has thus

many cross-cutting ties that prevent ethnic conflict from occurring.

The difficult and important challenge now is to draw the right conclusions and see how these could be transferred to other regions in the world. As we have seen, this has already been done in the case of Northern Ireland, but much needs to be improved and learned before these lessons can be implemented elsewhere. There is a need for research, education, and practical achievements regarding how the Swiss system, for example, will influence the future of ethnic conflict resolution.

Today, I am an assistant professor at a mid-sized liberal arts college in the U.S., teaching international relations and comparative politics with a focus on international law, international organization, human rights, and conflict. My goal is to bring an international perspective into my students' lives and share with them my interdisciplinary research and my personal experiences coming from an ethnically diverse country with a rich international legal tradition. It is my view that education is one of the crucial factors in solving the global problems we face today, ranging from environmental issues to economic and poverty-related problems as well as civil and international wars. Ethnic conflict is one of the major threats today and it can only be addressed by multilateral means and institutions in practice, along with interdisciplinary studies in theory, that involve political science as well as legal, psychological, historical, and other approaches. A lot of research needs to be done, especially interdisciplinary research combining different approaches. I hope that through my work I will add to the academic study of ethnic conflict and that I will provide my students with the relevant knowledge for them to be able to actively contribute to the solution of current global dilemmas.

Adventures in International Development

Molly Inman

I am currently a program manager at the American Bar Association (ABA) Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative (CEELI). This part of the ABA began as a very small technical legal assistance project in 1990 and has grown into a robust international non-governmental organization (NGO) providing a wide range of civil society and legal reform programs with over 25 offices throughout Central Europe, the former Soviet Union and the Middle East. My position as a program manager is one that I have grown into over my four years at CEELI. In this role, I work in the CEELI's headquarters office in Washington, D.C., and travel to Central Europe several times a year. The position itself is somewhat difficult to define and the job description does not really capture it. I make sure that all of the regular functions related to country programs happen (e.g., proposal writing, program design, reporting and budgeting), while also monitoring developments in the political environment and civil society in the region.

Additionally, I am the coordinator for the CEELI's human rights and conflict mitigation focal area. In this role, I directly manage several programs related to transitional justice including war crimes documentation projects for Darfur and Sierra Leone. For the Darfur project, ABA was contacted by the U.S. State Department based on a previous war crimes documentation project that CEELI had implemented in Kosovo, the analysis from which was used as evidence in the

trial against Slobodan Milosevic and will likely be entered into evidence in future trials of those most responsible for war crimes committed in Kosovo. For Darfur, the State Department wanted its own data on which to base its determination about whether genocide is occurring. This project was by far the most challenging and rewarding that I have encountered. In fewer than six weeks, we developed, implemented and completed the project. I coordinated with our partner organization and traveled to Chad to help pilot the questionnaire used to gather the data about the refugees' experiences. We successfully completed this project, gathering the more than one thousand statements the State Department needed.

I was amazed at how willing refugees were to talk with us. Some of our staff pointed out that life in a refugee camp can be pretty monotonous, so our presence was at least somewhat of a diversion. We worked through the official organizers of each camp and also through the traditional leaders in each community, which perhaps increased the refugees' comfort level, but I was still surprised at how forthcoming people were in sharing very painful and often tragic stories related to their families and friends. Frequently, we had to turn people away, because we did not have time to interview so many people in a day and also because we were trying to gather as random a sample as possible. In one camp that we visited early in the project, many people approached us upon our arrival, thinking we were with the camp management, and began listing all of the things that were wrong in the camp and basic needs that were not being met, such as not having plastic sheeting, tents and water. They were somewhat annoyed when we said that we would record their needs but that we were just there to talk. Nevertheless, again they were willing to participate in our survey. Several weeks later when another of our teams visited

the camp, refugees approached them overjoyed, saying that after we left, the things about which they had complained to us had been remedied. I think they knew as well as we did that we did not organize the improvements but rather that the camp organizers were afraid we would report on the camp somehow abusing the refugees through negligence. At least the refugees received some relief – if only temporarily.

The impact of the project was mixed. On one hand, the information we gathered was used to brief then Secretary of State Colin Powell about the conflict, and he and his staff, in turn, used the data to determine that the conflict in Darfur should be labeled genocide. At the time, this seemed like a huge step forward; it seemed that by acknowledging genocide was occurring, the U.S. government would become bound to take action by its obligations under the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. However, it is now more than two years since the determination was made, and while the U.S. government has remained engaged in attempting to resolve the conflict in Darfur, the conflict continues and civilians continue to be targets of violence. I am hopeful, though, that this data and the work that we did will be used in whatever accountability mechanisms are established, whether internally in Sudan or at the International Criminal Court, to which some of the main persons responsible have already been referred. It also lays the groundwork for future war crimes documentation related to the conflict.

This project was the most interesting on which I have worked, but I would have to say that human rights work and international development as a whole, at least in the way most organizations I have observed do it, is not so exciting everyday. Working on programs for an NGO often means that you are understaffed and wear many hats. The upside of such a

situation is that you learn many different skills and are very close to all aspects of the programs – from human resource issues, to finance and budgeting, to proposal and workplan writing and more.

So, how did I end up here? Well, I could go all the way back to my childhood with a father in the U.S. Navy, who traveled quite often and would come back home with exotic gifts and pictures and who took my mom and me with him to Brussels and London when I was ten years old. I was fascinated that there were all of these other places that were so different and so interesting. These experiences sparked my interest in international relations, world history and languages. In my undergraduate studies, I majored in foreign affairs and German, studied abroad and actively participated in Model UN.

During my fourth year of college, I was taking a class called ‘Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans’ and approached one of our guest speakers from the National Defense University (NDU) in Washington, D.C., about whether there were any internship possibilities related to the Balkans and/or peacekeeping issues at NDU. He gave me the name of one of his colleagues who was a senior fellow at the university’s Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS). I ended up interning for INSS and then being hired as a research assistant after I graduated. At INSS, I was exposed to so many resources and people who were on the cutting edge of peacekeeping issues—General Anthony Zinni, Ambassador Robert Oakley, General Wesley Clark—it was really amazing. While at INSS in 1999, Kosovo was the main topic of discussion with regard to peacekeeping, and I became very familiar with the issues, conducted research and even published a few articles.

When I started looking at graduate schools, I again contacted my professor from the Balkans class. He suggested that getting some experience in the field before pursuing a master's degree might serve my career well. I had been looking and had applied, but without already having some field experience, no one was interested in hiring me to work in the field. He then suggested a new master's program that was starting up in Sarajevo that was sponsored by the European Union and jointly hosted and accredited by the Universities of Sarajevo and Bologna. The master's was in democracy and human rights and drew students from countries throughout Southeastern Europe. It sounded interesting, so I applied, was accepted, and off I went to Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH).

It was so interesting talking to people and trying to get advice about this whole adventure before I left. I really had no idea what to expect. The last thing that anyone in the U.S. had heard about Sarajevo was about the war, 'sniper alley' and the bombing of the market, although the conflict had ended in 1995 and by then it was 2000. People who studied the region and should have known better warned me not to go; that it was not safe. These exhortations did not match the information I was getting from the University of Sarajevo or with research I had done, so I made the leap.

Sarajevo is such a fascinating place for so many different reasons. There is the rich cultural heritage and the mixing of peoples — from a certain intersection in Sarajevo you can see a mosque, an Orthodox church, a Catholic church and a synagogue — and then the conflict that tore apart one of the most prosperous countries in Eastern Europe from within. There is also the bizarre mix of thousands of international expatriates that have been working in the Office of the High Representative, international organizations and NGOs for

more than ten years. Even in 2001 when I was there, it was hard to find a restaurant in the city that did not have a version of its menu in English.

While I was studying in Sarajevo, I also interned for and was later hired by an NGO called the Housing Verification and Monitoring Unit (HVM) that verified the return to houses reconstructed by international donors. In the immediate aftermath of the war, international organizations and donor countries poured money into BiH to help rebuild much of the infrastructure, including housing. However, in the first five years after the conflict, there had been very little movement in terms of minority return. Donors wanted to know whether their money had been spent effectively and the international community wanted to promote the restoration of a multiethnic state instead of the ethnically partitioned one BiH had become. HVM went to sites of reconstructed houses and verified whether the previous residents had returned, whether the entire household had returned and whether they had vacated any other housing that they may have been occupying temporarily.

It was in Sarajevo that I also first realized that international development and post-conflict reconstruction have a dark side. In some ways, this kind of work is just another business, and the best interests of the country and its people are not always the highest priority. Politics and greed also come into play. Even more shocking, while I was in BiH, a scandal broke about American contractors engaging in sex trafficking. In some ways it was good to have my eyes opened so as not to pursue a career path blindly, but I have to say I left Sarajevo pretty jaded about development. Since then, my view of the field has rebounded, and I do see the value and importance of undertaking such work. However, these kinds of experiences have given me a critical perspective that pushes

me to question the motivation of various actors, from donors to beneficiaries.

If I were to give advice for someone wanting to pursue a career in international development programs, I would say that getting field experience early is really useful. Intern or volunteer if a paid position is too difficult to obtain, because there is no substitute for having hands-on, practical experience. The other thing that I felt served me well was beginning to search for a job and interning before I graduated from college. I feel like many of my peers waited until late in the year or after graduation and then had to spend a lot of time in the first year after graduation looking for a job in which they were interested and for which they were qualified. One last piece of advice that I would offer is less advice but more just something to keep in mind: the role of chance, timing and luck. Sometimes you are in the right place when an opportunity comes along; sometimes you are not, and there is very little you can control about it. When I graduated from college, Kosovo was the main issue in the field I was pursuing, so I developed regional expertise in the Balkans; had I graduated in 2004, perhaps I would have become an Iraq specialist. You can, however, educate yourself about what possibilities are available so that you will be in a position to recognize the opportunities when they come along.

All in all, I am satisfied with the way my career has developed so far, although I am only beginning to approach my mid-career years. There are so many paths and so much depends on external factors, but creating and pursuing opportunities will usually yield interesting results.

In Our Own Small Way We Can Change This World

Malika Mistry

My name is Malika. I am a Muslim woman. (Muslims are a minority in India). I am a proud Indian. I have a family. In fact, I live in a joint family, which is rare in modern societies and even in urban areas in India, a developing country. I am a full-time teacher at a local college. I teach economics and demography to undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate students, and supervise research. I do community social work and also I am a minority/human rights and peace activist. I am associated with a number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) at local, regional, national and international levels. It gives me immense satisfaction when I am successful in helping an individual or a member of a vulnerable community with self-empowerment. Self-empowerment is to make oneself powerful, for example, by asserting one's own rights. I enjoy the work I do – teaching, research, activism and social work. Through my work, I am empowered and also empower others.

My life has been a struggle, but a successful struggle. I was born in Andhra Pradesh, a southern state in India. When I was 12 years old, my father expired. We moved to my grandfather's place. When I was 13 years old, my grandfather expired. My mother, being a self-respecting person, did not want to stay with my uncles. In search of livelihood, she migrated to Bombay along with my brother, who was 10 years old. She was not highly educated. She had no resources except

courage and great faith in God. She struggled very hard for two years. When I was 15, just after completion of my 12th standard, she brought my younger sister and me from our native place to Bombay. All four of us lived in a small room (6' x 8') in a narrow four-storey building. I learnt stenography and found a regular job. My mother had a temporary job as a midwife in a hospital. My brother worked in a tin factory, and my sister went to school. I was the main breadwinner for the family. I was a part-time student and full-time worker. Eventually, I graduated from a local college, and continued into a master's degree in economics at Bombay University.

There was a nice marriage proposal. Dr. Abdul Karim Naik, a psychiatrist and social worker in Bombay, suggested this proposal. (I consider Dr. Naik my godfather). Compared to my status, my would-be husband was a rich man. He lived in a bungalow and owned a cinema house. He was a regional film producer and director. My friends and colleagues thought that I was getting Aladdin's lamp – a lower middle class girl moving into a rich family with a big house.

Marriage brought about major changes in my life. My mother had never told me that I had to behave differently because of being a girl; she had never restrained my behaviour, either in the name of Islam or in the name of being a 'woman'. But she instilled in me the values of modesty, chastity, honesty and straightforwardness. I think my mother is exceptional: even though she did not know about feminism, she thought and practised that women can live with dignity, efficiently and successfully – without men. She is a good model for many women. However, my marital home was very different from my natal home. My mother-in-law practiced discrimination against women in the family, especially against her daughters-in-law. Women in traditional societies have to put up with so much discrimination and oppression in the home. She troubled

my co-sister a lot, but she did not bother me much because I did not allow her to trouble me.

I learnt cooking and stitching. I had two children. Because of marriage I had discontinued my studies, but I had always wanted to study. My childhood ambition had been to obtain a Ph.D. Somehow I convinced my husband to permit me to continue my studies. It was a very big thing in my life. I joined Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, a prestigious and internationally reputed institution in India. After completing my M.A., I was also able to convince my husband to allow me to study for an M.Phil.

During my M.Phil. studies Dr. S. Srikantan, my research supervisor, explained to me that I should strive to do socially relevant research. He suggested that I study Hindu-Muslim fertility differentials – a hot topic in India. Muslim fertility, which is higher than Hindu fertility due to a number of reasons, has been a sensitive and contentious political issue. I completed my M.Phil. and published a number of articles in leading English-language newspapers in India, as well as national and international journals. I became an expert on Muslim fertility.

Dr. Srikantan had also told me that I should do community work because I was well placed in society. This appealed to me. Another professor introduced me to a female Muslim social worker, with whom I have continued working to this day. Together with the help of well-wishers and donors, we built a high school and an orphanage for girls. We also conduct employment-training courses for women. Recently, we have started a polyclinic. It gives us immense joy to have contributed to the development of the Muslim community.

After completing the M.Phil., I was awarded a fellowship to do a Ph.D. I did fieldwork in a Muslim majority area. I conducted my sample survey of Muslim women in Malegaon

town, a Muslim majority area where 90 percent of the Muslims are poor. Here I saw first-hand the socio-economic backwardness of the Muslim community in India. I observed that they were poor largely for reasons beyond their control.

From the time I started doing a Ph.D., I began receiving invitations for seminars and conferences. I also met a number of community leaders and social workers. My circle outside of home expanded. It was a total change from my earlier married life. In fact, I became a respected member of my community. I am known not because of my husband's name, but for my own achievements. This gave me dignity and confidence, and boosted my self-worth.

* * * *

I am often invited to conferences because I am a Muslim woman. My first visit abroad was to present a paper on violence in the Indian family at an international conference in Seoul, South Korea. I was nervous and overwhelmed by so many scholars from around the world, yet I became friendly with many of the participants. Then followed other trips, which were all enriching experiences for me. In 1998, I visited Amman, Jordan, to participate in a conference organized by the World Assembly of Muslim Youth of Saudi Arabia. There were only four female participants, including myself. The rest were all men, mostly Arabs. One young Arab man asked, "Where are our women?" It was a thought-provoking question. Furthermore, though it was supposed to have been a conference of youth, most participants were middle-aged. The inconsistency between thought and practice became apparent.

In February 2002, there was a state-sponsored genocide against the Muslim minority in the state of Gujarat, India, which was planned and executed by the Chief Minister of

Gujarat, Narendra Modi. Many Muslim women were gang-raped, maimed and killed. Innocent men, women and children were murdered by the mobs under Modi's guidance. Muslim properties were looted. Every day the destructions and killings were reported in the newspapers. I felt guilty because I could not do anything to help the victims. Then I got an opportunity. Two NGOs – the Centre for Study of Society and Secularism (CSSS) and the Minority Rights Group International (MRG) – sponsored my trip to Geneva to participate in the Neelan Tiruchelvan International Training Seminar on Minority Rights and in the UN Working Group on Minorities. With the help of MRG International, I spoke on the Gujarat genocide during the UN meeting. I went to the meetings in Geneva again the following year. It was a great experience. I met many people in whose countries the fate of minorities was as bad as the situation of Muslims in Gujarat. This training experience and interaction with the other participants gave me hope, optimism and confidence. I was satisfied that I had done my bit for the victims of the Gujarat genocide. I was optimistic that things would change in Gujarat. Today things are indeed changing, even though discrimination against Muslims and Christians continues, and the human rights of these minorities are being violated. But today Narendra Modi is not as powerful as he was in 2002. His power is waning and his own people are turning against him. Sooner or later, his downfall will come.

In 2003, I visited UN Headquarters in New York to submit a petition against Narendra Modi to Mr. Kofi Annan. It was forwarded to the Human Rights Commission in Geneva, which issued a reply. The reply was useful to one leading activist who is fighting the cases of the victims.

In July 2003, I became a summer fellow at the Asch Center. It was a great academic experience and another turning point in my life; I had the opportunity to refine myself as a

teacher and a scholar. The reading material on ethnic conflict provided is, in my view, enough for a lifetime. In addition, the directors of the center treated us as equals, rather than as students. Their behaviour had great influence over me as a scholar from a developing country. Through contact with the speakers who taught the course, I was exposed to great scholarship and humanism. I also was given an opportunity to study the women victims of the Gujarat genocide. My fieldwork in Gujarat involved documenting their cases and offering kind words and some material benefits to make them feel at ease. I was very happy to be doing this work.

* * * *

In India, the Hindu-Muslim problem erupts from time to time. Sometimes, there are communal riots (ethnic conflict) between Hindus and Muslims. Often, it is the Muslims who are at the receiving end of the inter-ethnic violence. Disproportionately more Muslims die and more Muslim property is destroyed. Enquiry commissions are constituted and they come out with their findings. But justice is not done. The culprits are not punished. One major reason for this is the hate propaganda by rightist Hindu fundamentalist groups against Islam and Muslims perpetuated over the last 70 years. The partition of India is used as one of the reasons for which to doubt the patriotism of Indian Muslims. The other reason is the socio-economic backwardness of the Muslim community in general, which in turn is due to the lack of good leadership, low education level, limited exposure to the outside world, conservatism and rigidity.

I am an educated and progressive Muslim. Therefore, I think it is my duty to change this situation by doing my bit for the Muslim community in particular and Indian society more

generally. To remove the misconceptions and prejudices against Islam and Muslims, we need to propagate the teachings of Islam in perspective, both among Muslims and non-Muslims. Also, we need to empower the Muslim community. I organize workshops, seminars and symposia for students, teachers, women activists, grass-roots level workers and police personnel in collaboration with the CSSS. In this way, I try to help reduce the ethnic conflict between Muslims and Hindus.

In addition, women are vulnerable in Indian society. We need to empower them by educating them as to how they can change their own situation by asserting themselves and by asserting their rights. I educate women about their rights and motivate them to assert themselves by overcoming social barriers. I also try to bring about awareness of gender justice, women's rights and women's empowerment through my lectures in the classroom, outside the university through the National Service Scheme camps for students, and in speeches on human rights. After each talk, I feel satisfied that I am doing my bit for the female cause.

Increasingly, I have realized that violence takes one nowhere. If violence could provide solutions, there would be so much happiness all over the world. In fact, violence begets violence and makes problems worse. Mahatma Gandhi's thoughts on non-violence are yet more relevant in today's world. It is amazing how his non-violent struggle achieved freedom for India. I work with Gandhians to help bring about peace in society. In March 2006, I helped organize a national-level peace conference for women. It was fulfilling to listen to the efforts of peace activists doing their work in different parts of India.

* * * *

In sum, my mission is to help underprivileged individuals and groups to empower themselves in whatever way I can. Sometimes action is needed. People in developing countries think that one cannot change the system, which is fraught with corruption, bureaucracy and red tape. But even a small person has some power to change society and make it a better place to live. Improvement can be achieved through the practice of universal values of compassion, caring, love, honesty, integrity, cooperation and courage. It is not easy to find the time to do community work. Yet it is important to do so, especially for women in developing countries and traditional societies. I have to make adjustments all the time. But the satisfaction that one gets from activism and community work compensates for the sacrifice that one makes.

Let me give some simple examples. As I was getting down from a bus, I saw two female students caught by a ticket checker. They could not produce tickets. They said they had lost them even though they bought them in the bus. They did not look like cheats, though they seemed irresponsible. I pleaded with the ticket checker to let the girls go without a fine because they seemed innocent. I told him that I am a teacher and I could understand them. I also told the girls that they should be more careful next time. Thus, I used the power I had as a teacher to solve the conflict in a positive way.

Another example. My friend, a social worker, wanted permission from the government to receive donations from abroad, which requires a recommendation from the Collector's office. This paperwork is usually obtained through a bribe. Instead, I introduced her to an honest high-ranking police officer, who recommended her case without a bribe.

I try to transform my students into activists. Even if only a few follow that path, my purpose will be served. Above all, one needs to have an aptitude for community work and

activism. Many times, even if one initially lacks the aptitude, incidents in one's own life can transform him or her into an activist and community worker. Thus, if you think you want to follow such a career, please go ahead with it. Success can come through earning enough knowledge, both in terms of theory and practice. Here the success may not be monetary but surely significant in terms of mental well-being which, in my view, is more rewarding. Being able to involve family members and friends in one's career is even more fulfilling. By being sincere and proactive, one can have an impact, however small, on mitigating conflicts.

International Development and Ethnopolitical Conflict: Peaks and Pitfalls

Jill Carty

The Green View Lodge

It had been a long day. It was freezing cold as I walked into the dank, dirty hallway that descended from the obscure little entrance where we parked our jeep. We had traveled four hours at night, along dirt roads and mountain passes into the tea growing region of Nepal. This bone wrenching jeep ride had followed on from a plane trip over the Himalayas. We had been delayed five hours before taking off at dusk, which as I was told once aloft, was a risky proposition. I was strapped into a small seat next to a smiling Nepali woman dressed in brilliantly woven traditional clothes. I smiled back and communicated in universal baby talk to her child who was swaddled tightly in festive wraps for this prop plane ride. The frustrations of the day, including the thought that my last words on Earth might only be understood by the baby next to me, soon resulted in my hysterically laughing at my traveling companion – the safety officer (seated several rows ahead). She was gagging on her attempt to eat the pink colored cotton that had been offered to us by the tiny flight attendant. It was not cotton candy, it was earplugs.

I was thinking there would be no “green view” at this dismal hotel that was going to be our resting place for the foreseeable future. I climbed up the dimly lit narrow stairs to a room that was locked by padlock through two eye screws, and

quickly found out there was no hot water. I accepted the steaming tea from the attentive Nepali hotel owner. The sickening sweet taste highlighted the lack of choice in the environment and did little to assuage my gnawing hunger that would have to be ignored. I climbed into the freezing, damp bed, pulled on every piece of clothing that I had with me to try and stay warm. I tied a tee shirt over my head as a hat, and piled on two pairs of pants, a jacket and a sweater. I was still cold. As I shivered I thought, “I hate this. Why the hell did I come back to this work,” a refrain that lulled me to an uncomfortable sleep.

Hours later, I removed myself from the bed – stiff and tensed against the clammy coldness of the room. I kept on the lot of clothes, and shuffled across the hall into the tea room of the hotel. The attendant tried hopelessly to be pleasant and answer my questions as he opened the heavy wooden window shutters to the most beautiful scene imaginable. The morning sun poured into the room, radiating intoxicating warmth. The green hills were bursting with tea bushes that rose steeply in front of me. Women with children strapped to their backs hovered over the work of picking the tea leaves – they seemed suspended in view from my angle of sight. The Himalayas in the distance set the starkly beautiful backdrop for this scene. The attendant brought me a cup of steaming sweet tea, as I sat down at the small breakfast table. *What a great day*, I thought. *This is exactly why I am here – to experience this moment.*

When the Peace Corps Volunteers arrived at the hotel, I was able to speak with the women tea workers. The Volunteers were community health workers who could speak the local dialect. The women spoke of their low wages, the difficulties of managing their work and child caring tasks, and their knowledge of tea cultivation.

While these Volunteers went about their daily work with the “locals,” there was a subtext of ethnopolitical violence in the country that was of concern. My mission was to assess the Volunteers’ level of comfort and coping in Nepal during this period. I would return two more times to Nepal, travel throughout the country visiting Volunteers and their Nepali counterparts, and spend a great deal of time with Nepali Peace Corps staff. In this process, I learned of the important ties that had developed between the Peace Corps program of over 42 years’ duration and the people of Nepal. And I discovered the devastating impact of removing a Peace Corps program – to Nepali Peace Corps staff, the communities the Volunteers serve, and the Volunteers themselves. Unfortunately, the decision was made to suspend the Peace Corps program in Nepal on September 13, 2004. More than 4,000 Volunteers have served in Nepal. Ethnopolitical conflict continues in this country.

This was one of my first temporary duty overseas assignments, in my current position of special services officer with U.S. Peace Corps. I work as a licensed clinical psychologist at U.S. Peace Corps Headquarters (HQ) in Washington D.C., along with nearly 800 other individuals who support the Peace Corps mission. This is the third time I have worked for this agency, and my tenth year of service.

I began my work with Peace Corps as a Volunteer in Guatemala, living and working in an indigenous mountain village, riding my horse to neighboring schools to teach school gardening. I served almost three years during a relatively peaceful time in Guatemala. When I returned ten years later, I found that almost everyone I knew had been killed due to ethnopolitical violence.

After my Volunteer tour, I pursued a master’s degree in public health with the intent of working in the field of

international health. I returned to Peace Corps Guatemala, as an overseas program management staff in international health. My job was to provide technical support to the Volunteers assigned to the Child Survival program, which included the promotion of immunizations and oral re-hydration therapy and the improvement of maternal/infant nutrition. I traveled throughout the country visiting Volunteers, their host country counterparts and supervisors, and the many village health centers and groups that were the Volunteer work sites.

My next staff assignment was to the Central African Republic, where I accepted a position as a Peace Corps programming and training manager. I had to adjust quickly to my new environment, including learning French on the job. I moved to the position of country director shortly after I arrived, as staff seemed to disappear into thin air from this isolated and impoverished country. Soon I found myself covering three staff positions, with little relief for over a year. One of the pitfalls of development or humanitarian work can be the overwork, responsibility and resulting stress on staff and Volunteers working in the field. I found that I had to move away from international work for a period of time to rekindle my energy and interest after completing this experience. The program in this country was suspended several years after I departed due to ethnopolitical conflict.

Clinical Psychology with a Specialty in International Development and Medicine – Is it Possible?

The challenges I experienced in working with large public health initiatives in developing countries fueled my interest in learning about how to work effectively with individuals. I also realized that the part of the work I enjoyed most was helping Peace Corps Volunteers and their counterparts interpret and adjust to their cross-cultural challenges.

I pursued clinical psychology with the obscure hope that I might somehow merge my international experience with a career in psychology. After the ten years that it took to become a licensed clinical psychologist, I returned to Peace Corps to find more challenges awaiting me that required the same kind of flexibility that Volunteers develop in the field.

The road to my current position as a clinical psychologist with this agency was not clear cut. In fact, when I accepted work with Peace Corps we were in the process of developing the Behavioral Health Service. The transition has been an interesting and positive process. I am now a member of the screening and medical review team which allows Volunteers to enter into service, or determine fitness to return to service after a medical evacuation. I am also part of an emergency response unit that travels overseas to work in the event of a crisis. I design continuing medical education (CME) modules and teach our 125 medical providers, the majority of whom are international medical graduates. This year our CMEs took place in Bolivia, Philippines and Tanzania, where we spend time with our colleagues to integrate our HQ and overseas operations.

We have also developed a clinical service that not only enables us to consult by telephone with the medical officers overseas, but allows us to treat Volunteers at HQ. We utilize a short term model with Volunteers who are medically evacuated to HQ for mental health reasons. We have 45 days to work with the Volunteers to send them back to the field, or to medically separate them. It is truly amazing how a treatment end point and a goal of returning to service enhance treatment outcomes. We have found that most Volunteers want to return to the field.

The major mental health problems of Peace Corps Volunteers are post-traumatic stress, depression, anxiety and

cross-cultural adjustment. These may seem fairly common psychological problems, however, the clinical presentation becomes complicated by the complexity of the cross-cultural, political and work-related variables. As mentioned above, I have been involved with the suspension of Peace Corps programs and evacuation of Volunteers due to ethnopolitical conflict in a number of countries. Unfortunately, in the pursuit of peace, conflict never seems to be too far behind, causing disruption and sadness for all.

Psychologists Working in Support of Global Social Change

I believe that my work as a clinical psychologist for Peace Corps helps in the process of global social change. And there is a growing consensus that psychologists are needed in the field of humanitarian assistance. There is a growing market and interest in providing psycho-social and clinical services for humanitarian/cross-cultural workers. Organizations are realizing that they need to create a culture that supports their workers overseas and at home. Major non-governmental organizations such as CARE and Save the Children are hiring staff to provide the kind of programming, support and psychological assistance needed. This is a career path for the future, and one that supports the mission of world peace and conflict avoidance.

Your work is not mapped out. The journey can be circuitous, with many highs and lows, dips and turns. But it is a path worth taking.

Peace Work in Sri Lanka: Reflections on Past Activism

Sumanasiri Liyanage

I am first and foremost a teacher. I have taught at the University of Peradeniya, which is in Sri Lanka, for 36 years. Peradeniya is a beautiful university about three hours away from Colombo, the capital of Sri Lanka. It is an extremely vibrant campus where students have time to reflect, read and learn.

I was a student at Peradeniya in the late 1960s and became involved in political activism then. This was before the violent ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka had started. I was involved in the student movement then, as were many of the youth in Sri Lanka and South Asia at the time.

The year 1983 changed the course of Sri Lankan history and politics. There had been tensions for some years between two of Sri Lanka's major ethnic groups. The Sinhalese were numerically a majority and had continued to discriminate against another ethnic community, the Tamils. The Tamils are concentrated in the North and East of Sri Lanka, along with the Muslims. Tamils in the North and East of the country had begun to organise themselves and arm themselves to resist Sinhala chauvinism. The Sinhala state had put in place restrictions to reduce the number of Tamils entering universities, and had declared Sinhala the official language of Sri Lanka, when both Tamil and Sinhala were spoken by its

polity. The state also started settling large numbers of Sinhalese farmers into the North and East to colonise them.

In July 1983 ongoing tensions between the state and the Tamils resulted in 13 Sinhala soldiers being killed by one of the Tamil militant groups, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). When the dead bodies of the soldiers were brought to Colombo, Sinhalese mobs started attacking and killing Tamils. Furthermore, many Tamil houses were burnt and their goods stolen.

This was perhaps one of the first times I became aware of the seriousness of ethnic tensions. Sri Lanka was literally burning while the state did little to control the violence and in many instances turned a blind eye to it. At this time I was teaching at the University of Peradeniya and many Tamils were vulnerable to attacks by Sinhalese mobs. I was involved, along with other lecturers, in securing university space as a shelter for Tamil academics and their families. Approximately 300 Tamils moved in and we constantly patrolled the area to make sure they were safe. They stayed there for two weeks and we provided food and attended to their other basic needs.

Subsequent to the riots, war commenced in a serious manner between the Sri Lankan state and different militant groups. I am not saying that activists had not been concerned about ethnic issues prior to 1983. We had been concerned and I had been part of what was called the Movement for Inter-Racial Harmony, Justice and Equality (MIRJE). It was started in Kandy, but the headquarters were in Colombo. The most dynamic member of MIRJE was Father Paul Casperz, a Jesuit priest. This was the first peace movement in Sri Lanka. Even before the events of 1983, we had begun campaigns to talk of peace, issues of racism and ethnic harmony. Once the 1983 riots devastated Sri Lanka, we were forced to deal with the ugly reality of war and the killings of many civilians. We felt that the

solution to ethnic tensions was to design some sort of model that would enable power sharing between ethnic communities. The Sri Lankan state is highly centralized and the different regions in Sri Lanka do not have much autonomy. We felt this needed to be changed.

By 1987, the war had devastating effects on Sri Lanka. Many civilians were being killed and Tamil militant groups were killing each other to gain supremacy. Out of some of these groups – PLOTE, EROS, EPRLF, LTTE – the LTTE managed through its might and by killing off members of other groups to gain supremacy among the Tamil groups. India had long been an active part of the Sri Lankan conflict. Many Tamils had fled as refugees to Tamil Nadu, in Southern India, as the situation continued to deteriorate in Sri Lanka. India then stepped in and an accord between the then prime minister of India Rajiv Gandhi and Sri Lankan President J. R. Jayawardena was signed in 1987. Many Indian soldiers came to the North and East to try to disarm the Tamil militants groups. They agreed to disarmament as long as the Sri Lankan state agreed to devolve power.

The Indo-Lanka accord was hated by certain Sinhala chauvinist groups. There was a mass campaign by one of them, the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP), to protest against the accord. The JVP did not simply carry out protest marches, but killed many who opposed them and desired a federal solution for Sri Lanka. This was a difficult time for many of us. I had welcomed the Indo-Lanka Accord as a way of resolving the conflict peacefully. These Sinhala nationalist groups felt that devolution of power would lead to the break up of the country and that Sri Lanka belonged to the Sinhala people. I remember traveling to many parts of the country at this time talking of how we needed to stop the war and allow Tamils to live with justice. I spoke a great deal about human rights violations of

this time. I worked toward making the Sinhalese aware of what the Indo-Lanka Accord meant and why we needed it.

This was not easy. I was often threatened anonymously. Once my house was attacked and I barely escaped. Some of my colleagues and friends were not so lucky and were killed. The Sri Lankan state, in an attempt to stop the actions of the JVP, started its own killing spree and many young Sinhalese, often from rural parts of Sri Lanka, were killed as a result. For anyone interested in reading more about this time, please read *Anil's Ghost* by Michael Ondaatje. At this time the state became even more authoritarian and undemocratic than before. In the early 1990s, the press was severely censored – speaking out against state violations could mean arrest and disappearances of those journalists who dared. What we faced at this time was not only the ethnic question, but also questions of human rights violations, civil liberties and freedom of expression. Again, many others and I struggled to speak of these issues. Many peace activists had to leave the country at this time because their lives were at risk. At the end of what is now called the JVP insurrection of the late 1980s, over 40,000 Sinhala youth had been killed by the state. Meanwhile, in the North the Indo-Lanka Accord did not bring about the anticipated results because both the state and the by then hegemonic LTTE refused to comply with it.

To date, the issues I have written about continue. The ethnic problem is still not solved; youth frustration – which is also part of what the JVP insurrection was about – still continues. There are few options for youth in Sri Lanka even today. In an effort to address some of these youth frustrations, in 1995-1996 I worked in schools along with other activists to address the concerns of youth. I worked for the government at this time, and part of my mandate was to speak to youth about the reforms needed by the state to enable a more equal and less

racist state structure. I did this for almost one and a half years and enjoyed these interactions immensely. Many of the students I got to know at the time still remain close to me.

It was in 2001 that I first came to the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict for its second Summer Institute. The Asch Center subsequently supported my work on the Sri Lankan peace process that had begun in 2002. A new Ceasefire Agreement (CFA) had been signed between the government of Sri Lanka and the LTTE in 2002. This was a moment of great jubilation for many Sri Lankans who thought that it was a chance to resolve the ethnic conflict. Despite the CFA, there have been sporadic bursts of violence in the Eastern Province of Sri Lanka starting in November 2002. This time it was between the Tamils and the Muslims. The tension between these two groups is a result of the LTTE wanting the North and the East for its separate state. While the Muslims had supported the Tamil cause, the LTTE did not consider them part of the Tamil community. Thousands of Muslims were expelled from Jaffna (the North of Sri Lanka) in 1990. Now, in 2002, these tensions continued. I traveled constantly to the East between 2002 and 2005 to try to intervene in the aftermath of these riots and also understand why they were happening. While I was working in the Eastern Province of Sri Lanka, I also started highlighting child rights violations by the LTTE. They were recruiting large numbers of children as child soldiers. This practice was continuing despite LTTE promises to various international organizations such as UNICEF that they would stop this. A report by Human Rights Watch, *Living in Fear: Child Soldiers and Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka*, provides more information on this.

* * * * *

Some of the challenges of working in the area of ethnic politics come from the fact that these conflicts are protracted and multifaceted. For example, what in simple terms seems a conflict between the Sinhalese and Tamils has also involved the Muslim communities and the Sinhalese youth. The JVP insurrection and the Muslim-Tamil tensions highlight these complications. Hence, there is no straightforward way in which to even think about resolving the ongoing conflict in Sri Lanka.

Secondly, while at an abstract level everyone agrees they want peace in Sri Lanka, what the term means to different communities varies. Peace may mean Sinhalese domination on the part of the Sri Lankan state and Sinhala elite. For the LTTE, it means achieving a separate state. For the Muslims, it is recognition of their losses and an involvement in the peace process, from which they have been largely left out. For parents of children who are forcibly recruited by the LTTE, peace is getting their children back. Hence, understanding what peace means to different collectives and meditating between them is important. I want to stress, however, that for me the needs of subaltern or oppressed groups are more important than the demands of both the LTTE and the state. The LTTE and the state are mostly interested in retaining their dominance and control over their people and their resources. It is those who have least power and are marginal that suffer the most as a result. For me, their rights and material needs are the most important.

As far as my academic career is concerned, two things have happened. First, although I was trained as an economist, the intensification of the conflict and my heavy involvement in peace work moved me academically from monetary economics to the political economy of conflict. Secondly, involvement in peace work to a certain extent created a time constraint on my university academic work. However, the university teaching

gives me enough freedom to engage in peace work independently. When many foreign funded NGO workers were – due to multiple reasons – conspicuously silent on child recruitment, human rights violations, and other issues, I was able to bring those issues to the center of the discussion because of the freedom and independence given to me by my university job.

SECTION 4

Academic Perspectives on Peace and Conflict

A Few Laps Around the *Non*-Tenure Track

Mikhail Lyubansky

“Yo man. Let me get this straight. You teach five hours a week and they pay you 50 G’s?”

It wasn’t a rhetorical question. Calvin, who as far I know answers only to “Hot Rod,” was expecting an answer, and I wasn’t sure what to say – especially since I was pretty sure that Hot Rod didn’t even know that I don’t teach in the summers.

“Dawg, I’m *in* the classroom five hours, but I spend a lot more time preparing for class. It’s just like out here, baby (I shove the basketball in the pit of his stomach); I only teach your ass for about an hour, but I spent years perfecting those pretty moves.”

Hot Rod chuckles at the lie. I play hard, have a passable jump shot, and am a willing passer, but at 35 my quickness and jumping ability ain’t what they used to be, and they never used to be all that good. As Mister Señor Love Daddy likes to say, “that’s the truth, Ruth,” but I’m not complaining – far from it. I get to hoop three or four times per week, which isn’t too bad considering that, my conversation with Hot Rod notwithstanding, teaching is just one of several professional activities that I and other university faculty juggle. But I’m getting ahead of my story.

* * * *

I go to college to study journalism. All right, I go to college because that’s what everyone (including me) expects me

to do after high school. But needing both a major and a potential career, I settle on journalism. It seems like a logical choice. A basketball career hasn't been a viable option for some time, but writing about sports seems appealing, especially since I fancy myself a good writer. Unfortunately, it doesn't occur to me during the college search to check whether each school actually offers a journalism major. My immigrant family, although very invested in my education, is in no position to advise me. Sure enough, when I scan the University of Pennsylvania course catalog for journalism classes, I discover they don't exist. My journalism career over before I take a single class, I spend the next two years considering a variety of other options, including international relations and communications. I finally settle on psychology, because the prospect of earning a living talking to people (I'm thinking about psychotherapy) seems almost as appealing as writing about sports. I don't yet know that a graduate degree is required to practice psychotherapy, nor do I know that I won't actually like doing therapy once I learn how to do it.

I start here to counter the myth that career journeys are linear – that all of us are in constant motion from point A to point B, as though we are born with the knowledge of what kind of work we want to do and just need to obtain the necessary education or work experience to be able to do it. No doubt some people actually have such linear journeys. But my path was always a process of discovery, always a combination of wrong turns and timely opportunities.

It's the end of my junior year at Penn. I'm completing a double major in communication and psychology but still don't really know what I want to do after graduation. Entry-level jobs in both fields seem unappealing, and my academic advisor finally deigns to share with me that a graduate degree is required to practice psychotherapy and that research

experience is required to be admitted to a graduate program. I frantically search for research opportunities. A staff psychologist at the now defunct Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic is looking for research assistants for his study on expressed emotion, as is a graduate student working with Marty Seligman on learned helplessness. The staff psychologist's middle name is Sigmund. I don't know who Marty Seligman is (I learn later that he's one of the most recognized psychologists of our time). None of this matters; I just need experience. I apply for and happily accept both unpaid positions.

* * * *

“What do you do?” Hot Rod asks.

It's how our conversation starts. It's how many conversations start. (The college version of this, of course, is “What's your major?”). And why not? For those of us with careers (rather than jobs), what we do at least partly defines who we are. This is so not only because who we are influences our choice of what we decide to study in college and graduate school (or even whether to go to college), but also because the process of preparing for our career shapes our personal values. But how to answer? Like every academic I know, I have one “job” but do lots of things.

“I'm a teacher,” I say, “I teach about race...”

More specifically, I am a faculty member in a psychology department of a very large state university. My official job title is “lecturer,” which is designed to distinguish me from 98 percent of the department and university faculty who are either tenured or tenure-track (i.e., on track to become tenured) professors. As far as the undergraduate students are concerned, the distinction is trivial. Like my tenured and tenure-track colleagues, I have a Ph.D., teach several undergraduate courses

each year, and have graduate students assist in grading, leading class discussions, and a variety of other classroom tasks. In addition, although students are not always aware of this, I also publish original research in peer-reviewed journals, review research manuscripts submitted for publication, and present my research at both academic conferences and community organization meetings. Yet, the distinction is not irrelevant. Although all faculty members are mostly engaged in the same activities, in most cases, there is a substantial difference in the proportion of time allotted to each. Tenure-track faculty are hired primarily as scholars. Their job is to produce scholarship – preferably “important” scholarship that moves the field forward. In the process, they are expected to teach a few courses (the “normal” teaching load in my department is the equivalent of two moderate size undergraduate courses per year), but they must be careful to prioritize their scholarship, as their performance reviews and job security are ultimately dependent on the quality and quantity of their research production. My primary job, by contrast, is to teach. The department is happy to have me engaged in research, but it’s not actually part of my job description.

My perception of my job depends a little on my mood. Most of the time, I think I have the best academic job on the planet. Since I am at a prestigious university (my department was ranked third in the most recent *U.S. News and World Report* rankings), I work and socialize with some of the brightest and most talented people in the world. Moreover, I enjoy teaching and the department allows me to teach the courses that I most want to teach. Yet, I still have time to pursue other professional activities, including research and community projects, and the fact that I don’t have to teach in the summers gives me time to travel out of the country – which my research often requires. Best of all, I don’t have to deal with the

“publish or perish” pressure that is the hallmark of academic life. This pressure is intense and typically leads junior faculty to work long into the evenings, as well as weekends – both because senior faculty members are often explicit about what it takes to get tenure and because of their own internal motivation to be successful.

But, of course, there is a downside. As a lecturer, I’m (at least so far) not included in the department’s official decision making (this includes hiring decisions, graduate admissions, and curriculum changes). I’m ineligible for most departmental and university committees and administrative positions, and I’m not allowed to sit on master’s and dissertation committees. I also get paid substantially less and do not qualify for a sabbatical every seven years. To most academics, mine is a second-class position, and there are moments of insecurity when I internalize this attitude, doubting my ability, questioning my productivity, and generally feeling like an under-achiever – especially since I used to hold a tenure-track rank prior to my current position. But most of the time, on most days, I like the trade-off. I get to teach and do research and be involved in the community, but still have time to hoop and talk to Hot Rod afterwards, as well as spend time with my family without feeling that I should be working.

* * * *

It’s my freshman year at Penn. My friends and I are standing in line at the theatre ticket counter, waiting to buy tickets for Spike Lee’s *Do the Right Thing*, which has just been released. It’s a long line, and my attention focuses on the group of young Black men standing directly ahead of us. They are boisterous and loud, seemingly oblivious to the rest of us waiting in line. I watch them because they are in front of me

and because I am enjoying their fun. After a time, I notice that four or five are wearing identical T-shirts with the words “It’s a Black thing, you wouldn’t understand” printed on the back. I am flooded with anger at the perceived injustice. I want to go up to them and say “How dare you make assumptions about me? How do you know I wouldn’t understand? Why don’t you try explaining it to me first?” But I don’t have the courage, so I just stand in place, watching them, seething. I like the film – feel bad for Sal and his family, as well as for Radio Raheem and think that, no, of course Mookie didn’t do the right thing. But as I walk out of the theatre, I notice that the African American audience seems agitated. They seem to take a different message from the film, but I don’t know what it is. Did they think starting a riot was the right thing to do? How could they? How could anyone? I feel angry at their anger. They have no right to think that way.

Two years later I am again in line, this time waiting to buy a late-night cheese steak. This line is short, and within a few minutes I’m placing my order with the short-order cook. “The grill is closed,” he informs me. I nod and head to the back of the store to rummage through the pre-made food options in the refrigerator. The door chimes as two men walk in. They head to the grill and a few minutes later are hunched over a small table, enjoying their cheese steaks. The two men and the short-order cook are Black, and I am usually perceived as White (I was born in the former USSR and identify as a Russian Jew). I assume that I just experienced racial discrimination. I am more incredulous than angry. I want to say something to the cook, but again I lack the courage. I slink out, trying not to make eye contact with anyone in the process.

These and other experiences stay with me. I don’t yet have the knowledge necessary to engage in an analysis of what the interactions mean or why they happened, but I instinctively

know they're important. I apply to graduate programs. I get many rejections but also several interviews. An offer comes from the only Black professor I interview with. His research is based in Jamaica. I accept the offer.

Three years later I arrive in Jamaica, along with five African American undergraduate students who, under my supervision, will conduct structured interviews with Jamaican kids who had been identified as having emotional or behavioral problems by either a family member or a teacher. One of the future interviewers is a friend, a former MSU football player from Detroit who gave up football in order to better focus on academics. He had worked in the research lab for several years, and we hit it off almost from the start. Usually thoughtful and reserved, Stan is nearly giddy with anticipation. He sidles up to me as we walk through the airport.

"You know," he says, "the airport security is Black, and when we get on a bus, the bus-driver will be Black, and hell – everyone else on the bus will be Black too."

He is clearly liberated by this thought. I can't really relate.

A few weeks after our arrival, the undergraduates and I decide to have some drinks together. We walk into a bar. About 20 people are spread out among the tables. My eyes instantly gravitate to the one White person there. He looks to be near 50. It is likely that we have nothing in common. In the U.S., I wouldn't have noticed him. In Jamaica, I find myself fighting the urge to walk over to say "Hello." What would I say after that? "I couldn't help noticing that you're White." Of course, I do no such thing. But I think that maybe I have a slightly better understanding of what Stan is experiencing.

* * * *

I love working in the field of race relations. The topic fascinates me, engrosses me, challenges me – constantly – even after more than 10 years. It’s ubiquitous, affecting how children are tracked in the education system, how employees are hired, evaluated and promoted, how laws are passed and enforced, and how health services are delivered. Even personal choices, such as whom to befriend, whom to date, and which neighborhood to live in, are either explicitly or subtly influenced by race. All of the above are well documented. Yet, many of us live in blissful unawareness of how race impacts our own lives and those of our neighbors, while others make a deliberate political and personal choice to deny the documented reality and pretend that race has no meaning. One good example of this is J.K. Rowling’s Harry Potter series, in which she clearly uses “half-bloods” to condemn group stereotypes and prejudice, yet creates a parallel universe where race exists (it is used in character descriptions) but is never actually mentioned or acknowledged by any of the characters. This lack of awareness (or denial) exists despite the fact that the White power structure of the Wizard world (there are no adult characters of color in authority) suggests a similar racial climate to our real universe.

The seeming inconsistencies beg discussion, demand exploration. How can one not be captivated by some aspect of this topic? I love the research questions and the self-examination that it inspires. I love that it brings me into contact with people of different backgrounds all over the world. I love that my work has taken me all over the country, as well as to Jamaica, Israel, and Germany. I love that it provides the opportunity to work closely with not only different types of psychologists but also historians, sociologists, political scientists, and cultural scholars. I love the students, particularly those who really engage with the material,

who are honest (not just with me, but with themselves) about the impact of race on their lives, who are willing to question me and challenge the ideas and theories from class – even when, especially when, they know where I stand. This doesn't happen to me in other classes I teach. I love how these relationships have enriched my life in ways I could not have predicted, and I look forward to continuing my professional journey, even as I have little idea where it may lead.

* * * *

The game Hot Rod and I are waiting on is almost over, and despite our conversation, we both slowly turn our attention to it. It's a unique sport, basketball. There is no hiding who you are on the court. Trash talk all you want, but within a few minutes your "game" reveals your real self to all present. Over the years, I've learned that to teach about race effectively I have to be just as "real" (just as transparent) in the classroom.

I stand in front, watching the students file in on the first day of class. I'm a little nervous, much less so than when I first started teaching about race, but nervous enough to need a distraction. I start counting faces. There are 72 of them, almost all completely unfamiliar. The bell sounds. I introduce myself, then quickly launch into a series of stories about some of my personal experiences around race. Some of the stories are embarrassing – like the one about my enthusiastic editorial in high school supporting my school's use of offensive Indian symbols and imagery, which included the "Savage of the week" award given to the week's top football performer (The high school has since chosen a new symbol and "retired" all Indian imagery, unlike the university where I currently teach, which maintains an Indian "Chief" as its symbol despite both internal demands by faculty and external pressures by the National

Collegiate Athletic Association to eliminate its use). Other stories, including some of the ones in this essay, reveal a similar past naïveté that I am usually not eager for others to know about. Yet, there are good reasons for sharing these stories.

Unlike most other courses where the instructor is generally assumed to be a legitimate authority on the topic by virtue of his or her position, legitimacy in race relations, in the eyes of many, is often at least partially dependent on lived experience. As a person who is usually perceived as White, I know that I need to demonstrate my legitimacy to teach about race before some students are psychologically able to learn from me. Some instructors deal with this by adopting a veneer of neutrality or objectivity, especially concerning the disclosure of their own political beliefs. They pride themselves on keeping their own ideological positions regarding race hidden from their students. This type of “neutrality” is often advocated, but I deliberately adopt the exact opposite way of being – not just on the first day of class but on every day and with every (relevant) issue. I didn’t come to this mindset lightly. I believe that by sharing my personal experiences and beliefs (and labeling them as such), I allow students to see me as a real person who has struggled and continues to struggle with different racial issues. This helps us connect and relate to each other. In addition, I believe that this kind of self-disclosure models a way of having honest and transparent conversations about race, which I think are important not only for my class, but for our society. I tell the stories with the hope that hearing about my experiences and opinions will motivate students to examine their own thinking. Ideally, the stories will also help students develop the skills and motivation to articulate their beliefs in a way that maintains an openness to the beliefs of others, even if, especially if, the beliefs don’t match their own. I also hope the stories facilitate the expectation of change and

growth – both in the self and in others. If my thinking has changed over time (and it has!), then why shouldn't theirs or their friends'? That said, in the interest of transparency, I have to admit to one other reason: I share my personal experiences and my racial ideology because I believe, as many have pointed out, that a refusal to take a political stance or express a political opinion is itself a political statement endorsing the status quo.

And that's one ideological statement about race I am unwilling to make – either in the classroom or in my writing.

Stop the World, I Want to Make Peace

Ephraim Tabory

My fear on the bus knows no limit. Three men have boarded the vehicle and grabbed the passenger in front of me and are holding his hands high while pulling his heavy coat open. The plain clothes police are shouting, and I am silently screaming. Are these the last sounds I will hear before the suicide bomber achieves his wish to ascend to Heaven, while blowing us all to Hell? In seconds it is over. The “bomber” has fainted from his own fear; his poor choice of wearing an inappropriate thick coat on a warm Jerusalem day has taken its toll on him for the moment, and on me forever. I never fail to wear one layer of clothing *less* than necessary any time I take a bus. And I never take a bus when I have any other alternative.

This was not my first encounter with terror, or more accurately, the terror of terror. My mother had been on an Israeli plane that was attacked by terrorists in Greece. The man sitting two rows in front of her was shot dead. I was sure that she was evacuated safely by the SWAT team when the radio report said that one woman even ran back down the aisle to retrieve her handbag. That had to be Mom (it wasn't). Mom even used her strongest curse words—hell's bells—to later describe the event. If this could lead even my mother to use *such* an expletive, I thought, there has to be some way to get out of this situation.

My college education never really prepared me for the reality that I have met in life. I studied sociology and psychology. Psychology taught us that we were all crazy. It

must have been an amazing sight to see our abnormal psychology class, with everybody smoking away like mad while the professor described all the inflictions of society. My classmates and I never actually saw the classroom, because we all had our heads buried, furiously taking notes so that the professor would not see our faces that revealed, "Yes, that's me." Sociology, at the time, was generally characterized by a "functionalist" orientation, a perspective that characterized society as oriented toward forward progress and cooperation. Conflict was the exception, a disruption or "dysfunction" in what should be the normal course of affairs. Sociology soon changed, and so did I, to a field that bridged the two, and seemed to recognize that people are actually people, influencing others and affected by them as well. People cooperate, and people compete. People can get along with other people, and at the same time seek to eradicate an entire nation from the face of this earth. And while this goes on, some bystanders may cry out in protest and risk their own lives to save the helpless, while others turn the page. I have never regretted my choice of social psychology as a field that helps me, and perhaps even a little bit influences others, to at least think twice before closing the book on actions that are insensitive and hurtful.

I live in a society that is rife with conflict. It manifests itself on an interpersonal level daily. Driving behavior here makes level 5 of the most sophisticated combat computer game seem like child play. There is tension between various ethnic groups, veterans and new immigrants, new immigrants and even newer immigrants, the haves and the have nots, men and women, religious and nonreligious Jews, Jews and Arabs, Israelis and Palestinians. We are proud to be a democracy, and struggle with the way that our identity as a Jewish state affects the principles of equality and justice. We do have full equality

and justice—for some. We rationalize our limited scope of justice and our mistreatment of the other by saying that “they started,” and “we were here first,” and that “it is ours, not theirs.” We are met by similar feelings on the other side. We are criticized for even saying things like I have said in the last sentences as appeasing and serving the enemy. We can even kill our prime minister for being a traitor in seeking peace instead of continuing on a path of battles and skirmishes, war and conflict, tearful funerals and destroyed families. We live in separate Jewish and Arab cities and neighborhoods with very little integration. We have built a wall to protect ourselves from Palestinian suicide bombers in a manner that cuts through Arab villages and makes it a painstaking ordeal for some children to go to school, for workers to get to their places of employment, or even to work at all, and for the sick to get to a hospital.

As an Israeli Jew who wants to live in security, I cannot even say that I am critical of this barrier. The 24 foot high concrete wall, described as a “fence” by Israeli politicians, has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Israel sitting as the Supreme Court of Justice, although it demanded changes in its planned route. This is a court that I very much respect, but I recognize that non-Israelis may not share my view. Indeed, the barrier has been declared illegal by the International Court of Justice. In the end, the wall does protect us from terrorist infiltration. That is why I support it. This is the reality in which I live. They are trying to kill us. I will leave it to their spokespersons to say what we are trying to do to them. I am sad that this is the situation, and that we have not been able to resolve our conflicts in an alternative manner. I am sorry that we cannot live together, benefiting from a multicultural society. Even religious Jews and nonreligious Jews find it difficult to live together and increasingly move to religiously

homogeneous neighborhoods. There are ultra-Orthodox neighborhoods that seek to prevent entry to persons who do not overtly behave according to their behavioral norms of dress. The only thing that we can all fear together is the threat of a nuclear bomb being sent our way by leaders who were really being described accurately by my abnormal psych professor. I live in a society in which hardly anyone really apologizes. "Sorry," does indeed "seem to be the hardest word."

My university established an "Interdisciplinary Graduate Program on Conflict Management and Resolution, and Negotiations" in 1999. University politics are no less conflict ridden than society at large, but I was fortunate in wading through all this and joining with a colleague in heading this program. My colleague comes from a political studies background, but despite this fault, we amazingly usually agree on our policy decisions. (When we don't, it is because he is wrong, of course.) I have had to work hard to expand my knowledge for this program, as far as conflict resolution goes. Not having come from a truly interdisciplinary background, as wide ranging as social psychology is, I have had to read up on a vast field of knowledge that we now (at least claim to) teach our students in a systematic and organized manner. Admittedly, I still have quite a way to go. I have taken several courses in mediation and am now a court-recognized mediator. We have established a mediation clinic that I direct, although we try to stress to our students that mediation is just a small part of our academic program. We now have students who work in the field and I am particularly thrilled with our students who are training second and third grade children to use mediation in their fights and disagreements with their classmates. It is a small beginning, but maybe they will even

have some influence on the behavior of their own parents and teachers.

In a class on conflict resolution, I even suggested to students who wanted me to ease the course requirements that we go to mediation. We had just finished covering that topic and I thought it would be a good exercise. I brought in one of our mediators, and we reached a successful conclusion, but I was not prepared for the emotional turmoil that I would go through as an actual participant in this exercise. The students' evaluation of the course went up tremendously as they positively evaluated my willingness to do this. My evaluation of myself went down tremendously as I saw myself as others saw me. We are now seeking to introduce a teacher-student mediation program at the university, not with much success. We are having more success in our involvement in the university's Dialogue Group Program that brings students of different levels of religious background together to increase understanding and tolerance. We seek to apply, and indeed test, theoretical principles in a real life setting. Sometimes things work out; sometimes they don't. That is the real world. The thrill of it all is that my involvement in this program has brought together all of my interests and made possible the realization of my desire to actually do something for society, or at least try and do something and not just sit idly by. I could answer the challenge of "seeing things as they might be and say, 'why not?'" rather than just seeing things as they are and saying "why?"

The authors in this volume are my colleagues in the Summer Institute at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict. How fortunate I was to participate in this truly exceptional program. I know that my own students roll their eyes when I—once again—tell them about this program, but it was truly phenomenal, and probably the most

concentrated intellectual experience I have had thus far. I have to express my appreciation to my colleagues for their influence on me and my thinking over and beyond the formal aspects of the program. Living in a society in which generally older students run between work, classes and family, while juggling military reserve duty so that it “only” entails missing classes, but not the test period, it was a luxury to be with people who actually read the assigned work prior to our lectures, and even sat and discussed the readings before the formal presentations. My own students have definitely benefited (or suffered from the additional readings that I assign them) from my own participation in this program, and I therefore characterize my students as grandchildren of the program.

My involvement in conflict resolution and management has not always made me a more tolerant person. It has not changed all of my political orientations, but it has affected some of them. It has affected my behavior perhaps more than my cognitions. Or at least I am more able to take that second step in cognitive behavior and say to myself, “wait, think this through.” It affected me in this closing story—I apologize, I am a story person.

A student in the conflict program, indeed a student in my own class for over seven months, came to see me in my office. She told me that she forgot something upstairs, and asked if she could leave her bag by me while she went to get it. And instead of seeing her at that moment as my student, I saw her as an Arab in an environment in which veteran, trusted workers have been known to stab their employers and undertake violent acts against seeming friends, and in which we are warned constantly of suspicious packages and even envelopes. Should I look at her as my student or as an Arab? And does being an Arab entail by necessity, suspicion? I thought of my bus trip, of my war experiences, and then of my

desire to build bridges or at least not create larger walls that we call fences, and I told her “sure.” I have described this scenario in various meetings and settings, and my Israeli listeners almost invariably say that I should have said no. Some persons say that I should have said yes—and then left the room and gone as far away as I could. What I had actually done was to stay in my room, and hope that my faith would not be misplaced. Obviously, it wasn’t.

This incident increased my realization that whatever we do to try and bring people closer, distrust is much easier to foster and maintain than is trust. It takes many baby steps to increase trust, but just one little wrong move to have it come crumbling down. Come walk with me down the path. Even if we do not manage to change the world, we might just be able to change ourselves.

Researching the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly

Hanna Zagefka

During the Nazi regime six million Jews were murdered by Germans. This is what I – as a German national – was taught in secondary school. Back then, as today, I was struggling intellectually and emotionally with trying to understand how atrocities on such a scale are possible. Which factors can lead humans to commit such inconceivable cruelties? What can be done to avoid such events?

I was also trying to come to terms with being German, and therefore being part of the perpetrator group. Was I guilty for what had happened long before my birth? Did I have special responsibilities, and if so – what were they? Back then, I went for an ‘easy’ escape route which many young Germans of my generation chose: I decided that being German was not integral to my sense of self, that little about my views, cultural preferences, tastes and attitudes was particularly German. In order to avoid feeling part of the group that did evil, I decided that I was first and foremost defined by being an individual, not by being German.

But, I was in for a rude awakening when I spent a year abroad in the Australian outback as a teenager. With this new frame of reference of Australian friends available to me, I suddenly realised how different I was from them in many respects, and how similar I was to people I knew in Germany. Grudgingly, I had to acknowledge that I was more ‘German’ than I had wanted to admit. These naïve introspections gave rise to some further questions: What is the relationship

between individual and group? Why do some people care about being members of their ethnic or national group, while others do not? Does identification with one's own ethno-national group necessarily bear the danger of derogation of and violence against other ethno-national outgroups? Even though I might not have been able to put these questions into these words back then, they nonetheless concerned me a great deal, and I decided to study social psychology in search of some answers.

I started studying in Germany, but then went to the Centre for the Study of Group Processes at the University of Kent in Britain (where I did an MSc). I chose Kent for its excellence in the study of the psychology of intergroup relations; and I enjoyed the place so much that I stayed on to do a Ph.D. there. During my studies, I came across many theories which were useful in answering at least some of the questions I had posed to myself. This is not the place for a detailed theoretical review, but I do want to mention two theories which were of particular importance in shaping my thinking: These are Henri Tajfel and John Turner's social identity theory and Gordon Allport's contact hypothesis.

I consider social identity theory my 'intellectual home.' It was first proposed by Henri Tajfel, a Jewish Holocaust survivor. My Ph.D. was supervised by Rupert Brown, who himself was Tajfel's student. Tajfel explicitly addressed questions of how and why individuals come to identify with social groups, and what consequences this identification can have. Unfortunately, the theory also paints a rather dire picture. It proposes that humans want to feel good about themselves, and that they try to achieve a positive sense of self by belonging to groups that are seen as good, strong, and positive. However, 'good,' 'strong,' and 'positive' are always relative. In other words, the ingroup is only 'good' if it is *better* than a

relevant outgroup. This is assumed to be the cause underlying intergroup competition, tension, and – occasionally – war and genocide. Because the processes are described almost as ‘innate’ drivers of human behaviour, the theory can be understood as being pretty fatalistic about the possibility of avoiding or resolving ethno-political conflict.

Fortunately, the basic tenet of Allport’s contact hypothesis is a little more uplifting. This is in essence a suggestion of how intergroup conflict might be reduced. It is thought that first-hand contact between individual members of warring parties can help transform negative intergroup attitudes into positive ones, at least if certain conditions are met during contact. Countless intergroup contact interventions have been conducted, for example in settings such as Northern Ireland. Although most research confirms that contact ‘works,’ some limitations should also be acknowledged. For example, changing attitudes through contact cannot be successful if necessary political settlements are still outstanding, and one can argue that it would even be unethical to try to change attitudes through contact if economic and social injustices have not yet been dealt with in an adequate manner.

Having said all this, the reader is probably still a bit fuzzy about the type of work I actually do. Concretely, how do I spend my time working on these issues within academia? To give a flavour, I will briefly outline a recent research project. As will become clear, my work has taken me quite a bit away from the original questions I posed as a teenager, but some commonalities still exist.

Intergroup relations in Chile. The Mapuche are Chile’s largest indigenous group. Like other indigenous groups on the American continent, since colonisation they have been robbed of their land, they have been discriminated against, and their culture has been suppressed. Even today, they are still

Chile's most deprived group. In recent years, Mapuche have ferociously fought against further infringements of their land rights and lobbied for an improvement of the dire conditions in which many of them still live. Some high profile court cases against Mapuche leaders as well as violent clashes with the police and private security firms (which have led to some casualties) have contributed to the bitterness and intensity of the conflict.

Our research group has designed and evaluated a long-term intervention programme aimed at improving the intergroup relations and mutual understanding between the Mapuche and the non-indigenous Chileans. This work has drawn heavily on Allport's contact hypothesis. However, we were not interested in trying to 'reduce' intergroup conflict in a situation where a discriminated group should be encouraged to rebel against unjust social stratifications – rather than disparaged for doing so. Economic inequalities, discrimination and deprivation were factors of explicit importance during the project. Hence, while the project confirmed that contact interventions in secondary schools can be helpful in improving mutual intergroup attitudes between indigenous and non-indigenous teens, it also looked at the effects of increasing students' knowledge about discrimination against Mapuche and past wrongdoings. Essentially, we found that instilling a certain level of 'white guilt' in non-indigenous students increased their positivity towards 'reparations' and 'affirmative action' policies. However, if levels of guilt were *very* high (i.e., if students felt ashamed) this actually had the opposite effect: students who felt *very* guilty tended to blame the Mapuche for their situation and to be against affirmative action, just like those students who did not feel guilty at all. It was only at the intermediate level of guilt where support for progressive policies grew.

Findings like these can have implications for how these issues should be taught, for instance, in secondary schools.

An important aim of this work was also to raise awareness of the Mapuche's issues both nationally (through several public conferences in Santiago de Chile, discussions with the Ministry of Education, national newspaper coverage of the research) and internationally (through international publications). The work has been extremely gratifying, because it has allowed us to learn more about an intriguing setting which otherwise we might never have heard about, because of the amazing people we got to know during the process, and because we had a real sense that what we were doing will have practical implications and yield tangible benefits, rather than just contributing to the accumulation of knowledge which is written up to gather dust in various libraries.

Advantages and disadvantages to this kind of work. Having provided a 'snippet' to illustrate the kind of research I do, I will conclude with some brief reflections of the advantages and disadvantages to this type of work. When I finished my Ph.D., I was all set on leaving academia to work in a more 'applied' field. I was considering positions with charities, NGOs, and government bodies, particularly in the realm of research, programme analysis and evaluation. However, after testing the water, I changed my mind. As I saw it, there were several drawbacks to such work which I had not considered previously and which made me decide for an academic career after all. I now hold a tenure track position in the psychology department at Royal Holloway, University of London. To be sure, there are certainly advantages and disadvantages to both kinds of work. My intention is not to claim that one is better, but to list some considerations which I found helpful when deciding which career path would suit me, considering personal preferences and inclinations. Some of the issues I raise have to do with the

character of academic versus other types of work (irrespective of the subject focus); some other issues deal directly with ethno-political conflict as a subject matter.

Working on ethno-political conflict as an academic. One issue which concerns all academics is that there is a huge pressure to publish a lot of work, quickly in high quality journals. Unfortunately, however, not all kinds of research have an equal chance to be accepted in good journals. In social psychology, for instance, one stands a much better chance of publishing in prestigious journals if one does theory-driven research into basic psychological social cognition processes, and if one relies on university students and neat experimental paradigms to investigate such issues. If one is instead interested in doing survey or qualitative studies among parties engaged in ethno-political conflict, one tends to get little credit for the fact that such samples are much harder to access, and that the research process is much more difficult and laborious. Hence, as an academic social psychologist interested in ethno-political conflict, one is faced with a constant balancing act between doing intrinsically interesting research at the danger of stalling one's career and doing research that 'sells' well at the danger of boring oneself to death.

Academia vs. 'real-world' jobs. However, there are other, more general considerations about choosing or not choosing to be an academic. For one, academic work can be quite solitary or even lonely. It certainly makes a difference whether one is locked into an office by oneself or whether one is out 'in the field' interacting with others all day long. Furthermore, in academic work one tends to need a lot of self-discipline. Precisely because it is such solitary work, there is rarely someone who would structure one's tasks, set deadlines, and monitor progress. Although there are also advantages to such a level of independence (e.g., the fact that one can work early or

late, take days off during the week and/or work weekends), some people might find it easier to work if discipline is reinforced by an external line-manager.

Working independently vs. working within a big organisational structure. Another distinct advantage of being an academic is that one can set one's own agenda, and pretty much work on whatever takes one's fancy. If I want to work on racism in the United Kingdom, I can. If I fancy researching intergroup conflict in Chile, I can. If I had started to work for a charity or NGO, even in a research position, my subject matter would have been much more prescribed. I also like the fact that I do not have to operate within a huge organisation. It will often be easier to get things off the ground and to see projects through if one operates within a small rather than a large organisational structure, such as the United Nations. Again, however, I think it probably comes down to individual differences which *modus operandi* one prefers.

Nonetheless, there is a flip-side to the coin. In the realm of more applied research, there can be a question about the legitimacy of academic interventions. Applied research can have – and is sometimes specifically designed to have – a practical impact on the research participants and the 'field.' However, academics who are causing such change are not 'authorised' to do so as democratically elected officials or as members of a recognised body like the UN. Most academics will probably quite like the fact that they are free to follow their own ethical codes and act according to their personal political convictions, without having to make allowances for and act according to the philosophy of the employing organisation. However, the fact that these academics can act on their own accord without needing to have their actions checked by an employer or some other outside structure is precisely what can put the legitimacy of their actions onto shaky ground. I, for

one, have done quite a bit of soul-searching in the past about who or what gives me the right to impact social situations with my research.

Challenges and rewards of working on the topic of ethno-political conflict. Finally, I would like to reflect on what I think are some of the challenges and rewards of dealing with the topic of ethno-political conflict as an academic social psychologist. There are two issues I have found particularly frustrating. First, as compared to some other social sciences, social psychological research has had little policy impact. In general, psychologists do not seem to fare well in conveying the applied value of their insights to non-academics. Although it is certainly always difficult to marry high analytical and theoretical standards with applied value, other disciplines seem to have mastered this balancing act somewhat better. Although this fact is nowadays quite widely acknowledged, identified as a problem, and calls to push towards more applicability are becoming more frequent, to date few concrete initiatives are underway to rectify this state of affairs.

The second issue concerns the lack of interdisciplinary work. When dealing with multi-faceted problems such as ethno-political conflict, no doubt different disciplines can contribute their bit to the jigsaw puzzle and help our understanding of the phenomenon. It is my belief that the approach taken by every single discipline can also benefit from at least a rudimentary awareness of activities in neighbouring disciplines to avoid reinventing the wheel and to aid the cross-fertilisation of ideas. However, psychologists tend to only pay lip service to such interdisciplinary efforts, and the responsibility to reach such integration is usually passed on to others, to be completed at some unspecified point in the future. Thankfully, there are now some efforts that seem to

take the interdisciplinary mission more seriously, like the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict.

To sum up, for me the study of ethno-political conflict is an intriguing and rewarding journey. It is intriguing because the issues under investigation are so complex, and it is rewarding because research outcomes can potentially have real applied value and make a tangible practical difference. If psychologists in the future will manage to address the issues of limited policy impact and lack of serious efforts to achieve interdisciplinary cooperation, this will greatly improve the quality of our work. With my own work, I hope to contribute to bringing about such a change.

So, how have my studies and work helped me to answer my initial questions of what it means to be German? To be honest, I am not sure they have, except perhaps in one way: I have learned to think about social encounters analytically, and I think the knowledge I have gained at times helps me to comprehend better my own and other people's behaviour. I will give an example. During the Summer Institute at the Solomon Asch Center, I got to know an Israeli scholar for whom the topic of Germany was very emotionally charged. Also, he had never had close interactions with a German before. One time he was travelling and his plane was diverted and had to land in Frankfurt, Germany. He refused to leave the plane, and was very uncomfortable with being on German soil. Over the course of the Summer Institute, we got to know each other pretty well, and he is now very dear to me, as I know I am to him. When I think about this now, I think of Allport's contact hypothesis and I have to smile. This was contact at work.

However, while it is nice to have acquired such an analytical toolbox, my studies have posed more new questions than they have answered initial ones. To my mind, a very

diagnostic exercise for anyone considering a career in this field would be to ask themselves whether they like better the excitement of discovering new questions, or the satisfaction that comes from having old questions answered. Those who prefer the former will probably be happier in academia.

An Accident of Birth?

Catherine C. Byrne

I was born in 1970, in the midst of apartheid, and grew up in a small town just outside of Johannesburg, South Africa. I am a white South African woman born into an anti-apartheid family. This “accident of birth” – as my mother referred to it on numerous occasions – has a lot to do with who I am today, the educational paths I have been fortunate to wander, and the work I have pursued.

One might describe me at times as somewhat obstinate. This may have something to do with the fact that when I was in second grade, when all the other children in my school (all white students at that point) stood to sing the national anthem at our school assembly, I remained seated. Why? Well, as I explained to the annoyed Catholic nun who initially came over to scold me, my parents had told me not to stand because the anthem did not represent “all the people in our country.” Some of my school friends did not really want to play with me because I would stop them from telling racist jokes or because they thought my parents were “communists.” It was, of course, their parents who had told them that about my parents, as you can be assured that none of us kids knew what a communist was at that point. However, white South Africans who supported the rights of black South Africans were easily given that supposedly menacing label during those times.

My parents took risks in opposing the government of the day and their courage at that time is something I greatly admire. My mother would comfort me and say, “Cath, it is just

an accident of birth. You were born into this family. And they were born into theirs. You believe what we do; they believe what they do.” This simple explanation helped me through the years. However, as I got older and saw my father arguing with the Catholic priest about the way in which the church initially supported the racist regime (and religion was used as a tool of oppression), or when I visited prisons with my mother to help ensure that black activists who had been detained without trial were not “disappeared,” or attended the Delmas Treason Trial hearings of those who fought hard to end apartheid and suffered torture and oppression for doing so, I wondered what hope we had to change racist and dehumanizing attitudes. If attitudes were an “accident of birth” and were such an integral part of socialization (schools, church, and family), how could a system of such racial segregation and oppression by a white minority (just over 10 percent of the population) with military and economic dominance of a black majority (over 80 percent of the population) be dismantled?

Since then, I have wondered how such discrimination and prejudice can be changed. Why do people hold the attitudes they do? Also, who am I to think that others should change theirs and I not change mine? How do we know our beliefs are right or just? I thought perhaps that a bachelor’s degree in psychology would help me answer some of these questions. However, though a rich and wonderful experience, this very individualistic approach to such broad and complex social issues left me questioning. In 1994, during my senior year of college, however, a miracle of sorts occurred. Nelson Mandela, who had been imprisoned since before my birth, but had been released from prison in 1991, became the president of the new South Africa. More questions followed. How would black and white South Africans now live together? What about the vast socioeconomic discrepancies that existed? What about the

atrocities that had been committed during the apartheid regime? Would the truth ever come out about killings, torture and disappearances? Would there be an attempt to cover it all up and move on? How does healing needed on such a grand societal scale occur? Is it possible? Does a change in political and legal dispensation lead to a change in personal attitudes? What happens to racist beliefs?

Following my bachelor's degree in psychology, I continued my search for answers on how we can create a more peaceful world – one in which we can co-exist with varying beliefs. A friend who was the facilitator of a hospice grief group I attended after the death of my mother (neither she nor my father got to see Mandela as president) during my freshman year, had told me about a master's program at the University of Notre Dame Joan B. Kroc Institute in International Peace Studies. I applied and was accepted. Here, I was given an education into the more macro issues of how policy decisions are made, how the United Nations works, what early warning systems can offer in preventing genocide, among other subjects. However, I still found myself asking questions regarding the gap between the individual and societal/international levels of analysis. Why do groups make the decisions they do? Why do people identify with groups they belong to? How do we resolve group conflict? For me, as I say, there was a level in between the individual and the societal that I needed to access to address such issues as “Why do people hold the attitudes they do and how might we change them?”

After I received my master's degree, I lived in Spain for 6 months and South Africa for a year and then decided to pursue a doctorate. My doctoral training in social psychology was demanding, exciting, and incredibly interesting. I learned more about human interaction than I could fully comprehend at the

time. For example, I studied attitudes: their structure, function, whether attitudes actually predict behavior, and ways in which to change them. I came to understand the importance of how we explain the cause of our own and other people's behavior and the "fundamental attribution error" that creates so much trouble in our personal relationships and can impact community, national and international conflict. The fundamental attribution error is the idea that we as human beings tend to attribute others' behavior to internal and dispositional factors with little or no regard for the influence of the situation and external factors on their decisions, choices and behavior.

It was easy to look at the South African conflict from a primarily race based analysis, but of course what drove the conflict in many ways was the capitalist system and a striving for socioeconomic dominance by the white minority. For instance, how did I as a white South African deal with the fact that by merely being white in South Africa I was a beneficiary of the education, housing, political, and economic systems that were denied to a majority of the population? A more sociological analysis of culture, structures and the systems that upheld them was beneficial. Social theory and critical realism in particular allowed for a view of reality I had not considered much prior to that point in time.

Sometimes the purely theoretical emphasis of the Ph.D. program concerned me, as I was impatient to apply what I was learning. However, after some conversations with the chair of our program we recognized that it was possible for me to "carve out" a more conflict analysis focused, applied dissertation topic. I realize now that it is important to shape one's education and not be limited by the bounds of the program itself. Over the years people change and grow.

Therefore, looking for alternative or additional sources that would complement one's training is a good idea.

In time, I completed my doctoral coursework and began to consider dissertation topics. The war in Kosovo was going on and the UN Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia was beginning its work. After talking with my academic advisor, I realized I wanted to understand how perpetrators of acts of violence legitimized to themselves and others the need for the acts they committed. What are the justifications, excuses and apologies perpetrators offer for such atrocities? How do victims and survivors react to such explanations? Thus began my dissertation project.

I decided to study perpetrators' explanations provided at the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), as the transcripts were available online. However, a year before I had heard about the Summer Institute offered at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict at the University of Pennsylvania and applied. I attended the institute that summer and was exposed to more explanations for the causes of conflict: issues of language, access to and competition for land and resources, and the importance of political, social and religious identities. That summer I drafted my dissertation research proposal that was to be considered for funding. I decided to expand my study to survivors' experiences of the TRC after realizing I might have a grant to cover the cost of fieldwork and to pay participants in the study. I wondered about what led survivors to testify before the TRC, their responses to contact with their own perpetrators through the commission, and their reactions to varying perpetrator explanations or "accounts" for wrongdoing.

I was fortunate to spend two months in South Africa in 2002 conducting the project. I interviewed 30 survivors of human rights violations who had provided a statement to the

TRC. The first survivor I interviewed (when we talked about the fact I would make a cup of tea for each person before they began the interview) pointed out that most black South Africans had probably never had a white person make a cup of tea for them. This simple realization and all it signified was only the beginning.

The project came with many challenges that ranged from logistical, to methodological, to ethical. An example of a methodological challenge around translation that I did not anticipate was that of sitting with the survivor and the translator as they cried together about what the survivor had just said (but was not yet translated) regarding the brutal hacking of her child. One of the men I interviewed had many years before been arrested on my fifteenth birthday and taken to prison in my home town. Some years following the interview when I saw him again he quipped that while I was “eating cup cakes” on my birthday he was in prison. The quantitative results of the accounts study were written up in the dissertation and the qualitative responses to TRC participation summarized in an article. Additional analysis on the need for and impact of survivors’ own perpetrators’ explanations is ongoing, as is a qualitative analysis of the reasons why survivors viewed justifications, excuses and apologies differently.

Following a one-year post-doctoral fellowship at the Solomon Asch Center, I applied for an academic tenure track job and was thrilled to accept a position at the University of California Santa Cruz in their social psychology department. Since starting in 2004-2005 I have taught a class of 300 students each quarter, among others. It is exciting to see students exposed to issues of stereotyping, categorization, conformity, and obedience. I thoroughly enjoy teaching – though it takes a lot of my energy. Generally, due to the

pressure to publish and the time spent writing, I find being an academic somewhat of an isolating job, which is something I had not anticipated. I thought there would be more collegial discussions on intriguing topics – over tea perhaps – however, everyone is busy with teaching, research and service work. Academia is in some ways just another example of a large corporation with various stakeholders holding varying degrees of power. Recently, I spent a morning mediating between student protestors, the university, and military recruiters. The students were protesting the presence of military recruiters on our campus. Suddenly, and in an impromptu manner, my mediation training was called to the fore. One never knows what bricks one lays years before will be those that come in handy later.

The year I began teaching a peace psychology seminar with 30 students, John Kerry was running against George W. Bush in the November election. On the first day of class when I asked students what others thought of their taking a class on “peace psychology”, one student commented that her father had said, “Why are you taking a Pro-Kerry class?” At the time I laughed and indicated what a sad statement that was about what a Pro-Bush course might focus on. I think the past years have unfortunately proven her father right, considering Bush’s wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and the recent support of Israel’s illegal and disproportionate attack on Lebanon.

I actually cringed when I first heard the term “peace psychologist.” The thought of identifying myself that way seemed so presumptuous. I was concerned that I would have to live up to that title. When I discuss interpersonal conflict with those dear to me, and when they ask why I do not apply the conflict resolution skills I learned in school to my personal life, I joke that I do not like to take my work home with me. But in all seriousness, the term peace psychologist is a

statement of hope in focusing my work as someone trained in social psychology, on issues of peace and conflict. I recently became involved with an organization that tries to disseminate important findings within psychology that can be of help in contexts of violence and conflict – Psychologists for Social Responsibility. I encourage you to learn more about the organization. Furthermore, for those interested in conflict and peace, Division 48 of the American Psychological Association (Society for the Study of Violence, Peace and Conflict) may be of interest.

Honestly, I still struggle with how my current work contributes to decreasing the potential for societal violence and to the lessening of conflict. I generally have more questions and not so many answers. As I started to think about suggestions I might offer to those wanting to become involved in studying and resolving issues of conflict, I realized that this might imply that I had figured out my own path, and that it had no detours. However, in my view, there is no set way in which to enter this field, no set program with particular steps to be taken. Instead, it may just be an accident of birth, as my mother used to say. Most people draw on their life experience, and, if they are lucky, discover what most ignites their passion and has the potential to contribute in some way to the well being of others. It is my hope you will do the same.

Ethnicity and Politics: An Outsider's Perspective

Britt Cartrite

Perhaps paradoxically, what continues to drive my interest in ethnopolitical mobilization beyond the topic itself is my own sense of having no “ethnic” identity and, therefore, being keenly interested in something that is beyond my experience and is yet seemingly so deeply rooted in the experience of so many others. For me, not to dismiss the considerable debate surrounding the nature and origins of ethnicity, an ethnic identity is an identity that defines a group, provides a history and homeland, and engenders a sense of communal bonding derived from a sense of belonging primarily through descent. Ethnopolitical mobilization is the process by which an ethnic identity becomes the basis for political activism, which may but need not include violence on behalf of the group.

My namesakes, the Cartwrights, came from England to the United States around 1800. Since then the Cartwrights (and the later Cartrite branch from which I descend) intermarried with others in the United States, mainly of European origin. To my knowledge, my lineage includes people from England, Wales, Ireland, Germany, Norway and Italy, as well as someone of either Apache or Comanche descent. Indeed, I could not say with any degree of certainty which of these heritages represents some sort of plurality in my genetic makeup. Thus, my personal “myth of common descent” is so highly mixed as to give little in the way of ethnic identification; I am, in Michael Walzer’s phrase, an “unhyphenated American.”

Similarly, my sense of homeland is ambiguous. I grew up in the suburbs of Denver, a new area in a young city, in a young state with no evidence of continuous human occupation prior to the founding of the city. My parents are from West Texas, but my great-great grandfather Cartrite and his brother (the two responsible for the change in spelling of my family name) homesteaded there after spending time in Iowa and, earlier, North Carolina during the American Civil War. The other branches of my family (Powells, Smauleys, and Gents) have similar stories. Thus, I cannot claim to call any one place my homeland.

I am, however, an American. Many suggest that this is itself an ethnic identity, although I would disagree. In addition to the problem of most Americans hyphenating with some more traditionally ethnic prefix, which suggests that American is itself not a sufficient, or at least satisfying, ethnic identity, the popular “myth of common descent” in the United States is that we are almost all descended from immigrants. This vast and diverse territory was, in the dominant collective memory, only recently “settled” and thus does not reflect a more traditional “homeland” as the place from time out of mind where one’s people lived. True, there are tendencies in the American identity that approach ethnic identity, including a propensity for English language, Christianity (particularly Protestantism), and being of European descent. However, there is considerable diversity even within these categories, with the exception of English as one’s primary language, which reflects the story we tell of ourselves: that anyone from anywhere can come to this country and become an American. Americans are, I believe, truly an imagined community, although imagined does not suggest insignificance or ambiguity.

Although I have a wide range of intellectual interests, including questioning ethnicity and identity, my academic pursuits have been more narrowly focused on political science and, to a somewhat lesser degree, history. My route to an interest in ethnic politics was typical of many graduate students trolling for a topic: I stumbled across an interesting set of questions and opted to explore the phenomena for my dissertation.

A number of factors piqued my interest in this. Personally and intellectually I am interested in people and places around the globe and across time. The array of possible cases of ethnopolitical mobilization certainly allows and indeed perhaps compels me to look beyond my own time and neighborhood to understand the topic. Then, of course, there is the seriousness of the topic itself: ethnic identity is seemingly at the root of so much violence. Therefore, exploring the process of ethnic identification and mobilization will, at a minimum, provide some understanding into one of the significant factors contributing to violence across the globe and, perhaps, may help provide insight into methods for avoiding, ameliorating, or healing the effects of ethnic conflict.

In addition, the process of ethnopolitical mobilization appears to be an extremely complicated one, involving a wide array of factors at the personal, inter-personal, state, and international levels and including elements of history, economics, geography, politics, psychology, anthropology, sociology, and likely others. Although as an academic I am narrowly specialized, I appreciate the necessity of interdisciplinary study for questions such as ethnic conflict; indeed my time at the Asch Center and teaching at a small college both have enabled me to collaborate with colleagues outside political science.

My collaborations at the Asch Center pushed my thinking about ethnopolitical mobilization in an unexpected direction: the study of complexity (or chaos theory), which explores the dynamics producing phenomena at one level as a function of the almost random and necessarily unknowable interactions of units at a lower level that themselves are not necessarily antecedents to the phenomena. Ethnic identification, ethnopolitical mobilization, and ethnic conflict are best understood as phenomena that may occur, rather than at some level resulting from inevitable, linear processes. There are likely many possible “paths” to the phenomena, varying not only in terms of the factors involved but also in contextual conditions. Furthermore, and perhaps reflecting common sense, as these processes unfold they shape the environment and institutions in which they occur. To date most applications of complexity analysis have been limited to, especially, biology (in neo-Darwinian evolution), although complexity plays an increasing role in physics, chemistry, meteorology, and elsewhere. Anthropologists and economists increasingly apply complexity theory in the social sciences, and I see real promise in taking complexity as the appropriate framework for describing and explaining ethnopolitical mobilization. This represents the theme that at present unites the various strands of my research.

However, in my research and among my colleagues I have had the privilege to meet many people who articulate clear ethnic identities. Indeed, many of the people I have met are themselves involved in various ways with ethnic movements and ethnic conflict. For me this presents a dual challenge. First, as is likely true when any academic meets a practitioner, there is a question of the relevance of the academic pursuit: in particular, meeting people who deal with conflict directly through their work or personal activism, can be humbling

despite the generosity and kindness many of these people demonstrate. It is easy to slip into the self-doubt of “I only teach/research, but they *do*.” However, I have found that practitioners often appreciate the distance of the academic perspective that hopefully allows the academic to see the forest beyond the trees.

Second, I find that my interest in ethnic politics (despite my lack of a hyphenated identity) generates an expectation among people who identify strongly with an ethnic group, whether academics, practitioners, or individuals I meet during research, that I view them as curiosities for study rather than as individuals. For many, ethnic activism is something of a vocation, a deeply ingrained cause they commit themselves to, while I seek to understand ethnopolitical mobilization from the outside. While I hope this distance allows me a certain degree of objectivity to offset the lack of a deep-rooted understanding of ethnicity, at least initially I am treated with skepticism.

Beyond allowing me to entertain my intellectual curiosity, travel to fascinating places, meet interesting people, and study a wide array of times and places, and despite the two main difficulties outlined above, there are other rewards to my work. Most of my students are from rural Michigan and many have never flown on an airplane, let alone traveled to another country or even beyond the American Midwest. Yet, like most Americans, they hyphenate their identities, particularly with Scandinavian references. To teach about ethnopolitical mobilization is to expose them to countries and situations with which they are unfamiliar and, hopefully, their understanding and appreciation of the world expands. But problematizing ethnicity yields a deeper benefit, albeit among fewer students: to raise questions about their “natural” hyphenation and to then explore the implications of that kind of identity on political and social behavior engenders in some students a

critical perspective. I hope this leads them to approach their understanding of their world in a new way. While I expect there are many possible routes to developing critical thinking in students, I find that ethnic politics as a topic allows this better than some others. And, perhaps, these students will themselves go on to make a contribution in the understanding of and solution to ethnic conflict.

In many respects, my career path is typical of academics and, as a result, perhaps does not yield new insights for someone interested in an academic career. I would offer, however, some advice that may be of some use. First, for those interested in ethnopolitical mobilization, take time to get to know practitioners. While my own research focuses on both political activists and “members” of ethnic communities, I would include as practitioners those who involve themselves in, particularly, ethnic conflict, including people dealing with refugees, those working to aid victims of conflict, and individuals working in post-conflict situations “on the ground.” Their experiences and insights, while particular when as academics we seek to be general, force the academic inquiry to constantly be tested against “the real world,” making for better study and teaching. Second, seek out resources relative to the topic but beyond one’s narrower academic field: the Solomon Asch Center in this respect is an exceptional place to bring academics of many disciplines together to evaluate and critique each other’s work. Social phenomena are complex, and it is prudent to suggest that no one academic field will sufficiently capture the range of factors and dynamics involved. While interdisciplinary collaboration is difficult, engaging with academics from other disciplines should not be.

I suppose the expected response to “what do I do” would be to state my profession: I have been a professor of political science at Alma College, a small liberal arts college in central

Michigan, since the fall of 2005. However, my professional résumé represents merely the means by which I do what I do. I have been and continue to be intensely interested about the world around me. And, as part of my attempt to make sense of the world, I try to pass along the knowledge I gain along the way. Thus, at the root, “what I do” is to learn and teach in an ongoing, dynamic process. My being a professor is, therefore, both a natural fit with my desire to continue learning and teaching as well as a luxury. It is a profession rather than a job.

Fathers, the Dinner Table, and Ethnopolitical Conflict

Donald G. Ellis

I have always been interested in matters related to politics and conflict because I sprang forth from the breast of liberalism. My father was a Jewish labor organizer and life-long liberal who was not going to let his young son escape lectures on the litany of horrors that befell the world. Our dinner table crackled with discussions of politics and events of the day and you had better be able to hold your own.

My earliest recollection of an international conflict was the controversy over Quemoy and Matsu. If you can believe it, my father actually explained this to an eight-year old in 1955. Quemoy and Matsu were two islands off the coast of mainland China that were held by the Nationalists of Taiwan, but claimed by the Chinese Communists. The controversy over these islands actually sparked Secretary of State Dulles to suggest using nuclear weapons against the Communist Chinese on the mainland. All of the political nuances notwithstanding, my father was actually a little sympathetic toward the Chinese Communists. After all, dad was a good leftist. I made the mistake a few times of actually mentioning Quemoy and Matsu to my buddies at school. I quickly learned something about family differences.

From the rigors of geopolitics I moved to the struggles between labor and management. Dad was most responsible for organizing restaurant workers. His tales of greedy bosses and

oppressed employees stayed with me for a long time. Even though unions have fallen out of favor, and my own politics have matured considerably, I maintain a reserve of rage for overcompensated CEOs and poorly treated employees.

There was a strong sense of social justice in the house. My father would tell stories about picket lines and organizing waitresses and my sister and I were always shocked that anyone could be treated so callously. Actually, dad was responsible for improving the lives of many people. He instituted forms of employee representation based on occupational identity, control over the labor supply, portable rights and benefits, and peer determination of performance standards and workplace discipline. In contemporary idiom, he “empowered” restaurant workers to have more control over the definition and evaluation of their work.

All this time I was developing an acute sense of group distinctiveness. For better or worse, my ability to categorize people as members of groups (e.g., “employees,” “owners,” “communists,” “nationalists,” “democrats,” “republicans”) was improving. And as a teenager I was developing my own social identity including cognitive processes associated with group membership. Self-categorizing and making sharp group distinctions can be dangerous business. It can lead to rigid definitions of “ingroups” and “outgroups” that result in racism, discrimination, and biased judgments. Still, I managed to escape the darker side of group identity and gravitate toward an interest in how these group differences could be reconciled.

The Jewish Question

My sense of social justice was both bolstered and challenged by the Jewish question. The Jewish question, in this case, was how to reconcile my Jewish identity and defense of Israel with the political aspirations of the Palestinians. My

father was not particularly religious or observant but he took great pride in his Judaism, in Jewish history, literature, and culture. He thought the State of Israel was a modern miracle; he could not believe the Jews actually had their own country. My upbringing as an American Jew included the typical mixture of bewilderment at the Holocaust and pleasure in cultural distinctiveness. Our family represented many of the cultural attitudes about being Jewish which included beliefs that our own group was vulnerable and subject to historical injustices as well as a sense of cultural and intellectual uniqueness. My chest puffed with pride in 1965 when Sandy Koufax requested not to pitch in Game 1 of the World Series because it fell on Yom Kippur.

But in later years Israel became a challenge. It was clear that the establishment of the state of Israel had displaced another cultural group and this displacement was going to haunt Israel for decades. How does one square the tension between Jewish self identity as steeped in traditions of justice and mercy with the political reality of an oppressed group (Palestinians and Israeli Arabs) suffering at the hands of the Jewish state? It is politically and definitionally difficult, if not impossible, for Israel to be a liberal democracy and still privilege one ethno-religious group. My own thinking about group differences was crystallized by the problem of Israel. There is a quip that a conservative is a liberal who has been mugged. In other words, one's sense of fairness and justice for all dissipates in the face of personal threat. I was mugged by Israel. As a college student in the 1960s I never met a minority group that was not oppressed. I held the standard Marxist opinions about how group differences and disparities were the result of structural inequality. But then I started to defend the state of Israel. All of my perceptions and attitudes changed. I could no longer see the perspective of the "other." My

accounts for group differences shifted from abstract Marxist structuralism to individual and group psycho-cultural explanations.

In the 1960s some faculty and students expressed an interest in peace studies. Until then war and political realism were the default approaches to politics and problem-solving. But it became clear after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that the world was a precarious place, and thus appeared a minor shift in intellectual predilections. The failure of socialists and liberal internationalists to prevent war motivated people to begin to look for a science of peace. Scholars and practitioners searched for something more than simplistic moral passivism. Initiatives in social psychology were of particular interest to me. The frustration-aggression hypothesis and Kurt Lewin's work in group conflict were influential for future issues in conflict resolution. Kenneth Boulding was a minor guru at the time and he would later help create the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. I always found the work of early peace theorists such as Boulding, John Burton, Johan Galtung, and Herb Kelman to be encouraging even if their perspectives no longer fully resonate with my own.

Communication

Clearly, the study of conflict resolution in general and ethnopolitical conflict in particular are most dependent on the traditions of political science and psychology. In the early days of peace studies, communication was considered the province of social psychology, and issues in media were embryonic because technology was undeveloped. Moreover, no one studied communication per se; that is, no one was doing close analysis of language and communicative interaction. In the 1970s I applied the Bales tradition of interaction analysis to various aspects of group behavior. This was a research

approach in psychology that focused on the analysis of sequences of communicative acts rather than psychological constructs “inside the head” of individuals. I started studying communication and conflict by defining the function of verbal messages and then tracking the sequential patterns of communication that emerged over time. I was concerned with the social interaction aspect of language, not with formal grammatical and linguistic properties of language. This research tradition considers communicative action and meaning as located *in interaction and relationships*, not in the heads of individuals. I tried out various theories that explained behavior as the result of a system of interaction (a communication theory) rather than a cognitive construct (a social psychological theory).

Later, colleagues and I applied these communication principles to discussions between groups in intractable conflicts, namely, Israelis and Palestinians. I remain convinced that conflict resolution must include relationship transformation and this can only occur within a healthy and productive communication process. There will always be groups with rigid boundary definitions, distorted perceptions of themselves and others, and great gaps of differences among one another, but only communication can transcend these boundaries, only communication can reach across these gaps between groups and close them up. There is a saying that “conflict resolution begins after peace treaties are signed.” This reflects the idea that deep relationship change is the only way to truly achieve peace. And even if this is not always achievable, and even naïve, it is the people-to-people contacts and relationships rather than government agreements that matter most.

My own thinking and teaching about ethnopolitical conflict has been guided by a few principles. I have been

teaching for many years about such matters, and these principles inform my teaching. I have found that students are very interested in the issues. Some might shy away from abstract political analyses of conflicts between groups, but they perk up when confronted with a cultural and communicative clash of ideas and perspectives. I have used transcripts, video, the internet, and news reports to analyze conflicts and these sources have sustained my teaching over the years. I use the various media to flesh out the issues and show how the media contribute to differing perspectives and can play a role in both aggravating and pacifying conflict. Many sources of information (e.g., news reports, propaganda) portray ethnic conflict as a fury reminiscent of pack animals going after raw meat. I explain to students that this only encourages a defeatist attitude and this prompts them to think about solutions and conflict resolution.

Communication in all its complexity is central to the understanding and resolution of conflict. The media, for example, can shape politics simply by calling something a “war.” This makes killing that much more justifiable and increases the intensity with which we understand the conflict. Were the perpetrators of 9/11 “criminals” or “terrorists”? What the media calls them will influence political decisions in no small way. In fact, a state can declare war and amass all the relevant legislative approvals, but the war is not “real” until it is the subject of international news. Exploring the match between the logic of the media and political logic is central to my teaching about conflict.

I also use the ethnopolitical conflict framework to teach about media plurality and literacy. In other words, the media vary in their ability to transmit credible information and one is media literate to the extent that he or she understands the strengths and weaknesses of various media. People get less of

their news from traditional sources (e.g., print media, newspapers) and are increasingly influenced by bloggers, individual web sites, niche publications, videos, and the internet. These do not exist in isolation but as part of the social and political world. It is easy to “blame the media,” and sometimes rightfully so, but the entire media system is too complex and multifaceted for conspiracies and simplistic blame.

Communication is particularly important when you begin with the assumption that conflict is the result of social processes and not an elemental property of groups. I increasingly teach about biological theories but still describe group problems as the result of socially constructed relationships. Ethnicity and religious identification are common categories of ascription. Students are highly identified with their own ethnic and social categories and such identification is a powerful classroom resource.

Communication approaches to conflict resolution for difficult ethnopolitical conflicts offer some of the safest and most realistic ways to control and manage deadly conflicts. They play a key role in benign intervention and community-building that is necessary for conflicting parties to strengthen their own resolution capacities. Conflict, like disease, is debilitating and sickens the body politic. Moreover, just when one disease is under control it mutates and takes on new forms. But the real lessons from my family dinner table were not about international relations or the petty politics of why one group hates another. Rather, the lesson was to refuse to surrender to intimidation, bitterness, and corruption, and to strive for goodwill rather than intolerance and prejudice.

A Perspective from a Cultural Psychologist Searching for Meaning

Adam B. Cohen

I grew up in Northeast Philadelphia in a conservative Jewish home. My upbringing was somewhat traditionally religious, and my parents sent me to elementary school at the Solomon Schechter Day School and to high school at the Akiba Hebrew Academy. These are both private, Jewish institutions, and so it is little surprise that my research program has emphasized how religion colors many social and personality processes, such as moral judgment and forgiveness. However, why did I become a research psychologist, and not a rabbi? Why do I work on moral judgment and forgiveness, and not other aspects of the psychology of religion, such as dietary laws, or those related to ritual purity?

I don't have good answers to these questions, but I think that may have to do with my unusual career trajectory. After high school, I went to Dickinson College, in Carlisle, PA. Dickinson is a liberal arts college, and I hence had the wonderful opportunity there to study different fields and to think about ways to integrate them – I was able to complete a double major in psychology and Judaic studies. Within Judaic studies, my advisor, Dr. Ned Rosenbaum, acting as a true mentor, creatively worked with me to build upon my elementary and high school training, and allow me to develop connections between my study of religion and my study of psychology.

Within the psychology major, I had varied research interests, and ended up taking 17 classes for the major, although I only needed to take 10 or so. I did this for different reasons. One is that I was genuinely interested in different fields of psychology, including, particularly, social psychology, behavioral psychology, sensation and perception, and clinical psychology. A second reason, though, is that I discovered that the more classes you take in a particular field, the easier they get. You may have had some of the material in another course. You may have had the professor in another course. So your grades will get a little better each time. Now, when I teach a course called Introduction to Psychology, I tell my students not to do this. I tell them to broaden their horizons and challenge themselves by taking courses in different areas. Someone probably gave me this same advice, but I doubt I listened.

After college, I worked for a year at the Monell Chemical Senses Center at the University of Pennsylvania, studying smell and taste. This work was very interesting to me, and I began graduate school at Cornell studying biopsychology. More particularly, I worked on chemical communication among golden hamsters, with Dr. Robert Johnston. As interested as I was (and am) in such basic questions within comparative and evolutionary psychology, I realized after a year or so that I did not want my obituary to state that I solved the problem of hamster pheromones. I wanted to work on problems that were more personally meaningful. I thus took the opportunity when it arose to transfer to Dr. Paul Rozin's lab at the University of Pennsylvania, and Paul ended up supervising my doctoral dissertation and post-doc at the Asch Center, and remains a collaborator and friend today.

When I arrived in Paul's lab, I had to figure out what I would study. I had a background in religion, smell research,

animal research, and other fields. Paul is most famous for his work on disgust, purity, and contagion, all ideas that have deep cultural significance. For me, problems that have deep cultural significance deal with issues that are truly important in how individuals and groups live their lives. Often, it seems to me that psychology focuses too much on problems that don't really matter to anybody but the few people that do the research, and don't even make any difference outside of the very specific context in which the research is done. For example, some psychological effects don't show up unless you run the experiment in exactly the same way every time, and in a way that doesn't mimic real life. So when I arrived, my first discussions with Paul were about menstrual impurity in different religions and cultures. Deep cultural frameworks about purity and contagion probably underlie as diverse a set of practices and feelings as the Hindu caste system, Jewish dietary laws, and notions of spiritual purity. There are some important understudied questions of real cultural significance here – questions that really matter to people and affect how they live their lives.

While Paul and I were having fascinating discussions about purity, disgust, and contagion, I was noticing something about the reading I was doing in cultural psychology. Almost the entire field of cultural psychology focuses on a small number of psychological distinctions (such as between individualism and collectivism) among a small number of cultures (North Americans compared to East or Southeast Asians). And a few things came together for me all at once. First, I concluded that the existing body of work on cultural psychology did not tell us *why* North Americans were different from Asians. I realized it could be differences in country of origin, but it could also be differences in religion. Second, I hypothesized that, even within one country, there were

meaningful cultural differences. Religion, I came to feel, was one such source of cultural differences. For example, Jews and Christians in the United States can be seen as culturally different from each other. And then I realized that I may have been in a somewhat unique position, owing to my background and interests, to explore questions about religion and culture. Most important, such research would be personally meaningful to me since I felt it could contribute to conversations about ethnopolitical conflict. As a result, much of my research has come to focus on issues of how religion affects moral judgment and forgiveness.

I have argued that religious culture is a crucial influence on moral development and I have theorized that the individualistic focus of American moral judgment draws its roots, in part, from Protestantism. In this vein, one of my programs of research has examined Jewish-Protestant differences in the evaluation of thoughts about moral or immoral actions. Protestant doctrine considers thoughts about immoral actions to be as morally relevant as the actions themselves (consider Jimmy Carter's revelation that he had committed adultery in his heart.) In Judaism, however, thinking about an immoral action does not generally have the moral status of the action itself.

In psychological experiments, I told people stories about a person who was thinking about doing something bad. For example, I described a married person who was attracted to someone he works with, and sometimes thinks about having an affair with her. Then I asked my research participants to explain their reactions to this person. Has he done something wrong? Or are such thoughts alright, so long as they are not acted upon? I found that Jews actually did consider thoughts about various immoral actions to be much less morally important than do Protestants. Protestants considered it bad

for a person just to think about having an affair, or hurting an animal, even if you don't act on those thoughts in any way. Although Protestants consistently rate thoughts about immoral actions to be more likely to be acted upon than do Jews, this is not why Protestants attribute more moral status to private thoughts. A married man thinking about having an affair with Julia Roberts was judged much more negatively by Protestants, even though he will probably never get to act on these thoughts. Furthermore, I was interested to find that Jews will pay attention to *some* thoughts. Jews and Protestants both give a person a lot of moral credit for thinking about doing something extremely moral, such as giving a large amount of money to charity.

This work on the influence of religious group on moral judgment, initially begun as part of my dissertation, prompted me to become interested in religion and forgiveness. Following the defense of my dissertation, I began work on the views of forgiveness in different religious groups. Like the work on moral judgment, I argued that members of different religions show specific and important differences in forgiveness processes. For example, Judaism and Protestantism both consider forgiveness to be a virtue. In Judaism, however, certain offenses are seen as being beyond forgiveness because they are too severe, because the offender must repent to obtain forgiveness, and only the victim has the ability to forgive. For example, consider the act of committing a murder. This is a severe offense. Also, the murderer can never repent toward the victim, and the victim does not have the ability to forgive the murdered. For these reasons, the Jewish perspective is that murder can never be forgiven, even by God. For Christians, however, God can forgive all sins.

Like my work on moral judgment, I wondered whether these differences in religious teachings would affect how Jews

and Christians would make their own judgments about forgiveness. In one set of studies I conducted along with Paul Rozin, Lina Chermas, and Ari Malka, Jews agreed that there are limits to forgiveness, but Protestants did not. Furthermore, Jews were less likely to forgive certain offenses, compared to Protestants, but only if these offenses were especially severe, if they were asked to forgive for an offense that happened to another person, and if the person who did the harmful action had not asked the actual victim for forgiveness. Examples of offenses which the Jews were not willing to forgive included the Holocaust, and also offenses that had nothing to do with being Jewish. For example, in one story, someone copies your best friend's paper and turns it in, causing your friend to be accused of cheating and fail the assignment. Jews find this offense to be beyond forgiveness, but Christians do not.

This work feels meaningful to me because it speaks to important but neglected influences of religion on forgiveness, which is crucial to understand in the aftermath of ethno-political conflict. Should we recommend to victimized individuals and groups that they should forgive and reconcile, without regard to their cultural and religious views of the limits of forgiveness? I would argue that it is important to appreciate these deeply imbedded cultural notions about the possibility and limits of forgiveness. Rozin, Malka, Chermas and I concluded our paper by considering the possibility that not forgiving may be religiously justified, and perhaps even healthy on certain levels, for certain offenses, and for certain individuals or groups. Among Jews, for example, not forgiving for the Holocaust might promote Jewish solidarity, although this benefit must, of course, be weighed against the possible disadvantages of withholding forgiveness.

Study of the limits to forgiveness for offenses like the Holocaust feels especially meaningful to me because I believe

that the Holocaust is a (or the) defining element of Jewish identity. How to understand and react to the Holocaust – on an individual and cultural level – as a part of the Jewish experience is to me the greatest challenge facing Jews. One reaction I have often seen is that the Holocaust is the worst example of man's inhumanity to man in the history of the world, and that no other group can ever understand or have the right to tell Jews how to think or feel. Part of me thinks this is true – a large part.

But another (and perhaps not even incompatible) reaction is that Jews can use such experiences as a platform from which to empathize with other groups who have been victimized and to understand, as few groups have, the challenges in dealing with such tragedy. It may even be precisely because of the Jewish feeling that no group has suffered as much that Jews can be of unparalleled help to other groups who have suffered, and can understand their experiences and emotions in a unique way.

I hope this is what I have done in my research.

Serendipity

Christian Leuprecht

Upon finishing high school, I strove to become a millionaire by age 28. I figured that the obvious way to get there was an undergraduate degree in commerce. I had been accepted to the most selective university in Canada. I figured that I must be smart, very smart. Since I was so smart, I did not really have to work or do my readings. Just going to class should suffice. As it turns out, I was not quite smart enough. Not smart enough, in any event, to score high enough in my first-year math and economics courses to be accepted into the commerce program.

Instead, I stuck with the courses at which I excelled: politics and French. This decision was much to the chagrin of my mother: “What in the world are you going to do with a degree in political science?” It would end up taking me the better part of ten years to convince my mother that I could actually earn a living in this way. In the process, I would also end up learning an important lesson, one I did not come to recognize until some years later: Stick with what you do well and you are likely to succeed.

I was living in Toronto, Canada at the time – perhaps the world’s most diverse metropolis insofar as ethnic, linguistic, and religious pluralism are concerned. As I was passing by one of the city’s busiest downtown intersections one day, I witnessed an exchange between a man standing on a corner protesting vociferously against allegedly anti-Tamil practices of the government in Colombo, Sri Lanka. Judging by the man’s

complexion, he was a Tamil himself. Meanwhile, another man had started berating him – in clear yet broken English. In other words, that man was an immigrant himself. The man speaking in broken English was telling the protester in no uncertain terms that this was Canada and that he had better check his grievances at the border rather than importing them, for he had come to this country precisely to get away from all this conflict.

For a novice convert to the study of politics, that was food for thought. Why is it that in a city as diverse as Toronto interethnic relations were relatively harmonious? Moreover, why were communities getting on fairly well which, by virtue of their ethnic background religion, language, or culture, would have been at odds with one another in their country of origin? That made me think back to my childhood. Why was my city of birth, Munich, comparably homogeneous relative to Toronto? How might one explain that attending school in one place, my friends basically all looked alike, whereas in Canada my acquaintances came from so many different backgrounds and many – like me – had not even been born in Canada?

Despite Toronto's deep diversity, people, by and large, treat each other with equal dignity and respect. That contrasted sharply with the five years I had spent in the Middle East where differential treatment had clearly been a function of a person's ethnic, religious, and regional origin, with the worst treatment reserved for South-East Asian guest labourers. My time in Kuwait – where I had come to live as a result of my father's line of work – was also formative insofar as shortly after we had moved there, Iraq declared war on Iran. For weeks on end, I would awake to the bluest sky, and the blackest horizon. The Iraqi oil installations at Basra were but 60 kilometres from where I lived. When they were shelled, the horizon turned into a solid black canvass. But why *do*

countries go to war? Why would they inflict such suffering on their populations and spend so much money on destroying one another rather than on improving the lives of their citizens?

The most glaring contradiction, however, I found in Canada itself. Why would an entire province – Quebec – strive to secede from the same country to which people the world over were flocking to find work and be treated fairly well, especially as compared to the treatment they might receive in many other societies?

Evidently, politics mattered. These phenomena occupied a good deal of my undergraduate time. In the process, I made another curious discovery. Many of the people who seemed to know best how to solve the situation with Quebec only spoke English. Could they really understand the grievances of Quebecers, the majority of whom have French as their mother tongue? For my part, I decided I had to learn French to understand both parties' perspectives on the dispute.

After spending a summer in Quebec, I decided to further my linguistic skills by studying in France. There I became aware of another conflict. During my year in France not once was I confronted by the police. Yet my friends whose ancestry was visibly North African would have their papers checked by the police on a regular basis.

From the philosopher Aristotle I had learned that patterns matter. I had stumbled upon two of them. On the one hand, majorities who control the institutions of a given state make a habit of treating minorities differently to the point of perceiving them as a threat. On the other hand, minorities seem to have misgivings about the state in which they reside – or at least about how they are treated by that state.

I now work for Canada's only military university. Securing a job at the Royal Military College of Canada was a conscientious choice. I wanted to teach peace and conflict,

civics and society, politics and government at an institution where most of the students would actually end up directly applying what they learn. Presently, many of the officer cadets I teach will find themselves in one of the world's hotspots. Their mandate will be some form of enforcing peace: keeping combatants apart, re-establishing security in countries that have been ravaged by war, and assisting in getting the people, their country, and their government back on track by providing security, humanitarian, economic and development aid, and by enhancing the indigenous capacity to build democratic institutions and a sustainable peace. My task is to help them understand why politics, government, and society in Canada seem to work, so that they may be better able to fulfill their peace-support mandates abroad.

Some of my former students have ended up wounded and even killed. That, in turn, has motivated me to think more about what might be done to warn about the impending escalation of violence in a conflict. I am not just interested in helping my government save money which can thereby be freed up for other purposes. I am also cognizant of how privileged I am simply by virtue of where I was born, where I grew up, and what I have experienced. As someone who believes that every human life is equally valuable, I feel a sense of obligation to help those less fortunate than I to safeguard their lives and improve their circumstances. Understanding more about conflict is a step in that direction.

I have become more interested in making a difference in recent years. My research interests used to be primarily academic. But I have to give credit to my friends from anthropology who have convinced me that research involving human beings ought never be an end in itself. For human beings, as Immanuel Kant contended, should never be treated as means to an end. In framing and designing my research,

then, I have come to ask myself what benefit someone in the places I study might derive from my work.

From Aristotle I take not only my inspiration as a social scientist but also my approach to learning. I have come to believe that everybody is good at something. But to find out what that something is, one has to take risks, try new things, live on the edge. I have this funny feeling that most people either never had the chance to take a chance or, more likely, prefer not to take chances. I feel for those folks; as a result of that attitude, they may never end up flourishing as human beings. Human flourishing entails a certain spirit of experimentation. But those who try something new need also be prepared to fail. A talented friend of mine during my undergraduate years consistently fared very poorly in his studies. His philosophy was that he had not really failed because he had not tried; had he tried and then failed, then he would have really failed because he had tried.

I arrive at quite the opposite conclusion. But today's Academy rarely encourages students to experiment. As a result, universities are replete with one-trick ponies. In his famous fable, the venerable Sir Isaiah Berlin refers to them as hedgehogs: They live contently in their hole, wary of venturing outside let alone too far for fear of the dangers that lurk. The fox, by contrast, sly and cunning, roams the woods. Foxes, to paraphrase Berlin, may not be extraordinarily outstanding at any one thing. But they lead an interesting life and fare reasonably well for themselves. Owing to their experience, they are well prepared to cope when confronted with unforeseen challenges. However, there is a drawback to being a fox. By virtue of the life they lead, they may never be the best at anything. Is it all right to settle for second place? There is nothing wrong with being second best. I much prefer to be second best in many a thing than best in but one.

Curiosity, experience, and reflexivity are key ingredients of the scientific endeavour. Be it x-rays or penicillin, so many of the world's great discoveries were accidental. There is nothing wrong with accidents. It is quite all right to have them. For how are we to learn otherwise? Accidents need not be mistakes. They can be opportunities to learn, to discover, to make a difference. If we shy away from them for fear of taking a risk, we miss out. Serendipity is the spice of academic life.

SECTION FIVE

Conducting Conflict Research

Fragments of Conflict Research

Maria Koinova

Two weeks ago I was planning to tell you other stories: funny and romantic, insightful and challenging – stories which I gathered living in seven countries over ten years doing research on ethnic conflict. The 2006 war in Lebanon changed my plans. I am writing this essay at a time when innocent civilians are being killed, when more than 600,000 refugees flee bombs, diseases and misery, when my colleagues from the American University of Beirut are herded onto crowded ships for evacuation, and when everyday life in Washington – where the crisis caught me – continues to run the same as before.

Deep in my heart I am an educator, and I want to pass along the good and bad experiences that await in such a career. Thus, I will try to return to the merrier stories. But you should forgive me if my smile is twisted, and if I see romance not in exotic flowers and breath-taking landscapes, but in selflessness and compassion.

Imagining the Past

Some people look at me strangely when I tell them how much I love archives. What could be so exciting about dusty pieces of paper, often unintelligible and usually stored in basements? Well, archives for me are the best place to imagine the past. There, I meet events known or forgotten, humans triumphant or disillusioned, pieces of a puzzle that I attempt to assemble. Archives can be a place to face your own soul as well.

In 1997 I went to the Open Society Archives in Budapest. These are the former archives of Radio Free Europe, which the Hungarian-American philanthropist George Soros bought for a serious price in the early 1990s. He made them available for public use at the Central European University, which was emerging as an important academic institution at that time. During the Cold War, Radio Free Europe was an outpost of Western propaganda, which gave voice to everything that was wrong under communism. I expected to find much of the material for my paper on the mid-1980s assimilation campaign of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. In the mid-1980s the communist regime brutally forced ethnic Turks to renounce their Arab names and accept Slavic ones, to renounce their Islamic religion in favor of atheism, and to become “Bulgarian” almost overnight. As a Bulgarian, I was puzzled by these developments, but I did not quite understand them. I was a high school student. I became much more attentive to this issue in 1989 when the government opened my country’s borders and “encouraged” more than 400,000 ethnic Turks to leave for Turkey. People had not been allowed to travel freely during communism, so this sounded like something really exceptional. Communists called this move “encouragement,” the rest of the world called it “expulsion.” Then, during the summer of 1989, people from all over the country – regardless of their education and occupation – were drafted to work in the fields. Ethnic Turks had been primarily employed in the agricultural sector, so there were few people left to collect the harvest. Manual labor was needed from the urban areas. I did not understand at the time that this event would become defining for my future profession. I had seen and participated in many communist-styled “brigades” before. But time and again, the refrain of assimilation and mistreatment of minorities recurred in my work. I wrote my first master’s thesis

on the issue of xenophobia. This is how my life journey brought me to the Open Society Archives in Budapest two years later as well.

I knew that researching this topic was not an easy task, because not much time had passed since the assimilation campaign and because Bulgarian and Western points of view continued to clash on the subject. The Bulgarian narrative had changed somewhat since the transition began in 1989: democrats blamed communists for these inhuman deeds, a Turkish party entered the parliament, and the triumph of the “Bulgarian ethnic model” buried the failures of the past. Very few people continued to ask inconvenient questions.

During a visit to the archives, I discovered a note written by a woman who managed to escape to Turkey. Her letter begged a diplomat of unknown origin to help smuggle her family across the border. My thoughts moved from the evidence sought for the paper to personal memory. In the 1980s I had ethnic Turkish friends. I did not understand them, as I was subject to the same propaganda as most Bulgarians during communism. Today I am outraged by how insensitive Western people can be to all the suffering in Lebanon. But back in the 1980s, could I have also been part of such collective insensitivity?

Research in Conflict Zones

At this time I would like to tell you a little about what I do: I am a researcher. I conduct research in archives, libraries and conflict zones. As much as I enjoy the tranquility of places for intellectual contemplation, I feel deeply connected to human beings and their passions, interests, inspirations when I am in the field. The following are some hints for survival and success that you may find useful to know if you plan to do field research in conflict zones.

Develop relationships with local people far in advance. Build local networks through contacts in reputable international organizations, with journalists who publish in analytical newspapers, and in good universities. Although you may think you know the “usual suspects” of conflict research – the international policy community, human rights activists, NGOs, scholars, and local politicians – you may soon realize that in the post-9/11 world you also need to establish contacts with military and peace-keeping forces if they are dispatched on the ground. From a democratization decade (the 1990s) the world moved into a security decade (the 2000s). Our research needs to acknowledge this change.

Do your homework and read a lot about the place in advance in order to grasp the biases and political agendas of your interviewees. This will help you to quickly “map” where your sources stand. Also, in “oral cultures” – which rely more on the spoken than the written word, and which are often the cultures subject to our research – people talk a lot and say little. Tune into what your interviewees do not tell you, as well as what they do. They have narratives they tell to friends, to locals, and to internationals. Most probably you will hear the international version. Try to compare it to what a person says in her native language in front of the TV.

Women who do research in conflict zones may well have additional concerns because they are women. Brute force is an essential part of conflict, dangers are many, and delicate flowers – women or men – do not thrive. If you have a chance to take a self-defense course in advance, go for it. But being pleasant and a good listener is often a better strategy. Top politicians – usually men – like to talk. Give them the chance to express themselves. This can give you more clues about what they really tell or hide from you.

Researchers like to interview top “actors” – those involved in a conflict. These interviews are perceived as giving more credibility to our findings. I advise you not to omit hearing the common people as well. Although they may not have the “sophisticated” view of other interviewees, their biases are clear and they can speak better for the community. Also, their intentions are usually more honest. They can also turn out to be your best friends in difficult situations, especially if you need support in a conflict zone. Bigwigs look after themselves first.

Navigating Passports and Borders

Now I want to tell you something more fun: about how I crossed the Macedonia-Kosovo border in 2002 when doing research for my dissertation.

Everybody who knows a little bit about the Balkans has heard how porous this border is: through check-points or remote mountain paths people smuggle people, cigarettes, fuel, arms, alcohol, anything that can be bought and sold. Researchers get smuggled as well, although in a more elegant way. They get a taxi from Macedonia, pay a lot to the driver, the driver bribes the border-guards, the car gets ahead of the queue, the researcher gets no passport stamp, and happily arrives in Prishtina in two or three hours. Instead of following this method, I decided to explore the ordinary way. I took the bus.

My trouble fell on the Macedonian part of the border. The bus driver collected all the passports and left the passengers to wait. Ten minutes later I heard my name called, and I was ordered off the bus.

Border-guard: “Where is your *zajavnitsa*”?

Me: “Pardon?” (Bulgarian language is supposed to be close to Macedonian, but I do not understand the word.)

Border-guard, impatient: “Your *zajavnitsa!* The paper that certifies where you slept in Macedonia!”

Me: “I slept at the house of so-and-so in Skopje, at this-and-this-address, arrived in Macedonia three weeks ago from Bulgaria by bus. If you want I can give you my host’s phone number to verify.”

Border-guard, more impatient: “Aha, but you did not register with the police?”

Me: “No, I did not, did I have to?”

Border-guard, nasty: “Are you playing stupid or what?”

Then the guard took me to his boss. In the meantime, the bus waited, and the people waiting inside gave me dirty looks, especially the women. Something was going really wrong.

Then I told my story to the boss: “I live in Italy, where I am doing research on the Balkans.” No reaction. “I am going to Kosovo to do research.” No reaction. “I did research in Macedonia.” No reaction. He wanted to know where was my *zajavnitsa*, where I had slept. He stared deeply into my Bulgarian passport. I was thinking: *Wrong address, Buddy, not from me. Nobody told me anything about the zajavnitsa on the Bulgarian-Macedonian border, and I did not do anything wrong. I am not paying a penny.*

I fished a business card out of my pocket and loudly asked for a phone to call an important politician. *Nota Bene!* Not a lawyer, a politician! The tone changed. I was allowed to go get back onto the bus. My fellow travelers continued to stare – the men with interest, the women with loathing.

Starting in the 1990s, Bulgaria, Romania, Moldova, Ukraine, Russia and other desperate transition countries in Eastern Europe have trafficked women towards Western Europe *en masse*. New criminal entrepreneurs promised women in poor countries good fortune, work, and ability to develop in rich ones. When women bought into that, they were forced

into prostitution and inhuman treatment. Trafficking turned into a new form of undisguised slavery. Kosovo was both a hub and a popular destination for trafficked women. Was I confused for one of them?

Photo Albums Left Behind

My albums are in Beirut. Am I ever going to see them? My mind starts searching for solutions to replace them if they get lost in the turmoil. I took so many pictures before the era of the digital camera.

Let me tell you about some pictures I love: Here is a big crowd dancing salsa. I am part of it. The dance club is on the premises of the United Nations Administration in Kosovo. The UN staff in such administrations comes from all over the globe. Some of the staffers from Latin America volunteered to teach the others to dance, to make their dire lives on the ground a little bit more fun.

Two other pictures are like twins. One of them shows a good Albanian friend of mine in 1999 on a simple street of Tetovo, the main town of the Albanian part of Macedonia. In 2002 the picture shows him in the same place. He has not changed. But the street did; houses, commercial buildings, and reconstruction activity were in full swing. The Albanian diaspora in Western countries paid for these rebuilding efforts, not the Macedonian state.

Next is a picture of Roma kids in a camp of stateless people in Macedonia. They are naked. Their “house” is part of a shanty town with no real sanitation. They have no real rights to claim, so human rights organizations try to look after them. The kids smile. The weather is warm. It is an Indian summer.

My memory sifts through pictures with warm and hospitable people in Macedonia. Of places where “locals” and “internationals” meet, drink *raki* – the local brandy – and

discuss elections or the latest gossip about politicians. I see some UN peace-keeping vehicles patrolling in the streets. They instill fear in some and rage in others.

My latest albums come from the digital era and my last year in Lebanon. They feature ancient historic sites, striking landscapes, passionate sea waves and the elegance of good-looking people. I kept sending these pictures from my “Snapfish” account to my friends in the world to try to help them associate Lebanon not only with conflict, but with something beautiful. Yet the most beautiful thing I have seen could not be captured by my camera.

Love Amid the Bombs

They met at dance lessons in Europe: She is a Muslim from Lebanon; he is a Christian from Western Europe. The Argentine tango made miracles for them. They fell in love. They commuted for two years between two continents. They wanted to stay together.

Now one might expect to hear how she left troubled Lebanon to live with him in a wealthy country happily ever after. To spend time discussing the best food in town, exotic travel destinations, and the latest models of cell phones, cars and kitchenware. Wrong. He wanted to help her keep her entire family in Lebanon together. He wanted to make her feel good in her own community. He even converted to her religion. He moved to Lebanon.

I pray for them and their love to survive under the bombs.

Researching the Effects of Political Detention: Some Thoughts from South Africa

Ashraf Kagee

Background to my work with South African former political detainees

In South Africa in the 1980s it was impossible for any young person to be apolitical. Resistance to the apartheid state was at its most intense in every sphere. The international community instituted economic sanctions, sporting bans and cultural boycotts to pressure the government to abandon its policies of racial oppression. Within the country students, workers, teachers, and ordinary citizens marched and protested against apartheid. When the police and army tried to quell internal resistance, scenes of brutality and repression were televised internationally for the world to see. As a student at the University of Cape Town in the mid-1980s I was part of the political movement against apartheid and attended meetings, sit-ins, marches, and protests. Later, as a high school teacher I made concerted efforts to increase political awareness among the students I taught.

I left South Africa in the late 1980s to pursue graduate studies in psychology in the United States. When I returned in 1993 the society was rapidly changing. Political prisoners had been released and the first ever democratic elections in the country's history were just a year away. During this time I made contact with an organisation called the Trauma Center for Survivors of Political Violence and Torture. The Trauma

Center provided medical and psychological treatment to activists who had been abused in government prisons. Many hundreds of former detainees passed through its doors and in the mid 1990s I volunteered my skills as a counsellor to political activists who had suffered trauma and abuse during their time in detention.

Later in my career, after obtaining my doctorate, I made contact with the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict. I applied for and was admitted to the Summer Institute offered by the Center in 2001. This was an enormously enriching experience that provided me with the opportunity to focus my ideas on trauma among former South African political detainees. In the process I conceptualised a research project that outlined the work I wished to undertake with former political detainees. The project was funded by the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation and the United States Institute of Peace. Together with a stipend from the Asch Center, these grants permitted me the opportunity to conduct a research project focusing on the psychological consequences of torture in detention.

My project, entitled *The Psychological Sequelae of the Political Torture in South Africa*, was conducted in 2002 and 2003. During this period I joined the faculty in the Department of Psychology at Stellenbosch University where I currently work. At present my job entails directing various research projects, supervising master's and doctoral theses, teaching courses in qualitative and quantitative research methods, and facilitating seminars in our department's professional psychology training programme. I regularly produce scholarly articles on my research with former political detainees and have presented my research at various international conferences. In 2004, in part as a result of my work and my interest in trauma, I was invited

to become a member of the board of trustees of the Trauma Center.

Special challenges

Conducting research with former detainees was not without its pitfalls. I outline some of these here not with the intention of discouraging research in this area but to alert readers to some of the issues that may arise when conducting research in a post-conflict environment. By definition, former political activists have a high level of political and social awareness, which was expressed in the manner in which many participants responded to my invitation to enroll in the study. Typical questions that arose were: *Who is the researcher? Who is the interviewer? What will be done with the information? How will it make a difference in the lives of participants? How will participants benefit from participating in the study?* Essentially, questions of this nature were expressions of concern about my sincerity in terms of the purposes of the research. It is often felt that researchers make only meagre contributions to local community development, but leave with rich data to fuel their academic careers. The importance of these questions needs to be considered in the context of the history of research in developing countries. It was necessary to ensure that participants and other key stakeholders understood that my project had potential applications to other marginalized groups such as refugees, internally displaced persons, crime victims, and others.

The question about what would be done with the data I obtained was an important issue for participants. I undertook to make available to community organizations and non-government organizations that provide services to former detainees whatever data I collected, so that intervention strategies could be developed that were guided by research data

rather than the clinical experience of practitioners alone. This undertaking signalled my commitment to the participants, the population they represented, and to the organizations providing treatment to them. I made an effort to allay concerns about academic opportunism by demonstrating dedication to addressing the needs of this population. However, the nature of the research questions I posed and the lack of clarity as to how individual participants would actually benefit from the findings complicated this strategy. I needed to explain that individuals would not directly benefit from my research, but that data would be disseminated in the form of reports or journal articles, which would presumably shed light on intellectual questions and would in turn filter down to influencing the work of clinicians. The issue of how the investigation would make a difference in the lives of the participants was therefore a difficult one to negotiate. Most participants and clinicians were unschooled in the relevance of research studies, but more familiar instead with clinical services, which are available in South Africa in various forms.

The project began shortly after the end of the work of Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa. One of the roles of the TRC was to document the human rights violations that had occurred during the apartheid era. During its operation between 1998 and 2000 an expectation was raised that reparations would be offered to survivors of these violations. In this context, some of the participants assumed that the research interview might have been part of their testimony about their experiences during the apartheid era that would be taken to the TRC, despite being told the contrary. This confusion was not trivial as many people expressed resentment at the TRC for not appropriately addressing the needs of victims of human rights violations. Part of my discussion around informed consent therefore

involved explaining that the interviews were actually unrelated to the statement-taking procedures of the TRC. I also needed to be clear that our role was not to lobby the government and the TRC, as I had no influence in these areas. Information provided by respondents would not necessarily be channelled directly to the TRC, but would be part of a broader set of research findings that would be disseminated in academic forums.

Some participants expected direct outcomes for their participation, such as improvement in their living conditions, financial compensation from the government, or other forms of support such as housing or jobs. This expectation was harboured in the context of promises that had been made about reparations. There was a great deal of unhappiness that these reparations were not forthcoming. For some participants there was initially an expectation that the interviewers would offer tangible benefits in return for their participation. In fact, participants thought that articulating problems and concerns to the interviewers would result in direct changes in their life circumstances. The ethical imperative was thus to dispel these assumptions at the point at which the study was introduced in order to dislodge unrealistic expectations and to replace these with a more realistic understanding of what to expect in return for participating in the project.

Participants were remunerated for their time and effort in engaging in the research interviews. There were several potential problems with disclosing to participants beforehand that they would receive financial compensation for their time. Firstly, as most of the participants were poor, there was a concern that a financial incentive would not allow them to choose to decline to participate. This was a potentially serious issue because there were some risks associated with participating in the study, such as emotional distress that might

arise from discussing traumatic experiences. I was concerned that offering a financial incentive prior to the interview would create a sense of needing to participate for the money, with the possibility of disregarding the potential risks of participation. Another concern was related to demand characteristics. I did not want participants to engage in interviews with the feeling that they needed to offer me dramatic stories and exaggerate the experiences and symptoms that they attributed to their experiences in detention in exchange for money. Instead, I wanted them to engage in a conversation and tell their story.

As participants in the study were former political activists who had undergone severe interrogation accompanied by torture and abuse, their experience with an interrogator was highly stressful and traumatic. It was thus important for the research interviews to avoid assuming the tone of an interrogation. Interviews were conducted either in the participants' home or in the home of a key person in the community in which respondents resided. This approach not only created a sense of comfort and safety for respondents, but was also convenient, as they did not have to travel to another location to meet the interviewer. Minor problems did arise in the home environment such as interruptions from family members and neighbours. Participants most often dealt with these themselves. They also controlled the confidential nature of the interview by selecting the appropriate location in their home in which to conduct the interview.

It was necessary also to engage in a prolonged trust-building phase with each participant and to be entirely transparent about the nature of the interview. Part of the relationship-building process involved demonstrating that the researchers and interviewers (two females and one male) had never been aligned to the apartheid government at any point. This kind of information was deliberately addressed and often

emerged as part of the initial phase of becoming acquainted with respondents. Thus, interviewers spent a long time socializing and talking about their own personal history before commencing with the interviews.

The group of interviewers consisted of two psychologists and a social worker. Having individuals with clinical experience conduct the interviews was necessary in the event of respondents becoming distressed during the course of the conversation. It was an ethical obligation to direct participants who were in need of psychological services to the appropriate agencies whose role it was to provide such professional support. I therefore arranged with a local non-governmental organization that I would refer distressed individuals for follow-up services.

The relationship between the interviewers and the respondents was also relevant from the interviewers' perspective. Having listened to stories of human rights violations, such as descriptions of abuse and torture, it was necessary for interviewers to have the opportunity to process some of the thoughts and feelings that arose. The interviewers had not been detained and therefore were not able to share this experience with respondents. Yet, all interviewers tried to develop an empathic understanding that was facilitated by an interest and concern for the well being of former detainees. This understanding was informed by a common history of having lived through the apartheid era in South Africa, and the knowledge of the challenges that communities faced.

Not all participants were fluent in English. I retained the services of two Xhosa-speaking interviewers who were able to interview respondents in their home language. Interviews had to be transcribed, translated into English, and then analysed. To a large extent the issue of language was potentially important as it facilitated the development of a sound rapport

between the interviewer and respondent. The translation of interviews was also a relevant issue, as some of the meaning conveyed might have been lost when translated into English. I addressed this by having a Xhosa-speaking interviewer fill in meanings that might have been understood differently in English. In this way meanings were understood as embedded within a particular context rather than in isolation. Interviewers also checked the accuracy of their understandings at various points during each interview.

It was also necessary to consider the issue of literacy. Some of the participants in the study, particularly those who were older, could not read and therefore had to have the informed consent form explained to them verbally by the interviewer. In these cases verbal consent in the presence of a witness was the most appropriate approach to adopt.

Suggestions for others considering similar work

The process of conducting my project with former detainees yielded important lessons for behavioral scientists conducting research in developing countries. First, knowledge of the political and historical context of the country in which one conducts a study is a vital aspect of sound and ethical research. Researchers need to have a comprehensive understanding of the contextual nuances of the communities in which they work, including local understandings of history, culture, and political dynamics.

Second, the research process needs to be as transparent as possible to participants. In the context of limited resources in developing countries, expectations about remuneration for participation in research may be inflated. Thus the notion of informed consent needs to be addressed with painstaking accuracy. Any false assumptions that potential respondents

may have concerning the benefits of participating should be dislodged prior to commencing data collection.

Third, responsible researchers should ensure that communities and respondents receive some benefit for having participated in the research. In cases in which research is descriptive or epidemiological in nature, its findings could be shared with representative organizations, interested parties, individual participants, or even the public where appropriate. Community education regarding the importance of descriptive research should be done through illustrating its role in informing intervention programs. Often, research participants, clinicians and programme administrators wish to understand the relevance of research projects to their communities if these are not clearly apparent. It is often helpful if researchers have some idea of how their findings may be helpful to communities rather than only conducting research for the sake of research. Thus, in my project, which was descriptive in nature, my hope was that the intellectual contribution it yielded would in some way inform clinical practice. Either directly or indirectly, I hoped it would create awareness among professionals working with former detainees about the limitations of uncritically applying the diagnostic criteria of the DSM with this population. Thus, offering clinicians and other researchers a way to think about reactions to trauma outside of the constraints imposed by Western psychiatry was, in my opinion, a contribution to community development even though it may not have had direct and immediate applications.

Some researchers feel no compulsion to make their findings relevant to community needs. In many developing countries such research may be seen as exploitative. Researchers need to take care not use communities to promote their own careers, or to convey the impression that they may be doing so. Thus, “tourist research” in which investigators

rapidly enter and leave a community without investing their time, energy, and effort in understanding the people whom they research is likely to be ethically problematic.

Fourth, methodological approaches should be employed that are appropriate to local and contextual realities in developing countries. The selection of appropriate methodologies is usually only possible when the researcher has an understanding of the context and culture under investigation. Researchers in post-conflict situations should be cognizant of their social responsibility to local sensitivities and more broadly to their own role in examining social issues. Intellectual and scientific questions are thus only reasonably addressed with an awareness of these political and social dynamics.

I continue to conduct research in South Africa, especially with historically disadvantaged communities. I have recently become involved with a group called the Community Healing Network that examines the effects of apartheid on present day South African communities. There is much important research yet to be done in South Africa and in other countries that have undergone political conflict. Such research is best conducted by passionate individuals who are committed to the ideals of human rights, justice, and peace. Almost all of my present work is conducted among persons who have been oppressed or in some way disadvantaged. These include former political detainees, HIV positive individuals, those at risk of contracting HIV, and refugees from other African countries. By continuing to address the concerns of those who are marginalised, I would like to think I am making a contribution to humanity. Thus, the values of community service and social justice that I, along with many South Africans, learned during the anti-apartheid struggle continue in my work as a scholar and teacher.

The Courage of Despair: Fragments of An Intellectual Project

Alejandro Castillejo-Cuéllar

Excerpts

In trying to pose the question of one's intellectual itinerary, I shall begin this history with its end. I refer back to my field notes, written in 2003 in South Africa, when I was conducting an ethnographic and collaborative study with apartheid survivors on the consequences that violence left on human beings and their existential landscapes. It is a reaction to Cape Town's uncanny feeling of "nothing happened here," as if the past had finally been left behind, estranged. For a student of violence, the existential conundrum that such a way of sensing the world poses relates to the seeming invisibility of violence. This sense of localized tranquility, as I have called it, is a byproduct of a world created by radical racial separation. It is difficult to imagine that in 1990, the year when the state of emergency was finally lifted and the African National Congress called off its armed struggle is only 15 years ago. The previous decades had seen massive, unprecedented resistance, major popular uprisings, rent and school boycotts around the country. In this city, the only way to overcome such "localized tranquility," which prevents many people from perceiving the scars of violence, requires a willful redirection of the gaze. The text poses the question of how complex, for anyone but especially for scholars, it can be to perceive and calibrate one's gaze to the resonance and the echoes of a violent past. I wrote:

“Colombia is a country at war. Unlike my countrymen, I can “see” it: I see its traces on the hungry men defecating on the city’s sidewalks, emanating their human fouls on the daily whirls of a destitute life, on the scores of gangs of children terrorizing the “middle classes” and making up a good chunk of the “gunmen” in the *Comunas*, *Invasiones* or *favelas* (depending on the country), on the families of the millions of displaced peasants wandering the cities and searching the garbage dumps looking for something eatable, a piece of rotten meat perhaps. I see the traces of war in the routine massacres and the routine impunity, in the increasing feeling of living in a city almost left to rot, of long-forgotten and defunct warehouses and empty rusting buildings used to house drug dealers, famished *Basuco* addicts and other urban transhumants; in the terror that the *other* represents, in the selective and forgotten annihilation of an entire left-wing political party over a period of less than a decade. I see the traces the war leaves on the 3000 kidnapped people, and the immense networks of drug and body trafficking that swallow this society while intertwining powerful armies under the banner of so-called democracy. “Peace” and “freedom,” the immaculate excuse for local and transnational autocracy.

As a visitor it is impossible not to pass through Bogotá’s many areas – wealthy and poor – without this constant feeling of sensory hypersensitivity to a life with no destiny (for many people), and of claustrophobic and emotional bombardment. The

Oikos – the house, the Ancient Greeks’ center of the intimate world – is dead and dismembered. Regional highways connecting cities are usually under threat by roadblocks where paramilitaries (now demobilizing and burying their genocidal past with the collusion of the entire political establishment), guerrillas and thugs – subcontracted by guerrillas to kidnap people to feed the national circuit of human trafficking – find it easy to get to the next human commodity. The city is like a jail, like my house, surrounded by a country carpeted with landmines, buried corpses in unknown soils.

In this ocean of global despair, and Colombia and South Africa are just two locations in a larger geography of exclusion, what is the “role” of the writer, the intellectual, and, in their absence, the scholar? Is the vague excuse of advancing “our” knowledge of conflict, war, and the nature of the enemy’s pseudo-psychology enough to maintain the theoretical and existential security of our institutional life-world?

“Sometimes Colombia looks like the South Africa of the 1980s, at the brink of destruction, as we have been for 50 years. Yet we all feel that war is lingering in the neighborhood. Others like the South Africa of today: we tend to believe and create the fiction, and I do not know whether it is some sort of defense mechanism or an ideological trick, that the war is carried out in the countryside, away from the geopolitical “center,” in the savage periphery. How long would it take to heal this place and its people, that is if “healing” is still a plausible metaphor? I wonder. How long would the

“reconstruction” process take? Reconstruction of what? The houses, the future, or the past? Could I ever say something like *nothing happened here*? Could I ever undo my scars, hide them or rather embrace them? Could I ever make them disappear? Cape Town, a violent place indeed; ironically, a solace for my spirit.”

Undoings

I remember it quite vividly; it happened when I was a child, during the 1970s in Colombia. My house was raided by the government’s military police. They were looking for “subversive” propaganda, pamphlets, any “proof” of my family’s ties or connections to the underground guerrilla movements. What they found instead was a huge family library, something of a rarity these days, where my parents archived their intellectual journeys: Martí and Bolívar, titans of the liberation struggles in Latin America, Marx’s *Das Kapital*, written in the mist of despair, hunger and isolation, and of course, Plato, Sapho, Proust, Joyce and many others. Reading broadly is another rarity nowadays, particularly for academics who fall prey to their specialized and utterly boring monologism. I grew up surrounded by the nurturing presence of books and languages.

Those were the years of the Cuban Revolution, where I was born, and where I return as often as I can. Those were years when a future for humanity was imagined and claimed by the many social and political movements mushrooming on the Continent: the history of America is also a history of misery and exploitation since the arrival of the *conquistadores*. The 1970s were the years when the global tyrannies of fake democracies, as it is still the case today, as well as military dictatorships in Chile, Argentina, and apartheid South Africa,

when the traces of Stalin's purges and renewed neo-colonial wars in Vietnam, posed complex questions for grassroots organizations and community leaders. Can a new society, a new *man* be attained? For many Latin American intellectuals it was just a matter of time. The raid of my house, the army "inspecting" the intimacy of my living space, reminds me of the time when social utopias that sought dramatic, radical social changes, were conceived as a plausible, even ineluctable destiny. Yet, that instant also represents, ironically and in the most existential sense, my first encounter with the world's violence and the power of human beings to inflict pain on others. Pain and utopia: two threads that intertwine my life as well as my writing.

But times have certainly changed. Raids stopped one day, and hardly anyone speaks of utopia. The so-called postmodern critique, and the resonance of certain international political transformations, has rendered it almost a discredited idea. It has been displaced, emptied of any positive content. Yet ironically, the world is today even poorer than 20 years ago: in Latin America and Africa more than 60 percent live in absolute, abject misery, unimaginable for people in other latitudes; in those places, this mass of humanity is "experienced" only through the written and visual media, if at all. Even researchers who claim intellectual expertise (and ownership) of the problems that emerge during conflict have no real sense of the wars they so eloquently speak about in international symposia. When my parents were engaged in politics, they received a world with the prospect of a "future," embodied by the term and its historic contents. Today, I have inherited its shreds, its impossibility. And this is a difficult place to inhabit, intellectually and morally, particularly in the face of the other's destitution.

Violence and the Question of Meaning

In the advent of daily, normalized terror, when the world collapses and the main organizing categories dissolve, when the neighbor embodies simultaneously “sameness” and “difference,” “familiarity” and “strangeness,” how do human beings and communities of people render meaningful a world that otherwise might seem unintelligible? What are the traces that this violence leaves on the existential landscapes of people? This has been the main focus of my research over the last years. It deals with two sets of intimately related questions, which speak to the fading memories of my childhood: on the one hand, it poses the problem of violence as the inscription of power on the human body, on the community, and on the social space. On the other hand, it deals with the question of memory and collective remembering. How can those “marks” be rendered intelligible, even visible? What does it mean to say that the life-world dissolves, and in what sense can it be said that certain kinds of human actions destroy meaning? And how do specific societies, in particular historical periods, define (along “racial,” “ethnic” and “cultural” lines) certain social groups as radical, dangerous, unintelligible *others*, deserving or requiring not only routine control and surveillance but even annihilation and extermination? What set of technologies of perception and destruction were set in motion to conduct such acts of denial?

The *other* as a philosophical and anthropological problem, as one of the main intertwining themes of my research, was initially developed in my first book: *Anthropology, Post-modernity, and Difference: A Cultural Debate in Latin America*. In this text, I dwelt mostly on the philosophical dimensions of the problem. However, the first time I had any existential encounter with the issue of “meaning” and “otherness,” and their relationship with terror, was during an intense stay in Europe between 1995

and 1996. I was part of a larger, transnational contingent of graduate students who were interested in peace and conflict studies.

Of those turbulent and lonely years, I particularly recall the histories of genocide that Martin had survived in Rwanda (his wife and only child were waiting for him somewhere in one of Tanzania's infamous refugee camps). I remember his face, his anguish, his mind dwelling on the past as he tried to build a future by convincing the Austrian government to grant them refugee status. He finally managed to stay. Janek was also there, as well as her uncontrollable fear of fireworks. They reminded her of Sarajevo, the snipers, and the camps. She used to hide beneath the bed for hours and hours, like a child. I have her silence carved into my body. I also remember Albert's endless testimony of death squads terrorizing his family in Uganda. Of him, I remember his shyness and his big, bright eyes. He felt strangely misplaced in Vienna, where we lived. Joyce had witnessed her entire family being raped in Sierra Leone by an armed group. One day she uttered to me, in a sort of ritual *communitas*, the slashes of that horrific night; I can't say much of her life now, and I rather respect her immutable, willful silence: I irremediably lost track of her one sad winter afternoon.

From them I learnt about survival and meaning, about witnessing and speaking, about the textures of experience and silence. About human strength. I also reflected about what it means to be an academic in the face of suffering, of chronic pain, of historical hunger. I learnt that, even in a world that seems to be lacking utopias, one has a political and moral responsibility as a scholar. In a global perspective, I mean speaking against power. In this regard, I have the feeling that reducing the role of academics to being just producers of "knowledge," to use such euphemism, a process often

undertaken in the familiar and comfortable confines of universities and research institutions (not to mention the political economy of privilege and the arrogance that arises from this process), seems to me a particular kind of moral failure. We have never had so many tools to collect and save information, we have never had such wide range of concepts to understand the complexity of the world, and yet we are unable to understand and even recognize the predicament of the destitute.

I returned to Colombia for a relatively short period of time. Given the particular circumstances of the day, I decided to write a new book: *Poetics of Otherness: Toward an Anthropology of Violence, Loneliness, and Internal Displacement in Colombia*. I explored the question of meaning and survival in the context of communities that had been displaced by paramilitary death squads working in collusion with drug traffickers, corrupt politicians, army officers and big landowners in the northern part of the country. I had firsthand information of who conducted a series of massacres, their names, and how they operated. There is nothing more complex than conducting fieldwork in the very center of the earthquake.

In this text, I was also concerned with the traces that this violence leaves, and how organizing small communities of survivors, around bread and butter issues, in the outskirts and shantytowns of the big cities was conceived as a survival strategy. It was a book about terror, about the mediation of fear through narration, and in this regard, it was a political artifact: the words written in those pages are not only the outcome of a collaborative research process with survivors but it also stood as a way of breaking what I called the “cycle of silence.”

Those were difficult months. Friends and other scholars speaking out loudly against the terror campaign unleashed

against “alleged guerrilla collaborators” had been threatened, and some even killed. I was forced to draft the final version of the text between Eastern Europe and the U.S.. To this day, I still remember the threatening letters I received via fax. I never knew whether they were serious. I did not stay to find out. I managed to return more than five years later, when the so-called peace process with paramilitary groups was under way.

During these years I was able to study and work in other contexts. Driven by my interest in how violence, memory and meaning intertwine, I ended up in South Africa, where I encountered new families, new friends, and a new intellectual project *The Archives of Pain: Essays on Violence, Terror, and Collective Remembering in Contemporary South Africa*. In this country I understood how the personal and intellectual itineraries one constructs on the basis of years of work are not really disconnected. I understood how societies, with great difficulty and courage, manage to render a violent past intelligible for the generations to come, and how “poverty” and “wealth” are, on both a local and a global scale, *consubstantial*. The poverty of some is correlated to the wealth of others. The racial organization of apartheid South Africa was also a social distribution of privileges – financial power, land, education – privileges in the most trivial sense. I also learnt how blind academics were when it came to understanding their own privileges. Trying to navigate such contradictions as a scholar, to find a place to speak from, is certainly a challenge, especially in a world lacking utopias (although I admit, with happiness, that I have seen small utopias in the hands of those who possess nothing).

Epiphanies

While working on a research project regarding the intellectual origins of the Holocaust, I had the opportunity to

travel to Auschwitz-Birkenau, one of Nazi Germany's most infamous concentration camps, located in the vicinity of Krakow, Poland. This sort of pilgrimage, so to speak, had taken me to other places around the world, places that invariably reminded me of the misery that specific human beings had to endure due to the will of others: *Ile de Gorée* and *La Maison d' Esclaves* in Dakar, *Robben Island* in Cape Town, as well as others not written into history books. This pilgrimage could certainly be endless, as is human capacity to inflict pain.

From Birkenau I brought a photograph that my wife had taken of one of the barracks where prisoners, before being sent to the gas chambers and the crematoria, were forced to live. The image shows the last strokes of crepuscular sunlight touching, almost caressing the dark interior of the room. That afternoon I wrote a short verse, part of a larger (Spanish language) poetry collection entitled *Alucinaciones e Itinerarios*: "In this universe, in its latrines and foals, dejections and ingestions fuse each other like a specter with the body."

The photo is taken inside this desolate space, as the light comes through a small window overlooking the immense, rational monotony of the camp. So great was the intensity of the light reflected on the floor and the three-tier plank beds where the prisoners were once crowded, that objects seemed to have a light of their own, as though the source of such energy came not from the sun but from the objects themselves. Things had taken a life of their own, a life that resisted any kind of oblivion.

A thought cut across my mind: it is truly uncanny to realize that even in the most terrible circumstances, in the face of the most abject human degradation, something blossoms – an empathic gaze, the echo of a fellow human being screaming from afar, a grain of life, an instant of life-saving luck in the darkness of death. These are what I have called "epiphanies,"

in a theological vein. I have read about these invisible instants in the works of writers and in the voices and silences of survivors. From all of them, at the end, I have learnt that there are only two subjects worth writing and teaching about: one is *death*, the other is *love*, the one that erupts from within the abyss. The rest are just useless words.

Field Research in Post-Conflict Scenarios

Inma Serrano

‘Why did you choose to come to Bosnia?’ I am often asked. Indeed, I have a bunch of reasons for that. This essay is mostly about them. So far, however, I have never felt like I have given a complete answer. I guess I have not wholly answered the question for myself. Nonetheless, this and many other questions arise daily in the work I do. And none of them have easy answers.

I am a graduate in sociology from the University of Salamanca. I hold a master’s degree in social sciences from the Juan March Institute, in Madrid. I am twenty-seven years old and have been undertaking the field work for my Ph.D. dissertation in Bosnia-Herzegovina since October 2005.

My project deals with the return or resettlement process after displacement as a result of violent conflict. My interest is placed in identifying the priorities, concerns and feelings that common people come up with after experiencing such degree of violence, as well as their resources and coping strategies. I am focusing especially on the possible role that social networks and emotions might play in such a context. The essence of this topic lies in understanding the effects of violence upon individuals and society. By looking concretely at the individuals’ decisions whether to return or not to their places of origin, I also pay attention to a second layer of interest: improving the understanding of the tie established between individuals and what it is called ‘home.’ The reasons why I

ended up with such a concrete project and in such a concrete place are multiple and blurred; a deep look into them is due for deconstructing that path.

The war in Bosnia was the first contemporaneous conflict I was fully aware of, at the age of fourteen. I followed it on the news. We discussed it in class and it was part of frequent conversations. That war put images in my mind that have persisted in my memory, not as mere images, but rather as evidence sustaining the need and the urgency for action, denunciation and transformation.

I was, as a matter of fact, an idealist. Not in the sense of being a dreamer, but in the sense of believing in the necessity of following the ideals, such as justice, equality or solidarity as a principle for action – instead of self-interest. The idea may appear simple, as there is more complexity in reality than these ideals may contemplate when put in big letters. For example, the idea of justice can be defined on different terms, following different criteria. Who is to be held responsible for collective or hierarchical actions? Or, should justice be practical and allow for specific or general limits when colliding with other concerns, like reconciliation and understanding? Even more basically, does justice collide at all with those other concerns or are they to be understood as a more intimate reality? I needed, then, to confront those ideals first, even fight them, from the point of view of competing views, competing concerns and ideals, and potential internal contradictions, in order to be sure that I had more than a strong intuition for that commitment.

I chose to study sociology because it perfectly matched my curiosity and interest in human relations and human society in general. I was especially eager to understand the complexities of conflict, injustice and human suffering, and to be able to think about them in a more founded, illuminated way. In

college, I never specialised or had a clearly defined area of interest. But my attention remained primarily focused on seeing how inequality, injustice and conflict originate and how they are sustained or transformed by social institutions. Such institutions range from the state (its nature and definition, the way it is ordered, the policies it applies) up to international relations (the implications and mechanics of a world of states) and down to primary groups (such as family). At the same time I was fascinated by the capacity, resilience and resourcefulness of the human being in coping with hardship, in adjusting to its circumstances, and in contradicting itself in constructive and destructive manners.

Personal acquaintances played a key role in the way I finally shaped my academic and life choices, mostly as sources of motivation and inspiration. I was lucky enough to enjoy particularly the expertise of one professor whose commitment and experience in fighting the gap between the academic world and the world of practitioners and activists helped me define my own commitments. With much support and encouragement, from this person and some others, I managed to figure out the way in which my work would make the most sense. I was encouraged to combine both my personal interests and intellectual restlessness with my academic training and to work in the so-called field, meaning I would go and stay amongst the people I was studying, rather than remaining bound by textbook theories or the university classroom.

The concrete project I am undertaking, about displacement and return as a result of war, came out of the personal interests I have roughly listed: human suffering, especially when provoked by other human beings, resilience to that suffering, and failure to prevent it or to stop it by international organisations, states, civil organisations or others.

But it was rigorously shaped by academic requirements in terms of theoretical and substantial relevance as well as methodological considerations. The choice of studying Bosnia-Herzegovina was singled out much the same way. The research design I proposed was based on a case study which could nonetheless be subject to certain generalisation. The case of Bosnia-Herzegovina met all the necessary requirements, such as internal variation in the levels of return, or a certain lapse of time since the end of the conflict, for instance. But more importantly, I considered that my personal connection to the country and to its earlier suffering was crucial in guaranteeing the passion and interest that such work would surely require and obviously deserve.

I was positively surprised when the project was approved by the Board of the Juan March Institute, where, after achieving a master's degree, I was now pursuing my Ph.D. as part of the scholarship program of the institute. The project departed from the centre's traditional areas of interest, such as comparative studies in democratic and transitional politics. It also relied heavily on non-quantitative techniques, which was also uncommon for the centre.

Thus, I felt this as a great responsibility, also at the personal level, because of the confidence that was being placed in me, not least because of the huge effort that the work would entail, and thus the risk involved in supporting it, given that in such cases the chances of failure or quitting are unavoidably higher. But above all, I felt responsible because I was in charge of carrying out research that could uphold the connection between this concrete area and some of the traditional threads of interest and concern in the centre. Or at least it could show its relevance and potential for research and join them in the centre's program. The importance of all this

would be to facilitate the opening of spaces for the multiplication of bridges between academia and the immediate reality of violence and conflict. In other words, to clear the road between those on the ground, taking action and decisions affecting people's lives, and those in the university classrooms, studying how people's lives are affected by certain actions and decisions.

The way I give sense to the work I am doing has then less to do with the formality of the Ph.D. degree and much more with making meaningful connections. All my work in the field has been possible thanks to the connections made with practitioners and actors on the ground (including both local and international organisations, governmental and non-governmental). I have been able to contribute to some of their activities based on my academic background (meaning both expertise and personal contacts). And I hope my research will be meaningful and make a contribution to the academic as much as to the practitioners' endeavours.

But despite all of this, it is difficult to feel and to be legitimized to do this work. For example, there may be doubts about my intentions from the population I work with. They may question the aim of my work, about what myself and others could do with it. It could be the case that they just do not understand what my project is about, or even if they do understand, they may simply not see the point of it.

The people I deal with are people who suffered through a war and became displaced as a result. They are coming out of absolutely demolishing experiences, and many of them are still enduring very hard times. In the past, they may have been mistreated or betrayed by 'internationals' (workers and academics like myself). It is difficult for many of them to accept me into their lives, especially when I am asking them a

bunch of questions they find meaningless. It is even harder that when they finally accept me, I will leave when I have finished with my study. They know I have never experienced the hardship and suffering they have experienced. They assume I am coming as an authority (or potential authority) to describe and define what has happened to them. Understandably, all of this gives rise to the kind of questions as the one I was mentioning at the beginning.

Field research that means jumping into people's lives in order to better understand them will always have to deal with such contradictions. The implications are not only ethical, but also crucial for the development and success of the research, because so much depends on having the acceptance of the people you are working with.

For me, doing things right meant, first of all, an intense and comprehensive preparation for what was to come. Such preparation included involvement with different people and organisations of various kinds in the area. For instance, I volunteered with the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Kosovo doing some monitoring work during the summer of 2003. The next summer I volunteered in the Mostar Intercultural Festival in Bosnia-Herzegovina, doing very basic logistics and assistance (my main role was being a member of the catering team). The more varied and numerous the experiences, the richer the insight and understanding you get from them. I learned Serbo-Croatian, both the Latin and the Cyrillic alphabets. (Serbo-Croatian is nowadays officially divided into three variants labelled as Bosnian, Serb and Croat.) I visited the area in which I would work. And I did extensive research on Bosnia-Herzegovina and issues related to refugees and displacement.

Once I arrived in the country, my primary goal was to get familiarized with the surroundings and their possibilities and challenges. But I also wanted to get somehow involved in something other than my own research. This meant, for instance, joining a club for displaced women in Tuzla as a volunteer. I was very warmly received in the women's club. However, it was immediately assumed that my role there was to pose questions. It did not take much effort, nonetheless, to break such assumptions and to become a member, both passive and active, just in the same way as the other women in the club. No matter how loosely related to my work these activities are, they have allowed me to have a better grasp of the reality around me and they have made me somehow more participatory in such a reality, easing many of the barriers inherent in mutual communication and understanding. Most importantly, this period and these activities have allowed me to introduce myself and the reasons that had brought me to Bosnia in a way that goes beyond cheap-talk. I found this first period of several months absolutely invaluable.

Putting all together, my short experience thus far has taught me that conducting field research should entail, first of all, a profound awareness of the context and the role that the researcher plays in it. And secondly, it requires a consistent and respectful approach to such a role, which will usually imply important commitments in terms of time, resources and personal involvement. However, practical (and academic or professional) limitations more often than not work against these requirements. For instance, when working in multiple countries it is unlikely that you can learn all of the domestic languages or that you can prepare yourself in the same in-depth manner. Despite that, we should always keep in mind what is involved in research like this, and the reasons why it is

important to carry it out in the way proposed. Not an easy task, as the challenge is to balance the requirements of academic research along with the peculiarities of the field. If we cannot fully apply it in every single case, at least we should try to find alternative ways and strategies that keep us striving toward that direction.

In Need of Conflicts: EU Funding, Central European Experiences

Gábor Eröss

We definitely need conflicts. We, social scientists in Central and Eastern Europe. Ethnic conflicts are the reason why we are funded. In social sciences, just as in other sciences, there has always been a tension between following interesting research questions (that one might find compelling on a personal level) and following research agendas that are likely to be funded. For instance, whereas the tension is minor in the case of biologists developing a new medication, it can be huge if they're asked to participate in developing biological weapons. We, social scientists, have to sell research too.

The “ideal” type of conflict – one on which research is likely to be funded – doesn't include ethnic fighting but “cold ethnic war”, which is institutionalized, ethnicity-based social exclusion, with the risk (which ideally never becomes reality) that the latent conflict turns into violence. When the war begins (see: ex-Yugoslavia), social scientists too start to fight or flee. All we need is conflict in peacetime.

Central Europe (as well as the Eastern Balkans) is an ideal place for that: multilingual, multiethnic states, ethnic minorities, contested borders, contested constitutions, and, above all: socially, and/or politically, and/or culturally oppressed ethnic groups. From the Baltic Sea (with numerous Russian-speaking minorities living in the three Baltic States), to

the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary (with large Roma communities), to Romania (with ethnic Hungarians and Roma), and Bulgaria (with ethnic Turks and Roma) minorities are inevitably the context in which we live.

1st ADVICE: Fill up with the region's spirit: act like an anthropologist.

This is to say that there is a rich field of study in this region, without the physical dangers and risks of an area like Afghanistan or Chechnya. But there are also other factors explaining the flourishing social scientific “ethno-business”: EU funding and the Europeanization of resources on the one hand, and Anglo-American scholarship focusing on the race issue, on the other. In other words, as a researcher in one of these generally poor and small countries, you need to seek “foreign” money: from international human rights organizations, the EU, and other sources. You also need to include “foreign” concepts when you apply for such funding. This double phenomenon – the globalization of funding and of scientific approaches – is probably less visible in the U.S., but goes on worldwide. Let's take a very simple example: if you plan to do innovative research on the Hungarian minority living in Romania, your government may not want to finance your “subversion.” So, you have to apply for international funding. In this case, you can't call them “Transylvanians” anymore, as you are used to doing – you must change your terms, and say “ethnic Hungarians living in Romania” (for an American audience) or even “Romanian citizens who are Hungarians by origin/mother tongue” (for a French or EU audience).

2nd ADVICE: Accept the importation of concepts and money; don't be a nationalist yourself.

After four decades of communist dictatorship, the rise of liberal democracy made it easier to describe and analyze Central and Eastern European countries – and even the issue of inequalities – in terms of race or ethnicity, rather than in terms of class, a Marxist concept (although, as the British sociologists pointed out, segregation based on class and race often go together). Therefore I shall write mainly on two areas in which I have been involved: first, the Roma in Hungary and the greater region, and second, the “ethnic Hungarians” of the countries neighboring Hungary. The story I am about to tell is about a part of the world where ethnicity is more than a topic for social scientists; it is an everyday context.

How have I begun?

Every relevant aspect of interethnic relationships – co-existence, cooperation and conflict – can be observed in Hungary and in the region. In Hungary itself, surprisingly, many social scientists study the social and psychosocial configurations of the coexistence between “ethnic Hungarians” and those labeled as “Roma” (often called Gypsies). Others deal with sources of – mostly latent – interethnic conflicts, such as anti-Semitism (the largest Jewish community in Central Europe lives in Hungary), or problems with integration of the new migrants (Budapest also gave birth in the last decade to the largest Chinese community in Central Europe). Ethnic conflict is not one topic among many in our country; it is the main topic.

So, how did I personally start to deal with this issue? When I was undergraduate, I took part in a project concerning the new immigrants from China, commissioned by the city of Budapest. Through whom did I get this job? Well, some sociology students, who are my friends, have influential relatives.

3rd ADVICE: Accumulate your social capital; build your network of political influence.

The study consisted of carrying out field research and issuing policy recommendations. The Mayor wanted to grasp a wide range of social data, complete with anthropological observations about the Chinese in contact with Hungarians, in order to evaluate the potential of conflict when considering whether to let them build a Chinatown in a particular district of the Hungarian capital. The Mayor had decided not to do so; the survey was aimed to confirm the accuracy of this decision. That's how policy-oriented research often is.

Another research project I participated in, under the auspices of the Hungarian Institute for Statistics and Demography, also has direct links with ethnicity and nationalism. The study aimed to analyze the “foreigner” as seen and represented by the Hungarian media. A very interesting phenomenon was observed: ethnic Hungarians fleeing from Romania (because of misery), and from Serbia (because of the war) in the 1990s – refugees – were perceived as *foreigners*. Many of them were kept in refugee camps for years and are still targets of xenophobic reactions. An epistemological imperative constitutes the next piece of advice.

4th ADVICE: Never forget that ethnicity, ethnic identity is a construction, differently crystallized in every single group relationship.

The Roma: A perfect object

In 2004, the Eastern part of Slovakia was shaken by interethnic violence of an intensity never experienced in East-Central Europe (ex-Yugoslavia excluded) during the last 15 years. After a reform of the Slovakian social care system, which meant heavy cuts and restrictions of access, ethnic Roma formed bands and attacked town halls, shops and other public

buildings. The army intervened to stop the riots. This open conflict, however, constituted an exception. The “cold ethnic war” – the institutionalized, ethnicity-based social exclusion and domination – is an enduring subject for researchers indeed.

During the completion of my Ph.D. dissertation a friend and colleague of mine at the university contacted me and invited me to participate in a European Union funded research project. It wasn't exactly about ethnic conflict, but rather about education. Still, we quickly understood that we were, in fact, asked to write mainly about how the impact of new regulation modes in education on social inequalities and ethnic segregation – “special” schools, “special” classes, “special” diagnostic methods (the “medicalization” of social inequalities!), as well as early selection of the pupils and school competition – contribute to exclude Roma children from “normal” schools. The fifth framework program of the European Union itself established the topic of inequalities as a priority. That is why the participating teams linked the analyses of school policy with the social production of inequalities as well as ethnic segregation. In this study, Hungarian, English, French, Belgian and Portuguese educational systems were compared.

5th ADVICE: Accumulate your international capital; build your transnational network of researchers.

As an outcome of this research, we invented the notion of “benevolent segregation,” defined as an undesired effect of the total autonomy of parents, schools and city districts and of early selection. As its adjective indicates, this segregation is not necessarily a source of conflict, since it's also followed by a more or less effective “no child left behind” policy. But all of this contributes to transform ethnic Roma into an underclass,

and in poor villages in the Eastern part of the country segregation of Roma children sometimes even provokes open conflicts. The most famous case is that of the small town of Jászladány, where ethnic Hungarians simply decided to exclude *all* Roma from the local public school and “place” them in a “Gypsy School”.

The above-mentioned European research project ended this year, but as a researcher at the Institute of Sociology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, I am now leading a new one, in the same district of Budapest, with similar, but not identical research questions. This project is called “Education and Politics”, and aims to pinpoint the social and ethnic inequalities. It is also an attempt to implement the thick description method put forward by the anthropologist Clifford Geertz. That is, it examines everyday interactions – pupils vs. pupils, pupils vs. teachers of different ethnic origins, etc. – as they shape, increase or decrease the social and ethnic gaps, which are in turn a potential source of conflicts.

6th ADVICE: Take advantage of the fear of ethnic conflict that leads your government to generous subvention of research in this field.

However, the anthropological perspective shouldn't hide the political dimension. Can educational policy take steps toward the social inclusion of Roma children? For example, the secondary vocational schools nowadays have become a synonym for failure and an institution of Roma who have been excluded from the “normal” educational system. We would like to map how the educational authority can aid in the decision process of underclass parents. The present unequal situation can (and should) be balanced by a well thought-out educational policy, so that potential social and ethnic conflicts inflamed by segregation processes can be prevented.

7th ADVICE: Cross the frontier between science and policy, when social and ethnic peace is at stake.

PEACECOM, or “Peace processes in community conflicts: From understanding the roots of conflicts to conflict resolution” is another trans-European research my institute and I participate in. The research design of that EU-financed project is based on regional cooperation. Our research team is responsible for Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic, in addition to Hungary. The focus, again, is on everyday coexistence and conflicts within local communities, such as the famous “Ghetto Wall” separating the Roma from the ethnic Czech built by the city authorities in a small Moravian town called Usti nad Labem (Czech Republic). The eventual goal is to develop and evaluate tools and options for conflict resolution, by first reviewing the history of community conflicts and the effects upon them of European integration.

8th ADVICE: These countries are too small; sell your country in a “package” along with other countries of the region.

Last, but not least, I also started to teach “Multicultural Education – Intercultural Education”, an master’s course intended for psychology students who shall work principally with Roma children as school psychologists. The task is huge: to make them understand the mechanisms of multi-cultural education, so that they can act in their future career as conflict-solving, tension-diminishing agents. A first step is to impart to them that the roots of the conflict are of social and psychosocial – not genetic or neurological – nature.

9th ADVICE: Convert your research experience into teaching status.

Ethnic Hungarians: Another peaceful conflict

Numerous communities of ethnic Hungarians live in the countries that border Hungary: Romania, Slovakia, Serbia and Ukraine. Transylvania in particular (now situated in Romania) is considered in Hungary as a very central part of Hungarian history and identity. Hungarians in the countries neighboring Hungary constitute an important topic of investigation for those concerned with ethnicity.

For me, it started with a survey I was involved in, conducted by Márton Áron College, an institution gathering students from those countries. It was aiming at building an inventory of educational and scientific institutions of the Hungarian minority in the neighboring countries. I was in charge of the Eastern Slovakian region. I collected data in an ethnically mixed region, and observed the strategies of ethnic Hungarian students. Ethnopolitical conflict inside the European Union is a particularly sensitive issue for the EU. That is why the destiny of Hungarians living in the neighboring countries, for example, is now in focus. The political events of yet another country make this topic appear again and again on the diplomatic agenda. Most recently (in June 2006) an extremist party – the Slovak National Party (SNP) – has joined the Slovakian government led by the social democrats. The social democrats, due to the anti-Hungarian diatribes of SNP leaders, are now being excluded from the Socialist International.

Government funds provide most of the research funding in this sub-field, as governments are still the most important sponsors of social science in our region. The book I co-edited (together with the director and the vice-director of our institute), *Conceptions of the Nation: Minority—Majority*, was also supported by the Office of the Chancellor. By the way, the left and the right wings have their “own” public research institutes

in this field, so you have to choose your “camp”, as we say in Hungary, meaning: to take your side. The director of our institute has chosen the left (i.e., the liberals, in American terms), although he keeps trying to maintain good relationships with all sides. So the suggestion for others who might want to pursue this type of career is, cynically, but realistically, the following.

10th ADVICE: Choose your side!

There is another growing “market” for social scientists dealing with the issue of “ethnic” Hungarians abroad: the institutions, especially the universities of those “ethnic Hungarians”. Invited by the Sapientia University, a private body in Romania that is mainly financed by the Hungarian state, I had the occasion to present my hypothesis – developed during the Solomon Asch Center’s Summer Institute in Philadelphia – about “them.” My main idea was that the “ethnic Hungarians” are and act *like a Diaspora, not like a minority*: they have understood and accepted that the territory they live in is part of another country than their kin-state; that is the reason why – among others – they don’t use violence. Their reaction was quite hostile and they presented facts that contradicted my initial hypothesis.

11th ADVICE: Be humble. Don’t imagine that if you know an ethnic conflict, you understand and can solve all of them!

Conclusion

External (EU) funding, as well as imported and then naturalized (Western) concepts contribute to redefine a research focus and reshape a research career. Mine too. In this field, more than in others, the rewards of this type of work are that you may hope to help bring about peace, or – in my case – to reduce social exclusion, segregation and inequalities that

contribute to non-violent social and ethnic conflict, particularly the non-violent cold ethnic war between the Roma and the ethnic majorities in Central and Eastern European countries.

Globalization and transnationalization are not empty words in a small country's (or region's) scientific life. Funding, concepts, research topics, and political and scientific frameworks in which researchers are evolving, are increasingly international. So are the topics of *ethnicity* and *minority*. In addition, a single country is not always easy to "sell", so that there are two levels of internationalization. First, working in and with neighboring countries; and second, "selling" the region (whether you call it Central or Eastern Europe) as a whole to the EU. Though some of the above-mentioned "advices" could appear cynical, there is a last one which, based on all my experiences as a researcher, transcends them all.

12th ADVICE: Conduct research (about ethnic conflict) with the aim to avoid war.

Doing Research at the United Nations

Tina Nebe

If you are after a high-paid, secure job with lots of benefits and a UN passport, read no further. The small research institute, UNRISD, which is presented in the following, has little to do with that side of the United Nations. But if you are wondering how to make your research more accessible to policy-makers who routinely deal with ethnopolitical conflict, if you dream of collaborating directly with scholars from the countries concerned by the social issues you study and if you would like to do applied research in an international, multi-lingual environment close to policy-making, then this article might interest you.

I am currently based at the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) in Geneva. Concretely, I am a research fellow (on external funding) assisting the research coordinator of the “Gender and Development” programme in developing a research project on “Varieties of Public Religion and Gender Equality.” UNRISD is an autonomous body within the United Nations that specialises exclusively in applied social science research and the dissemination of its research findings (through various publications, conferences and the like). It has a staff of 26. Its current priority areas are social policy and development; democracy, governance and well-being; civil society and social movements; markets, business and regulation; identities, conflict and cohesion; and gender and development. UNRISD is mainly doing “South-South” research, looking at developing

countries from a comparative perspective. Its funding is extra-budgetary which means its money is provided by a number of (mainly Scandinavian) donor countries on top of their contributions to the regular UN budget. Having extra-budgetary funding means that UNRISD is free to pursue research without being bound by the political views of the more powerful UN countries and without being vetoed down by those who disagree with the research findings. Its governing body (UNRISD Board of Advisors) is composed of prominent academics and public figures from diverse regions and countries who participate in their individual capacity (and not as representatives of their governments); the chairperson and the members of the Board are formally appointed by the UN Secretary General.

Compared to research work at academic institutions, working with UNRISD implies a more explicit “administrative” component (which exists at all universities but tends to be hidden in academic job advertisements). This has to do with the particular way UNRISD does research. The research staff at UNRISD draft proposals for research projects that are sent out to potential funders such as international development agencies, political foundations or governments. Once funding for a project has been approved, the research coordinator in Geneva and his or her staff (generally one research assistant and one intern) begin looking for researchers who can do the country-level studies on the ground (occasionally, the level of analysis can also be a transnational movement, a region, an ethnic group). Generally, the researchers are academics working in the country under scrutiny who are able to communicate in English or French and can show proof of high-level publications in the required field. All researchers then come together for a methodology workshop and decide on how exactly they want to go about

doing the research. Often, some theoretical “thought pieces” will have been commissioned prior to that date to be discussed by workshop participants. From then on, UNRISD mainly ensures collaboration, reinforces deadlines, comments on draft papers, and – in the final stage of the project – carries out the cross-country comparative analysis. Programme papers, policy briefs and edited volumes are some of the products of this research process.

As a fellow working with a research coordinator, my tasks differ according to the stage of the research project. In the initial project drafting phase (which is when I joined), a lot of time was spent in the library, reading, summarising, photocopying, discussing with the coordinator, surfing the Web for funders and collaborators, contacting potential partners, reading some more, and drafting and re-drafting the project proposal. In the coming year, I hope to write one “thought piece” on women and public religion (“Are women more attracted to public forms of religion than men, and if so, why?”) and to play a strong role in devising the methodological framework for the research project on “Varieties of Public Religions and Gender Equality.” I also spend some time in UNRISD internal and general UN meetings, discussing strategic developments and current affairs.

After spending almost a decade in full-time higher education and research, I felt it was time to move on. Was doing academic research in the university setting really a way to “make a difference” in our world, which is what I had always aspired to? Wouldn’t my Ph.D. and any other publications end up assembling dust in the second basement of some nameless university library? After all, which university in which country would give me a good job? With an interdisciplinary social science background (bachelor’s degree in social policy with social psychology; master’s in contemporary European studies;

a diploma in social science data analysis; Ph.D. in political and social sciences) and an international – if Eurocentric – orientation (having studied in five different European countries and languages), I found it difficult to “retreat” to one national academic system and market myself as a “specialist” in any of the social science sub-disciplines that feature in academic job advertisements. Furthermore, I had the impression that both my “soft skills” (communication, presentation, foreign languages) and my managerial skills (organising conferences, working in a team) were not very much appreciated in the academic setting.

For these reasons, I applied to the programme “*Stiftungskolleg für internationale Aufgaben*” funded by two German foundations in collaboration with the German Federal Foreign Office, permitting selected graduates who speak foreign languages and have done internships in the field of international affairs to work within the UN system for one year. All work placements within this programme are self-organised around a theme of one’s own choosing. Interested in the so-called “clash of civilisations” (and with it in Islam, the Arab world and gender issues) and eager not to “throw away” my research skills in favour of an administrative office job somewhere in the UN, I contacted UNRISD to propose my services. UNRISD has a particularly good reputation and is at the heart of Europe’s UN power centre, the *Palais des Nations* in Geneva. I also considered other UN research institutes such as United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU/WIDER, Helsinki), the UNDP International Poverty Centre (Brasilia) and the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre (Oslo) that have similar mandates: they all do applied social science research on real-life social problems and have close links to policy-makers around the globe. To my

mind, working in such an institution is a great way to do research that can potentially make a difference.

The main challenge connected with working at UNRISD is the price it pays for its institutional autonomy: UNRISD is notoriously underfunded and has no stable posts to offer. An absolute anomaly within the UN system, UNRISD posts (including the director's post and those of the research coordinators) are six month contracts; there is no "career track" for younger researchers and assistants. Most young people join UNRISD as so-called "research assistants" or unpaid interns. Research assistants are hired on regular UN "consultancy" contracts as soon as a project receives external funding and therefore takes its official start. Consultancies mean remuneration on an output basis (per paper, chapter, conference organised), no health insurance, no benefits and no extras such as conference participation or professional travel. At UNRISD, consultancies also mean living on low pay in a very expensive city. All UN consultancies expire after a maximum of two years, after which the former consultant is barred from UN employment for six months.

Although one of the most exciting aspects of working with UNRISD is the institute's hybrid nature between UN policy-making and research, this may also potentially be a weakness when it comes to finding a follow-up position. At UNRISD, you are "in-between two worlds." On the one hand, if you are a research fellow, an external coordinator or any other kind of post-doc at UNRISD and hope to find an academic post afterwards, you may have done too much "research management" and not produced enough publishable research (which, as previously noted, is essentially done by the country-level collaborators). The situation is similar for research assistants and interns: these young researchers are very dependent on the coordinator they work with; the degree

to which they are involved in actual research tasks varies considerably. This is also due to the project cycle. Research work at UNRISD is concentrated at the beginning and end of a project – in between, research is done by the teams on the ground. Although research assistants are encouraged to work on at least one self-standing paper for publication during their two years at UNRISD, they often have limited time to do so. On the other hand, those who hope to use their time in Geneva as a “trampoline” into the UN system need to show a lot of initiative. The experience gained at UNRISD tends to be highly specialised (interlocutors in other agencies are limited) and clearly falls into the “office job” category. However, the UN Secretariat and most agencies such as UNDP tend to value “field experience” above all when it comes to selecting candidates for their (career-track) young professional programmes. It is therefore up to each individual assistant or fellow (and depending on the discretion of the coordinator) to, for example, plan additional visits to country-level research teams. Conference participation, which can be sponsored by UNRISD, is one way to overcome this isolation and get in touch with “the field.”

Further challenges at UNRISD have to do with the nature of the UN system (outside the smaller field offices): contrary to what I have seen at European and U.S. universities, UNRISD is a rather hierarchical place where the coherence of the institute’s work programme is given priority over the individual research interests. Despite its mixed population (including many staff from developing countries), the “Anglo-Saxon” nature of social relationships and academic references is striking. For the “one-world idealists” among us, it can be frustrating to find yourself in Switzerland surrounded by a bunch of – at least – bilingual staff who hardly ever speak French and rarely cite African or Asian authors. Since different

languages are associated with different frames of references, this practice can be a serious impediment to doing the innovative and provocative work to which UNRISD aspires.

In terms of rewards, doing research within the United Nations-system is appealing first and foremost because of its direct link with international affairs. In an institution where for each researcher there is one person doing “dissemination” of research, one’s findings might actually reach many of the policy makers concerned (whether or not they read it is a different question). Besides, working in the *Palais de Nations* in Geneva and being able to participate in UN meetings and debates, language classes and social events and meeting many interesting people from all over the world is of course extremely stimulating and exciting. In particular, it is great to be in such an environment and yet be able to say and write what you think because your agency is autonomous! Maybe the bad contracts are worth it for the “clear conscience” to work in a UN agency that enjoys high esteem within the system as being non-corrupted, innovative and truly concerned with the Southern hemisphere?

If you are interested in working with UNRISD or other UN research institutes, there are many ways of approaching them and a couple of clear-cut *dos* and *don'ts*. Much depends on the level of studies or career you are in. If you are a young graduate with excellent credentials, you could become a “research assistant” to one of the research coordinators. If you are a post-doc, you could work with UNRISD as a research fellow but you need to bring your own funding (a scholarship of some sort). If you hold an academic position, you could become an “external collaborator” at UNRISD or apply for a “research coordinator” position if a post becomes vacant and if you have the necessary experience in policy-making or working in the UN system. For all UNRISD positions, it helps

to hold the right nationality – i.e. if possible, one not yet represented at the institute with preference for researchers from developing countries.

In terms of the *dos* and *don'ts*, I would advise the following: first, do learn languages (especially the UN languages of Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish) and make sure your drafting skills (at least in English) are excellent. Second, do as many internships in civil society and/or public sector organisations across the globe – and especially in developing countries – as possible. It is the mix between good grades and research skills and “*engagement*” that is attractive to UNRISD. Even if you are 30 years old and hold a Ph.D., consider joining what French sociologists call the “*précarial*” (young high-skilled people with precarious jobs) for a couple of months of unpaid internship in Mali. It might pay out later. Third, approach research coordinators directly (rather than the UNRISD administration) and approach them via content: read what they have produced, comment on it or suggest an aspect you would like to discuss with them in person. Do not straightforwardly ask for a job. Something that has worked for me is the infamous “*Ich bin eh schon da*” *Prinzip* (“I am already here” principle). Come to Geneva. Call the respective UNRISD coordinator you wish to collaborate with and ask for a meeting within the next few days. Finally, check out the Websites of UNU/WIDER and the UNDP research centres for similar internship and employment opportunities.

Contributors

Adedayo Adeyemi is a public health physician and the projects director of Healthmatch, a research and outreach organization based in Lagos, Nigeria. He is involved in HIV/AIDS control, prevention, conflicts management and developing health information systems in Nigeria. His current interests are peacebuilding, infectious disease epidemiology, research ethics and public health informatics.

Catherine C. Byrne, Ph.D., is a social psychologist and an assistant professor of psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Her work centers on issues of social justice and transitional justice frameworks. Cath's recent research has focused on victims who took part in the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the benefits and burdens they expressed regarding participating in the process.

Britt Cartrite, Ph.D., is currently an assistant professor of political science at Alma College. Previously, he was a research post-doctoral fellow at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict at the University of Pennsylvania. His current research interests include: ethnopolitical mobilization in Western Europe, complex adaptive systems theory applied to ethnicity and politics, and computational simulation as a methodology for scientific inquiry. Email: cartrite@alma.edu

Jill Carty, Psy.D., is a clinical psychologist working for the U.S. Peace Corps Office of Special Services in Washington, D.C. She was a Peace Corps Volunteer in Guatemala and later returned as Associate Director of Health Programs. She completed a second tour as Programming and Training Officer and Acting Country Director in the Central African Republic.

Alejandro Castillejo-Cuéllar is an assistant professor of anthropology at the Universidad de los Andes, Colombia. He was a research fellow at Columbia University in New York and at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict. In 2007, he was a British Academy visiting professor to the University of London. His doctoral dissertation received the Stanley Diamond Memorial Award by the New School for Social Research. Email: acastill@uniandes.edu.co

Julie Chalfin received her Ph.D. from Claremont Graduate University. She previously held positions at Save the Children, the University of Pennsylvania's Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict, the Carter Center and the International Rescue Committee. Julie currently works in the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of African Affairs as a science and technology diplomacy fellow. She is interested in developing, facilitating and promoting strategies for constructively transforming conflicts.

Serena Chaudhry, M.S.W., M.P.H., is currently the executive director of the Peace and Justice Center in Burlington, Vermont. Serena has worked with displaced communities both domestically and abroad and has developed various programs ranging from health care to needs assessments of refugees. She also serves as a technical advisor to African Refuge, an outreach of the International Trauma Studies Program at the Mailman School of Public Health and Columbia University.

Adam Cohen received his B.A. in psychology and Judaic studies from Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. His Ph.D. in psychology is from the University of Pennsylvania. He is currently an assistant professor of psychology at Arizona State University. Adam's main research interests are in culture and religion with a focus on moral judgment and forgiveness. Email: adamcohen@asu.edu

Elizabeth Hoak Doering holds an M.F.A in sculpture from Boston University (1997) and a B.A. in anthropology from Amherst College (1988). She has been a lecturer in sculpture at the University of Pennsylvania's School of Design since 2000. Institutional support for her work includes grants from the U.S. Fulbright Program, the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts, and the Leeway Foundation. Her artwork is regularly exhibited in the U.S. and Europe. www.ehdoering.com

Teri L. Elliott received her Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from Long Island University. She trains and consults on a wide range of topics including trauma, psychological first aid, disaster response, and preparedness planning. Dr. Elliott has responded to numerous disasters and worked with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies to provide psychological support program training for developing countries. Email: tle@tlelliott.com; <http://tlelliott.com>

Donald G. Ellis is professor of communication in the School of Communication at the University of Hartford. Don is the past editor of the journal *Communication Theory* and the author of numerous books and articles including the recent *Transforming Conflict: Communication Approaches to Ethnopolitical Conflict*. He was a Fulbright scholar in Israel in 2004-2005. Don lectures and writes in the fields of communication, conflict resolution, and intercultural communication, as well as related topics. Email: delis@hartford.edu

Gábor Eröss, Ph.D., has worked as a researcher at the Institute of Sociology in Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He co-edited a book on ethnic studies and coauthored a book on the sociology of education. Gábor's four main research interests are comparative cultural sociology, sociology of education, ethnic studies, and sociology of health care policies. He has been an assistant professor for Károli University, Budapest. Email: egabor@socio.mta.hu

Miriam Coronel Ferrer is an associate professor at the Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines. She has been a visiting professor at Gadjah Madah University, Indonesia; Hankuk University, Seoul; and currently at Hiroshima University, Japan. She is one of the “1,000 Women for the Nobel Peace Prize” nominated in 2005, for her local and international involvement in peace, human rights and humanitarian campaigns.
E-mail: miriam.ferrer@up.edu.ph

Adina Friedman holds a Ph.D. from George Mason University, an M.S. from Goteborg University, Sweden, an M.A. from Tel Aviv University, Israel, and a B.S. from San Jose State University, California. Adina has taught courses on Middle East conflict analysis and resolution at several universities and has also published on these topics. She worked extensively in the Middle East and in the U.S. on projects pertaining to regional issues and to Arab-Israeli relations.
Email: adinaf@gwu.edu

David Goodwin, Ph.D., earned his doctoral degree in clinical and health psychology from the University of Florida (1991) and his undergraduate degree in sociology and social psychology from Loughborough University, England. David is interested in mainstreaming ethnopolitical issues in psychiatry residency training and core curriculum for clinical psychology programs. His experience includes treating refugees and his research focuses on mental health treatment for refugees and the role of narcissism in the perpetuation of conflict. Email: goodwind@einstein.edu

Alan Gross has been involved in conflict resolution since 1986. He has volunteered as a mediator, arbitrator, and trainer in New York City where he served as acting senior director and 9/11 family mediation coordinator for the Safe Horizon Mediation Program. Alan’s other involvements include consulting, organizing businesses, hosting a talk radio show and driving a night taxi. He was formerly a psychology professor and a department chair at the University of Maryland. Email: AlanEGross@aol.com

Thomas Hill is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education and a visiting scholar at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict. He also is a senior associate at Columbia University's Center for International Conflict Resolution. Thomas spent 13 years as a professional sportswriter at several daily newspapers, most recently the New York *Daily News*.

Daniel Holland is an associate professor of psychology at the University of Arkansas-Little Rock. His work focuses on the experience of disability and chronic illness and the sociopolitical contexts within which such experiences take place. He has been a Fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies; a two time Fulbright recipient; a Research Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; and a Mary E. Switzer Distinguished Fellow in Rehabilitation Research, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, U.S. Department of Education.

Rebecca Horn holds a Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Birmingham in the UK, and has a specialized background in forensic psychology. For the past three years she has been working for the Jesuit Refugee Service in Kakuma Refugee Camp in northwest Kenya, managing four psychosocial programmes in the camp. Previously, she worked as a university lecturer in psychology and as a prison psychologist. Email: rebecca_r_horn@yahoo.co.uk

Elodie Hugon entered the PROIMMSE-UNAM in San Cristobal de las Casas, Mexico in 2001 as a visiting scholar. Her professional experience includes teaching at a social science university and as a social worker with local Mexican NGOs in southern and central Mexico. Elodie recently started to collaborate with the state of Queretaro's security department as a consultant for the design of participative programs that would help to prevent petty crimes and delinquency.

Molly Inman is a program manager for Central and Eastern Europe at the American Bar Association's Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative. She has an M.A. in Democracy and Human Rights from the Universities of Bologna and Sarajevo and a B.A. in Foreign Affairs and German from the University of Virginia. She is interested in issues related to ethnic conflict, forced migration and transitional justice.

Ashraf Kagee is a professor of psychology at Stellenbosch University where he teaches courses in research methods and cognitive behaviour therapy. He holds degrees from the University of Cape Town, the University of Portland, and Ball State University. A former fellow of the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict, his research areas include posttraumatic stress, the effectiveness of cognitive behavioural therapy in South African settings, and HIV risk behaviour among adolescents.

Tina Kempin is an assistant professor for international relations in the Department of Government at Christopher Newport University in Newport News, VA. She received her Ph.D. and M.A. in history from the University of Zurich, Switzerland. She was a visiting scholar at the Solomon Asch Center (2005-2006), a research fellow at the University of Zurich Law School (2003-2005) and a research assistant at the Center for Security Studies, ETH Zurich (1999-2003). Email: tina.kempin@cnu.edu

Maria Koinova, Ph.D., is an assistant professor at the American University of Beirut and a research fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D.C. She holds a doctorate from the European University Institute in Florence, Italy. She is the author of several publications on minority-state relationships in the Balkans. Her current comparative project examines the impact of diasporas on intrastate conflicts in the Balkans, Caucasus and the Middle East. Email: mkoinova@hotmail.com

Christian Leuprecht is an assistant professor of political science at the Royal Military College of Canada and cross-appointed to the Department of Political Studies at Queen's University. He is a research associate at the Institute for Intergovernmental Relations in the School of Policy Studies and a fellow at the Queen's Centre for International Relations. He studied at the University of Toronto and at the Université Pierre Mendès-France before obtaining his Ph.D. at Queen's University. www.christianleuprecht.com

Sumanasiri Liyanage is a senior lecturer and heads the Department of Economics, University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka. He is a program consultant for the South Asian Peace Institute in Colombo. His research interests include constitutional reforms, identity-based conflicts in South Asia, social movements and ethnic riots. Email: sumane_1@yahoo.com

Mikhail Lyubansky is a clinical psychologist and a lecturer at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign, where he teaches about the psychology of race and ethnicity and theories of psychotherapy. He recently co-authored an academic book on the Russian-Jewish diaspora and a chapter examining race and racism in *The Psychology of Harry Potter*. Mikhail's research focuses on beliefs about race and nationalism. www.psych.uiuc.edu/~lyubansk/

Lorraine Majka, Ph.D., has been a university professor, and a Fulbright scholar at the University of Oxford's Refugee Studies Center. She has worked on refugee issues at the United Nations, in NGOs and government offices, and in refugee camps and communities in Kenya and Ethiopia. She is a founding member of the University of Oxford's International Association for the Study of Forced Migration. Email: Lmajka@hotmail.com

Malika B. Mistry received her Ph.D. from Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics in Poona, India. Her dissertation research examined Hindu and Muslim fertility patterns. She is a peace activist with a focus on human rights and minority rights. Recently, Malika

conducted research on the Gujarat genocide in India. She is currently a senior lecturer at the Poona College of Arts, Science and Commerce in Poona.

Tina Nebe specializes in the fields of racism, gender equality and ethnoreligious conflict, especially in Europe and in the Middle East. She holds a Ph.D. in political and social sciences from the European University Institute and currently works as a consultant at the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development in Geneva and as *chargée de recherche* at the Centre de recherches politiques de Sciences Po in Paris.

Diane Perlman, Ph.D., is a clinical and political psychologist. She is co-chair of the Committee on Global Violence & Security for Psychologists for Social Responsibility. Diane is starting a think tank in Washington D.C. called The Paragon Institute for Enduring Security. The institute will apply social science knowledge to issues of terrorism, nuclear proliferation, conflict transformation, and strategy and policy design. The intended audiences include the media, members of Congress, activists, and the public at large. Email: dianeperlman@gmail.com; www.consciouspolitics.org

Carolyn A. Ristau is a consultant with Pro-Natura International-Nigeria (www.pronatura-nigeria.org). She is also a research fellow at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict at the University of Pennsylvania and is affiliated with the psychology department at Barnard College of Columbia University. Her work involves conflict analysis and community development, particularly in Nigeria's Niger Delta. Carolyn also has a background in cognitive ethology. Currently, she also conducts research with great apes. Email: car31@columbia.edu

Inmaculada Serrano is a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at the Juan March Institute and the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid. She received her undergraduate degree in sociology at the University of Salamanca and an M.A. in the social sciences from the Juan March

Institute. In 2005 she was a summer fellow at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict. Currently, she is undertaking field research in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Champika K. Soysa, Ph.D., is from Sri Lanka. She earned her doctorate in clinical psychology at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. She is currently an assistant professor of psychology at Worcester State College, Massachusetts. Her research interests include collective trauma in the context of war and natural disaster, and the investigation of cultural features in the manifestation of psychological distress.

Shanee Stepakoff is a psychologist at the UN-backed Special Court for Sierra Leone. She holds a Ph.D. in clinical psychology; M.A. degrees in political and clinical/community psychology; undergraduate degrees in psychology and urban studies; and certificates in women's studies, child development, trauma, psychoanalysis, and ethnopolitical conflict. She has worked with refugees in Guinea with the Center for Victims of Torture. She is also a registered poetry therapist. Email: shaneestep@aol.com

Ephraim Tabory is deputy director of the Graduate Program on Conflict Management and Resolution at Bar Ilan University, Israel, and a member of that university's Department of Sociology. He teaches social psychology and intergroup relations, and is currently researching the social and political discourse of Jews and Arabs regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; religious conflict in Israel; and the perceived nature of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state. Email: tabore@mail.biu.ac.il

Eugene K. B. Tan is an assistant professor of law at the Singapore Management University. A former 2005 fellow at the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict, Eugene is privileged to be part of a global community concerned with and working towards a better understanding of ethnopolitical conflict. His research interests include the mutual interaction of law and public policy in

the formation of ethnic identities and the regulation of ethnic conflict. Email: eugene@smu.edu.sg

Georgios Terzis, Ph.D., is an associate professor at Vesalius College, Vrije Universiteit Brussel in Belgium and chair of the Journalism Studies Section of the European Communication Research and Education Association. He worked as a foreign correspondent for Greek media and as media programs director of Search for Common Ground in Brussels (www.sfcg.org). He organized media and conflict resolution web-based programs and trainings for journalists from Angola, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cyprus, Greece, the Middle East, Sri Lanka, and Turkey.

Hanna Zagefka completed her Ph.D. in social psychology at the University of Kent in 2004; her thesis focused on perceived relative deprivation and conditions leading to collective action in ethnic minority members in the U.K. and Germany. She is currently in a tenure track position in the psychology department of Royal Holloway, University of London. Her research interests concern psychological processes related to intergroup relations, and particularly intergroup conflict.

Editors

Roy J. Eidelson is executive director of the Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict at the University of Pennsylvania. He received his bachelor's degree in psychology from Princeton University and his Ph.D. in psychology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Roy's research interests focus on how core beliefs about vulnerability, injustice, distrust, superiority, and helplessness influence relationships between people and groups. He is also a licensed psychologist and maintains a consulting and psychotherapy practice.

Jena Laske is programs officer at the Solomon Asch Center. She received a master's degree from the International Peace and Conflict Resolution Program at Arcadia University and holds a bachelor's degree in communications from Pennsylvania State University. Jena has been a freelance writer for several years. Her research interests include women's economic development, particularly in post-conflict settings. She is an editor of *The Seed Quarterly*, a non-profit publication.

Lina Cherfas is the project coordinator at the Greater Southern Brooklyn Health Coalition. She holds a bachelor's degree in psychology and European history from the University of Pennsylvania and a master's degree in forced migration from Oxford University. She was previously a research specialist at the Solomon Asch Center, where she focused on collaborations regarding psychosocial initiatives with conflict-affected communities, particularly in Sri Lanka. Lina's research interests include the psychosocial aspects of health promotion and rights-based perspectives on justice in post-conflict societies.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank several individuals and organizations for helping to bring *Peacemaker 101* to fruition. First, we are thankful to the National Institute of Mental Health for its support of the Asch Center's summer institutes, and for the funding that made this book possible. We also appreciate the generosity of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Atlantic Philanthropies, and the University of Pennsylvania for their contributions to the success of the summer institute programs.

Peacemaker 101 also benefited considerably from the insights and guidance of Paul Rozin and Clark McCauley, the founding directors of the Solomon Asch Center. Expert advice provided by Peter Agree and Lars Mylius was also indispensable.

Finally, we wish to thank the 39 contributors who generously agreed to share their personal stories with us. We wish them continued success and fulfillment in their professional pursuits.

