

Elizabeth Claggett-Borne

“It cannot be said that humans are innately peaceful or aggressive,” argued Elise Boulding, a founder of the peace studies field in the United States (Boulding, 1998, third paragraph). In her view, both peaceful and aggressive behaviors flourish, but the shaping of children’s attitudes in different cultures determines how peacefully or violently the country handles conflicts. Moreover, she contended, “Society contains in itself resources that can shift the balance from a preoccupation with violence toward peaceful problem-solving behavior” (Boulding, eighth paragraph). What insights can people residing in different countries give us into this quintessential quest for peace in our time?

Social science researchers appear to have devoted much more attention to war and other forms of aggression than to issues of peace and reconciliation, yet the achievement of peace may be essential to human survival. Attention to international reconciliation is rapidly developing and integral to the pursuit of peace. Human fallibilities have inflicted gross pain and shame on entire peoples. Atrocities have been committed and denied, genocide happens, apologies are slow to transmit, and reconciliation often resisted. Yet warring parties have reached peace agreements and in many cases have achieved reconciliation – as was true of the Western European nations following World War II. Probably most people would

agree that peace and reconciliation are desirable goals, yet what is meant by these terms?

In this first section of the book, we report on definitions of peace and reconciliation from eight major regions of the world, involving 47 different countries. This chapter has several purposes: to address the historical context for peace and reconciliation, to offer some standard definitions of the words reconciliation and peace, and to explain the methods used in coding definitions of peace and reconciliation from our international sample. Lastly, this chapter addresses the importance of research on peace and reconciliation in helping to transform the world out from paralyzing violence.

Background

Peace and Reconciliation in the Last 100 Years

The Path Toward Peace

In the twentieth century, world citizens and world leaders strode forward in their understanding of peace. A petite, dark-skinned lawyer, often seen walking with a cane, rocked the world and spelled the demise of the British Empire. Mohandas Gandhi reconfigured human understanding of peace, with novel ideas for overcoming tyranny without bloodshed. Peace in action reached a pinnacle. In the northern hemisphere, Bertha Suttner, popular author of *Die Waffen nieder* (Down With Arms), persuaded Alfred Nobel to endow the

E. Claggett-Borne (✉)
Alternatives to Violence Project, Friends Meeting,
Cambridge, MA, USA

Nobel Peace Prizes, starting in 1901. An international peace conference was held at The Hague in 1907 with representatives from 44 countries from Europe, North and South America, and Asia. An organized army of tireless peacebuilders created libraries, advocated for diplomacy, and held congresses for at least 20 years until 1914. To wrestle with international conflicts, a shining example of popular insistence on negotiation occurred in 1905: Norway and Sweden peacefully separated despite threats of war from both governments. Then, in 1917, Europeans glowingly declared WWI as “the war to end all wars.” Hopes of world peace were dashed just 20 years later, as the Nazi power machine undertook conquest of Germany’s neighbors.

Although historians and scientists have frequently conceptualized peace simply as the opposite of war, Johan Galtung (1969, 1996) has urged people for 50 years to see equitable distribution of resources (positive peace) as just as important as stopping bloody conflicts (negative peace). After the aborted League of Nations (1920) and the end of WWII (1945), international diplomacy and conventions against war and abuse of power proliferated with monumental events such as the birth of the United Nations (1945); India’s non-violent independence from Great Britain (1947); the UN Declaration of Human Rights (1948); Geneva Conventions of humane treatment (1949); UNESCO’s Culture of Peace Program (1980s); and the Earth Charter, which extended our understanding of reciprocity to humans living in the natural world. Researchers are briskly adding to our understanding of peace in its myriad colors.

Similarly, in the 1950s and 1960s, sweeping liberation movements throughout Africa overthrew the yoke of colonialism, with the countries of Libya (1951) and Sudan (1956) leading the way. Peace processes in the horn of Africa, former Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe unfolded fitfully and usually painfully. More recently, the Balkan Peninsula sprouted new countries like Montenegro (2006), and in the horn of Africa, new countries like Eritrea (1993) and Southern Sudan (2011) have emerged.

Efforts by the United Nations have contributed to a decline in interstate warfare in the last 60

years; however, the level of civil war (intrastate) increased steadily throughout the Cold War period (1945–1991). In 1991, the Regieringen Institute calculated that there were over 50 armed conflicts, whereas by 2003 the numbers were down to 32 (Butaug et al., 2006).

The Path Toward Reconciliation

In the face of international crimes or any abuse of power, humans tend to push back with penalties or imprisonment. What does modern history offer as an alternative to punishment and retaliation following armed conflict? As illustrated by the failure of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, reconciliation is more than a contract. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) responded to the horrors of WWI with programs of healing and people-to-people diplomacy. IFOR strove to transform social injustice: “There can be no genuine peace without reconciliation. [Reconciliation] transcends ... international law among the States and allows...the people to step in” (Committee on Peace and International Security of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2004, p. 3).

In the last 30 years, the study of reconciliation has arisen out of grassroots initiatives, restorative justice work, and the peace study fields. The 1980s saw many peace walks to establish people-to-people connections in the face of intergovernment hostilities, such as the American-Soviet Peace Walk in 1987–1988. In the 1990s, Reconciliation Walks began, such as the Pilgrimage of the Middle Passage in 1998, which retraced slavery routes in three continents from Massachusetts, USA, to Capetown, South Africa (PBS, Blackside, 2003). In 1990, the International Reconciliation Coalition (IRC) announced a religious call for reconciliation. The IRC sponsored a walk of forgiveness across Europe, 900 years after the first crusade, where thousands of innocent Jewish and Muslim people were massacred (Across Pacific and Asia, n.d.). Some 2,500 people retraced the footsteps of the crusaders for 3 years, walking in apology to Jerusalem: “We renounce greed, hatred and fear, and condemn all violence done in the name of Jesus Christ” (International Reconciliation Coalition, 1998, p. 1). Abdel Mounim Ariss, mayor of Beirut,

received a framed copy of the Reconciliation Walk apology in Arabic in a meeting with the team of participants on September 8. “I personally thank you for what you have started,” Mounim Ariss said. “I hope you are received well all throughout the Middle East. It is high time we had a world without bloodshed. Maybe this message will encourage leaders to make a healthy world that is safe for our children” (Reconciliation Walk, 1998, lines 5–6).

Since 1990, the UN has promoted reconciliation with two International Decades of the World’s Indigenous People. The UN promotes reconciliation through UNICEF, UNESCO, the Geneva Convention, and UN Peacebuilding Commission. The UN offers mechanisms to carry reconciliation forward. Two examples are formal apologies from governments that had forcibly removed children from their homes (Australia, Canada) and countries that had eradicated ethnic languages, religions, and culture (Japan). Truth commissions, mediation, and sports or music camps are among the efforts undertaken to address the trauma experienced by victims of war, with the goal of bringing former opponents together.

Since the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission was created in 1995 under charismatic Bishop Desmond Tutu, as many as 20 other such commissions have been formed in other countries in response to domestic strife. South Africa’s commission allowed incentives to be used to give voice to the perpetrators. These reconciliation projects encourage members of both parties to gather within a contained space so as to learn about each other’s pain and fears in a context of at least a minimum level of trust

Because justice is integral to reconciliation, truth commissions that allow impunity for perpetrators in the interest of hearing the truth may be flawed. When heinous acts of terror or apartheid draw little redress to the offenders and no steps against governments that assailed human rights, survivors and their kin can feel ill-used. Nevertheless, according to Lind (2009), “Strategies of reconciling are unpalatable in many ways – yet are wise from the standpoint of international reconciliation.” Reconciliation is born out of sweat and hope and is carried out by many hands.

Reconciliation, as generally conceived today, is not surrender and is more than arbitration between enemies. It is not a one-way street. The path to peace includes efforts by both sides or all constituents. When achieved, reconciliation permeates all levels of society: dyads, family units, and wider communities. Reconciliation on the world stage can be powerful: In South Africa, Nelson Mandela cooperated with his rival F.W. DeKlerk in 1990; in Israel, Meacham Begin shook hands with Palestinian Yasser Arafat in 1993; in Ireland, Gerry Adams from the IRA and Ian Paisley from Northern Ireland signed the Good Friday Agreement in 2007.

Conventional Definitions of Peace

One of the major definitions of peace in the Merriam-Webster online dictionary (2011) is “tranquility; freedom from civil disturbance; a state of security or order within a community provided for by law or custom.” Sociologist Elise Boulding, who helped develop the concept of the culture of peace, described peace as when “humans live together nonviolently, creatively, fulfilling all the potentials.” Boulding (2000, p. 55) promoted the possibility that humanity can learn to grow “without compulsion and oppression” with one another. According to the World Government of World Citizens (2011, definition 7), peace is the “result of a codified social contract between equally sovereign humans living in the same geographical environment.”

Conventional Definitions of Reconciliation

The study of reconciliation has seen considerable growth, arising in the last 30 years out of the field of conflict resolution. John Paul Lederach (1999), a Mennonite scholar in peace studies, identifies four components of reconciliation: truth, justice, mercy, and peace. The Merriam-Webster online dictionary (2011) simply defines reconciling as “to restore to friendship or harmony.”

Reconciliation invites both parties to reach further than arbitration. “It transcends ...international law among the States and allows...the people to step in. ...There can be no genuine peace without reconciliation. Over the past years, reconciliation has tended to become an inescapable political and legal process” (Mongbe & del Picchia, 2004, pp. 2–3). Reconciliation appears to be most successful when achieved through a multifaceted strategy, including (a) mutual recognition, (b) making peace, (c) mediation, (d) establishing joint institutions, (e) justice, (f) remembrance, and (g) conducting joint projects (Mongbe & del Picchia).

Many researchers anchor reconciliation to peace. Joseph Maïla from the University for Peace defined reconciliation as the crowning achievement of peace. “It aims not to resolve the conflict but to go beyond it. It implies that rights are recognised but all the same, goes further, for its ultimate objective is to achieve an appeased society which recognises free and equal individuals able to confront a history marred by violence, and above all, overcome that history... Reconciliation goes hand in hand with forgiveness” (Mongbe & del Picchia, 2004, p. 2).

Although there are some differences in conventional views on peace and reconciliation, there are not huge divergences – probably the most significant one is between positive and negative views of peace. To what extent do ordinary people from very different countries and regions around the world define peace and reconciliation in relatively conventional terms? Do some of them conceptualize peace in positive peace terms, involving fairness, equality, etc.? Do others conceptualize peace as the absence of war or other forms of aggression? Do any of them define peace and reconciliation in unique ways? These are the questions to be addressed in the chapters in this section of the book.

& You, 2006) were recruited by members of the Group on International Perspectives on Governmental Aggression and Peace (GIPGAP) through many different approaches, including personal networking and posting of the survey link on a number of organizational sites. Participants completed either a paper copy of the survey or an online version. Our sample was a nonrepresentative convenience sample; as such, results cannot be assumed to be generalizable to the populations of the geographical regions.

The total global sample consisted of 5,000 adults from 47 countries, which we have organized into eight regional groupings for the purpose of this book: (a) Africa, including Angola, Botswana, Egypt, Ghana, Nigeria, South Africa, and Zambia; (b) South/Southeast Asia, including India, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka; (c) East Asia, including China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan; (d) Latin America, including Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Peru; (e) the Middle East, including Afghanistan, Bahrain, Iran, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates; (f) Russia and the Balkan Peninsula, including Russia, Greece, Serbia, and Slovenia; (g) Western Europe, including France, Germany, Iceland, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden; and (h) United Kingdom/Anglo countries, including Australia, Canada, Great Britain, North Ireland, and the United States.

We collected basic demographic information from each respondent, although not all respondents replied to all items. In order to explore the possibility that definitions of peace and reconciliation varied as a function of some relevant demographic characteristics, we conducted some basic chi-square analyses to determine if definitions varied in relation to (a) gender, (b) military service, (c) having a close relative who served in the military, and (d) participation in at least one protest activity.

Sample and Procedures

Respondents to the Personal and Institutional Rights to Aggression and Peace Survey (PAIRTAPS; Malley-Morrison, Daskalopoulos,

The Coding Process

A grounded theory approach was used to create coding systems for the participants’ definitions of

peace and reconciliation. Grounded theory (Clarke, 2003; Gilgun, 2005; Glaser, 1978) is a type of research method used with qualitative verbal material. Grounded theory researchers begin the coding process trusting that themes will emerge from the data in an inductive fashion (Charmaz, 2006). Grounded theory offers an approach to “build rather than test theory” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.13).

The definitions of peace and reconciliation coded for in the chapters in this section were derived from responses to the Personal and Institutional Rights to Aggression and Peace Survey (PAIRTAPS; Malley-Morrison et al., 2006), developed by a group based in Boston University, the Group on International Perspectives on Governmental Aggression and Peace (GIPGAP). The survey included a section asking participants to provide definitions of a number of key terms, including “peace” and “reconciliation.”

Using the grounded theory approach, we derived coding categories from a diverse international coding manual sample that included several hundred definitions of peace and reconciliation from almost all of the countries contributing survey responses to the project. After reading, rereading, and sorting all codeable units within the definitions into thematic categories, GIPGAP members identified several major categories, as well as subcategories. For example, definitions of peace that cast some doubt as to whether peace was something that could be achieved were sorted into a major category that we called *question of achievability* and two subcategories that we labeled *unattainable* and something to *strive for*. The manuals were continually revised, with subcategories being added and combined until we established a final version that we could apply to a new set of responses with good intercoder reliability; it was this manual we used for the current study. All responses (codeable units) were independently coded by at least two coders and checked by a team leader.

As mentioned, definitional responses were segmented into separate units of meaning labeled codeable units, and each of these units received a code. In any particular answer to the request for definitions, we identified the smallest meaningful

units, which could range from a single word to a lengthy phrase. For example, one person defined peace as “serenity,” which is a single unit coded into a subcategory labeled *tranquility*. Another participant offered a more complex answer, saying that peace is “a time of no war and justice prevailing.” This answer has two codeable units: (a) “a time of no war,” which is coded into the *rejecting violence* category, and (b) “justice prevailing,” coded into a category for *prerequisites for peace*. Throughout the chapter, the terms “response” and “definition” are used to refer both to complete answers and to single codeable units.

Furthermore, the categories and subcategories for each of the major categories were added together to create superordinate categories that were scored for presence or absence (1=presence, 0=absence). That is, if a response was coded into any of the categories or subcategories within a major category, the response received a 1 for the superordinate category. The name of the variables created through these procedures was the name of the major category followed by the word “presence.” For example, if a response was coded for either *general question of achievability/ideal*, *unattainable*, *strive for*, or *spiritual/God*, it also received a score of 1 in the *question of achievability/ideal presence* category. This procedure allowed us to determine whether there were group differences not just in the individual subcategories of a major category, where the frequencies were often rather small, but determine whether there were group differences in the set of subcategories considered as a whole.

Coding System for Definitions of Peace

The four major categories of the peace coding manual are *negative peace*, *positive peace*, *question of achievability/ideal*, and *focus on perceived reality*. Except for a few extraneous answers that were identified as *uncodeable*, most responses were coded into one of these major categories or their subcategories. For

example, one definition of peace was “a world of love,” which was coded within the *positive peace* category. Another definition was “a state of order and harmony,” which had two codeable units. “A state of order” was coded within the *positive peace* category and “harmony” was coded for *positive outcomes harmony*.

Negative Peace Definitions

Responses coded into the major category labeled *negative peace* describe peace in terms of what it is not rather than what it is. That is, they define peace as involving the removal, absence, or end of some aggressive act or dangerous situation. One example of a *negative peace* definition is “a state of the mind feeling no danger”.

Within the *negative peace* category, there are five subcategories: *no conflict*, *rejecting violence*, *rejecting terrorism*, *negative emotions*, and *rejecting intimidation*. Responses in the *no conflict* subcategory define peace as the absence of conflict without specifically mentioning violence. One example of a *no conflict* response is “living amicably without disturbances.” Responses that define peace as the end of violence were coded into the *rejecting violence* subcategory, which includes responses defining peace as the absence of fighting. Two examples of *rejecting violence* are “atmosphere of no violence” and “when two fighting factions have put their arms down...”

Another *negative peace* subcategory is *rejecting terrorism* – for example, “the state where war or terrorism is not practiced.” Responses coded into the *negative emotions* subcategory identify peace with the absence of emotions such as fear or feeling threatened; for example, one person said peace is “a condition in which there are no worries in mind.” The last subcategory of the major *negative peace* category is *rejecting intimidation/threat* and is illustrated in a definition indicating that peace is “absence of war or the threat of any physical violence of any sort”; in this response, the second codeable unit was coded for *rejecting of intimidation or threat*.

Positive Peace Definitions

Positive peace is another major category that includes two subcategories as well as numerous tertiary subcategories. The subcategory of *prerequisites for peace* applies to responses describing conditions that must be in place so as to have peace or that lead to peace being achieved. An example of *prerequisites for peace* can be found in the statement that peace “is not only a state of being, it should be an environment that allows a human being to grow to his/her highest potential”.

Within the *prerequisites for peace* subcategory, there are an additional seven subcategories descriptive of the particular prerequisites mentioned with the greatest frequency: (1) *granting of human rights*, (2) *equality*, (3) *acceptance/tolerance*, (4) *democratic participation*, (5) *openness to working toward a mutual goal*, (6) *security*, and (7) *access to resources*. Moreover, within the third subcategory of *acceptance/tolerance*, two more subcategories emerged from analysis of the responses: (a) *understanding* and (b) *solidarity*.

The *granting of human rights* subcategory of *positive peace* includes responses identifying peace with the achievement of human rights; such responses often mention inherent rights to human dignity and to life. Two examples of *granting of human rights* are “liberty to live life” and “a state in which the basic human rights of people are being met...” However, responses that describe structural, legal, institutional, or cultural equality are coded into the *equality* subcategory. Examples of *equality* include “the respect of international human rights for all” and “genuine kindness toward all humans, regardless of color, race, economic, or social background.”

The third *positive peace* subcategory is *acceptance/tolerance*, which includes responses referring to individuals coexisting or getting along with others – for example, “complete agreement, getting along or at the very least indifference toward other countries.” Within the *acceptance/tolerance* subcategory, there are two additional subcategories: (a) *understanding* and (b) *solidarity*. Examples of responses coded for *solidarity* are “everyone respects each other” and “mutual tolerance and/or understanding”.

Table 2.1 Definitions of peace: coding categories and subcategories

I. Negative peace [N]
A. No conflict [NC]
B. Rejecting violence [NV]
C. Rejecting terrorism [NT]
D. Negative emotions [NE]
E. Rejecting intimidation//threat [NI]
II. Positive peace [P]
A. Prerequisites for peace [PP]
1. Granting of human rights [PPHR]
2. Equality [PPE]
3. Acceptance//tolerance [PPT]
a. Understanding [PPTU]
b. Solidarity [PPTS]
4. Democratic participation [PPD]
5. Openness to working toward a mutual goal [PPO]
6. Security [PPS]
7. Access to resources [PPA]
B. Outcomes [PO]
1. Positive emotions [POE]
2. Calm//tranquility [POC]
3. Harmony [POH]
III. Question of achievability//ideal [A]
A. Unattainable [AU]
B. Strive for [AS]
C. Spiritual//God [AG]
IV. Reality [REAL]

Democratic participation, the fourth *positive peace* subcategory included in the *prerequisites for peace* subcategory, applies to definitions focusing on the need for everyone, or the majority of people, to be able to voice their opinions. An example of *democratic participation* is “a state or condition where each citizen can say what he feels about his country.” A fifth subcategory, *openness to working toward a mutual goal*, contains responses identifying peace with open communication and cooperation and allowing groups to work toward a common goal. These responses mention processes designed to address root causes of conflict and solve problems through dialogue, negotiation, reconciliation, and treaties. For example, a respondent said that peace is “a state where conflict arises as it naturally does, but is solved around a table.” The sixth subcategory is *security*. These responses identify peace with a sense of security. Two examples are “one can live

in comfortable zone” and “a secure condition; in an individual’s case, a state in which there is satisfaction psychologically, physically, financially, and bodily.” One final subcategory within the *prerequisites for peace* subcategory is *access to resources*. For example, one respondent said peace is “justice, equality, and optimum conditions for human development.” In this example, the last phrase is coded *access to resources*.

In addition to *prerequisites for peace*, a second subcategory of *positive peace* definitions emerged for responses focusing on *outcomes* – that is, definitions mentioning the results of having peace or characteristics of a culture of peace (e.g., “everyone feels happy”). Responses identifying peace with the freedom to do something are coded into the *outcomes* subcategory, which has three subcategories: (a) *positive emotions* (e.g., “can love each other freely”), (b) *calm/tranquility* (e.g., serenity), and (c) *harmony* (e.g., “period of harmony and equilibrium”) (Table 2.1).

Other Major Coding Categories for Definitions of Peace

The major category *question of achievability/ideal* includes responses focusing on how attainable peace is or describes peace as an ideal. Three examples of *question of achievability/ideal* are “a dream in which everything is rose colored,” “unimaginable,” and “Good!” Within this major category are three subcategories: *unattainable*, which describes peace as never achievable; something to *strive for*, which describes peace as something that should be sought; and *spiritual/God*, for responses identifying religion or God as important to achieving peace. Responses such as “never” or “impossible” are coded into the *unattainable* subcategory. Examples of responses coded into the subcategory *strive for* include “we all need peace for the success of each country and everyone” and “something that humans should have and want to keep.” In the subcategory, *spiritual/God*, a typical example is “something attainable only by the wisest and spiritual beings”.

Responses in the fourth and last major category, which has no subcategories, focus on

perceived reality – that is, they refer to some sort of real-world situation as perceived by the participant rather than directly defining peace. Some examples are “Costa Rica” or “what we have now, the way we are living in Egypt today.” A small number of responses that were bizarre or inexplicable were labeled *uncodeable*.

Coding System for Definitions of Reconciliation

Developing a coding system for PAIRTAPS definitions of reconciliation was challenging due to a high level of diverse definitions. Nevertheless, based on responses from the international coding manual sample, we identified several strong themes in the reconciliation definitions, yielding five major coding categories: (a) *process*, (b) *state*, (c) *human characteristic*, (d) *future orientation*, and (e) *question of achievability/ideal*. Responses coded for a focus on *process* identify steps needed to address past conflicts. Those coded for *state* identify reconciliation as an end product. Some responses simply identified reconciliation as a *human characteristic*. The *future orientation* category is for responses suggesting that reconciliation involves a continuation of relationships into the future. Finally, responses coded as *question of achievability/ideal* imply that reconciliation is an ideal that may or may not be attainable.

Definition of Reconciliation as Process

Responses in the *process* category define reconciliation as a process needed to reach the end of hostilities. An example is “working things out.” Within the *process* major category are nine subcategories: (a) *move on*, (b) *engage in apology and forgiveness*, (c) *make reparations/compensations*, (d) *resolve/fix*, (e) *recognize/acknowledge/respect*, (f) *come to terms/agreement/compromise/negotiate*, (g) *reach understanding*, (h) *unite*, and (i) *undertake prevention/preventing*. Some of these subcategories are

Table 2.2 Definitions of reconciliation: coding categories and subcategories

I. Process
A. Move on
1. Active
B. Apologize and forgive
1. Without forgetting
C. Make reparations/compensations
D. Resolve/fix
1. Make amends
E. Recognize/acknowledge/respect
F. Come to terms/agreement/compromise/negotiate
G. Reach understanding
H. Unite
1. Healing/reuniting
2. Building new relationship with former enemy
I. Prevent future violence or conflict
II. State
A. Peace
B. End of conflict/violence/hostilities
C. Positive emotional state
III. Human characteristic
IV. Future orientation
V. Question of achievability/ideal
A. Strive for

divided further into a third-level subcategory (Table 2.2).

Move on defines reconciliation as the act of putting something behind you or forgetting the problem. An example in this category is “setting aside the past.” Within the *move on* subcategory is a third-level subcategory *active*, which describes reconciliation as a deliberate act of moving on. Two examples of the *active* subcategory are “agreement to ‘forget the past’” and “when people/countries try to forget their grudges”.

A second *process* subcategory is for all definitions using the term *apology* and/or *forgiveness*. Two examples are “forgiving past grievances” and “apologizing and asking forgiveness.” A subset of *apology and forgiveness* responses were coded into a third-level subcategory called *without forgetting*, for responses explicitly separating forgiving from forgetting – for example, “perhaps forgive but not forget”.

A third subcategory under the major category *process* is for references to *reparations/*

compensations. These responses refer to the provision of reparations or compensations for past wrongs or injuries committed. Examples include “repayment for misconduct” and “compensation, including (not necessarily all of the following) money, labor, and aid”.

A fourth subcategory, *resolve/fix*, includes responses identifying reconciliation with an effort to rectify problems between disputing parties. Some examples are “Participants in disagreement find a solution that solves the disagreement.” or “making things better.” Within the *resolve/fix* subcategory, there is a third-level subcategory, *make amends*, for responses that explicitly include the word “amends” – for example, “to make amends for past wrongs” and “amends are made for the damage caused”.

The fifth subcategory, *recognize/acknowledge/respect*, is for responses describing reconciliation as a process of acknowledging, recognizing, or respecting the issues that led to the need for reconciliation. One good example of this subcategory is “recognizes one country’s crime or accusation.” A further subcategory within the *recognize/acknowledge/respect* subcategory is for responses specifying arrangements to be made toward the goal of reconciliation that involve reducing demands or changing positions. Examples of responses in this third-level subcategory, labeled *come to terms/agreement/compromise/negotiate*, are “exchange of talks and give and take” and “conclusion to outstanding conflict through compromises”.

A sixth subcategory of *process* responses is *understanding*, for definitions focused on understanding or knowing the other party. Examples include “understanding between different countries that have been in a situation of conflict in the past” and “when two opposing groups come to understand one another”.

The seventh *process* subcategory is *uniting*, which includes responses that describe a restoration of the former relationship or a new start among disparate parties. Two examples of this category are “return to the old status” and “a new beginning.” The subcategory of *uniting* has two tertiary-level subcategories within it: *healing/reuniting* refers to restoring a formerly construc-

tive relationship and *building new relationship with former enemy* refers to an improved relationship between two former opponents.

Finally, the eighth *process* subcategory is *prevention/preventing*, which describe reconciliation as a process designed to prevent future violence. “The process toward inner peace, also preventing things happening again in the future,” and “prevention of future conflicts” are two examples of *prevention/preventing*.

Definition of Reconciliation as an Achieved State

The second major coding category is for definitions defining reconciliation as a *state*, which includes responses referring to the end of the process or the end of conflict or the achievement of peace. An example of a response coded for *state* is “conclusion of an unsettled situation.” Within the *state* category, there are three subcategories: (a) *peace*, (b) *end of conflict/violence/hostilities*, and (c) *emotional state*. Coded within *peace* are responses mentioning the regaining of peace or restoring or earning peace without specifying the process for reaching this state. Two examples of responses in the *peace* subcategory are “a return to peace” and “action of peace.” *End of conflict/violence/hostilities* is another subcategory of the *state* category and applies to definitions portraying reconciliation as the end of violence such as “the official ending of hostilities” or “ending the fight.” Definitions in the *emotional state* subcategory identify reconciliation with the achievement of a positive emotion such as “joy” and “good will”.

Other Reconciliation Coding Categories

Another major coding category into which the definitions of reconciliation fell is *human characteristic*; these responses indicated that reconciliation is inherent in our human condition – for example, “human nature.” A fifth major category is *future orientation*; these definitions portray reconciliation as an ongoing process that continues

into the future. Examples are “a long-term, ongoing healing processes” and “committing itself to desisting from any such harmful acts in the future.” The sixth major category, *question of achievability/ideal*, is for responses expressing doubts about the achievability of reconciliation or describing it as an “ideal” or “a utopia.” *Strive for* is a subcategory within the *question of achievability/ideal* category; examples of *strive for* responses include “efforts should always be directed in this direction,” “an absolute goal of humankind,” and “the best way toward peace.”

Summary

Section Structure and Limitations

This chapter provides an orientation to the first of the four major sections of this volume, namely, the definitions of peace and reconciliation. The following eight chapters summarize research findings related to definitions of peace and reconciliation within each of eight regions. This study, like all studies, has limitations, including the limited selection of countries within each region, restricted and varied sample sizes, and selection of participants through various nonrandom methods. Consequently, results should be interpreted with caution and not be generalized to populations as a whole. On the other hand, the chapters in this section offer a unique opportunity to consider the extent to which ordinary people across very diverse regions define peace and reconciliation in similar or divergent ways and to consider the extent to which their definitions vary in relation to characteristics such as gender, military experience, and involvement in protest.

Implications

PAIRTAPS is designed to provide respondents with a forum to share their perspectives and reasoning pertaining to complex and pressing sociopolitical issues of the present day, including peace and reconciliation. Leaders seeking reconcilia-

tion desire to understand the parties' priorities in the reconciliation process. These chapters partially address the following questions: Do ordinary people tend to associate reconciliation with reparations or with acknowledgement of past damages? Do they envision reconciliation as a process of negotiation or prevention? As we search for sustainable peace, can reconciliation lead us toward justice? Is it more useful to shift perceptions of peace away from complete tranquility to an achievement that ordinary people can see as attainable?

Nelson Mandela, in his 1994 inaugural address as president of South Africa, provides a model of hope for peace and reconciliation:

Out of the experience of an extraordinary human disaster that lasted too long, must be born a society of which all humanity will be proud... We, the people of South Africa, feel fulfilled that humanity has taken us back into its bosom, ... we, who were outlaws not so long ago. The time for healing of the wounds has come. The time to build is upon us. We have, at last, achieved our political emancipation. We commit ourselves to the construction of a complete, just and lasting peace. We pledge ourselves to liberate all our people from the continuing bondage of poverty, deprivation, suffering, gender, and other discrimination. We must therefore act together as a united people, for national reconciliation, for nation building, for the birth of a new world. Never, never, and never again shall it be that this beautiful land will again experience the oppression of one by another... The sun shall never set on so glorious a human achievement.

References

- Across Pacific & Asia. (n.d.). Reconciliation. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://across.co.nz/Reconciliation2.html>.
- Blackside, Inc. & PBS. (2003). This far by faith: African-American spiritual journeys. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from http://www.pbs.org/thisfarbyfaith/journey_5/p_9.html.
- Boulding, E. (1998). Peace culture: The problem of managing human difference. *Association for religion and intellectual life. Crosscurrents*, Summer 1998, 48(4). Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.crosscurrents.org/boulding.htm>.
- Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Butaug, H., Gates, S., Hegre, H., & Strand, H. (2006). *Global trends in armed conflict*. Oslo, Norway: Ministry of foreign affairs. Retrieved April 1, 2012,

- from <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/kampanjer/refleks/innspill/engasjement/prio.html?id=492941>.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. London: Sage Publications.
- Clarke, A. E. (2003). Situational analyses: Grounded theory mapping after the postmodern turn. *Symbolic Interaction*, 26, 553–576.
- Committee on Peace and International Security of the Inter-parliamentary Union. (2004, March 2). Promoting international reconciliation, helping to bring stability to regions of conflict, and assisting with post-conflict reconstruction. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.ipu.org/conf-e/110/1Cmt-rpt.doc>.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.
- Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. London: Sage Publications.
- Gilgun, J. F. (2005). Qualitative research and family psychology. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19(1), 40–50.
- Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- International Reconciliation Coalition. (1998). Statement of apology. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.crusades-apology.org/Crusades%20Project/walk.htm>.
- Lederach, J. P. (1999). *Journey towards reconciliation*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Lind, J. (2009). Apologies in international politics. *Security studies*. 18(3). Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09636410903132987#preview>.
- Malley-Morrison, K. et al. (2006, spring). International perspectives on war and peace. *Peace Psychology*, 15 (1), 6–7.
- Mandela, N. (1994). Retrieved April 1, 2012, from http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Nelson_Mandela/.
- Merriam Webster Dictionary. (2011). Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/peace>.
- Mongbe, R., & del Picchia, R. (2004). *Promoting international reconciliation, helping to bring stability to regions of conflict, and assisting with post-conflict reconstruction*. Mexico City: Inter-Parliamentary Union. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCUQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ipu.org%2Fconf-e%2F110%2F1Cmt-dr-rpt.doc&ei=My8XT6PiJOL30gH-7OHHAg&usg=AFQjCNFhjXBS3SOEsmrTuYrSv1QVDjnmQ&sig2=w2eIwDtm1GURAHPlnZWGNg>.
- Reconciliation Walk. (1998). Reconciliation Walk enters Lebanon despite travel warning. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.crusades-apology.org/Crusades%20Project/98sep.htm>.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- World Government of World Citizens. (2011). Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.worldservice.org/wcw-faq.html#7>.

International Handbook of Peace and Reconciliation

Malley-Morrison, K.; Mercurio, A.; Twose, G. (Eds.)

2013, XVI, 681 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-4614-5932-3