SHARING MEALS - BUILDING PEACE

A theoretical and empirical study of how the act of eating together can serve as a place for ritual to promote reconciliation in peacebuilding

Ingeborg Heggheim Tappel

Supervisor

Gunnar Harald Heiene

This Master's Thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the MA degree at

MF Norwegian School of Theology, 2016, spring

AVH5035: Master's Thesis (60 ECTS)

Study program: Master in Religion, Society and Global Issues

44 926 words

"The natural effect of good eating and drinking
is the inauguration of friendships and the creation of familiarity..."

François de Callières, 1645- 1717

Abstract

Food is universal. Sharing meals makes people come together. In negotiations and diplomacy at different levels, eating together has always been a part in the processes of promoting peace. In this thesis I will answers the question: How can the act of eating together facilitate reconciliation on different levels of peacebuilding. Researchers have lately begun to shed light on the concept of eating together referred to as culinary diplomacy in this thesis. By looking into how worldview matters in conflict and theories of how ritual can be a symbolic place, we will see how the meal can be a place like this. It will also be discussed if the act of eating together can facilitate reconciliation on different levels of peacebuilding?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1   INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I will first describe the background and my personal motivation for writing this thesis, and following this I will present the main topics to be described in the theoretical framework. This is important in order to understand the research questions that will follow next. In continuance of this I will briefly present the methodology used to answer the research questions, and present the main literature used in the theoretical framework. The concluding section of this first chapter will present an outline for the thesis.

1.1 Personal motivation

My interest for the field of peace and reconciliation was awakened a few years ago writing a paper where I compared the juridical processes after World War 2 in Norway and Apartheid in South Africa. I was fascinated by the emphasis on reconciliation in South Africa, in contrast to the Norwegian process. The interest for the subject grew as I worked for a French boutique in Oslo selling olive oils and got acquainted with the history and symbolic attributes of olive oil, and the rich history this nurturing oil has. My own interest for creating delicious food grew, not the least talking about food! And I was struck time by time how friends appreciated the effort in making and presenting the food. Finally, when I watched the Danish drama film *Babette's feast*, based on the novel written by Karen Blix. I was captured by how Babette's food and the splendid table with white tablecloths, candlelight, and as one dish more extravagant than the other was served, the ambience changed and the relations between the diners were transformed. And I knew right away that I wanted to explore the relation between food and reconciliation further.

Food is universal, and in every culture, amongst all humans, people share meals. Whether it is around a table sitting on chairs using plates, knives and forks, or it be on a carpet on the floor, eating and sharing food from the same pot. And the fellowship is beautiful. Everyone I have been speaking with about this thesis agrees that it is important to eat together, and that it sets a special ambience. But I wonder; why is it so? What happens when people eat together? And what happens when adversaries eats together?

1.2 Presentation of Main Topics

In this thesis I will explore how the act of eating together can serve as a promoter of reconciliation in peacebuilding. Reconciliation can be described as the deepest possible change in how adversaries relate to each other, and how peace in relationships is restored after conflict.

When we explore peacebuilding we will see that initiatives occur on mainly three different levels in society; a top-level, a mid-level, and a community level. Efforts of conflict transformation include dialogue, principled negotiation, and mediation (Schirch, 2004, p. 49). Both the levels and the approaches used in peacebuilding relates to classic diplomacy. What these two disciplines undoubtedly have in common is the mere fact that eating together occurs. A word describing the act of eating together is commensality; a Latin word that derives from the two words *com*, which means 'sharing', and *mensa,* which means 'a table'; thus meaning sharing a table or eating together. Then what will be explored in this thesis is what can possibly happen when enemies or adversaries eat together, and how this can affect the different levels of peacebuilding, and if reconciliation can be facilitated with an emphasis on top-level.

In recent years, the potential meals and commensality have to build relationship within the spheres of International Relations, Diplomacy and Peacebuilding, have started to be researched more in depth. Terms like *'culinary diplomacy'*, *'gastrodiplomacy'* and *'diplomatic gastronomy'* describes this evolving field within Diplomacy, which is more and more noticed the past few years. But that doesn't mean that it's a brand-new concept, rather, it is argued that it has existed as long as man have negotiated. But the institutionalized method of using food as a tool within diplomacy is quite new and little researched.

Some theorists have addressed the need for approaches to peacebuilding addressing the psychosocial and cultural elements, overlooked by traditional diplomacy. When analyzing conflict, we will see that a rational, a social, and a symbolic dimension can be identified, which each needs to be approached differently. It is argued that the rational approach to conflict have dominated diplomacy and peacebuilding initiatives, because conflicts often gives the impression of concerning material resources of some kind. The social approach has been given some attention, while the symbolic dimension and approach is given very little attention in regard to the two others. The symbolic dimension and approach to conflict are

connected to how people's worldviews shape how they understand the world, and this concerns conflict as well. Schirch suggests "creative strategies to engage people's physical and sensual selves, their emotions, identities and values" (Schirch, 2005, p. 32) as an approach to the symbolic dimension of peacebuilding, and we will see that ritual and symbolic actions are central.

Ritual as referred to in this thesis is loosely defined, and symbolic actions can also be used to name less formal rituals. Three specific characteristics of ritual as used in this thesis can be identified: First, ritual takes place in a special or unique social space apart from everyday life. Second, instead of communicating mainly through words, "ritual communicates through symbols, senses, heightened emotions" (Schirch, 2005, p. 2). And thirdly, ritual aids the process of change, as it verifies and transforms "people's worldviews, identities, and relationships with others" (Schirch, 2005, p. 2).
It will also be argued that ritual can be seen as a place, based on the systems theory. Related to ritual as a place is creating *safe spaces,* a well-known concept in peacebuilding. It will be argued a ritual context is created when people who do not normally interact come together.

At the heart of peacebuilding lies transforming identity and relationships to promote reconciliation. Central to this thesis is reconciliation suggested as a place where the past can be grieved, and a common future can be envisioned. And hopefully, this will lead to a new vision on the past (Lederach, 1997, p. 31). Central to the concept of reconciliation is also a newer approach emphasizing the need to approach reconciliation as an artistic process including creativity. Because brokenness and hurt is lodged in the emotional memory, it is argued intellectual approaches alone to reconciliation are insufficient (Lederach, 2005, p. 160). The heart has to be approached as well, engaging all the human senses.
This thesis will not provide an in- depth analysis of the concept of reconciliation. Rather, a discussion of why it is important and by which factors it may be promoted will be discussed.

Worldview concerns how people everyday creates and re- creates the world, and how every individual perceive the world through their own unique worldview lens (Schirch, 2005, p. 39). Central to understanding worldview is the five elements that forms it; perception, emotional and sensual cognition, values, culture, and identity in particular. Participants in peacebuilding initiatives from two different sides will have totally different views on a conflict based on

their different worldviews. Arguments to how worldview and identity can be transformed will also be presented.

Several theorists mention the importance of establishing shared identities, and it involves an analysis of current identities and adjudicating the different versions of history. The purpose is to find a foundation for a fellow future.

I acknowledge that cultural and religious norms concerning food and meals are extremely important to be aware of when arranging meals in peacebuilding and diplomacy settings, and maybe even more when it is done in a setting where conflict is already a reality. But this is not a focal point for thesis. I will rather focus on the possibilities and challenges that sharing meals encompass on a mere relational and practical level.

1.3 Research question and sub- questions:

How can the act of eating together (commensality) facilitate reconciliation on different levels of peacebuilding?

Sub- questions:

a. What is culinary diplomacy, and how it is applicable to peacebuilding?

b. How can the meal as a ritual be used on different levels of peacebuilding?

c. How can transformed identity and worldviews impact processes of reconciliation?

1.4 Method and Material

A classical qualitative approach was a natural choice of method in this thesis because I was going to research a social phenomenon rather than test a theory. Induction is normally the method used to conduct qualitative research, but my research is rather abductive in nature. The theory is seen in light of empirical data, but the empirical findings also challenge the theory (Bryman, 2012, pp. 26, 380, 401).

My epistemological position is interpretivist, as I try to understand what happens when adversaries with the presence of mediators eat together, through the mediators or negotiators experience. And with an ontological constructionist position, the phenomenon in my research, are indeed what Bryman describes: "social properties are outcomes of the interactions between individuals" (Bryman, 2012, p. 380). A more thorough description of the methodology used to answer the research questions will be given in chapter 5. In continuance of the methodology presentation in chapter 5, the findings from the three interviews and the written empirical findings complementing the interviews will be presented in chapter 5.

1.5 Literature

In the following I will briefly present the theoretical material used in this thesis, and the authors behind.

Sam Chapple-Sokol's research on culinary diplomacy forms the base for the theoretical material used in chapter 2. This field is not researched to a great extent, but Chapple-Sokol provides a theoretical framework for studying commensality's role in diplomacy in *Culinary Diplomacy - Breaking Bread to Win Hearts and Minds* (Chapple-Sokol 2013). Because the nature of this theory has both theoretical and empirical attributes, it will serve as partly theory, and partly empirical findings in the analysis.

Liza Schirch is a scholar in the field of peacebuilding, and contributes extensively to the theoretical material used in this thesis. I will refer to two different books by Liza Schirch in chapter 3. When outlining peacebuilding I will mostly refer to *The Little book of Strategic Peacebuilding* (Schirch, 2004), where a general introduction to peacebuilding is given. When I start presenting conflict analysis, the different approaches and dimensions to peacebuilding, and ritual, the book *Ritual And Symbol in Peacebuilding* (2005) serves as the source. The same book (Schirch, 2005) also provides the basis for the theory on worldview, and transforming worldview and Identity in chapter 4.

In the myriad of different theories on reconciliation, John Paul Lederach, Johanna Santa Barbara and Cecilia Clegg each offers different, but useful approaches to understanding reconciliation, adding valuable insight to this thesis. John Paul Lederach whom is a leading scholar and practitioner in peacebuilding contributes valuable insight on reconciliation in

chapter 4, found in *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Lederach, 1997). I have also included some remarks from his book *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace* (Lederach, 2005).

Johanna Santa Barbara adds interesting perspectives on reconciliation and on existing reconciliation rituals in *Reconciliation: Clearing the Past, Building the Future* (Santa Barbara, 2012).

Cecilia Clegg contributes to the conceptualization of reconciliation in recognizing how different levels in society requires different approaches or kinds of reconciliation, written in *Embracing a Threatening Other - Identity and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland* (Clegg, 2008).

In addition, three interviews and written empirical accounts serve as research data in this thesis.

1.6 Outline

In this thesis I will answer the Research Questions posted in 1.3, and I will follow the thematic chronology implied.

Chapter 2 will present the theory of *Culinary Diplomacy* as proposed by Sam Chapple-Sokol. Some of the material connected to this theory in progress will be presented in chapter 5 because of its empirical nature. Early in the chapter a description of different tracks of diplomacy is briefly outlined.

In chapter 3 of this thesis, I will first give a general introduction to peacebuilding as defined by Schirch (2004), and in continuance of this, a conflict analysis and the different approaches and dimensions of peacebuilding (Schirch, 2005) will be outlined. The theory of ritual and symbol in peacebuilding (Schirch, 2005) will be introduced following this. One of the most central aspects here concerning the subject in this thesis will be how ritual is suggested to be a place.

Then, chapter 4 will present the final aspects of the theoretical framework; reconciliation as proposed by Lederach and Clegg, including elements from Santa Barbara. Reconciliation per se is central, but also how Clegg suggests reconciliation to happen on several levels.

Following this, we will return to Schirch whom argues worldview is connected to conflict, and whom suggests ritual as pivotal to the transforming of worldview and identity, which are fundamental to changing relationships in conflict.

When we reach chapter 5, I will first give a more thorough description of the methodology used to answer the research questions for this thesis. In continuance of this, my unique empirical material of the interviews will be presented, followed by a qualitative content analysis of existing empirical accounts relevant to the theme on how commensality can enhance the transforming of relationships.

In chapter 6 I will present my analysis, where I will discuss the theoretical framework presented in the prior chapters in light of the empirical material presented in chapter 5.

Chapter 7 will serve to sum up my findings, answer the research questions, give some concluding remarks, before noting possible areas for further research of the findings in this thesis.

CHAPTER 2   CULINARY DIPLOMACY

Culinary diplomacy is a new and evolving field, and Sam Chapple-Sokol tries in his article to establish a theoretical framework for how the matter of eating together, or commensality in diplomacy, serve to build bridges between top-level politicians, diplomats, and citizens. In the theory we are soon to explore, *culinary diplomacy*, the name implies that it is related to the frame of diplomacy. Traditionally, the term 'diplomacy' has been a sufficient word describing interaction between nation-states. But in recent times, scholars have defined different levels of diplomacy (United States Institute of Peace, 2011). Before introducing culinary diplomacy, I will briefly present the different tracks of diplomacy.

2.1 Different tracks of diplomacy

Track 1- diplomacy refers to formal and official discussions normally involving political and military leaders on high level. Peace talks, cease- fires, and other treaties or agreements are in focus.

Track 2- diplomacy normally involves problem- solving activities and unofficial dialogue where relationship- building and encouraging new thinking is in focus and the aim is to inform the official process. NGO leaders, religious, influential academics and other civil society actors often take part. These can normally often interact more freely than those whom take part in track 1 diplomacy. To describe a situation where both officials and non- official actors cooperate to resolve conflicts, *track 1,5 diplomacy,* is sometimes used.

Track 3- diplomacy describes people-to-people diplomacy where individuals and private groups encourage interaction and understanding between hostile groups. It also involves awareness raising and empowerment. The grassroots level is normally in focus, and organizing conferences, meetings, and media- exposure are examples of initiatives.

Multi-Track diplomacy is a term used when several tracks are used at the same time, and where both official and unofficial conflict resolution efforts are in focus, and where all possible levels could have a lead- role (United States Institute of Peace, 2011).

2.2 Culinary Diplomacy in a historical setting

Before we look into the theory Chapple-Sokol lays as a foundation for culinary diplomacy, we will see how he shows that food and commensality is deeply rooted in the tradition of diplomacy, and he refers to Professor of International Relations at the University of Cyprus, Costas M. Constantinou and his book *On the Way to Diplomacy* were he explores the relation between food and diplomacy in ancient Greece.

2.2.1 Commensality in Ancient Greece

One of the ways a necessary sense of community was maintained between public citizens within and among the city- states of ancient Greece was through commensality. Aristotle himself in his book *Politics*, discussed how a 'bond of solidarity' similar to the one in a family unit was provided through common meals within a community. "This was especially important between ambassadors from rival cities *primordial corps diplomatique* to discuss allegiances, conclude aggressions, or ratify treaties" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 163)
And Constantinou himself emphasize in his book: "In ancient Greece, therefore, participation in common meals was constitutive of political and diplomatic community" (Constantinou, 1996, p. 131).

Chappel-Sokol also refers to a similar concept discussed by Ragnar Numelin in his book *The Beginnings of Diplomacy.* He shows how in non-Western societies warring groups could set aside their struggle and discuss the possibility of coexistence through ceremony and a common meal, which often included a sacrifice to make peace.

2.2.2 Culinary Diplomacy in the pre- modern France

From there, Chapple-Sokol jumps to pre-modern diplomacy in France, where the importance of food and culinary diplomacy is rooted in the French tradition. With Cardinal Richelieu who was the first minister of Louis XIII, a new professionalism would affect the practice of Diplomacy. He established a new paradigm within diplomacy where "resident embassy replaced more temporary *ad hoc* appointments" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 164). This new paradigm provided a new familiarity with the personalities and conditions for diplomats, and it was possible for continuous negotiation, and deceit as a tool of diplomacy was eliminated. The next French pre-modern diplomat Chapple-Sokol refers to, François de Callières writes in his book *On the Manner of Negotiating with Princes* about this new important diplomacy and its connection to cuisine. When ambassadors took up residence in new neighboring capitals in

this new era of diplomacy, they brought along their tradition of cooking and other traditions. And Chapple-Sokol quotes De Callières who says in his book:

> "An ambassador's table should be served neatly, plentifully and with taste", and " [The Ambassador] should give frequent entertainments and parties to the chief personages of the Court and even to the Prince himself. A good table is the best and easiest way to keeping himself well informed. The natural effect of good eating and drinking is the inauguration of friendships and the creation of familiarity, and when people are a trifle warmed by wine they often disclose secrets of importance"
> (De Callières quoted in Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 164).

According to Chapple-Sokol, what De Callières does is to emphasize the importance of culinary diplomacy, even though the concept of serving wine to the extent that diplomats get inebriated isn't universally accepted today.

The third French referred to in Sam's article is the cook Antonin Carême often referred to as the "king of cooks and the cook of kings" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 164). In 1814 he was asked to prepare the meals marking Napoleons abdication in 1814, by the French diplomat Charles Maurice Talleyrand- Périgord, whom understood the importance of good food both in negotiations and at the table. Maybe Talleyrand-Périgord tried to ease his way back into leadership at the Congress of Vienna by impressing the others with good food, and maybe it eased the embarrassing moment of Napoleons abdication. But what's certain, Carême impressed with his cooking, which included a *gateau Nesselrode* in honor of the Russian negotiator, and as a tribute to Tsar Alexander, a *Charlotte Russe*. - At least, all the good food cooked by Carême didn't hurt France's reputation, Chapple-Sokol says. There's also an anecdote saying that the negotiators each praised their own national cheese, but the competition was settled in favor of France when Talleyrand served the famous cheese Brie de Meaux (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 165).

2.3 Theory of Culinary Diplomacy

Sam Chapple-Sokol verifies my experience when he says that the theory field of Culinary Diplomacy is not researched to a great extent. But he proposes that

> "such a theory can be formed using a combination of the current thinking on public and cultural diplomacy, including non-verbal forms of communication, along with contact theory, a concept borrowed from he field of conflict resolution" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 163).

Chapple-Sokol refers in his theory to Paul Rockower who has popularized the term gastrodiplomacy, and whom focuses on the concept of nation- branding. However, I will not describe this, due to irrelevancy. I will now present how he ground his theory.

2.3.1 Community, Non- logocentrism, and Diplomatic Signalling

First in his theory grounding, Chapple-Sokol refers to Constantinou whom talks about what he calls 'gastronomic diplomacy' in his book mentioned earlier. According to Chapple-Sokol, Constantinou proposes we start considering gastronomy and diplomacy as a "locus of community, both private and public, domestic and international" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 166). Earlier we saw how Aristotle considered commensality important in order to create commonality. And as Chapple-Sokol says referring to Constantinou; antagonisms and hostility is reduced and ties are strengthened when sharing a meal with friends or enemies. Constantinou also means that gastronomy is a kind of communication that doesn't make use of words, as it's a non- logocentric form of communication. According to Chapple-Sokol, he is here just *en ligne* with Raymond Cohen and his theory of non- verbal diplomatic signalling which is discussed in his book *Theatre of power*.

Non- verbal communication has according to Cohen two aspects, "both the deliberate transfer of information by non- verbal means from one state to another and also from the leadership of a state to its own population on an international issue" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 167). When diplomats and other dignitaries share meals, but also when a domestic or international culinary outreach program is established, a non- verbal transfer takes place. Cohen says, "Underlying diplomatic signalling is an assumption of intentionality" (Cohen quoted in Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 167), and this is true for culinary diplomacy as well, as it serves as a powerful tool of communication. The absence of words just makes it stronger. While words spoken or written and even body language tells an obvious message, a diplomat can make gestures through private culinary diplomacy as obviously or ambiguously as desired, Chapple-Sokol says. Through the menu for example, what's included and what's left out could send a message. And the seating according to protocol and what's expected sends a message, but it does so subtly. According to Cohen, a sort of commitment or provocation involved in an explicit verbal statement could be avoided when signalling. This is a new kind of diplomatic language emerging when communicating through food and drink, and as Chapple-Sokol puts

it - "one that diplomats must be aware of in order to maximize its effectiveness" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 167).

2.3.2 Soft Power, Public Diplomacy and Cultural Diplomacy

Cultural diplomacy is an aspect of public diplomacy that takes place both at official and informal levels. When a nation makes use of cultural diplomacy, it's using soft power defined by Joseph Nye as "the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 167). Chapple-Sokol shows that culinary diplomacy fits perfect into both cultural and public diplomacy projects, and a nation's cuisine is a cultural resource that may appeal to both foreign leaders and populations. And we can talk about both private and public culinary diplomacy - private when behind closed doors as at the Congress of Vienna, or another intimate setting, and public when nations try to appeal to foreign publics.

Because the Japanese chefs mastered French cooking, some assume that French President Jacques Chirac obtained a better relationship with the Japanese because he was served his own kind of food and he probably felt more at home. And here Sokol touches upon a key-issue in regard to food; familiarity and familiarization. When tasting a country's cuisine a process of familiarization starts, and from there a greater understanding of our shared values and tastes can emerge. And as with Chirac, the Japanese gesture of serving him French food made him feel at home. And emerging out of the process of familiarization could be newfound respect for a given country.

2.3.3 The Contact Hypothesis

Chapple-Sokol borrows a concept from the field of conflict resolution while attaching a more psychological aspect in the contact hypothesis to the theory of culinary diplomacy. In the 1950s Gordon W. Allport created the contact theory through a number of studies which was published in *The Nature of Prejudice,* and Chapple-Sokol states that it's "a powerful tool to explain how relationships evolve and change as a result of inter- group contact" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 171). The theory assumes that hostility will be reduced and more positive behavior will be promoted under the right conditions, through contact among members of different groups in inter- group meetings. This is based on the assertion that tension and potential rivalry is created due to unfamiliarity and lack of knowledge about another group.

Positive connections can be made when contact is used in a good context and proximity including discussions, learning and teaching.

Psychologists Marilynn Brewer and Samuel Gaertner developed the theory further by researching which conditions for contact would lead to positive interactions. They found that individuals should have equal status in order to overcome stereotypes, and contact need to be intimate and not superficial. Contact also needs to be natural, comfortable and not forced. Chapple-Sokol also refers to another psychologist Yehuda Amir whom through his further research on the contact theory found that people are encouraged to seek mutual understanding and appreciation if the contact is pleasurable in addition. And by this Chapple-Sokol shows that the contact theory

> "- adds to our understanding of public and private culinary diplomacy through the fact that sharing food - whether between individual civilians, diplomats, or heads of state - necessarily brings people into contact in an intimate and pleasurable setting" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 172).

A term that has become a metaphor for sharing a meal is the Biblical term 'breaking bread' from the Eucharist. And what is described above is just that, breaking bread. Earlier we saw that de Callières described how friendship and familiarity is created through sharing a meal with good food and drink. Chapple- Sokol also refers to the book *Diplomacy of the Dish*, where the author Tafoya states "the practice of sitting down together at a table and breaking bread is one of the most ancient forms of contract negotiation, sealing a deal, or promising a betrothal" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 172). And he goes and describe how the word 'companion' implies friendship and familiarity and how 'company' which derives from Latin *com*, translates 'together', and *panis*, meaning bread. In other words, originally company implies breaking bread with someone. Chapple -Sokol argues by this that the theory grounding is fully in line with what was discussed earlier; the commensal community-building that have taken place from the ancient world to today.

Food is central, but often an understated role in the lives of every living being, and when consuming and sharing a meal, the basest of what it means to be alive is invoked in us. And Chapple-Sokol quotes Roland Barthes: "food is a system of communication, a body of images, a protocol of usages, situations and behavior" (Barthes quoted in Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 172). When you eat with someone there's a communication happening between each of the parties that you might not notice, normally everyone notices only what they themselves

feel and experience. The host may have a certain motivation or attitude, maybe he or she tries to impress, satisfy or comfort. And the different parties each have their own reactions, they may be hungry, maybe they are afraid of being poisoned, or just trying to be polite. Each meal carries with it a web of complex interactions.

These subconscious aspects invoked by sharing a meal mentioned above may be planned or intended to a greater extent that it is today in diplomacy. Some do, and Chapple-Sokol refers to when U.S. President Ronald Reagan had the Gorbachev's for the historic state dinner and served Russian caviar and California red wine from the Russian River valley in tribute of the many Russian immigrants in the area. Obviously, the Russians must have appreciated this and taken it as a friendly gesture. The other way round, the Japanese demonstrate power when they serve Chinese diplomats exquisite Chinese food, a gesture the Chinese chefs can't return on behalf of the diplomats. And the Chinese diplomats reflect the chef's loss of face. By these examples of culinary diplomacy, Chapple-Sokol shows that

> "The intimacy of contact between the parties - and the underlying system of communication that is represented by food - can form diplomatic relationships that are far stronger than those without food present" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 173).

In chapter 5 I will explore the different practices of culinary diplomacy presented by Sam Chapple-Sokol in his article, this material is better suited there because of its empirical nature.

2.4 Criticisms

It is important to note that there is critics of culinary diplomacy, and as one of them have said "breaking bread can never foster coexistence if inequities go undressed" (Chapple-Sokol, 2014). But Chapple-Sokol argues culinary diplomacy to be a valuable addition to the toolbox. And he presents some potential criticisms of the theory of culinary diplomacy.

First, Chapple-Sokol points to the fact that it is difficult to measure the result of public and private culinary diplomacy as it is qualitative in its nature. Public and private culinary diplomacy is difficult to assess if communication and relationships have been enhanced. As Chapple-Sokol says

"Outcomes are merely presumed from theory. Allport's work with extrapolations from the field of cultural diplomacy and soft power, suggest that the above makes sense. In reality, it is difficult to ascertain the truth" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 181).

But because this is true for other fields as well, culinary diplomacy cannot be condemned, Chapple-Sokol argues. More accepted forms of cultural diplomacy as sending musicians to enhance goodwill among foreign populations and embassies teaching about national policy through public diplomacy campaigns behind enemy lines are accepted, even if it's difficult to measure the outcomes of them and poll if hostile attitudes have changed.
Sam Chapple-Sokol reckons culinary diplomacy has the potential to become a strong and durable side of diplomacy that could be used by governments worldwide with its function as a soft power and in addition to strategy, in spite of the fact that it's difficult to measure the outcomes.

The second potential criticism Sam points to, is that the concept discussed is 'only food'. For some, food doesn't mean much and reckons it solely as fuel, and Chapple-Sokol argues, culinary diplomacy won't work among people whom aren't interested in cuisine.

Thirdly, some may accuse the diplomatic tool of culinary diplomacy for being accessible only to the elite. And the private branch of culinary diplomacy is difficult to take part in, as it is an efficient tool among diplomats and statesmen and remains behind closed doors. But as Chapple-Sokol points to, the public initiatives of culinary diplomacy at different levels are accessible for everyone. And he argues, the to twin pillars in public and private initiatives give culinary diplomacy a "functionality that does not just involve elites" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 182).

2.5 The Future for Culinary Diplomacy
We have seen that Sam Chapple-Sokol shows in his article how culinary diplomacy is rooted in diplomatic history back to ancient Greece, and how culinary diplomacy reached a point of institutionalization in pre- modern France. Different sides of culinary diplomacy work together and make it a useful tool of diplomacy, were "the non-verbal communication of food and the physical closeness of commensality create powerful locus that is centered on the space in which food is shared" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 182). And this is true for both public and private practices of culinary diplomacy. On all levels the most central point is

commensality, that culinary diplomacy occurs when individuals share food and drink, whether it be private citizens or statesmen. Because food is universal, the tool of culinary diplomacy is potentially efficient everywhere in the world, Chapple-Sokol says.

And what regards the future of culinary diplomacy, Chapple-Sokol emphasize that as a new field, culinary diplomacy is in need for more research and study. And when food becomes more important in popular culture, its prospective power as a tool in international relations increases. And I will let Chapple-Sokol words conclude the presentation of his theory:

> "Wherever food is used to interact with someone to improve cooperation, change attitudes, or encourage understanding - whether at an urban stall, a restaurant, or the White House - a nexus of culinary diplomacy has been created" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 183).

CHAPTER 3   RITUAL AND SYMBOLIC ACTIONS IN PEACEBUILDING

First, I will define peacebuilding according to Schirch, her analysis of conflict and the three different approaches and dimensions of peacebuilding. In the following I will explore ritual and symbolic action as defined by Schirch, and we will see that she proposes ritual to be space as well as a performed ritual. Towards the end of the chapter a story from a certain peacebuilding initiative in Cyprus will be presented, where Schirch has named a phenomenon she calls dinner diplomacy. It is important to notice that I will refer to two different books authored by Schirch. On the topic of peacebuilding in general, Schirch (2004) is the source. When we come to conflict analysis, the different dimensions of peacebuilding and ritual, Schirch (2005) is the main source.

3.1 Peacebuilding

The term peacebuilding is used in many different ways. By some it is used to describe activities and initiatives following war, others think of it as a way of approaching development, emphasizing peace. Others again, mix it with conflict transformation or see it solely as a relational and psychological process (Schirch, 2004, p. 8). The United Nations Peacebuilding Fund define Peacebuilding as

> "A range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development" (United Nations Peacebuilding Fund)

The United Nations Peacebuilding Fund also emphasizes peacebuilding strategies must be coherent and designed for the specific country and based on local ownership, and the objectives described should be achieved through a carefully prioritized set of activities.

3.1.1 Strategic Peacebuilding

In *The Little Book of Strategic Peacebuilding*, Lisa Schirch attempts to present peacebuilding in a unified and strategic way, bringing together various fields and activities into a conceptual framework. *Strategic Peacebuilding* is at its core, which is an "interdisciplinary, coordinated approach to building a sustainable *justpeace* - a peace with justice " (Schirch, 2004, p. 6). She claims that strategic peacebuilding requires coordination, and aims to encourage people working for peace in various fields in the same area to network with each other. Later in this

chapter, we will see how Schirch (2005) argues peacebuilding takes place in three dimensions; the material, the social and the symbolic dimension.

Schirch claims that there is a set of values, relational skills, and analytical frameworks important in peacebuilding, but I won't explore these further her due to relevance. What I will look deeper into is what Schirch says about the different and important *approaches* to peacebuilding which are interdependent, ongoing and often simultaneous, and which provide complementary contributions to peacebuilding. These approaches to peacebuilding are by Schirch arranged into four categories: *Waging Conflict Nonviolently*, *Building Capacity*, *Reducing Direct Violence* and *Transforming Relationships*. Each of these is important, but because the latter is the focus in this thesis, I will only describe in detail which approaches she have included in this category.

3.1.2 Transforming relationships
Trauma healing, conflict transformation, restorative justice, transitional justice, governance and policymaking are the approaches Schirch lists within the category of transforming relationship. And Schirch claim: "For peace to replace violence, relationships must be re-created by using an array of processes that address trauma, transform conflict, and do justice (Schirch, 2004, p. 26)".

Individuals, families, communities, businesses, structures, and governments needs to be transformed from destructive growth and development, and this is one of the many tasks of peacebuilding. In order to reduce violence and secure human rights, relationships needs to be transformed. Schirch points to the fact that it is through processes, within the category of *Transforming Relationships*, opportunities for people to forgive and reconcile is created (Schirch, 2004, p. 47). I will give a more thorough description of reconciliation in chapter 4, but for now it is important to understand it within the frame of peacebuilding.

3.1.3 Transforming Conflict
Forgiveness and reconciliation are not required to transform relationships, but it may describe the deepest possible changes in how people relate to each other. Three interrelated support processes help right relationships form according to Schirch: *healing trauma*, *transforming conflict*, and *doing justice.* The process in focus in this thesis is that of *conflict*

transformation. I recognize that the other processes Schirch name are important as well, but there will not be space to investigate all of them. One of the principles of conflict transformation is to build relationships between people in conflict, with the hope of obtaining forgiveness and maybe even to start a process of reconciliation. Another principle according to Schirch is to develop creative solutions so everyone's needs are met, and also to empower the people involved transforming their own conflicts. It's also important to identify those experiences and issues that have caused a sense of injustice, harm, and trauma (Schirch, 2004, p. 48).

Efforts of conflict transformation are needed on all levels, from "international diplomats; politicians and policymakers; business, religious, and media organizations; and community-level leaders" (Schirch, 2004, p. 49). And they are useful among both warring groups and allies, Schirch points out. Effective coalitions and democratic negotiating opportunities are enhanced by conflict transformation initiatives, which is also needed within and between peacebuilding organizations in order to "improve coordination and build constructive relationships" (Schirch, 2004, p. 49). Essential approaches used in conflict transformation are dialogue, principled negotiation, and mediation.

Concerning *Dialogue*, Schirch describe it as a process that brings together groups of people leaded by a facilitator in order to increase understanding and address important issues. These kinds of conversations are preferably sustained over a long time. *Principled Negotiation* is dialogue with the aim to find solutions to a conflict, including strategies to "build and maintain relationships with others while seeking creative win- win solutions that satisfy the needs of all" (Schirch, 2004, p. 50). *Mediation* is similar to principled negotiation, Schirch says, but a process assisted by a trusted person in order to make all the participants share their perspectives and experiences, brainstorm creative solutions, identify underlying needs and come to an final agreement.

3.1.4 Peacebuilding and Transformation on Different Levels of Society
As with the different tracks of diplomacy described in chapter 2.1, there are relating levels or tracks in peacebuilding. At the top- level, national governments, the United Nations, and religious leadership in national and international arenas as the World Council of Churches takes part in negotiation, official dialogue, and mediations, mainly to address conflicts such as

political crisis. At the middle level, initiatives include coordinating relief aid for humanitarian crisis, by national and regional organizations and businesses. The community or grassroot level leads civilian peacekeeping, relief and development programs, dialogue, trauma healing, education and training programs and similar projects (Schirch, 2004, p. 71).

I would also like to include Lederach's levels of leadership (Lederach, 1997, p. 39), where he proposes there are different types of actors or leaders on different levels in countries affected by conflict, and whom have different roles in dealing with the situation (Lederach, 1997, p. 38). Level 1 includes Top Leadership, including military/ political/ religious leaders that are highly visible. Level 2 include Middle-Range Leadership include ethnic religious leaders, academic/ intellectuals and humanitarian leaders (NGO). The Grassroots Leadership includes local leaders, community developers, local health officials and refugee camp leaders. The lower the level, the bigger groups of people it encompasses. I think Lederach's way of identifying leadership on different levels is useful in order to understand the interrelations between levels peacebuilding and different diplomacy tracks as will be discussed in the analysis.

Levels of Transformation
Schirch, referring to Lederach, claims fostering transformation on different levels are required in peacebuilding. These levels are personal, relational, cultural and structural change (Schirch, 2004, p. 67). All of the levels should not be addressed by each peacebuilding initiative, program or activity, but Schirch argue, "a coordinated peacebuilding strategy will address all levels through various programs" (Schirch, 2004, p. 68).

- **Personal change** includes new knowledge, behaviors, and new attitudes by individuals in the given context.
- **Relational change** includes improved or new relationships between groups.
- **Cultural change** involve fortified values that supports peace.
- **Structural change** concerns new policies, institutions and/or leaders.

3.2 Conflict Analysis and different dimensions of peacebuilding

Before addressing the different dimensions and approaches of peacebuilding, it is necessary to understand how this is based on the understanding that three different levels can be identified when analyzing conflict.

3.2.1 Conflict Analysis

Schirch has developed a very useful three level analysis of conflict from a widely accepted definition of conflict developed by two conflict practitioners, William Hocker and Joyce Wilmot: "*Conflict is an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce resources, and interference from others in achieving their goals*." (Schirch, 2005, p. 31). The key elements of the definition can be divided into three levels; 1) people need or desire resources to achieve their goals, 2) conflict is expressed or communicated with others in a struggle, 3) perceptions shape how people understand and act in conflict. Further, Schirch points to three general approaches to problems in the Western world which is proposed by communications theorists John Cragan and Donald Shields; rational, relational, and symbolic approach. From there, Schirch refers conflict theorist Jayne Docherty whom have applied these three categories to different understandings of what makes conflict occur, and according to Schirch; Docherty argues it occurs in rational, relational, and symbolic "worlds" (Schirch, 2005, p. 31).

From the three worlds or levels of conflict proposed by Docherty, we will in the following section see how Schirch describes conflict in different ways in the three dimensions, that there are different human needs and rights in each dimension, and that each dimension requires a different approach to peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

The concepts of human needs and human rights are foundational to the fields of peace and conflict studies, an idea Schirch says was pioneered among others by conflict scholar John Burton; because "unmet human needs or inherent drives for survival and development such as identity, security, and recognition cause conflict" (Burton quoted in Schirch, 2005, p. 31). Schirch says that in peacebuilding, one seeks to establish societies that "affirm human dignity through meeting human needs and protecting human rights" (Schirch, 2005, p. 31). If people don't have their needs met by their community, Schirch claims that they are likely to engage in conflict.

We will now look into the three different dimensions and approaches to conflict, which Schirch proposes. She recognizes that the three dimensions are connected and overlap each other. But no single dimension is sufficient to understand and approach all conflicts, and each of them has powers and weaknesses (Schirch, 2005, p. 34). We will briefly look into the material and social dimension and approach to conflict, while the main focus will be on the symbolic dimension and approach.

3.2.2 The material dimension and approach

The material dimension of conflict covers obvious and often clearly articulated disagreements on territorial matters, food, or other material resources that people want, according to Schirch. And she says the tradition as how to address the material dimension of conflict is rooted in Western philosophy, starting with the Greek philosophers. They began the tradition of understanding the world in a reasonable and rational way, with emphasis on objective truth. And since the beginning of the European enlightenment period, Schirch goes on; this quest has dominated thought in the Western part of the world. One typical Western belief, universalized by Rene Descartes early in the enlightenment period, says that "human emotions, senses and beliefs are inaccessible if not irrelevant to study and therefore unknowable" (Schirch, 2005, p. 34). And Descartes understanding of rationality "involved suppressing emotions, which hinder objectivity, and categorizing the subject to be studied on its own rather than in its relationship to its context" (Schirch, 2005, p. 34). Schirch notes that this gives us some of the theoretical background for the Western intellectual tradition, and why the material dimension and approach of conflict, being more evident the relational or symbolic dimension, is in general preferred above these. Schirch claims that in the social sciences, rational theories assume "humans are capable of communicating through detached, unemotional, objective logic" (Schirch, 2005, p. 35). And Schirch says a rational approach to conflict solving naturally focus on objective, rational, and logical methods.

As conflict often contains irreconcilable goals and insufficient resources, Schirch says that many theorists in the early days of conflict studies "saw disputes as isolated social situations that could be settled or resolved with a variety of rational strategies or formulas" (Schirch, 2005, p. 35). And Schirch gives a good example of a typical material approach to managing and solving conflict in the international best seller authored by Roger Fisher and Bill Ury, *Getting to Yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. As listed (Schirch, 2005, p. 35),

their main strategy includes 1) separate the people from the problem, 2) focus on interest, not positions, 3) invent options for mutual gain, and 4) insist on using objective criteria.

Because conflict is an unclear and sentimentally messy matter, they offer a "concise, step-by-step, proven strategy" (Fisher and Ury quoted in Schirch, 2005, p. 35) of principled negotiation for approaching conflict. This book has been an important contribution to how to approach conflict in Western culture, but it doesn't provide much help on how to address the human component in conflict. And as Schirch makes us aware of, outside a Western- based cultural framework, people can react negatively to the idea of separating people from problems, especially when identity is a major factor in the conflict (Schirch, 2005, p. 35). Conflicts are hard to organize into neat, rational packages, even though some processes make an attempt to do so, Schirch says. Often, politicians and activists try to frame a conflict over land or other material resources. A good example of this is the conflict between Israel and Palestine, where we, at least from the news, often get the impression that the conflict is all about land disputes. But Schirch points out that the conflicts touches upon deeper issues as well, as identity, values, and perception of each other. And when both the conflicting sides attack each other's religious sites, it only makes the conflict even more complicated. And Schirch emphasizes social and psychological factors are real, even though they're not measurable in a rational way. What is rational to a Western person may be totally irrelevant to people with another worldview. Then, approaching a conflict in a non- Western culture with rational, analytical tools could be problematic, and in some cases make things even worse.

Another thing which Schirch emphasizes is how problem- solving approaches to conflict easily overlook how Western- based concepts of rationality are favored over others. In some contexts, Schirch argues, the rational approach to conflict concerning resources will be successful. But the chance for success in non- Western cultural settings, and when dealing with social and symbolic dimension of conflict, is according to Schirch much lower.

For further research it would it would be interesting to explore more in detail how the modern culture, history and worldview influence the academic fields of international relations and peacebuilding, and then see it in relations to different worldviews dominant in other parts of the world. Worldviews influence societies, and Paul G. Hiebert emphasizes in his book *Transforming Worldviews* "we must keep in mind that worldview exist and are deeply shaped

by their historical contexts" (Hiebert, 2008, p. 87). We will now look into the second dimension and approach Schirch describes.

3.2.3 The social dimensions and approach

Building relationships in peacebuilding is important, and Schirch acknowledges that the relational dimension of conflict is acknowledged to a great degree in all levels of peacebuilding. Without good relationships it is difficult to address conflicts constructively, and the result can be ineffective communication patterns, hierarchical social structures, and competitive attitudes. In addition, Schirch says, an imbalance in access to power and resources makes the conflict difficult to control.

In the social dimension of peacebuilding, the focus is on relationships, communication, power, and social structures to analyze and resolve conflict (Schirch, 2005, p. 36). If relationships are improved, it is believed that conflict will be less damaging and maybe even productive. As with the material approaches to addressing conflict, Schirch says that the relational approaches also emerge from Western social sciences such as anthropology, economics, political science and sociology.

Schirch refers to Scott Brown and Roger Fisher whom in their book *Getting Together: Building Relationships As We Negotiate,* adds to the rational approach in *Getting to Yes (*Fisher and Ury*)*, an approach to improving relationships through communication skills. The authors also encourage readers to separate objective, rational discussions of issues from the relationship issues of the conflict (Schirch, 2005, p. 36). And Schirch notes that a number of skills to improve communicating through both listening and speaking with greater care have been developed by many other conflict theorists as well, including Hocker and Wilmot (3.2.1).

Conflict often occurs because of irregularities in power balance in a society, for example when lower groups in a society have nothing to say as to how decisions are made by the elite group in society. Two peacebuilding strategies here include creating new social structures, where people are encouraged to cooperate instead of competing, and improving communication (Schirch, 2005, p. 32). Other social approaches to peacebuilding includes" the creation of participatory methods of democratic decision- making that foster respect and recognition of others" (Schirch, 2005, p. 37), and promote equivalent relationships.

Schirch admits that relational approaches to conflict gives an important addition in examine conflict and the practice of peacebuilding, but that this approach is inadequate alone. And she says that what this approach often misses is that the Western worldview assumptions about the best way to communicate influences the communication techniques taught in peacebuilding seminars around the world. And a very good example that illustrates this Schirch says, is how Western communication specialists recommend using direct language and "I" when describing personal feelings. But this way of communicating may be offensive in community- based cultures, which often prefers the use of we- language. Another example of relational differences between cultures Schirch refers to is the use of eye contact, as many Westerners prefers direct eye contact and understand it as a sign of honesty. But in many other cultures one pays respect by avoiding eye contact (Schirch, 2005, p. 37).

3.2.4 The symbolic dimension and approach
Schirch emphasizes that people's worldview shapes how they comprehend the world and make sense of it, including conflict. And this leads us into the symbolic dimension and approach to conflict. Here, according to Schirch, "the perceptual, emotional, sensual, cultural, value- based, and identity- driven aspects of conflict are important" (Schirch, 2005, p. 32). Schirch claims what makes the plot line of this dimension is that two different cultures apprehend the world in entirely different ways and will have difficulties to see the conflict from the other side's perspective. Approaches to peacebuilding in this dimension include "efforts to shift perspective through creative strategies to engage people's physical and sensual selves, their emotions, identities, and values" (Schirch, 2005, p. 32). Schirch also states that the symbolic dimensions of conflict present the background for understanding the use of ritual and symbolic acts in peacebuilding.

Kenneth Boulding, an early conflict theorist Schirch refers to, discusses in his book *The Image* how "individuals perceive the world differently and how this affects conflicts" (Schirch, 2005, p. 38). And Schirch notes that a growing number of conflict theorist argue that how we percept and express conflict is impossible to understand without paying attention to the symbolic dimension. - But because this is the chaotic part of conflict, it is often neglected or overlooked in the theoretical garbage container. Or at least, this part of conflict has been left on the outer edge of the conflict chart, Schirch says, because it is such

unpredictable elements of conflict, and it isn't compatible with a rational and objective way of dealing with conflict. Even though some conflict studies scholars try to explore the symbolic dimension of conflict and make some references, Schirch says that they rarely dive deep into it or provide useful symbolic tools. But there are exceptions, and some scholars who are known for exploring the symbolic dimension of peacebuilding, are John Paul Lederach, Jayne Docherty, Kevin Avruch and Peter Black (Schirch, 2005, pp. 38, 53- 54).

On the surface it may look as if many conflict concerns contending demands to scarce resources, but often it is difficult to recognize how people "are symbolically constructing the meaning and value of resources" (Schirch, 2005, p. 38). Schirch gives an example in how loggers and paper companies may look at the trees of the Amazonas as a material resource, and a farmer may see it as a potential field for produce. But environmentalists and indigenous people of the area value land and resources differently, as "it symbolically represents health, wholeness and life" (Schirch, 2005, p. 38). And Schirch says in this case negotiations over interests will probably raise some awareness of the cultural differences, but discussing and mediating over the land itself will probably not lead to a solution.

And now Schirch leads us to how worldview matters in conflict, as people symbolically construct conflict through this dynamic lens from which they understand the world: Through the senses, emotions, culture, values, identity, and complicated perceptual dynamics that make out worldview. To more fully understand a piece of land's symbolic meaning for the conflicting sides in the example mentioned above, the different worldviews must be exposed and experienced, Schirch says (Schirch, 2005, p. 38). Important questions to answer would be: What basic values does people hold about the land? What is the symbolic meaning of the land for the different parties? How do the people involved pertain to the land, emotionally and sensually? Does the land help define people's identity, if so, how? And in relation to land claim negotiations in North America, Schirch notes that some of the most fruitful and creative processes have taken place when representatives from both conflicting sides walk on the area of dispute talking about it's symbolical significance.

John Paul Lederach emphasized already in the 1990s that traditional diplomatic approaches to conflict overlooks that contemporary conflict is also driven by psychosocial elements; the perceived threat to identity and survival in long- standing animosities. So even if the conflict

is sustained and driven by contested issues of substance, Lederach points to how they often are rooted in psychological and cultural elements (Lederach, 1997, p. 17).

Schirch argues, "building peace requires stretching and transforming worldviews" (Schirch, 2005, p. 38), and when people are involved in conflict, their understanding of identity, adversary, and the conflict issues contradicts. But still, in Western cultures, there's often a quest for objectivity or complains ones subjectivity, while worldviews are encompassed in other cultures. Some even claim that the concept of objectivity is impossible to virtually translate in many Asian and African cultures (p. 38).

Again, Schirch refers to Jayne Docherty, whom uses the term *worldviewing* to explain how "people express, confirm, and re- create their worldviews every day to explain why the world is as it appears or what it could or should be" (Schirch, 2005, p. 39).

I will look deeper into the worldview dimension in the chapter 4, and we will see how the five interacting elements; perception, emotional and sensual cognition, culture, values, and identity, shape worldview and how it affects conflict according to Schirch. We will also explore how she proposes ritual and symbolic actions as efficient peacebuilding tools when transforming worldviews and identities in conflicts. Now we will look deeper into the theory of ritual.

3.3 Ritual and symbolic actions

For every human being, rituals of both religious and secular character are a common element of life that follows us from birth until death. But based on what was presented above, what are most often referred to in peacebuilding are negotiations, rational discussions, principled negotiation and effective verbal communication even though peacebuilders at different levels daily experience a handshake, coffee break, meal, or some other symbolic, physical act. The importance of ritual or symbolic acts in complex and deep- rooted conflict is rarely articulated, and Schirch claims that a classic approach to rituals and symbolic acts by scholars schooled in Western science is that it is ineffective or irrational tools for communicating. Schirch doesn't argue that ritual should replace other tools for approaching conflict, but she thinks it should be seen and valued to a greater degree as a supplement to the traditional approaches to conflict (Schirch, 2005, p. 1). Before we explore what ritual offers in relation to

transforming conflict in the next chapter, we will now look into some of the characteristics and definition of ritual.

3.3.1 Definition of Ritual

There is disagreement as how to define and understand the concept of ritual, and Schirch refers to several theorists whom have defined ritual in different ways. I have chosen to solely use Schirch's own definition of ritual, as it serves to understand her theory well. It is also applicable to different kinds of ritual, and easily understood: "Ritual uses *symbolic actions* to communicate a *forming or transforming* message in a unique *social space*" (Schirch, 2005, p. 17).

Schirch explains further: S*ymbolic actions* are physical actions that communicate first and foremost through symbols, senses and emotions, preferably over words or rational thought, and that require interpretation. A handshake is a good example of a typical symbolic action which in many cases symbolize friendship. A symbolic act, which is formal and/ or repeated within a tradition, is often referred to as ritual. If the handshake is used as a greeting repeated through time, it is a ritual. The *forming or transforming* message that is sent through a symbolic action means that some rituals can form people's worldview, identities, and relationships, and thus strengthen them. But on the other hand, some rituals help the process of change. In other words, ritual can be a powerful tool. The unique *social spaces* where the rituals take place are separated from everyday life in different ways. And a way to identify ritual is then to analyze the context in which the ritual or symbolic act happens, Schirch says (p.17). Schirch admits herself that she uses the term ritual very loosely, and when talking about less formal rituals, she suggests calling them symbolic actions (Schirch, 2005, p. 28).

3.3.1.1 Different kinds of Rituals

She goes on talking about the fact that there are several kinds of rituals, and they are often divided into religious vs. secular, traditional vs. improvised, formal vs. informal, socializing vs. transforming, and constructive vs. destructive rituals, or anything between these 'opposing' categories. Off course, there exist other kinds of rituals, but those listed here are those of highest relevance to the field of peacebuilding, according to Schirch (Schirch, 2005, p. 18). Religious rituals express connection to a supernatural power and religious values, while secular rituals reflect secular, non- religious values. A traditional ritual is based on tradition and a long history of repeating that same ritual, while an improvised ritual is created for new events. If a ritual is formal, the participants know and understand that they take part

in a ritual. On the other hand, the more informal a ritual is, the less are the participants aware that they take part in a ritual. When a ritual is socializing, it teaches existing values, rules, and structures to new members of a community. But when a ritual is transforming, it questions and reshape the status quo (Schirch, 2005, p. 23). Ritual is a neutral tool, and it can be used in both a constructive or destructive way. Used in a constructive way, ritual betters the life of the people who use it. But when the ritual is used to make life worse for someone, or it does so unintended, it is destructive (Schirch, 2005, p. 24).

Schirch notices that symbolic tools and ritual is more often supported by what she calls "softer academic fields such as theology, psychology, anthropology, and sociology" (Schirch, 2005, p. 15), than other academic fields related to peacebuilding.

3.3.1.2 Rituals according to LeBaron

Another theorist, whom has emphasized the need for rituals to address the symbolic dimension of conflict, is professor at Allard School of Law, Michelle LeBaron. She has published extensively on subjects concerning religion, culture, intercultural relations, conflict, and creativity. Similar to Schirch, she uses a three level analysis of conflict, where briefly said; the material, the relational, and the symbolic matters each have their levels or dimensions (Torstensen, 2014, p. 58). Further, she has developed what she calls creative tools that can be useful instruments capable of challenging cases and situations richly laden with symbolic content. These kinds of dimensions of a conflict are not easily obtained through logic analysis alone (Torstensen, 2014, p. 59). These creative tools are commemorating tools such as rituals, symbolic tools such as metaphors, and narrative tools in stories. When using these tools, the objective is to find "new ways to think of and be with the conflicts that most challenge us" (LeBaron quoted in Lindahl, 2014, p. 59).

I will not explore this further, but it's interesting to be aware of another theorist who moves in the symbolic spheres of peacebuilding, and I think it fortifies what Schirch proposes concerning the use of rituals in addressing conflict. It would have been interesting to compare Schirch and Lebaron's theories further, but this will not serve the quest in this thesis.

 Because the focus in this thesis is not on ritual per se, but on how ritual can be used as a tool within peacebuilding, this has only been brief outline of the concept. Now, I will look into

another interesting area of ritual Schirch explores; how she argues ritual can be a symbolic space.

3.3.2 Ritual as space

Schirch argues that ritual can be interpreted as symbolic space, and how it is formally created and set apart from everyday life. She bases it on the systems theory, also called cybernetic relationships, synergetics, or complexity theory. - Conflict, ideas, humans, and language exist in ecological relationships, and this theory is holistic and provides a framework for analyzing "the world and the patterns of relationship that occur within it" (Schirch, 2005, p. 66) Schirch also emphasize: "system theorists believe that a part of a system can only be understood by examining its relationship to other parts" (Schirch, 2005, p. 67).

Referring to Gregory Bates, Schirch points out how all interaction that takes place within a given situation or an environment, like a bathroom, kitchen or a soccerfield, are defined by the symbolic meaning held in that place. Schirch also refers to cognitive theorists Maturana and Varela, whom have presented the concept of *autopoiesis*, a term used to describe "systems' ability to generate and define themselves" (Schirch, 2005, p. 67). Parts of the system and the relationship between them are dialectical, and "each part of a system defines the other parts" (Schirch, 2005, p. 67).

A third theorist Schirch refers to grounding a theory for ritual as space, is Erving Goffman and his book *Frame Analysis* where he examines "how individuals make sense of and create symbolic frames for certain social situations" (Schirch, 2005, p. 67).
The importance of context is highlighted by the systems theory, Schirch emphasize, where briefly said meaning is determined in how humans relate to their physical context and other people (p.67).

Schirch argue peacebuilders are in position to set the stage for peace, and in the same way a theater director uses a specially- designed set for each play, setting the emotional tone with special lighting, uses symbols to conjure up time and place for the play, and other things that gives the actors a context for their words and actions; a peacebuilder must think about that space where conflicting people will come together. It is important to find a way to make context symbolically support the work of building peace (p.67).

Even though not connected to the concept of ritual, the idea of creating a safe space is noted in peacebuilding literature, Schirch says. Well known advices in peacebuilding for establishing and creating these include finding a setting away from the conflict- setting which neutralizes hostility; seating people besides each other, and not opposite of each other which will provides psychological support; and making sure the people involved have equal power in the setting chosen. Schirch acknowledges the importance of this existing practice of creating safe space in peacebuilding, but argues a deeper understanding of the power of ritual and how space is symbolic and communicates messages is needed (Schirch, 2005, p. 68).

Symbolically separated places or settings where the rules for acting and interpreting meaning that are different from the rest of life, makes out liminal spaces, an idea proposed by Victor Turner, according to Schirch. Another term, ritual space is according to Joseph Campbell a place where you don't know what will happen, and a place for creative incubation, and something special always happen in the ritual space (Schirch, 2005, p. 69).

Ritual space is different from normal space in different ways, including: location, time, symbols, sounds, smells, tastes, and people. The latter, people, is indeed interesting for this thesis. When a combination of people who normally would not interact is brought together, a ritual context is created, Schirch argues. Even though eating normally isn't a ritual act, Schirch argues when a meal is shared by divided groups, "the context is unique and set apart from normal rules and patterns of interaction..." and "...eating together takes on heightened symbolic meaning and becomes ritual" (Schirch, 2005, p. 72).

Specific smells, sounds and tastes can create or mark ritual space. Some cultural and religious rituals makes use of incense, a secular rituals could be starting off the weekend by drinking beer. The smudging ceremony by Native Americans is another example of ritual space. A feeling of calm and health can conjured through homemade bread or soup in some cultures, whilst in other cultures a glass of kava, a cigar, a glass of red wine could help create an atmosphere "in which people who are adversaries can relate to each other with more ease" (Schirch, 2005, p. 72), Schirch says.

When taking part in a ritual or ritual space, people involved in conflict can move beyond the conflict into an oasis for peace away from the destructive forces of conflict. And Schirch

emphasize in this place, within rituals transformative space, new relationships and values can form:

> Peacebuilders who bring people in conflict together are glorified hosts and hostesses, leading people out of the desert of conflict toward an oasis of peace. Hospitality is high on the peacebuilding agenda" (Schirch, 2005, p. 76).

Schirch argues even the process of mediation is a ritual, because it takes place outside of normal, everyday social rules and mediation provides a safe place. New attitudes and behaviors are encouraged, and discussion can take place without the pressure everyday life holds for the participants in their conflict societies.

3.4 Symbolic and Transforming act in Dinner Diplomacy

Schirch gives a very good example of how a symbolic action can have great impact on a peacebuilding process. In the early 1990s, a group of American conflict resolution trainers started working with Greek and Turkish Cypriots on Cyprus. Since the conflict started in 1974 the two groups had lived separated in two ethnically divided communities on the island, the Turkish Cypriots on the northern side of the island, and the Greek Cypriots on the southern side (Schirch, 2005, p. 5). The Americans started bringing Greek and Turkish Cypriots together for the first time in more than twenty years. In 1994, the conflict resolution trainers led a series of ten- days workshops where the focus was to build the capacity of Turkish and Greek Cypriots participants to conflict- management without violence, and they aimed to improve skills in communication, problem solving, and negotiation. In one of these workshops, the Greek and Turkish Cypriots ate dinner together in local restaurants after the training. They often danced together as well, and in the good ambience of candles, white tablecloths, delicious food, music, and a dance floor, the stage was set for a different kind of interaction between the workshop participants. Symbolic occasions like these in a conflict resolution- setting are often referred to as *dinner diplomacy.* When eating is done in the company of enemies, the participants do more than just eat together. The act of eating becomes symbolic because the participants are unusual, coming from different sides of a conflict (Schirch, 2005, p. 5, 67-72), like it was argued above. In the Cyprus setting, eating and dancing together helped transform the participants understanding of the whole conflict, themselves, and their enemies. And in turning from the negotiation table to the dance floor, they started seeing each other identities being more than 'Turkish' or 'Greek'. They ate the

same food and sang the same songs, and this emphasized their similarities more than their differences. Through dancing and eating together, significant symbolic, transforming activities took place and their fellow identity as Mediterranean islanders, who has lived together for centuries, was strengthened (p.5).

Schirch compares her Cypriot observations to the rituals of First Nations peoples in Ontario, Canada, that she participated in during fieldwork concerning land claim issues from 1990 – 92. The Natives rarely spoke directly in interpersonal conflict, but the negotiating happened through drinking tea, hunting moose, smoking and passing on of the peace pipe, and other ceremonies. Through the rituals they handled conflict and repaired relationships in a silent way. This illustrates how Native communities handle conflict different from Western industrialized societies, as peacebuilders schooled in the Western tradition emphasize direct forms of communication and other verbal communication skills. (Schirch, 2005, p. 6). Schirch even claims that "the use of symbolic acts and rituals is common sense for people who know little about the academic field of conflict studies or peace building" (Schirch, 2005, p. 13), while trained Western scholars in general doesn't focus much on the symbolic dimension even though they intuitively knows that it is important to eat together etc. There are few peace builders with a Western background who fully recognize or articulate why ritual is important in the work and art of building peace, and what it does for the people involve. Schirch thinks this is because there's a lack of understanding about symbolic actions and ritual. Another reason for this according to Schirch is "limited understanding of the dynamics of conflict and the breadth of the peacebuilding field" (Schirch, 2005, p. 28).

Schirch acknowledges that maybe it is just stating the obvious to say that sharing a meal or some other symbolic acts is important in peacebuilding. But she also emphasizes that there's a higher chance of doing it well if we speak about it and acknowledges its importance.

As Schirch notes, we are born as sensual beings with a need to create and re- create, and with a penchant for symbol and action (Schirch, 2005, p. 27). Symbolic acts have an enormous effect on humanity, and the first step toward embracing the symbolic dimensions of peace building, is to recognize this. Because symbolic acts speak to all the senses in humans, they can penetrate the impenetrable and overwhelm the defensive.

CHAPTER 4   Reconciliation, Worldview, and Transforming Identity

Earlier when we looked at peacebuilding, we learned that reconciliation is one of the deepest possible changes when trying to transform conflict. And when trying to promote reconciliation, transforming relationship between conflictants is crucial. And relationships are affected by worldview, and identity in particular. Schirch emphasize, "building relationships between people in conflict is the heart of peacebuilding" (Schirch, 2005, p. 151).

Now, first I will outline reconciliation according to Lederach, Santa Barbara and Clegg. Included in Clegg's perspectives is how different levels of reconciliation are required in a society. Following this, I will look into Clegg's thoughts on re- negotiated identity and the challenges in embracing a threatening other, which stands in accordance to her reconciliation theory. In continuance of this, we will return to Schirch, and explore how she explains worldview and identity to be central aspects to be aware of in conflict. After defining worldview and what it consists of, I will present how worldviews and identity can be transformed according to Schirch.

4.1 Reconciliation

In the second chapter, the concept of reconciliation was briefly mentioned as a possible result within one of the approaches to peacebuilding, *transforming relationships*. Reconciliation is the restoration of friendly relations (English Dictionary), or as Lederach says: "Reconciliation is focused on building relationship between antagonists" (Lederach, 1997, p. 34). Originally, reconciliation mean "coming back into council" concerning matters important to mutual sides (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 11), and Santa Barbara defines the concept: "Reconciliation is the creation or restoration of peace in the relationship" (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 11), where different kinds of healing needs to occur, moral debts must be closed, and balance must be restored between the conflicting parties to make this happen.

   According to Santa Barbara, elements common in reconciliation are:

- Safety from further harm in this relationship
- Uncovering the "truth" of what happened
- Acknowledgement by the offender(s) of the harm done
- Remorse expressed in apology to the victim(s)
- Forgiveness
- Justice in some form, punitive or restorative

- Planning to prevent recurrence
- Resuming constructive aspects of the relationship
- Rebuilding trust over time
- Rebuilding peaceful relationships
- Closure

All the elements aren't present in every situation, but "participants in particular reconciliations will select the elements relevant to their needs ore prescribed by their culture" (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 17). I acknowledge that all the elements of reconciliation are important, but what is in focus in this thesis is rebuilding peaceful relationships, or transforming relationships as is the term used by Schirch and Lederach.

The past two decades reconciliation has been more and more in focus in peacebuilding, especially since the end of the Cold War and the work of the Peace- and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa after apartheid. Reconciliation is as old as society itself, and like professor at Norwich University Charles Lerche states (Lerche, 2000), burnt out towns and villages, hearts and minds ravaged by violence and war are in need of reconstruction. And partly, the success of peacebuilding depends on "assisting antagonists to put their pasts of violence and estrangement behind them" (Lerche, 2000). Reconciliation is quite differentiated and there are several different theories on this concept, and Lerche already pointed out in 2000:

> "The literature diverges further on whether reconciliation is an end or a means, an outcome or an process; whether it is politically neutral or unavoidably ideological, and the extent to which it is conservative or transformative in orientation" (Lerche, 2000).

In *Building Peace* from 1997, John Paul Lederach calls for a significant shift in peacebuilding; "articulated in the movement away from a concern with the resolution of issues and toward a frame of reference that focuses on the restoration and rebuilding of relationships" (Lederach, 1997, p. 24). And as he points out, this is because the traditional framework and activities that make up statist diplomacy doesn't succeed in addressing the complexity of conflicts, and innovation is needed when handling the relational dimension of conflict with its emotional and psychological aspects. Severe stereotyping, fear, and deep-rooted intense animosity often characterize conflicts, and the conflicting groups are likely to live close to each other, he says. And maybe they have direct experiences of trauma and long

cycles of hostile interactions may lock the situation. Each conflict includes a uniquely human dimension that needs to be taken into consideration, and the realpolitik way of solving conflict doesn't always provide the good solutions for this (Lederach, 1997, p. 23). This relates to Schirchs theory in chapter 3, concerning the need for more than a rational approach to peacebuilding.

Lederach suggests reconciliation as a meeting point between realism and the innovation needed to solve conflicts. Briefly said, Lederach in his book from 1997 suggests reconciliation as a meeting point where truth, justice, mercy and peace meet. Truth represents honesty, revelation and clarity; Mercy includes compassion, forgiveness, acceptance; Justice endeavor making things right, equal opportunity, rectifying the wrong; whilst Peace represents harmony, security, and well- being. Seen like this, Lederach argues reconciliation can be seen as a social space, a locus, "a place where people and things come together" (Lederach, 1997) 29. And Lederach goes on:

> "Reconciliation must be proactive in seeking to create an encounter where people can focus on their relationship and share their perceptions, feelings, and experiences with one another, with the goal of creating new perceptions and a new shared experience" (Lederach, 1997, p. 30),

> and further;

> "...a focus on relationship will provide new ways to address the impasse on issues; or that providing space for grieving the past permits a reorientation toward the future and, inversely, that envisioning a common future creates new lenses for dealing with the past" (Lederach, 1997, p. 31).

In other words, the new relationships, which potentially can be created through encounters of the conflicting sides, may pave the way for constructive dialogue where the past can be grieved and a new common future can be envisioned, something that again hopefully will lead to a better way of dealing with the past.

I would also like to include some later reflections on reconciliation Lederach gives in *The Moral Imagination* (2005), where it is obvious that his theory and view on reconciliation has evolved since the book referred to above was published. In general in this book, Lederach discusses how peacebuilding is somewhere in between an art and a skill possible to be learned, and including creativity and art in the conduct of peacebuilding is central. And

Lederach compares the process of reconciliation to an artistic process that does not progress linearly, and he says healing must be seen as a process paced by its inner timing (Lederach, 2005, p. 160). And Lederach quotes professor of psychology Herm Weaver in what I think catches the essence in what Lederach talks about in his book:

> "Reconciliation gets complicated and compounded when we try to address it purely on the intellectual level. Somewhere along the way we came to think of hurt as lodged in the cognitive memory. Hurt and brokenness are primarily found in the emotional memory. The reason I like the arts - music, drama, dance, whatever the form - is precisely because it has the capacity to build a bridge between the heart and mind" (Weaver quoted in Lederach, 2005, p. 160)

This also relates to an evolving branch of peacebuilding and conflict resolution including beauty and creativity in its peacebuilding initiatives, which is described in Ragnhild Lindahl Torstensen's master thesis on Creative Tools in Reconciliation after Terrorism (Torstensen, 2014). She bases some of her thesis in the work by Michelle LeBaron (referred to in 3.3.1), whom like Lederach refers to the need for creativity in peacebuilding work. It also relates to the symbolic dimension of conflict according to Schirch presented in Chapter 3, and also the theory of ritual. This will be discussed in the analysis.

4.1.1 Rebuilding peaceful relationships

Santa Barbara notes restoration of trust is essential when restoring peaceful relationships in a way that allows it to reach its fullest potential in mutual benefits. Sometimes the exchange of goods and services is the first sign of approaching reconciliation, and Santa Barbara remarks sharing food and gift giving are used extensively in reconciliation. Something that can enhance the rebuilding of relationships, are joint projects of some kind, and she says:

> "A joint project, ideally with benefit to both, or to the community as a whole, provides a context for (re) establishment of friendship between individuals or groups of various sizes. This may enable reversal of the dehumanization that may have taken place in the disharmonious relationship following harmful acts" (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 36).

But at the same time, if the conflict remains unresolved at a higher political level while attempting reconciliation at a lower level, Santa Barbara notes that some claim the joint project is likely to be unsuccessful as it perpetuates it. Well- intentioned people may believe they actually do something positive about the whole situation, while it doesn't solve anything

at all, she says. This is the case for many Israeli- Palestinian projects, as artists, intellectuals, health workers, researches etc. join to build relationships and aim at reconciliation. But the conflict isn't resolved, and it remains violent. But Santa Barbara argues at least the friendships, networks and understanding built through the joint project will stand back, and this will be a starting point when a resolution eventually comes.

Reconciliation takes place in the minds of the participants (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 38), and Santa Barbara argues the shifts in cognitive structures and emotions are among the most dramatic in all human relations. The author notes it's important to be aware that the shifts are different in the perpetrator and the victim, but this won't be elaborated here.

4.1.2 Reconciliation rituals

There are several examples of how food serves as symbol of completed reconciliation in reconciliation rituals in non- western societies (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 45). Santa Barbara says that many reconciliation rituals are even finished with a meal or sharing food to symbolize completed reconciliation, and a very good example is the Arabic- Islamic ritual of reconciliation, *Sulh,* used across Arab- Islamic societies. It is a restorative justice process "which draws heavily from the Quran and other sacred scripture" (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 45). After several acts of apologizing and reconciliation, the ritual is concluded "with a shared meal hosted by the family of the offender (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 46). Some African reconciliation rituals mentioned by Santa Barbara also includes or ends with a shared meal of some kind.

In African societies reconciliation is almost entirely based on ritual (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 47), something that may reflect the role of the supernatural in the culture that becomes the mediator between the parties in need of reconciliation. In the Western world, more rational processes dominate these kinds of processes, Santa Barbara notes.

Even though there are limitations to the use of symbols and rituals in reconciliation, these are powerful tools because they derive their power from shared meanings. They are also open to depths of projected meaning, "and from their frequent linkage to belief in the supernatural" (Santa Barbara, 2012, p. 49) Santa Barbara points out.

Earlier, I've touched upon the issues of different levels and dimensions in diplomacy and peacebuilding. I will now look into how Clegg propose different kinds of reconciliation on different levels in society.

4.1.3 Clegg's typology of reconciliation:

Cecilia Clegg, professor in practical theology at the university of Edinburgh, with extensive experience from working with reconciliation in the peacebuilding field, proposes a typology of reconciliation in peacebuilding. She states that the process of making peace has to happen on different levels in in society if it's to be sustainable (Clegg, 2008, p. 81). Clegg describes reconciliation as both a process and a goal, and her typology includes four elements or levels of reconciliation: political, societal, interpersonal and personal (Clegg, 2008, p. 82).

The *political level of reconciliation* is about re- establishing order, governance and justice, and it affects all the other levels (Clegg, 2008, p. 82). Here, peace agreements are crafted and evaluated, and important to note: other types of reconciliation take place within this level. Forgiveness and repentance are not necessary in this type of reconciliation, rather apologizing or expressing regret is important, Clegg says. She also notes that "the role of ritual and memorialization are important" (Clegg, 2008, p. 83) at this level.

The second level of reconciliation Clegg describe is the *societal level*, and it "tries to establish or re- establish the possibility of people co- existing without violence in a shared space" (Clegg, 2008, p. 83) This level focuses more on relationship than the former level described, and learning people to share a formerly trialed space is in focus. A will to co- exist between the groups in conflict is absolutely necessary to achieve or work toward societal reconciliation. At this level of reconciliation Clegg says, forgiveness and repentance are not required, but they could be present.

Interpersonal reconciliation makes the third point in Clegg's typology of reconciliation. The level of relating is small group to small group, or individual-to-individual. Because this level concerns personal hurt and healing, "forgiveness and repentance are paramount" (Clegg, 2008, p. 83). Suitable grieving processes and reconciling processes are required, Clegg says, depending to some extent on the status of personal reconciliation (see the next level described).

The last level in Clegg's typology of reconciliation is about personal reconciliation. This is about a "person reconciling the parts of her/ himself that are, or have become, alienated since conception" (Clegg, 2008, p. 83). *Personal reconciliation* could include personal psychological growth and developing awareness on a personal and/ or spiritual level, Clegg says, and this level of reconciliation is impossible without forgiveness and compassion.

Clegg notes that it can be tempting to focus on the political and interpersonal level in conflict situations, but she refers to former diplomat and conflict transformation theorist Harold Saunders, whom have said that it is the citizens who can make or break the peace accords in practice (p.83). In other words, Clegg emphasizes the societal level of reconciliation as paramount.

4.1.4 Societal reconciliation

Societal reconciliation is of crucial importance in the creating and embedding of transformed relationships in post- conflict society according to Clegg, and this level is linked outwards to political reconciliation and inwards to interpersonal reconciliation. It is crucial to decrease negative reactions rooted in anger and hurt in a conflicted society, even though forgiveness and repentance is not a must on the societal level (p.84).

Trying to achieve societal reconciliation is extremely difficult. It always begin from a very low starting point, and it is the hard way to deal with conflict compared to it's opposite, different types of violence. And because reconciliation movements are small and fragile, even small setbacks can retard and destroy them (Clegg, 2008, p. 84). Then, the processes of societal reconciliation are necessary to bring all the elements of society into positive and life-giving relationships, which are characterized by openness and honesty and entail goodwill towards the 'other'. Goodwill is simply said, wishing the best for others, for their own sake, and doesn't presuppose liking or loving in the first place (Clegg, 2008, pp. 84-85).

Identity, belonging and community, are central aspects to societal reconciliation (Clegg, 2008, p. 84). The need for identity involves acknowledging and establishing a firm place to stand as individuals and as groups, "and recognizing them as who they say they are" (Clegg, 2008, p. 85). And because identity is the safe place for associating with others, it allows people to open up to the other and to perhaps letting themselves be changed the other. And the other way,

Clegg says, maybe the other can be changed as well. Further according to Clegg, in connection with others, human beings come to self- understanding and eventually to completeness. - Here lies the need for belonging that it is seen in "belonging to one another through intimate relationships, families, groups, clubs, and shared interests" (Clegg, 2008, p. 85) Human beings are in physical, intellectual, and spiritual interdependence, and this illustrates the need for community. Community in this sense is an ecological concept, according to Clegg, involving close or loose groupings (Clegg, 2008, p. 85).

One of the most difficult parts of societal reconciliation, and one of it's pre- requisite, is the will to co- existence, Clegg says. One has to shift "from thinking of 'them and us' to 'us and us' and an emotional shift to deal with the harsh realities" (Clegg, 2008, p. 85).

4.1.5 Re- negotiating identity

As one of the most important tasks when trying to achieve societal reconciliation in a given society, is re- negotiating of group identities. This is crucial if peaceful co- existence is to be obtained and sustained. In conflicts, group identities are often twisted to "what conflict-theorist Marc Gopin calls 'negative identity' " (Clegg, 2008, p. 86), which is an identity formed over against another to be a 'threatening other'. And in order to keep a stable sense of this identity, one has to continue to see and treat the other as a threat, Clegg says.

When groups are re- negotiating their identities, one of the important things is to find which parts of their group- identity that is of negative character and to let go of these. Re-negotiating identity is hard work and could include a change of position in society, Clegg says. A group that has kept an identity of victimhood in a conflicted society might see themselves as lacking both responsibility and power in society, and this leads to some kind of detachment. This group needs to find other positive aspects of their identity to be able to move on and take part in the societal reconciliation. On the other hand, a group, which has seen themselves as superior, may have challenges seeing themselves as equal to 'the other'. But even as this re- negotiating and re- balancing is painful, it is necessary (p.88).

Clegg acknowledges that re- negotiation identity is difficult for groups in any situations, and especially in conflicted societies and societies moving out of conflict. There's an "immediate history of hostility and an ever- present threat of a return to the fighting or separation" (Clegg, 2008, p. 88). Clegg highlights some elements of a potential methodology in helping groups to

re- negotiate identity in divided societies, and I will look into three of them; safe spaces, new knowledge, and new contact" (Clegg, 2008, p. 88).

It is important that facilitators in processes of re- negotiating identities provide *safe spaces* where people feel free, respected and heard. In some settings, churches can provide these safe spaces. Then, for divided societies where groups are locked in negative identity formation, there are potential sources of fuel for conflicts in all the myths and half- truths existing about 'the others' according to Clegg. Ignorance as well is a potential source of conflict. Because of this, it is important to offer *new knowledge* about the other side, and to tell their story to help to re- negotiate identity. Clegg argues, this new knowledge is not dependent on direct contact, and has many potential forms like books, movies, and stories in the news. What is crucial is a will to find out more about the other (Clegg, 2008, p. 89). The last methodological element I want to highlight is *new contact*. There's no substitute for direct contact and personal meetings, and in meeting each other personally groups on different sides of a conflict may learn new things about the others that can re-shape their identity (Clegg, 2008, p. 90).

4.1.6 Embracing a threatening other
There's a long and difficult journey from mere contact to 'embrace', Clegg says, as embracing is an intimate and vulnerable act and signifies a closer relationship or a common bond. To genuinely embrace a threatening other doesn't happen often either individually or corporately (Clegg, 2008, p. 90). Clegg has borrowed the metaphor of embracing from the Croatian theologian Miroslav Volf, and it's about choosing to act differently than to just let hostility and violence decide how to act. It is also about being open to the 'other'. This is a key process for groups and individuals, Clegg notes (Clegg, 2008, p. 91).

Because groups or communities with relatively strong and stable identities have an inner strength to reach out to the other, at least in imagination if not in reality, they are more likely to embrace a threatening other (Clegg, 2008, p. 91). Clegg lists three pre- requisites for developing a will to embrace; "empathy for the other, recognizing that others have experienced suffering to, and admitting that the community one belongs to has wronged the other" (Clegg, 2008, p. 91).

4.2 Worldview and Identity

4.2.1 Perception

Schirch compare worldview to the lenses in a pair of glasses with five different elements. Perception is the first element of the worldview lens to be presented. The psychological process of perception helps the mind find meaning by categorizing all the experiences and observations a human mind has throughout a day, according to "the patterns that are evident to the individual" (Schirch, 2005, p. 39), Schirch says. This process called perception forms the core of *worldviewing*, and it is ruled by human's biological structure.

Schirch names Immanuel Kant to be the first to articulate perceptions centrality for the human mind in the Western context. In continuance of this, later philosophic works as *The Principles of Psychology* by William James, and *Philosophy in a New Key* by Susanne Langer, describes how "humans symbolize, conceptualize, and seek meaning in experience" (Schirch, 2005, p. 39). Schirch notes that the system of perception is self- corrective, and when humans perceive something that doesn't fit with past experiences, there are mechanisms that tries to hide it, or in the most extreme cases shutting off parts of the perception process. This process is called cognitive dissonance, (Schirch, 2005, p. 40). There are two ways people maintain cognitive consistency: First, only information consistent with their way of viewing the world is filtered in, and second, the world they expect and want to experience is actively created (Schirch, 2005, p. 40), Schirch says.

On a general level, humans perceive information in a selective way, by discarding dissonant information or twisting it to make it fit the current understanding (Schirch, 2005, p. 41). When humans take in the small part of the world that only fits previous experiences, it is called tunnel vision. And Schirch says justifying existing ways of thinking and protection against change is called cognitive defense mechanisms. An idea developed by Freud, is that "people rationalize their behavior and their belief to maintain a positive self- image" (Schirch, 2005, p. 41). And Schirch explains: Telling your self why information can be disposed is the process of rationalization. Further, through the unconscious process of forgetting called repression, or the conscious process of avoiding dissonant memories called suppression, information is selectively remembered, Schirch says.

When working with conflict and reconciliation, it is important to be aware of these psychological processes mentioned above, Schirch claims. People involved in conflict often have tunnel vision about how they understand the actions by the adversary. Maybe they will ignore all the good things the 'others' do, only paying attention to the bad things they do. Or maybe they will rationalize any positive actions by their adversaries by believing that these actions are only superficial attempts to disguise their wicked nature, or that these actions are only an exception to the rule (p.41).

Schirch refers to a range of different psychological processes which can affect behaviors and relationships in conflict: Because people cognitively create the world by projecting their beliefs and values onto reality, what is first just an image in their minds, may be created. And this is the process of *projection*. In conflict, Schirch says, people can project untrustworthiness onto their enemy. And "the more distrustful people are of others, the less likely an adversary is to actually try to build trust" (Schirch, 2005, p. 41). Another psychological process is *transference*, where a thing or an individual's attributes are transferred to another thing or person. *Dehumanization* is one of the most tragic perceptual processes of creating reality, Schirch claims, and killing your neighbor in conflict is a result of extreme dehumanization, where the experience of cognitive dissonance over treating another human cruelly is non- existing. Ralph White addresses this in *Nobody Wanted War*, where he describes "how enemies with purpose often dehumanizes each other by creating diabolical or animal images of the other" (Schirch, 2005, p. 41).

Schirch goes on exploring how human biology can explain how humans react and interact. She refers to neurobiologists Laughlin, McManus, and d'Aquili whom have written extensively about how "neurological structures in the brain guide human experience in the world" (Schirch, 2005, p. 41)*, in Brain, Symbol & Experience: Toward a Neurophenomenology of Human Consciousness*. Assimilating all new experiences into existing ways of understanding the world occurs both biologically and symbolically, they say according to Schirch. And current understandings of the world are maintained in neurological structures, and "the authors suggest that worldviews are reflected in actual physical structures in the brain that become engraved in the brain" (Schirch, 2005, p. 42). And how we understand new experiences is influenced by these structures. - Instead of changing these existing patterned structures in the brain, new experiences and ideas tend to just flow through them, Schirch says.

All people use these perceptual defense mechanisms mentioned above to bring meaning and order to their everyday lives, and peacebuilders face a constant challenge to discover ways of breaking through these, Schirch emphasize.

4.2.2 Emotional and sensual cognition

The emotional and sensual process of cognition is the second element in the worldview lens. Humans make sense of the world through hearing, touching, tasting and feeling it. In the West, Schirch says, most of us has been raised and trained to think of body and mind as separated entities, even though all our senses function to make sense of the world. But Schirch points out that there's recently been an increase in theory about how the mind and body are intertwined, and all the body's senses are valued to a greater extent than before (Schirch, 2005, p. 42). We gather information about the world through all our bodily senses, as extensive research by experimental psychologists has shown, Schirch notes. Our daily lives are filled with visual and auditory symbols. A familiar smell gives you an experience in the moment, but it can also symbolize certain memories from your childhood. Seeing snow symbolizes cold weather, but it can also symbolize Christmas or skiing. Our senses are "the receptor's of information and connects images, sounds, or objects, into symbols with unique personal histories" (Schirch, 2005, p. 43).

Maturana and Varela describe how most educational processes only use two senses, hearing and seeing in the effort to transmit knowledge, but more effective teaching makes use of the whole body and all its senses (p.43). And communication in general depends on more than just one sensory vehicle. In some cases, our bodies learn more quickly than our brains. Clifford Geertz points out, "A child counts on his fingers before he counts in his head; he feels love on his skin before he feels it in his heart" (Schirch, 2005, p. 43). We simply learn by doing, not thinking.

With the argument that emotions cloud reasonable thinking, rationalists discount the value of emotions, Schirch says. But emotions are crucial to being able to making sense of the world. Emotions should never be separated from a process of self- knowing because it set a context for reason and knowing, Schirch points out (p.43). Through physical or sensual interactions with the world, humans learn about it. First, Schirch says, emotions gain our attention and

make us aware of a certain experience, where the intensity of the feeling indicates the importance the experience has for our lives. But in continuance of this these feelings are demonstrated and communicated for others. Schirch notes that "emotions are physiological responses that work interdependently with other cognitive processes" (Schirch, 2005, p. 43), and these physiological responses are expressed through physical tension, crying or laughter. When expressing an intense feeling of pain or loss through crying, it symbolizes the emotion itself, Schirch says, but it also connects symbolically with all the past expressions of crying. Action speaks louder than words, and in the case of crying it effectively communicate the inner state of the one who is crying.

When people face conflict, Schirch notes, they react by perspiring, blood rushes to the head, and their hearts beat faster. This reflects how conflict is both an emotional and a sensual experience. Former emotional and sensual experiences with conflict shape how people understand current and future conflicts, and it also shapes how they choose to respond to new conflict, Schirch adds. Because humans by nature are both emotional and sensual, Schirch claims peacebuilding- activities should engage people by addressing "the full range of ways humans know and make sense of their world" (Schirch, 2005, p. 44). And Schirch emphasizes that activities like dancing, sports, taking walks outside, visiting places, and eating together, allows people to use more of their sensual and emotional capacity in the process of building peace.

4.2.3 Culture
The third element of Schirch's worldview- lens is culture. While most theorists often use the terms culture and worldview interchangeably, Schirch refers to anthropologist Clifford Geertz whom in his classic *The Interpretation of Cultures* suggests individuals have their unique worldviews, while groups hold culture. And Schirch adds: "Culture, simply put, is the way groups of people live and make sense of their collective lives together" (Schirch, 2005, p. 44). We all know something about the world, but what we know differs because every human being has unique interactions and life experiences. Humans understand the world through systems of meaning, and these systems of meaning are cultures in all kinds of variations. And Schirch emphasize, "the world humans experience is a symbolically created world" (Schirch, 2005, p. 45).

Members of a certain culture share moral code, rules of how to behave, social structures and a common way of being.. - And the unique mix of cultures a person belongs to are reflected in his or hers worldview and identity. A mix of cultures could include family, school, religion, age, sex, class, language, region etc. The several different cultural groups a person belongs to will each affect the identity and worldview lens, Schirch notes.

In addition, "cultural groups often develop a common way of understanding conflict" (Schirch, 2005, p. 45), and cultural groups can even hold a group memory of fellow experiences, both positive and negative. These events or moments in the group's history can take on a huge symbolic meaning, and become "chosen traumas" or "chosen glories" as Vamik Volkan says (Vamik Volkan quoted in Schirch, 2005, p. 45). - And according to their chosen traumas, cultural groups can mobilize and justify conflict and war.

And Schirch also notes that a certain way of addressing conflict can also be developed within a cultural group. However, theorists rooted in the material or social dimension of conflict often view culture as an obstacle to addressing conflict. In contrast, symbolic approaches to addressing conflict uses culture as a resource in peacebuilding (p.45). And Schirch adds; within different cultures, different approaches to how to handle conflict will be found. And some cultures even have rituals created to help resolve problems and conflict. Cultural resources for peace are valuable in peacebuilding work, and new rituals and symbolic acts may even be developed, building upon important symbols, metaphors and myths within the specific culture (p.46). The skills peacebuilders have developed in the wider field are also important, but Schirch recommends peacebuilders should encourage and build upon local cultural knowledge as well.

4.2.4 Values

In addition to holding different cultures, an individual holds certain values. And values are the fourth element of the worldview lens. Values are related to the cultural groups, but it's not the same matter. Within different cultural groups, different values will dominate, so every individual have to choose which values to live their life by, because they are members of different groups. Schirch describes values' role in a simple and good way; "values are the most important meanings or principles that guide individual choices in life" (Schirch, 2005, p. 46). - And the core values an individual holds, as what the most important in life is, religion,

how do spend time and money, and so on, are shaped by the values one lives by. And Schirch says the cultural groups a person spend most time with, will probably shape your values and behavior. (Schirch, 2005, p. 47) And in the case of conflict, two different persons will behave and understand the situation differently, shaped by their differing values.

Even though some address the issue of values in peacebuilding, it isn't discussed in depth. And Schirch even claims that "rational and relational approaches to conflict overlook underlying value differences between people in conflict" (Schirch, 2005, p. 47), and differences in values will not be addressed or revealed by principled negotiation and communications techniques. Schirch refers to Jane Docherty, whom in *When People bring their Gods to the Table*, suggests peacebuilding processes should be designed to clarify the values participants bring to the mediation table; the values which without a word direct how people make decisions.

According to Schirch, the value framework of most peacebuilding practitioners and conflict theorists favors the protection of human rights and needs. And she notes that what is also important to remember is that each peacebuilder brings his or hers values, which affects the choice of peacebuilding process, either it be radical approaches as nonviolent direct action to more conservative efforts at dialogue. In addition, peoples underlying motivations in conflict are often concealed by an emphasis on the skills of peacebuilding and the analysis of conflict (p.47).

4.2.5 Identity
The final element of worldview Schirch discuss is identity, which is closely related to culture in particularly, but also the other elements of worldview. Through how we live our life, behave, and clothe ourselves, we define ourselves and tell others; this is who I am. And based on the social or cultural groups that influence and shape us, Schirch says, we define ourselves. - And to understand one component of our identity, we must look at all the components and the interaction between them (Schirch, 2005, p. 48). If someone is defined as "white", we don't really know much about that person. The picture will change if we in addition get to know that this person is a man, 45 years old, a father, middle class, well educated, professional, and English. But still these characteristics only define a small part of this person, Schirch says. And because most of us move between different cultural groups, how we

behave and define ourselves will shift from context to context. And as pointed out by identity theorist Kenneth Gergen, Schirch says; in different contexts, "individuals will experience a unique sense of themselves in the different contexts in which they interact" (Schirch, 2005, p. 48). Each of the cultural groups we belong to gives us a set of cultural values and experiences that shapes our unique worldview, Schirch says, but at the same time, each of our identities is an identity in and of itself. If we return to the "man" mentioned earlier his identity as a father is different from his identity as a professional, and at the same time they influence each other and the man's worldview.

The dynamics of conflict are influenced in different ways by the need for a sense of identity. An Schirch points to Terrel Northrup, and argues, "many conflicts become stuck on identity" (Schirch, 2005, p. 48). And when identity needs and dynamics aren't addressed properly when dealing with the material dimension of conflict in peace settlements, Schirch argues that the negotiations are dubious to succeed. And Schirch also refers to Tajfel and Turner, whom within the field of social psychology, have developed a *social identity theory* to explain how people favor groups they belong to and discriminate the others in order to increase their self-esteem (p.48). Similar theories are developed by Coser and Volkan, Schirch says, whom argues that an ongoing denigration at some level of an *other* is required to keeping one's own sense of identity. Schirch also refers to another theorist, Lewis Coser, who claims in *The Functions of Social Conflict* that conflict is essential for group life and formation and premised on the identification of an *other* and describes the benefits groups and individuals obtain from engaging in conflict. The last book Schirch refers to on the subject of identity is *Minorities at Risk,* where Ted Gurr concludes that both the differences between groups and the identities of oppressed groups become stronger in times of conflict (p.48).

Humans obtain a sense of self both through relations with different people and those who are the similar to them, Schirch notices. And when forms of identity are based on sameness, positive comparisons with others are used, like I know who I am because of a positive relationship with some other. On the other hand, negative comparisons is used when identities is based on differences, like "I know who I am by knowing who I am not" (Schirch, 2005, p. 49). Through biological (such as age, height or sex) or socially constructed distinctions (such as class, ideology or religion), people separate themselves from others.

"Forms of identity based on difference are often a source of conflict" (Schirch, 2005, p. 49), Schirch claims, or a result of the conflict in itself. - When people is led to believe that their social identity is superior to others by the psychology of ethnocentrism, they may be willing to even kill and die themselves in order to defend certain identities. In this case the differences in identity is the source of conflict. On the other hand, when conflict contributes to creating allies or "in groups" and enemies or "out groups", the differences in identity is the result of conflict. In this case conflict allows people to create simplified understandings of the world by strengthening the perceptions of who is good or who is bad, Schirch says (p.49).

Another aspect when dealing with identity and conflict, according to Schirch, is how individuals tend to identify themselves differently in nonconflict and conflict situations. People tend to define themselves broadly and according to their whole specter of identities in nonconflict situations. But when conflict occurs, the opposite happens says Schirch, and people are likely to see themselves mainly through the lenses of the particular conflict. Say, if the conflict is based on race, those involved will probably perceive them as mainly black or white. In other words, one particular identity may come to dominate all the other sources of identity if it is involved or endangered in conflict (p.49).

Schirch notes another important aspect is how an individual or a group tends to define others differently in nonconflict and conflict situations. In the case of nonconflict, people do not grade or label others according to only one social group. But when conflicts evolve, the psychological process of ascribing an identity to another person or group increases, Schirch says. - And by depriving each individual of other sources of their identity and humanity, people dehumanize each other (p.49).

According to Schirch, conflict are impacted by threats to identity, and refugees fleeing from conflict are likely to loose important symbols of their identity, as family, religious places, communities etc. And those who are victims of violence and their families may loose important perceptions of who they are, and many rape victims carry with them the identity of victimhood in many years after the crime (p.50). And because of this connection between identity and conflict, Schirch argue, "perceptions of self and others may need to be transformed in peacebuilding efforts" (Schirch, 2005, p. 50). And she suggests reaffirming or

creating new identities through rituals and symbolic actions may assist the process of healing which is crucial for reconciliation and peacebuilding.

Increasing or transforming the flexibility of how people (afflicted by serious conflict) perceive of themselves and the enemy is required for the process of rehumanizing, Schirch says. And people will gain a fuller sense of their own and their enemy's complex humanity when they become aware of their interdependence with other social groups, including shared identities with their enemies (p.50). A good example is how Israeli and Palestinian women have gone through a process of rehumanizing their sense of self and other, through meeting each other and discussing the many aspects of their lives as wives, mothers, sisters, and victims of a painful conflict that they have in common (Schirch, 2005, p. 50).

Schirch argues that since the typical, sterile, negotiation room encourages those involved to see each other solely as negotiators or members of only the identity group related to the conflict, it is difficult to facilitate change in perception of identity (p.51). But if the peacebuilders are able to create contexts where adversaries are encouraged to see themselves and others through lenses that allow a fuller definition of each other, change in perception of others is easier to accomplish.

Because "ritual and symbolic action is set apart from other social context, Schirch argue it may enable people to transform their perceptions of their own and their adversaries' identity"(Schirch, 2005, p. 51).

Schirch emphasize it is important to recognize and acknowledge the different worldviews present in conflict, and not favor one of them. Even rationalist Karl Popper acknowledges this, and says that rather than to ignore or deny worldview differences in conflict situations, people should "explicitly lay out his or her worldview to be understood by others", and to "acknowledge being captive to their worldviews" (Schirch, 2005, p. 51). In peacebuilding this means that everyone participating should share "through word, symbol, and ritual his or her own unique worldview" (Schirch, 2005, p. 52).

4.3 Transforming worldviews and identity

4.3.1 Transforming worldviews

Schirch claims ritual has the power to aid peacebuilding processes, through assisting processes of transformation of worldview, identity and relationship. Ritual can make people see the conflict with different eyes. In relation to worldview, ritual works in two ways according to Schirch, and we will see how in the following.

First, "ritual helps people make sense of the world around them to create and affirm a shared view of the world" (Schirch, 2005, p. 99). And Schirch claims that through ritual, worldviews can be formed, built and protected, as it is a socializing activity that nurtures common social values and behaviors.

Through ritual, people are connected to the values and beliefs they share, that help them understand the world. And Schirch refers to Emilie Durkheim, whom "proposed that collective beliefs and ideals are created, understood and affirmed through ritual" (Schirch, 2005, p. 100), and also Mircea Eliade, whom saw ritual "as a way of acting out the primary myths and symbols that cultures used to understand the world" (Schirch, 2005, p. 100).

Participating in rituals of different kinds offers a pause from the everyday life where dissonant information and contradictions crowds the mind. And Schirch proposes that through ritual, peacebuilders can build worldviews supportive of peace and justice, especially for children and young people whom have worldviews that change rapidly. A very good example of a public peace project is the Butterfly Garden in Sri Lanka, made "to encourage psychological healing for war- affected children and youth while promoting peaceful and tolerant cultural values in a multicultural society" (Schirch, 2005, p. 100)

Second, "when worldviews clash and conflicts erupt, ritual can give birth to new worldviews and new ways of living and solving difficult problems" (Schirch, 2005, p. 99). Ritual assist the often, painful lens- shifting process transforming worldview is, and it helps people make sense of their world during a time of transition often filled with ambiguities and paradoxes. Schirch claims, "ritual has the capacity to break through the filters and structures designed to preserve existing worldview framework" (Schirch, 2005, p. 101), and new ways of thinking can be created, even the ways human envision the world can be changed.

When new ways to give meaning to and of understanding the world should be found, ritual is critical, something Tom Faw Driver confirmes:

> "Rational political methods alone cannot bring about transformation of society from a less to a more just condition, because they cannot fuse the visionary with the actual as rituals do... Nor can ideas alone do this, for in order to bear fruit ideas require flesh- and- blood performance (Driver quoted in Schirch, 2005, p. 102)".

Schirch also mentions Victor Turner, whom suggests that meanings is circulated in rituals, like a room full of magical mirrors that "exaggerate, invert, re- from, magnify, minimize, dis-color, re- color, even deliberately falsify" (Turner quoted in Schirch, 2005, p. 103) how someone views the world. Another term used to describe how ritual can change perceptions about conflict, is that of healing metaphors.

Schirch argues a cause-effect relationship for how ritual can facilitate the shifting of worldview might be tempting, but not desirable. Schirch refers to other scholars whom even warn against what they call a simplistic equation. And she goes on: "ritual does not work in a cause- effect, consequential pattern" (Schirch, 2005, p. 103), and she refers to Ranjini Obeyesekere whom argues, "the relationship between ritual and social life is semiotic rather than consequential" (Schirch, 2005, p. 104). Schirch also makes a reference to Catherine Bell whom claims you shouldn't take a social problem to ritual for a solution, but rather create a ritualized environment that transforms, instead of solves, the problem.

And Schirch argues the goal of implementing ritual in peacebuilding is to offer a new frame in which to interpret the conflict,. And she says:

> "Ritual acts like a prism that allows people to view the world through a new lens that emphasizes relationships and a wider, more complete understanding of the nature of conflict"
> (Schirch, 2005, p. 117).

In the story about dinner diplomacy from Cyprus in chapter 3, we saw how eating and dancing together in a ritual space, helped the groups see each other in a new way. Ritual engages emotions, bodies, and senses and holds the capacity to penetrate into the symbolic core of people holding frozen and fearful attitudes.

Worldview change will foster a shift in identity and the relationship with others, and in the following I will look into this subject.

4.3.2 Transforming Identity

In this section we will see how Schirch argues that through ritual, identities can be transformed, and ritual can build, create and affirm identities. Also, in times of conflict, identities, needs to be protected or healed.

Schirch claims that it's difficult to identify conflict intervention not addressing identity, and that transformation of this matter is necessary in peacebuilding. Identity transformation includes healing identities threatened or wounded in conflict, and creating new identities. In conflict, both individual and group identity are threatened, whereas dehumanization; "the removal of the humanity of an individual or group" (Schirch, 2005, p. 125), is the worst possible outcome when people strip each other for the others sources of identities than those related to the conflict. In the case of dehumanization, the good vs. evil dominates how people understand identity, and a way of handling conflict then is to rid the world of evil, including the persons dehumanized.

When people are able to identify themselves in several different ways, they have a flexible identity, and finding shared identity with their enemy is also possible. And Schirch claims: "recognizing shared identities enables people to more effectively build peace in their communities" (Schirch, 2005, p. 126), and "people who have found shared identities with people across conflict lines are doing the most to bring about reconciliation" (Schirch, 2005, p. 126).

Another theorist who also points to the importance of establishing a shared identity between two, or several aggrieved parties in a conflict is Robert Schreiter, professor of theology with experience from reconciliation work. He says this involves an analysis of current identities, as they are narrated within the community and to those outside the community, and also adjudicating the different versions of history maintained by the different parties (Schreiter, 2008, p. 7). Schreiter says that the purpose of establishing a shared identity is to identify a common past and to provide a platform for a different future.

In ritual, a humanizing space can be found. The physical and relational situations will affect how perceptions of identity changes, which shows that identity is defined in context. And

Schirch emphasizes: "A ritual context can help people find common identities and recognize the complex identities each person holds" (Schirch, 2005, p. 126). And where conflict tries to narrow identity to one or a few aspects, ritual aims at transforming people's identity back to state where multiple cultural groups are emphasized. Schirch advises peacebuilders to construct what she calls "ritualized contexts conducive to transforming perceptions of identity" (Schirch, 2005, p. 127), and where they can see what they have in common, like the Greek and Turkish Cypriots did when eating and dancing together.

Group identities can also be formed by the use of ritual, Schirch says, and can form rituals that energizes and initiates their members. Groups also "assert themselves symbolically through creating names, dress codes, and common ways of acting" (Schirch, 2005, p. 128). When groups experience conflict, they can use public rituals to increase power and raise awareness, like the civil rights movement did in the US.

Schirch encourages peacebuilders to use both formal rites de passage and what she calls informal and improvisational "confessional performances". This can even include sharing pictures of family and children, childhood stories, and visiting the homes of each other. -And these rituals can be planned towards "transforming, creating, and healing identity" (Schirch, 2005, p. 135). In regard to assist changes in how people identify themselves and others, in order to create new, joint identities, more formal rituals and ceremonies can assist.

Schirch shares from her own research and acknowledges the challenge for those who have participated in peacebuilding workshops, rituals etc., is to make the people they come home to understand the change in perspectives they've had, and to pay it forward. Because the people they come home to, have not experienced the same.

If we learn through our bodies, emotions, and senses; Schirch argues that it is rational to assume that ritual offers a different, but fruitful pathway toward peace.

Peacebuilders can search within a cultural group if there exist ritual resources for peace, and help develop these. If basic value differences are a problem in a conflict situation, peacebuilders can help those involved recognize these and find similarities through the use of rituals. And when people's identities are central to how they percept conflict, a fruitful

peacebuilding process naturally includes ways to assist transformation of identity, Schirch says (p.52).

Another aspect I want to include towards the conclusion of this chapter is from Robert Schreiter whom uses the term *healing of memories,* which has become the accepted term for how memories must be transformed if victims are to have any future beyond remaining hostages to the past (Schreiter, 2008, p. 12). It is not about forgetting, but rather a way of dealing with the past. It's about embracing the past without being swallowed up by it, and moving from being captive to the past without abandoning it (Schreiter, 2008, p. 12). And Schreiter says:

> "The building of common memory and the quest for truth is not done in a vacuum. It occurs first in those hospitable social places where trust is built, a sense of belonging is restored, and a renewed sense of common purpose and destiny can be nurtured" (Schreiter, 2008, p. 9)

This place Schreiter talks about relates to both the place for reconciliation Lederach talks about in addition to the ritual place Schirch talks about, and I will discuss how in the analysis.

CHAPTER 5 METHODOLOGY, INTERVIEWS AND EMPIRICAL ACCOUNTS

Starting out researching theory for this thesis, I had a notion that something important may happen when adversaries eat together, but I was curious to find what really happens in, and between, the participants when friendships are formed across conflicting lines. The research question I started out with was: *In which ways can the meal serve as a place for reconciliation?* In the following sections I will give a more thorough description of the methodology briefly outlined in chapter 1.4. In continuance of this, my own unique empirical findings will be presented and sequenced by this, the empirical findings of documents analysis will be presented.

5.1 Research Method

In order to answer the research questions, the empirical material will serve as a lens for the theoretical theories and framework provided, an inductive approach to research. But at the same time, my research can be categorized as abductive; an approach to research in between inductive and deductive research.

The concept of abduction is originally Aristotelian, but was developed to an explicit theory of inference by Charles S. Pierce (Svennevig, 1997). Inference can be defined as "a conclusion reached on the basis of evidence and reasoning" (English Dictionary).

Abduction is often referred to as "Inference to the Best Explanation" (Douven, 2011), and is frequently employed in scientific reasoning. Although it is hard to accurately define abduction, it is claimed about the concept that "explanatory considerations have confirmation-theoretic import" (Douven, 2011). So, in relation to my research, I can say that in light of inference; the conclusions I will present in chapter 7 will be based on explanatory considerations between the theoretical and empirical material. My answers are not firm, but the theoretical material sheds light on the empirical accounts and vice versa.

The tools used to gather research data are semi- structured interviews and analyzing mass-media outputs relevant to the subject.

The goal of many qualitative researchers is to study the world and social events through the eyes of those being studied, and to interpret the social world from their perspective, "rather than as though those subjects were incapable of their own reflections on the social world" (Bryman, 2012, p. 399), as Bryman puts it.

The already presented theoretical material is wide and takes a large part of this thesis. But since the subject in discussion is quite new, at least the role commensality is about to obtain in diplomacy and peacebuilding- settings, it is quite necessary to establish a solid groundwork. Except from Sam Chapple-Sokol, there's no easy accessible theory on how meals can affect processes of different kinds related to peacebuilding and diplomacy. Because of this, the literature review has been an ongoing process almost until the end of the research, parallel with the empirical data collection, as is quite normal in social research (Bryman, 2012, p. 117). Through the literature review, different concepts have emerged, adding important knowledge to the prior concepts I started out with researching for this thesis (Bryman, 2012, p. 9). The most central concepts have served to form the research questions.

Two central principles of the epistemology basic of qualitative research are first, face-to-face interaction is the most fruitful way to understand and take part in the mind of another human being. Second, in order to obtain social knowledge it is necessary to take part in the mind of another human being (in sociological terms, Bryman emphasize) (Bryman, 2012, p. 399). In my research I have tried to understand what happens during meals in diplomatic/ peacebuilding setting from participants point of view, through the eyes of my three interviewees. In addition, when analyzing the written empirical material I have tried to understand the authors' perspectives and context.

It is difficult to maintain objectivity when conducting social research, and Bryman notes that the researcher's values influence the conduct of research more or less on the different stages of the research process (Bryman, 2012, p. 39). It is not possible to be value free, Bryman states, but it is important to recognize and acknowledge this, and to make sure "there is no untrammelled incursion of values in the research process and to be self- reflective and so exhibit reflexivity..." (Bryman, 2012, p. 39). Reflexivity is a wide concept, but when it is used as *methodological reflexivity*, it includes philosophical self- reflection and methodological self- consciousness (Bryman, 2012, p. 394).

Starting out writing this thesis, I had a notion that eating together provides a very good environment for negotiations. And thus, my personal values highly affected the at least early quest for theory and partly formed my interview guide. But to a certain degree, my motivation served the research in a good way as well, helping me to stay close to my quest. And

throughout the research period, my views have been balanced by the new knowledge obtained. Total objectivity is impossible in social research, and the interpretative nature of social research may be regarded as a strength rather than solely negative (Bryman, 2012, p. 380).

5.1.1 Interviewing in qualitative research

Due to its flexibility, the most convenient kind of interview for me to use was semi-structured interviewing (Bryman, 2012, p. 469). Because the subject of this thesis has not been researched to a great extent, and it was difficult to find existing literature and theories on the subject, I performed the interviews quite early in the research process. The interviews helped me along and guided me into a direction in the process of finding focal points for my thesis. Starting out with a few questions and topics I wanted to ask my three interviewees, I performed semi-structured interviews. Each interview process was different, and I tried to let the interviewees lead the conversations, picking up on their remarks and stories. Looking back, the three interviews came out very different, which is natural because their experience and stories are different. The interview guide I prepared for the interviews is presented as an appendix of the thesis.

When selecting informants, it was important that they each had relevant experience to the field of research. Due to practical reasons it was also important that the informants could be interviewed near Oslo. I recorded the interviews, and took notes in addition. The transcribing of the interviews took some time, and translating them to English prolonged this process. One of the interviewees required validating the material I ended up using from the interview, as respondent validation (Bryman, 2012, p. 391).

5.1.2 Documents and Mass-media Outputs as Sources of Data

Sources of data deriving from newspapers and magazines, or *mass-media outputs*, falls into the category of documents as sources of data according to Bryman (Bryman, 2012, p. 543). These sources are not produced for research or at the request of some researcher, and they are 'out there', as Bryman says, ready to be collected and analyzed. And off course, the documents chosen to be examined needs to be relevant for the research conduction. Mass-media outputs are often analyzed through the use of content analysis within quantitative research, but in the

case of qualitative research, these kinds of documents can be "examined so that their qualitative research is preserved" (Bryman, 2012, p. 552).

Finding these documents are often challenging Bryman says, and I agree indeed. It took a long time and a lot of research attempts to find the articles I hoped for. And I believe it took so long because with small margins I 'googled' the wrong words or themes. Because of the novelty of research on the theme of commensality in the spheres of international relations, peacebuilding, diplomacy, it was hard to find relevant documents. But with a small adjustment in what I searched for as was proposed by my supervisor, hundreds of articles concerning food and commensality within peacebuilding related settings became available. And a new world opened up to me; the world of *culinary diplomacy*, as proposed by Sam Chapple-Sokol. Finding the articles which will be referred to later in this chapter came to be a turning point in my data collection.

Some of the challenges with articles documents on the Internet are unclear authorship of articles and credibility (Bryman, 2012, p. 553). I ended up using articles whit clear authorship and which concerned relevant themes presented in my theoretical framework.

When it comes to interpretation and analyzing of documents; Bryman lists qualitative content analysis, semiotics, critical discourse analysis, and hermeneutics, as possible approaches (Bryman, 2012, p. 557). The most useful approach for me was that of qualitative content analysis, where I searched for underlying themes in existing written material relevant to shed light on my theoretical material.

5.1.3 Research Criteria - Reliability and Validity
In order to secure quality in social research, validity and reliability is crucial criteria (Bryman, 2012, pp. 389-390). Throughout this thesis, the *internal validity* is confirmed because my observations as a researcher through the interviews and the written empirical material, is balanced and checked by the theoretical framework and vice versa.

The *external validity* in general refers to if findings in a study can be generalized (Bryman, 2012, p. 390). Normally, this is difficult for qualitative researchers as the nature of the research goes in depth rather than focusing on numbers or measurement to the relevant group.

But where quantitative research provides findings easy to generalize, qualitative research can offer a deeper *contextual understanding* of values, beliefs, behavior etc. (Bryman, 2012, p. 408). Then, to ensure an external validity in this thesis, a deeper contextual understanding is aimed at through analyzing and discussing if and how the meal can serve as a place of ritual in peacebuilding and reconciliation work, through the unique empirical findings in the interviews.

Would it be possible to arrive at my conclusion in a similar study? This question leads us to reliability, the last research criterion we will look at, and which normally refers to if a study is replicable. Bryman acknowledges that this is a difficult criterion to meet in qualitative research, because "it is impossible to freeze a social setting and the circumstances of an initial study to make it replicable..." (Bryman, 2012, p. 390). In my case however, the setting of meals described by my interviewees are probably in some ways similar to settings in other peacebuilding- processes, as it includes adversaries eating together. And eating is an act, which is done repeatedly in all peacebuilding, negotiations and other diplomatic settings. Thus, in some ways I can argue that it would be possible to arrive at a similar conclusion in another study.

5.2 Presentation of the Empirical Findings in the Interviews

In this section I will first present the three interviewees, before I outline the data they provided thematically sectioned. This means that I will move between their 'voices', and not present each interview as a whole.

5.2.1 Presentation of the interviewees

Atle Sommerfeldt (born 22 November 1951) is bishop of Borg since January 2012. In the 70s he became engaged in the social ethical movement in the Church of Norway, leading him to engagement in the Church of Norway Council of Ecumenical and International Relations. From 1989 he served as an assisting General Secretary of the Botswana Christian Council. In 1993 he became the General secretary of the Church of Norway Council of Ecumenical and International Relations, and from 1994- 2011 he served as the General Secretary of the Norwegian Church Aid (KN).

Erik Solheim (born 18 January) is chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) since December 2012. He is also former Minister of Environment & International Development, Norway. He has long experience as a politician for the Socialist Left Party in Norway, leading the Party from 1987 - 1997, and as a Member of Parliament from 1989 - 2001. He has long diplomatic experience from working in the Norwegian delegation trying to resolve the Sri Lankan civil war, before the conflict escalated once more in 2006.

Petter Skauen (born 11 September 1944) has extended experience from peace and reconciliation work through the Norwegian Church Aid. From 1972- 1978 he worked with human aid in Ecuador, and from 1978- 1999 he was engaged in Guatemala, playing an important part in the peace treaty signed in Oslo 1996. From 1999 the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in collaboration with the Norwegian Church Aid has engaged him in peace and reconciliation work in Haiti and The Dominican Republic.

My three interviewees each bring different perspectives to my research. Erik Solheim has experience from a top level in peacebuilding, participating in formal diplomatic negotiations on behalf of the Norwegian government. Atle Sommerfeldt doesn't have quite the same experience concerning direct peacebuilding, but he offers interesting perspectives based on his experience from leading a NGO, the Norwegian Church Aid, which is involved in peacebuilding. Compared to Erik Solheim he offers perspectives from another side in peacebuilding, and some of these perspectives include seeing the challenges of both the upper and lower levels of peacebuilding, and the interactions of these. Petter Skauen also represents the Norwegian Church Aid, but he offers perspectives from both a high and a lower level of peacebuilding as some of his experience includes being engaged direct peacebuilding and in actual processes of reconciliation of former enemies.

5.2.2 The interviews
My three interviewees each offered different perspectives, and I've divided the different answers and reflections into seven categories. First, we will look slightly at some reflections concerning different levels and actors of peacebuilding and the need for settlement and reconciliation. Then we will look into structured unstructured meals, meals in different settings, and in continuance of this the practical challenges when planning and hosting meals in a peacebuilding and negotiation setting. Finally we will see how food can bring back

memories, and how sharing a meal can contribute to a change of ambience and humanizing of the 'other', or the enemy.

Eating together follows all peacebuilding work and traditional diplomacy settings because of this simple fact that everyone needs to eat. Erik Solheim says -" In all cultures, all places on earth, in all development, from the hunter- gatherer society until this day, the meal is the most central arena for conversation, contact, without doubt." But, he adds, - "at the same time, very few have thought very conscious/specific of this matter, and I think it pops up in peacebuilding without a lot of reflection." Before we look further into my interviewee's reflections on meals in peacebuilding, we will briefly look into some remarks on peacebuilding and actors on different levels.

5.2.2.1 Different levels and actors in peacebuilding

The dynamic between states and independent actors like NGOs in peacebuilding is important and Atle Sommerfeldt had some interesting remarks concerning this. During the 90s KN was partly an independent actor in the Guatemala- process while the UN was officially in charge. KN was responsible for making the participants attend the actual negotiations, keeping them there, and testing out the texts written. Sommerfeldt remarked that as a NGO, KN did not have any power when involved in conflict and negotiations and they only played a facilitating role. It was important that those who were in power to make decisions actually participated, like the UN officially was in charge in the Guatemala process. NGOs naturally play a more neutral role than an official actor or state in negotiations, and Sommerfeldt emphasized that this balance of a neutral facilitator and official decision maker is extremely important in processes like the Guatemala process. But during the late 90s, the dynamics changed in Norway.

When Hilde Frafjord Johnson first served as a Minister of International Development from 1997 to 2000, she changed the system, making the Department of Foreign Affairs take over most of the responsibility, leaving KN less independent. Erik Solheim, who took over her post in 2005, continued this new regime. And Sommerfeldt continues; "One very good example this is the Sudan process which was one of our biggest projects at the time. We had made a five- year plan/ perspective, and Halvor Aschjem (now deceased) being one of the most experienced KN- workers, was a central part of the conversations". Aschjem had gathered many connections and knew the conflict well, and KN gave him 5 year to fulfill his plans. But

when Frafjord Johnson became minister, she wanted Aschjem to lead her work in Sudan, something he actually wished to do. And Sommerfeldt goes on; "off course, I let him take leave from his position in KN to do so, but I had to tell Frafjord Johnson that I disagreed with her decision. Because what you're really doing now, is ruining KN's long built up capacity..." - We no longer had the opportunity to function parallel in the system. Until now, we could tell the actors that we ran the negotiations and decided our self whom to talk to, but now this possibility was reduced to a great extent. He believes Erik Solheim ran the Sri Lankan process from the Norwegian Department of Foreign Affairs, but it's hard to tell if these peace negotiations would have ended differently in other circumstances. The Sudan process ended well, but they didn't have the same independence anymore, he resumes.

The Department of Foreign Affairs has taken over much, leaving independent actors and organizations less independent. And Sommerfeldt emphasizes this, saying; "peace processes need independent actors and I think something was lost in the Norwegian model when the department of Foreign Affairs took one step to much". - At the same time, Sommerfeldt continues; "KNs role was a supplement in the Sudan process, but we gained legitimacy and significance through having the same actors and the fact that we used this all the way into the formal process.

And Sommerfeldt notices that one of the most interesting things with the whole Guatemala process is that Petter Skauen established good relations to the Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation. This led to the use of churches and services as an arena for reconciliation and even Communion as a natural tool in the process. Sommerfeldt tells that he participated in a service like his one- year after the peace treaty was signed, and he says "it was a strong and moving experience with generals, guerrilla representants and widows praying Our Father in unison and singing hymns". And he said that the fellowship of the meal in the Communion includes the elements of humanization of the other, but also human failure and transparency to each other. And sharing Communion also gives responsibility to act and change afterwards. Both accept, truth and sin leads way to a process of reconciliation and conflict resolution. From this it is easy to assume that for Skauen while being an independent actor, it was easy to connect with local and worldwide independent actors like the local church in Gutemala and the Lutheran World Federation. It would probably have been more difficult for an official actor to make use of churches and communion.

Top- level negotiations are naturally the most important when trying to resolve conflict and establish peace. But because I believe it's important to include other levels as well I asked Solheim if good relations obtained at top- level negotiations could be transferred to other levels in society. His response was that "we should not forget that war is one of the most centralized of all human action, groups of people never spontaneously attack each other".
- The violence is always directed from above, or at least accepted by politicians and generals. If people fear getting into trouble if acting out violence, in most cases they won't do it. They only do it if they're told that they freely can do it, and won't be imprisoned. And Solheim continues; "creating peace between the most central actors, presidents, prime ministers and generals is the most important. To create peace from the top and down and not vice versa is the most most central". He added that it off course get's hard to maintain peace if the people doesn't support the politicians or generals. But he emphasized top- level negotiations as the most important in order to stop violence and killings, and save human lives. Arguably, his opinion isn't necessarily in conflict with Sommerfeldts thoughts on the dynamics between official and independent actors in peace negotiations. But from my point of view, Sommerfeldt and Solheim represent two different kinds of actors in peacebuilding with different experiences.

5.2.2.2 The need for settlement and reconciliation

When I interviewed Petter Skauen we talked about to what degree reconciliation is emphasized in peacebuilding. His immediate response was that "if there's a main theme to describe my time in peace and reconciliation work, it is reconciliation. Earlier, it was a word you only heard in church around Easter. But today reconciliation is a concept in all parts of society...". And he goes on: " In the process of war and conflict, the road to reconciliation is long. It's not just to draw a line and say 'let's turn the leaf and start over'. Repentance is not the same as a resolution. Many of these steps towards reconciliation and a fresh start is repentance, forgiveness, fault, punishment; all of these things which are founded in the Bible as well." And Skauen tells about the widows in Guatemala and East- Timor whom had the same need to know to rise again. "They needed to know the truth or as much of it possible to bear, in order to move on with their lives". And "...both victim and transgressor are in need of some kind of reconciliation". And Skauen mentions how in South Africa where a specific model was used to help reveal the truth, and in Argentina where two different governments didn't manage to give the mothers on the May Square a final settlement. Some of them still

frequent the May Square in search of answers, and they're paralyzed until they get to know the truth. In other words, a settlement/ resolution is important to obtain.

Skauen notices that "the Guatemala- process is one of the peace processes that have kept, and reconciliation was a major topic. The current president, general Otto Pèrez Molina was one of the four which negotiated the peace treaty". - He has been wise enough to keep some of his former enemies as advisers, and trusts them., and Molina crossed over the bad past knowing they haven't done each other something personally and valuing their education and wisdom. And Skauen emphasizes, "trust is a key word in all kinds of peacebuilding". - Without trust a meal looses its potential. But on the other hand, the meal can help create this trust. "Trust- enhancing work is important, and a walk through a snow storm in Oslo creates trust, a fishing trip, a trip with snow scooter with militaries on Heistadmoen in full winter clothing when the participants never have seen snow in their entire lives..."And Skauen continues: "And this is not on top level seen from a diplomatic point of view, but the Heads of state needs to be there. And the most important is for the victims to name cases for the negotiation table". - If not, there's a chance transgressors will negotiate easy solutions free from punishment, court and walk straight into political positions with the result of reconciliation breaking apart.

And Skauen says: "In Guatemala there are more than 250 000 widows and persons whom has experienced the cruelest things..., ...and the families are just to keep on with their lives, not knowing what happened and not experiencing justice. - Reconciliation takes a long time, and "the stories should be listened to a hundred times if necessary". There should also be a balance between punishment, forgiveness, and 'crossing over', Skauen says. -But it has to grow out naturally as between Trinidad and the military man (story in 5.2.2.7). - Skauen remembers one widow in Guatemala in particular, who had been mute because of fear for three months. He tried to ask here what she wanted for herself, and after some time she gave her first smile in a long time and said that she wanted a dress with a zip in the back, as simple as that. "All these small things are important in reconciliation work", Skauen says, "and you can say that the court in Hague is important as well, there will always be assessment concerning the level of punishment...".
We've seen here that Skauen agrees with Solheim that peace should be resolved between heads of state and actors of power. But he also emphasizes that victims should be included in the process, or at least be given a possibility to tell their story.

5.2.2.3 Unstructured vs. structured meal

Atle Sommerfeldt pointed out that the meal in peace and reconciliation work has been used in two different ways, the meal and the structured meal. He remembers one specific situation from his time in Botswana, when the current archbishop Walter Makhulu opened his home to everyone. He was a black South African, and one of the leaders in the fight against apartheid. He once met a white Rhodesian woman on the road in Gaborone, a street between Zimbabwe and South Africa, just after Zimbabwe's independence. This woman was on her way to South Africa, and appeared to be very confused. So Makhulu invited her home. Whether or not they ate together, we don't know. But Sommerfeldt's point is that a meal doesn't always include food, but something to drink may also provide a suitable setting for a meeting and conversation. Archbishop Makhulu communicated this in how he invited people home, for unstructured meals.

"The other way to do meals", Sommerfeldt says, " is the structured type of meal which has been an important part of the peace work and processes KN has taken part in, where formal and informal meals attached to the conversations all the way". There have been big events with many invited, including speeches and other formalities or program. But maybe more important are those intentional meals who were part of conversations lasting several days. And when you stay at one place several days, a room is created for a different focus. This way we could say that the meal is something everyone are familiar with, even though food habits differ. But still, it's something everyone does, everyone needs to eat and everyone has the experience of eating together with someone. And in some situation this makes it easier to group people when eating. "There's a humanization of relations that happens during a meal", Sommerfeldt says. And he goes on: - "I've been to many formal dinners taking place in war and conflict negotiations, giving a speech as the leader of KN, sign invitations or just be there during informal meals and meetings. This gave those who actually work with the negotiations room to focus on their tasks". When Sommerfeldt's participated it underlined the importance of the conversations or the negotiations as the leader KN.

5.2.2.4 Meals in different settings

Now, after talking about unstructured and structured meals, we have to look on the different settings where meals in peacebuilding take place. We will see that some settings make it easier to get personal and build relationship.

The culture within a formal diplomatic setting can differ from country to country. Solheim said that "in Sri Lanka, you mingle before dinner with drinks, and then you eat very quickly afterwards. In other countries, you it's the opposite way. - It is important to adjust and not force people into Norwegian traditions. When seated, there are a lot of different people around you and people are seated according to rank, and "sometimes it's easier to speak one to one or in smaller groups after the dinner", he continues. When hosting a diplomatic dinner, you can't place the adviser higher than the minister or politician, even though the adviser is the key person to talk to". And Solheim goes on: "because official dinners often are stiff and formalized, it's even more important to invite people home or host more informal meetings. Then you can discuss what you really want to, not only what and who which are etiquette. Some people are extremely aware of their status, and will get insulted if they feel overlooked".

How long a meal last, how many different dishes that is served, and what to drink varies from culture to culture. But in general, when people share good food, Solheim reckons the ambience will rise. And if there are several dishes to choose from, it gives people opportunity to eat something they actually like.

And Solheim tells of when a Sri Lankan delegation came to visit, and he tells: "The first night of three, we dined at Statholder- gården, a well-known restaurant in Oslo. It was a disaster, and the Sri Lankans didn't like anything at all. The second night, we visited Dinner, a well-known Chinese restaurant in Oslo, and the food suited them a little bit better. The third night, we took them to Bombay Brasserie that served Indian food, and they were thrilled. They were happy, and the costs were lower to us". - Leaving a restaurant with a happy group that has eaten well gave another feeling than leaving Statholder- gården with low spirits. Solheim also thinks that those who have travelled a bit are often more interested and exited when they're introduced to new kinds of food, but those who have stayed in one place their whole life will probably feel insecure in the same situation.

 On my question of whether or not its a difference between eating in an official setting in comparison to in a more private setting, or in someone's home, Solheim says: " Yes, even though official meals have its place. If you can invite people home it will just be positive. Again, there are exceptions and people who think its gets to intimate... ... but 95% of all those

I've invited home, I think have reckoned it to be a mark of respect... ... and a sign that you like them and respect them, that you like people", Solheim says.

Solheim once invited the most well known Japanese diplomat ever home to his apartment in Oslo. And every time he's met him since, this Japanese have talked about it. The Japanese diplomat "even wrote an epistle in a Japanese newspaper about how he saw Solheim himself with his son walking home with fresh croissants bought from the local bakery for the visit". By inviting him home, Solheim made a grand impression. And when inviting people home, "it's just as important to think of what to serve to make a good atmosphere", Solheim says. Making people feel at home is the best, and knowing what they prefer when it comes to food helps a great deal.

Norwegian politicians and diplomats don't invite people home to a great extent, something Solheim thinks that is because servant ship is unusual. But he emphasizes that it should absolutely be taken advantage of more. - What is certain, when you're invited home to someone, you'll sure get to know this person better. Even if they have servants and you won't make dinner together, there are many natural topics to discuss as family pictures on the walls, art and other interests their home reveals.

5.2.2.5 Practical challenges

When arranging and hosting meals in a peacebuilding setting, a whole lot of practical challenges may occur. In the section above we looked at the setting for meals and some of the challenges attached to it. Here we will look at the cultural and religious side of it. The host of the negotiations may have a different background than the participants, and there's religious rules concerning food, cultural and personal preferences to take regard of. When being irrespective of these differences it may cause problems and even conflict. In some cases when being aware of these differences, it may provide interesting topics for further discussions, and sometimes even humor.

Sommerfeldt emphasizes that when you prepare a meal you always have to relate to the other ones relationship to food, and it's one of the less dangerous ways to get close to the other. - When Ethiopia and Eritrea started their war, KN wondered how to interact. And Sommerfeldt said: "We chose to make a meeting point between the religious leaders of the two countries. And we succeeded in establishing an arena where orthodox, protestants, catholic and Islamic

leaders on both sides met. And we, as organizers had to keep control in which ones who ate what or not and which ones whom fasted".

The need of religious awareness will of course vary in diplomatic settings. But respecting cultural preferences is important as well. Solheim says: "Some likes everything, but it's desirable to avoid unnecessary irritations by serving food everyone likes".

There are many filters between people who meet each other, and this is maybe more evident in a peacebuilding setting than anywhere else, Solheim relfects. -The actors may not like each other on a personal level and maybe they don't speak the same language or have the same beliefs, and they may have a long history of seeing each other as enemies. On top of all of this, if you push them into eating food they dislike you push them even further apart from each other and yourself. Food is important to people, and it may help create a strong relationship, but it can also create further distance. As part of the negotiations in Sri Lanka, Erik Solheim believed the meals would help getting the parties to closer understanding through fellow meals as the Tamil Tigers have used every day the past 30 years figuring out how to fight the Government. Direct instruction of what to do would do more harm than anything, but eating together was always a good way to make people understand each other better. At the same time it's important to remember that the meal can create problems as well, and not everyone are interested in tasting new kinds of food. Some only wants to eat food they're familiar with. The Tamils wanted to eat their rice and curry, and in order to get to know them we had to eat their kind of food. If not we would just hinder good communication.

Skauen emphasizes that food is an essential in peace negotiations, off course; "everyone needs to eat. The food will always be discussed and often remembered. And among those peace negotiations- participants I've reunited with later, the strongest memories are connected to food". On my question on whether or not Skauen had experienced anyone refusing to eat, he told about a few Guatemalans during the negotiations at Holmenkollen who didn't want to eat salmon. During one of the stays at Holmenkollen, the chefs and waiters ended up being referred to the 'salmon guerrilla', because they served salmon in all kinds of versions. - It ended up being a funny thing everyone laughed at. This is a very good example of how a potential conflict ended up being a source of humor instead.
What's to eat was always a topic of discussion during the Guatemala- negotiations, Skauen remembers. - Where to eat, what to eat, how to eat it, can I eat it, will it kill me etc. The meals

during negotiations are an immensely huge source of discussions, Skauen says, and humor and laughter when what's served is on the more exotic side.

Unlike Erik Solheim, Petter Skauen has good experiences of bringing people to restaurants serving traditional Norwegian food. - It is a good opportunity to tell stories about Norway and introduce Norwegian democracy in a modest way. The department of Foreign Affairs also uses many of the traditional and well-known restaurants frequently. But on the other hand, Skauen admits that the most fun restaurants are to attend are Indian, Thai and Japanese. This kind of spiced food is closer to what their familiar with. - Even though many of them are fascinated by the Norwegian food.

5.2.2.6 When food brings back memories
Maybe the best way to make people feel at home is by serving food that brings back memories, smells and a taste of their home country and childhood.
When Skauen hosted peace negotiations between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, they brought the participants to Kristiansund in Norway because a well- known producer called Lossius in this city exports 'klippfisk' to Port au Prince and Santa Domingo. The participants remembered their mothers going to the market bringing back fish from Norway. "And now we visited the factory and observed how they packed and shipped the fish, then we went to a restaurant and ate Bacalao together. And we were told childhoods stories of childhood, the two bacalao- cultures different from each other. The Haitian cuisine is influenced by the French cuisine, and the Dominican cuisine influenced by the Spanish cuisine. It was a night filled with Bacalao that brought the participants together". And what's interesting, Skauen notices, is that when the conflicting sides gave thanks to each other that night, one of the politicians giving thanks, talked about bacalao and memories of how his grandmother called him in every night to eat supper and take his 'aceite de bacalao', fish oil for the sake of health benefits. And Skauen continues: "This emphasizes that the meal isn't only important in it self, but everything that surrounds it is as well matters". - A group of singing people coming to entertain during negotiations will certainly produce mixed feelings among the participants. "But the meal and the food in comparison is a common need and a non- discussable, everyone is hungry and in need of food", Skauen concludes.

Skauen also notes that something he and his co- workers often notices is that the closer one gets to the home- cuisine of the participants, the more success. Nothing else gets people more thankful than providing the familiar food they love most. They like to taste new and interesting food, but eating their own kind a food touches their hearts. "Sometimes", Skauen says, "I brought beans from Guatemala and served the participants, showing them the can to verify that it was true Guatemalan beans. This communicates our concern and interest for them, and makes them feel welcome".

5.2.2.7 Meals contributing to change of ambience and humanizing of the other
Now we've reached one of the most important and interesting sides of eating together. While seated together and eating, a room is opened where it is possible to build relationship, connect as fellow human beings. And though challenging, this is possible even when conflicting parties in peacebuilding sit down together. Already when we looked into Unstructured vs. Structured meals (5.2.2.3.), we saw that Sommerfeldt mentioned how your enemy can be humanized through the fellowship of eating together. Now we will look into my three interviewee's experiences of this.

Sommerfeldt has some thoughts on how the meal can contribute to change: When people eat together, "the personal communication actually means something", so when using the meals, a personal and a systemic understanding of how to change society meets. And it is interesting how the meals help create new personal relations between actors of power". But he points out that the weakness of the meal as a tool for reconciliation appear if those who participate in meals that contribute to reconciliation in a given negotiation do not necessarily bring this back to those who didn't participate in the meals and their society where the peacebuilding and negotiations have to continue.

Even though the meal has not been given much systematically attention in peacebuilding work, Petter Skauen is one of those who have used it to a great extent. The first time the conflicting sides in Guatamala came to Oslo to start conversations in it was on the initiative of KN, and Skauen tells: "The Army and the Guerrilla had each sent 4 representatives... , ...and the aim of this first gathering was to make a plan or a roadmap towards peace. The conflicting parties lived in different hotels, and were supposed to spend only a few hours together each day". The tension- level was extremely high, and in this situation, the negotiating setting and

the restaurants mattered a great deal, because good food in a good environment helped everyone relax, loosen up and feel secure. The meals were gathering in contrast to the negotiations, because meals "creates and build community, and they make enemy perceptions diminish, because (through the meal) we have a fellow experience of something, and something to talk about, something cultural", Skauen resumes.

In a setting otherwise filled with tension, the participants share an experience that naturally provides subjects to discuss around the table and later on. A meal has many elements, and Skauen goes on: -" You're hungry and wonder what's to eat, the chefs comes and tells what is being served, maybe it's something mysterious as 'Lutefisk', and everyone's excited. All the elements about the meal could provide topics for discussion for a long time. To find good subjects to discuss is challenging when the time table otherwise is filled with negotiations, problems, possible solutions. But eating together provides good breaks".

Skauen also notices that in many countries in Latin America, the Christian Communion and supper is called the same thing, "la comida", which phonetically gives the act of eating together a holy dimension.

Erik Solheim experienced the matter of meals a little bit different when he was involved in the peace negotiations in Sri Lanka. He says that "as a third part in the Sri Lankan process we were eager to include fellow meals because it is a unique meeting point, but the conflicting parties wished to avoid it fearing it would create to good an ambience amongst the negotiators in contrast to the high scale conflict right on the outside". They tried to avoid having photos taken, something that could have given a misgiving impression that the negotiators were a happy group of people while people outside risked their life. -" The Tamil Tigers were eager to dine with me and the Norwegian delegation", says Solheim, "and it was mainly because of this I got to know the main Tamil negotiation, Anton Balasingham, but they wished to avoid including the Singhalese government and their delegation of negotiators". The Singhalese government desired joined meals to a greater extent than the Tigers, because they believed it would help create a better ambience. So even when joined meals are preferable to some, not all sides involved in peacebuilding may agree.

When eating together, it is possible to talk about other things than conflict and painful subjects, and even laughing together. Even though it was difficult to arrange fellow meals with the Tamil Tigers and the Singhalese government, Solheim tells of important meals alone with one of the conflicting parties. When I asked Solheim if there were any meals that he

remembered better than others, he replied that when he worked in Sri Lanka, he had lunch with the Tamil Tigers every week or at least every 14th day. They always ate strong Chinese food or Indian food with white wine, and they always ate with the Tamil head negotiator, Balasingham. He didn't eat Norwegian food, and he preferred eating with his hands, Solheim says. " -The spirits always got high, and a trust between us grew that could never have been created in another setting. First, we had a meeting, and then we ate and talked about everything else." As a mediator, building trust with each of the sides in a conflict is important, and we see that eating together was an important tool for Solheim in Sri Lanka.

A good ambience doesn't always come naturally only because there's good or interesting food, and sometimes the meals attendants may dislike the food. This makes it crucial to get a good conversation in order to obtain and maintain a good ambience when eating together with people you hardly know or have a challenging relationship to. Normally a meal takes a certain time, and it is important to facilitate a good environment for everyone. Erik Solheims tells from the time a Norwegian delegation was in China meeting one of the top leaders of the Chinese Communist Party. They were seated around a round table, as is custom in China, and were served small Chinese dishes to share. The conversation was formal and slow until Solheim asked the Chinese leader about Chinese history, and it was like a light was practically lit in him. "If you're interested in and know a little bit about the people you're going to meet, the chance for a loosening up the ambience is much higher in stead of fumbling around after interests. The more you know about another person, the easier it is to get a good connection. Find what the other is interested in, and bring it to a personal level. We're all humans when it gets to the point", Solheim says. "And when it comes to planning and finding interesting subjects to discuss during meals, Norwegians are often very bad at this", Solheim concludes. And even though this is not directly related to peacebuilding, rather diplomatic relations, it illustrates the complexity and challenges connected to meals in a bi- or multicultural setting.

Some stories more than others emphasize the need for reconciliation. "The easy solutions are nearly impossible, because simply regretting isn't enough", Skauen says, and he told me about two militaries he brought along in his work in Guatemala. One of them always had a contest during the conflict in his troop of who was able to kick an Indian-lady to faint or death in the least amount of kicks. He always won because he was big and strong. And when this military was to meet up with one of the widowers, he was very nervous. But this lady he met, a small

woman called Trinidad, whom had killed her own children in order to keep all who where hiding safe, said to him: "Don't be afraid, because I have forgiven you. I haven't forgiven what you did, but I have forgiven you". And Skauen tells that because he was forgiven, this military was now able to move on with his life. "Regret and forgiveness doesn't come easy, they are processes, they request many conversations and a long time, and they cannot be forced through". Skauen thinks that in these settings eating together and sharing meals, both as small breaks in the negotiations and tool, strengthens relationships on the long way towards reconciliation.

The Communion in the Christian church is a worldwide ritual and a meal, even though you don't eat much. Skauen tells that part of the peacebuilding work in Guatemala City were church services, which were used as a tool for reconciliation. Petter shared some strong memories from a particular service where all the parties involved in the negotiations and peacebuilding process attended, and Oslo Gospel Choir participated as well. Victims and transgressors were at the same service, and about 90 % took Communion. After the Communion, everyone was to hold hands and say 'may Gods peace be with you' to each other. One of the officers participating in this Communion told Skauen later that he didn't know what to do in that situation. During the conflict he had participated in many of the massacres, and in the service he ended up next to the leader of the widower organization, Ninnette Montenegro. She first withdrew her hand, as the officer held his hand towards her. But during the song they sang she held her hand towards him, and Skauen says that the officer had told him later that he felt forgiven because she gave him her hand. And Skauen goes on: "This was part of the Communion. The meal is shared in the Communion, and also after negotiations one day. And it is some kind of forgiveness, we're dependent of each other, we need everyone to succeed... Most of the difficult questions are addressed during meals..." And because of this, it is important to plan the meals well, whether or not to have a buffet, what to drink and so on.

Sommerfeldt remarked that unity can be created between the present actors through a meal, but the challenge is how to bring this unity back to their societies. And Sommerfeldt underlines that this is one of the limitations of the meal as a tool in peacebuilding. From Solheims and Skauens direct experience from peacebuilding and diplomatic work, we see that a change of ambience is possible through eating together, and where transforming of enemy- perceptions and humanizing of the other can possibly happen.

5.3 Empirical findings in existing accounts of meals related to peacebuilding

As mentioned earlier, the meal as a tool in peacebuilding and diplomacy have not been thoroughly researched. But there are some; academics, politicians, and others whom are interested and passionate about this issue. I have sorted the different initiatives into the three different levels of diplomacy and peacebuilding. The lines between diplomacy and peacebuilding are blurry here, but the most important is to recognize how eating together can be an important tool on the three different levels connected to International Relations. Top-level initiatives will be presented first, the mid-level second, and then community level. What will be noticed is that there are few accounts of mid-level accounts of peacebuilding. However, as said in 2.1, unofficial dialogue and new thinking to inform the official process is often the goal, so I assume that the mid-level resembles the top-level, only hosting people on a less official scale. In the lack of academic articles concerning the meal as a tool in diplomacy and peacebuilding, the Internet has provided interesting interviews and articles for my research.

5.3.1 Top-level Initiatives of using the Meal as a Tool

Now I will present my own and some of Chapple-Sokol findings on White House and US official initiatives concerning culinary diplomacy. Where Chapple-Sokol is the source, it will be referred to him. Where I have found the source personally, these will be referred to.

In September 2011, the United States appointed their first culinary ambassador, Spanish- born chef José Andrés whom has worked a long time in the DC area. His role is foremost to be the ambassador of Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (a UN Foundation initiative), but his engagement for food reaches far out and what he does is still connected to culinary diplomacy. In July 2012, chief protocol officers from more than hundred countries were gathered for the first Global Chiefs of Protocol Conference in Washington. The purpose of this conference was to strengthen the role of protocol in diplomacy, and to exchange ideas, knowledge, evaluate and more. But one of the most interesting things here, regarding our subject of discussion, is that José Andrés were there to cook and talk about the importance of commensality in diplomacy. Shortly after this, then Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, whom attended this conference, shared her regards concerning the importance and power of culinary diplomacy with the New York Times:

"Showcasing favorite cuisines, ceremonies and values is an often overlooked and powerful tool of understanding between countries and offer unique setting to enhance the formal diplomacy we conduct every day" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 178).

5.3.1.1 White House initiatives on Culinary Diplomacy

After Chapple-Sokol's main article on culinary diplomacy was published, the White House has expanded their initiatives concerning culinary diplomacy. In September 2012 the White House launched the Diplomatic Culinary Partnership in the United States. This is an initiative created to promote "the role of culinary engagement in America's formal and public diplomacy efforts" (Spokesperson, 2012). There's obviously economic interests and motivation here, but the importance of building relationships in private culinary diplomacy is also highlighted, as we will see later. American chefs serve among other things in this initiative as resources for the Department when planning and preparing meals for leaders from abroad. Shortly prior of this the American Chef Corps was created, a network of American Chefs who promotes American culinary culture and interests home and worldwide, and bonds with chefs from over the world in the US. This network of American chefs participates in the Diplomatic Culinary Partnership (Spokesperson, 2012). According to Kerry, this partnership was founded because of the importance of food in diplomacy and the chefs also serve as culinary ambassadors all over the world. Through travelling and visiting other chefs, hosting events together and so on, these chefs form bilateral relations across borders and cultures that Kerry thinks is important.

On April 21, 2015 this partnership was celebrated in the Ben Franklin Room in The White House and Secretary of State John Kerry gave a speech. He admitted that these diplomats aren't like traditional diplomats, but they "foster cross- cultural exchange by interacting with people all over the globe" (Kerry, 2015). Kerry also talked about the importance of food in diplomacy and negotiations, and he said that good food brings people together, - on which diplomacy is all about. And he emphasized on his many trips abroad as Secretary of State, the meals shared with different counterparts often are the best. And he goes on:

"[meals...] are a critical part of our ability to be able to do business and talk and break bread and break down barriers and listen to each other and understand culture, history, and really dig underneath all the policy issues" (Kerry, 2015).

He continues and emphasizes, "some of the most candid and productive conversations that I have had have been over a good meal in somebody's country" (Kerry, 2015).

In his speech he also told from conversations concerning environment with China in the speech. The fall of 2014 he hosted the state counselor of China, Councilor Yang. They had a three- hour lunch in Boston at the well-known restaurant Legal Seafoods with a view to Boston harbor. They were working on different issues, and previous of this lunch they had spent a day at the harbor talking. But Kerry says that over this particular lunch they had a breakthrough. - Sitting in the restaurant talking about climate change, Kerry was able to point out to the harbor telling what they've done to clean up and how it's possible to change things. Kerry then says in his speech

> "This became a foundation for our ability, ultimately, when I went to Beijing to be able to negotiate with them... and that the meal were critical in helping people to understand the mutual interest that we shared in that. We - I think people connect in unique and powerful ways over food, and often you can make progress around a dinner table that you can't make around a conference table" (Kerry, 2015).

Kerry and his administration took advantage of the meals during the conversations and negotiations with China, and this is a very good example the powerful tool food can be. The lunch Kerry had with the Chinese councilor is an example of private culinary diplomacy, as it is only for a few to attend. John Kerry, is in the same line here as my three interviewees and acknowledges the importance of sharing meals together in negotiations, diplomacy and peacebuilding.

5.3.1.2 Club des Chefs

Another interesting thing to mention, is Les Club des Chefs des Chefs, a club founded in 1977 by the French chef Gilles Bragard, and which is a secretive society of the personal chefs of the world's most powerful politicians. This group has currently 21 members and among these are Cristeta Comerford, the personal chef of Barack Obama, the Queen of Englands own head chef, Mark Flanagan and Guillaume Gomez, head chef at the Élysée. In 2014 they gathered in England, and reporter from the Telegraph Katy Balls got an exclusive opportunity to meet these chefs (Club de Chefs). In this group the chefs meet like- minded people and Cristeta says "you can relax here and also learn from each other" (Club de chefs), and evidently, these

chefs do understand each others situations. If the meal they cook put their Queen, president or King in a bad mood, it could cost them their job. In 2013 the chefs met French President Francois Hollande, and he emphasized foods important role: "If you wreck a dish, it's harder to plead a cause" (Club des chefs).

And when another head of state comes to dine, the local chef calls the chef of the other and ask "hey, tell me about your guy" (Club des chefs), Cristeta says. Tim Wasylko, the personal chef of Canadian Prime Minister agree with Cristeta and adds that this way it is simpler to get to know the information you need to know. Discretion is off course important, but practical information like "the time of the day they eat, if there's a certain portion size, or we need to know if he's travelling all month and needs something healthy" (Club des Chefs), Wasylko says. Communicating directly like this it's easier for the chefs to please important guests when visiting.

5.3.1.3 Breakfast Diplomacy
Every time I've talked about the theme I've chosen for my master thesis people have spontaneously started talking about Thorvald Stoltenberg and his famous breakfast- meetings. Stoltenberg (born 8th July 1938) is a former well- known Norwegian politician whom has served as Minister of Defense and Minister of Foreign Affairs. He has also served as a diplomat, mediator, as general secretary of the Norwegian Red Cross and in local politics. World leaders as Nelson Mandela, Kofi Annan and Willy Brandt and other politicians have eaten breakfast home in his apartment at Solli plass in Oslo (Peace for breakfast). When Mandela visited Oslo in 1992 he wished to visit Stoltenberg whom were Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time for breakfast. Mandela came early and Thorvald had prepared him a classic Norwegian breakfast with coffee, bread, cheese and jam. Stoltenberg says in an interview that for two politicians to meet at home was quite unusual at the time. - But anyone can relax in a situation like that, because you get to know each other and get to talk (Stoltenberg and Mandela).

5.3.2 Mid-Level Initiatives of using the Meal as a Tool

5.3.2.1 Peacebuilding in Mali
Through correspondence with a former professor of mine, Kåre Lode (at what then was called Misjonshøgskolen in Stavanger, now called VID Vitenskapelige Høyskole), which have

extensive experience from peacebuilding work, he sent me an E-mail with a few reflections concerning how the meal is present in peacebuilding. One of the most interesting things in the E-mail was a story from Mali concerning the peace process at the end of the rebellion in 1995-96 in Northern Mali. Lode coordinated a group who worked to create a space for common people to contribute to peace, and to involve the popular movement in the peace process. A team member of this team, Zeïdan Ag Sidilamine told the story I will present now to Lode, and who formerly had been the General Secretary of the Popular Liberation Front of Asawad-movement (PLFA). This group had been in conflict with a self-defence movement called Ganda Koy. The groups realized at some point it was nonsense to fight each other, and decided to meet in a small village called Bourem, on the Eastern bend of the river Niger. After hiding away their arms, the time was come for the negotiations led by Zeïdan. The opposing groups were ready to discuss and argue against each other, but Zeïdan surprised them and gave a lesson in French grammar. He said according to Lode: "Je fais la paix. Tu fais la paix. Il fait la paix. Eux, ils font la paix. Vous, vous faites la paix. Nous faisons la paix" (I make peace, you make peace, he makes peace, they makes peace, we makes peace). No arguments were prepared to argue against a lesson in French grammar, and everyone started laughing and there was no negotiating. But the meal was ready, so they shared the meal, laughing and making practical arrangements. Lode says that peace entered an open door, and the conflict ceased to exist.

It was difficult to find examples of how the meals as tool can be used on the middle- level. We will however see in the discussion that some of the examples connected to the community- level initiatives can be seen as multi- level or multi- track.

5.3.3 Community-level initiatives of using the Meal as a Tool

5.3.3.1 Gastrodiplomacy
The American University in Washington D.C. were the first to establish a course in Gastrodiplomacy in any school of international relations ever in 2014. The teacher behind the new course is policy expert on international conflict Johanna Mendelson Forman. - To foster cultural understanding among countries is the aim of this course, using food as the most important tool. Forman say, "what's unique is that students themselves would never make the connection that food is a part of international relations" (Gastrodiplomacy). During the course

they study war and conflict prior to Sept. 11, and how some immigrants in today's D.C. is there as a result of these conflicts. In addition to focusing on how food affected those conflicts, the course include fieldtrips to local ethnic restaurants where the student gets to hear the owner speak about their cultural heritage and history.

The field of gastrodiplomacy is quite new in the world of public diplomacy, but "the idea itself can be tracked back to the ancient Romans, who often made peace with their enemies over a good meal" (Gastrodiplomacy).

Co- teacher Sam Chapple- Sokol at the gastrodiplomacy course in D.C. (whom we met in the theory chapter) says that before now none have dug into the "cuisine" aspect of diplomacy, even though many international relations programs have some emphasis on food security. He also says that food is often only reckoned to be something trivial or frivolous, but this is changing (Gastrodiplomacy). In 2014 The Public Diplomacy Magazine ran a survey in which more than half of the 140 people interviewed answered eating food from a particular country made them think more positively of this country.

5.3.3.2 Dining with the enemy

In 2011 the TV series *Dining with the enemy* (Tilbords med fienden) was launched in Norway. Reporter from the Norwegian television channel TV 2 Fredrik Græssvik is the host and he brings the well- known Norwegian chef Tom Victor Gausdal to countries in conflicts or post- conflict. Representatives from different sides of the conflict are invited to share a wonderful meal inspired by local traditions prepared by Gausdal, while Græssvik leads the conversation. The areas they visit include Israel/ Palestine, Burma, Rwanda, Lebanon and Egypt (Seated with the enemy). The meal is at the very core of the conversations forming, and through the eight episodes we see the powerful tool dining together can be. The show has been sold to American Travel Channel, and will probably soon appear in an English-speaking version.

A similar concept is *Parts Unknown* where the host Anthony Bourdain takes the audience to Jerusalem where he explores falafels and perspectives on politics from both Israelis and Palestinians. Also, in Australia there's a concept called Food Safari that visit the homes and restaurants of members of different immigrant communities, displaying food from Cyprus to Sri Lanka (Potlucks for Peace).

Through these series ordinary people at home in their living rooms are presented to the notion of food as a promoter of cross- cultural understanding and even peace.

Sam Chapple-Sokol calls for invoking culinary diplomacy on a less official scale in situations of conflict, and he refers to A.V. Croft's findings presented in the article *Silver Lining: Building a Shared Sudanese identity through Food*. Croft describe how people from all over Sudan are brought together in the capital Khartoum, and in the look for livelihoods they start to cook and sell provincial food from their own regions. Meals do potentially serve as unofficial culinary diplomacy as urban Sudanese starts to appreciate food from the provinces. This isn't the easiest model of conflict resolution to copy in other situations, but it shows a possible power of the tool (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 179).

5.3.3.3 Culinary Diplomacy on the citizen level of Public Diplomacy

In his article *'War and Peas: Culinary Conflict Resolution as Citizen Diplomacy'* published in the Public Diplomacy Magazine in March, 2014, Chapple-Sokol argues food can best be used as a fruitful tool of conflict resolution at a citizen level or track 3 (Chapple-Sokol, 2014).
On a person-to-person level, Chapple-Sokol reckons food to be a powerful tool to overcome tensions, and it can occur on several planes according to how deeply interaction goes between the parties. He adds: "the act of eating together, or commensality, can set the table for potentially healing conversations" (Chapple-Sokol, 2014). But the exception is for the entrenched sides of protracted conflict, where as little contact as possible is for the better, and he goes on, "indeed, in those situations, food can be a major catalyst for conflict" (Chapple-Sokol, 2014).
In his article quoted above Chapple-Sokol directly links the Contact Theory, as described earlier, and again he quotes the founder of the Contact Theory, Allport, who says about contact:

> "The nub of the matter seems to be that contact must reach below the surface in order to be effective in altering prejudice. Only the type of contact that leads people to *do* things together is likely to result in changed attitudes (Allport, 1979, p. 276).

And Chapple-Sokol goes on saying track 3 diplomacy in contrast to tracks 1 and 2, doesn't seek to solve the wider conflict, something that gives more room to focus on contact and understanding. And, "it is the cooperative aspects of the contact hypothesis, those that form

the foundation of Track 3 diplomacy, that give maximum strength to the concept of culinary diplomacy" (Chapple-Sokol, 2014). And he says groups in deep conflict sometimes need more than simple contact to overcome generations of differences on various areas, enemies of long time may even need to make the bread together before breaking it and eating.

In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania there's a local version of culinary diplomacy called Conflict Kitchen. It's a restaurant based in Pittsburg, which serve food from countries the United States are in conflict with. Performances and discussions often follow the dinners.
Food is used to "as a force for peace, understanding, and reconciliation" (Chapple-Sokol, 2014).

Chapple-Sokol says himself that there aren't many examples of these kinds of projects, something that makes it difficult to draw comprehensive conclusions. Chapple-Sokol propose to establish cooking schools across conflict lines, in in-person dinners could be organized along the border regions, for example the India-Pakistan border, including cooks, hosts and diners for a joint event. And maybe these kinds of cooperative initiatives can "engender transformation" (Chapple-Sokol, 2014).

In the analysis I will investigate if it is possible to promote peace and reconciliation on the other levels of diplomacy.

5.3.3.4 Conflict café and Talking Peace festival
International Alert is one of the worlds leading peacebuilding organizations which works locally in conflict- areas empowering people to understand the key issues that affects their life. They work in more than 25 countries over the world and advise governments, companies and organizations. Among many other areas they focus on the importance of food, and they say, "food is a universal language that brings people together" (International Alert). Cultural understanding and peaceful co- existence is promoted through making and sharing meals, and it opens up the possibility of sharing histories and identities, what people have in common and what is different across cultural borders, and it can facilitate conversation. Inspired by a US phenomenon, International Alert launched something they called Conflict Kitchen London (later called conflict café) in 2014, which is a take- out restaurant serving food from conflict-affected countries (Similar to Conflict Kitchen Pennsylvania). International Alert hoped this

launch would make people talk about peace (International Alert). In September 2014 they also launched their Talking peace festival in London, were their pop- up café welcomed hundreds of diners to eat exotic food made by chefs from areas in conflict. In 2014, the conflict café focused on Myanmar, Peru and Jordan. In 2015 they focused on Syria, Middle East, Nepal, Colombia and Turkey. By serving food from conflicts areas they hope to "demonstrate the power of food to break down barriers and foster dialogue and understanding" (Talking Peace Festival 2).

In 2015 at the conflict café hosted a Syrian chef named Haitham Yassin (born in Damascus) working in London, made traditional Syrian dishes for the diners 2 nights. He mentioned how food has been a powerful peacebuilding tool in Syria: "Throughout the Arab world, food plays a role in resolving conflicts. When two families or tribes are in conflict, another family will act as peacemaker, bringing them together, and serving food and coffee as part of helping to resolve their disagreements" (Talking peace festival).

There's another ancient Arab saying, "when you eat with someone, you can't betray them" (Talking Peace Festival 2). This in addition to what the Syrian chef shared about food above underline food's central role in Arab cultures.

Nepal was in the focus one of the other nights in the pop- up café, and Nepali chef Rajiv KC made some signature dishes from his country. He said that "Food brings people together and when people come together with ideas and solutions, extraordinary things can happen" (Talking peace festival). He also thinks a lot is to be learned about a nation through it's food, and bridges can be built once when understanding is the foundation.

International Alert have also partnered with the Caucasus Business and Development Network (CBDN) in the initiative 'Recipes for Peace', a project launched in August 2014 (Recipes for Peace). The aim of this project was to "promote reconciliation between Gyumri Communities in Armenia and Kars communities in Turkey through discovering and raising awareness of the resemblances in their culinary traditions" (Recipes for peace). They hoped to strengthen mutual understanding and cooperation that is essential for peace by bringing people together through the process of preparing and sharing and learning about each other traditions and techniques.

I could probably have gone on and on naming different initiatives on food and peace, as there are numerous initiatives at least on NGO and public level. And hopefully in the future, we'll

see more at an academic level as well. We need the top level politics to follow as well being aware of the meal as the powerful tool it is, like US Secretary of State John Kerry witnessed himself above. From here, the analysis will be presented, where I will see the theoretical and empirical material in light of each other.

CHAPTER 6   ANALYSIS

In this chapter I will discuss and analyze the theoretical material presented in chapter 2-4 in light of the three interviews and the written empirical accounts. The analysis is mainly three-fold, and I will answer sub-questions a, b and c chronologically.

In the first part of this analysis, material from chapter 3 concerning general attributes to peacebuilding, will serve to give the theory of culinary diplomacy presented in Chapter 2, a frame of discussion. Apart from this, the main focus will be to discuss culinary diplomacy and how it is applicable to peacebuilding in light of the empirical material.

The second part of this analysis will use the theoretical material in Chapter 3 to compare the different levels and dimensions of peacebuilding, which is necessary to understand the need for ritual and symbolic actions in peacebuilding. Then, I will argue how the meal can be a place for ritual or symbolic action according to Schirch. Further, I will discuss when the meal can, and cannot be seen as a ritual in the three different levels of peacebuilding in light of the empirical material.

When reaching the third part of the analysis, I will first look into why reconciliation is important after conflict. Also central in this part of the discussion will be to briefly discuss how different kinds of reconciliation is required on different levels in society. Then I will discuss why worldview and transformed worldview matters in relation to conflict. Finally in this analysis I will discuss how identity can be transformed, and how this can help enemy perceptions diminish.

6.1 How is Culinary Diplomacy applicable to Peacebuilding?

6.1.1 Diplomacy tracks and levels of peacebuilding

Chapple-Sokol defines culinary diplomacy as "the use of food and cuisine as an instrument to create cross-cultural understanding in the hope of improving interactions and cooperation" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 162).

Now, first we will look into how the levels peacebuilding initiatives occur in, and relates to the different tracks of diplomacy. In chapter 3, strategic peacebuilding was presented as an "interdisciplinary, coordinated approach to building a sustainable *justpeace* - a peace with justice " (Schirch, 2004, p. 6). We also saw that the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund says that the goal of peacebuilding is reduce conflict "to lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development (United Nations Peacebuilding Fund), through different initiatives on all levels. Further, according to Schirch, there's different approaches to peacebuilding, where transforming relationships is the most relevant approach to this thesis. These approaches often happen simultaneously, and as we saw in section 3.1.4, peacebuilding initiatives happen on mainly three different levels. These are top level, mid level and grassroots' level.

If we compare these levels to the three diplomacy tracks in section 2.1, we see that *track 1 diplomacy* relates to top- level approaches to peacebuilding, *track 2* relates to mid- level approaches, and *track 3* relates to the grassroots' level. There are however some differences, like the mid-level of peacebuilding aims at coordinating relief aid for humanitarian crisis, by national and regional organizations and businesses, while the track 2 level of diplomacy as presented in 2.1, normally involves problem-solving activities, and unofficial dialogue. But both occur at an organizational level at least, so some similarities can be found. Arguably, there are some blurry lines concerning diplomacy and peacebuilding, as in many cases the fellow goal is to build peace. However, if we include the perspectives on how different leaders are present at different levels in society with different roles in approaching conflict in Lederach's Leadership Pyramid briefly outlined in 3.1.4, the perspective is widened to see how different levels of society holds different kinds of leaders. I would argue these different levels of leadership relates to the different levels of peacebuilding as it identifies which leaders to approach when working towards a specific level in society.

When Chapple-Sokol talks about diplomacy and the different tracks of diplomacy, these are relatable to the levels of peacebuilding Schirch describes. So when it comes to the different levels identified in diplomacy and peacebuilding, I argue that culinary diplomacy is applicable to peacebuilding. Looking at the interviews, we see that Solheim refers mostly to official diplomatic settings as a representative from the Norwegian state or government, and Skauen and Sommerfeldt rather to peacebuilding settings and representatives of an NGO involved in peacebuilding. But all the three of them have experience from official negotiations, related to both track 1 of diplomacy, and top-level of peacebuilding. This somehow underlines the blur limits between these two spheres of international relations, as they all work for peace, but in slightly different arenas.

6.1.2 Culinary diplomacy in peacebuilding

Chapter 2 presents the theory of culinary diplomacy according to Sam Chapple-Sokol, which he founds in historical accounts, through commensality in ancient Greece (2.2.1), and in pre-modern France (2.2.2). What is useful to emphasize from the historical account is how the matter of eating together has been central since the very beginning of diplomacy. In ancient Greece, common meals were important when aggressions were to be concluded (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 163), and meals even served as constitutive to political and diplomatic community (Constantinou, 1996, p. 131). It is also interesting to see how the French diplomat Talleyrand- Périgord used food to improve relations during the Vienna Congress (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 165).

6.1.3 Commensality and the Contact hypothesis in peacebuilding

Because sharing a meal with friends or enemies can reduce antagonisms and hostility according to Chapple-Sokol, we can say that eating together is a great tool in peacebuilding where the goal is to reduce or hinder conflict. - Commensality can possibly create commonality (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 166), something some of the stories from the interviews highlight. In the section on practical challenges (5.2.2.5), Skauen tells from the Guatemala negotiations at Holmenkollen, and how the menu was always a topic of discussion, taking the edge of the real struggle. Solheim also has the experience from Sri Lanka, that when eating together, it is possible to discuss other matters less painful apart from the conflict (5.2.2.5). On the other hand, Solheim claims that the good ambience does not always come naturally because of good or interesting food. If the attendants dislike the food,

the host or the mediator should be able to start good conversations or create a good ambience in other ways. Solheim also says that the more you know a person, the more likely it is that a good connection will be made.

Chapple-Sokol does however expand his theory when he introduces the contact theory borrowed from Gordon W. Allport and the field of conflict resolution (2.3.3). This theory explains how relationships evolve and change in inter- group settings, and that a more positive behavior will replace hostility, but argues it has to happen under the right conditions (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 171). It is assumed that unfamiliarity and lack of knowledge about another group leads to tension and potential rivalry. Chapple-Sokol also refers to other theorists whom have evolved the theory and found that equal status is imperative, and contact should be intimate rather than superficial in order to obtain positive interaction. In addition, if the contact is pleasurable, the attendants are more encouraged to seek mutual understanding.

Skauen tells from when starting the Guatemala negotiations in Oslo (5.2.2.7) the different sides lived in different hotels and did not spend much time together each day. The negotiation setting mattered, Skauen says, because eating good food in a good environment helped everyone relax. The participant's shared an experience in an otherwise tension filled setting. Skauen even emphasize that meals "creates and build community, and they make enemy perceptions diminish". Skauen talks about how trust is imperative in all kinds of peacebuilding (5.2.2.2). Without trust, a meal looses it's potential, but on the other hand, a meal can help create this trust. In light of Skauen's experience here, it is obvious that the contact theory can be applicable to peacebuilding.

Solheim's experience from the negotiations in Sri Lanka is partly different. The Tamil Tigers did not want to eat together with the Singhalese government- representatives (5.2.2.7), and they wished to avoid having photos taken of the two groups together as it could send out an impression of cheerful negotiations in contrast to the reality. Above, equal status is listed as imperative for the contact theory, and it is easily assumed that the Singhalese in power, and the Tamils in opposition had unequal status that would be hard to transform. But at the same time, if eating together could have helped diminish the lack of knowledge about the other group, maybe the negotiations could have been more fruitful.

Solheim did however have lunches with the Tamil head negotiation Balasingham every 14th day or so during the time he worked as a negotiator. Solheim tells that they ate strong Chinese

or Indian food with white wine, and that the spirits always got high. A trust between Balasingham and himself grew, which undoubtedly is important between mediators and each of the conflicting parties.

In the written empirical accounts, there's another good example of how commensality lead to commonality when the US Secretary of State John Kerry had meetings with Chinese Councilor Yang in Boston (5.3.1). The lunch at Legal Seafoods, which lasted three hours, provided a breakthrough in the conversations, Kerry says. And he emphasizes how the meal was critical in helping the participants to understand the mutual interest, and this became a foundation for the ability to communicate with the Chinese later when Kerry visited China. In the same speech where Kerry talked about this, he also acknowledged the meal's centrality in saying "some of the most candid and productive conversations that I have had have been over a good meal in somebody's country" (Kerry, 2015).

6.1.4 Food as diplomatic signalling

Chapple-Sokol suggests that food is a non-logocentric way of communication, because in itself it does not make use of words (2.3.1). Rather, it sends a message, given un- or intentionally. He argues this referring to Raymond Cohen and his theory of non-verbal signalling. The menu and the seating arrangements are the most obvious things that can communicate hidden meanings. This emerging language, as Chapple-Sokol calls it, is important for diplomats to be aware of to take the fullest possible advantage of it (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 167). Solheim confirms this, as he implies that seating in diplomatic dinner settings is important to pay attention to, because people have to be seated according to rank (5.2.2.4). And some are extremely aware of their status, and easily get insulted, Solheim says. And he adds: "Because official dinners often are stiff and formalized, it's even more important to invite people home or host more informal meetings", and it becomes easier to discuss what you really want to discuss free from etiquette. In other words, Solheim have invited people home to avoid the problems un- intentionally or intentionally signalling may produce.

Chapple-Sokol also quotes Roland Barthes whom says "food is a system of communication, a body of images, a protocol of usages, situations, and behaviors" (Barthes quoted in Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 172). And during a meal, a lot of unobvious things happen. Chapple-Sokol says that it can be intended from the host's side, or the host can simply be unaware of the

messages being sent through different aspects of the meal. Chapple-Sokol refers to how President Reagan served food with Russian attributes to Gorbachev, something that most certainly produced a feeling of familiarity.

Concerning the feeling of familiarity, Solheim has some interesting remarks (5.2.2.4). He tells from when a Sri Lankan delegation came to Oslo, and they visited three different kinds of restaurants: The visit to the most expensive one was a complete disaster, as it was unfamiliar to the Sri Lankans. But when they ate at restaurant serving familiar food, which also was the cheapest one, everyone was thrilled. This illustrates how important it is to get to know some information in advance of hosting meals, as it has direct implications for the ambience.

6.1.5 Criticisms

Chapple-Sokol himself points to three potential criticism of his theory, but I will only address the two first here. First, it is difficult to measure the result of culinary diplomacy, if communication and relationships have been enhanced (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 181). But this is true for other fields as well, he says. From my perspective, and in light of the interviews performed it is however possible to measure in the way that Skauen and Solheim especially each experienced a change of ambience through meals certain times. One example is when Skauen hosted the peace negotiations between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and an ambience of familiarity was created as they visited a to them well known producer of 'klippfisk' (5.2.2.6). Both nations mentioned have a long tradition for making Bacalao, a dish where this fish is used. Skauen says that the participants were brought together through sharing this meal and eating a dish familiar to the two different sides. Skauen also emphasized because food is a common need and non- discussable, it differs from for example a group of singing people to entertain during the negotiations.

Another aspect Skauen mentions, and which Solheim also notices, is that the closer you get in offering the home- cuisine, the more success and good ambience (5.2.2.4; 5.2.2.5; 5.2.2.6). Skauen even brought beans from Guatemala sometimes for the negotiations in Oslo, as this shows concern, interest, and makes them feel welcome. Above, when discussing food as diplomatic signalling, we saw that Solheim obtained more success and happy participants bringing the Sri Lankan delegation to a restaurant that offered familiar food, in contrast to the negative ambience when visiting a fancy Norwegian expensive restaurant.

The second potential criticism Chapple-Sokol points to is that some may argue that the concept discussed is only food. He says that culinary diplomacy will not work among those whom are not interested in food.

In the written empirical accounts of Sam Chapple-Sokol (5.3.3), he argues culinary diplomacy is best implied on track 3- diplomacy, which relates to the grassroots' level of peacebuilding. This is partly relevant here, but I will return to this matter in the next section of the analysis, when discussing meals as ritual on different levels in peacebuilding.

6.1.6 Transforming relationships

Can the discussion above be connected to the theory of transforming relationships? Transforming relationships is one of the approaches to peacebuilding according to Schirch. And conflict transformation together with trauma healing, restorative justice, and transitional justice are sub approaches to transforming relationships (3.1.2). Then, if we look deeper into conflict transformation (3.1.3), this is one of three interrelated support processes that help right relationships form in peacebuilding. Then, if the goal is to help right relationships form in peacebuilding, I would argue that in light of what has been discussed in this section, parts of the theory of culinary diplomacy is relevant to peacebuilding, especially the aspects concerning contact theory and diplomatic signalling.

Solheim mentioned that very few are aware of how important meals are in peacebuilding settings, and meals are hosted and arranged without a lot of reflection (5.2.2). Together with what has been suggested above, this underlines that more knowledge on how to make use of culinary diplomacy or commensality to a greater extent in peacebuilding is needed. However, this theory needs to be worked with and evolved. Chapple-Sokol himself also emphasize that this theory is in need of further research, but he also propose that culinary diplomacy has the potential for becoming a powerful tool in international relations (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 183). In his article he states something I will highlight again, and which I found descriptive of some of the empirical accounts explored in this section:

> "The non-verbal communication of food and the physical closeness of commensality create powerful locus that is centered on the space in which food is shared" (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p. 182)

I partly agree with Chapple-Sokol in the statement. But we have also seen in this discussion that it is sometimes difficult to share a meal, hence it is more accurate to say a powerful locus *can* sometimes be created through commensality, rather than saying commensality always *creates* a powerful locus.

6.2 How is the meal present on different levels of peacebuilding, and when can it be seen as a ritual?

6.2.1 How is the three different dimensions of Peacebuilding present on the three different levels of peacebuilding?

In the former part of the analysis, we saw how three levels in which peacebuilding occurs in can be identified; a top level, mid- level, and a community or grassroots' level. Schirch added to this theory of peacebuilding (2004) three identifiable dimensions of peacebuilding based on a conflict analysis (2005) (3.2). Referring to Jane Docherty, Schirch argues conflict occurs in rational, relational and symbolic 'worlds' (Schirch, 2005, p. 31), and from this she proposes three different dimensions and approaches to conflict. Schirch acknowledges that these approaches are connected and overlap each other, but alone these approaches are not sufficient in order to understand and approach all conflicts (Schirch, 2005, p. 34)

As Schirch describes in section 3.2.2, a material or rational approach to conflict address the material sides to conflict through objective, rational and objective methods. One of the main problems concerning this Western based approach according to Schirch is that it separates people from problems and does not address the human dimension of conflict, as identity and values.

A relational or social dimension and approach to conflict is in general acknowledged says Schirch, as building relationships in peacebuilding is reckoned important in most spheres. Communication, power, and social structures serve to analyze and help resolve conflict (Schirch, 2005, p. 36), and this approach is also Western based. When reading section 3.2.3, it becomes evident that this approach to peacebuilding, emphasize improving communication and encouraging people to cooperate in stead of competing, all based on a Western worldview and values (Schirch, 2005, p. 37).

In order to understand the need for using ritual and symbolic acts in peacebuilding, we need to understand the symbolic dimension of conflict. And when Schirch describes this third dimension and approach to conflict (3.2.4), she emphasize worldview affect how people understand conflict, and that cultural, perceptual, sensual, emotional, value-based, and identity- driven aspects of conflict is central (Schirch, 2005, p. 32). This part of conflict is challenging and unpredictable, and often overlooked or neglected, Schirch says. And further,

Schirch says that worldview matters in conflict because conflict is symbolically constructed through it, by the people involved in the conflict.

I will discuss the concept of worldview more thoroughly in the next part of the analysis, but for now it is important to understand how it affects conflict, and that it's presence require a different approach than the rational and relational approach to peacebuilding. As we saw in section 3.2.4, Schirch says an approach to peacebuilding in this dimension include "efforts to shift perspectives through creative strategies to engage people's physical and sensual selves, their emotions, identities, and values" (Schirch, 2005, p. 32). Everyone, including those involved in conflict on any level, has their own unique worldview lenses' that affects the interpretation conflict. And when these lenses contradict each other, it can intensify the conflict.

Now, we have seen how Schirch points out three different dimensions of conflict, the material, the relational and the symbolic. Then, as presented in section 3.1.4 and discussed in section 6.1.1, there are three levels on which peacebuilding initiatives occur in, the top level, the mid level, and the community level. Thus, on every level where conflict is approached, the material, the relational and the symbolic dimensions needs to be recognized and addressed. The rational/material and the relational dimensions are the most recognized sides of conflicts, and which are approached by initiatives rooted in a long tradition. But the symbolic dimension is less known, and in the next section of the analysis I will discuss the approaches Schirch propose for this dimension.

6.2.2 How can the meal be seen as a ritual?
Characteristics and definition of ritual according to Schirch are presented in section 3.3.1, and ritual is seen as using "symbolic actions to communicate a forming or transforming message in a unique social space" (Schirch, 2005, p. 17). Schirch acknowledges that she uses the term ritual loosely. She also refers to different kinds of rituals (3.3.1.1), and those I want to highlight in this discussion is religious rituals, and those socializing or transforming in character. When a ritual is socializing, existing rules, structure, and values are learned to new members of a community. But when a ritual is transforming, the status quo is questioned and reshaped (Schirch, 2005, p. 24). A very good example of religious and transforming ritual from the interviews is to be found in 5.2.2.7, from a communion in Guatemala City. But back

to Schirch: What is also important to notice is that when a ritual is used in a constructive way, it betters the life for those involved. But when it is used in a destructive way, it makes life worse for someone, even if it is unintended. Because the character of some rituals is less formal, Schirch suggests calling these symbolic actions.

Then, Schirch evolves this theory of ritual and suggests that ritual can be seen as a symbolic space that is formally created and set apart from everyday life (3.3.2). She bases her theory on the systems theory or complexity theory, where the social action and the place this action takes place, are intertwined and dependent on each other, and can only be understood in this relationship to each other. The context matters, Schirch says, because meaning is determined in relation to it (Schirch, 2005, p. 72).

Further, Schirch refers to other theorist whom have proposed the terms *liminal places* to describe symbolic separated places or settings where the rules for acting and interpreting meaning is different from the rest of life, and *ritual space,* where you don't know what will happen, which is a place for creative incubation, and where special things will happen. (Schirch, 2005, p. 69). Based on this, Schirch argues that when a group of people who normally do not interact is brought together, a ritual context is created. And as presented in 3.3.2, when a meal is shared by divided groups a different context is created apart from normal patterns of interaction, and "eating together takes on heightened symbolic meaning and becomes ritual" (Schirch, 2005, p. 72). Schirch also notes that central to these ritual places is to create a context where the atmosphere helps people relate to each other with more ease.

Schirch talks about an experience of what she calls dinner diplomacy in Cyprus in the 1990s (3.4), which fortifies the theory of ritual as a place (3.3.2.), and how eating together, can be a place like that. Through eating and dancing together in a restaurant, in an ambience with candle lights, white tablecloths, food and music; a different setting was provided for the Turkish and Greek Cypriots (Schirch, 2005, p. 5). This setting emphasized the similarities more than the differences between these to conflicting groups. - They ate the same kind of food, they knew the same songs, and the whole setting helped the participants see the conflict with new eyes, Schirch says, and not the least, this setting helped them seeing each other identities being more that their nationality.

Petter Skauen has similar experiences as Schirch. When he facilitated the negotiations between the conflicting sides of the Guatemalan conflict in Norway (5.5.2.7), he says the meals where gathering in contrast to the negotiations, because a fellow experience was provided through the food. And Skauen mentions how a meal provided topics of discussion, which naturally was difficult to find in a timetable otherwise filled with negotiations, problems, and discussions of possible solutions. Skauen also notices that the first days of these negotiations where challenging, and the conflicting parties lived in different hotels, and could only spend a few hours together each day. But my impression is based on the interview with Skauen, that the relationships evolved during the negotiations.

In the first part of the analysis, I mentioned Skauen's experience hosting negotiations between Haiti and the Dominican Republic in Kristiansund, and how visiting the factory producing 'klippfisk' for shipping to these two countries enhanced their similarities. Eating bacalao brought back many memories to the participants, and a feeling of familiarity rose. And Skauen emphasize that is was not just the food, but all this particular kind of food had connotations to as well.

Then, based on all this I would argue that the meal can be seen as a ritual in settings where adversaries eats together, because the context is different from their normal reality, and as Schirch says; eating together (in these settings) takes on heightened symbolic meanings and become ritual. But I think there will always be exceptions, and in some cases the realities makes it to complicated to just gather adversaries around a meal expecting a transformation to come about. But still, maybe it is worth giving it a try anyway? As was also mentioned in the former part of the analysis that Solheim experienced that it sometimes is too complicated to bring people together. It would be interesting to explore the conflict in Sri Lanka, and what made it so difficult for the Tamil tigers to eat with the Singhalese representatives. Solheim gives a hint saying that the Tamil Tigers have used every day the past 30 years to figure out how to fight the (Singhalese) government (5.5.2.5).

6.2.3 Structured vs. Unstructured Meals

Atle Sommerfeldt made me aware of something interesting concerning different kinds of meals (5.2.2.3). He said that two different kinds of meals occur in peacebuilding, the structured and the unstructured meal. The first could be an official dinner with many invited and formal speeches, or it could be the meals during negotiations lasting several days.

Sommerfeldt says when you stay several days somewhere a room is created for a different focus. The unstructured kind of meal could be a drink, a cup of tea/ coffee, and does not have to include food. This does not relate directly to the discussion here, but it is an interesting remark to the whole quest for establishing a theoretical framework for commensality in peacebuilding.

In my view, the stories told by my interviewees, bears witness of what Schirch argues; that a ritual space, in this case the meal, can provide an oasis of peace, where people involved in conflict comes away from the destructive social structures that fuels conflict. And these rituals provides a transformative place where new relationships and values can form (Schirch, 2005, p. 76)

6.2.4 How can the meal be present on the three different levels of peacebuilding, and in which cases can it be seen as a ritual?

In this section we will see examples of how the meal can look on all the three different levels of peacebuilding and diplomacy. And because these are intertwined and related, as was discussed in 6.1.1, examples from both spheres identified on the same levels will be presented in the same section. Not all the examples will relate to the meal as ritual, but rather as gathering and promoting good relationships. It is however important to include these, due to little research on the subject of using meals as a tool on different levels of peacebuilding in general. But first we will look into some remarks on the dynamic between top and mid level of peacebuilding initiatives.

Atle Sommerfeldt had some remarks concerning the dynamics between state and organizations in peacebuilding (5.2.2.1). He experienced that the Norwegian State and the current Minister of International Development took over a lot of the responsibility. KN had built up a unique capacity and contact base, which was possible due to KN's independent and neutral role. This was reduced when the Minister hired KN's top man in the process to lead the official Norwegian peacebuilding initiatives. Sommerfeldt acknowledges that the state actors are officially in charge, but that the balance between an official decision maker and a neutral facilitator is crucial, like it was in the Guatemala process. Sommerfeldt emphasizes peace processes need independent actors, and he points to how Petter Skauen established good relations on different levels. Skauen was engaged in the formal negotiations, but he also established good relations to the Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation, which

would have been difficult if he was a representative of a top-level actor, Sommerfeldt says. Solheim's response to Sommerfeldt's remarks on this was presented in the same section (5.2.2.1). This adds to the whole discussion of the different levels of peacebuilding some interesting remarks from two practitioners with extensive experience from the field. As highlighted in 5.2.2.1, Solheim and Sommerfeldt each represent different levels of peacebuilding, and have different kinds of experience.

Most of the material from the interviews relates to the top-level of peacebuilding and diplomacy. Both Solheim and Skauen share examples of how eating together has been important in official negotiations, and in some of them the meal can be argued to be seen as a ritual, as adversaries are eating together and a special community is formed, as was argued according to Schirch's theory in 6.2.2. Examples of when the meal can be seen as a ritual are in 5.2.2.6; where he tells about the negotiations between Haiti and the Dominican Republic in 5.2.25; where Skauen talks about the meals during the Guatemala- process. Skauen also tells that Catholic services were used to in peacebuilding in Guatemala City (5.2.2.7), and sometimes the Communion was part of these services. The Communion being a religious meal highly laden with ritual in the first place, becomes even more ritualized when adversaries shares it. I will return to this particular story in the next part of the analysis while discussing reconciliation.

The meal with Councilor Yang, which John Kerry refers to in 5.3.1 refers to a top-level, but is not related directly to peacebuilding. And because Kerry and the Councilor cannot be seen as adversaries, the meal cannot be seen as a ritual if following Schirch's arguments. But as discussed in 6.1.3, the meal can however be seen as filled with commensality, leading to commonality, hence it is still important. The same can be said about Breakfast Diplomacy described in 5.3.1, where Thorvald Stoltenberg invited top leaders visiting Norway home for breakfast in his apartment in Oslo.

The mid level has been the most difficult to find examples of where the meal is used as a tool in peacebuilding. But Sommerfeldt whom represented KN, which is as a NGO, often works at the middle level and do much relief work together with local organizations, and meals are probably often carried out. One experience Sommerfeldt shared (5.2.2.5) of how KN gathered religious leaders when Ethiopia and Eritrea started their war, directly represents a mid-level of peacebuilding initiatives in my view. Sommerfeldt mentioned that he often participated in

official dinners hosted by KN (5.2.2.3), and these could concern local organizations at a mid level.

The story from my correspondence with Kåre Lode also represents this level in my view, as it concerns mid-level leaders (5.3.2) in the two opposing groups mentioned.

In contrast to the mid-level, there are plenty examples of how sharing meals look like on the community level, or grassroots level. There are several examples listed in the section of empirical accounts (5.3.3). First, the Gastrodiplomacy course on the American University (5.3.3) is connected to the community- level, as the students are ordinary citizens. This cannot be seen as a direct peacebuilding initiative, rather as a kind of training of peacebuilders, academics or diplomats. The meals here cannot be defined as ritual, if not the two or more of the participants or students by chance should be adversaries.

The Norwegian TV-series Dining with the enemy (5.3.3) can basically be seen as a community- level initiative, reaching ordinary people watching television. But if we look to the participants in the show, for example when they visited Egypt. The participants in this episode were on different sides in the Egyptian conflict (from my own recount of watching the series), and seemed to be connected to the mid- level of diplomacy/ peacebuilding. Because of this, it is possible to see this initiative as including different levels, hence a multi-track initiative. And because the diners belonged to opposing groups, the ritual can be seen as a ritual, and this dinner probably did something with the participants. But on the other side, as this dinner was a one- time happening, it is questionable whether it is efficient as a peacebuilding tool on the middle- level. It rather serves to inform Norwegian citizens on a community-level about the situation in Egypt.

Conflict café (5.3.3), the take- out restaurant serving food from countries affected by conflict, and the Thinking Peace Festival aims at informing citizens in London about conflict, hence, it can be reckoned as a community - level initiative. The organization International Alert wishes to "demonstrate the power of food to break down barriers and foster dialogue and understanding" (Talking Peace Festival 2). This initiative is not a conflict- setting as such, but if participants of the different dinners are adversaries and eats together, the meals within this initiative or festival can be reckoned as ritual. But even if it cannot be seen as a ritual, it can foster understanding of conflict- affected countries to many people who gathers because of a common curiosity for exotic food.

Finally on the matter of meals on a community- level, I will discuss some arguments given by Chapple-Sokol in section 5.3.3. He talks about Conflict Kitchen Pennsylvania (the pre- runner of Conflict Café in London), where food gathers people to promote peace, reconciliation and understanding. He argues using the meal, as tool in peacebuilding is best used on a community- level because this level does not seek to solve the conflict, in contrast to the two other levels. He also states that food can be fatal to conflict on the two other levels, at least in the cases of protracted conflict. Solheim's experience from Sri Lanka (...) confirms this in the way that is was very difficult to get the opposing sides to dine together. But as we have seen earlier in this section, Skauen has several experiences from top-level negotiations where food is a force for relationship building and good ambience, so I would argue Chapple-Sokol is wrong in his statement. But still, making enemies eating together is absolutely not a quick- fix to deep conflict, and it should be planned with great care.

I agree with Schirch whom says ritual should not replace traditional approaches to peacebuilding (3.3), but it should rather be seen as an important supplement as described. We have seen that the meal is present to different degrees on top- level, mid level and the community level of peacebuilding and diplomacy. What grounds the base for naming the meal in peacebuilding as ritual, is when adversaries eat together, and some of the examples listed above represent the meal as a ritual. The other promotes good relationship and understanding. The theoretical material discussed in this section stands strong compared to some of the empirical accounts I have referred to above, and specifically the (lack of) examples from the middle-level discussed. But some stories from the interviews, as those told by Skauen strongly confirm that the meal can be seen as a ritual, which can approach the symbolic dimension of conflict on Top-Level peacebuilding. However, the theory of how to use the meal as a tool on different levels of peacebuilding needs to be researched and evolved to a greater degree.

6.3 How can transformed identity and worldviews impact processes of reconciliation?

6.3.1 Why is reconciliation so important after conflict?

As stated in 3.1.3, transforming relationships is one of four different approaches to peacebuilding listed by Schirch (2004). Then, reconciliation is one of the deepest possible changes in this approach. Further, one of the three interrelated support processes that help right relationship form is conflict transformation, which again is supported by the principle of building relationship between people. And this is needed on different levels (see 3.1.1 - 3.1.3), and essential approaches to conflict transformation are dialogue, principled negotiation, and mediation. And through these approaches, it is easily assumed that eating together happens regularly.

There exist many definitions of reconciliation, and some of them are presented in 4.1. And we can say that reconciliation most definitively concerns relationships and transforming these for the better after conflict. Reconciliation is important because there's a relational side to conflict which statist diplomacy activities does not solve according to Lederach. He names animosity, stereotyping and fear as characterizing of the relational side to conflict, and conflictants may even live close to each other. And as shown in chapter 3, and discussed in the former part of the analysis, there is also a symbolic side to conflict which traditional approaches does not succeed at reaching. As said in 4.1, Lederach suggests reconciliation to be a meeting point where new relationships can be formed that may pave the way for constructive dialogue where the past can be grieved and a new common future can be envisioned.

In addition, Santa Barbara says rebuilding of trust is essential when restoring peaceful relationship (4.1.1), and names joint projects on lower levels in society to sometimes enhance the rebuilding of relationships. But some reckon these joint projects to be unsuccessful as long as the conflict remains unsolved at a higher level. This somehow relates to the discussion in the former part of the analysis, where Chapple-Sokol claims initiatives like Conflict café to be better alternatives on a community- level where the goal is not to solve the conflict. But if we compare adversaries eating together or do something else that builds relationships to joint projects, I argue based on the discussion in 6.2.3 that it can be relevant to, and successful on higher levels as well.

In 5.2.2.2, Skauen emphasize that the road towards reconciliation is long, and both victim and transgressor are in need of reconciliation. He also says trust is essential, and without trust, a meal looses it's potential. But on the other hand, the meal can help create this trust.

We have seen that Clegg suggests (in 4.1.3) that different levels of society require different kinds of reconciliation, and she claims societal reconciliation to be paramount (4.1.4), because it is the people whom can make or break the peace accords in practice (Clegg, 2008, p. 83). The levels and types of reconciliation Clegg suggests are intertwined and connected to each other, and on all the levels, the transformation of relationships are central. The levels of reconciliation also relates to the levels of transformation in which peacebuilding initiatives occur in which were briefly mentioned in 3.1.4, and which underlines how the process of reconciliation is connected to the structures of peacebuilding. Earlier in the discussion (6.2.3) we saw how the meal as ritual can be present on different levels of peacebuilding, and in my view it is natural to assume that in the same way, the meal as ritual can be used on different levels of reconciliation to promote the transformation of relationships between those engaged on the different levels.

6.3.2 Symbols, Rituals and Reconciliation

Skauen tells about a widow in Guatemala (5.2.2.2) whom had become mute due to fear, who eventually smiled again and started to speak. Skauen asked her several times what she wanted for herself. And her wish was simple and yet beautiful: she wanted a dress with a zip in the back. I want to include this little story, for somehow, this dress may have symbolized dignity. In 4.1 I briefly mentioned Lederach and his book *The Moral Imagination*, where he compares reconciliation to an artistic process that do not evolve chronologically, and that healing has its inner timing. He also quotes Hem Weaver, whom says that hurt and brokenness is not lodged in the cognitive memory, but in the emotional memory, which grounds the need to address reconciliation with more than intellectual tools. And Weaver names arts in whatever the form to address reconciliation because it has the capacity to "build a bridge between the heart and the mind" (Weaver quoted in Lederach, 2005, p. 160).

Now, this relates to ritual defined in 3.3.1, where Schirch says, "ritual communicates through symbols, senses, heightened emotions" (Schirch, 2005, p. 2). And further, it relates to the meal as a ritualized place discussed in 6.2.2, where "eating together takes on heightened symbolic meaning and becomes ritual" (Schirch, 2005, p. 72) when adversaries eat together.

Based on this I would say the meal as ritual can be used to address the emotional memory and build a bridge between heart and mind, like Weaver says, and promote reconciliation.

6.3.3 Existing reconciliation rituals including shared meals

Santa Barbara (4.1.2) talks about existing reconciliation rituals including food as an important element, symbolizing completed reconciliation. In my view this emphasizes what is argued above, that the meal as ritual can be used to promote reconciliation. Even though this is not a discussion on rituals per se, it is interesting to be slightly acquainted to these, as central to this thesis is whether or not, and in which settings, the meal can be seen as a ritual. What also enriches the perspectives on existing reconciliation rituals, are the perspectives from some of the contributors to Conflict café and Talking Peace festival described in 5.3.7. The Syrian chef Haitham Yassin mentioned how sharing meals have been a powerful peacebuilding tool throughout the Arab world. This statement relates to the Arabic- Islamic reconciliation ritual of Suhl named by Santa Barbara in 4.1.2, which is concluded by a shared meal of some kind. Also listed in the empirical material in 5.3.7, a project named *Recipes for Peace* by International Alert, aims at promoting reconciliation between some communities in Turkey through discovering their common culinary heritage and traditions.

6.3.4 How is Worldview connected to Conflict?

Schirch says that people symbolically construct conflict through their worldviews in 3.2.4. The human mind is a complex matter, and now we will explore Schirch's theory on the different elements of the worldview lenses presented through 4.2.1 - 4.2.5. How worldview affects humans in conflict is central because some of its processes or attributes can either fuel the conflict or help diminish some factors on which conflict is based on. It is also important to understand the basis of worldview, before we look into how it can be transformed. Schirch compare worldview to the lenses in a pair of glasses, and perception, emotional and sensual cognition, culture, values, and identity makes out the different elements of the lenses. *Perception* (4.2.1) is the psychological system the human brain uses to find meaning and categorize experiences and observations, and it is ruled by biological structures. The human mind is capable of twisting new information so it fits with former knowledge. Many different processes are described, but some of those affecting the human mind in conflict in particular, is projection, tunnel vision, and dehumanization of your enemy. The latter is maybe the most extreme result of perceptual processes of creating reality, as described according to Schirch in

4.2.1.Schirch also refers to some neurobiologists whom suggest that worldviews are reflected in actual psychical structures in the brain (4.2.1), where all new experiences are assimilated into existing ways of understanding the world (Schirch, 2005, p. 41). So, instead of changing the existing patterned structures in the brain, new information flow through the brain. Schirch says that peacebuilders face a constant challenge in how to find ways to break through these defense mechanisms.

The next element in the worldviews lens is emotional and sensual cognition as described in 4.2.2, and it concerns how the different human senses help us make sense of the world. Even though many in the West are raised to think of body and mind as separate entities, Schirch points to a recent increase in research on how the body and mind are intertwined, and that senses are valued more than before. Schirch says that images, sounds, or objects are connected into symbols by our senses, which are the receptors of information (Schirch, 2005, p. 43). It is stated that sometimes our body learn more quickly than our brain, and we learn more by doing, and not thinking. Physical tension, crying, or laughter is physiological responses that work interdependently with other cognitive processes. Conflict is both an emotional and sensual experience as people react by perspiring, blood rushes to the head, and their hearts beat faster, as Schirch says. Former emotional and sensual experiences with conflict affect how people react to current and future conflicts. And Schirch claim peacebuilding activities should include dancing, sports, taking walks outside, visiting places and eating together, in order use more of peoples sensual and emotional capacity in peacebuilding processes.

The matter of eating together is obvious central in this thesis, and this activity is well reflected in the empirical material. Earlier in this section, I have also touched upon the issue of joint projects as proposed by Santa Barbara, which relates to the theory of how emotional and sensual cognition matters in conflict.

The third element of the worldview lenses is culture as presented in 4.2.3. Worldviews are connected to individuals, while culture are held by groups. As said in 4.2.3, cultures are systems of meaning through which humans understand the world, and members of a certain culture share moral code, rules of how to behave, social structures and a common way of being. And Schirch says groups often develop a common way of understanding conflict, and they can hold onto fellow experiences, which can take on huge symbolic meaning. These

moments can become chosen traumas or chosen glories, and through these, Schirch says groups can justify conflict and war.

Traditionally, culture has been seen as an obstacle to addressing conflict among theorists rooted in material or social dimension of conflict. But in contrast to this, Schirch says that the symbolic approaches to addressing conflict uses culture as a resource. Schirch even says that within some cultures, there exist different approaches on how to handle conflict, something confirmed in the discussion above on existing reconciliation rituals. Mentioned there was the Arab- Islamic ritual of Suhl, but Santa Barbara also mentions that there also exist reconciliation rituals in some African societies (4.1.2). And this reflect how it is important to research within a given culture if there are ways of approaching conflict, and make use of local cultural knowledge. Schirch says that new rituals or symbolic actions can even be created or designed to a specific culture.

Values make out the fourth element of the worldview lens, which are held by individuals and related to the different cultures an individual holds (4.2.4). Because individuals are members of different cultural groups emphasizing different cultural values they have to choose which values to live their life by, says Schirch. The groups you spend the most time with, will probably shape your values and behavior, which again affect how you react or relate to conflict. Schirch says that the issue of values is often overlooked by rational and social approaches to conflict, and differences in values will not be revealed by the traditional rational and relational approaches to conflict. The solution to this, says Schirch, is that peacebuilding processes should be designed to reveal the values people bring into the process. It is also important to remember that each peacebuilder brings values into a peacebuilding process, which affects the choice of process.

Here I would like to emphasize from the interviews how Skauen's values are reflected in what he tells from the peacebuilding processes he has taken part in. In my view, the need for reconciliation and the building of relationships can be identified as important values to him and which have formed to some extent the different processes he has taken part in. s

The final element of the worldview lenses is identity, as presented in 4.2.5. This element is closely related to the other elements of worldview, and culture in particular. Schirch says how we behave and define ourselves will shift in different contexts as we move between different

cultural groups. And as said in 4.2.5, each of the cultural groups we belong to gives us a set of cultural values and experiences that shapes our unique worldview. At the same time, each identity is an identity in and of itself. How this matters to conflict is because the need for a sense of identity, influences the dynamics of conflict. And thus, when the matter of identity is not addressed properly in conflict, Schirch argues the negotiations are not likely to succeed. Also important according to Schirch, is how people in conflict favor the groups they belong to, and discriminate the others. And some theorists claim that an ongoing denigration of *an other* is necessary to keep one's own identity (Schirch, 2005, p. 48). And one of the most central points is that some theorists claim that both the differences between groups and the identities of oppressed groups becomes stronger in times of conflict. Forms of identity based on differences, is a source of conflict, or even a result of conflict.

Because physical or relational context matter, Schirch suggests using other rooms than sterile and neutral negotiation rooms, which can encourage the participants to see each other as more than negotiators ore only a member of a conflicting identity group. Schirch also encourages peacebuilders to create contexts where adversaries can see each other more fully than enemies, which can make it easier for them to change the perception of each other (Schirch, 2005, p. 51).

The importance of context is reflected in what Solheim says in 5.2.2.4, where he says that even though official meals have its place, many people consider it as mark of respect to be invited home. -95 % of those he has invited home have appreciated it. He also tells of when he invited a well known Japanese diplomat home, whom later wrote an epistle in a Japanese newspaper about how he saw Solheim an his son walking home with fresh bought croissants for the meeting, so Solheim must have made a grand impression. And Solheim says that when you invite people home, or get invited home to someone, you'll get to know this person better though possible family pictures on the wall and interests their home reveals. Now, even if Solheim's story here is not directly connected to peacebuilding settings, I argue it is relatable, because it illustrates how context matters.

Schirch's argument on how the context for negotiation matters also makes me think of the impression I got from interviewing Skauen and how the ambience and atmosphere created at Holmenkollen mattered for the Guatemala negotiations. I got the impression that it started out quite tense, and the participants could only spend a few hours together (see 5.2.2.7). But this

evolved, and later the participants even found fellow things to laugh about like the 'salmon guerilla' mentioned in 5.2.2.5.

6.3.5 Transforming Worldview

Schirch claim ritual, as presented in Chapter 3 and discussed earlier in this analysis, has the power to aid peacebuilding processes in two different ways. First, through the socializing activity of ritual nurturing common social values and behavior, worldview can be formed, built and protected. And Schirch says that through ritual, people are connected to the values and beliefs they share, and a pause from dissonant information and contradictions is offered. This is reflected in what Skauen says in 5.2.2.7, about how eating together provided good breaks from the negotiations where community was built. Solheim also confirms this in the same section, saying that when eating together, it is possible to talk about other things than conflict and painful subjects, and even laughing together.

The second way ritual can help peacebuilding processes, Schirch says, is how ritual can give birth to new ways of living and solving difficult problems when worldviews crash (Schirch, 2005, p. 99). New ways of thinking can be created, even the ways the world is envisioned.

Further, Schirch says that even though a cause-effect relationship for how ritual can facilitate the shifting of worldview, it is not desirable. Rather, ritual transforms the problem instead of solving it, offering a new frame in which to interpret the conflict. And she compares ritual to a prism, which allows people to see the conflict through new eyes where relationships and a wider understanding of conflict are emphasized (Schirch, 2005, p. 117). Earlier, I've discussed the story on Dinner Diplomacy presented in 3.4, and Schirch says that the ritual space here helped the groups see each other in a new way. Earlier in this analysis we have seen that based on Schirch's theory, the meal can be seen as a ritual space when adversaries eat together. Schirch says that ritual has the power to penetrate into the symbolic core of those whom holds frozen and fearful attitudes, through engaging emotions, bodies, and senses. This relate to the discussion in general in the former chapter on how commensality can help improve relationships.

6.3.6 Re- negotiating and Transforming Identity

Schirch claim transformation of identity is crucial in peacebuilding (4.3.2), and this includes healing threatened or wounded identities, and creating new identities. Both individual and group identities are threatened in conflict, and dehumanization is the worst possible outcome when conflictants strip each other for other identities than the one connected to the conflict. This relates to what Clegg talks about in 4.1.4, where she describes identity, belonging and a will to co- existence as pre- requisites to societal reconciliation. In 4.1.5, she also says that re-negotiating of group identity is important when trying to obtain societal reconciliation. I believe the re- negotiating of group identity is also relevant to the interpersonal levels of reconciliation, which also affects the political level, because the politicians, military, and other present here are likely to be on opposing sides and in need of reconciliation on some level. How the theories of Schirch and Clegg relates to each other, supports in my view the centrality of re- negotiating or transforming identity in relation to conflict.

Schirch says that when people have a flexible identity, they are able to identify themselves in several different ways, which makes finding a shared identity with their enemy possible. And when people are able to see similarities, peace can be built more efficiently. And Schirch says that even reconciliation can be promoted when people have found shared identities with people across conflict lines (Schirch, 2005, p. 126). Right here she is just in line with Robert Schreiter and his remarks on the importance of establishing a shared identity (4.3.2). When participants of peacebuilding processes eats together, I would argue they at least have a shared identity as humans in need of food. And when Skauen talks about the Guatemala-negotiations at Holmenkollen (5.2.2.5), the participants found a fellow identity in being strangers eating foreign food, and maybe it evolved, and they managed to see each others like mothers or fathers, Guatemalans. Maybe they even reached the point where they showed each other pictures of their families, which Schirch calls Confessional Performances, or an informal ritual.

Schirch says that in ritual, a humanizing space can be found. Earlier, I've discussed how the meal can be a ritual based on Schirch's theory. Sommerfeldt confirms that ritual provides a space for humanizing the enemy in 5.2.2.3, when he says that there is a humanization of relations that happens during a meal. Both Skauen and Solheim confirm this in their experience shared in the interviews.

In 5.2.2.7, Skauen tells from one of the Communion- services in Guatemala City, which were used as a tool to promote Reconciliation. After the communion, everyone was to hold hands and wish each other Gods peace. An officer ended up next to the leader of the widower organization, whom withheld her hand in the first place. But during the song they sang, she held her hand towards him, and the officer later told Skauen that he felt forgiven in this moment. I would argue Skauen here managed to create a "ritualized contexts conducive of transforming perceptions of identity" (Schirch, 2005, p. 127).

When re- negotiating group- identities, it is important for people to feel free, respected and heard when re- negotiating identity, thus *safe space*s are crucial, says Clegg. Schirch also mentions that creating safe spaces is noted in peacebuilding literature (3.3.2), and it is advised to find a setting away from the conflict setting, which can help neutralize hostility. In addition, Schirch says that it can help seating people besides each other and not opposite of each other (Schirch, 2005, p. 68). Further, Clegg says *new knowledge* about the other side is also important, and this does not require direct contact. It is important to learn about the other, because myths and half- truths about the others serve as a potential source of fuel for the conflict. Then, there is no substitute for *new contact* and meeting each other personally in order to re- negotiate identity, says Clegg.

A small remark here to some of what Solheim talks about in relation to meals between the Singhalese and the Tamils in 5.2.2.7. The Tamil Tigers did not wish to eat together with the Singhalese, and it is easily assumed that this relationship was very tense. Maybe it would have been wise to do as Clegg suggests, working on making new knowledge available to the Tamils before suggesting direct contact. But as I have not explored the Sri Lankan conflict in-depth in this thesis, I reckon it unwise to elaborate this. But it came to my mind working with this discussion. And If I were to do another interview with Solheim, I would have asked him if they focused on providing new knowledge within the two groups.

Above, we have seen that identity and the transforming of worldview and identity is central in peacebuilding. Clegg says when groups or communities, (and individuals I would say based on the discussion above), have a strong and stable identity they are more likely to embrace a threatening other as seen in 4.3.1. In order to make this possible, empathy for the other is important, and recognizing the suffering they have experienced, and admitting that one's own community have wronged the other (Clegg, 2008, p. 91).

We saw in 6.1, that transforming relationship is the basis for reconciliation. And when identities (and worldviews) are transformed, it is possible for relationships to be transformed, thus reconciliation becomes possible.

Schreiter talks about the healing of memory or building of common memory (4.3.2), and how this first occurs in those places hospitable where trust is built. Skauen tells how different contexts have served to build trust between peacebuilding participants (5.2.2.2), including meals. A walk through Oslo in snowy and windy weather, a trip with snow scooter on Heistadmoen in full winter clothing when none of the participants have ever seen snow before.

And I would say, based on the discussion above, that the meal seen as a ritual can provide a hospitable space where trust and common memory can be built. The ambience context the meal as a ritual place can provide offers something different into the peacebuilding process which addresses the whole human body, with emotions and senses.

CHAPTER 7   CONCLUSION

The objective of this chapter is to sum up the discussion and findings in the analysis in chapter 6, and thus answering the research question and sub-questions in an easily and understandable manner.

7.1 What is Culinary Diplomacy, and how is it applicable to peacebuilding?

Sam Chapple-Sokol suggests culinary diplomacy to be the use of commensality to promote understanding across cultures, hoping to improve interactions and cooperation. The different tracks of diplomacy in which the theory is discussed, relates to the different levels of peacebuilding (6.1.1). By including the contact hypothesis to the theory of culinary diplomacy, it is suggested that through eating together, relationships evolve and change, and hostility will be replaced by a more positive behavior. Food and practical arrangements surrounding the meal communicates messages un- or intentionally, ant it is important to be aware of this in diplomacy and peacebuilding- settings (6.1.4). The top-level diplomats and peacebuilders referred to in the empirical material mostly confirm commensality creates good relations and reduce hostility. But commensality is sometimes difficult to obtain, as Solheim experienced in the Sri Lanka- negotiations. But this should not overshadow the powerful locus that in many cases is created through commensality, reflected throughout the interviews and empirical accounts. As argued (6.1.6), culinary diplomacy can help transform relationship; hence it is relevant to peacebuilding

The theory of culinary diplomacy has the potential to become an important tool in diplomacy and peacebuilding. However, this theory is new and a further theoretical research is needed in order to establish the theoretical framework further.

7.2 How is the meal present on different levels of peacebuilding, and in which cases can it be seen as a ritual?

On all the three different levels of peacebuilding, a material, a social, and a symbolic dimension of conflict can be identified which each require different approaches to solving the conflict (6.2.1). Central in the symbolic dimension to conflict is how everyone in conflict has their unique worldview lenses deciding how conflict is interpreted, based on perception, sensual and emotional cognition, values, and identity. Schirch suggests that approaches to the

symbolic dimension of conflict require ritual and symbolic actions to engage the whole human with all it's senses, emotions, identities, and values (Schirch, 2005, p. 32).

Schirch proposes ritual to be a space when a group of people who normally do not interact comes together (6.2.2). And it is argued when divided groups share meals, a different context is created, and the act of eating together becomes ritual. Many of the stories presented in the interviews confirm how the meal as ritual can provide a place where new relationships can form, providing a gathering and pleasurable setting in peacebuilding, in contrast to tense negotiations.

Further, examples from the interviews and the written empirical accounts reflect how the meal is present on the three different levels of peacebuilding (6.2.4). Several examples illustrated how the meal is present on a top-level and community-level. In the cases where adversaries eat together, the meals can be seen as ritual. Otherwise, the meals serve to improve relationships, which is important as well.

It is argued by Chapple-Sokol that the meal as a tool in peacebuilding is best used on a community- level, as this level do not seek to solve the conflict. But in light of what Skauen in particular have experienced, the meal as a tool is applicable to the top-level of peacebuilding as well. Making enemies eat together does not solve all problems, and sometimes it is difficult to gather conflictants as Solheim experienced in Sri Lanka. Using the meal as ritual, and rituals in general should not replace traditional tools either, as argued by Schirch. But it should be valued as an important supplement to existing tools on all the three different levels of peacebuilding.

7.3 How can transformed identity and worldviews impact processes of reconciliation?

Reconciliation is one of the deepest changes possible, when working to transform relationships in and after conflict (4.1). The relational side to conflict is approached when working towards reconciliation, which is not provided by traditional statist diplomacy. Lederach suggest reconciliation to be a meeting point where new relationships can be formed, the past can be grieved and a new common future can be envisioned. Santa Barbara adds to Lederach's perspectives on reconciliation that through it, restoring peace in the relationship is crucial. Clegg suggests different levels of society require different kinds of reconciliation. On all these levels, interpersonal reconciliation is present in some way.

Because people construct conflict through their worldview lenses, it is important to understand the five interacting elements of the worldview lens as discussed (6.3.4). Peacebuilders face constant challenges in how to break through psychological defense mechanisms related to perception. Due to emotional and sensual cognition, peacebuilders should include activities as dancing, sports, and eating together. It is important to be aware of culture, and research for existing local reconciliation rituals in peacebuilding work. A peacebuilder should be aware of his or hers values that may affect the process and choice of methods, and it is important to try to identify the participant's values as well. Identity in particular influences the dynamic of conflict, and is extremely important to address in peacebuilding initiatives. Physical and relational context matters, and Schirch suggests choosing locations which can encourage the participants to see each other as more than negotiators of a conflicting identity group. This is reflected in the experiences of both Solheim and Skauen.

Schirch argues ritual to be capable of transforming worldviews and identity (6.3.5 - 6.3.6). Worldviews can be formed, built and protected through rituals, and new ways of thinking can be created through the use of rituals when worldviews crash (Schirch, 2005, p. 99). Ritual brings a new perspective on the conflict rater than solving the conflict. Schirch argues through her story of dinner diplomacy (3.4), that the ritual space her helped the participants see each other in a new way.

The theory on re- negotiating identity by Clegg (4.1.5) and Schirch theory on transforming identity (4.3.2) reinforces the importance of approaching identity in conflict. Both individual and group- identities are threatened in conflict. Transformation of identity in conflict (6.3.6) includes healing threatened or wounded identity, and creating new identities. Establishing shared identities are central, making it possible for conflictants to identify with each other. Schirch argues ritual provides a humanizing space, and Sommerfeldt confirms this for the meal as ritual when he says a humanization of relations happens during a meal (5.2.2.3). Establishing safe spaces, new knowledge, and new contact is central to re- negotiating group identities according to Clegg (4.1.5). In the cases where it is difficult to gather opposing participants of peacebuilding initiatives, it may be important to work on providing new knowledge to each of the groups before trying to make new contact (6.3.6).

Based on the discussion in chapter 6 (6.3), ritual and the meal as ritual can arguably help transform worldview and identity. And when worldviews and identities are transformed, the transformation of relationships become possible, and reconciliation becomes possible. In other words, the meal as ritual can facilitate reconciliation.

Recent literature on reconciliation (6.3.2) suggests addressing reconciliation with tools addressing the emotional memory, as hurt and brokenness are located there. Arguably, the meal as ritual has the power to address the emotional memory, as "ritual communicates through symbols, senses, heightened emotions" (Schirch, 2005, p. 2). In this perspective as well, the meal can be seen as promoting reconciliation.

The meal seen as a ritual can provide a hospitable space where trust and common memory can be built (6.3):. The ambience and context the meal as a ritual place can provide offers something different into the peacebuilding process which addresses the whole human body, with emotions and senses.

7.4 Limitations and Outlook

Because this is an under- researched area, it has been important to look into how food as a tool in reconciliation is connected to different areas. The theoretical material has a strong position in this thesis, due to the lack of a solid existing framework for how to make use of commensality in peacebuilding.

It would be interesting to see more thoroughly research on the matter of using commensality in peacebuilding, adding new insight to this thesis and the theory on culinary diplomacy as proposed by Sam Chapple-Sokol.

Bibliography

Allport, G. W. (1979). *The Nature of Prejudice .* Basic Books.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods.* Oxford OX2 6DP: Oxford University Press.

Chapple-Sokol, S. (2013, 8). Culinary Diplomacy: Breaking Bread to Win Hearts and Minds. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* , ss. 161-183.

Chapple-Sokol, S. (2014, March 2). *Public Diplomacy Magazine.* Retrieved March 2, 2016 fra University of Southern California: http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/warandpeas/

Clegg, C. (2008). Embracing a threatening other - Identity and Reconciliation i Northern Ireland. I P. K. Sebastian C. H. Kim, *Peace and Reconciliation - In Search of a Shared Identity* (s. 205). Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Constantinou, C. M. (1996). *On the Way to Diplomacy .* Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Douven, I. (2011). *Abduction.* Found May 02, 2016 fra Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosofy: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/abduction/

Hiebert, P. G. (2008). *Transforming Worldviews.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Kerry, J. (2015, April 21). *U.S. Department of State.* Found February 26, 2016 fra U.S. Department of State: http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2015/04/240965.htm

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies.* Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace.* New York 10016: Oxford University Press.

Lerche, C. (2000). *Peacebuilding through Reconciliation.* Found March 27, 2016 fra The International Journal of Peace Studies: http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol5_2/lerche.htm

Lindahl, R. (2014). *Creative Tools in Reconciliation after Terrorism .* Oslo: Det Teologiske Menighetsfakultetet.

Santa Barbara, J. (2012). Exploring Reconciliation. I J. G. Joanna Santa Barbara, *Reconciliation: Clearing the Past, Building a Future* (ss. 10-98). Transcend University Press.

Schirch, L. (2005). *Ritual and Symbol in Peacebuilding.* Bloomfield: Kumarian Press, Inc.

Schirch, L. (2004). *The Little Book of Strategic Peacebuilding.* 17534: Good Books.

Schreiter, R. (2008). Establishing a Shared Identity - The Role of the Healing of Memories and Narrative . I P. K. Sebastian C. H. Kim, *Peace and Reconciliation - In Search of a Shared Identity* (s. 205). Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Spokesperson. (2012, September 5). *U.S. Department of State.* Retrieved February 26, 2016 fra U.S. Department of State: http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/09/197375.htm

Svennevig, J. (1997). Retrieved May 2, 2016 fra http://home.bi.no/a0210593/Abduction%20as%20a%20methodological%20.pdf

United Nations Peacebuilding Fund. (u.d.). *United Nations Peacebuilding Fund.*
Retrieved March 16, 2016 fra What is Peacebuilding?:
http://www.unpbf.org/application-guidelines/what-is-peacebuilding/

United States Institute of Peace. (2011). Retrieved March 7, 2016 fra Glossary terms
for conflict management and peacebuilding: http://glossary.usip.org/resource/tracks-
diplomacy

Sources retrieved from the Internet:

Front page picture is found on the blog Culinary Diplomacy, but no copyright is named.
http://culinarydiplomacy.com/blog/2012/09/25/commensality/ (10.05.2016)

Chapple-Sokol, **2014**
http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/warandpeas/ (02.03.2016)

Club de Chefs des Chefs
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/foodanddrink/10982411/Club-des-Chefs-welcome-to-the-
worlds-most-elite-dining-club.html (29.02.2016)

Dining with the enemy
https://sumo.tv2.no/programmer/fakta/til-bords-med-fienden/ (26.02.2016)

Gastrodiplomacy
http://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2014/03/24/291980375/gastrodiplomacy-
cooking-up-a-tasty-lesson-on-war-and-peace (27.02.2016)

International alert
http://www.international-alert.org/news/what%E2%80%99s-food-got-do-peace
(26.02.2016)

John Kerry
http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2015/04/240965.htm (26.02.2016)

Peace for breakfast
http://oslo.arbeiderparti.no/nyheter/16390556/Fred-til-frokost.-Frihet-til-lunsj
(26.02.2016)

Potlucks for peace
http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/potlucks-for-peace/ (29.02.2016)

Recipes for Peace
http://www.international-alert.org/news/culinary-dialogue-promoting-cooperation-
between-communities-armenia-and-turkey (29.02.2016)

Stoltenberg and Mandela
http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/soer-afrika/thorvald-var-frokostvert-for-mandela/a/10117895/ (26.02.2016)

Talking Peace Festival 2
http://talkingpeacefestival.org/food/ (27.02.2016)

Talking Peace Festival
http://talkingpeacefestival.org/events/event/conflict-kitchen-monikers/ (27.02.2016)

The Diplomatic Culinary Partnership
http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/09/197375.htm (26.02.2016)

Interview guide:

- Is the meal used intentionally in peacebuilding?

Are there any meals you remember better than others with regards to building relations?

- Do you have any thoughts regarding what makes a good setting for sharing a meal in peacebuilding?

- Is there a difference in ambience in a meal in an official setting, f. ex a hotel in comparison to in someone's home?

- What do you think makes a good setting for a meal to be shared by conflicting parties?

- What kind of food?

- As Atle Somemrfeldt mentioned; what about the drink after the meal? (Added after the first interview)

- Does peacebuilding and negotiations have to happen on a top level?

- How much is reconciliation emphasized in peacebuilding?