

*Between Eden and Armageddon:  
The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking*

Published in 2000 by Oxford University Press

**Chapter II**

**Between Religion And Conflict Resolution: Mapping A New Field Of Study**

© Marc Gopin

Every major religion of the world has expressed at some point, through its leaders and thinkers, a commitment to the value of peace, both in classical texts and modern reformulations. [\[i\]](#)<sup>[1]</sup> Furthermore, religious actors are playing an increasingly important and valuable role in resolving international conflicts. These include Mennonites, Quakers, and Catholic leaders who have successfully intervened in and mediated African, Asian and Latin American conflicts, key Buddhist leaders, such as Maha Gosananda from Cambodia, Thich Nhat Hanh from Vietnam, and many others. [\[ii\]](#)<sup>[2]</sup> But a faith-based commitment to peace is a complex phenomenon. While some believers creatively integrate their spiritual tradition and peacemaking, many others engage in some of the most destabilizing violence confronting the global community today. The purpose of this paper is to outline what will be necessary for a new course of study of religion that examines its relationship to conflict and conflict resolution methodologies.

Through the long era of human history religion has been a major contributor to war, bloodshed, hatred and intolerance. Yet religion has also developed laws and ideas that have provided civilizations with a cultural commitment to critical peace-related values. The latter include empathy, an openness to and even love for strangers, the suppression of unbridled ego and acquisitiveness, human rights, unilateral gestures of forgiveness and humility, interpersonal repentance and the acceptance of

responsibility for past errors as a means of reconciliation, and the drive for social justice.

There are two essential benefits to exploring a relationship between religion and conflict resolution theory: First, there is a vast reservoir of information in sacred texts on peacemaking and conflict, and on pro-social and anti-social values that affect conflict. This literature contains a long history of individual struggles with the inner life that have either led toward or away from a violent disposition. What has worked and failed to work in the past and why? What can it teach us about the relationship between violence and the religious person in a particular culture? The replicability of past methods of conflict resolution or methods of deterring a violent disposition should be a critical concern.

Second, religion plays the central role in the inner life and social behavior of millions of human beings, many of whom are currently actively engaged in violent struggle. Diplomats and conflict resolution experts could benefit from an in-depth understanding of the motives for either violence or coexistence. With this understanding there might be more productive interaction between religious communities and conflict resolution strategies.

### **The Nature of Religious Decision-making Regarding Peace and Violence**

It is certainly often the case that motives other than religion, such as the desperation of economically disenfranchised people, are central to conflict. However, religious language and symbolism are critical ways in which human beings interpret reality, [\[iii\]](#)<sup>[3]</sup> expressing the full range of emotions in religious terminology. It is essential to be schooled in how the variety of myths, laws, or metaphysical

assumptions, express in the minds of believers their deepest feelings. This enables the negotiator to empathize with the forces on both sides of the conflict, and to dynamically interact with the spiritual language of frustration and anger that leads to violence. Thus, even if the roots of the conflict are economic disenfranchisement the revolt against the status quo may in fact express itself in religious terms. [\[iv\]](#) <sup>[4]</sup> This necessitates an intervention strategy that can acknowledge and utilize the role of religion.

It is important to understand not only the relevant texts of a religious system, but also the actual practitioners themselves. What, for example, is the inner life of a Gandhian Hindu today in India dedicated to peace, as opposed to another Hindu who is prepared to destroy a mosque and die in the effort? What are the metaphysical priorities of each, and why do they attach themselves to differing visions of Hinduism? Clearly there is a complex array of contributing influences beyond religious instruction or orientation. But it would be valuable to examine several overtly identifiable aspects of such choices. For example, which sacred phenomena--texts, rituals or images of God or gods--emerge most often in the minds of believers who are prone to violence, as opposed to those who are prone to conciliatory approaches? These questions raise the need for empirical studies that combine an intimate knowledge of the lived religious traditions engaged in conflict with a social scientific understanding of why particular texts and symbols are clues to both the deep motives of conflict and possible hermeneutic ways to move religious adherents to a less violent place.

Let us illustrate with an example. Many violent trends are initiated in India with various radical Hindu parties' use (or abuse) of sacred mythic tales of the gods, and using the dramas of defeat and victory to stir up rage against foreigners, and

specifically Muslims. Now the standard, rational, Western approach to this, which many middle class and academic Hindus have embraced, is to fight for the strengthening of the typical components of civil society—civil rights for all, free press, honest courts, integrated police enforcement and so on, and that effort is to be lauded.

I have a good friendship with Dr. Rajmohan Gandhi, one of Mahatma Gandhi's most active grandchildren, who has dedicated his life to peacemaking, to the spiritual improvement of Indian society, in addition to Hindu-Muslim reconciliation. Now Dr. Gandhi asked me my opinion a couple of years ago about writing an expansion, or modern fictional continuation, of the *Mahabharatha*, one of the most central mythic epics of Hinduism, whose various episodes and characters are known by most Hindus, and retold repeatedly in literary creations, at celebrations and on television. One of his close associates thought this to be crazy, considering how much else he needed to write about the urgent needs of Indian peace and conflict. Rajmohan asked me my opinion, and I did not know quite what to say, trying to be respectful. After I read a while later that Shiv Sena, the most radical Hindu party, had caused an immense amount of conflict by dressing up a car as a mythic god, driving it through the country, and stirring riots against Muslims, I realized what Rajmohan was up to. He wants to engage the deepest myths of Hindu reality and evoke from them the ideas of non-violence, or bring out what he believes to be their ultimate spiritual truths, which he, his grandfather, and many others see as nonviolent, expressing the highest virtues, including *ahimsa*, nonviolence.

I realized much later, after years of training students and researching, that Rajmohan was exactly right, that our solutions must speak to the average person's mythic sense of the true and the untrue. And that if we understand exactly how

fomenters of violence appeal to otherwise decent people, we may stand a chance of moving society in the opposite direction.

A close study of sacred texts, traditions, symbols and myths that emerge in conflict situations, may contribute to several theoretical approaches of conflict analysis theory. For example, close analysis may indicate to what degree perceptions of empowerment or lack thereof are at work in a particular crisis. Psychodynamic models of conflict resolution that analyze the relationship between enemy and self, or the role of deep injuries, could be enriched by examining such materials. One could also examine what human needs are fulfilled by the texts or imagery involved. Finally, these phenomena may also provide a useful frame of reference for conflict resolution workshops. They could create a bridge to the unique cultural expression of a particular conflict, although more experimentation in the field will tell us how this might work well. [\[v\]](#)<sup>[5]</sup> For example, in a recent training workshop for Christian peacemakers I used Matthew 7:1 and the concept of suspension of judgment of others as (1) a bridge to other monotheistic traditions with similar moral values, and (2) the theoretical frame of a conflict workshop for Christians where the parties would have extra religious motivation to humanize the other and suspend stereotypes during the course of their meetings.

Theories of peacemaking and conflict resolution need to analyze the nature of the leaders in society who have the courage to advocate peace with an enemy, even when they are subject to ridicule. What, for example, are the laws, prophetic texts, and rabbinic stories, that passed through the mind of an Orthodox woman in Jerusalem who was a member of a group called Women in Black, that protested the West Bank occupation on a weekly basis on the streets of Jerusalem? Why was she willing to suffer insults for what she believed in? What sustains that degree of

courage? [\[vi\]](#) <sup>[6]</sup>What, by contrast, is in the mind and heart of the West Bank settler who will die to defend his piece of sacred, ancient Israel? One may know by heart selections from the book of Joshua in which the Israelites are commanded to occupy all of Canaan and dispose of its inhabitants, while the other dreams of the moment between God and Abraham in Genesis 18:19 where the gift of the land is based on a commitment to justice and righteousness. These textual foundations of religious positions can offer crucial insight into what creates, sustains, or, alternatively, prevents violence in Israeli life. We are beginning to understand now that both parties may see their texts through the lens of deep fears and concerns, and that the action that they see implicit in these texts and symbols may in both cases be motivated by high ideals.

Let us illustrate this. Acting like King David and conquering the land by whatever means necessary may be seen as conforming to the finest tradition of Jewish idealism, helping the Jewish people flourish militarily for the first time in two thousand years, and, in fact, being militarily stronger than even in the heyday of the ancient Jewish monarchy; the latter possibly intimates the potential arrival of the long-awaited Messiah. To think that one may be empowered to be a part of this process is astonishing enough, but to do it in the shadow of the Holocaust, the greatest destruction ever wreaked on the Jewish people, in the wake of the final showdown with a gentile world that many Jews feel have always despised us, is to be literally immersed in a Divine Plan.

Within this cognitive, emotive, spiritual construct, one will tend to focus on the physical, land-based markers of ownership of the land of Israel as outer manifestations of a Divine spiritual program. Thus, gravesites and ancient ruins become the banners of identity, and, even more importantly, the markers of Divine

intention unfolding. In this context, singing “David, King of Israel, lives and survives”, becomes a critical song, whereas old, East European songs that celebrate humility and relatively quietistic moral virtues, such as right speech or judging all people favorably, tend to fade into the background. I grew up hearing all the time a song, derived from Psalms 34:13, that went, “Which man desires life, and loves the days [on earth] to see the good? [What should he do?] Guard your tongue from speaking evil things, shun evil and do the good, chase after peace and pursue it.” It was a popular liturgical song in the first half of the twentieth century, and one of the most magnificent songs in my family’s repertoire. I do not hear that song anymore. Many peacemakers in Israel and the Jewish community, with some notable exceptions, do not know or remember such songs, and they, from their cultural construct, prefer to think of peace emanating from Jews by lessening the power of Jewish spirituality not increasing it. Of course, this leaves religious enthusiasts in the hands of a conflict generating theology.

In the religious Zionist context that has come to predominate modern Orthodoxy there has developed a fundamental disagreement over the relative sacredness of land, human life and morality itself. For most of the history of rabbinic Judaism, when forced to choose, the priority of sacredness has been given to human life and morality over land. [\[vii\]](#)<sup>[7]</sup> In the twentieth century there has been a minor but steadily growing trend to attach supreme sacredness to land, and to sanction violence in order to protect it. [\[viii\]](#)<sup>[8]</sup> But there is still a great degree of inner confusion about these matters. This confusion is important because it implies that the choices being made for violence may be negotiable if it were clear that attaching too much sacredness to land is endangering human life. Fear and insecurity in the face of terrorism and war are more important in the minds of many religious people than is the sacredness of land. That means that confidence-building measures regarding the

protection of Jewish life could be effective not only in the secular community but also in a large portion of the religious and fundamentalist community if it became clear that giving up land would truly lead to this protection. In point of fact, the vast majority of religious Jews in Israel are not affiliated with Gush Emunim or Kach, two radical religious groups representing many settler Jews that have placed a premium on land. [\[ix\]](#)<sup>[9]</sup> Rather, the primary religious opposition to the peace movement is simple fear of loss of life that has explicit *halakhic* (religious/legal) ramifications in terms of obligatory defense. Knowing this should profoundly modify the goals and tactics of conflict resolution strategies involving religious Jews.

There are a variety of possible explanations as to why people choose one religious response over another to conflict. Certainly, one cannot dismiss the cognitive or emotional needs that may be met by a particular text, idea, or spiritual image. Further it is often true that there are powerful social motivations for affiliating with a particular group that espouses a certain approach to religious experience, an affiliation that, in turn, enmeshes the person in a particular moral, social, and political universe. The violent or politically coercive aspects of that response may be less important to the person than the other benefits received from this association. How deep is the commitment to violence? Can it be separated from the rest of the spiritual commitment? For example, the Islamic Brotherhood in Egypt, along with other religious groups, seems to enjoy great popularity for their humanitarian and post-disaster work among the poorest people of Egypt. When people vote for them in the polls, are they voting for caring humanitarians who fulfill the demands of the Qur'an to redistribute wealth, or are they voting for a group that works to violently overthrow the government? Clearly we cannot know without better research, but we are certainly failing to comprehend the appeal of extremism or to adequately address the violence if we do not understand this complex interplay of religious values and institutions.

It is only partially true that what causes a person to focus on one text or another is due to one's emotional nature, family upbringing, or socioeconomic status. This is too easy a dismissal of the powerful impact of ideas and texts on human minds or hearts in the search for guidance in ambiguous ethical and political circumstances. It is the ambiguity of many human situations that is crucial here. No one would assume, at least on the individual level, that an arbitrary poverty line, for example, can predict who will become violent or anti-social. Some disenfranchised people, often in the worst of circumstances, become saints, while others become rebels, revolutionaries and terrorists. [\[x\]](#)<sup>[10]</sup> To take another example, a loving family structure will not necessarily provide a guide as to how someone will behave in complex violent or confrontational circumstances. Certainly it is helpful to have been reared in a nurturing environment, and it has been persuasively argued that the family environment has a critical impact on which personalities are more prone to either violence or altruism. [\[xi\]](#)<sup>[11]</sup> Yet the ambiguity remains, especially over an extended span of time where the stress of protracted periods of fear greatly affects a person's judgment. More investigation is required into the effect of one's most deeply held beliefs on violent behavior. For many people those deeply held beliefs and habitual actions are religious in character. The values and texts that spring to mind first in radical circumstances of societal upheaval or personal crisis are critical.

### **Universal Codes of Conduct and Religious Subcultures**

Among people of a secular, liberal religious or cosmopolitan orientation, there is broad-based support for the notion that the best way to move society away from religious intolerance and toward more pluralism is the development of a universal set of political guidelines, such as those expressed in United Nations documents

regarding political and civil institutions and individual rights. However, many religious people around the world do not share this universal, "secular" moral discourse. It is fine to wish that they did, but in moments of crisis what is needed are methods of dealing with religious actors as they currently define themselves. A nuanced approach will identify those actors who are prepared to engage in a more universal discourse, but will also be prepared to work as well with religious actors that span the spectrum of attitudes to modernity.

Analysis of religious peace organizations is instructive in this regard. Take, for example, Oz Ve-Shalom, the Orthodox Zionist peace organization in Israel. They have, over the course of the last twenty years, provoked a national conversation in Israel on the nature of Jewish values, writing essays and citing numerous legal and non-legal Judaic sources that justify a peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli wars. Their publications are dedicated for the most part to justifying this position from the vantage point of pre-modern *halakhic* (religious/legal) and *midrashic* (Biblical exegetical) texts, as well as by citing contemporary rabbinic authorities. [\[xii\]](#)<sup>[12]</sup> Many of the Oz ve-Shalom writers happen to be quite committed to Enlightenment conceptions of human rights and civil liberties. But it is vital to their arguments that they justify their positions independently of the modern universal discourse, mostly due to the kind of people who they are trying to convince. A conflict resolution expert who enters into such a universe needs to understand these subtleties in order that he/she knows how religion can be used to resolve rather than exacerbate social and political conflict. The mistake of the Israeli Left has been that they often undermine these potential allies by promoting themselves politically as the group that will fight religion in Israel, rather than the group that will fight hateful expressions of religion. They fail to recognize that in lumping together all religious people they generate more conflict in Israel

rather than less, and that instead of true reconciliation work, they are merely transferring enmity from Palestinians onto religious Jews.

### **Tracking Trends in Religious Subcultures**

There are a number of ways in which religious texts and traditions can contribute to conflict resolution studies. For example, in a more negative sense, the study of religious traditions and laws will reveal the dangers that lie ahead for dealing with a particular group whose leadership is buoyed by violent traditions. Subtle theological changes in a particular culture might provide an early warning system of sorts as to the nascent growth of religious intolerance and the justification of violence. This would be an invaluable tool of responding to conflict before it breaks out or reaches a stage beyond which it cannot be controlled. Tracing the full range of benign and violent interpretations of *jihad* in the Arab world, for example, would provide an important set of clues as to the state of a particular society.

Familiarity with classical sources might make it possible to distinguish where and when a leader is expressing real traditions and when he is using the religion to gain political power through the use of violence. Even if he/she is expressing an authentic violent source, exploration is required to see if there is room for theological deliberation, a new look at the sources, or alternative sources that might countermand the desire for violence or conflict that is implied in the tradition. Religious traditions are dynamic and can change profoundly through discussion and the influence of leadership.

In a more positive sense, conflict resolution studies should examine ways of coexistence within the ideal community, as it is expressed in the sacred texts and

history. Leaders of most religious traditions have expressed rhetorical commitment to peace, but a serious analysis of the texts and cultures in question will yield far more than this. There have been many theologies created over the centuries replete with ethical precepts and inspirational literature designed to create coexistence in spiritual communities. This has something crucial to contribute to the contemporary discussion of strategies of communal conflict resolution and negotiation.

One example is the spiritual process of transformation of character through reflection and ethical improvement of one's behavior. Several theories of conflict resolution suggest the importance of personal transformation for the resolution of deep conflicts. [\[xiii\]](#)<sup>[13]</sup> Spiritual programs of personal transformation might be combined with this kind of conflict resolution methodology in religious settings. For example, a unilateral gesture of forgiveness is encouraged in many traditions, and much has been written over the centuries on this one self-evident but extremely complex gesture. A related but very different value is the requirement to confess to past wrongs, repent and apologize to the victim. What is the inner spiritual/psychological dynamic of unilateral acts of forgiveness or repentance? Could such phenomena be incorporated into conflict resolution strategies among religious peoples or even more generally? [\[xiv\]](#)<sup>[14]</sup> It seems to me that the answer is if the challenge is presented equally to both sides of a conflict [\[xv\]](#)<sup>[15]</sup> and, it speaks to profound cultural and religious metaphors of both adversaries.

Another aspect of religious literature that pertains here involves the critical importance of authoritative leaders. These leaders could be either living or dead, human or deified. The critical role of such leaders in the inner life of religious adherents cannot be overestimated. The role of charismatic leadership in conflict resolution theory and political psychology has received some attention. [\[xvi\]](#)<sup>[16]</sup> How

can the role of the religious leader be analyzed in this regard? In many societies, emulation of an ideal figure, including a deity, is the foundation of all pro-social values. [\[xvii\]](#)<sup>[17]</sup> This makes the analysis of leadership critical, and might suggest unique strategies of coping with violence. Gandhi understood this well, and therefore undertook to study and interpret the *Bhagavad-Gita*, one of the most widely recounted books, and reinterpreted the role of battle, in order to make princes and gods into teachers of a peaceful path in life. [\[xviii\]](#)<sup>[18]</sup> Furthermore, leaders play a crucial role regarding the process of injury and healing mentioned above; their smallest gestures, for better or for worse, take on mythic significance in relation to these injuries. This is a liability when one is saddled with callous leaders and a boon when a leader understands the healing power of symbolic behavior.

### **Religious Values, East and West, and Conflict Resolution Strategies**

There is an abundant supply of values around the globe that need to be identified in terms of their importance for conflict resolution theory. I would like to tentatively identify just a few of them.

#### ***Empathy***

The critical importance of empathy in Western religious and secular traditions cannot be overestimated. [\[xix\]](#)<sup>[19]</sup> The concept or experience of empathy could be used in religious contexts either in terms of advocacy and long-term education or more directly in the conflict workshop setting. The advantages of its use as a basis for devising workshop strategies is that there would be a built-in spiritual motivation to engage in exercises emanating out of a familiar value. [\[xx\]](#)<sup>[20]</sup> As an example, hearing the public testimony of parties to a conflict at Moral Re-Armament's Caux retreat, is

critical to their conflict resolution process. [\[xxi\]](#)<sup>[21]</sup> Empathy is evoked by the painful story of the other party, and, in this religious setting, both parties refer to God's role in their lives. This, in turn, generates a common bond between enemies that has often led, with subtle but careful guidance, to more honest discussion and relationship building.

The religious adherent must see that his/her way of looking at reality is being directly addressed by the content and method of conflict resolution. If, for example, relational empathy is a key concept that informs the conflict resolution methodologies at work, one could explore a means to view that concept in positive spiritual terms, an easy leap for many religious value systems. [\[xxii\]](#)<sup>[22]</sup> For example, in a dialogue or conflict resolution workshop involving devout Christians and Muslims, one might frame the discussion in terms of emulation of God's empathy as a vehicle of understanding each others' needs and aspirations. Allah is referred to throughout the Koran as "the Compassionate and the Merciful", and Jesus' empathy with others in their suffering is well illustrated throughout the New Testament. Clearly the details of how to operationalize this in a culturally sensitive fashion would have to be adjusted to each situation.

### ***Nonviolence and Pacifism***

A critical concept for the inner life in the Eastern traditions of Jainism, Buddhism, and Hinduism is *ahimsa*, nonviolence, made famous in the West by Mohandas Gandhi. [\[xxiii\]](#)<sup>[23]</sup> Certainly, in an Asian context the elaboration and use of this principle could be a critical cultural tool to traverse ethnic and social boundaries.

Pacifism is a related, though different, concept that has had a profound impact on the early Christian church and many sectarian interpretations of

Christianity. [\[xxiv\]](#)<sup>[24]</sup> Even for those Christians who do not subscribe to a purely pacifist view of Christianity, the pacifist writings, primary and secondary, are a powerful basis of discussion and debate. [\[xxv\]](#)<sup>[25]</sup>

### ***Sanctity of Life***

Another central value in religion, often a source of controversy, could also be a source of reconciliation or joint commitments. The sanctity of life is a core value of Christian society, however one feels about the way it has been interpreted or the uses to which it has been put regarding abortion. What has been less obvious is that this value of the sanctity of life is shared across many cultures. [\[xxvi\]](#)<sup>[26]</sup> This too could become the basis for inter-religious conflict resolution.

### ***Interiority***

Another important aspect of religious experience that will condition the nature of conflict resolution strategies is interiority. What I mean by this is that disciplines, even in societies that are quite communally oriented, are especially focused on the inner life of the individual. Prayer, meditation, the experience of divine love, ecstasy, guilt, and repentance all reflect the central importance of the inner life. [\[xxvii\]](#)<sup>[27]</sup> This means that conflict resolution techniques applied to religious groups or workshops might consider, where deemed appropriate to both sides, the usefulness of focusing on this aspect of human experience. For example, I was witness to the work of Maha Gosananda, a Cambodian Buddhist monk, who is quite prominent in the efforts at Cambodian reconciliation, when he moved a large room of religious people of many faiths practically to tears, simply by recreating with them, in a matter of ten minutes, the kind of meditational practices that help generate in him a perpetual state of *metta*, loving kindness for others; *metta* forms the basis of his work on reconciliation

between enemies. Many of the people in that room were very conservative Christians. But the monk touched something quite deep in the inner life that circumvented the cultural divide and enabled a transformative moment to take place. [\[xxviii\]](#) <sup>[28]</sup>

### ***Buddhist Compassion***

The Four Sublime Moods of compassion (*karuna*), equanimity (*upekkha*), joy in others' joy (*mudita*), and loving kindness (*metta*) [\[xxix\]](#) <sup>[29]</sup>, are an important tool of conflict resolution available in the Buddhist context; they also have important pedagogic value for the general understanding of changes necessary in internal perceptions of the other who is an enemy. The focus of the Four Noble Truths and Eightfold Path has been mostly on restraint. [\[xxx\]](#) <sup>[30]</sup> For example, Right Action, one path of the Eightfold Path, expresses itself in five precepts of restraint: murder, theft, adultery, intoxication, and lying. But there is a proactive character of the Four Sublime Moods [\[xxxi\]](#) <sup>[31]</sup>, at least by implication, that make them potentially a critical tool of conflict resolution for Buddhist societies. The Moods suggest a disposition of peacefulness and compassion that create the groundwork for effective engagement in peacemaking. [\[xxxii\]](#) <sup>[32]</sup> On the one hand, Buddhist traditional texts on this matter place most of the emphasis on one's state of mind, and this would seem to be missing, or in need of, a proactive hermeneutic that contemporary activists and interpreters are providing. On the other hand, these Buddhist texts have much to teach Western approaches to conflict resolution which systematically ignore the inner state of peacemakers and conflict resolvers. The latter often leads to failed processes due to unexamined motives, anger, and mixed emotions, that have not been dealt with internally by either parties to the conflict or by the intervenors and mediators, who themselves have inner states that affect the intervention and that, therefore, need to be examined.

## ***Religious Disciplines and Conflict Resolution***

Related to the experience of interiority in religious traditions is the great emphasis placed on discipline of the body. Experimentation with limiting personal violence has involved this aspect of religious experience, and Gandhi's experiments are instructive here. It seems clear that for Gandhi his *brahmacharya* experiments with discipline of the body were critical to his commitment to *satyagraha* and the attaining of *ahimsa*. Self-restraint of the senses was central to his conception of self-restraint in violent situations. The multiplication of wants that inheres in Western civilization was a key for him to the understanding of political violence, repression, and imperialism. [\[xxxiii\]](#) <sup>[33]</sup>

The following is an example of how Gandhi combined religious discipline, pluralism and conflict resolution. Religious fasting and dietary restrictions were experienced on Gandhi's Tolstoy Farm as a means of promoting mutual respect and tolerance, as each religious community member—be he Parsi, Hindu, Christian, Jewish or Muslim--would aid the others in the observance of the discipline of their respective traditions. Consider the effect on the participants or the witnesses to Gandhi's encouragement of Christians and Parsis to help a young Muslim to fast the whole day during Ramadan and to provide food at night for him. The fast itself is beyond reproach in its commitment to ancient Islamic tradition. Yet it is transformed, in Gandhi's hands, into a moment of inter-religious discovery of immense power that leads the participants to nonviolence. Gandhi's concern was to provide a model for religious observance that simultaneously creates tolerance. There are very few models that have been generated by the world's religions that are simultaneously authentic to a religious tradition and simultaneously accepting of other traditions. In a certain sense, it is India's unique contribution to inter-religious peace that Gandhi elicited

from his cultural matrix. Gandhi's concept of lived religiosity that is both authentic and pluralistic needs to be examined as a model for contemporary societies that mix people of many faiths. Contemporary American examples of this include the Jewish community's organizing of volunteers for soup kitchens and homeless shelters across the country precisely on Christmas Eve, so that the Christian workers can spend the night with their families. The key is not the blurring of religious distinctions or categories but the peacemaking quality that inheres in enabling someone else to practice her or his religion.

### ***Messianism and Imagination***

All three monotheisms have a crucial contribution to make to conflict resolution studies in the area of social criticism, envisioning of more just social constructions, and new possibilities of the human social order. The phenomenon of religious messianic dreaming and envisioning new realities should be studied in terms of how to combine it with the imaginative element that is necessary for conflict resolution. The prophetic imagination, as it expressed itself in Biblical literature, may provide a critical precedent for this use of imagination. [\[xxxiv\]](#)<sup>[34]</sup>

### **Stages of Interfaith Dialogue and Conflict Resolution Theory**

Interfaith dialogue is another important avenue of research. What models have worked better over the years, and what models have failed? Many of the same considerations of conflict resolution theory regarding states or other large entities need to be applied to religious institutions. Strategies such as confidence-building measures and unilateral gestures have all been used at one time or another in interfaith work, but little has been done to document the successes and failures of these methods in religious settings.

There are discernible patterns of progression in interfaith conflict resolution that, if properly identified, may provide a framework of analysis and activism not currently available. For example, in the past decade there has been a remarkable development in the Catholic Church's attitude toward Jews and Judaism that has progressed from papal pronouncements to changes in catechisms and educational materials. [\[xxxv\]](#)<sup>[35]</sup> This is of profound importance because it represents not only a theological shift but also a commitment to change the attitudes of over 800 million believers. The confidence-building character of this development, especially for those who have felt deeply injured by the long history of repression of Jews and Judaism, is remarkable.

This is not to say that there are not still some serious disagreements. Most of the disagreements involve acknowledging past wrongs of the Church, and conflict resolution theory and practice would be useful in both analyzing this conflict, and moving it toward resolution. Thus, for example, there needs to be greater attention to the perspectival differences of both parties. For example, many members of the Jewish community point out past sins of the Church, especially during the Holocaust, and regarding Pope Pius XII's actions or lack thereof. But members of the Jewish community tend to under-emphasize the heroic role of other popes, most noticeably the most recent two, who were particularly committed to the Jews during the Holocaust. For some, this is the expression of a need to be angry at a long history of mistreatment, but for others it expresses a desire for apology from the highest sources.

We have here an interesting combination of social-psychological elements of conflict scenarios, and communication difficulties informed by theological differences. Jewish tradition has a habit of emphasizing that even Moses, the greatest Jewish leader and prophet of all time, must be criticized and found to have committed

at least one sin, in order to make the clear distinction between a supreme God and imperfect human beings. The Church, however, has a very hard time criticizing a Pope without undermining its essential theological legitimacy. [\[xxxvi\]](#)<sup>[36]</sup> It can, however, issue bold new statements and make substantial changes, such as the current Pope's recent interest in investigating and repudiating the horrors of the Inquisition, without necessarily naming names of Popes who obviously, by implication, were responsible for what happened. Many Jews, however, are expressing a need, it seems to me, for the Catholic Church as such to apologize. A good conflict resolution process would delve deeply into the subtle needs of each tradition, both psychodynamically and theologically, in order to arrive at compromises and novel gestures that would satisfy the needs of both communities. Good people on both sides are doing excellent work on this, but I still hope to see greater attention to filtering this process down to the millions of adherents on both sides. It is in and through the masses of religious people that history has a nasty habit of repeating itself, unless there is a profound, broad-based transformation of relationship.

By contrast, the Christian-Jewish relationship in Russia is still at the primitive stage of trying to get the higher echelons of the Russian Orthodox Church to condemn anti-Semitic beliefs, some of which are still occasionally promulgated by prominent members of its own hierarchy. [\[xxxvii\]](#)<sup>[37]</sup> Such cases illustrate the fact that religious dialogue has stages of development, and that there could be a fruitful interplay of conflict analysis, resolution strategies, and interfaith religious discourse.

The Protestant-Jewish relationship has also improved remarkably since the War. The fascism of so many Europeans in the war, and the results of genocide, led to a profound level of soul-searching, and extensive Protestant-Jewish dialogue that has been quite fruitful. A very worrisome trend, however, is the commitment of some

conservative denominations to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into active programs of proselytizing Jewish people, particularly the vulnerable ones who are lonely in college, or senior citizens. This return to the medieval assaults on the integrity of the Jewish community is certainly creating a backlash of hatred that is diffuse in its anti-Christian expression, certainly among the Orthodox. At present this is still a relatively minor subject of conflict, but, depending on how the war over Christian culture goes in the United States, this could lead to serious inter-religious conflict.

A telling sign of a worsening relationship is Jerry Falwell's recent assertion that the coming anti-Christ must be a Jewish male. The Jewish community was understandably horrified, but it was made far worse by the steady lessening trust of the Jewish community in the direction of right-wing Christian America, as evidenced by the proselytism. [\[xxxviii\]](#)<sup>[38]</sup> Now here is a case where, indeed, there are several old Christian traditions about who the anti-Christ is, and one of those traditions is that it is a Jew, but Falwell, for whatever purpose, chooses to pick that one tradition that makes this dark, evil figure into a Jew. Thus, this hermeneutic is combined with a cultural/psychological war that Falwell and others are engaged in to make the United States into a Christian nation, with, of course, the expected reassurances of fair treatment to minorities. It is very clear that liberal Jews, both secular and religious, stand in the way of that aim, since they are among the staunchest guardians of church/state separation.

This is more dangerous a trend than most Americans realize. The Jewish community, which has a very long memory for past eras of Christian revivalism, is worried. The alliance of conservative Christians and a strong pro-Israel, anti-Palestinian stand, that makes them helpful partners to certain political parties in Israel,

is no real comfort to most American Jews. This trend will worsen unless there is a serious effort to intervene in this relationship.

I am particularly concerned by the tendency in conservative circles to demonize two groups in America, lawyers and anyone associated with Hollywood, two areas where Jews have been prominent. There is no doubt that there is much to criticize in American legal practice and in the media. But there is also no doubt that these professionals are a mere reflection of deep cultural trends of the United States. Whatever is right or wrong on television, is right or wrong with the culture of America that makes those ratings go up and down. And lawyers do what clients want them to do. There are deeper reasons why America is a legalistic culture, having far more to do with the fact that this is a young, highly multi-cultural society from its very inception that was only bound together, not by etiquette or social custom but, by the Constitution and the rule of law.

But it is in the nature of certain expressions of religious psychology, out of bewilderment at the admittedly terrible problems of American popular culture, to search for a simple cognitive construct of reality that concocts a grand conspiracy which can be laid at one entity's doorstep, thus exonerating the rest of us. This is a compelling myth for many people who no doubt struggle with and experience guilt over the changing roles and problems of their own families. It would be tragic if the trend, already in place, to look at Disney and Hollywood as the source of all evil--and the greatest competition for the attention of conservative Christian children, not coincidentally--moves hermeneutically into a demonization of Jewish media figures. If politics became more extreme, due to various social or ecological disasters, how far would it be for some on the fringe to see someone like Steven Spielberg as the anti-Christ? It sounds absurd, but has not Falwell opened the door to this? And someone

like Spielberg would be all the more tempting a choice precisely because so many of his films have a redemptive message. This enrages those who have become obsessed with “taking America back for Christianity”. [\[xxxix\]](#)<sup>[39]</sup> Of course, this is all rather distant from the American mainstream, but conflict analysis must keep a close eye on the fringes of religious society, for that is where violence often springs up, given the right circumstances.

### **Conflict Analysis and Situational Religious Ethics**

I have offered a brief sampling of values derived from classical sources that might be considered as creative conflict resolution techniques in religious settings. This is a deductive method of beginning with classical sources, conflict resolution theory, and then moving to concrete situations. This has value as preparation for dealing with religious conflict, but, in the real situation of conflict, priority must be give to an inductive approach, which involves an empirical investigation of a conflict scenario, listening to the needs being expressed in the conflict, and then eliciting a series of religious ideas, values and institutions that may be appropriate for that conflict setting.

My own work in Arab-Jewish relations and intra-Jewish conflict has led me to the conclusion that each new scenario of encounter between enemies can elicit the use of religious values and corresponding strategies of behavior that may work only in that setting. This is why replication and professionalization of these efforts by third party actors must be accompanied by (1) broad-based knowledge of the traditions in question that can be drawn upon in a wide variety of circumstances, and (2) a level of elasticity and humility on the part of intervenors that allows each new situation to

dictate its own unique constellation of responses, both in terms of conflict analysis and in terms of religious texts and ideas. [\[x1\]](#) <sup>[40]</sup>

For example, when I met a group of Jordanian students in a retreat center several years ago, the clear danger was that the relationship would be reduced to a series of angry exchanges about Israel. Dialogue and conflict resolution work regarding Israel was clearly the goal in this setting, but how to get to that goal was unclear. The unique circumstances of this meeting--the retreat center, the pluralistic religious context, and the personalities involved--led me to interpersonal strategies of conflict resolution that were derived from my knowledge of rabbinic Judaism. That was only occasionally made explicit to the other parties. Mostly this was an internal process of struggling with conflict resolution techniques, my conscience, and traditional ethics. But the techniques that emanated out of that internal process, including an intensive commitment to honor adversaries, a commitment to external and internal humility, empathy, listening and the wisdom of silence, all worked quite well in breaking barriers and creating relationships. It was a powerful motivator to me, as a party to the conflict as well as a conflict resolver, to be able to draw upon deeply held sacred traditions while engaged in the difficult and emotionally draining process of conflict resolution.

### **Religious Jurisprudence as a Peacemaking Tool: Prospects and Problems**

There is an entirely different set of religious literature which, I would argue, could be used in fruitful conjunction with the more traditional subjects of peace studies. I refer to the uses of international law in situations of conflict, arguments for international commitments to human rights, and new paradigms of global relations and mutual

security based on the rule of law. [\[xli\]](#)<sup>[41]</sup> Another way, therefore, in which religious literature can play a role in conflict resolution is in the examination of practical values and laws as they might relate to international concerns such as human rights. There are two possible areas of investigation here: (1) an analysis of the correlation of religious laws and values with the basic institutions of civil society, such as human rights [\[xlii\]](#)<sup>[42]</sup>, and (2) an analysis of religious traditions as they pertain to conflict management, and the peaceful resolution of legal disputes. Religions with strong legal traditions, such as Islam and Judaism, should be investigated regarding the management of such conflict. The foregoing would be studied as a paradigm of intra-communal relations that could be applied to broader inter-communal dialogues [\[xlili\]](#)<sup>[43]</sup>.

The problem is that communitarian commitments are limited to the faithful. The difficulty of widening the scope of religious ethics to include outsiders or nonbelievers remains a serious challenge, especially in fundamentalist circles. This is a cognitive and emotional leap that would have to be nurtured very carefully by third parties.

### **Extending Religious Ethical Categories Beyond the Faithful: The Problem of Scope**

There are two questions to be asked about nonbelievers: first, which values affirm coexistence with those outside the world of the believer, and which do not? Second, can the values that affirm coexistence be strengthened by leaders and activists in such a way that it dramatically removes the animosity to nonbelievers?

There is an unprecedented level of interaction between people of many faiths around the globe due to patterns of rapid mobility, mass communication and the spread of capitalism. This is deeply threatening to many religious leaders, especially fundamentalist ones. These leaders are reacting to the chaotic reality of a pluralistic society by emphasizing that aspect of their respective religions that is the most rejectionist of the legitimacy and even humanity of nonbelievers. [\[xliv\]](#)<sup>[44]</sup> On the other hand, more adherents are coming into contact with others who are not of their belief system than ever before. Clearly, religious hermeneutics that creatively engages tolerant texts of the past are necessary in order for the respective religions to flourish without building their base of support by intolerance.

It is necessary in a conflict situation, therefore, to develop a methodology of positively interacting with religious leaders and thinkers, even fundamentalists. The conflict resolution expert must elicit from this interaction the possibility of developing religious traditions that are accepting of the Other. [\[xlv\]](#)<sup>[45]</sup> Rarely do diplomats or conflict resolution experts currently engage religious groups on their own terms and dynamically interact with their categories of thinking in order to produce a greater commitment to coexistence and peacemaking. But the effort may produce important benefits that have eluded international diplomacy until now.

These efforts will undoubtedly be complicated by the fact that religious leaders and practitioners are also influenced by the emotional and socioeconomic factors discussed above. The complexity of mixed motivations does not negate, however, the usefulness of interacting hermeneutically with a religious tradition. It simply means that the interaction must be engaged on many levels. The religious human being in conflict must be approached on a number of planes, just like his secular counterpart. Some people think of peace and conflict in rational terms of the

calculation of interests, others think in terms of ideological principles that necessitate conflict, and still others in deep emotional terms; most people tend to experience these questions in some combination of several cognitive and emotive constructs. It is exactly the same in religious life. Some people are moved to conflict or hatred by deep emotional scars, and they express this in religious terms; they clearly need to be moved from that stance by deep emotive methods of conflict resolution that emerge out of the moral guides of their traditions combined with appropriate conflict resolution techniques. Others, especially in leadership positions, tend to think more in terms of the cognitive categories of faith, dogma, law and institutional interests. They clearly need to come to believe that coexistence and peace are defensible legal and metaphysical possibilities within their system of belief, and are of practical benefit to their institutions as well. The successful conflict resolution expert will learn to creatively interact with all of these strains of religious life.

Leaders and practitioners must be given the chance to creatively engage their traditions, especially the ways in which difficult dilemmas were negotiated in the past. Allow me to demonstrate this by way of example from Judaism. There are clear rules in ancient Judaism against idolatry and, in many instances, against idolaters, that would produce terrible violence if they were ever put fully into practice again. [\[xlvi\]](#)<sup>[46]</sup> But another fundamental metaphysical assumption of Judaism, based on Genesis 1.26, is that every human being is created in the image of God. That metaphysical assumption leads to a series of ancient rabbinic rules that reinforce the idea that every single human life is precious, as precious as the world itself. [\[xlvii\]](#)<sup>[47]</sup> Hillel, an older contemporary of Jesus, and the most important founder of rabbinic Judaism, was motivated by this belief to call for the love of every human being as the highest calling of Judaism, and for Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakai, the central hero of Post-Temple rabbinic Judaism in the first century, to greet every

human being, Jew or idolater, with kindness and peace. [\[xlvi\]](#)<sup>[48]</sup> Thus, a dynamic process was set in motion that led one metaphysical assumption to overwhelm and effectively cancel the practical implications of another, and the result was a more peaceful society. This was a choice made inside the mind of religious leaders that provides a precedent from classical sources for later generations to follow.

This ethical posture makes a place in the rabbinic universe for someone utterly Other, who will never be Jewish or even monotheistic. Furthermore, the position is not based on a hidden agenda or mixed motivation of hoped for conversion. [\[xli\]](#)<sup>[49]</sup> The latter, while better than violence, would call into question the ultimate acceptance of the Other who will remain different and distinct. Rather the motivation for coexistence is their fundamental belief that God has commanded them to value all human beings.

It is apparent that much work has yet to be done in many religious traditions on constructing a theological and metaphysical approach to the Other or “outgroups”, while, at the same time, maintaining a meaningful and authentic system of belief and practice.

There is a good deal of bad precedent in the treatment of traditional Others, especially in the history of the monotheisms. One example of this is the treatment of heretics, apostates, and slaves. This also includes the attitude to women, and a feminist critique of religious systems would therefore be quite important in this regard. This should be undertaken in order to see both the dangers of each system as well as its dynamic possibilities. Much can be learned about the dynamic possibilities within traditions by examining the steadily improved status of some of these Others over the centuries. I do not deny that the status of some groups has often risen and fallen over time, without progress. What is crucial for purposes of conflict analysis

and resolution is the dynamic of the internal process of change, when and how a group status has improved and how it has been justified.

A few cautionary notes are in order before I conclude. There are two dangers to highlighting the importance of religion in conflict resolution: (1) that analysts and activists, in their enthusiasm about religion's positive contribution to conflict resolution, overlook its violent potential, [\[i\]](#)<sup>[50]</sup> and (2) that analysts will overemphasize religion's role and not see it as part of a complex array of factors that generate violence and peacemaking. It would be a profound error, for example, to attribute a conflict exclusively to religion--and, therefore, its resolution to religion--if, in fact, the society in question is plagued by problems that have been appropriately called "structural violence". [\[ii\]](#)<sup>[51]</sup> If a society is afflicted by gross economic inequities or tyrannized by a brutal regime it would be seriously misguided to think that religion is all that is necessary to resolve the conflict. Worse, it could make society more violent by masking the underlying problems, and thereby, unwittingly or wittingly, taking sides in the conflict. That does not mean that religious intervention cannot be an important element in the conflict resolution process. It just means that it should not distort that process with a narrow agenda.

This brings me to my next point. Let us assume that there is a broad range of values in most of the world's religions that express a commitment to peace and elimination of violence. [\[iii\]](#)<sup>[52]</sup> That happy circumstance does not begin to address the problem of countervailing religious values that will at times override the call for peace. This struggle of conflicting values or, in some traditions, conflict of laws, is, to be sure, often manipulated by powerful interests that do not want peace. That does not mean, however, that the conflict of values is not a formidable reality for the average

believer or cleric who struggles with his/her conscience. Acknowledging and dealing with those struggles is crucial for conflict resolution in a religious context.

As an example, let us take the response to Bosnian genocide in the United States. There were numerous voices in the Muslim and Jewish community to call not only for an end to the violence on the part of the Serbians, which was certainly also vociferously called for by the Christian community, but also a commitment to arm the Bosnians to defend themselves, and even to strike Serbia militarily. There are various cultural factors that could be pointed to in order to explain this rather unusual alignment of Jew and Muslim versus Christian pacifists. But it must be noted that in Judaism, according to most readers of the traditional texts, the principle of saving innocent lives in violent situations, where there is no alternative, overrides the commitment to peace [\[liii\]](#)<sup>[53]</sup>. In Islam unjust injury is certainly grounds to defend oneself. [\[liv\]](#)<sup>[54]</sup>

These conflicting values will have to be acknowledged in conflict resolution settings, and the cultural and religious differences fully confronted. There will be some interesting combinations of values that may seem unusual in the predominantly Christian West. In Christian conversations about war and peace there is a great deal of struggle with pacifism, probably because it has such strong roots in the pre-Constantine church, and due to a laudable degree of soul-searching concerning the disastrous medieval religious wars and crusades. [\[lv\]](#)<sup>[55]</sup> There are some voices, both classical and modern, in Judaism and Islam, that are also pacifist. [\[lvi\]](#)<sup>[56]</sup> But they are a much smaller voice. However, Islam, Judaism and non-pacifist versions of Christianity all have a reservoir of sources that would commit them to aggressive efforts to limit war, pursue peace or resolve conflicts even if they are not pacifist. In other words, there may be plenty of agreement on conflict resolution strategies even if

not on pacifism. Conflict resolution may be a much more useful bridge between religious cultures, offering a language of discourse that may provide many more points of entry for a wide variety of religious cultures, than either just war theory or pacifism. The pragmatic emphasis of conflict resolution theory, the goal oriented nature of its methodologies allow for people of many cultures to support the same processes of engagement. This has been my experience among leading conflict resolution practitioners and theoreticians, only some of whom are absolute pacifists but, who, nevertheless, share a rich array of methods for aggressive conflict prevention and peacemaking. Furthermore, making conflict resolution respectful and inclusive of a broad representation of religious values, not just pacifism, can further strengthen the bond between conflict resolution practice and the behavior of religious parties to the conflict.

### **The Dangers of Religious Expansionism**

My final cautionary note involves what appears to be one of the central tenets of several world religions, namely, evangelism, or the notion that there is either an obligation unfulfilled or a spiritual reality unfulfilled as long as the whole world does not profess the tenets of a particular religion. A corollary is the drive to convert as many people as possible to one's faith. While this spiritual disposition does not by itself require violence, (A) it certainly has included extreme violence in the past on the part of some, both in principal and in practice, and (B) the very drive, nonviolent though it may be, will cause more and more of the pretexts for violence in the crowded world of today. In particular, the corporate institutions of religion, for whom power is dependent upon the number of adherents, tend to vie with each other in increasingly hostile ways when this issue is not confronted.

The question is, can there be complete religious fulfillment for adherents in a world of unbelievers? What needs to be explored is what are the options in each religious tradition on these matters. The typical modern assumption is that radical change is the only possibility. That may not be the case. It may be the case that shifts in emphasis will suffice or a return to other non-evangelical classical sources or experiences, or redefinitions of concepts like “mission”. Each religious system must work on this in its own way. There must be, for example, great respect accorded to those who have dedicated their lives to a religious principle such as “mission”, and an empathetic understanding of their inner spiritual life. But the issue of how to negotiate the enactment of this value in the future, while committed to authentic peace with others, must be confronted as part of a long-term conflict resolution strategy for the world’s religions.

### **Religious Pluralism and Conflict Resolution**

More thought needs to be given to why some people find deep religious fulfillment through their particular tradition that exists side by side in their minds or hearts with an abiding respect for other religious traditions. [\[lvii\]](#)<sup>[57]</sup> But other people have such an intense level of identification with their own group, that any affront to their group is a deep affront to their sense of personal survival, and any compromise on their group’s domination is an attack on their personal legitimacy. [\[lviii\]](#)<sup>[58]</sup> This over-identification with one’s ethnic group is also typical of patterns of over-identification with one’s religious group.

I would tentatively suggest that those, like Gandhi, and many others, who find it quite natural to honor and encourage other religious traditions have a sense of self that is inclusive of but not exhausted by their own religious affiliation. Their religious world-view does not confine them to one identity. They see and define themselves as

religious adherents of one faith and practice, but also as human beings standing in communal relation with other valued human beings. They share faith with their own group, but humanity with all other humans, and life with all living creatures and organisms. And their spiritual psyche values all these relations, and consequent identities. It is the multiplicity of healthy identities that prevents a level of over-identification with one group, be it an ethnic group or a religious community.

## **Conclusion**

In summary, we have analyzed a variety of issues relating to world religions that demonstrates the need to engage in a positive interaction between the study of religious texts, traditions, and practitioners, on the one hand, and, on the other, conflict resolution research. This is necessary in order to elicit from that interaction a series of strategies for engaging in conflict resolution where some or all of the parties to a conflict hold strong religious beliefs.

Until now we have engaged in a general map of the issues surrounding world religions and their potential for violence and peacemaking. We have also indicated that a substantive interaction between religious traditions and the social science of conflict resolution would be most desirable as a way of hermeneutically engaging religious traditions as vehicles of peacemaking. However, this marriage of religion and peacemaking or conflict resolution has been thwarted till now by the limitations of thinking in two distinct areas of scholarship, the analysis of religious traditions on war and peace, and the social science of conflict resolution. There are a variety of complex reasons for these limitations that touch upon the basic rift between liberal, secular modernity and the world of religious belief and practice. We will explore this in the next chapter.

---

[i]<sup>[1]</sup>See generally Henry O. Thompson, *World Religions in War and Peace* (Jefferson, N. Carolina: McFarland, 1988); John Ferguson, *War and Peace in the World's Religions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Homer A. Jack, ed., *World Religions and World Peace: The International Inter-religious Symposium on Peace* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).

[ii]<sup>[2]</sup>See Thich Nhat Hanh, *Being Peace* (Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1987); Maha Gosananda, *Step by Step: Meditations on Wisdom and Compassion* (Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1988); idem, *A Report from the Inter-Religious Mission for Peace in Cambodia* (Providence, RI: The Cambodian Mission for Peace, 1988); Cynthia Sampson, "Religion and Peacebuilding," in *Peacemaking in International Conflict*, ed. I. William Zartman & Lewis Rasmussen (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1997).

[iii]<sup>[3]</sup>See, for example, Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (United States: Basic Books, 1973), part III.

[iv]<sup>[4]</sup>An example of the complex interplay of economics and religious extremism might be the comparative status of the Shiite community in the Middle East and the popularity of the Iranian revolution among them, or the economic scenario of Iran just prior to the revolution. Another example might involve an analysis of the economic and social status of the followers of Meir Kahane in the United States and Israel. Kahane, since the inception of his radical activity in the 1960's, was brilliant at empowering working class Jewish youth who were decidedly marginalized by the upper class mobility and intellectual accomplishments of most of their ethnic contemporaries. Kahane moved them from a relatively inner directed anger at their social position to belligerency against hoodlums attacking old Jews in the U.S., thence to Soviets who oppressed Jews, and finally toward hatred of Arabs. For an analysis of class conflict and conflict resolution, see Richard E. Rubenstein, "The Analyzing and Resolving of Class Conflict," in *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice*, ed. Dennis Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe (Manchester, NY: Manchester University Press, 1993), 146-157. On Kahane's class consciousness see his *Uncomfortable Questions for Comfortable Jews* (Secaucus, NJ: L. Stuart, 1987). On Kahane's life, see Robert I. Friedman, *The False Prophet, Meir Kahane: From FBI Informant to Knesset Member* (Brooklyn, NY: Lawrence Hill Books, 1990).

[v]<sup>[5]</sup>Mohammed Abu-Nimer, "Conflict Resolution in an Islamic Context," *Peace and Change* 21, no. 1 (January 1996): 22-40, has cautioned against the unadulterated application of Western conflict resolution methods to non-Western contexts. I am suggesting some ways in which religious traditions may serve as a bridge that helps conflict resolution experts adjust their methods to each cultural situation.

[vi]<sup>[6]</sup>On women's role in general in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, see Simona Sharoni, *Gender and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: the Politics of Women's Resistance* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995).

[vii]<sup>[7]</sup>See Haim Cohn, *Human Rights in Jewish Law* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1984), 27-47; Reuven Kimelman, "Non-Violence in the Talmud," *Judaism* 17 (1968), 316-334; David S. Shapiro, "The Jewish Attitude Towards Peace and War," in *Studies in Jewish Thought*, ed. David S. Shapiro (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1975), vol. 1, 316-373.

[viii]<sup>[8]</sup>See Eliezer Schweid, "Land of Israel," in *Contemporary Jewish Religious Thought*, ed. Arthur A. Cohen and Paul Mendes-Flohr (New York: Free Press, 1972), 535-542; Martin Buber, "The Land and Its Possessors," in idem, *Israel and the World* (New York: Schocken, 1963), 226-233. Buber's Zionism, however, was a radical advocacy of a binational state of Jews and Arabs; see Martin Buber, *A Land of Two Peoples*, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983). See also Ehud Luz, "The Moral Price of Sovereignty: The Dispute about the Use of Military Power Within Zionism," *Modern Judaism* 7 (Fall 1987): 51-98.

[ix]<sup>[9]</sup> On Gush Emunim, see Laurence J. Silberstein, ed., *Jewish Fundamentalism in Comparative Perspective: Religion, Ideology and the Crisis of Modernity* (New York: New York University Press, c1993).

[x]<sup>[10]</sup> See Richard Rubenstein, *Alchemists of Revolution: Terrorism in the Modern World* (New York: Basic Books, 1987).

[xi]<sup>[11]</sup> See Ervin Staub, *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Evil and Other Group Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 72-75, 279-281; see esp. 317, n. 15; Alice Miller, *For Your Own Good: Hidden Cruelty in Child-Rearing and the Roots of Violence* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983).

[xii]<sup>[12]</sup> See, for example, *Oz Ve-Shalom* English Bulletin Series, no. 1-no. 8 (Jerusalem, Israel, 1982ff.). Some of the bulletin titles are instructive: “One Standard of Justice”, “The Cry of Religious Conscience”, “Torah against Terror”, “Violence and the Value of Life in Jewish Tradition”.

[xiii]<sup>[13]</sup> See, for example, Robert Bush and Joseph Folger, *The Promise of Mediation: Responding to Conflict Through Empowerment and Recognition* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994), 27; John Paul Lederach, *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures* (Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1995), 16-20.

[xiv]<sup>[14]</sup> See Joseph Montville, “The Healing Function<sup>[14]</sup> in Political Conflict Resolution,” in *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice, op. cit.*, 117-124.

[xv]<sup>[15]</sup> Even though the classical expression of these virtues emphasizes their unilateral character, it seems to me that in order to work as a conflict resolution strategy there has to be an agreed upon bilateral character to these interactions, even if, as it is finally accomplished in public, the interactions have the look and feel of a unilateral event. Rarely does only one side of a conflict consider themselves victims deserving of apologies. Furthermore, proper use of this method would necessarily entail judicious choices of the third party negotiators, based on an inductive analysis of the circumstances. It may be that in certain circumstances, such as post-genocide, mutual apologies would be obscene, and perceived as such. It may also be that one side has more to apologize for. These considerations must enter into the give and take of the conflict resolution scenario. Also, the object of the apology must be given careful consideration. One must analyze where the gravest injuries have occurred to particular parties. For example, it seems to me that Israelis and Palestinians, unconsciously or consciously, have managed to direct their injuries of the other precisely to the most vulnerable areas of the adversary. Israeli policy of demolishing homes, uprooting olive trees, expulsions or expropriation of land in retaliation for Arab violence hits the Palestinian precisely in the most painful place, the loss of sovereignty over one’s land. On the other hand, Palestinian support of terrorism against civilian targets over the years has hit Jews in their most vulnerable injury, the massive loss of innocent life due to genocide in the twentieth century combined with a jittery awareness of being such a tiny minority in the world. This is why Israelis are obsessed by every reaction of Arabs to murder of a Jew, while Palestinians are obsessed with every acre of land that is under dispute. The apologies and confidence building measures need to be directed to these areas of injury.

[xvi]<sup>[16]</sup> See Rafael Moses, “The Leader and the Led: A Dyadic Relationship,” in *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships*, ed. Vamik D. Volkan, Demetrios A. Julius, and Joseph V. Montville (Lexington MA: Lexington Books, 1990), vol. 1, 205-217.

[xvii]<sup>[17]</sup> See, for example, David S. Shapiro, “The Doctrine of the Image of God and *Imitatio Dei*,” in *Contemporary Jewish Ethics*, ed. Menachem Kellner (New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1978), 127-151; “The Christian is and must be by his very adoption as a son of God, in Christ, a peacemaker (Mathew 5:9). He is bound to imitate the Savior who, instead of defending Himself with twelve legions of angels allowed Himself to be nailed to the Cross and died praying for His executioners.” Thomas Merton, *The Nonviolent Alternative* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1980), 13.

[xviii]<sup>[18]</sup> *Gandhi: Selected Writings*, ed. Ronald Duncan (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1971), 33-64.

[xix]<sup>[19]</sup>See, for example, Thomas Merton, “The Climate of Mercy,” in idem, *Love and Living*, ed. Naomi Stone and Patrick Hart (San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1979), 203-219; Marc Gopin, “The Religious Ethics of Samuel David Luzzatto,” (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1993), chaps. 2,6,7. The entire tradition of moral sense theory, especially as it was articulated by Rousseau, is rooted in the importance of empathy.

[xx]<sup>[20]</sup>There exists, however, the perennial problem in a religious context of the scope of the spiritual commitment. In this case, for example, can the religious adherent extend the experience of empathy for a non-believer; is she/he even allowed to do so by standards of that tradition? This has to be examined in advance, and will depend on the type of people participating, their particular hermeneutic of their tradition, and how far that hermeneutic can be stretched to include nonbelievers. We will discuss below the problem of the limited scope of religious ethical values.

[xxi]<sup>[21]</sup>Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson, eds., *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), ch. 6.

[xxii]<sup>[22]</sup>On relational empathy, see Benjamin Broome, “Managing Differences in Conflict Resolution: The Role of Relational Empathy,” in *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice*, ed. Dennis Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe (Manchester, NY: Manchester University Press, 1993), 97-111. Of course the concept of empathy would need to be mediated by each side of the conflict. Each side would have to translate the concept in terms of its own religious traditions. Naturally, this might lead to differences and debate. Furthermore, the ensuing debate may reflect casuistic nuances that actually mask deeper issues. A skilled third party might want to work at bringing both sides together on the definition of terms, while simultaneously addressing what he/she believes to be the underlying differences of the casuistic debate. A secular observer may quickly tire of such debates over traditions. In fact, however, these kind of debates are critical to the way some religious people negotiate their needs and claims upon the world. It is also the way in which compromise is often achieved in very religious contexts. Furthermore, the very indulgence in such discussions has a value in itself, namely, the valuation and honoring of religious traditions that is completely overlooked in most first and second track diplomacy settings. Honoring the traditions makes compromise more possible when religious combatants are involved in conflict.

[xxiii]<sup>[23]</sup>Mohandas Gandhi, *All Men Are Brothers*, ed. Krishna Kripalani (New York: Continuum, 1980), ch. IV; Christopher Key Chapple, *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions* (Albany: State University of New York, 1993).

[xxiv]<sup>[24]</sup>See, for example, Roland Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979), chaps. 5 & 10; *The Pacifist Conscience*, ed. Peter Mayer (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), 355-410; John Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William P. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972); idem, *Nevertheless: Varieties of Religious Pacifism* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1992). On the Mennonite/Anabaptist tradition, pacifism and the central importance of Jesus as the model human being, see Paul M. Lederach, *The Third Way* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1980). Note the critical importance of emulating God, *imitatio dei*, in establishing an ideal model of peace making, and see my thoughts above on leadership. This concept is a critical bridge between Jewish and Christian values, and possibly Islamic as well, in terms of emulation of the Prophet.

[xxv]<sup>[25]</sup>On other Western religions and pacifism see below, as well as R. Kimelman, “Nonviolence in the Talmud,” *op. cit.*

[xxvi]<sup>[26]</sup>“Although Islam urges its followers to fight and die in defense of their faith, it considers suicide a sin; the preservation of one’s life, to many Muslims, takes priority over all other considerations, including the profession of the faith.” Khalid Kishtainy, “Violent and Nonviolent Struggle in Arab History,” in *Arab Nonviolent Political Struggle in the Middle East*, ed. Ralph Crow, P. Grant, & S. Ibrahim (Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1990), 11. A Jewish rabbinic text of the first century states, “Therefore was a human being created alone, in order to teach you that everyone who wipes out a single person it is as if he has wiped out an entire world, while he who saves a single person it is as if he has saved an entire world.” Mishnah Sanhedrin 4:5.

[[xxvii](#)] <sup>[27]</sup>Note the overwhelming importance of interior experience in the classic studies by William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: The Modern Library, 1936) and Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (London, Oxford University Press, 1923).

[[xxviii](#)] <sup>[28]</sup>For more on the special contribution of Buddhism to the inner life and peacemaking, see Kenneth Kraft, ed., *Inner Peace, World Peace: Essays on Buddhism*(Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992).

[[xxix](#)] <sup>[29]</sup>“You should develop unlimited thoughts of sympathy for all beings in the world above, below, and across, unmarred by hate or enmity...this is called the holy state. When you hold on to opinions no more, when you are endowed with good conduct and true insight, when you have expelled all craving for pleasures, you will be reborn no more.” *Metta Sutta*, in *Suttanipata* (Pali Text Society Publications) I:8, 143-152, quoted by Luis Gomez in Kraft, *op. cit.*, 40. Avoiding rebirth is the great goal of Buddhist spirituality. Note the relationship between no longer holding opinions, gaining true insight, and the capacity for empathy. This has interesting implications in terms of the mental states necessary for someone to see an enemy in a new light, and the possible ground rules for an indigenous method of Buddhist interpersonal engagement. Note also the focus on pleasures and desire in this regard and cf. below on Gandhi’s experiments.

[[xxx](#)] <sup>[30]</sup>See, however, Sulak Sivaraksa’s remarkable expansion of these concepts to a very contemporary, proactive--and daringly progressive--interpretation of the Eightfold Path, in Kraft, *op. cit.*, 127-137.

[[xxxi](#)] <sup>[31]</sup> See Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed., *Sources of Indian Tradition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 117.

[[xxxii](#)] <sup>[32]</sup>For a Tibetan program of training in compassion, see Tsong-kha-pa (1357-1419 CE), *Lam rim chen mo*, in *Ethics of Tibet*, trans. Alex Wayman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 52-57 et passim.

[[xxxiii](#)] <sup>[33]</sup>See Mohandas Gandhi, *All Men Are Brothers*, ed. Krishna Kripalani (New York: Continuum, 1980), ch. V.

[[xxxiv](#)] <sup>[34]</sup>See Elise Boulding, “States, Boundaries, and Environmental Security,” in *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice*, *op. cit.*, 198. “The task of innovation may not be as impossible as it seems because people and societies have always been capable of imagining the other and different. It is an interesting fact that the image of the peaceable garden--a localist world in which people live harmoniously with each other and with their environment, with warriors laying aside weapons has persisted in every major cultural tradition...” Elise Boulding conducted a seminar several years ago at George Mason University on the uses of imagination in conflict resolution.

[[xxxv](#)] <sup>[35]</sup>For a full account, see Eugene Fisher, *Faith Without Prejudice* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Co., 1993), ch. 7; idem, “Evolution of a Tradition,” in *Fifteen Years of Catholic-Jewish Dialogue, 1970-1985*, ed. International Catholic-Jewish Liason Committee (Rome: Vatican Library, distributed by Lateran University, 1988), ch. 10; Eugene Fisher and Leon Klenicki, *In Our Time: The Flowering of Jewish-Catholic Dialogue* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990); for a Jewish response to the new catechism, see Rabbi Leon Klenicki, “The New Catholic Catechism and the Jews,” in *Professional Approaches for Christian Educators(PACE)* 23 (April 1994).

[[xxxvi](#)] <sup>[36]</sup> See David Novak’s careful analysis of this issue and its relation to the Jewish community, “Jews and Catholics: Beyond Apologies,” *First Things* 89 (Jan. 1999): 20-25.

[[xxxvii](#)] <sup>[37]</sup>See *The Washington Post*, March 28, 1995, p. A13, on the pronouncements of Metropolitan Ioann, the Russian Orthodox Primate of St. Petersburg. To be fair, I attended a meeting in June of 1996 at the U.S. Institute of Peace where the Arch-Priest representing the External Department of the Russian Orthodox Church recounted, in the presence of Moscow’s Chief Rabbi, his efforts at reconciliation and pluralism in recent years. It was somewhat encouraging, though not terribly courageous regarding past wrongs.

[[xxxviii](#)] <sup>[38]</sup> “Falwell’s Antichrist Remarks Anger Jews,” *The Boston Globe* January 28, 1999, A7.

[xxxix]<sup>[39]</sup> The Catholic Church has an old tradition of locating all evil in the Devil. This has led recently to an updating of the practice of exorcism. The Devil is seen as a cosmic liar and murderer, and the presence of the Devil expresses itself in modern culture in the “idolatry” of money, lies, deceit, and sex. See “New Vatican Guidelines Revise Rite of Exorcism,” *The Boston Globe* January 27, 1999. The Church, it seems to me, has been quite careful in recent years not to utilize this theological tradition and practice in order to demonize whole groups, unlike the sermons that one can find on the fringes of conservative Christian life. The Church, under this Pope, tends to locate evil in certain practices and societal trends rather than personages. But this requires more investigation, and inter-faith discussion. The entire subject of certain religious tendencies to locate evil outside the human being, in some ontic entity, is of profound concern in terms of conflict analysis, and requires further study. This is especially common in African religions, and I am still investigating the effects of this on conflict and war, and how to respond to it from the point of view of conflict resolution practice. There are obvious dangers, but there may also be a way to engage the reification of evil in terms of conflict resolution.

[xli]<sup>[40]</sup> See, for example, John Paul Lederach, “Pacifism in Contemporary Conflict: A Christian Perspective”, paper commissioned by the U.S. Institute of Peace (Washington, DC, July 20, 1993).

[xlii]<sup>[41]</sup> See W. Scott Thompson et al., eds., *Approaches to Peace: an Intellectual Map* (Washington DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1992).

[xliii]<sup>[42]</sup> See John Kelsay and Sumner Twiss, eds., *Religion and Human Rights* (New York: The Project on Religion and Human Rights, 1994). It must be cautioned that many religious subgroupings might welcome the introduction of a human rights discussion, for example, while some may see it as an invasion of Western values, or at the very least, a system of values that they instinctively and initially consider alien to their traditions. The third party negotiator must decide whether the benefits outweigh the costs of introducing concepts such as human rights into a discussion between warring religious groups, or whether the goals of conflict resolution can be achieved in some other way.

[xliv]<sup>[43]</sup> The Just War legal tradition in the three monotheisms, which addresses the moral problem of violence with outsiders is not as helpful for the study of conflict resolution as one would hope. Just war theory indicates which wars are either justified, limited, circumscribed or prohibited. See, for example, James Turner Johnson and John Kelsay, eds., *Cross, Crescent and Sword: The Justification of War in Western and Islamic Tradition* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990); David Novak, *Law and Theology in Judaism* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 125-135; Reuven Kimelman, “War,” in *Frontiers of Jewish Thought*, ed. Steven Katz (Washington, DC: B’nai B’rith Books, 1992), 309-332. There are important moral arguments in these traditions that would force a religious society, in principle at least, to consider all the consequences of war before engaging in it. Furthermore, there are a series of restrictions regarding the conduct of violence that try to blunt the impact of violence on enemies. However, such legal concepts tend to emphasize warmaking strategies and not peacemaking strategies. They tend to skew the discussion toward the abstract theological choice of war or not war, without a nuanced sense of all the stages at which aggressive interpersonal and intergroup conflict resolution may address the real needs of the situation. Thus they do not really address the dynamic possibility of human relationships between adherents and outsiders or adversaries. These laws tend also to abstract the enemy, a major impediment, as we now know, to conflict resolution.

[xlv]<sup>[44]</sup> For a full exploration of fundamentalism today in its relationship to politics, see Martin Marty and F. Scott Appleby, eds., *Fundamentalisms and the State: Remaking Politics, Economies, Militance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

[xlvi]<sup>[45]</sup> I use the term “Other” in the sense of anyone that is either a. outside the community of the faithful in a particular religious grouping or b. a group within the religious community that is considered to have a different and/or inferior status. Emmanuel Levinas’ conceptualization of the Other, and the topic of intersubjectivity, in general, that he and other religious philosophers, such as Martin Buber, engage in, might prove useful in provoking inter-religious dialogue on the problem of the conflict between religions. Some of the debate between Levinas and Buber on the nature of the intersubjective moment, whether, for example, it is asymmetric or equal, may have important implications for designing theories of conflict resolution. See Levinas’ critique of Buber’s epistemology in *The Levinas Reader*, ed. Sean Hand (Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 59-74, and 37-58 for an introduction to Levinas’ theory of the Other. For an introduction to Buber’s philosophy of the inter-human, see

Martin Buber, *The Knowledge of Man*, ed. Maurice Friedman (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), 59-88. An interesting area of research might be to attempt to elicit from these religious epistemologies approaches to the problems of violence between self and other, as well as between nations and religious groups. On a psychodynamic approach to the relationship between self, other and violence, see Vamik Volkan, "An Overview of Psychological Concepts Pertinent to Interethnic and/or International Relationships," in *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships*, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, 31-46; Rafael Moses, "Self, Self-view, and Identity," *ibid.* 47-56; Bryant Wedge, "Psychology of the Self in Social Conflict," in *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, eds. Edward Azar and John Burton (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1986), 56-62.

[xlvi]<sup>[46]</sup> See Moses Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, Book of Knowledge, Laws of Idolatry, ch. 7; Henry O. Thompson, *World Religions in War and Peace* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Co. Press, 1988), 12-17. It should be said that idolaters are condemned mostly for complete moral decadence in many Biblical [Amos 1-4] and rabbinic sources [Numbers Rabbah 11; Midrash ha-Gadol, Noach, 11:9; Talmud Bavli Yoma 9b], which has led a number of modern Jewish religious thinkers to dismiss the harsh anti-idolatry rules in the context of the major modern religions, all of which have strong moral codes. See Harold Kasimow and Byron Sherwin, eds., *No Religion is an Island: Abraham Joshua Heschel and Interreligious Dialogue* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991); David Novak, *Jewish-Christian Dialogue: A Jewish Justification* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[xlvii]<sup>[47]</sup> See Mishnah Sanhedrin 4:5; Talmud Bavli Sanhedrin 37a.

[xlviii]<sup>[48]</sup> See Talmud Bavli Berakhot 17a; Avot of Rabbi Nathan, version A, ch. 12. The Hebrew term *beriot*, and the amplification of the idea in the text, make it clear that Hillel referred to all human beings.

[xlix]<sup>[49]</sup> There has been a discouragement of conversion to Judaism since the beginnings of rabbinic Judaism almost two thousand years ago. See, for example, Talmud Bavli Yevamot 47a. However, in the period immediately prior to the flourishing of rabbinic Judaism, Hasmonean kings did convert people en masse, sometimes by force. See Robert M. Seltzer, *Jewish People, Jewish Thought* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1980), 130, 182, 193. It cannot be said with absolute certainty what Rabbi Yohanan's and Hillel's respective attitudes were to conversion, although they were pivotal figures of rabbinic Judaism. One thing is certain, the way the texts have been received and read by rabbinic Jews--the critical issue in hermeneutics--would preclude their being an encouragement to conversion, but rather as methods of expressing a commitment to peacemaking and care for all of God's creation. I make no claim, furthermore, that their words are representative of all of rabbinic Judaism; there are plenty of angry statements about gentiles in rabbinic literature. My purpose is to demonstrate the dynamic possibilities of religious hermeneutics that inhere even in ancient texts, not to gloss over the problems associated with pre-modern religious literature.

[l]<sup>[50]</sup> See David Little's important work on religious intolerance and political violence, for example, *Sri Lanka, The Invention of Enmity* (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1994); *idem, Ukraine: the Legacy of Intolerance* (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1991). The genocide of Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994 was not a religious action. However, religious institutions have been implicated. See Pierre Erny, *Rwanda 1994: cles pour comprendre le calvaire d'un peuple*. (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994); Gerard Prunier, *Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995). I have received personal correspondence from a Tutsi Jesuit priest, who lost some of his family, telling me how saddened he is that the Church in Rwanda is part of the process of examining the atrocities when it itself is implicated, based on what he saw himself. Another Tutsi survivor, who lost most of her family, told me that she was forced to learn in religious schools why Tutsi were inferior and dangerous. On the alleged participation of priests in the genocide, see "Clergy in Rwanda Is Accused of Abetting Atrocities", *New York Times* July 7, 1995 A, 3:1. Thousands of Tutsi refused to go to church as a result of the crimes of the priests. See "Rwanda Struggles with a Crisis of Faith," *San Francisco Chronicle* January 2, 1995 A 8:1.

[li]<sup>[51]</sup> Johan Galtung, "Peace, Violence, and Peace Research", *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (1969): 167-191.

[lii]<sup>[52]</sup> See Henry O. Thompson, *World Religions in War and Peace*; John Ferguson, *War and Peace in the World's Religions*.

[liii]<sup>[53]</sup> Mishnah Sanhedrin 8:7; Ephraim Urbach, “Jewish Doctrines and Practices in Halakhic and Aggadic Literature,” in *Violence and Defense in Jewish Experience*, ed. Salo Baron, George Wise, and Lenn Goodman (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of American, 1977), 87-112.

[liv]<sup>[54]</sup> Abdulaziz A. Sachedina, “The Development of *jihad* in Islamic Revelation and History,” in *Cross, Crescent and Sword: The Justification and Limitation of War in Western and Islamic Tradition*, ed. James T. Johnson and John Kelsay (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 39.

[lv]<sup>[55]</sup> See, for example, the debates over the Gulf war in *Religious Perspectives on War: Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Attitudes to Force after the Gulf War*, ed. David Smock (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1992), and, generally, Roland Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979), 66-84. See also n. 24 above.

[lvi]<sup>[56]</sup> See, for example, Chaiwat Satha-Anand, Glenn D. Paige, and Sarah Gilliat, eds., *Islam and Nonviolence* (Hawaii: University of Hawaii, Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace, 1993). On a pacifist interpretation of *jihad* by the Ahmadi sect of Islam, see Yohanan Friedmann, *Prophecy Continuous: Aspects of Ahmadi Religious Thought and its Medieval Background* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 165-180; in Judaism, see Murray Polner and Naomi Goodman, eds., *The Challenge of Shalom* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1994), and my essay ad. loc., “Is There a Jewish God of Peace?”, 32-39.

[lvii]<sup>[57]</sup> “I believe in the fundamental truth of all great religions of the world. I believe that they are all God-given, and I believe that they were necessary for the people to whom these religions were revealed.” Mohandas Gandhi, *All Men Are Brothers*, 55. See also Diana Eck, *Encountering God* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).

[lviii]<sup>[58]</sup> See Bryant Wedge, “Psychology of the Self in Social Conflict,” in *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, op. cit., 57.