

We are not what we know but what we are willing to learn.

Mary Catherine Bateson

Introduction

Beatrix Austin

This second print instalment of the *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation* presents 20 new contributions from a total of 47 articles and 9 Dialogue issues that have been published thus far by Berghof Conflict Research (previously known as the Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management). Begun over a decade ago, the Handbook has expanded substantially and has become a recognised hub for finding easily accessible state-of-the-art knowledge and critical practitioner-scholar dialogue.¹ As part of this ongoing effort, the present volume collects updated and revised chapters that were previously only available on the internet, along with several new chapters written specifically for this volume.

Several key aspirations have been guiding the Berghof Handbook team and are reflected in this book. The Handbook brings together practitioners and scholars in conflict and peace studies, as well as related fields (development, human rights, etc.). It assembles in one place theory-driven debate (e.g. on concepts like social change, systemic thinking, civil society and state-building), method-orientated practice pieces (e.g. on nonviolent action, on mediation) and practitioners' experience and reflection (on training, on evaluation). It builds from concrete experience in specific cases (Sri Lanka, Nepal, the region of former Yugoslavia, the Asia-Pacific region and many more) and reflects on current trends and issues. It draws attention to established practices and concepts, as well as to thorny issues, dilemmas and challenges; and finally, attempts to put all these issues and practices into a broader conceptual framework in order to understand their functions, strengths and weaknesses, documenting the learning that happens in the field.

We have chosen the conceptual framework of “conflict transformation” for this endeavour because we consider it to capture the key elements for addressing the root causes of violent conflict and also because it focuses on both structures and processes of interaction between stakeholders in protracted social conflicts. In our understanding, conflict transformation is a complex process of changing the relationships, attitudes, interests, discourses and underlying

¹ All publications are available online (www.berghof-handbook.net). The online platform contains stand-alone articles as well as a Dialogue Series, in which one expert article is discussed by scholars and practitioners from different disciplines and regions.

structures that encourage and condition violent political conflict.² It refers to “actions that seek to alter the various characteristics and manifestations of conflict by addressing its root causes over the long-term, with the aim to transform negative ways of dealing with conflict into positive, constructive ones. This concept of conflict transformation stresses structural, behavioural and attitudinal aspects of conflict, and refers to both the processes and structures required to move towards ‘just peace’” (Fischer/Ropers 2004, 13). Rather than laying out a golden path towards the elimination or suppression of violence, it has “a positive role in re-describing the field of peace and conflict research and directing our attention at previously under-emphasized issues” (Ryan 2007, 154).

This highlights several important aspects. Conflict transformation:

- necessitates thorough analysis of positive as well as negative factors in conflict dynamics (especially that of underlying/root causes), since conflict has the potential for driving necessary change (individual, social and structural) as well as for escalating into destructive violence;
- may demand changes in attitude, behaviour and context which call for empathy, skill (capacity-building) and structural leverage;
- is a long-term, multi-actor, multi-dimensional undertaking, which is aware of system dynamics and eschews quick fixes;
- has a normative vision of just peace and is value-based (honouring our shared humanity, gender-aware, empowering, building from local ownership and local knowledge); and finally
- integrates processes of critical self-reflection by those engaging in it, be they insiders or outsiders to a conflict setting.

The new volume of the *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation* enters a world of conflict marked by significant shifts in conflict types and dynamics. Changing forms of violence pose new challenges for the transformation and nonviolent expression of conflict. Supporting processes of conflict transformation with thorough academic debate and practice-orientated reflection is thus as necessary as ever.

This volume sets out to meet this two-fold task: to take stock of what we have learned to date through research and practice, and to explore different experiences and new challenges for the road ahead. Dedicated to the advancement of our practical and theoretical understanding of the methods, potential and dilemmas of conflict transformation, we note a significant increase in knowledge, but also numerous open questions, both old and new.

On the one hand, there have been remarkable advances in the study and practice of the field. Scholars and practitioners have worked on understanding violent conflict and creating peaceful relations at the interpersonal, intergroup and international level. New theories have been developed or further elaborated; methods have been tested and refined. Emerging global norms – embodied for example in UN resolution 1325 or the responsibility to protect – give further weight to efforts aimed at transforming conflict and advancing inclusive social change.

² Not all of our authors subscribe to a uniform understanding. Different interpretations are noted where appropriate in the individual chapters.

For example, there is now a more realistic and critical assessment available of the numbers, type and dynamics of (violent) conflict (e.g. Gleditsch et al. 2002; HSRP 2005; Toft 2010; followed up by Tara Cooper, Sebastian Merz and Mila Shah in this volume). There is also more clarity and a better understanding of conditions for war-to-peace transitions and post-war peacebuilding (e.g. Paris/Sisk 2009; Jarstad/Sisk 2008; Pugh 2000; discussed, among others, by Louis Kriesberg, Christopher Mitchell and Norbert Ropers in this volume). Its many components have become part of a professionalised international prevention and response repertoire. Building on the peacebuilding palette put forth in the Utstein report (Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2004, 28), this may include work on political frameworks including governance, human rights, democratisation and institution-building; work on socio-economic issues; work on security-related themes including security sector reform and disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants; and justice and reconciliation initiatives (discussed, among others, by Michelle Parlevliet, Luc Zandvliet, Herbert Wulf and Martina Fischer in this volume). At the same time, the ideological underpinnings and actual effects of international intervention have come under close scrutiny (Richmond/Franks 2009; MacGinty 2008; Paris 2004; see also Diana Francis, Susan Woodward and Volker Boege in this volume). General capacity-building, academic and practice-orientated training opportunities have grown in number and quality (Zelizer/Rubinstein 2009; Meerts 2009; illustrated by Beatrix Austin, Véronique Dudouet and Nenad Vukosavljevic in this volume). So, too, has work on specialised methodologies and approaches, a prominent example being mediation (Slim 2007; Mason 2009; taken up by Ronald Fisher and by Hans J. Giessmann and Oliver Wils in this volume). There is now a clear understanding that many different actors and levels need to be involved in building peace and transforming conflict (Lederach 1997; van Tongeren et al. 2005; Crocker et al. 2007); and it has become clear that processes of transitional justice, reconciliation, state- and institution-building are long-term, multi-dimensional undertakings (Bloomfield et al. 2003; Pouligny et al. 2007; exemplified by Martina Fischer in this volume). Finally, self-reflection and the development of sound evaluation processes and criteria have been advanced by various initiatives (Anderson/Olson 2003; OECD-DAC 2008; Paffenholz 2010; also discussed by Reina C. Neufeldt and Cheyanne Scharbatke-Church in this volume).

Yet on the other hand, the fact that violent conflict has continued and even threatens to proliferate points to a myriad of open questions. To mention but a few, which are taken up by various contributions to this volume: numerous intrastate and cross-border conflicts persist, among them in Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Afghanistan. Military confrontation has become no less of a threat, as the Global War on Terror, the tensions surrounding the Korean peninsula and Iran, or the lessons drawn by some from the violent military victory in Sri Lanka's civil war demonstrate. In light of this, the trend of the 1990s and early 2000s towards a decline in (inter- and intrastate) war appears unstable, leading to the question of what instruments there are to assess and prevent the risk of a return to more violence in either war-related or criminal scenarios? How can we explain and deal with non-linear patterns of escalation and de-escalation in some of the most protracted conflicts, as well as in overall global violence? In this context, it will be important to assess whether the capacities and

practices that have been developed over the past decade are still appropriate and effective, or in what ways they will have to be improved and adjusted. A further pressing question is what ways there are to enhance the coherence and coordination of actors and approaches in the field of conflict transformation and peacebuilding. What are the means to address highly asymmetric conflicts, like the confrontation that continues to eclipse resolution efforts in the Middle East? Whether approaches can be developed and strengthened that are based on thorough and encompassing analysis, mindful of cultural differences and traditional approaches and orientated towards a long-term, inclusive process of change towards greater social justice and sustainable peaceful relations will continue to be of great importance.

For peace studies and the practice of conflict transformation, despite much progress and growth, the task has not become easier. In fact, it has been said that the field's "age of innocence is over" (Edgar 2002, 139). A time of great optimism about the potential of conflict transformation has given way to open debates about achievements and shortcomings (Fisher/Zimina 2009). Both in terms of theory and practice, conflict transformation needs to adjust to a four-fold "contemporary global condition" (Lederach/Appelby 2010). First, by figuring out ways to address and promote exchange between a much *wider range of actors* above, below, within and across national borders, as there are many new groups that have become increasingly influential. Second, by exploring and providing *multiple perspectives of analysis and entry-points of intervention* integrated into *long-term process design*, as peace processes (and struggles for social justice) tend to be long-drawn-out, non-linear and fitful. Third, by finding ways of working with and between *local and global dynamics*, which are interwoven and powerful in their own right. And fourth, by taking into account the *numerous dimensions* of the experience of violent conflict and by developing and employing a *wide range of approaches* (symbolic and cultural as well as political or economic) in order to contribute to the healing of people, mending of relationships and rebuilding of communities and polities.

The volume in your hands hopes to capture and enrich this ongoing discussion. It presents the current state of the art in practical, empirical and theoretical knowledge on conflict transformation, and aims to provide thought-provoking and practice-empowering reflections on the pressing themes outlined above. The chapters are grouped into five sections to discuss the most recent ideas and methods, new developments, challenges and dilemmas along the broad lines of conflict transformation.

Section I presents conceptual approaches and challenges for conflict transformation.

Tara Cooper, Sebastian Merz and Mila Shah contribute insights from the Human Security Report Project, which has, since publication of its first report in 2005, produced quantitative data that call into question some of the fundamental beliefs in the current study of violent conflict, namely that the world is becoming an ever more violent place. They claim that most forms of organised, intergroup violence around the world have been declining rather than increasing. Cooper and her colleagues back up this claim by examining the level of deadliness, development paths and endings of armed conflicts. They also examine recent data on conflicts

between non-state actors and violence targeting civilians, thus widening the scope of analysis beyond interstate and ‘conventional’ civil war. While “specific recommendations cannot be distilled” from trends at the aggregated, global level, several hypotheses emerge. For example, the impact of both the work of the United Nations and numerous non-governmental initiatives is seen as palpable, and the experience gained over decades in designing peace agreements, accompanying peace processes and ending wars appears to have started paying off.

Louis Kriesberg takes stock of the current state of the art in conflict transformation. Aided by several changes in the global context, the institutionalisation and mainstreaming of conflict transformation ideas have increased considerably. Still, thus far, the ideas and practices have had “only limited success”. There are several possible explanations: the inappropriate employment of ideas that are taken out of context or stripped of their long-term time-frame and value-base; the confinement of these ideas to a relatively small group of people and arenas, and the fact that knowledge is still patchy regarding the difficult problems faced in studying and fostering the transformation of *large-scale protracted* conflicts. In terms of practice, Kriesberg urges for critical self-reflection regarding the ends sought and methods employed. Furthermore, the benefits of the approach must be promoted beyond the small group of people “in the field” to the general public and influential sub-elites, since “fundamental social changes are needed for the transformation approach to be more widely used and for it to be more effective”.

Christopher R. Mitchell explores conflict transformation as a deep-reaching programme of social change, investigating dynamics of conflict formation and protraction as well as methods for mitigating and resolving protracted social conflict. In Mitchell’s view it is paramount to explore why protracted conflicts remain locked in a paradoxically stable dynamic. Maybe surprisingly, these questions have so far received little rigorous attention. A basic flaw in political and scholarly thinking has been to disregard that escalation often involves thresholds, which, once crossed, fundamentally change the nature of the conflict. The overall impression from historical cases and from existing theories is one of immense obstacles to changing strategies away from coercion and violence towards conciliatory moves. However, “it is undoubtedly also the case that such changes *do* take place, and obstacles *are* overcome or removed”. A series of factors can account for such changes, among them envisioning multiple roles for agents of change. Well-coordinated processes of change towards resolution and transformation are therefore a must.

Norbert Ropers reflects on the potential of systemic thinking for enhancing conflict transformation’s ability to bring change to protracted conflict systems, based on his and others’ work in Sri Lanka between 2001 and 2008. Central features of these systems are their complexity, dynamism and non-linear development paths. Current methods for conflict analysis and third-party intervention are compared and contrasted with systemic extensions/additions (e.g. the tetralemma for generating options and the concept of “archetypes” for explaining and dealing with patterns of “break-down” and “getting stuck”). Distinctive is a focus on interpretations and

beliefs among the conflict parties themselves, opening up analysis to understanding seemingly irrational and deep-seated concerns and involving affected conflict parties much more directly in “negotiating a fair picture of [their] landscape”. Conflict transformation itself becomes less of a once-and-for-all solution, but is seen as a process that may form “a corridor of different kinds of mitigation, settlement and re-escalation”. Envisioned as a radical system change, it demands of those engaged in it considerable creativity, flexibility and persistence.

In the last chapter of section I, *Cilja Harders* addresses the interconnectedness of gender relations, violence and conflict transformation, asserting that “even though it is quite possible to make formal peace without including women and looking at gender relations, the *transformation* of violent conflict is impossible without these gendered lenses”. She unpacks the gendered dimensions of major concepts of the field (conflict, violence, war and peace), revealing a systematic link between the domestic and the international realm and identifying unjust gender relations as a root cause of violence and war. The interaction of structural factors and individual agency points to the need to move beyond postulating ‘natural’ gender behaviour towards understanding the way in which roles and kinds of behaviour fulfil certain functions and are supported by deeply-rooted institutions of state and society. Harders proposes a programme of small steps for changing gender relations, understanding peace as a continuous social process that is open to change, involving participatory approaches and a willingness to learn from insiders and outsiders.

Section II focuses on enhancing capacities and advancing practices, both for third-party intervention and insider action.

Ronald J. Fisher adds several new reflections on the contingency model of intervention. He argues that mediation is best complemented by a set of other types of peaceful intervention: conciliation, consultation, power mediation, arbitration and peacekeeping. These can be combined and sequenced in different phases to respond to both objective and subjective conflict elements. Several thorny issues need to be addressed in all efforts, among them gaining cross-cultural sensitivity; dealing with various forms of power asymmetry; reading moments of ripeness and right timing; working to enhance effectiveness and efficiency by coordination; and developing a code of ethical conduct for practitioners of third-party interventions. Acknowledging that coordinated long-term efforts are necessary in conflict transformation, it will be important to further explore and better understand the potential complementarity of different forms of intervention in concrete peace processes, in order to “convince decision-makers and policy makers that unofficial conflict resolution efforts have an important and increasingly documented contribution to make”.

Hans J. Giessmann and *Oliver Wils* take up the issue of mediation and add to it the perspective of conflict parties themselves, which has so far been an under-explored factor for mediation failures and successes: “If mediation is to be primarily about conflict transformation and not

about just seeking a compromise between the parties in conflict, their own interests and perspectives on the root causes of the conflict must be taken seriously”. Parties’ interests and perspectives need to be explored on why and when mediation is sought, who is preferred as a mediator, what process design is appropriate and which outcomes are expected. Several aspects are crucial: an interest-based analysis, a combination of forms (official-unofficial; insider-outsider), coordination of different actors in different roles, work with a variety of factions, creativity in conveying parity of status and process management that includes insider mediators. For third parties, it is key to understand that they are working within a broader mediation system. Learning about this broad system of mediation has only just started, and should best be pursued in collaborative research teams.

Beatrix Austin provides an orientation for the broad field of conflict transformation training and a comprehensive overview of resources. As training is often the method of choice for capacity-building, it is crucial that it be strategic and well-tailored to its participants’ needs. It can be noted that considerable effort has been invested into improving training curricula and formats in the past decade. Critical challenges for the future use of training are to address underlying assumptions and to formulate realistic expectations of what can and cannot be achieved by training; to explore how training can reach those who are not already ‘converted’ to conflict transformation’s basic values; the importance of creating opportunities for ongoing learning, e.g. through follow-on support, mentorships or apprenticeship opportunities; and finally the difficulty of assessing how much individual learning contributes (or “adds up”) to societal-level change. More research into the trajectories of those who are being trained is seen as one way forward, as well as comparative assessments of the changes actually effected by the professionalisation of the training field.

Véronique Dudouet examines the context and conditions in which nonviolent resistance can contribute to successful and sustainable transformation processes. She argues that it should become an integral part of conflict transformation, both as a process of social change and as a set of methods of action well suited to address structural injustices. Two specific areas of overlap are illustrated with examples from the first Palestinian intifada. First, nonviolent resistance can be a means to redress asymmetry and gain leverage in negotiations for previously marginalised groups. Second, it seems particularly promising for laying the grounds for a cooperative and constructive post-conflict situation, since it is a self-limiting form of struggle that inhibits violent extremism and feelings of humiliation and desire for revenge that often result from violence. Also, as it is inherently participatory, it can lay foundations for a lively democratic culture. One conclusion is that “highly polarised conflicts can only be transformed through multiple forms of intervention, from negotiation, bridge-building [...] and external mediation to nonviolent activism and cross-border advocacy”.

Nenad Vukosavljevic expands the themes of training and nonviolent action by providing an insider-activist perspective. He reflects on experiences from cross-border work in the region of

former Yugoslavia. Activities to instil civic responsibility and practical nonviolence to counter widespread “victimisation” are seen as being of critical importance, yet also meet with great obstacles in countries that remain polarised along ethnonational lines. Some recommendations support mainstream findings: the use of participatory, emancipatory and experiential methodology; strategic selection of participants based on motivation and potential; the importance of multiplying and networking; the challenge of connecting individual training to social change and action; the importance of providing support structures and networks; finally, that “empowerment is a goal that can only be achieved if people take responsibility and stand up for the consequences of their actions”. Some conclusions make for provocative reading: the role of emotions and non-linearity of (personal) learning and development paths; the emphasis on activism instead of professionalisation (“we want to work with people who want to change reality”); the necessity of practising what is preached; the importance of setting realistic expectations and paying attention to obstacles, i.e. factors of “peace-destruction” on the attitudinal, behavioural and structural level.

Section III discusses the scope of different actors and levels in creating space for transforming conflicts.

Martina Fischer investigates the role of civil society actors in conflict transformation and peacebuilding, identifying their strengths and limitations. She looks at the types of activities that international and transnational NGOs undertake in order to influence international politics in a way that contributes to coping with global challenges. In addition, she analyses the role and potential of civil society actors in war-to-peace transitions. With reference to experiences in Bosnia-Herzegovina, she investigates civil society’s contributions and how they relate to external state-building initiatives. Civil society, including local NGOs, has been very active in many fields, in particular aiming at post-war recovery, peacebuilding and reconciliation, but has not been able to compensate the lack of progress on the political level. Civil society, it is hence argued, can support peaceful change, but should not be overloaded with unrealistic expectations. Although the case of Bosnia has many specific notions, it also offers some general insights into problems and dilemmas that stem from the development of civil society in societies affected by ethnopolitical conflict. International strategies need to be adapted accordingly.

Susan Woodward addresses how to deal with the threat to peace and security that failing or fragile states are presumed to pose. Woodward strongly challenges the state-builders’ argument on state failure and its global threats, and uses various cases from the former Yugoslav region to illustrate this. Fundamental flaws of the conventional model are its unrealistic expectations; its inappropriateness to many contexts in which it is applied; an implicit blindness against locally-grown solutions that work better than the imported model; ignorance of conditions of civil war and post-war societies; and “market fundamentalism”. With respect to the former Yugoslavia, the state-building agenda has been plagued by ignorance of the actual local situation. Internationally imposed political orders have failed to gain any domestic legitimacy

and social and economic outcomes attest to their ineffectiveness. What is needed, above all, is a strong focus “on the actual policies, goals and varying choices of those driving this state-building agenda and practice” – both in public awareness and critical research.

Herbert Wulf revisits the state of the art and dilemmas of security sector reform (SSR) in developing and transitional countries. SSR has become a prominent area of engagement for the international (donor) community in recent years. Mostly understood in a broad, whole-of-government sense, it includes a host of actors: security forces as well as their civil oversight bodies, the executive, financial management institutions, international donors, but also civil society, media, and more. Wulf asserts that expecting peace to stabilise a society without touching the security sector is wishful thinking. Prominent challenges are the political sensitivities surrounding security sector reform, frequently incoherent donor policy, difficulties in implementing local ownership and the crucial importance of addressing root causes of conflict and violence. More creative solutions are being sought nowadays in integrating non-statutory actors (e.g. non-state armed groups and traditional actors) or in the mainstreaming of gender issues. But there remains a general dilemma: will security serve development and peacebuilding purposes, or will development and peacebuilding end up being “securitised”?

Luc Zandvliet explores why the business community and conflict transformation advocates have difficulties in working together to try and create just and stable environments. To date, discussions about conflict transformation frequently focus on companies but rarely include those companies. A range of options exists for more constructive engagement with corporate actors. The starting point must be a strategic partnership that builds on areas of mutual interest and joint concern. Companies’ leverage effectively varies: at the national or macro level, it decreases with time; at the local or regional level, it increases over time. Zandvliet calls for acknowledging that the business sector is “dynamic and self-organising, not monolithic”, and gives examples for developing dynamic strategies that take into account different capabilities according to conflict levels and phases in the project cycle. Closing two persistent gaps between the actors – regarding relations/communication and regarding content – are seen as most pressing in order to remove obstacles for engaging corporate actors in conflict transformation.

Section IV emphasises dimensions necessary in order to sustain transitions from war to peace.

Michelle Parlevliet reflects on the necessary steps to create “just peace” from an interlinked human rights and conflict transformation perspective. A tentative conceptual framework for the relationship between both underlines that human rights violations can be both causes and consequences of violent conflict and introduces a multi-dimensional understanding of rights as rules, structures and institutions, relationships and processes. This has implications for practice. The first is to deal with symptoms *while* keeping in mind the larger, more structural conditions. The second is to find better ways to work, simultaneously, on understanding (and changing) the nature, organisation and functioning of the state and on empowering weaker parties and

marginalised groups to become capable of challenging the status quo. The third is to enhance state capacity without supporting undemocratic forces, attitudes and beliefs. In this context, actors should not shy away from initiatives that may cause tension or feed into existing divisions. Nonviolent strategic action, non-adversarial advocacy and employing different tactics at different points in time each play an important role. Finally, there is a great need for role clarity and role integrity among actors and interveners.

Martina Fischer reviews the current state of the art in “dealing with the past”, which is seen as a necessity for societies emerging from a history of violence and war, oppression and human rights violations. Two main strands are investigated: transitional justice (which initially focused mostly on prosecution and truth commissions but has broadened considerably in scope in the past decade) and reconciliation (which has similarly gained attention). Both are multi-dimensional processes involving international support as well – crucially – as local initiatives: “war-torn societies need multi-level approaches aiming at questioning and reshaping discourses on the political and societal level, and in particular in the fields of media and education”. Informed by practical examples from the Western Balkans and the Middle East, Fischer portrays pertinent dilemmas, like the open question of how to relate the imperatives of truth and justice or peace and justice in concrete conflict transformation processes, how to guard against excessive expectations, and how to advance our still patchy knowledge on the interplay of different actors and levels. Assessments of the impact of various approaches will only be possible in the long run, based on careful, longitudinal, empirical studies.

Volker Boege explores traditional approaches that are grounded in the cultures of conflict-affected societies in the specific context of the Asia-Pacific region, with Bougainville as a prime example. Unlike the chaos and lawlessness implied in today’s debate on fragile or failing states, large parts of the world exhibit “hybrid political orders” in which the state is one actor among many: therefore, both the analysis of violent conflict and approaches to the control of violence must overcome their state-centric position. Traditional approaches are always context-specific, but commonalities can be described: they aim at restoring relationships and community harmony; are holistic and consensus-based; and embedded in a relatively small “we-group”. Traditional approaches are credited with legitimacy; are time- and process-orientated; provide for participation and inclusion; and focus on psycho-social and spiritual dimensions. They also show weaknesses, since they may go against universal human rights standards, have a limited sphere of applicability, are mostly geared towards the preservation of a “good order” and can be abused. In the end, what is needed is “a way forward to mutual positive accommodation and constructive interaction of traditional ways on the one hand and western state-based and civil society ways on the other”.

The final section V addresses themes of evaluation and critical self-reflection.

Cheyenne Scharbatke-Church discusses evaluation in peacebuilding and conflict transformation. Evaluation is often influenced by other ends than the espoused values of accountability and learning. Among them are public relations, self-justification or fundraising, which is explained by a mix of structural and individual reasons. Also, there is a tendency to focus far too much on the unique elements of peacebuilding. Learning and accountability are furthermore seen by many as being contradictory, and “the field prioritises evaluation for learning and where possible moves away from accountability”. Even so, few agencies create an organisational culture to support learning, visible in the absence of structures, opportunities or time. Reasons for the hesitating engagement with accountability, on the other hand, are rooted in issues of power, control and ownership. The general lack of ongoing participation by the presumed beneficiaries of peacebuilding programmes is an aggravating factor. Scharbatke-Church argues that only if the field and its activists and scholars start addressing these underlying issues can evaluation of peacebuilding become all it could be.

Reina C. Neufeldt stresses the importance of identifying and discussing assumptions. She makes out two distinct approaches, the “frameworkers” (derived from the logical framework tool) and the “circlers”. The former tend to strongly believe in planning and the possibility to measure impact and effectiveness in peacebuilding, basing their actions on linear cause-effect chains. The latter rather seek organic processes, in which pre-determined goals might be inappropriate or hamper flexible solutions, and complex confluence – rather than linear causality – is playing out. The frameworker approach currently appears to be carrying the day, with the potential benefits of planning that is well thought through and conscious monitoring. Yet this is also worrisome, as there is some evidence that “the business model of development, with its emphasis on efficiency and results-based management, undermines relationships, leads to hasty planning, wasteful programme expenditures, short-term attention and conveys messages of disrespect to local communities”. Neufeldt recommends developing bridging methodologies (such as theories of change or storytelling) and more regular forums for debate that give space to different approaches.

Diana Francis closes the fifth section with a reflection on different ways of understanding power – power as domination and power as cooperation. She proposes a radical rethinking of what needs to change in order for conflict transformation to progress towards deeper social change: “I believe that while the structures and culture of global militarism (which constitute the context for all violent conflict) remain unchanged, attempts to address specific conflicts directly, while still necessary, will be unlikely to succeed to a degree that matches peacebuilders’ aspirations”. At the same time, the power of nonviolence must be explored and trained in response to various levels of violence: deterring and resisting invasion, intercommunal violence and civil war, extreme acts of one-sided violence or struggles against structural violence and tyranny. The course of action outlined by Francis amounts to nothing less than a “paradigm shift” in international relations, envisaging global disarmament and a movement of movements that requires active engagement at all levels of social and political life, by everyone.

The 20 contributions in this volume underline that conflict transformation has come a long way. Yet they also point to numerous (new and old) intellectual and political challenges that will have to be met in the years to come. We are reminded that conflict transformation is an ongoing and continuously reflective process. The authors have proposed tentative solutions to some of the questions outlined at the beginning. Others will still need to be tackled by the community of practice and research. Beyond the questions raised earlier, there are more: for example, what effects resource shortages or climate change will likely have on conflict and violence, or what shifts may result from the rise of the BRICS countries. They will certainly give the Berghof Handbook project and its contributors ample food for thought and dialogue beyond this second print volume, and we are looking forward to continuing our joint explorations in conflict transformation in the coming years.

This handbook reflects the importance in this endeavour of a multitude of organisations (international organisations, states, civil society, movements), processes (analysis, activism, intervention; individual, interpersonal, intergroup; socio-political, economic, cultural), structures (state reform, security sector reform, human rights) and overarching themes (justice, reconciliation/healing, power). It also points to the paramount task of finding ways of combining the many pieces of the puzzle that together are necessary to broaden our knowledge of how to advance conflict transformation and peacebuilding.

We wish to thank all our contributors for their insights into this puzzle – without their dedication, experience, flexibility and openness to exploring the boundaries of the field, this project would not be possible. Thanks, of course, are also due to the many people behind the scenes who have been contributing to the realisation of this volume as well as to the making of the *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation* over the years: they include in-house Amy Hunter (language editing and layout support), Astrid Fischer (layout support), and Sebastian Marambio (graphics support). We are also grateful to our partners at Coxorange graphics design, especially to Ulrike Hesse, to the team at Barbara Budrich publishing (for guidance, proofing and indexing), and to the former editors of the Handbook for their input over the years. Finally, we wish to acknowledge the generous support of the Berghof Foundation for funding the Berghof Handbook project, as well as the publication of this print volume.

Berlin, December 2010

References

- Anderson, Mary B. and Lara Olson 2003. *Confronting War. Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge: CDA.
- Bloomfield, David, Teresa Barnes and Luc Huyse 2003. *Reconciliation after Violent Conflict. A Handbook*. Stockholm: IDEA.
- Crocker, Chester, Fen Osler Hampson and Pamela Aall (eds.) 2007. *Leashing the Dogs of War. Conflict Management in a Divided World*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Edgar, David 2002. *The Prisoner's Dilemma*. London: Nick Hern Books.
- Fisher, Simon and Lada Zimina 2009. Just Wasting Our Time? Provocative Thoughts for Peacebuilders, in: Beatrix Schmelzle and Martina Fischer (eds.) *Peacebuilding at a Crossroads? Dilemmas and Paths for Another Generation*. (Berghof Handbook Dialogue No 7.) Berlin: Berghof Research Center, 11-35.
- Fischer, Martina and Norbert Ropers 2004. Introduction, in: Alex Austin, Martina Fischer and Norbert Ropers (eds.). *Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict. The Berghof Handbook*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 11-22.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg and Håvard Strand 2002. Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A New Dataset, in: *Journal of Peace Research* 39(5), 615-637.
- Human Security Report Project (HSRP) 2005. *Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jarstad, Anna K. and Timothy D. Sisk (eds.) 2008. *From War to Democracy. Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lederach, John Paul 1997. *Building Peace. Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lederach, John Paul and R. Scott Appelby 2010. Strategic Peacebuilding. An Overview, in: Daniel Philpott and Gerard F. Powers (eds.). *Strategies of Peace. Transforming Conflict in a Violent World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 19-44.
- MacGinty, Roger 2008. *No War, No Peace. The Rejuvenation of Stalled Peace Processes and Peace Accords*. Houndmills/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mason, Simon 2009. *Insider Mediators – Exploring their Key Role in Informal Peace Processes*. Berlin: Berghof Peace Support.
- Meerts, Paul 2009. Training and Education, in: Jacob Bercovitch, Victor Kremenyuk and I. William Zartman (eds.). *The SAGE Handbok of Conflict Resolution*. London: Sage, 645-688.
- OECD-DAC 2008. *Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities*. (Working Draft for Application Period.) Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Paffenholz, Thania (ed.) 2010. *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: A Critical Assessment*. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner.
- Paris, Roland 2004. *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Paris, Roland and Timothy D. Sisk (eds.) 2009. *The Dilemmas of State-Building. Confronting the Contradictions of Post-War Peace Operations*. New York: Routledge.
- Poulligny, Béatrice, Albrecht Schnabel and Simon Chesterman (eds.) 2007. *After Mass Crime. Rebuilding States and Communities*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Pugh, Michael (ed.) 2000. *Regeneration of War-Torn States*. Houndmills/New York: Macmillan.
- Richmond, Oliver P. and Jason Franks 2009. *Liberal Peace Transitions. Between Statebuilding and Peacebuilding*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2004. *Towards a Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding: Getting Their Act Together*. Overview Report of the Joint Utstein Study of Peacebuilding. Oslo. Available at www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/ud/rap/2000/0265/ddd/pdfv/210673-rapp104.pdf.
- Ryan, Stephen 2007. *The Transformation of Violent Intercommunal Conflict*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Slim, Hugo 2007. *A Guide to Mediation. Enabling Peace Processes in Violent Conflicts*. Geneva: Humanitarian Dialogue Centre.
- Toft, Monica Duffy 2010. Ending Civil Wars. A Case for Rebel Victory?, in: *International Security* 34(4), 7-36.
- Van Tongeren, Paul, Malin Brenk, Marte Hellema and Juliette Verhoeven (eds.) 2005. *People Building Peace II. Successful Stories of Civil Society*. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner.
- Zelizer, Craig and Robert A. Rubinstein (eds.) 2009. *Building Peace. Practical Reflections from the Field*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.

[All weblinks accessed 9 Dec 2010.]