

Multi-Track Diplomacy and Conflict Transformation Syllabus

Class Schedule: Blockseminar on Mondays 14:00 – 18:00 and Fridays 10:00 – 14:00

Course Leader: Ariadna Anamaria Petri

Email: petria@staff.uni-marburg.de

Course outline

This course is designed to provide conceptual and experiential perspectives on the variety of ways to bring about conflict resolution, mitigation, transformation and peace building on multiple levels, ranging from personal through community and organizational, to international. Such levels, often termed “tracks”, encompass official “First Track” diplomacy and a spectrum of unofficial initiatives by civil society organization (CSO) and grassroots leaders and activists. These activities are essential complements to formal conflict resolution activities, especially for complex societal conflicts involving non-state actors.

Multi-track diplomacy has become an increasingly important tool for diplomats, government, UN and regional international organization (IO) agencies and CSO staff working in development, relief, refugee and humanitarian aid, peacekeeping and other activities in areas of conflict and political instability. Almost all violent conflicts are now at least primarily internal rather than inter-state, with at least one party a non-state community, and no mutually acceptable official structure through which disputes can be settled. In the context of mistrust and uncertainty, the sustainability not only of peacemaking efforts, but also of development, aid or humanitarian programs often depends on our ability to encourage communities, organizations or opinion leaders to find common ground on implementation of planned initiatives. Trust building, skills building – in areas such as nonviolent communication, prejudice reduction and integrative problem solving – along with consensus building and action planning methodologies may become essential elements for success.

The *Course* will introduce participants to concepts, issues and techniques in the field of multi-track diplomacy, conflict transformation and peacebuilding. This course has a strong practical focus, implemented through classroom discussions, student presentations and in-class small group projects. Students, in groups, pick a conflict from around the world, to which they will be applying the concepts discussed in class. This group work will be presented and discussed in class. These, along with regular academic discussions based on scholarly publications are the launch pad for conversations with participants in Multi-Track activities, including former diplomats, (informal) mediators and facilitators, and CSO and grassroots leaders.

General Readings:

1. John Davies & Edy Kaufman (eds.) *Second Track/Citizens' Diplomacy: Concepts and Techniques for Conflict Transformation*. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield 2003.
2. Paffenholz, T., Zachariassen, A. & Helfer, C., 2017. What makes or breaks national dialogues?. *Inclusive Peace & Transition Initiative*, Geneva: Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies.
3. Paffenholz, T., 2021. Perpetual Peacebuilding: A New Paradigm to Move Beyond the Linearity of Liberal Peacebuilding, *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 15:3, 367-385, DOI: 10.1080/17502977.2021.1925423
4. Saunders, H. 1999. *A Public Peace Process: Sustained Dialogue to Transform Racial and Ethnic Conflicts*. New York: St. Martin's Press
5. Louise Diamond & John McDonald *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace* (3rd ed.) West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press, 1996.
6. John Paul Lederach *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995.
7. John Paul Lederach *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
8. Roger Fisher, William Ury & Bruce Patton *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* (2nd ed.) New York: Penguin, 1991.
9. Davidson, E. D. & Montville, J. V., 1981. Foreign Policy According to Freud. *Foreign Policy*. 45. pp 145-157.

PETRI – Multi-Track Diplomacy and Conflict Transformation

10. Douglas Stone, Bruce Patten & Sheila Heen *Difficult Conversations: How to Discuss What Matters Most*. New York: Penguin, 1999.
11. Edy Kaufman, Walid Salem & Juliette Verhoeven *Bridging the Divide: Peacebuilding in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2006.
12. Mohammed Abu Nimer *Nonviolence and Peace Building in Islam: Theory and Practice*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2003.
13. Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf *What's Right with Islam: A New Vision for Muslims and the West*. New York: Harper San Francisco, 2005.
14. Raymond Cohen "Negotiating Across Cultures." In Chester Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson and Pamela Aall (eds.) *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*. Washington DC: US Institute of Peace Press, 1996. (See also Crocker, Hampson and Aall's *Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World*, USIP Press, 1999).
15. Johan Galtung *Transcend and Transform: An Introduction to Conflict Work*. Boulder CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2004. See also Galtung's on-line manual at www.transcend.org.
16. Oliver Ramsbotham, Tom Woodhouse, Hugh Miall *Contemporary Conflict Resolution, 2nd edition*. Cambridge UK: Polity, 2006.
17. FISHER, R., 2022. Interactive conflict resolution: Addressing the essence of ethno-political conflict and peacebuilding. In *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding and Ethnic Conflict* (pp. 118-130). Routledge.
18. Diana Chigas. "Track II (Citizen) Diplomacy." Beyond Intractability. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Posted: August 2003 <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/track2-diplomacy>.
19. Daniel Lieberfeld. "Evaluating the Contributions of Track-Two Diplomacy to Conflict Termination in South Africa." *Journal of Peace Research*, 39,3,(2002): 355-372.
20. Azar, Edward, *The Management of Protracted Social Conflict: Theory and Cases* (Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth University Press, 1990)
21. Davies, J. L. & Kaufman, E., 2003. *Second Track Citizens' Diplomacy: Concepts and Techniques for Conflict Transformation*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
22. Eronen, O. (2016). Organising Artisans for Peace: CMI on a Learning Curve. In: Brusset, E., Coning, C., Hughes, B. (eds) *Complexity Thinking for Peacebuilding Practice and Evaluation*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-60111-7_6
23. Touval, Saadia & Zartmann, I. William (1989). "Mediation in International Conflicts". In: Kressel, Kenneth and Pruitt, G. Dean (eds.) *Mediation Re-search: The Process and Effectiveness of Third-Party Intervention* (Hoboken: Jossey-Bass).
24. United Nations Department of Political Affairs (2017). "Guidance on Gender and Inclusive Mediation Strategies". New York, United Nations.
25. Austin, A., Fischer, M. & Ropers, N. eds., 2013. *Transforming ethno-political conflict: the Berghof handbook*. Springer Science & Business Media.
26. Paul van Tongeren, Malin Brenk, Marte Hellema and Juliette Verhoeven *People Building Peace II: Successful Stories of Civil Society*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2005 (see www.euconflict.org)
27. Heidi Burgess and Guy Burgess, 2010 *Conducting Track II Peacemaking*, Washington DC: US Institute of Peace Press
28. Lehrs, L., 2016. Private peace entrepreneurs in conflict resolution processes. *International Negotiation*, 21(3), pp. 381-408.
29. Schiff, A., 2010. "Quasi Track-One" Diplomacy: An Analysis of the Geneva Process in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, *International Studies Perspectives*, Volume 11: 2, pp. 93-111, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-3585.2010.00396.x>
30. Dean Pruitt, 1997, Ripeness Theory and the Oslo Talks, *International Negotiation*, (2), pp. 237 – 250.
31. Susan Allen Nan & Andrea Strimling. 2004. "Track I - Track II Cooperation." Beyond Intractability. Eds. Guy Burgess & Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder.
32. Mitchell, D., 2021. Comparative consultation: The theory and practice of 'sharing les-sons' between peace processes. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 56(1), pp.65-82.

Assessment and Grading

Regular attendance and participation in the seminars based on familiarity with the assigned readings for each session is essential for participants to benefit from (and receive credit for) the courses. The success of the program will depend on the participation and commitment of all participants. It is intensive, both in terms of the amount of reading and written work required in a short period, and in terms of the need to actively prepare for and participate in exercises, including reflecting on one's own experiences with conflict and conflict transformation, and discussing them in relation to the readings and approaches covered in the Program. Grading will be based on the following:

- ✓ Class participation (in-class presence, contributions, and group work) [Pass/Fail] – Further instructions will be given in class
- ✓ In-class presentation [40%] – Students (in groups of 3) prepare and give a 15 minute in-class presentation on one of the Discussion topics above. You will pick your group for your presentation during the first class and you will then sign up for a date to deliver the presentation on the Notepad in Ilias. Please put your group presentation topic down on ILIAS before the end of April.
- ✓ Final paper [60%] – Write and submit a short **Research paper** OR a **Concept Paper** on one of the topics below (3400 words, +/-20%), **deadline** 1/07/2023.

Preparation

- Make a **notebook** for this class (or a section of your diary). You will be asked to write reflections by hand (strong preference for pen and paper).
- Think: **Which conflict would you like to focus your Paper and Presentation on?**
- Read at least the first suggested reading for each class. Make sure you are familiar with all the recommended readings for the topic you want to write your essay on.
- Try to read relevant material for your in-class presentation ahead of time to enhance the quality of your participation, your time management and your overall wellbeing.

Guidelines for Concept Paper

Prepare a *concept paper or policy briefing* on a state or minority group or community selected as currently experiencing a complex, societal conflict that has involved at least sporadic violence, and which you think would benefit from a Multi-Track intervention involving your organization (or an organization you would like to work with). You may choose to write on any conflict that meets these criteria, but the choice should be approved in advance. You may also elect to focus on any specific issue or organization within such a conflict – there is room to think creatively and build on your strengths. The report should be addressed to an organization whose assistance or support your organization is seeking for this initiative (as funder, collaborator or official body whose approval is required).

The report should begin with a *title page*, including: (1) your name and the name of the organization you are working for (or would like to be working with – role-play it) in preparing the report, (2) who your local partner organization(s) are (if your organization is not local, your partners' probably are) – if not sure, indicate the type of local organization you are hoping to partner with (e.g., CSO, local government, educational institution, women's group, business organization etc.), and (3) the name of the organization(s) to whom the report will be presented as potential supporters. Associate yourself with any organization you would like to work with – the paper could be used as a way to show them why they should employ you.

PETRI – Multi-Track Diplomacy and Conflict Transformation

Next should be an *executive summary* of no more than a page, highlighting the key points of your conflict assessment, prognosis, recommended initiatives and projected outcomes, as needed to motivate your intended audience to read the full report and act on it.

The report will be in three parts: *diagnosis, prognosis, treatment*.

Part 1 should assess the *dynamics of the conflict* and the feasibility of a potential Multi-Track intervention (diagnosis):

- a. What is the conflict about? Place the *conflict issues* briefly in historical and regional context, noting significant *factors* driving the conflict. Note what *stage* the conflict is in now (unstable/militant politics, low-level/escalating violence, war, talk-fight/stalemate, de-escalating/contained, contested settlement, reconciliation).
- b. Who are *the parties* involved, including states, minority groups, leaders, organizations, factions, alliances, spoilers, regional or international stakeholders? How are they affected, what are their sources of relative power, and what are their *agendas or demands* (positions)?
- c. What are their *perceptions of each other*, and what information and *communication channels* are available between or among them? What cultural (and value) contrasts are involved here? To what extent do the groups need each other to achieve their goals?
- d. Identify the primary *interests* of each party motivating these agendas and perceptions, and the (non-negotiable) human *needs* underlying them. Note which interests or needs are shared, which may be complementary and which are conflicting.
- e. What previous *attempts to settle* the conflict have been made or are being made, by whom and with what results? Reasons for failure or limited success?
- f. Are the groups *willing to talk* with each other? At what level (officials, informal leaders or grass roots)?
What factors are pushing them to talk or inhibiting them? Under what *conditions* and at what level might they be willing to talk?

Part 2 should focus on *future scenarios*, specific to the conflict situation you are addressing (prognosis):

- g. What are some plausible *alternative future scenarios*, or common futures, for the conflicted society *as a whole*? Note the assumptions or conditionalities on which each overall scenario is built (refer to factors driving the conflict as noted in 1a above), going beyond simple war/no-war dichotomies, and not restricting yourself to single issues or strategic choices in isolation from the big picture.
- h. Of these scenarios, which is the *preferred overall outcome* considering the interests of all parties? In contrast, what is the best overall outcome *each* of the main parties could achieve *without negotiating* an agreement with the others (“BATNAs”)? How about the worst alternative to a negotiated agreement? (WATNAs)? This contrast needs to be clear to motivate the parties to engage in the multi-track activity.

Part 3 should outline the *proposed multi-track initiative*, giving a *time-line* including preparation steps, workshops (problem-solving, confidence-building, etc.) and follow-up steps for implementation and evaluation, and outlining some *potential outcomes* (treatment):

PETRI – Multi-Track Diplomacy and Conflict Transformation

- i. What are your organization's *goals* in the initiative, who are your (potential) *partner organizations*, and what representatives of the parties have expressed interest in your assistance?
- j. Which organizations would convene and facilitate the workshops and *who would represent the parties* in such talks? *What issue(s)* might they be willing to discuss?
- k. What *specific steps are proposed to prepare the ground* for a suitable interaction among the parties as “partners in conflict” or “partners in peacebuilding”? How will participants be selected and agreed to? What prior caucusing with each party may be needed to ensure agreement on an agenda and ground rules?
- l. What *steps for trust building and skill building* are proposed for the participants in the first workshop before focusing on their own conflict?
- m. What *steps are proposed for facilitating consensus building in the first workshop* by the participants toward better understanding and cooperation in seeking common ground?
- n. Give examples of *specific integrative options* for conflict transformation or peacebuilding (sustainable development) that might emerge from the proposed Multi-track initiative, which would promote the realization of the preferred overall outcome. Explain how they address key interests/needs of the main parties, who might implement them, and whether each one represents a short-term response (e.g., threat containment, confidence building), medium-term strategy (e.g., structure for a peace process) or long-term objective (e.g., appropriate new institutions of inclusive democratic governance, power sharing, autonomy).
- o. How is it proposed to *facilitate action planning, re-entry, implementation and longer-term constructive engagement* by participants and other actors in building on the initial workshop?
- p. Give examples of *expected outcomes*, including impact both on participants and on their communities, that could provide criteria for evaluating the success of the initiative. For example, how will the process link into or promote an official peace process or otherwise facilitate constructive official engagement and/or broaden grassroots support for peacebuilding?
- q. *How will the initiative be evaluated* throughout? Include output, impact and outcome assessment.
- r. What *specific actions or support are now requested* from the organization(s) to whom this paper or brief is addressed, in order to help make this initiative happen? (No budget required at this stage.)

Guidelines for Essay (Hausarbeit)

Pick one of the three Parts of a report described above (diagnosis, prognosis, treatment) and write a critical analysis of how such activities have already been applied in a specific conflict and an evaluation of their success. Make sure you present your theoretical framework and your method of analysis. The essay can be a useful choice if you want this to be a stepping-stone for further work on the topic (articles, thesis, etc.).

The following on-line sources may be helpful in locating current and historical background information on the conflict you have chosen: International Crisis Group

PETRI – Multi-Track Diplomacy and Conflict Transformation

(<https://www.crisisgroup.org/>); Conciliation Resources' publication *Accord* (www.c-r.org/accord); Centre for Systemic Peace (<https://www.systemicpeace.org/>); USIP (www.usip.gov); Websites of ministries of foreign affairs, USAID, UNHCR, UNOCHA, HEWS, Reliefweb, Crisisweb, Minority rights, World Bank, regional development banks, etc. Other useful on-line sources are accessible from regional news source web sites for covering recent developments, as well as Google Scholar and Marburg University Library.

Academic Integrity

Every student is expected to be familiar with and comply with Phillips University Marburg policy on academic integrity. You can access information on how to produce different kinds of academic work (essays, term papers, presentations) on the website of the [School for Social Sciences and Philosophy](#). Further support for digital and analogue research is available from the [Library](#) or the [Service Center](#).

The Lecturer

Ariadna Petri is a conflict resolution researcher, analyst, consultant and lecturer. Currently she is finalizing her PhD in Conflict Resolution at Complutense University, Madrid. Her DAAD Fellowship in the Center for Conflict Studies of the Philipps-Universität Marburg, and her Europaeum Fellowship from Oxford University articulate her research across the whole spectrum from theoretical research, through policymaking, and into practice. Previously, Ariadna Petri held researcher and lecturer appointments at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv University, Institute for National Security Studies, Al. I. Cuza University, Bard College and Al-Quds University and lectured extensively in Romania, Germany, Cambodia, Kyrgyzstan, Spain, Mexico and the UK.

GOOD LUCK AND ENJOY!