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“The room we were in, the door wouldn’t close. It wasn’t like this one – every time you’d close it, it would tick open. And somebody got up to try to push it closed, and I remember one of the Sinn Fein representatives saying, ‘You’re wasting your time: it’s a Methodist door, and it doesn’t close.’ Well, I thought, ‘If nobody ever says anything nicer, that’s nice. We can live with that. We can live with that one.’” --Simon
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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the methods, influence, and effectiveness of clergy peacebuilders in Northern Ireland during the violent conflict known as “The Troubles,” through the signing of the peace agreement and the first decade post-agreement. Twenty-one clergy, all committed to ameliorating the conflict, were interviewed once for approximately ninety minutes regarding their theological motivations, activism efforts, constraints, and perceived effectiveness. Interviewees include eight Methodist, eight Church of Ireland, three Roman Catholic, one Presbyterian, one ecumenical order, and one evangelical parachurch clergy.

Analysis of the interviews revealed strong theological similarities of inclusivity and dedication to living one’s beliefs despite denominational differences; however, clergy expressed a range of views on Manichaeism and pacifism/Just War theory. They also experienced a range of direct and indirect violence. These factors increased their perceived risk of activism and shaped their ministerial approach and effectiveness. The context of conflict, which predisposes parishioners to prefer certain leadership styles, and
clergy access to expert, referent, and legitimate power also affected clergy influence and activism.

The study argues that, as a whole, activist clergy possess a particularly favorable platform for successful outgroup exposure due to high group salience and boundary de-emphasis. Typical clergy peacebuilding activities influence individuals, structures, and communities. Also, clergy influence through indirect outgroup contact, ripple effects, and synergism, decreases hostility and increases the possibilities of achieving peace. Clergy use of “soft power” lets them operate in a democratic deficit, helps build trust, improves the quality of negotiations and agreements, ameliorates identity conflict, and enhances stability.

This study, the first conducted among a range of activist clergy in Northern Ireland, concludes that in order to optimize peace efforts, secular interest groups should cooperate with clergy peacebuilders. Moreover, denominations and seminaries should consciously augment clergy expert, referent, and legitimate power and reduce clergy fears of perceived professional risk resulting from activism. The thesis adds to Peace/Conflict studies by providing in-depth insight into the various capabilities, constraints, and the significance of civil society/religious peacebuilders.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview of the problem

“They threatened to burn down the church if we didn’t stop our ecumenical prayer meetings”… “We rode out into the middle of where the riots were starting to see if we could calm them down”… “We were told a gunman planned to target our church services”… “I found a petrol bomb in my back yard, a clear warning to stop my work”… “I had to check under my car for bombs every day”… These harrowing statements come from clergy in Northern Ireland. Clergy face death threats and put their lives at risk when they attempt to ameliorate the violence and hostility that wracked the region for decades and continues to undermine democracy, stability, and peace. This thesis examines their efforts in-depth to understand exactly how clergy contributions influence society and what impact they have on violence and peace.

The recent three decades of intense violence in Northern Ireland, often termed ‘The Troubles,’ lasted from approximately 1968 until the peace accord in 1998. Analysts typically divide the peace process into three phases.¹ The first phase, from the mid to late 1980s until 1994, involved the gradual movement from war to politics and the eventual establishment of the 1994 ceasefire. The second phase, from 1994 to 1998, consisted of political negotiations and careful tactics to formulate and pass the power-sharing agreement, usually called the Belfast Agreement or Good Friday Agreement (GFA). The third phase, from 1998 to the present, involves implementation and stabilization of the

GFA and its Northern Ireland Executive (NIE), and attempts to move beyond intercommunal hostility to democratic cooperation and improved relations.

The implementation phase has experienced a variety of challenges and stumbles, in which recalcitrant politicians, extreme paramilitary factions, and intercommunal hostility present significant obstacles to progress. Increased segregation also impairs economic development. British Prime Minister David Cameron, in his June 2011 speech to the Northern Ireland Assembly, notes that since 2006, the number of ‘peace walls,’ which segregate the two communities, has increased from 37 to 48. The resultant duplication of services costs an extra £1.5 billion per year.\(^2\) Citizens and analysts alike frequently use the broad term “sectarianism” to describe the situation. Joseph Liechty and Cynthia Clegg provide a useful definition of the term, based on their in-depth study of the issue:

> Sectarianism is a complex of problems – including dividing, demonizing, and dominating – which typically arise from malignant intersections of religion and politics and which are characteristic of the kind of religiously-shaped ethno-national conflict experienced in Northern Ireland. …a system of attitudes, actions, beliefs, and structures, which arises as a distorted expression of positive, human needs especially for belonging, identity, and the free expression of difference and is expressed in destructive patterns of relating: hardening the boundaries between groups, overlooking others, belittling, dehumanizing, or demonizing others,

\(^2\) David Cameron, *Address to Northern Ireland Assembly* 2011.
justifying or collaborating in the domination of others, physically or verbally intimidating or attacking others.³

Liechty and Clegg observe that sectarianism developed as a result of choices rather than inevitable forces. Furthermore, the difference in context today provides hope that new choices can deconstruct sectarianism.⁴

Clergy have worked in various capacities to ameliorate conflict and build peace throughout the earlier phases of the Troubles, and they continue to work in the present phase. Aside from studies of obviously influential activities such as secret negotiations between the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and Protestant or Unionist leaders, analysis of the conflict lacks in-depth scrutiny of clergy efforts. This study seeks to gain insight about the range of clergy peacebuilding⁵ activities, what makes their contributions unique, how their work pertains to current theories about conflict and peace, and the extent to which their efforts have influenced and continue to influence the peace process.

Northern Ireland continues to struggle with sectarian violence and instability. Increased understanding about how to maximize clergy effectiveness can improve coordination among the disciplines that study peacebuilding and enhance cooperation among religious, civil, state and international actors.

⁴Ibid., p100.
⁵The term peacebuilding has caught on among scholars and practitioners of peace and conflict studies. It supplements or replaces older terms such as peacemaking or peacekeeping, which sometimes refer to earlier stages of conflict transformation or less comprehensive approaches, with a narrower focus on ending or preventing open warfare. Peacebuilding tries to describe the process of conflict transformation more broadly: the term includes both the progressive phases of transition from open conflict to harmony as well as the construction of societal justice necessary for durable, stable peace.
Summary of extant work

1. Critical and relevant literature

A study of clergy peacebuilder effectiveness necessarily spans multiple disciplines. This work draws on scholarship from the fields of sociology, social psychology, international relations, political science, practical theology, and other conflict resolution specialists who also combine disciplines, as well as experts on the Northern Ireland conflict. The literature discusses seven main topics: 1) the role of religion in conflict; 2) Track Two diplomacy and different sources of power 3) sustainable peace; 4) the roles of outgroup contact and identity in peace processes; 5) middle-tier and grassroots peacebuilding; 6) clergy leadership and activism; 7) religious peacebuilding efforts in Northern Ireland. These topics provide theoretical and empirical structure with which to examine the influence of clergy peacebuilding activities in the Northern Ireland peace process.

2. Conceptual analyses of the role of religion in conflict

Analysts of conflict span a range of views regarding the importance and role of religion. Edward Luttwak (1994) and Stanton Burnett (1994) find that persistent anti-religious prejudice from the Enlightenment and Realism schools cause policymakers, diplomats, journalists, and scholars to disregard religion as of negligible importance in foreign affairs, both as a cause of conflict or of conflict resolution.8,7 As Steve Bruce

---

(2001) observes, many secular analysts view religion as a cover for secular motives, while evangelicals view secular motives as a cover for a religious struggle. However, essentialists such as Bernard Lewis (1990) and Samuel Huntington (1993) believe religious differences can inevitably cause, reignite, and sustain conflict. Mark Juergensmeyer (2003) and J.P. Larsson (2004) also blame religion, rather than fanaticism, for violent conflicts. Juergensmeyer (2003) states that religious ideas motivate conflict; they do not mask political or secular motives.

Other analysts consider religion to have multiple, diverse strands of meaning, which interplay with society in nuanced ways that can exacerbate or ameliorate conflict. Scott Thomas (2005) finds that international relations scholars often misunderstand religion and consider it dangerous when mixed with politics. Thomas advocates a deeper appreciation for various modern forms of religion and their potential in diplomacy, peacebuilding, and civil society.

---

10Samuel P Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?," Foreign Affairs 72, no. 3 (1993).
12J. P. Larsson, Understanding Religious Violence : Thinking Outside the Box on Terrorism (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
13Juergensmeyer.
Jay Demerath (2000, 2001) observe that religion both shapes and is shaped by its culture and social context.\textsuperscript{15,16,17,18}

3. Conceptual analyses of religion and conflict in Northern Ireland

Some scholars view the conflict in Northern Ireland as primarily ethnic/national,\textsuperscript{19,20,21,22,23,24} others as colonial\textsuperscript{25}, territorial,\textsuperscript{26} economic,\textsuperscript{27} psychological,\textsuperscript{28,29} or religious.\textsuperscript{30} Scholars describe a range of ways and degrees to which

\begin{itemize}
  \item David Martin, \textit{Does Christianity Cause War?}\ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p38
  \item Steve Bruce, \textit{The Edge of the Union: The Ulster Loyalist Political Vision}\ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
  \item Cathal McCall, "From 'Long War' to 'War of the Lilies': 'Post-Conflict' Territorial Compromise and the Return of Cultural Politics," in \textit{A Farewell to Arms: Beyond the Good Friday Agreement}, ed. Michael Cox, Adrian Guelke, and Fiona Stephen\ (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
\end{itemize}
religion caused or exacerbated the conflict.\textsuperscript{31,32,33,34} Martin Marty (1988) and Steve Bruce (2001) note the impact of Ian Paisley’s Manichaean fundamentalism as a factor that contributes to the conflict,\textsuperscript{35,36} and John Fulton finds that the churches contributed to the power struggle and to negative views of the other community.\textsuperscript{37} Brewer (1998) examines how Protestant clergy have used theology to support ascendancy since the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{38} Hickey (1984) observes that religion inspires politics, and theology helps to shape religious adherents’ attitudes and actions toward social and political issues.\textsuperscript{39} Chapter 2 explores what experiences and religious resources inform and shape clergy approaches to peacebuilding. The interviewees express four main theological themes: inclusivity, reconciliation, loyalty, and the call to live one’s faith.

\textsuperscript{33}Roy; Steve Bruce; David Taylor Wallis, "No Surrender!": \textit{Paisleyism and the Politics of Ethnic Identity in Northern Ireland}(Belfast: Department of Social Studies, The Queen's University of Belfast, 1986).
\textsuperscript{34}Jennifer Todd, "Two Traditions in Unionist Political Culture," \textit{Irish Political Studies} 2, no. (1987).
\textsuperscript{36}Bruce, "Fundamentalism and Political Violence: The Case of Paisley and Ulster Evangelicals.", p398.
\textsuperscript{39}Hickey., p59.
Liechty and Clegg (2001) note that when scholars reduce religion to doctrine, they distort its significance in the conflict. Liechty and Clegg encourage a “both/and” approach to religion and other factors in the conflict, such as economics or politics.\textsuperscript{40} Ruane & Todd (1996) explain that through structured divisions and continued contact, religion affects even people who no longer attend church.\textsuperscript{41} David Hempton and Myrtle Hill (1992) observe that religion has intertwined with politics so as to make it a distortion to try to separate them.\textsuperscript{42} Wright (1973) states that socio-economic/political context and religious ideology both affect each other, and their interplay shapes the conflict.\textsuperscript{43} Mitchell (2006) similarly observes that while the conflict in Northern Ireland does not stem from theological disputes, religion still maintains primary salience as a badge of communal identity. Religion undergirds that identity with meaning and content because it shapes the way people approach their identity boundaries, power relationships, and ethnonational loyalties.\textsuperscript{44} Chapter 2 explores the question of how interviewees chose to become clergy peacebuilders. It examines the family and cultural background of each interviewee, what influenced their views about the two communities, how they turned to a religious orientation of reconciliation and activism, and their views about good and evil. Included is a discussion of how religion both shapes and is shaped by context for these clergy.

\textsuperscript{40} Liechty and Clegg., p49, 37.
\textsuperscript{41} Joseph Ruane and Jennifer Todd, \textit{The Dynamics of Conflict in Northern Ireland: Power, Conflict and Emancipation} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
\textsuperscript{42} David Hempton and Myrtle Hill, \textit{Evangelical Protestantism in Ulster Society, 1740-1890} (Routledge, 1992).
\textsuperscript{44} Mitchell., p2, 6-7.
4. Conceptual parameters of the thesis

A. Context

Though the conflict involves two parties, considerable religious and political diversity exists within the two communities. One group, the Catholic/Nationalist/Republican community, consists of people who tend to prefer reunification with the Republic of Ireland and have a family and social context connected with the Catholic Church. The other group, the Protestant/Unionist/Loyalist community, includes people who tend to prefer to remain part of the United Kingdom and have family and social networks linked to various Protestant churches. Roughly speaking, Nationalists and Unionists tend to be considered more moderate than Republicans and Loyalists, and less supportive of violent means to secure political ends. All labels generalize, neglect nuances, and obscure deep analysis. However, labels also provide the minimum structure necessary to start the conversation. With these limitations in mind, and cognizant of the problematic and disputed concept of the role of religion in the conflict in Northern Ireland, this study generally refers to one community as Catholic and the other as Protestant. These labels reflect the understanding that while not a primary causal factor, religion nonetheless structures the divide between the two communities to a large degree.

B. Track Two Diplomacy

Diplomats and scholars of International Relations initially resisted the idea that social psychology or non-elite peace efforts could make any valuable contribution to

---

45F. W. Boal, Margaret C. Keane, and David N. Livingstone, Them and Us?: Attitudinal Variation among Churchgoers in Belfast (Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, Queen's University of Belfast, 1997).
William Davidson (1981) and Joseph Montville (1981, 1987) began to change the attitude toward informal peace efforts with their presentation of “Track Two diplomacy.” Davidson & Montville (1981) argue that psychological strategies by unofficial, middle tier or grassroots actors can complement official, high level (Track One) diplomatic conflict resolution efforts. Montville (1987) later expands the concept to include any strategic efforts to improve perceptions of the other community, support conciliatory measures, and cooperate to enhance the attractiveness and economic benefits of conflict resolution. Track One analysts such as William Zartman (1989) began to engage other contextual concepts such as timing. Zartman notes that Track One actors must correctly identify the “ripe moment,” an optimal time to act based on contextual factors.

Leaders in the field of psychological approaches to conflict, such as John Paul Lederach (1997) and International Relations scholars such as Frederic Pearson (2001) find that a lack of Track Two efforts significantly diminishes the success of ethnopolitical peace.

---

processes. Mary Kaldor (2003) discusses the power of global civil society to impact international norms about human rights and humanitarian intervention. Camilla Orjuela (2008) describes how civil actors can prevent violent conflict, protect civilians in the midst of war, lay the ground for top-level peace efforts, and support sustainable peace. Practitioners such as Ronald Fisher (2006), Harold Saunders (2001), and Chester Crocker (1999) have studied how to maximize Track Two efforts through careful coordination with Track One work. Mathijs van Leeuwen (2009) notes that analysts should study the everyday practices of civil society peacebuilders to understand how their beliefs and activities contextualize theory and give it concrete meaning.

While Frank Wright (1987), Michael Cox, and Paul Gillespie, discuss Northern Ireland peace efforts primarily or entirely in Track One terms of international power

---

brokers, armies, and threats of violence,\(^6\) scholars have also examined the role of Track Two diplomacy in the peace process. Paul Dixon (2006) states that scholars have overemphasized the IR dimension of the Troubles and peace process.\(^6\) Neil Jarman (2009) notes that due to the relatively small and straightforward nature of the Northern Ireland peace process, Montville’s original two-track model applies to Northern Ireland better than subsequent, more complex models of multitrack diplomacy.\(^6\) Feargal Cochrane (2006) observes the perceived ineffectiveness of political elites at various stages of the peace process.\(^6\) Paul Arthur (1990)\(^6\), Joseph Popiolkowski, and Nicholas Cull (2009)\(^6\) discuss important contributions of Track Two diplomacy in Northern Ireland.


\(^6\) Paul Arthur, "Negotiating the Northern Ireland Problem: Track One or Track Two Diplomacy?" *Government and Opposition* 25, no. 4 (1990).

In addition, analysts have examined the importance of grassroots context in Northern Ireland. Kirsten Schulze (1997) applies the concept of the “ripe moment” to Northern Ireland and observes that ripeness involves a process of multiple moments, which depend on elements such as structures, parties, and potential alternative outcomes. Paul Arthur (2002) notes that while concepts of ripe moments, hurting stalemates, and Track One leadership hold merit, “we ignore at our peril the quiet attitudinal changes being nurtured in the undergrowth,” which alone can provide the sense of ownership necessary to maintain peace. Chapters 4 and 6 discuss how clergy foment grassroots attitudinal changes.

C. Types of power and their effects on peace efforts

The types of power utilized by clergy differ from those used by other actors, particularly elite, Track One leaders. Sometimes, these non-elite forms of power can significantly affect a peace process. David Martin (1997) finds that communities often abandon and reject changes that increase or promote pluralism because those changes cause so much counter-pressure. Frank Wright (1987), Paul Bew (2006), and Stefan Wolff, (2001) observe that for all their coercive power, elite actors could not establish stable peace in Northern Ireland. John Morison (2006) states that sustainable peace

---

70 Martin, p73.
71 Wright, *Northern Ireland: A Comparative Analysis*. 
in Northern Ireland requires alternative forms of governance and new ideas of power, which include grassroots empowerment.\textsuperscript{74}

John French and Bertram Raven (1960) explain the bases of social power and how they operate to influence people.\textsuperscript{75} French & Raven find that while coercive and reward power can compel people to obey a social agent while in that agent’s presence, such influence has a limited scope and depends on the ability of the agent to enforce and sustain punishments and rewards. In contrast, powers such as referent (attractive) power, legitimate power, and expert power can influence people in wide ranges of views and behaviors. Those forms of influence can also last much longer, even without the presence of the influencing social agent.

Joseph Nye (1990, 2004) applies these concepts to foreign policy with his discussion of “soft power,” a term that has gained popularity with some Track One practitioners.\textsuperscript{76} Nye defines soft power as the power to attract, which French & Raven (1959) call referent power. Nye also includes elements of legitimate and expert power in his descriptions of how soft power can have influence, and his analysis blurs the

\textsuperscript{72}Paul Bew, "Myths of Consociationalism: From Good Friday to Political Impasse," in \textit{A Farewell to Arms: Beyond the Good Friday Agreement}, ed. Michael Cox, Adrian Guelke, and Fiona Stephen(Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
\textsuperscript{74}John Morison, "Constitutionalism, Civil Society and Democratic Renewal in Northern Ireland," in \textit{A Farewell to Arms: Beyond the Good Friday Agreement}, ed. Michael Cox, Adrian Guelke, and Fiona Stephen(Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
distinctions among the types of power. Nye notes that civil society, citizens, and Track Two actors and institutions sometimes possess more soft power than governments; thus, sufficient soft power can influence Track One policies about conflict and peace. While one cannot measure the influence or effects of soft power so easily as hard (coercive or reward) power, soft power can significantly affect the success of negotiations. The less concentrated a state’s hard power, the stronger influence soft power can have; thus a dictator can ignore public opinion more than a democratic leader.77,78 However, political scientist Gene Sharp (2002, 2003, 2008, 2010) outlines with great precision how grassroots actors can use nonviolent sources of power to overthrow dictatorships.79

Peace studies often utilize these forms of grassroots power to create Track Two strategies. For example, Johan Galtung (1959) advises grassroots peacebuilders to engage in “systematic norm infraction,” by which they break required norms or omit required behaviors and live according to the norms they wish to promote. These types of civil disobedience maintain consistent identity in both ends and means; thus, they can significantly impact the social structure.80 Grassroots actors and institutions in an unstable state such as Northern Ireland have possessed particularly strong soft power, as politicians relied heavily on constituent support for the success of the GFA. Chapter 6 asks the questions, “Did you make a difference?” and “How much did it all matter?” and

argues that while clergy do not have the power to threaten war or withhold money, they have other kinds of power that significantly impacted each stage of the peace process. This paper argues that clergy peace efforts use these soft forms of referent, legitimate, and expert power, through which they influence ripeness, mood, the quality of negotiations, and post-agreement stability.

D. Sustainable peace

In their focus on Track One diplomacy, scholars and practitioners of conflict have emphasized the importance of negotiation and peace agreements as the crucial element to move from conflict to peace. In 1981, Roger Fisher and William Ury of the Harvard Negotiation Project published the first of three editions of their widely acclaimed theory of successful negotiation, *Getting to Yes*, which continues to influence Track One diplomacy efforts. However, almost half of all peace agreements last fewer than five years; even more break down within ten years. Many peace agreements that seem to last longer actually enter an indeterminate state between war and peace, which qualifies as neither success nor failure.

The high failure rate leads analysts to debate how best to translate a peace agreement into sustainable peace. The realist camp looks to refined Track One efforts. Legal scholars such as Christine Bell (2006) and political scientists such as Virginia Page Fortna (2004) find that the proper wording of a peace agreement can ensure durable

---

peace, especially with sufficient coercive power by state actors.\textsuperscript{83,84} United Nations peacekeepers speak of the need to expand the roles of UN actors. Steven Ratner (1995) suggests a broad “new peacekeeping” approach to stabilize peace, especially when a belligerent population resists peace agreements.\textsuperscript{85} John Mackinlay (1992) and Jarat Chopra (1992, 1998) promote UN “second generation peacekeeping”\textsuperscript{86} within states, and “peace maintenance” through political, military, and humanitarian assistance.\textsuperscript{87} Charles Call and Elizabeth Cousens, (2008) assign international actors the roles of peacebuilding, state building, stabilization, and reconstruction. While they also assign national actors those roles, national actors’ most important role involves nation building: to overcome sectarian hostility, promote united loyalty and identity, and mobilize civilian support for the common state.\textsuperscript{88}

Other analysts depart from a statist approach and further emphasize the nation-building role of local actors. Galtung (1996) notes that sustainable peace requires more than a “new architecture”; rather, the parties must change internally and relationally in

\textsuperscript{83}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{88}Charles T Call and Elizabeth M Cousens, "Ending War, Building Peace: International Responses to War-Torn Societies," \textit{International Studies Perspectives} 9, no. 1 (2008), p4.
order not to continually reproduce their conflict.\textsuperscript{89} Galtung (1959) outlines a framework that expands the definition of violence from direct, physical injury to include indirect and psychological forms, such as economic exploitation and destruction of cultural symbols.\textsuperscript{90} Because cultural violence legitimizes all other forms of violence,\textsuperscript{91} violence tends to flow causally from cultural via structural to direct violence.\textsuperscript{92} Galtung (1996) distinguishes between negative peace – the absence of direct violence – and positive peace, the absence of all forms of structural, cultural, direct, indirect, physical, and psychological violence.\textsuperscript{93} Moreover, positive peace includes content to build a just and harmonious culture. Direct positive peace involves kindness; structural positive peace involves freedom, equity, dialogue and integration; cultural positive peace involves the legitimization of peace in religion, law, ideology, language, education, and media.\textsuperscript{94} Galtung sees peace as a process rather than a state. The virtuous spiral of peace can break the vicious spiral of violence, as it flows from cultural peace through structural peace to direct peace, which will bring about positive peace.\textsuperscript{95} Because all violence breeds violence and all peace breeds peace, positive peace provides the optimal protection from violence.\textsuperscript{96} To this end, Galtung recommends that peace studies include an holistic approach, which considers the
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web of military, political, economic, and cultural factors in order to build sustainable peace.97

Critics of Galtung and peace research often describe it as naïve. Herman Schmid (1968) notes that peace research tends to focus on negative peace, which serves the interests of established powers. Positive peace has little concrete content, and established powers reject or ignore any components that do not serve their purposes.98 Georg Pict (1975) similarly notes that established powers want to maintain the status quo, which depends upon inequities that will inevitably produce violence. Thus, representatives of power disregard any peace theories that challenge the status quo.99 Alfred Bönisch (1981) provides a socialist critique and states that the concept of positive peace lacks rigor. Bönisch finds positive peace concepts overly bourgeois and utopian because they try to add elements of peace to an inherently unjust and violent social order. To build sustainable peace, society must abolish antagonistic class structures.100 Ilan Gur-Ze-ev (2001), in a postmodern critique, states that the naïve, universalist, essentialist concept of peace that informs peace education preserves and reinforces the hegemonic, violent reality it attempts to transform.101

97Ibid., p22.
Despite these critiques, support for the goal of positive peace, an inclusive social and political process to build justice and equity, continues to grow among practitioners, scholars, and advocates interested in peace maintenance. Kenneth Boulding (1991) combines negative and positive peace into the term “stable peace,” defined as the absence of war as well as how social systems such as religion, ideology, and economic behavior stabilize or destabilize peace.\textsuperscript{102} UN Secretary-General Boutros Ghali (1995) defines peacebuilding to address all aspects of conflict: root causes, conflict prevention, actions during warfare, and post-conflict activity.\textsuperscript{103} John Paul Lederach (1997) similarly defines peacebuilding as “a comprehensive concept that encompasses, generates, and sustains the full array of process, approaches, and stages needed to transform conflict toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships.”\textsuperscript{104} These broad definitions of positive, stable peace and all-encompassing peace efforts represent well the lofty goals and wide-ranging activities of clergy peacebuilders in this study. Other terms such as ‘religious peacemaking,’\textsuperscript{105} ‘religious conflict transformation,’\textsuperscript{106} ‘religious conflict resolution,’\textsuperscript{107}
and ‘faith-based diplomacy’ convey similar ideas. However, the term ‘religious peacebuilding,’ which Little & Appleby (2004) define as “the range of activities performed by religious actors and institutions for the purpose of resolving and transforming deadly conflict, with the goal of building social relations and political institutions characterized by an ethos of tolerance and nonviolence,” (emphasis theirs) best expresses the gradual, continual, painstaking construction of positive peace and reconciliation exhibited by these clergy. Chapter 3 explores how clergy experiences of violence shape their peacebuilding efforts, and how their approaches to the topics of violence and pacifism shape, and are shaped by, their peacebuilding work in a conflict zone. Chapter 4 describes the scope and goals of clergy peacebuilding.

Analysis of sustainable peace often involves the concept of reconciliation. Lederach (1997) points out the importance of reconciliation as a relational framework in which to address issues of deep-rooted enmity. Borris & Diehl (1998) describe reconciliation as political processes in transitional societies, which aid groups to move beyond past animosities toward mutual conciliatory accommodation. Other social scientists (Tavuchis, 1991; Krepon & Sevak, 1996; Asmal, Asmal, & Roberts, 1997;}
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Kriesberg, 1998; Rothstein, 1999) have applied similar ideas of reconciliation to case studies and conflict theory.113,114,115,116,117

Political psychologist Daniel Bar-Tal (2000) develops a rich theory of reconciliation. Bar-Tal notes that a peace agreement forms only the first step of peacebuilding. In protracted, violent conflicts, parties must also transform their conflictive ethos to a peace ethos. When a group believes in the justice of their goals, that belief forms the cognitive basis of the conflict and presents the most significant obstacle to peace. A peace agreement removes the perception that the goals of the parties contradict each other; however, society needs new goals and rationalizing beliefs, symbols, and myths in order to translate the initial agreement into a peace ethos sufficient to sustain the peace. Groups feel threatened by any effort to refute the conflictive ethos because 1) this ethos forms the foundation of group identity; 2) societal structures replicate the ethos; 3) it constitutes the only reality some generations have ever known; 4) it forms the ideological basis for political groups; and 5) those who deviate from it experience sanctions. Groups must replace negative, generalized stereotypes about each other with positive, differentiated beliefs, and replace uncritical, positive self-

glorification with the objective ability to recognize their group’s contribution to the conflict. The parties must normalize both a cooperative relationship with each other and also the use of peaceful mechanisms to resolve future disagreements.\textsuperscript{118}

As we shall see, Bar-Tal’s theory of reconciliation resembles many clergy peacebuilding activities in Northern Ireland. Chapter 4 describes these activities: clergy peacebuilders offer new goals, beliefs, symbols, and myths to replace previous sectarian ideas; clergy work to break down stereotypes and challenge their communities to accept responsibility for wrongdoing; clergy try to normalize cross-community cooperation and nonviolent problem solving. Chapter 5 details the considerable pressure clergy face when people who cling to the conflictive ethos feel threatened by their work.

E. Sustainable Peace in Northern Ireland

Analysts of Northern Ireland generally express concern for the stability of the peace process. Unlike most authors, Jon Tonge (2006) views the threat to peace process as minimal.\textsuperscript{119} In contrast, Lee Smithey (2011) notes that parading, murals, and sectarian violence indicate that Northern Ireland has not reached a postconflict state; rather, the communities continue the conflict by other means.\textsuperscript{120} Arthur Aughey (2006) observes that while enough Unionists voted for the GFA to allow its passage, Unionists despise the

\textsuperscript{118}Daniel Bar-Tal, "From Intractable Conflict through Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation: Psychological Analysis," \textit{Political Psychology} 21, no. (2000).
agreement and resist its implementation.\textsuperscript{121} John Darby (2006) points out that ongoing communal violence has repeatedly destabilized the peace process.\textsuperscript{122} Darby and Colin McInnes (2006) view the delay in IRA decommissioning as a major threat to the stability of peace.\textsuperscript{123}

Analysts also promote the need for broad peacebuilding, which includes reconciliation.\textsuperscript{124} Derick Wilson & Jerry Tyrell (1995) state that the cease-fires and the GFA represent only the first steps in a long-term process of social reconstruction.\textsuperscript{125} Paul Arthur (2002) notes that a peace process merely begins the long journey from disorder and bitter conflict towards peace and reconciliation. Civil society must construct a culture of tolerance and create conditions in which people can heal, forgive, and reclaim their dignity.\textsuperscript{126} Borris & Diehl (1998) highlight the importance of trust in the reconciliation process.\textsuperscript{127} Liechty and Clegg (2001) develop a careful strategy to promote justice and build trust in order to achieve communal reconciliation in Northern Ireland.\textsuperscript{128}
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F. Outgroup contact and identity

In their formulation and promotion of Track Two diplomacy, Davidson and Montville (1981) draw upon the psychological approach of Herbert Kelman. Kelman (1997) shows how perceived threats to identity cause people to negate their opponents and view the conflict as a zero-sum game. People deny the validity of their opponents’ experiences in order to preserve belief in their community’s innocence, deny responsibility for past wrongs, and avoid future concessions.\(^{129}\) Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper (2000) note that the many layers of meaning, some contradictory, in the term ‘identity’ present difficulties in the use of this ambiguous concept.\(^{130}\) However, Donna Hicks (2001) finds identity theory useful to design strategies to help people come to terms with the perspectives of their opponents at a pace they can handle. People can absorb only so much cognitive dissonance about their community’s culpability and the other community’s valid grievances before they ‘freeze’ and reject all further input.\(^{131}\) Chapter 5 describes how clergy peacebuilders in Northern Ireland constantly address the identity issues Kelman mentions and employ pacing strategies so their parishioners will not ‘freeze.’


\(^{130}\) Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper, "Beyond "Identity"," *Theory and Society* 29, no. 1 (2000).

Studies of identity have brought attention to the role of “outgroup contact” (exposure to the other community) as a way to reduce anxiety toward and negative perceptions of the opposing community.\textsuperscript{132} Scholars such as Kelman (1999) and Paul Connolly (2000) isolate the conditions under which outgroup contact results in the greatest benefits.\textsuperscript{133,134} However, Dixon et al. (2005) caution that lists do not always work in the real world; scholars must listen to the voices and perspectives of participants to determine what works best in each unique context.\textsuperscript{135}

Sean Byrne (2001) provides a thorough description of the various identity aspects to the conflict in Northern Ireland.\textsuperscript{136} Miles Hewstone et al. (2005, 2006, 2008a,b), Ulrike Niens et al. (2003), Joanne Hughes et al. (2007) and Bernadette Hayes et al. (2007) examine how the nature of outgroup contact in Northern Ireland affects its efficacy\textsuperscript{137,138,139,140,141,142,143} and find that close relationships reduce anxiety and increase

\textsuperscript{134} Paul Connolly, "What Now for the Contact Hypothesis? Towards a New Research Agenda," \textit{Race, Ethnicity and Education} 3, no. 2 (2000).
\textsuperscript{135} John A Dixon, Kevin Durrheim, and Colin Tredoux, "Beyond the Optimal Contact Strategy: A ‘‘Reality Check’’ for the Contact Hypothesis," \textit{American Psychologist} 60, no. (2005).
people’s ability to see their opponents’ point of view (“perspective taking”).\textsuperscript{144} Hewstone et al. (2005, 2008b) also find that indirect contact, in which people have friends or family members who experience outgroup exposure, mitigates perceived threat and outgroup hostility.\textsuperscript{145} Katrina Lloyd & Gillian Robinson observe that intermarriage also helps reduce outgroup hostility.\textsuperscript{146} Chapter 4 discusses the contact hypothesis at work in clergy peacebuilding efforts, which produce forgiveness and trust. The chapter explores the roles of forgiveness, trust, reduced threat, and increased perspective taking in embedded work, negotiations, mediations, and intercommunal reconciliation. This paper argues that clergy outgroup contact efforts have particular potential for widespread impact because clergy have access to large segments of the population and because church-based efforts can provide optimal parameters for outgroup contact benefits.


\textsuperscript{140} Miles Hewstone, Joanne Hughes, and Ed Cairns, "Can Contact Promote Better Relations? Evidence from Mixed and Segregated Areas of Belfast," (2008).
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G. Middle-tier and grassroots religious peacebuilding

Over the past twenty years, scholars have increasingly recognized the merits of religiously based informal peace work. In 1994, Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson published an anthology of religious Track Two contributions to peace efforts. The authors acknowledge ways religion exacerbates conflict but also highlight important historical contributions religious actors have made to conflict resolution. Edward Luttwak observes that religious mediators can improve negotiations. William Vendley and David Little discuss ways religious communities can optimize their potential to work for peace. Stanton Burnett notes that the historical record demonstrates potential for religion in conflict resolution; Burnett advises the foreign policy community to gain a deep understanding of how religion affects each context in order to coordinate optimal strategies. In a review of the case studies, Johnston observes that religious peace efforts can overcome the inadequacies of traditional diplomacy. The authors generally advocate for religious peace efforts and agree that secular efforts often fail because they ignore the importance of religion. However, they maintain the statist, realist view that conflict resolution depends primarily on Track One actors.

148 Luttwak.
150 Burnett.
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Subsequent work gives increasing credit to the strengths and potential of religious contributions. Martin (1997), and Miroslav Volf (1996) note that cultures often find justification and motivation for intergroup violence in religious traditions; however, correct interpretation of the foundations of Christianity theology fosters peace.\textsuperscript{152,153} Sampson (1997) observes that religious leaders often have unique legitimacy to overcome political impasse or operate in the democratic deficit of a weak state. Also, informal, unofficial religious efforts have augmented many successful conflict resolution efforts.\textsuperscript{154} R. Scott Appleby (2000) acknowledges the negative impact of religious extremism but observes that Track Two religious efforts have substantially aided conflict resolution. Appleby finds that religious peacebuilders add a crucial element to peace efforts, which Track One diplomacy must consider and support.\textsuperscript{155} Douglas Johnston’s (2003, ed.) collection of theory and applied case studies attempts to harness and optimize the diplomatic capabilities of passionate religious activists.\textsuperscript{156} Harold Coward and Gordon Smith (2004) combine theological inquiry with a survey of case studies and conclude that religious peacebuilding makes a unique and substantial contribution.\textsuperscript{157} Other scholars, such as Tombs & Liechty (2006), Cejka & Bamat, (2003), Gopin (2002), also find that with careful theology religion can contribute to conflict transformation via
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grassroots activism. Daniel Philpott (2006) uses theology to formulate a politics of reconciliation. Philpott (2007) also describes the role of religious actors as much more significant than secular liberal human rights actors, particularly in terms of transitional justice and reconciliation. David Little (2007) analyzes the work of peacemakers on the ground to identify successful methods and compiles case study evidence of the power of Track Two religious diplomacy and grassroots reconciliation. Little finds that when religious commitment motivates actors, they can employ religious ideas to inspire others and foster a peacebuilding trend in society. Megan Shore (2009) predicts that the field will continue to award Track One diplomacy primary importance, but the study of grass roots and religious efforts will gain increasing importance as an important alternative to the traditional statist, secularist approach in international relations and diplomacy.

As recognition for religious peacebuilding gains steam, scholars seek to pinpoint exactly when and how religious efforts work best. The 1997 Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict lists five qualities that give religious leaders and institutions

164 Megan Shore, Religion and Conflict Resolution (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
particular effectiveness in international conflict: 1) a clear message that resonates with followers; 2) long-standing and pervasive presence on the ground; 3) well-developed infrastructure that often includes a sophisticated communications network connecting local, national, international offices; 4) legitimacy for speaking out on crisis issues; 5) traditional orientation to peace and goodwill.¹⁶⁵

David Smock (2006) also notes that religious actors have unique capabilities, which complement secular efforts. Smock provides Douglas Johnston’s list of attributes that religious leaders and institutions can offer in promoting peace and reconciliation: 1) credibility as a trusted institution; 2) a respected set of values; 3) moral warrants for opposing injustice on the part of governments; 4) unique leverage for promoting reconciliation among conflicting parties, including an ability to rehumanize situations that have become dehumanized over the course of protracted conflict; 5) a capability to mobilize community, nation, and international support for a peace process; 6) an ability to follow through locally in the wake of a political settlement; 7) and a sense of calling that often inspires perseverance in the face of major, otherwise debilitating, obstacles.¹⁶⁶ Shore (2009) outlines the assets of religious peacebuilders.¹⁶⁷ Coward and Smith (2004) also list specific recommendations for policy makers, religious leaders, and other civil society organizations in order to optimize the potential of religious peacebuilders.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ Shore.
¹⁶⁸ Coward and Smith.
Chapter 4 outlines a typology of clergy peacebuilding activity, which consists of three roles: pastoral, prophetic, and bridge-building. This typology also develops the concept that religion both shapes and is shaped by context: each role includes a particular theological underpinning, level of societal influence, and goal. Pastoral work, which models Jesus the Good Shepherd, influences individuals. It attempts to move individuals beyond fear to a more trusting openness to change. Prophetic work, which models Jesus the prophet, influences society at the structural level and strives to build structural support for sustainable justice and peace. Prophetic work attempts to point out the difference between what is and what should be, paint a vision of a better world, and inspire people to help create that world. Bridge-building work, which models Jesus the reconciler, influences society at the communal level. It attempts to overcome divisions so that people can work together to create a peaceful and just society.

However, Sampson (1997) notes that religious peacebuilding efforts lack formal systems or structure precisely because religions encompass all aspects of life, both private and public. While secular actors increasingly wish to harness the potential of religious peace efforts, the nature of religion thwarts attempts to manage religion for political purposes, which will backfire.\(^{169}\) With its focus on local clergy of varying levels of activism, this study avoids the problems associated with attempts to manage religion. Instead, this study argues that with training and support clergy can optimize their individual strengths to incorporate peacebuilding into their inherent ministerial approach with optimal success in diverse congregational settings.

\(^{169}\) Sampson.
H. Clergy leadership and activism

While this study does not quantitatively examine lay perceptions of clergy influence, it examines theories of religious influence and leadership to gain insight into the scope, mechanisms, and challenges of clergy attempts to make a difference. Church attendance in Northern Ireland is comparatively high; in addition, religious influence can extend beyond attendees. Scholars such as Grace Davie, Danièle Hervieu-Léger, and N. Jay Demerath find significant religious identity and ideology in people and communities who lack obvious religiosity markers, such as church attendance.170,171,172,173,174,175

Studies of clerical authority indicate that personal, institutional, and societal factors affect the amount of influence laity allot to their clergy. Max Weber (1958) observes that even charismatic leaders must demonstrate that they are divinely appointed/sanctioned and protect the welfare of their communities. If their communities fare poorly, charismatic leaders forfeit their status of divine approval.176 Paul Harrison (1959) notes that expert authority can arise from the clerical office or personality. A

175 Demerath, "The Rise of Cultural Religion in European Christianity: Learning from Poland, Northern Ireland, and Sweden."
leader must continually demonstrate expert authority that stems from h/her personal expertise, whereas expert authority from one’s office depends on the amount of expertise perceived by the institutional sanction. Harold Quinley (1974) agrees that authority can arise from the institutional structure or from personal attributes; Quinley finds that institutional authority sometimes frees clergy from needing approval in controversial matters. Quinley (1974) and Phillip Hammond et al. (1978) observe that when authority stems more from personal attributes, clergy will avoid controversial topics or behaviors, and will not involve themselves in social concerns. Anthony Russell, (1980) David Martin, (1978) and Donald Scott (1978) show that the scope of clergy roles and authority has narrowed to spiritual matters, and clergy authority now arises mainly from personal influence. David Schuller et al. (1980) find that clergy attributes affect their influence with laity. Thus, as institutional authority wanes in Northern Ireland, and clergy must rely more heavily on personal attributes for influence, one might expect them to avoid controversial topics or behaviors. Chapter 4 discusses modes of influence and how different clergy roles attempt to influence different levels of society.

Clergy also encounter strong resistance from parishioners, who tend to hold more conservative views. Johnson Benton (1967) and Philip Converse (1964) find a close association between Protestant clergy beliefs and their social and political attitudes.\textsuperscript{183,184} Quinley (1974) finds that clergy with the most progressive theology have the most liberal political views and the highest levels of activism.\textsuperscript{185} Philip Converse (1964), Charles Glock et al. (1967), Glen Trimble (1969), Hadden (1964) and Quinley (1974) show that clergy tend to have more progressive social views and higher levels of activism than their parishioners.\textsuperscript{186,187,188} Glock et al. (1967), Thomas Campbell & Yoshio Fukuyama (1970), and Ernest Campbell & Thomas Pettigrew (1959) find that parishioners support the general idea of clergy social activism but oppose specific activities, especially if they disagree with the position.\textsuperscript{189,190,191} Fillimore Sanford (1951) and Laurnor Carter state that
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both leader and context should be studied, because a certain leader personality or style might succeed one place but fail in another.\textsuperscript{192,193}

Opposition from parishioners, as well as lack of support from denominational leaders and clergy colleagues, creates severe stress and substantial professional and personal risk for clergy who engage in activism.\textsuperscript{194} In the context of Northern Ireland, the level of violence in society causes intense and widespread trauma and victimhood among the population.\textsuperscript{195} Boal et al. (1997) note that many citizens fear ostracism and condemnation from their own community for perceived betrayals (for example, when they visit friends or patronize shops in the other community) more than they fear the other community.\textsuperscript{196} Morrow et al. (1991) describe how violence deeply affected the churches and shaped their approach to ministry.\textsuperscript{197} Brewer et al. (2011) describe in detail the intense resistance clergy and denominational leaders in Northern Ireland experience when they engage in peacebuilding work, which sometimes includes death threats. However, whereas Brewer et al. acknowledge that this hostility impedes denominational leaders and politicians, they nonetheless state that this antagonism should not and does
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not cause local clergy to curtail their efforts.\textsuperscript{198} In contrast, Leichty and Clegg (2001) find that parishioner resistance profoundly restricts clergy efforts to build peace.\textsuperscript{199}

Chapter 5 discusses the stresses and constraints clergy experience when they deal with controversial topics with regard to peacebuilding and the outgroup. The chapter analyzes the psychology involved when clergy attempt to challenge prejudices and the power churches have to impact clergy professional success. Elements of personality, leadership style, and context help explain why some clergy experience much more anxiety and constraint than others.

\textbf{I. Religious Peacebuilding in Northern Ireland}

Analysts of Northern Ireland have increasingly sought to identify exactly how and to what degree religious actors and institutions made a positive impact. Morrow et al. (1991) observe that churches often try to represent and speak for their communities, rather than to lead or change them.\textsuperscript{200} Others point out particular religious contributions to peace. Sean Byrne (2001) notes that clergy brokered ceasefires and mediated with the 1981 hunger strikes.\textsuperscript{201} Gerald McElroy (1991) observes that Catholic priests and cardinals aided human rights campaigns and other peace efforts.\textsuperscript{202} As Fulton (2002) notes, some authors have constructed inclusive theological approaches to the conflict in
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an effort to strengthen religious contributions to peace.\textsuperscript{203,204,205,206,207,208} Ronald Wells (2005) describes the efforts of Presbyterian minister Ken Newell and Catholic priest Gerry Reynolds to overcome communal hostilities and help the peace process.\textsuperscript{209} Eric Gallagher and Stanley Worrall find that on balance, clergy have contributed more to peace than to conflict.\textsuperscript{210} Ian Ellis (1984) surveys eighty-four peace projects, a minimum of roughly 40 of which have religious foundations or motivations.\textsuperscript{211}

Analysts who find positive religious contributions differ regarding the degree of impact. Some authors, such as John Whyte (1990) find that the churches contributed both to division and to peace.\textsuperscript{212} However, Brewer et al. (2011) state that while clergy mediators helped the political process, all other religious efforts had little positive effect or exacerbated the conflict;\textsuperscript{213} moreover, churches did not contribute to overall improvement in community relations, which came as a result of the GFA rather than its
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cause. However, Geoffrey Evans & Mary Duffy (1997) report that those who attended church supported the GFA more than non-attendees, and attendees also supported more moderate political parties. Robert Wuthnow (1996) finds that churches contribute to civic society through small groups and the spread of positive morals. Moreover, Derek Bacon (1998, 2002, 2003) observes that congregations add to ‘social capital’ (the quality of society) through voluntary community involvement, low visibility cross-community work, and a message of hope. These activities strengthen bonds both within and across communities.

Studies of civil society in Northern Ireland also dispute its significance in the peace process, and the role of religious actors and institutions in civil society. Maney et al. (2006) observe that grass-roots legitimacy bolstered the Good Friday Agreement; however, they state that civil society played a marginal, if not negative role and encourage efforts to strengthen civil society. In contrast, Cochrane & Dunn (2002) find that secular civil society efforts, while not crucial to peace, made a positive and
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significant impact.\textsuperscript{221} Brewer et al., (2011) observe that much literature about the importance of civil society in Northern Ireland neglects the role of churches.\textsuperscript{222} Morrow et al. (1991) note that the churches in Northern Ireland constitute by far the largest collection of voluntary groups and highest number of voluntary members within civil society.\textsuperscript{223} Ganiel and Dixon (1991) find that governmental and religious actors within civil society can form complementary ideologies and structures in order to transform society.\textsuperscript{224} Chapter 6 highlights the complementary relationship between elite and grassroots efforts and argues that clergy have unique and necessary contributions to help build a stable, peaceful society in Northern Ireland.

Scholars struggle to measure clergy impact in part because clergy, churches, and parishioners differ widely across the region. Morrow et al. (1991) observe great variation among parishes within denominations: while some churches provide the only cross-community work in a given area, many churches ignore the issue.\textsuperscript{225} Frederick Boal et al. (1997) show that despite the temptation to consider the communities united or monolithic, Belfast churchgoers show remarkable diversity in theological and political attitudes.\textsuperscript{226} Mitchell (2006) notes that inclusive evangelical Christians have gained some
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influence but do not have political representation or represent predominant attitudes.\textsuperscript{227} However, Gladys Ganiel (2008) says the change in evangelical mindset brought about by evangelical leaders contributed to a peaceful political transition.\textsuperscript{228} Liz Fawcett (2000) found that 40 per cent of Presbyterian clergy preached about political and economic issues regularly.\textsuperscript{229} In contrast, Fionnuala O’Connor (1993) found that most Catholic churchgoers do not know what their clergy think about the conflict, other than that they denounce violence.\textsuperscript{230} Despite these wide variations, Leichty and Clegg (2001) offer theological and practical guidelines to help clergy and congregations contribute to peacebuilding.\textsuperscript{231}

Chapter 6 explores how actual members of the clergy impacted society through influence on individuals, communities, politicians, and the peace process. Clergy affect individual change, which spreads to the wider community. Mass prayer also affected politicians as a form of constituent pressure. Clergy contributed to the peace process in several ways: they opened channels of communication, included paramilitary groups at the negotiating table, built trust, normalized cooperation between former enemies, influenced negotiators to make concessions, created a climate in which an agreement could be reached and accepted by constituents, and bolstered post-agreement stability.
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3. Gaps in existing research and theory

Existing research has not adequately addressed the following questions: How, and to what degree, did clergy peacebuilders affect the Northern Ireland peace process? What can their effectiveness tell us about how to optimize clergy peacebuilding efforts in general?

A. What effect did they have?

While many analysts have studied how churches, parachurch organizations, and secret clergy mediations contributed to peace, they have not examined the range of local clergy activism, or how influence at different levels works together. Nor have scholars considered how experiences shape the beliefs, behaviors, and motivation of clergy peacebuilders, who then shape theology and ritual to motivate others. Analysts also have not applied a social psychological understanding of the bases of social of power to clergy peacebuilding. Nor have scholars studied theories of clergy activism, leadership, and change to determine what empowers or constrains clergy peacebuilder work. Studies of theological contributions tend to focus on ecumenical efforts or evangelicals but ignore how local clergy gradually persuade members to accept increasingly ecumenical or reconciling viewpoints. Analysis tends to pay little heed to how clergy efforts contribute to broad changes of mindset over time, and how those changes contribute to positive and sustainable peace.

B. How to optimize clergy peacebuilding?

Studies do not tend to study how best to promote positive changes but not alienate or divide congregations. Nor have they examined the relationships among institutional
churches and individual clergy in light of leadership style and change theory, or how to enable timid clergy to engage in higher levels of activism. Studies tend to look at clergy who feel naturally confident enough to take bold risks, or ecumenical groups full of people who feel comfortable enough with ecumenism to participate. Clergy tend to exhibit more progressive views and activist behaviors than the general population; however, many clergy do not possess the inherent daring to make huge waves or brush off death threats. As Everett Rogers shows, only a small percentage of the population possesses the risk-averse personality necessary readily to advocate or embrace change. Scholars have not considered how to help higher numbers of clergy engage in higher levels of activism. Furthermore, many churchmembers feel too uneasy to attend an ecumenical group or event. Studies have not addressed how clergy efforts persuade their more conservative or anxious parishioners to embrace increasingly progressive ideas. Thus, studies of bold clergy activists and ecumenism represent only a narrow slice of peacebuilding work and leave out much of the population. Moreover, studies have not examined how to optimize clergy peacebuilding potential but not overly manage or co-opt religion for secular purposes, which tends to backfire.

4. Research design, methodology, bias, and goal

As noted above, sociologist Mathjis van Leeuwen (2009) states that to understand peacebuilding, scholars must study the everyday activities of civil society peacebuilders
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and learn about their beliefs, behaviors, and underlying meaning construction. Van Leeuwen advises analysts to examine individual actors in depth to see how they interpret and respond to the specific conditions they encounter.\textsuperscript{236} This study applies van Leeuwen’s approach with an in-depth investigation of clergy peacebuilders to ascertain a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of their contributions and potential.\textsuperscript{237} The clergy interviews produced qualitative data, which provided detailed portrayals of interviewees’ perceptions, feelings, beliefs, behaviors, and activities.\textsuperscript{238, 239, 240} In addition, some interviewees referred me to published materials to supplement their narratives.

Because the topic often induces anxiety, discomfort, and painful memories, the interview process prioritized the emotional comfort of the interviewees. To gain as in-depth a view as possible, interviewees were encouraged to tell their stories in their own way, rather than answer a rigid set of questions. A semi-structured format encouraged certain topics, but each interview produced its own subset of content. Similar to the study done by Morrow et al. (1991), these case studies can therefore only suggest a representation of the range of clergy experiences and perspectives. Nonetheless, the rich

\textsuperscript{236} Leeuwen.
\textsuperscript{237} The original project planned to include quantitative analysis of lay perceptions of clergy influence. Ironically, the institutional requirement to sign a form, which assured participants of their anonymity, rendered laypersons so concerned about this threat to anonymity that almost none participated.
data provide a record of an important aspect of the situation, and the clergy narratives comprise a substantial portion of this report.

The questions in Appendix 1 provided the basic interview structure. These questions examine clergy beliefs, behaviors, and external influences relevant to their peacebuilding activities. Specifically, the questions pertain to clergy background and life experiences, formative events, exposure to violence, theological approach, methods and strategies of activism, incidents of parishioner resistance, and perspectives about how and whether their work affected the peace process.

To choose interview subjects, I initially consulted with denominational leaders and well known clergy peacebuilders to get a sense for the apparent activism level and perspectives about sectarianism of various clergy, and which clergy might be most willing to be interviewed. I had some clergy colleagues within the Methodist Church and the Church of Ireland, and they put me in touch with the denominational leaders who could give me the most valuable perspectives about clergy. I encountered more difficulties gaining information about and interviews with Presbyterian and Catholic clergy, most likely because I did not have the preexisting connections and the associated trust that goes with being a somewhat familiar, known entity in those communities. Over the course of the two month period, I gained increased access to the Presbyterian and Catholic communities such that had I been able to extend my stay, I would very likely have added several more interviews from those denominations.

The interviews attempted to provide a relaxed, informal atmosphere to put subjects at ease. We usually met in their homes, though a few clergy came to where I was
staying at Edgehill Theological College, drove me to events they thought I would find interesting, or took me out to lunch. They usually served me tea and delicious chocolate biscuits, and I often commented on their family photos or asked a few social questions to create a comfortable atmosphere. Several subjects remarked at my sincere, genuine interest and how comfortable they felt talking with me. I also volunteered personal information about myself, and some clergy asked me personal questions, which I willingly answered. In these pre-interview conversations, I remained neutral and avoided value-laden statements about anything regarding topics relevant to the study. However, I responded to their own jokes and comments with warmth, appreciation, and encouragement. Over the course of the meetings, which generally lasted 1-2 hours, clergy progressively relaxed and expressed stronger emotions and more detailed descriptions of their experiences and opinions. In almost every case, the interview ended on a warmly positive note, and we parted with a feeling of mutual respect and appreciation.

Despite best intentions, an author’s bias always shapes h/er work. I was raised in New England, in a family of United Methodist clergy. That experience gives me firsthand insight into and sympathy for the life of a clergyperson, particularly within Methodism.

In 2003, I worked as an intern for two parishes of the Church of Ireland, in Northern Ireland. During that experience, a parishioner led me to believe the other churchmembers would not mind if I invited some Roman Catholic friends, including the local Sinn Fein councilors, to my farewell barbecue. However, the barbecue took place immediately following a march of the Royal Black Preceptory, a Protestant Order similar to the Orange Order. The post-march mood of the parishioners could not countenance the
presence of the Sinn Fein councilors. The resulting uproar caused enormous turmoil. The priest, who had struggled with parishioner hostility to his own activism, eventually had to leave the church. Over the next few years, the councilors began working amicably with the most conservative senior church leaders on local issues, and the barbecue became a running joke among them all. One councilor was invited to read scripture in the local Church of Ireland cathedral at Christmas time, and he walked beside the Church of Ireland bishop during the local St. Patrick’s Day parade. That experience of conflict and resolution helped shape my perception of the volatile nature of clergy peacebuilding work, the intense pressure on Northern Ireland clergy, and the changes in cross-community relations over time.

The ultimate goal of my research has been to improve our understanding of the role of clergy in peacebuilding, with the implication that greater understanding will help lead to better prospects for negotiating lasting peace, not only in Northern Ireland, but elsewhere. This paper applies current scholarship about diplomacy, social psychology, and conflict to clergy peacebuilding efforts to examine the above two questions about clergy peacebuilding effectiveness and optimization and. Most studies concentrate on the few “maverick” clergy who engage in the most visible and obvious peacebuilding work, or survey the range of clergy attitudes to calculate what percentage of clergy hold inclusive or exclusive views. This study looks at a range of clergy peacebuilding activities and examines a spectrum of peace activism among clergy who hold similarly inclusive views.

---

5. Conclusions

The data explored in the following pages indicates the following scenario: through contact hypothesis, indirect contact ripple effect, and the synergistic effect of the various types of activity and levels of influence, clergy peacebuilders in Northern Ireland increased ripeness in the pre-agreement phase, improved the quality and success of negotiations and agreements, and strengthened positive peace and stability in the implementation and post-agreement period. My material shows that even relatively “passive” efforts wherein clergy promote tolerance, forgiveness, inclusivity, love of one’s enemies, and other such values, contributed to widespread forbearance and resistance to civil war and built a context conducive to the acceptance of the agreement. Clergy peacebuilders possess sufficient referent, legitimate, and expert power, and sufficient access to society, substantially to impact the peace process.

My study sought patterns common to all the clergy as well as differences among their personalities and activities. I examined what led these clergy to embrace inclusive ideas and what separates bolder activists from their more timid colleagues. My analysis also seeks to understand the clergy contributions on their own terms, listen to their perspectives, and consider their opinions about what works and does not work, and to what degree. This open-ended and fine-grained technique, placed within the academic framework I have outlined above, provided useful insights into the constraints, scope, and potential of clergy peacebuilding efforts in conflict zones. As a result, I propose that in addition to inclusive theology and ecumenical programs, denominational and seminary leaders should incorporate study of change theory, leadership theories, and the bases of
power to clergy training, and provide stronger support for clergy to use their individual gifts to their greatest potential. By so doing, churches can maximize the capability of clergy activism to build positive peace in individuals, communities, and countries, and yet preserve the ability to for churches to “be church,” rather than be managed for secular or political interests.

6. Chapter summary

Chapter 2 gives an overview of the interviewees and examines what experiences lead people to the vocation of clergy peacebuilding. It examines how religion both shapes and is shaped by context for these clergy and outlines the theological themes common to their approach and work. Chapter 3 looks specifically at clergy experiences of violence and discusses how their perspectives on violence and pacifism inform their work. Chapter 4 divides clergy peacebuilder work into a typology based on theology, level of influence, and goals. It analyzes the interplay between belief and behavior and provides a framework in which to understand how the various levels and types of activism effect change. Chapter 5 discusses the resistance clergy experience to peacebuilding efforts, the range of personality types and responses to resistance, and strategies clergy employ in response. It discusses the importance of personality and context in activism. Chapter 6 analyzes how clergy peacebuilding efforts affect individuals, communities, politicians, and the peace process overall. It argues that clergy utilize forms of power that ameliorate identity conflicts. Furthermore, the levels of clergy influence combine synergistically to build momentum and construct a context conducive to successful peacebuilding.
CHAPTER TWO: ANATOMY OF A PEACEBUILDER

Van Leeuwen (2009) advises scholars to study the beliefs, behaviors, and underlying meaning construction present in everyday activities of civil society peacebuilders, to see how local peacebuilders interpret and respond to the specific conditions they encounter.\textsuperscript{242} This chapter begins such a study of clergy peacebuilders with an in-depth investigation of what factors shape and motivate their work, and how their meaning construct shapes the way they interpret and respond to their environment. Specifically, this chapter examines how religion shapes and is shaped by social context vis-à-vis clergy work in Northern Ireland. I explore how religion affects clergy dedication to peacebuilding, and how clergy committed to peacebuilding select elements of religion as a tool with which to work. The chapter provides background data on the clergy in order to investigate how context shapes their experience of religion. It also provides theological themes common to the clergy in order to examine which features of religion provide the most useful resources for their peacebuilding work.

Studies of religious peacebuilding tend to group all religious actors and institutions under the same heading and evaluate them as a unit. For example, the Carnegie Commission (1997) and Smock (2006) lists of religious peacebuilding assets include qualities specific to institutions, such as infrastructure or institutional credibility, as well qualities specific to individual clergy, such as a clear message or local community access. In contrast, my study focuses on local clergy in order to distinguish between local

\textsuperscript{242}Van Leeuwen.
clergy and other religious actors such as senior church leaders, denominations, and parachurch organizations. All interviewees are ordained clergy, and this study does not investigate comparisons between clergy-led and laity-led peace efforts. Local clergy work, while situated in an institution, nonetheless has dimensions, strengths, and limitations that differ from overall institutional efforts. Institutions require the process of bureaucratic process to implement changes, whereas individual clergy can respond to the needs of their congregation much more quickly and creatively. Institutions tend to control information and communications in order to preserve unity and authority, whereas local clergy can engage in more open interactions and express opinions that do not reflect official positions. Church senior leaders have a more distant, indirect relationship with laity, which gives them less access to member sentiments and reduces their ability to persuade members who require more than institutional authority to get them on board. Clergy develop intimate relationships with their parishioners, which engender different kinds of trust and influence.

However, some local clergy serve as senior church leaders for portions of their careers. This study includes three such clergy and analyzes their parish activities separately from their work as bishop or president. In each case, these clergy used the specific advantages of the local clergyperson during clergy work. When working as senior leaders of their denominations, they use different advantages, which include the ability to implement programs that support clergy peacebuilding work. These three interviewees give perspectives that help refine the distinctions and complementary relationship between local clergy work and senior church leadership.
In like manner, studies of parachurch organizations tend to comprise clergy and laity who have sufficient commitment to peacebuilding to attend a relatively progressive program or event. In contrast, clergy efforts include a far more diverse cohort, which includes parishioners who actively resist any progress toward improved communal relations. Clergy efforts also include the context of a home church community, rather than the remote setting of a parachurch organization. This embedded aspect of clergy work gives it different strengths and obstacles. An event with strangers in a removed location supported by a universal institutional ethos of progressive peacebuilding may inspire participants to make dramatic disclosures and seemingly great leaps toward intercommunal reconciliation. However, once a participant returns to h/er home church, insufficient support for such marked progress often causes h/er slowly to revert back to previous patterns of thought and behavior. Local clergy efforts may move more slowly than parachurch efforts, but they reach a more diverse population and change the tenor of the home church community. These changes have the potential to sustain lasting progress. As Sampson (1997) notes, religious peacebuilding enjoys a distinct advantage because religions encompass all aspects of life, both private and public. Local clergy, more than senior denominational leaders or parachurch organizations, operate in an extended, deep, broad, comprehensive relationship with church members and communities.

---
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This study includes specific data from interviews with twenty-one Northern Irish clergy, as well as occasional support from general themes found in interviews with an additional eleven clergy. This chapter will detail some background information about the twenty-one clergy, to provide personal and theological context for their peacebuilding. Each clergyperson has a pseudonym, and the names of specific places and other people they mention have been changed, except for occasional references to well known figures.

This study seeks to investigate why clergy of similar beliefs exhibit different levels of activism and efficacy, in order to gain insight into how to increase the quantity and intensity of clergy activism and success. Clergy generally tend to exhibit more progressive views and activist behaviors than the general population, however, only a small percentage of people possesses the risk-tolerant personality necessary readily to advocate or embrace change. To investigate the variance in activism among pro-peace clergy, the study includes a range of clergy within three denominational subgroups (Methodist, Church of Ireland, and Roman Catholic), arranged roughly from least to most active. Some clergy who believe in the importance of reconciliation work very cautiously in non-controversial ways. Despite the variation in their levels of activity, these clergy all profess a theology of inclusivity and an ideological commitment to ecumenism and intercommunal harmony: they view Catholics and Protestants as legitimately Christian, and they express the sentiment that clergy and churches should make it a priority to help their members move beyond sectarianism. The clergy share a
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desire to make a difference, end various forms of direct and indirect violence, and build positive peace. The study originally intended to interview clergy who did not share these values and goals. Denominational leaders identified numerous such clergy as potential interviewees; however, none of them consented to participate in the study. As a result, the study includes only clergy who profess a desire to build peace. Nevertheless, interviewees differ markedly in their apparent capabilities to translate that goal into activism. Chapter 5 explores the behavioral and leadership differences among clergy of different activism levels.

The study also includes one Presbyterian minister, one minister with an ecumenical traveling monastic order, and one evangelical leader from the parachurch organization ECONI (Evangelical Contribution On Northern Ireland, now the Centre for Contemporary Christianity). The Presbyterian minister complements the Methodist and Church of Ireland cohorts; no noticeable theological trends emerged to distinguish among the three main Protestant denominations based on confession. The traveling monk and the ECONI leader illustrate some of the similarities and differences between the large institutional churches and other institutions discussed above. No discernable gender-based differences emerged between the two female clergy and the 19 male clergy. Differences in risk-aversion are discussed in Chapter 5.

The following table lists the clergy whose interviews constitute the bulk of data for this study. Where available, the table indicates how sectarian, moderate, or pro-reconciling a clergyperson’s family background was and whether s/he lived outside of Northern Ireland. Interviewees were asked the frequency and types of peacebuilding
efforts. Their answers provided general impressions rather than numerical precision. The clergy interviews produce qualitative data, which can provide detailed portrayals of interviewees’ perceptions, feelings, beliefs, behaviors, and activities.249,250,251

The intensity of activism designates the following general description of their behaviors, with no implications regarding the effectiveness of their attempts to ameliorate conflict and foster peace. Chapter 4 discusses how different types of activism attempt to influence society at different levels. Activities that target the individual level cause change in the beliefs and behaviors of individuals. Activities that target the communal level cause change in the culture of congregations, denominational mores, neighborhoods, towns, groups, or surrounding areas. Activities that target the structural level cause change in negotiations, laws, systems, denominational polities, or other economic, political, or cultural structures within society. Interviewees within the same category of activism level differ in terms of the specifics of their work. For example, some clergy engage in more frequent activism but target mainly their own congregations through sermons or Bible studies, while other clergy discuss sectarian topics less often but organize cross-community activities or engage in long-term embedded work.

- Very Low: Individual conversations with parishioners, support for existing programs, occasional, general, or gentle messages in sermons, uses denominational resources when available (such as the Church of Ireland “Hard
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Gospel” or “Think Again” projects), avoids controversial messages, programs, or activities; attempts to effect change at the level of individuals

- **Low**: Increased quantity and intensity of the above activities; in addition, leads small group studies, sets the example of good relationships with outgroup friends and colleagues, engages controversial topics occasionally and with great caution; attempts to effect change at individual and congregation or community levels

- **Moderate**: Regularly or routinely engages in activities such as the above or equivalent: long-term embedded work with the out-group, or regular support for/participation in cross-community programs, but not as a leader; attempts to effect change at individual and congregational or community levels, and expresses support for structural changes

- **High**: Engages in activities such as the above continuously; in addition, regularly urges congregations to engage in outgroup exposure activities, dismantle sectarian beliefs, structures, or behaviors, and take additional steps in the face of opposition; attempts to effect change at the individual and congregational or communal levels, and advocates structural changes

- **Very High**: Engages in activities such as the above continuously; in addition, engages in public efforts to effect political or structural change, secret mediations, or high-level negotiations; attempts to effect change at the individual, communal, and structural levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Church/Organization</th>
<th>Activism Intensity</th>
<th>From/Family</th>
<th>Lived Away</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Scotland Catholic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>NI antiCatholic</td>
<td>Republic, England</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>NI antiCatholic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>NI antiCatholic</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>NI antiCatholic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>NI pro-reconciling</td>
<td>Republic, USA</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Ch of Ireland</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Ch of Ireland</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Republic, pro-reconciling</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Ch of Ireland</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Ch of Ireland</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>NI antiCatholic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Ch of Ireland</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Ch of Ireland</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>NI antiCatholic</td>
<td>Republic, England, Africa</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Ch of Ireland</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>NI moderate</td>
<td>Republic, England</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>R Catholic</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>NI moderate</td>
<td>S America USA</td>
<td>Redemptorist</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>R Catholic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>England Protestant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jesuit, Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>R Catholic</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Redemptorist</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>NI moderate</td>
<td>Republic, England</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Heart of St Patrick</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>NI moderate?</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>Ecumenical Traveling Order</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>ECONI</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>NI antiCatholic</td>
<td>England Indian subcontinent</td>
<td>Para-church</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.1 Interviewees**

The following section outlines where these clergy grew up and their family culture, whether they lived outside of Northern Ireland, how they came to be reconciliation-minded, and their approximate level of peacebuilding activity. The second and third sections discuss theology in more detail. The second section describes their
views about Good and Evil, and the third section examines religious resources that inform and aid their peacebuilding beliefs and activities.

**Background**

*Methodist*

Henry, who grew up in England, had been a Methodist for only two years when we spoke. Previously, he was in the "Church Army," which he described as the equivalent of the USA Salvation Army. He also lived in the Republic of Ireland before coming to Northern Ireland, and he expressed the belief that Catholics are definitely Christian. Despite his convictions, Henry does not engage in peacebuilding activism and confines mention of controversial topics to private conversations with individual parishioners, small groups, and youth fellowship.

Mark, who grew up in Scotland, has lived in Northern Ireland since the early nineties. Mark described his faith journey as follows:

I was brought up Catholic, but I was never really sort of a person of faith. My wife was brought up Catholic as well. We were married in the Catholic Church, but our journey of faith took us in a new direction. We were in the south of England, and through involvement with the Methodist church in the little town we were staying in there, we really came to the Lord through that relationship we had with the minister and his wife there. That experience, that’s why I’m in Methodism. I don’t have an ax to grind either way. I’m not a Catholic. I wouldn’t say I rejected Catholicism; I just sort of didn’t involve myself in it. But I wouldn’t be anti-Catholic as a consequence. I didn’t make a u-turn on it. But I would have an insight into Catholicism others don’t because I suspect there is a lot of – people have a
lot of conceptions, preconceptions in their head about what Catholicism is about that is not true. Maybe it built up within their community, and just people grasp onto that and believe Catholics are this, that, and the other, when they’re not. And [they believe] that the [Catholic] Church is this that and the other, and in my experience it doesn’t. Challenging that is actually a very difficult thing.

Mark does not engage in controversial activities or active cross-community work. Rather, he focuses his efforts on changing the hearts and minds of his parishioners with positive messages via small group studies, sermons, individual conversations, and the example of his good relationships with Catholic friends and colleagues.

James grew up in Northern Ireland, in what he described as a “traditional, Orange” family, and then he spent some time living in the Republic of Ireland and in England. He became reconciliation-minded because of Catholics friends he made while in the Republic, who were obviously sincere Christians. Like Mark, James generally confines his reconciliation efforts to gentle persuasion within his parishes. He preaches, does Biblical exegesis to counter sectarianism, and visits the homes of murdered Catholics.

Rachel also grew up in Northern Ireland. She played with Catholic children neighbors when she was young, but her family background included paranoia of Catholics. She was not allowed to go inside the houses of her Catholic neighbors for fear of being abducted into a convent. Rachel engaged in embedded cross-community work to earn the trust of Catholic people and break down barriers.

Stan, who grew up in Cork, said he has always known devout Catholics. He believes Catholics are Christian, but some of their doctrines are not Biblical. Stan felt that
his youth work on the Shankill, an economically depressed, staunchly Unionist/Loyalist area of Belfast, strengthened his commitment to reconciliation and peacebuilding. He uses sermons, small group studies, and cross-community ecumenical activities to encourage his congregations to overcome sectarianism.

Peter grew up in Ballymena, in a family and community culture he describes as “redneck, Paisley, bands, Loyalists, Ulster Scots heritage.” As a young man, he joined the Air Force. At that time, he was atheist or agnostic. However, with the Air Force he spent time in Scotland, Wales, and England, and he found the English church “embracing.” He began to read the Bible and became Christian after about five or six months. Peter remembers,

The only other Christian in the Air Force was an English Catholic. He said to me, “I hope God blesses you when you go to your church on Sunday.” I was hardened; it’s hard to explain. But he was so nice! I kept goin’, “But he’s not a Christian!” It was an awful conflict. I kept thinking, “This fella is more Christian than me, loves Jesus more than me!” I had to give in. That was me; I was saved that day. It was painful, but I shifted overnight: people are people.

Peter prefers the small group setting to challenge sectarianism; he also arranges cross-community events for his parishioners and takes them to parachurch organizations such as the Christian Renewal Centre in Rostrevor.

Jean grew up in Belfast and describes her family background as charismatic, Orange, and Loyalist. She recounts her journey away from her upbringing as painful but clear:
I went to a charismatic thing in the Dublin airport, but it was at Catholic Church. I couldn’t believe it! The Spirit was in it. The pastor I had at the time was way ahead of his time, at the beginning of the Troubles. He had no time for it. He kept saying, “We’re not of this world: our kingdom is the Kingdom of God.” He preached something that liberated me from it. …Catholics and Protestants are both Christian. Have you read Father Robert Capon’s books? How big is God’s Grace? To hell with hell! Jean preaches challenging sermons against sectarianism, organizes cross-community experiences, and urges her churches to take difficult steps, such as to stop carrying the Union Jack flag into worship services.

Simon grew up in Belfast and other parts of Northern Ireland, the son of a reconciliation-minded Methodist minister. He did not think much about politics growing up, but that began to change in the 1960’s:

I remember coming home one night, hearing huge disturbance in center of town. I went into the center of Newry to peep around corner, and I saw people with a water cannon hosing people from Margaret Square, in the center of Newry. That was a wake up moment as a young fella growing up here. I thought, “I don’t fully understand what this is all about; but all I know is, that there is degrading. It’s inhuman. It’s a violation of something, and certainly whatever it’s trying to solve, I see it as pouring fuel on a fire rather than trying to drench the passion.” That I think was the beginning of my understanding of division and bitterness. And I remember people saying, “That will stop it all now. That’ll teach them, these nationalists, republicans.” I remember thinking, “I don’t know an awful lot about what is going on in our world. But to me, that is the beginning of something rather than the ending of something. Something’s not going to go away.” I was in the states in the 60’s, and I began to see same sort of
thing. I began to realize how divided America was. There were good
people trying to do something about it. The church I was in was
extraordinary. There were two black families trying to join the church.
There was a special board meeting to see whether that was all right, and I
remember thinking, “Hey, if these were two Irish families, would they
have to bring it to the board meeting?” But these people didn’t see that
as—they thought this was actually being liberal, being open and
welcoming. And they said, “Of course, we welcome you.” I thought
differently, saw it differently. Yet these were good, well-intentioned,
thoughtful people who thought they were being radical. Anyway, we just
wanted to make sure these people were going to be warmly welcomed,
there was no point in welcoming them if they were going to be stomped.
So that was the rationale. I began to see Northern Ireland in a new way as
I saw the conflict in the States, heard some of the same kinds of rhetoric,
talk. For instance, we have a phrase here, “But some of my best friends are
Catholics, or Protestants.” I began to hear, “Some of my best friends are
black. I have a very good friend who’s black.” I had heard all this before,
and I began to make connections between racism and sectarianism, to see
them as two similar things, two of a kind.

Simon also attended an ecumenical seminary in the US for a Pastoral Care degree,
which he credits for his ability to build trust with his parishioners and lead them forward
in new directions. During his time serving as pastor of a black church during the civil
rights movement, he felt profoundly impacted by the assassination of Martin Luther King
Jr. during that period and the deep faith and grace of the black churches. Simon views
theology as a series of concentric circles, such that he should worry about his own beliefs
and not judge others who believe differently. He leads his churches and denomination to
take brave steps forward and engages in radically high levels of peacebuilding, activism, and reconciliation work, including high-level secret mediations.

*Church of Ireland*

William was brought up in “a broad and generous catholic Anglicanism” in England, the son of a Church of England priest. He recalls, “I remember little bits of suspicion about Catholicism and Rome in my childhood, things that were said. It was nothing particularly divisive; there was nothing sectarian about it.” He defines as his theology as “catholic and reformed; that is, I tend to look for the inclusive and for the wholeness, points of agreement, points of identity.” He lived in the Republic as well. While William believes in the importance and necessity of peacebuilding work, he feels that as an outsider he should mainly listen to his parishioners and support their efforts rather than impose his own ideas onto them.

Gary was born in the Republic, in a family of reconciling clergy. He lived in the United Kingdom and the Caribbean for many years as a chaplain. He felt inspired and influenced by the cross-community sentiments and activities of other clergy in his family heritage, one of whom was described as follows: “Because he neither supported Orange nor Free Masons, he kept his doors open to all.” Gary felt called to follow in their footsteps, “by not supporting or encouraging either side I think we can keep our doors open to everyone.” He says he grew up surrounded by a culture and sentiment of reconciliation and unity, which remained a central focus of his ministry. Gary worked to connect his parishioners with experiences of reconciliation through the Christian Renewal Centre and other parachurch peacebuilding and missionary organizations. He continually
tried to bring Protestants and Catholics together and to educate his parishioners. Gary says, “It was a constant teaching, teaching on reconciliation and unity as well.”

Frank was born in Canada, a place he visited many times after his family returned to Ireland. The son of a Church of Ireland priest, he grew up in the Republic of Ireland and he attended the University of Dublin before serving several parishes in the Republic. Frank particularly appreciated the positive changes in Protestant-Catholic relations he experienced when Pope John XXIII came into office. Those warm relations contrasted sharply with the situation he experienced when he moved to Northern Ireland in the 1980’s and served churches in the “murder triangle” area of Belfast, a place so named due to the particularly high number of bombings and deaths in both communities. Frank has worked to promote reconciliation and peacebuilding in his communities through sermons, public statements, attending Catholic funerals, and visiting Catholic families affected by sectarian violence. Frank prioritized ecumenical relations as a local clergyperson and a senior church leader.

Carl grew up in a mixed area of Northern Ireland, with decent cross-community relations. He describes his journey from staunch anti-Catholic to passionate peacebuilder:

I was brought up in a funny way with these tensions, growing up becoming anti-Catholic/nationalist, and rebelling against that. As a Christian theologically thinking Catholics are in error, can’t be Christians, should come out of the Catholic Church, need to be come Protestants – that would’ve been quite clear in my thinking. Priests are almost like the devil’s right hand men corrupting these people. Then in theological college, some people came from the Christian Renewal Centre in Rostrevor. They were sharing with us. A lady was Catholic, who was
asked to talk about her spiritual journey and give her testimony. I was
dumbfounded beyond belief. In listening to her speak it was a mirror
image of my thoughts. She [had] thought Protestant people are not
Christian?! And how she loved the Lord, how she had gone to a Protestant
church, but then felt God wanted her in the Catholic Church, so she went
back. The more she spoke, the more I was awestruck. I had to say to
myself, “She is a Catholic, and clearly a Christian; so therefore, at least
one Catholic can be a Christian.” Then encountering others, situations of
renewal, the charismatic involvement, Catholic people praying, listening
to their prayers. I remember thinking, “They sound like prayers I do! They
love the Lord. They use different language,” but thinking, “They have got
it.” …The truth of scripture and experience in forming my opinions, then
having to say, “I have this wrong somewhere,” having to adjust, having
the decision of the will to go with that adjustment. What I would believe is
the work of the Spirit in challenging and reforming me, having the will to
go with that. And then thinking, “I firmly believe this enough that I have
to put my neck on the line, and as a preacher I can’t not tackle this – I
have to both speak it and live it out.”

Carl felt so transformed by this experience that he made peacebuilding a
central component of ministry as he served various churches in urban and rural
settings around Northern Ireland. He tries to inspire his churches continually to
take challenging, difficult steps toward greater reconciliation.

Michael was born and raised the Republic of Ireland, and he lived in England for
his theological training and early ministry years. He moved to Northern Ireland in the late
1970’s to serve as a chaplain. He remembers, “As I began to learn about the Northern
Ireland situation living here, we felt very much if we weren’t careful the different
denominations could maintain the divisions in their approach to chaplaincy.” Thus, with
the influence of another chaplain who worked at a parachurch peacebuilding community, Michael helped organize programs to bring students together. Michael went on to lead parachurch peacebuilding programs, worked in broadcasting and media, and then served several churches. He focused all of his ministries on promoting peace and reconciliation.

Joseph was brought up in Belfast, in an “aggressively Protestant” Church of Ireland. He remembers that his parents and his church believed, “Catholics were beyond the pale, probably not Christians, prone to subversive activities, did not accept existence of the state, potentially enemies – as bad as that. We had no dealings with Catholics. I didn’t like this very much even then. I was probably just being strappy and not going along with my parents, but they were very much that way.” He spent time in the Republic of Ireland, Rhodesia, and the US, where he befriended Catholics and grew to appreciate their faith. He also joined the liberal “Student Christian Federation,” which significantly influenced his interpretation of Christianity and its prophetic witness for justice. Joseph worked actively to combat sectarianism and build peace in a variety of ways, many of them controversial and some dangerous, as a teacher, writer, organizer, and priest.

Luke was born and raised in Belfast in what he calls a “fairly liberal” family. His mother's father was Catholic, a fact she kept secret because she worked for the UU party. He describes a mixture of liberal and anti-Catholic messages in his upbringing:

I remember clearly [the childhood message] that Catholics have more children. Therefore, nationalists will at some stage outbreed unionists, and at some stage the tricolour will fly from city hall. It was something I didn’t look forward to, but I assumed it would happen. I wasn’t worried about it. We had a strong sense of Irishness even within unionism. We’re Irish.
Once when the queen was coming, she was going along... the main road where we lived. I asked my mother, “Are you going to see the queen?” She said, “I wouldn’t go from behind the bar to see her.” In other words, she did not like the idea of royalty. At one stage of my life I went to live in England. There was a sense of, “Why would you want to live in England?” So we had a strong sense of Irishness. But when I was born, my mother wanted to call me either Aidan or Patrick – she grew up in Aidan parish. My father said, “We’re not having any of those fenian names here.” So there was a certain amount of [sectarianism] in the background.

Luke attended university in the Republic during the beginning of the Troubles, and later in England. He worked as a university chaplain in Northern Ireland and then moved to the Republic. He recalls that his children had never thought about the terms Protestant and Catholic until they moved south: “I remember them sitting in the back of the car saying, “Dad, are we Protestant or Catholic?” I said, “What do you think?” They thought they were Catholics. I said, “In a way you are,” and talked about it.” Luke’s visits home to a war zone while he was away strengthened his commitment to reconciliation throughout his ministry. He worked continually to lead his churches and his denomination to combat sectarianism at every level and take daring steps toward reconciliation.

*Roman Catholic*

Matthew grew up in a mixed border town in Northern Ireland, where he played both Catholic and Protestant sports with children from both communities. Matthew recalls that an early teacher of his “planted the seed that all people are holy. That seed came to fruition later after meeting people of different churches.” He worked as a
missionary in South America for many years and spent time in the US. Matthew returned to Northern Ireland in the early nineties, to the Redemptorist community. Since he had always felt an interest in church unity, he wanted to be a part of the peacemaking work there. However, he felt his talent lay in supporting the efforts of others rather than leading himself.

Ted grew up in England to parents he describes as “nominal Church of England.” He attended a Catholic primary school, and he says, “God became very real to me through the teaching and example of the sisters,” who were very affectionate. He sometimes went to church at the local Church of England, but his parents would not allow him to attend the Catholic Church regularly. He had two intense spiritual experiences where he felt called by God to become a Catholic priest, but he decided that he could not answer the call because he was not Catholic. He envied friends of his from various denominations who attended seminaries and could follow their calling, but his horrified parents told him to stop attending any church or associating with seminarians. After his third call experience, his parents finally stopped opposing his wishes; he immediately converted to Catholicism, joined the Jesuits, and began theological training. Ted lived and traveled throughout Europe, where his colleagues described him as ecumenical enough to represent other denominations at joint meetings. After he developed an intensely close friendship with a Catholic from Northern Ireland, with whom he spent many hours praying for peace and reconciliation, he felt God calling him to move there and work as a peacebuilder. Ted worked as a chaplain in prisons and schools, a parish priest, and as part of the Columbanus community. He continually
attends many different types of churches so he can be “nourished at more than one fountain.” He says, “I need that nourishment.” Ted also feels strongly that Eucharist should not exclude people from different denominations, and he tries to open Eucharist to non-Catholics as much as possible without exposing himself to discipline from his superiors. In his ministry as a priest or a chaplain at prisons and schools, Ted persistently works to bring Catholics and Protestants together and to build peace.

Philip grew up in the Republic of Ireland in a family that included Redemptorist priests and nuns, and he valued the good relationships between his family and the Protestant families in his area. Certain priests involved in his theological training increased his appreciation for the Protestant faith and his openness to ecumenism. When Philip moved to Belfast in the mid-eighties, his colleague Father Alec Reid told him, “There's nothing as important as trying to stop the killing.” Philip describes his theology as follows, “That’s the mystery of the church: it’s the same heavenly Father who reaches out towards the people of the Shankill, and Jesus his son, and the Holy Spirit, which reaches out to the Falls, too. It’s the saving mystery of God, wherever it is found. There is one church in many churches; many churches have grown into the fullness of church.” Philip engaged in intensely active and controversial peacebuilding initiatives over the decades, including high level secret mediations, and he made reconciliation the focus of his work.

Other Denominations

Ben, a Presbyterian, comes from a mixed rural community in Northern Ireland. He studied economics and civil service before entering theological training, and he
studied and worked in England and the Republic of Ireland. As well as parish ministry, Ben has worked as a chaplain to students. The Holy Cross dispute, wherein Protestant protesters attempted to prevent Catholic school children from walking to school, had a significant effect on his strong commitment to work as a peacebuilder. Ben engages in intensive, high-level cross-community work, some of it risky, in order to promote peace and justice in church and society.

Jason, a minister with an ecumenical monastic traveling order, grew up in the murder triangle area to a family he describes as "hatch, match, and dispatch" Church of Ireland. A person in his school influenced him to embrace a deeper faith, and he felt called to an ecumenical, embedded ministry throughout all of Ireland. Jason works hard to maintain neutrality, despite his experience that Catholics generally embrace ecumenism more than Protestants. When people argue that people from the “other” community are not Christian, Jason notes,

We say, ‘Define what is a Christian church? Is that what you’re here, all your members followers of Jesus, all those who come on Sunday morning active members of Jesus? I doubt it. In fact if you think they are, I can assure you they aren’t, because we were out on Saturday night and saw them!’ [laughs] Or you know we question the premise of the question, and so by doing so, we refuse to play a game of trying to draw up sides.

While Jason is Protestant, his charismatic evangelical beliefs form the foundation of his passionate commitment to ecumenism, peacebuilding, and embedded community ministries.

Richard, a leader in the ECONI (Evangelical Contribution on Northern Ireland) parachurch movement, grew up in what he calls an “evangelical Paisleyite family… a
very strict evangelical background with a remnant mentality: ‘We’re the last bastion of true evangelicalism in the world! The forces of communism and Catholicism combined together in the PIRA to try to eradicate us!’” He rebelled as teen and attended a Methodist church, which broadened his thinking with more liberal theology and trips to the Christian Renewal Centre in Rostrevor. He also joined a Pakistan mission. His experience on a mission trip to Pakistan further opened his mind. He recalls,

Suddenly I realized there were more evangelicals in Pakistan than Northern Ireland, just by sheer numbers. I realized we can’t be the last bastion. With one thought, everything unravels.” His theological studies in England also transformed his thinking, because “Christian doctrine was always in the context of history, politics, culture, the geopolitical challenges of the day. It changed my hermeneutical perspective for understanding scripture and faith... in those days I was described as conservative evangelical. I would now describe myself as radical evangelical, with less emphasis on ‘evangelical,’ and more on ‘radical orthodox.’ I maintain a strong Christology. Ecumenical people often have no Christology, which means they aren't Christian. ...If someone presents themself as a follower of Jesus, and is orthodox in their understanding of who Christ is, and living the Christian life, if God has wrapped them up in his grace, I have to too.

Richard recounted a meeting following the Anglo-Irish agreement and the subsequent Protestant backlash. He recalls that one person advised, "Do nothing. Christians are too naïve, and the situation is too complicated for us to have an impact." Another advised a “simple, short response.” Richard advocated a "do a lot, clear, detailed response." He says the group chose his proposal, and that began his work as a peacebuilder in the evangelical community. Richard organized programs to persuade
evangelical churches to renounce sectarianism and support reconciliation, published study materials for churches, engaged in high level cross-community activities, including secret mediations, and tried through education, advocacy, and politics to contribute to peace.

Theology

As many scholars point out, religious leaders often use religious justifications to support either inclusivity or divisiveness, especially in relation to issues of identity, purity, and out-group intolerance.\textsuperscript{252, 253, 254} While this study does not attempt to quantify the effect of theology on clergy peacebuilding activity, theology nonetheless forms an important piece of clergy work. Harold Quinley demonstrates that theology correlates with clerical attitudes toward social and political issues and levels of social activism.\textsuperscript{255} As scholars observe, religious beliefs and social action shape each other in a reciprocal manner.\textsuperscript{256, 257, 258, 259} One’s social location affects where and how people construct meaning, and meaning construct affects how people engage society.\textsuperscript{260} These clergy care deeply about their beliefs, and they express passionate opinions regarding how their beliefs affect their commitment to peacebuilding.
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This study sought to identify themes and commonalities of belief in order to scrutinize the motivation and effectiveness of clergy. First, the study posed the hypothesis that unlike divisive, fundamentalist clergy such as Ian Paisley, peace-oriented clergy would reject a Manichaean belief system. Second, the study asked the clergy what religious resources motivated their work and shaped their attempts to influence others.

*Good and Evil*

A Manichaean worldview divides the world into demonic evil powers at war with angelic good powers. Galtung (1996) states that immanent, non-transcendent/supernatural theologies of God reduce Manichaeism and decrease cultural violence via the religious characterization of outgroup as damned or inferior.\(^\text{261}\) Martin Marty has pointed out that militant fundamentalists such as Ian Paisley and his Free Presbyterian Church operate under a totalizing, exclusivist Manichaeism typical of conflict zones.\(^\text{262}\) Steve Bruce notes, “Liberal Christians criticise Paisley for his religious imagery and language on the grounds that it appears to encourage violence and that, even when it does not, it assumes a radical division of the world into the saved and the damned, the good and the evil, them and us.”\(^\text{263}\) Paisley’s brand of Manichaeism does not support ecumenism or cross-community reconciliation efforts. This study hypothesized that clergy who work for reconciliation and peace would reject Manichaean dualism.

\(^\text{262}\) Marty.
\(^\text{263}\) Bruce, "Fundamentalism and Political Violence: The Case of Paisley and Ulster Evangelicals.", p398.
Interviewees were asked broad questions such as, “How do you define good and evil?” or, “Where do you see good and evil in Northern Ireland?” Approximately 17 of the clergy formally reject a Manichaean/dualist worldview. They tend to define evil as the absence of good, and they recognize the presence of good and evil in everyone. As Peter says, “We’re all flawed. The world is flawed. We all have sinned.” Many of the clergy follow a “substitutionary atonement” approach to redemption as expressed by Carl, “Every person is good, created in God’s image, but flawed because of sin. The only way for [sin] to be redeemed is what God did for us on the cross.” While Paisley’s followers may also believe in substitutionary atonement, they often categorize an out-group as so deeply flawed by the sin of erroneous doctrine that they must renounce their religious and political commitments and convert to the in-group’s belief system to gain Christ’s redemption. In contrast, these interviewees saw each Christian tradition as a path, rather than an obstacle, to salvation.

When clergy maintain a non-dualist view, they often define it in the context of the conflict as a rejection of Paisley’s exclusive fundamentalism. Mark notes, “When you look at both sides, both are convinced of the rightness of their own actions. Yet each has brought hurt, pain, and death. People are still living with physical, emotional, and mental disability as a consequence of people doing what they were convinced was the right thing to do.” Simon expresses a similar sentiment, “Because there was so much wrong on both sides on this continent, nobody has a right to focus on the wrongs of the other.” These clergy understand that a Manichaean identification of one community as good and the other as evil can fuel sectarian strife, and they carefully contradict that kind of dualism.
Clergy also reject Manichaeism to validate their pragmatic peacebuilding efforts. Richard, who self-identifies as “supernaturalist,” adamantly rejects dualism in the context of the conflict:

God intervenes by sending peacemakers: Christians living their faith. I do not believe in spiritual warfare with demonic powers. I have a wonderful ongoing conversation with some charismatic friends in England – they can be so patronizing. They say “[Richard], we’re so glad you’ve peace in Ireland. We were holding this prayer meeting every week for x years in our nice suburban house in England, and we prayed into that situation, held onto the demonic powers and bound the meaning of Christ, and we delivered. That’s where the real battle was, that’s where peace was won for Northern Ireland.” And I said, “Well, while you were praying over those years, I was going off into Republican areas at 1 o’clock in the morning to meet with leaders of the IRA and talk to them. Do you think what I and countless others like me were doing had anything to do with it?” They say, “Well that was all very helpful, but it was the prayer that won it!” Och! I could punch them!

Richard expressed frustration with the Manichaean sentiments of his friends because he felt as though they chose a much easier task than his, and then they took all the credit for his dangerous and difficult work. He rejects dualism in part because he wants Christians to feel God calling them to do cross-community peacebuilding and reconciliation work rather than simply stay home in prayer.

Gary, another non-Manichaean, actually takes the opposite view:

The only thing I think that really broke through [the political impasse] was prayer. If anything is going to happen, a prayer basis foundation has to be laid down before anything can happen. That maybe unseen, but it has had
a quite profound influence on the political situation in this country over the past ten years. For example, there were prayer movements working in Stormont, meeting to pray there to intercede fairly regularly. There were days when we were able to get into Stormont and pray within the senate room and buildings. I’m sure all those things, the prayer setup has had a profound influence on the outcome of the political situation in this country. We felt strongly that what had spared Ireland from going down the same road as Rwanda because there was so much prayer around the world for Northern Ireland.

Gary did engage in pragmatic types of peacebuilding work, as described above; however, he did not undertake the sorts of risky, political, high-stakes efforts that Richard carried out. Both Richard and Gary credit the specific types of work they chose as most important. They reject dualism, embrace supernaturalism, and believe in the power of prayer to help bring peace through the types of work they chose.

However, approximately four peacebuilding clergy do hold an explicitly dualist view. Jason says his order “exists to do as much damage to the devil in the name of Jesus with as little collateral damage to people.” He clearly sees his work as part of a supernatural fight between the forces of good and evil, though he also sees good and evil in each person. Jason ministers to paramilitary members from both communities and criminals of all kinds, including pedophiles, because he believes that Jesus calls Christians to love and serve everyone. His dualism manifests in a radical inclusivity and broad ecumenism.

Other clergy base their Manichaean beliefs even more directly on their experiences of the conflict and define sectarianism as a force of evil. Ted asserts, “Good
comes from the Holy Spirit, and anything that fosters unity and understanding and relationship to me is good, whereas the work of the devil is division. Wherever there is division, suspicion – that’s evil, where the devil is at work.” Ted’s experience of inter-religious tensions, particularly in Northern Ireland, has shaped his Manichaeism to reflect his belief in the importance of religious harmony. In the following example, James applies his Manichaean views to specific examples of violence in Northern Ireland:

I believe in the devil and his angels. …And I believe there’s a point at which a person can become the instrument of evil. And I believe on a scale, all sort of people can participate in evil things. I have seen, one might describe it... certain points in my life when I have seen evil take over people, if you like: their intent to kill and to maim in a mass sort of section. I was going driving up the Falls Road, a predominantly Roman Catholic area. And just in front of me – this was at the, probably starting to the height of the troubles. And I saw the – there was a Police Land Rover in front of me, one car in front of me. And people came out of the side streets. And the face and body language of, the body language was sheer hatred for that, what all of that represented. I’m not saying those people are evil. I believe that the forces of evil, the controlling forces of evil when people get into a mass sort of situation like that can do that kind of thing. I saw it equally on the Shankill Road, which is the Protestant area. I was there on one occasion. I felt, I felt the presence of evil. Terrible. …God created human beings in his image. Whatever we mean by “The Fall,” there is certainly - humanity has fallen and leave themselves open to the potential of being manipulated by forces other than we recognize.

James applies his clear Manichaean views to his experiences of violence, in an effort to reject sectarian prejudice and violence. However, he carefully distinguishes
between the evil of hateful activity vs. the characterization of a person or group as evil. As with Jason and Ted, James structures his beliefs to support his commitment to communal reconciliation.

Sometimes in applying their theology to the conflict, clergy become a bit imprecise their dualism, such as Carl’s statement:

Evil is manifested in every person’s life, and in every situation there is some evil evident there, but in some it is much more to the fore. Some horrendous things happened in this country as in all countries. There were some extremely evil people behind that, and some very good people who have got caught up in that. Even Christian people living a good positive lifestyle nevertheless can have a leaning towards that in support of that. I see the whole spectrum from extreme evil right through.

James and Carl both describe a scale or spectrum; but for Carl, people who commit “horrendous things” have so much evil inside them that they are “evil people.” Other “good people” also contain evil inside them, which manifests when they support the evil acts of others. Like James, Carl divides good and evil based on individual sin rather than communal alignment. Their supernatural dualism comes through when James describes people, “being manipulated” by “forces of evil,” or “evil take over people,” and Carl mentions, “good people who have got caught up in [evil things that happened].” While Carl’s description moves back and forth between the “evil in everyone” of a non-dualist view and the “evil people/good people” of a dualist view, he nonetheless joins James, Ted, and Jason in a robustly Manichaean worldview.

Thus, most interviewees do reject Manichaeism. As theology and context work to shape each other, the clergy who reject Manichaeism do so at least partly in response to
the divisive, hostile rhetoric of fundamentalists in their society. However, four clergy reclaim Manichaeism by equating divisiveness and hostility with evil, especially when they lead to violence. It would be interesting further to explore Manichaeism in Northern Ireland alongside other psychometric factors, such as religious fundamentalism, right wing authoritarianism, and quest orientation.\textsuperscript{264} Studies of evangelicals such as Ganiel (2008) highlight changes in mindset that helped foster peace.\textsuperscript{265} Further studies could examine how such changes reject or redefine potentially divisive theological elements.

\textit{Religious Themes}

In order to gain insight into their motivations and effectiveness, this study investigates what religious themes seem most important to these clergy in their work as peacebuilders. Scholars such as Thomas (2005) have brought attention to the multi-vocal nature of religion, such that certain themes and strands within religions can support peace and democracy.\textsuperscript{266} Other studies, such as Tombs & Liechty (2006), Cejka & Bamat, (2003), Gopin (2002), also find that with careful theology religion can contribute to conflict transformation via grassroots activism.\textsuperscript{267,268,269} Philpott (2006) uses theology to formulate a politics of reconciliation.\textsuperscript{270} Little (2007) finds that when religious
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commitment motivates actors, they can employ religious ideas to inspire others and foster a peacebuilding trend in society.\textsuperscript{271} The 1997 Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict notes that a clear message that resonates with followers gives religious leaders and institutions particular effectiveness in conflict.\textsuperscript{272} Quinley has found that clergy with the most progressive theology have the most liberal political views and the highest levels of activism.\textsuperscript{273} Cynthia Sampson notes,

> Religious traditions establish ethical visions that can summon those who believe in them to powerful forms of committed action. Many religions provide moral warrants for resistance against unjust conditions, including those that give rise to conflict, and thus provide an impetus for adherents to take responsibility for preventing, ameliorating, or resolving conflicts nonviolently.\textsuperscript{274}

In Northern Ireland, Hickey (1984) finds that religion inspires politics, and theology helps to shape religious adherents’ attitudes and actions toward social and political issues.\textsuperscript{275} The clergy interviewees cited a variety of theological opinions, both conservative and progressive. In order to find themes, clergy were asked what resources from their faith tradition influenced them most, and what they used most in their efforts to convince parishioners to support peace and reconciliation. Interviewees tended to focus on scriptures and traditions that express three major themes: 1) inclusivity, 2) a God-centered identity, and 3) the call to put their faith into action.
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Inclusive Commands and Stories:

Clergy peacebuilders often feel strongly that they are doing the work God calls them to do, based on their interpretation of scripture, tradition, and doctrine. Claire Mitchell argues that because of the Roman Catholic emphasis on ritual, liturgy, and sacrament, Catholics generally do not connect their social or political views with any theological ideas or beliefs.\(^{276}\) However, Philip, Ted, and Matthew each expressed strong connections between their theological beliefs and their social and political views. While the Protestant ministers cited mostly scriptures, the Catholic priests also cited many leaders from within their faith tradition who inspired them. They named Pope John XXIII, Alphonsus Liguori the founder of the Redemptorists, Charles de Foucauld, Father Paul Couturier of Lyons, and the friendship between Francis Xavier and Ignatius of Loyola, and more. Priests certainly draw these links more than laity, though these priests, like their Protestant counterparts, consistently tried to convey the theological imperatives of peace and reconciliation in all their ministries.

When asked what faith resources inform their theology and shape their approach, many clergy cited scriptures that command us to love inclusively or describe God’s inclusive love. Clergy cited Jesus’ commands to love our enemies (Matt 5:44, Luke 6:27, Rom 12:17-19), to love our neighbors as ourselves (Mark 12:31), and to love our neighbors even if they are of a different, despised out-group (Good Samaritan story, Luke 10:25-37). Joseph discussed inclusive stories when he taught Religious Education courses:

\(^{276}\) Mitchell, p130-1.
When we read in the Bible about people objecting to Jesus because he was kindly disposed towards Samaritans, I would always make the point that this is what we’re talking about [in Northern Ireland today], isn’t it? Love your enemies. I discussed the story of Jesus healing the hemorrhaging woman on the Sabbath, and how the religious leaders objected. I told them, “We can't obsess about some theological detail at the expense of the heart and Spirit of the whole thing. We're supposed to have confidence, trusting of the Lord.”

These clergy used inclusive scriptures to guide their congregations and students toward a more inclusive approach to the out-group. Clergy also cited scriptural stories about how our enemies and religious out-groups receive God’s blessing and salvation, such as the book of Jonah and the Woman at the Well (John 4:1-40). Jean said she always uses Peter’s vision about the sheet coming down with animals to eat, and the message “what God has called ‘clean’ can be clean.” (Acts 10) She tells her parishioners, “How can we call [Catholics] unclean? We can’t get away from that, how can we get around that?” She continues, “They’ll know we are Christians by our love [John 13:35] – we hardly show love by shouting at each other!” Philip also mentioned the vision of the peaceable realm from Isaiah 11:6-9. He stated,

God’s purpose for us is that we live in peace, right relationship, and justice. If God wills peace, it has to be possible. All that’s lacking is human cooperation, human response to God’s call, or human will. A person who believes in the true and living God, who loves all humans, who has no enemies… has to in some way make God’s vision of the world a practical reality however he or she can. God is working in human history to bring us into right relationships.
These clergy use an array of scriptural sources to bear witness to their vision of an inclusive God and persuade their congregations that Jesus calls Christians to live in inclusive communities.

*We are reconciled because of Jesus*

Another inclusive idea, the theme of unity in Christ, also inspired and guided the clergy. Ted said, “The heart of the Christian faith is the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, and that is the call to unity for all who believe it. The body of Christ is a wounded body because it is divided.” Several clergy also mentioned epistles calling us to a ministry of reconciliation. For example, we are to be reconciled to God and one another (2 Cor 5, Col 1:20-22), because Christ breaks down the wall of hostility between religions (Eph 2:14). Some clergy cited the message of reconciliation as the cornerstone of their faith, such as Peter’s statement,

> The whole message – Grace, show love to enemies, be ye reconciled – you can’t get away from it. …if you look at the life of Christ, how can you? If Grace is all you see, you can’t hide seeing Grace at every turn of scripture, and you find faith at every turn. When you follow the message of the Good News of Jesus Christ, there cannot be any aspect of alienation—whether Catholic, homosexual or whatever. The universal message is just there every week.

Few clergy expressed similar support for same-sex relationships. However, most clergy find the message of reconciliation so fundamental and universal that it encompasses many aspects of life.
Our loyalty must be to God

Some clergy base their calling as peacebuilders on the conviction that Christians must find their primary loyalty and identity in their relationship with God, rather than with any worldly group, even a church denomination. By promoting this conviction, some clergy challenge their congregation to be more inclusive, such as in this powerful statement from Carl:

We’re all created equal in the sight of God. Every person created is deeply loved. …Across the board, it doesn’t matter who the person is – black, white, Hindu, Protestant, Catholic, nothing, solidly Church of Ireland – it makes no difference. Everyone is welcome in church. …People say, “What are they doing coming into our church?” I always make it clear that everything that happens, from having a cup of tea to leading a service – Orange services included – are open to everyone. Anyone is to be there, no differences are to be made, and everyone is precious in Christ. As Paul writes, barriers are broken down – Jew, Gentile, all that stuff.277 Where people in a Catholic Church and Protestant church, if they have a relationship with God through Christ, they’re united by the Spirit anyway. They are one as God’s people. And the other differences are there, but you have to say, “Though I strongly disagree with a lot of what they believe, if they’ve got that core, we’re united.” You have to accept it: we are united under God, and we have to work together where we can.

In like manner, Simon argues that a Christian’s highest loyalty must be to the Kingdom of God, not the United Kingdom or Mary, Queen of Ireland. Thus, church must be “neutral ground,” and he prohibits his congregations from singing the National

277 Peter refers to Galatians 3:28 “There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.” (NRSV)
Anthem. As described above, the Dublin preacher who inspired Jean to embrace ecumenism and reconciliation preached that, “We’re not of this world: our kingdom is the Kingdom of God.” Because that sermon transformed and liberated Jean, she also conveys the same message to her parishioners. These clergy draw upon scriptures that ground identity in a theology of Christian unity in order to promote a more inclusive ecclesiological approach.

Some clergy carefully preserve particularity within the message of ultimate loyalty to God. William says, “I preach the love of Christ: loyalty to Christ above all, not as denying other loyalties but as transcending other loyalties.” William never implies that Christianity forbids weaker loyalties to worldly entities in order not to alienate his passionately Unionist parishioners. Richard takes a somewhat different approach and uses theology and scripture to preserve the importance of diverse identity within a united loyalty to God:

In Revelation [we see the unity of] everybody around the world, from every people, tribe, and nation. The reason why that one is important to me is it says identity matters. Part of the Christian response of Christian citizenship is to say “I’m a citizen of the Kingdom of God; therefore, it doesn’t matter that I’m male, female, Irish, British, or American. We’re all Christians; this doesn’t matter now.” – Poppycock! Our embodiment in human existence in our time and place does matter. And Revelation says to me that when we are in that new age of the Kingdom, you will be an American, I will be an Irishman, and it is in celebration of that diversity, not in its eradication in some sort of Christian blandness.

Richard quotes Revelation 7:9 to support and explain his view of unity with diversity. These clergy meticulously balance universality with particularity, in which
Christians unite in loyalty to God and belong to certain earthly communities. In this way, they affirm their parishioners’ identities and simultaneously call them to an interpretation of identity that reduces out-group hostility.

*Our call to live our faith:*

Several clergy mentioned the connection between faith and action, and the need to translate Christian beliefs into concrete work on behalf of peace, justice, and healing. They apply this directive to many forms of ministry, both general and specifically related to sectarianism and peacebuilding. For example, Simon bases his overall approach to ministry, which he calls “Talk, Truth, Trust,” on Jesus’ life. Simon believes Jesus models those values as an example for how Christians should live, and he uses that model as a guide for his work with everyone from parishioners to politicians and paramilitaries.

Jason described the guiding conviction of his ministry as the example set by Paul in 1Cor 9:19-23: “become all things to all people, so that some might be saved.” Jason and his group of missionaries follow Paul’s command quite literally: they travel around Ireland and do whatever sorts of projects need to be done, including construction work, for local churches. They endeavor to support local priestly structures as traveling prophets. Jason says his group sometimes enjoys more latitude to engage in radically prophetic forms of reconciliation and mission work than local clergy, who are accountable to their congregations and church hierarchies. He believes that he and his group are accountable only to how faithfully they follow the Bible, regardless of how many feathers they may ruffle along the way. For him, fidelity to Scriptural authority grants him the liberty and courage to live his faith as fully and radically as possible.
Even clergy who confine their peacebuilding efforts to sermons, Bible studies, and individual conversations rely on the concept of “faith in action” to persuade their parishioners that Christians should help the out-group. Mark turns to “scriptures about issues such as God’s call for us to protect the oppressed, widows, and orphans, to uphold justice, and our responsibility to protect others within our communities.” He applies these scriptures to the context of Northern Ireland sectarianism and urges his parishioners to act with fairness and compassion toward Catholics.

For clergy who actively combat sectarianism, this call can give them guidance and courage to face challenging or frightening situations. Ben mentioned Jeremiah 29, when the exiles are told to settle in Babylon, as an example of how the welfare of church always connects with the welfare of its city. Ben believes that God calls him to exert himself on behalf of reconciliation through active involvement in communal affairs. On the morning when he first felt called to put himself at risk by going out to the scene of an angry cross-community dispute, his wife read scripture to him in order to give him courage:

Her reading that morning was Psalm 27: phrases like “Though an army besiege me—and of course the army were on the streets at this point—my heart will not fear. Though war break out against me, even then will I not be afraid.” And similar verses from that Psalm, which in a sense provided me with a word from the Lord for the time, and that’s been quite a rock in many ways. In the Providence of God and by the prayers of hundreds of people… I did a number of things to live on both sides of the fence without getting contaminated.
These clergy find the strength to put their beliefs into action, even put themselves at risk, through their faith in scriptural guidance and inspiration.

As Smock (2006) notes, religious peacebuilders feel a sense of calling that inspires perseverance in the face of daunting obstacles. Interviewees report that faith resources inspire them to keep trying and have hope when the situation seems hopeless. Simon calls “Amazing Grace” an example of human and divine effort, wherein people who said “no, never” now work together in government. To expand on the vital role of Grace, Simon quoted a lawyer from South Africa, who addressed the issue of prisoner release as follows: “This is not about justice. This is about giving all parties to the conflict an opportunity to share in a new beginning, whether you believe they are deserving of that or not.” Simon argues that Grace is both necessary and miraculous: “As Jürgen Moltmann said, ‘Always remember that Jesus takes the inevitability out of history.’” He also mentioned Isaiah 43:19, “Wait for the new thing I am doing. If you’ve eyes to see, it’s happening already; it’s in your midst.” Simon used these concepts to encourage himself, his colleagues, and his churches to continue along the arduous, often discouraging road toward a more peaceful society. When clergy such as Simon take risks and face obstacles, these scriptures give them hope, endurance, and guidance to continue their difficult work.

Conclusions

These peacebuilding clergy come from a variety of backgrounds and espouse a variety of beliefs. Some of them grew up in ecumenically minded families or countries
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where Catholics and Protestants lived in peace; others were raised in strongly sectarian homes and churches. Almost all interviewees, whether or not they grew up in Northern Ireland, spent some time living in a different country. Northern Irish clergy generally agree that the experience of living where Catholics and Protestants coexist in harmony contributed to their ability to overcome their own Northern Ireland sectarian upbringing. Moreover, clergy who left Northern Ireland to live elsewhere often met members of the outgroup, who displayed evident, inspiring faith convictions and no religious hostility. These individuals also challenged their prejudices.

Some clergy from sectarian backgrounds changed their views in response to a reconciling message. Jean chose to stay in Northern Ireland: “I stay ‘cause I love my extended family. But also because I remember driving past the City Cemetery one night and thinking, ‘Everyone leaves! Anyone with two brain cells and an ounce of common sense gets out of here ASAP.’ And I felt challenged to stay! That's all!” Jean attended a charismatic event in Dublin, and the ecumenical message of the preacher sparked her change in attitude. Carl, who also never lived outside of Northern Ireland, attended an ecumenical event at the Christian Renewal Centre and reacted dramatically to the testimony of a nun. Other clergy also mentioned the formative influence of teachers, clergy, or particularly religious friends or colleagues in their faith journeys. The combination of inspiring religious ideas and transformative experiences shaped their understanding of and dedication to peacebuilding.

While these clergy disagree about certain religious beliefs, they apply their doctrinal convictions to the conflict in similar ways. Some of them espouse strongly
evangelical or charismatic convictions, while others follow a much more liberal or academic faith. Other than Manichaeism and pacifism (Chapter 3), this study did not catalog specific doctrines for quantitative analysis. Clergy interviews revealed a wide range of views about atonement, other religions, same-sex relationships, Christology, supernaturalism, and even ecumenism. However, interviewees agree on the importance of inclusivity, unity, loyalty to God over worldly loyalties, and living one’s faith. This combination of diversity and thematic similarity reveals how dissimilar theological doctrines can produce a similar organizing philosophy.

Why do clergy united by the above themes and organizing philosophy exhibit such a wide range of peacebuilding activity, from low levels of gentle persuasion to constant, high level engagement? James Downton and Paul Wehr (1998) describe several theories regarding why people engage in social activism. Activists may be motivated by general cultural beliefs, rational pursuit of resources, or ideological convictions based on group identity or subculture. If a person’s beliefs align with the goals and means of a movement, that person exhibits the “attitudinal availability” necessary to take action.279 The above themes that unite these clergy may constitute the agreed-upon goals and means required for a clergyperson to choose to join the “clergy peace and reconciliation movement,” if a basically unaffiliated and widely diverse set of people can constitute a movement. Perhaps clergy disagree about how the principle of “living one’s faith” applies to the inclusive themes, which affects their level of activism. Chapter 5 explores the question of why some reconciliation-minded clergy take more action than others.

Another theory suggests that religion has nothing to do with why some clergy dedicate their lives to peacebuilding. Bruce (2001) observes, “Secular analysts see religious rhetoric as a cover for essentially secular motives.”280 A secular analyst could argue that these clergy use various modes of religious rhetoric to justify other interests or their commitment to principles such as justice and peace – ideals that do not require religion. This secular view implies a psychologically impossible boundary between religious and non-religious components of a person’s social construction of reality. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966) describe how the socialization process develops beliefs, which form the basis of how a person interprets h/her experiences.281 These clergy do not experience any boundary or distinction between their faith convictions and their devotion to the above ideals. Rather, the relationship is bidirectional: their faith shapes the way they experience the world, and they refine their beliefs in response to their experiences. Their experiences have led them to perceive that God calls them to build peace; thus, they select specific themes within their faith for guidance on how best to accomplish that call.
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CHAPTER THREE: PACIFISM AND EXPERIENCES OF VIOLENCE

This chapter further investigates how ideas and lived experiences combine to shape clergy beliefs and behaviors. Specifically, the chapter examines how clergy from Christian traditions, who express commitment to peacebuilding, view the topics of peace, violence, pacifism, and Just War, especially in the context of their experiences of violence in Northern Ireland. Greater insight into how peacebuilder clergy comprehend these topics and their ethical obligations can help further the effort to understand both what motivates these clergy and what ideas they employ to influence others.

This study did not inquire into the details of interviewee seminary training. Therefore, this paper does not provide analysis about which doctrines clergy were taught, or how clergy responded to specific doctrines. However, theories of Just War arise from central figures in the Christian tradition and tend to influence the ethical approach of mainstream Christian seminaries. Seminary also likely exposed clergy to some pacifist perspectives found in Christian scriptures, historical and modern figures, and some current denominations. From the beginning of the Christian movement through the present day, Christian scholars, saints, and leaders have developed rich theories of pacifism, which reject the idea that violence is inevitable or justifiable and construct nonviolent alternative methods to challenge violence and injustice.\(^{282}\) Simply put, pacifists believe there is no moral justification for war. Denominations such as Quakers,

Mennonites, and Anabaptists, and well-known figures such as Dorothy Day and Stanley Hauerwas have significantly shaped Christian discourse on these topics. Secular theorists have also contributed to the discourse, though clergy likely had less exposure to them. Moreover, various peace movements across Northern Ireland brought attention to theoretical debates about justifiable vs. nonjustifiable use of coercive force and violence. With the exception of Richard, an Anabaptist, clergy expressed deep respect for pacifism but did not exhibit familiarity with pacifist theories. The other clergy come from traditions that generally tend to follow Just War doctrines over strict pacifism.

Christian Just War theories began with the fifth century writings of Augustine of Hippo, who claimed that Christians could serve as soldiers, and that Christianity permits

the use of violence to protect innocents or preserve long-term peace. The thirteenth century writings of Thomas Aquinas gave shape to a theory of moral justification for war: sufficiently noble and dire motivations, state authorization, and a constant, continual pursuit of peace. Many other central figures in the Christian traditions and secular society weighed in over time to hone and refine various precepts. Unlike political realism, which claims that states must prioritize their security and self-interests, Just War theories hold all parties accountable to universal deontological and teleological moral criteria. These criteria determine the conditions under which war is morally acceptable, limit permissible activities undertaken during war, and describe proper post-war behaviors and agreements to promote justice. Clergy views on peace
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and violence reflect familiarity with basic Christian Just War tenets such as the need for justifiable cause, nonviolent alternatives whenever possible, and minimal casualties.\(^{303}\)

As discussed in the Introduction, conflict analysts have begun to engage Galtung’s (1996) distinction between negative peace – the absence of direct violence – and positive peace, the absence of all forms of structural, cultural, direct, indirect, physical, and psychological violence.\(^{304}\) Positive peace involves such methods and goals as kindness, freedom, equity, dialogue, integration, and the legitimization of peace in the structures of society.\(^{305}\) Critics of Galtung, Lederach, and other proponents of positive peace tend to describe these ideas and authors as naïve and lacking rigor. These scholars generally believe established powers will maintain the unjust status quo in order to preserve their interests and outgun advocates of positive peace.\(^{306,307,308,309}\)

While clergy training rarely includes psychological or sociological discussions of negative vs. positive peace per se, it tends to involve a thorough analysis of relevant Christian ethics as contained in scriptures and traditions. As evidenced by the religious themes discussed in Chapter 2, these clergy express an ethical commitment to ideals that correlate neatly with Galtung’s description of positive peace. Interviewees identify principles such as inclusivity, equality, justice, trust, compassion, grace, dignity, and harmony in their descriptions of the divine vision, which they must strive to announce,
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create, and live out. While clergy certainly recognize the importance of negative peace, the ethos of their tradition contains rich content and emphasis regarding the positive peace they feel called to build.

In parallel with this broad definition of peace, the Christian traditions typically take a broad view of violence, which shapes their peacebuilding ideals. This view includes the indirect and psychological forms Galtung (1959) describes, such as economic exploitation and destruction of cultural symbols. In tandem with their belief that they must put their faith into action, clergy often perceive that their faith compels them to ameliorate any kind of conflict in their community, however they can. The inter-denominational itinerant monk Jason expresses a particularly all-encompassing view. As Chapter 5 reveals, when clergy back away from a peacebuilding effort, they do so out of the perception that they cannot help the situation rather than the opinion that they ought not try. Interviewees do not want to exacerbate the situation, but their faith commitments compel them to discern and reach the limits of their ability to ameliorate all conflicts within their sphere.

As the interviews show, their well-developed models of peace and violence necessarily shape the way clergy view the topics of peacebuilding and conflict. As clergy both shape their religious beliefs and are shaped by them, the issue of violence plays a particularly significant role in their ministries. Experiences of violence touch all of the clergy and continually dialog with their internal ethics and faith commitments regarding pacifism, redemption, and moral accountability. This chapter gives these clergy an
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310 Galtung, "Pacifism from a Sociological Point of View.", p69.
opportunity to tell their stories of the brutality, trauma, and terror they witnessed and experienced, and how it affected their ministries. It also explores clergy views on pacifism and how they apply to the Northern Ireland context. The Catholic and Protestant clergy views aligned with Just War theory, while the more evangelical itinerant cross-denominational monk and ECONI leader seemed heavily influenced by the ideas of Hauerwas.\(^{311}\)

**Violence**

All of the interviewees had experienced the violence of their context in ways that shaped, and were shaped by, their theology and approach to ministry. Clergy who grew up in Northern Ireland experienced the violence of the troubles as children living in a war zone. Clergy who dared to challenge injustices or engage in cross-community efforts—and even some who did not put themselves at risk—sometimes feared for their lives. All Northern Ireland clergy hear terrible stories of pain, loss, and rage from their wounded parishioners. While some clergy experienced violence more directly or dramatically than others, the violence that permeates their context forced all of them to wrestle with the unique challenges of ministering to a traumatized society.

As mentioned in the Introduction, Johan Galtung (1959) classifies violence into four categories: direct, indirect, physical, and psychological. Direct physical violence includes bodily injury and coercive force. Indirect physical violence includes actions such as economic boycott and exploitation. Direct psychological violence includes verbal violence, such as “systematic distortion of the adversary’s opinion.” And indirect

psychological violence includes cultural violence and “destruction of cultural symbols dear to the adversary.”  

Galtung later organized these types of violence into three categories: cultural, structural, and direct.  

All of these types of violence occur regularly in Northern Ireland; clergy experienced or witnessed each of them, firsthand and/or through their families, parishioners, and colleagues.

Each of the clergy who grew up in Northern Ireland described how the violence shaped their childhoods. Jason recalls a “very vivid” memory from when he was 8 years old, of waking up in the middle of the night to see his father and oldest brother, dressed in black, carrying a large stick and his grandfather’s truncheon from the 1916 rising. He describes life in 1974 Belfast, when the city shut down every night, and neighborhood vigilantes all gathered to protect their streets from murder gangs, barricades, and intimidation. He remembers two incidents from when he was 4 or 5 years old, when murder gangs gunned down his aunt and a friendly Catholic shopkeeper who gave him sweets. Similarly, Luke described going away to school and coming home for holidays – he never knew if the buses would be running, whether bombs would be going off, which streets were open, or what buildings would have been reduced to rubble.

Simon experienced a formative moment early in his life, when he witnessed an act of violence against the Nationalist community:

I remember coming home one night and hearing a huge disturbance in center of town. I went into the center of Newry to peep around the corner, and I saw them using a water cannon, hosing people from Margaret
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Square, in the center of Newry. That was a wake up moment as a young fella growing up here. I thought, “I don’t fully understand what this is all about, but all I know is that there is degrading, it’s inhuman, it’s a violation of something, and certainly whatever it’s trying to solve, I see it as pouring fuel on a fire rather than trying to drench the passion.” That I think was the beginning of my understanding of division and bitterness, and I remember people saying, “That will stop it all now, that’ll teach them- these Nationalists and Republicans.” I remember thinking “I don’t know an awful lot about what is going on in our world; but to me, that is the beginning of something rather than the ending of something. Something’s not going to go away.”

Simon went on to witness similar kinds of violence against the African American community in the United States, which strengthened his conviction to work for peace, justice, and reconciliation.

Ten years later, Simon chose to put himself at risk during a volatile, violent time:

I remember the night in ‘69 when the word was that the whole place was going to erupt tonight, going to be terrible conflict tonight. That night it was between Loyalists and the British army, not between Catholics and Loyalists. There was a fear that the Republicans might come, all these rumors going around. And after the morning service, the word was, this was going to get a terrible night. Some people were going to leave their homes and go stay with their families elsewhere. These were all the tight knit streets, little red brick houses, which have all now been knocked down and new houses built around there. But there are still some of the old streets left. Just imagine all these little streets, and people were boarding up their windows. And some of the men in the church said, “We’re coming down this afternoon, and we’re going to keep a watch on the church.” They talked about whether or not we should have an evening
service, because people would be too frightened to come out. And I said, “No, we’ll have the evening service.” And people began, men brought down hard board, hammers, nails, to board up windows of the church. I said, “I’m not happy about this. I feel we need to leave the church open. I’ve decided I’m going to stay here tonight, and we’re going to leave the church doors open, and we’re going to leave all the lights on. People will need to know there’s a safe house in this area.” … Some of the men said, “No, you can’t do that.” And I said, “Well, that’s what I want to do.” One of the women said, “You’ll need somebody to make tea.” Somebody else said, “Yeah, we’ll come down and make tea, because if some people come to the church, they’ll be looking for a cup of tea.” That’s a good Irish thing. I said, “Great.” One of the men said, “If you ladies are coming down, you’ll need somebody to keep an eye on ye; I’ll come too.” And within a few moments I had half a dozen volunteers, men and women, who said, “I’ll come with ye.” That church never closed for three weeks. The lights blazed on all night, the doors stayed open day and night for three weeks. We had people living in the church. We had people sleeping in the rooms. We had families that had been put out of their homes, Catholic families who had been living in the area, very few but there were those, and we would take them in overnight and then get them away to a safe place the next day. We’d a young mom who’d committed suicide and left five kids with an alcoholic father who couldn’t look after them. Social services had broken down; they couldn’t cope with it all. So we took those kiddies, and we made a dormitory for them in one of the Sunday school rooms. …But then one weekend there was a whole street of Catholics… burnt out by Loyalists. …I stood up the next morning, Sunday morning in my church in the middle of the Shankill, said, “I know I don’t need to condemn this in your presence, we all condemn it, I know we do; but words aren’t enough.”
Simon invited his parishioners to donate money and goods to the Catholic families. He said people must have emptied their pockets and purses. From this poor, working class Shankill Protestant church, an incredibly generous sum of money and carload after carload of supplies went to those burned out Catholic families.

Some clergy experienced violence as a direct result of their efforts at reconciliation. Simon invited local schools to participate in his church Christmas carol service, and a Convent school accepted. He remembers,

The word had got out, and both the school and church got threats from loyalist rogues and rascals, but we went ahead with it. We had police lurking in the shadows, totally unseen, because we thought, “This is just talk. They’re not really going to do it.” Nor did they, but they drove up and down with a loudspeaker …shouted and played loyalist songs we didn’t hear inside. That congregation said, “This is the right thing. We must do this; we must not allow ourselves to be intimidated. Of course we will be welcoming to this Catholic school.” That’s the little provincial town where attitudes were very hard, and yet…

Simon also experienced death threats: he discovered a petrol bomb in his yard. He perceived the threat sufficiently serious to require the removal of his family from their home, but he remained to continue his peacebuilding work. Luke and Frank also received death threats; like Simon, they pressed on with their efforts apace. William started a monthly prayer group with members of his church and the local Catholic parish. He then received “subtle threats to burn the church. A fuel line of a car was cut one night, fuel spilled around the place, fire brigades called at all times of the night.” In response, he drastically reduced the visibility and publicity around his monthly prayer group in order
to pacify the community. Threats of violence force clergy to grapple with what price they are willing to pay to live their convictions and how to respond to communal pressure. Frank, Luke, and Simon chose to press on unabated in the face of death threats, while William chose to tone down his work. William felt that the only reconciliation work possible for him was quietly to keep his monthly prayer group going over the years in the face of severe community pressure.

Some clergy place themselves in the middle of potential violence, as an attempt to calm down volatile situations. Joseph joined with his friend, a Presbyterian minister, and rode around every night on his friend’s “wee Vespa” motorbike to wherever riots seemed to be forming. He recalled,

We were conspicuous in that we were wearing clergy collars, and we’d go wander over self-consciously to a group of people, and say, “Hi.” They’d say, “Who are you, are you a Catholic?” And I’d say, “No, I’m church of Ireland, he’s Presbyterian.” And we’d just talk to them, we’d say, “What are you doing?” And they’d say, “Oh, they’re gonna attack us!” And we’d say “Och, come on, what are you doing?” After about 20 minutes of this, we’d wander across the no man’s land to the other side, and the same thing. And then by that stage, they’d all just all drifted off. We were never in the middle of stone throwing or anything like that, it all just died away, or the rain would come on, or something on television, and they’d all go away.

Joseph felt that by giving the opposing sides something on which to focus their energy – a pair of “odd people” on a “funny wee bike” talking to them – they were able to diffuse tension.
Ben felt compelled to be present at the riots surrounding a terrible dispute, because his church was right next to them. He feared for his safety, but he felt as though he was put in a no-win situation:

If I kept my head down, then by definition the Protestant churches had nothing to say to this horrendous exhibition of public evil, and whatever credibility you might have thought you had would just go out the window… On other hand if you surface, you’re the Protestant clergyman whose side was doing the aggravation.

Ben attempted to walk a tightrope, wherein he condemned the Protestant protests but did not provoke the Protestant community to ostracize him. He described his experience:

I stood as an observer. I would stand on my own like this, with my arms folded, very, very, very deliberate – my body language saying I am watching this. My arms are folded: I don’t have anything in my hands to throw. One particular piece on the evening local news - I was at one level quite horrified, and at another level hugely grateful to God – the piece started with a close-up of me [standing] like that. Then it panned back, a long telephoto shot, panned back to show a riot. I remember talking to the reporter afterwards about it. He said that was their contribution to protecting me. I wore the same jacket every day, I always wore my dog collar, and I stood in the same place, with the same pose. I wanted to make it clear to my side that I was on their side of the fence, but not participating in the riot, and the other side saw that too. …I was in no way contributing to the violence. Every morning I would go over to the Nationalist side where the press were and be seen talking to Nationalist politicians, [the local priest], the police – I was quite happy for most of that to be recorded on TV. The Lord protected me. The Providence of God
gave me a strong public platform of being able to walk that line between being disowned or contaminated.

Ben’s choice to put himself in harm’s way in order to condemn the aggression without rejecting his community earned him tremendous respect from many quarters. He felt he had earned a the credibility and trust from which to carry out many forms of reconciliation work, including work with hard line paramilitary Loyalists.

Even clergy who avoided controversial behavior sometimes found their lives threatened. James described his experiences in a particularly turbulent area:

At that time there was a notorious gunman going about, and he shot up one of the churches, a Pentecostal church—went in with automatic weapons and spread the congregation. I can’t remember how many were killed. …well he was called, “the fox.” And the police came to me sometime after that, and they said, “Look, this guy has stolen a car a couple of nights, and we feel he’s going to do another church. And we feel it’s either yours in [town] or the local Presbyterian church in [town].” And I had members of the security forces in my congregations. I know for a fact some of them would sit with a revolver beside them in the congregation, covering it obviously with something because they were aware that it was a church that someone would [might get] shot. I had to make a decision: we either cancel the service, or we went with it. So we went with the service. But something I’d never seen: we had an armed guard presence outside, which did not sit very comfortably with me. I only tell you that because—and I for some time looked under my own car when I would have meetings there because you just don’t know. Now that context of fear, to talk about some of the things that we might feel we ought to talk about – it was just the wrong context. You had to work in a totally different way. I haven’t talked about those things – you’re probably
the only person I’ve told, outside of my wife and maybe one or two people. …You just live with that… we had outside our home, I’ve seen it: suddenly a helicopter would land across the field, and you’d have somebody sitting outside with a huge M25 machine gun sitting out there and that he had set up.

Many clergy relate to James’ description of a “context of fear,” and how it shapes their ministerial approach. While all clergy interact with parishioners who have been victims of violence or perpetrators of violent acts (whether paramilitary or state sanctioned), some of them relate experiences of particular intensity. For example, IRA violence deeply affected two Catholic priests, but they responded in different ways. Matthew, who spent a lot of time trying to help people escape from IRA violence, formed particularly vehement anti-Republican sentiments. He recalls,

We would listen to the anguish and pain and sorrows, the desperation of many people. In some cases young men were given 24 hours by the IRA to get out of the country, or they’d be kneecapped or worse. It was their form of social control. It horrified me, because in one sense it kicked me out of my lethargy and my comfort zone. I had to really start getting this thing lifted, these groupings facilitated sanctuary - it made me angry. There were different groupings, trying to get a place of refuge, a safe place—all caused by this reign of terror by the IRA. And so that really upset me – I suppose I am of a sensitive nature, non-confrontational. The father of a family obliged to drive a truck with a bomb in it up to a police station, and if he didn’t do that, his wife and children would be killed back at home. This happened – the discussion happened 2 or 3 years ago, the event happened 15 or 30 years ago. I was speaking to these IRA, ex-IRA Republican prisoners, who benefitted from the freedom agreements that came through different levels of – different slices of government. I was
saying, “Listen, the IRA can call for as many inquiries as they want for the crimes committed by the Loyalists on our Catholic community, but until I see some inquiry about what the IRA are doing to bring to the surface the crimes committed by themselves and what is the process… No one is going to tell me that those involved in putting that man into the truck and forcing – suicide bombing! Forced suicide bombing. No one is going to tell me the IRA are keen on healing memories.” So they said, “That’s in the past.” I said, “Where does Jesus Christ come in the middle of this?” For the Republicans, Jesus Christ doesn’t come in at all. They’re Catholic by ethos, Christian by ethos, but the fifth commandment is not number one.

Matthew’s extensive exposure to the victims of Republican violence motivates this priest to commit so thoroughly to condemning Republican violence that he confines his work with the IRA to one of advocacy for victims.

In contrast, Ted, who worked a good deal with Republican prisoners, expressed incredibly openhearted compassion for these men despite his clear stance against their violent practices. He worked closely with some IRA members to help them turn from violence and crime. When I spoke with Ted, a phone call about one of his IRA prisoner friends interrupted our interview. After he hung up, Ted wept repeatedly as he described the way his friend had been recently set up and betrayed by the mother of his children, such that dissident IRA members beat him almost to death:

[The mother of his children] said to me - she was stunned – she couldn’t believe it. He let them beat him up; he didn’t respond or react. It really is an absolute miracle he survived. I’m told it was only because police happened to be near close at hand, and they worked on him for an hour. They didn’t think he’d make it; the paramedics didn’t think he’d make it.
They got him to the hospital, and he discharged himself on Sunday. Have you ever seen the film passion of the Christ? I don’t recommend it; I wouldn’t see it again. But when Jesus is all beaten up, one eye closed, congealed blood – Anthony looked exactly like the Christ. All he could say was, “I don’t want anyone to be punished.” As I said in the [Easter] sermon, that’s exactly like Christ: he took all the beating, and he didn’t want anyone to be punished.

Ted carefully and thoroughly separates acts from souls: he condemns violence but refuses to reject the people who perpetrate it. In fact, he embraces them with love, compassion, and a hope for redemption.

These two priests equally reject Republican violence, and they respond with equal compassion to the laypeople in their sphere. But for Matthew, exposure to the victims of IRA violence shaped his ministerial approach to be very different from Ted, who works closely with IRA prisoners. Note the contrast between the former priest’s statement, “For the Republicans, Jesus Christ doesn’t come in at all” vs. the latter priest’s statement, “That’s exactly like Christ.” Thus, these priests’ exposure to violence contributes to how they view Republicans: repugnant pseudo-Christians vs. wounded souls in need of healing and capable of Christ-like qualities. Matthew wholeheartedly supports his colleague Philip’s work to help Republican paramilitary members find a path to non-violence; however, he tends to treat Republicans with blunt condemnation.

Philip’s approach somewhat resembles Ted’s, in that he treats Republican paramilitary members with respect, compassion, and an underlying trust in their desire for redemption. Philip notes,
I could identify with Sinn Fein as committed to the transformation of society to make society just and fair. …I could never really identify with the arms presence, though I’ve never really condemned them. …Condemnation really doesn’t solve anything, really is what alienates. And maybe public judgment is important, creates a structure, a theory that we work towards. But pastorally if you condemn people, you sever your relationship with them more than likely. The only hope for transformation is to stay in relationship with people.

Like Ted, Philip can separate people from their violent acts. Philip and Ted believe that to end the violence they abhor, they must preserve their relationships with the people trapped in an “unnatural state” of war. Thus, unlike Matthew, Philip and Ted take a pragmatic approach to pacifism. Rather than condemn people as violent, they try to show people a better alternative: a path to peace.

Clergy encounter many kinds of violence; but the violence they speak of most comes from the lives of their parishioners. Inevitably, clergy spend a good deal of their ministry attempting to bring comfort to their traumatized, wounded, frightened congregations and communities. Stan mentioned parishioners who had been members of the UDR. These parishioners have neighbors who in the past “tried to blow them up” – and they are still neighbors. James discusses the painful, wounded memories of his parishioners:

People would take you to spots, and there was a mark on the wall outside the back of the church where one of the member’s sons was shot dead, outside the back of the church. ‘Cause you know, that mother still had that guy’s suit hanging in the wardrobe several years after that guy was shot. And the pain that woman went through, and the father – they were
members of our congregation. And down the street there was a businessman with two sons. They weren’t Methodist; they were Church of Ireland, but …he would come to me on a Sunday evening service. And you know, one… one awful day the two sons were sitting in the business. One of the sons was going out that morning to pick up his wife from hospital, who had had her second baby. The first son, his wife was pregnant with her first. She was due in I think six months. Two guys walked into the office and shot them both dead. Just like that, for no other reason than they were Protestant business people in that area. …Now, that’s the context of pain and so on that people suffered in that area; that’s why it was called the ‘murder triangle.’

James spends a lot of time visiting families of Protestant and Catholic people who had been killed. He tries to be a pastoral presence and bring the comfort of the Gospel to all those who suffered, and he tries to trust God to “make that Good News live” even when it seemed “trite.” Mark also describes the difficulty of ministry to traumatized parishioners:

Some are retired policemen, who would’ve seen many friends injured and killed in line of duty. People have family members, friends who were killed in the Troubles, in a random sense – bombing, or deliberate sectarian attack. You must be sensitive that you’ve got to work round that hurt that exists there. It’s a very difficult situation if they feel there is an enemy that’s there, almost a sense that what they’re looking at now in the political process is a selling out to what they’ve stood for, suffered for in the past.

Like James, Mark wrestles with how to respond to the relentlessness of the trauma. He says, “What can you do but try to bring the presence of Christ into it through your own presence in some way?” Mark and James both confine their peacebuilding
work to gentle, positive messages in sermons, Bible studies, or individual conversations. The context of widespread violence prompts these clergy to tailor their ministries to a wounded, traumatized community in ways that shape their approach and their theology.

**Pacifism and Just War**

Their faith commitments and experiences of violence inspire many clergy to hold strong opinions about the morality of violence in society. None of the clergy identified her/himself as strictly pacifist, though several clergy defined themselves as “almost pacifist” or “aspiring pacifist.” For example, Frank says, “And the end result it’s clear to see that violence, physical or verbal, is always wrong, no matter who perpetrates it.” However, all interviewees agreed that violent coercion is sometimes a necessary deterrent to evil. That said, these clergy unanimously condemned the war in Northern Ireland as illegitimate and unjustified – a “dirty war.” Within that classification, they expressed significantly different ideas about the ethics of various types of violence in Northern Ireland.

The Catholic clergy expressed a range of views toward Republicans, from unequivocal condemnation to compassion. The most passionate anti-paramilitary sentiment comes from the Catholic priest Matthew:

I am viciously anti-Sinn Fein, anti-Republican, anti- that philosophy of murder, and the spiral of violence that leads to murder and hate. I just couldn’t take that on board at all. A few times when I was in [our building], people came to the parlor to speak to a priest. There, we would listen to the anguish and pain and sorrows, the desperation of many people. …It horrified me because in one sense, it kicked me out of my lethargy and my comfort zone... It made me angry: the different groupings
of people all trying to get a place of refuge, a safe place, all caused by this reign of terror by the IRA. I am so, so angry about the violence committed for a united Ireland, the killing committed… I’m violently anti-violence!

Matthew feels as though his gifts lie in supporting reconciliation efforts done by more charismatic leaders. He does not feel qualified to minister directly to paramilitary volunteers or mediate bridge-building efforts himself. He may perceive that the simplicity and emotional intensity of his views on paramilitary violence obstruct his ability to work with paramilitary volunteers. However, he feels strongly committed to a compassionate, comforting pastoral presence to victims of violence, and he enthusiastically supports the ministries of his colleagues who do work with volunteers.

The two priests who do work with IRA members express a much more complex, nuanced view. For example, Philip conveyed a combination of pacifism and compassion for the IRA: “Nobody wants to be in war, except a psychopath. War is an unnatural state of being for people, and people want to get out of it, but… in a just and appropriate way. I think if you’re trying to stop the war, stop fighting, you will always get a hearing from people who have any degree of sense.” Similarly, Ted called himself “basically pacifist, opposed to violence, in particular paramilitary violence in NI.” In his significant time as a prison chaplain to incarcerated IRA volunteers, he always made sure the prisoners knew that while he respected them as people, he was appalled by any violent acts. Nevertheless, Ted admitted,

I can understand how grievances led communities, Protestant or Catholic, to resort to violence. I don’t approve of it in any way; I wouldn’t be chaplain to the IRA or anything, but I can understand how grievances led people to violence. The movie ‘The Wind that Shakes the Barley’ depicts
the partition in 1920 – you see the brutality of the British army and Irish army, and you can see how people are pushed into resistance in the form of the IRA. And then all the family divisions that come. There is a powerful scene in church during Mass – the priest is giving off, condemning violence, and someone – a volunteer of the IRA – stands up and challenges him. The priest says, “How dare you speak in my church, get out!” Other people do as well. Sure, it’s exaggerated as they do in films, but nevertheless that would be typical. I certainly would be more nuanced; I would have some sympathy as to why people were led. A few years ago after I first came here there were some paintball attacks on our churches in a predominantly loyalist part of town. I was deliberate – well, not deliberate, just me being myself – I never condemned or said, “Oh, scumbags did this!” My line was, “I would love to talk to these people.” Because you don’t just go around throwing paint; they must be hurting.”

Ted displays a particularly compassionate nature in the way he clearly views all people – no matter how violent, no matter from which community – as equally human and in need of help. He opposes violence, but he prioritizes healing wounded souls.

The Protestant clergy tend to put state sanctioned forms of violence and violent coercion in a separate category from paramilitary violence, both Republican and Loyalist. Protestant clergy generally equally condemn all paramilitary violence, but they express some version of Carl’s sentiment, “Where evil is there, there needs to be some deterrent… and that should come through government and authority rather than individuals take things into their own hands.” This sentiment echoes the first principle
outlined by Thomas Aquinas in *The Just War,* that non-state actors should never use violence.\(^{314}\)

Richard gave a detailed analysis of the ethics of IRA violence. He asserts in part, At a level I’m willing to understand, and while I don’t agree with it, accept the moral choice of people who say, “The Republicans had no option not to fight.” I would want to argue with them actually you always did have. Yes, were the powers complicit and wrong on bloody Sunday? Yes, they were; but this wasn’t a dictatorship… Sunnydale was brought down by two forces: Sinn Fein and the DUP. The IRA and Ian Paisley fundamentally rejected a nonviolent path, made a moral choice, and we must hold them culpable for that. They condemned us all to twenty years of horrific violence.

Richard also identifies as “almost pacifist” – he says, “I believe there’s enough people in the world, and some of it people only understand a punch in the nose.” While all of these clergy denounce Ian Paisley, Richard gives a unique perspective in holding the DUP and the IRA equally culpable for two decades of violence. Richard also expresses a particularly nuanced opinion of the IRA, though these Protestant clergy generally understand that the Catholic communities do not trust the police or army to treat them fairly, given their history of political oppression. Mark notes,

Consider the likes of military and the police during the times of the Troubles, and some of the things that were done, which I am quite sure in the minds of the people making the decisions were the right decisions at the time. But when you step back in retrospect wonder, “Was this the appropriate way for a government to act?” If you go back to Augustine,

---

Just War Theory, that sort of thing, “Where does the authority to take this action come from?” So in the context of the Northern Ireland troubles, it’s a very gray area. It’s an area that’s caused a lot of hurt and still causes a lot of sensitivity between the two communities. [Paramilitaries] felt fully justified in their own minds on what they were doing. Then there’s a reaction against it by the state, fully convinced of their own justification on what they were doing. The root is still the sense that the police are biased organization, now still. It’s one of the biggest issues politically to bring nationalists on board to policing; they still see the police as an arm of the loyalist side of the community. It’s the same with the military. The significance of the military, the end of military operation, I don’t think can be underestimated.

Mark tries hard to have a more balanced view of the legitimacy/illegitimacy of state and non-state violence. However, clergy can feel confused or daunted by how to express such views to a congregation. Carl said he tries to talk about it with his parishioners as gently as possible: “We must condemn violence and say it isn’t appropriate. But we must also say, ‘Why are those people being violent? Do they have a point? Are we in the wrong? Are they in the wrong? Is the violence not justified? Do they need to be challenged?’” Clergy seek to address the contentious issue of violence, a continuing reality in the region, in ways that ameliorate sectarian tension.

On the other hand, clergy such as Henry and William hesitate to condemn state violence even when they know the state has committed wrongdoing. William clearly divides violence between state-sanctioned and “terrorist”:

Where there are things that have been done wrong by the forces of the crown, however much in combating a terrorist campaign, those can’t be condoned. I’m clear about that. That’s a private opinion; I’ve never said
that publicly. But I think as part of our healing, these things will have to come to the light; they cannot remain in the dark. I don't discuss violence or pacifism. Before you offer comment, you need to understand very deeply what’s happening—and I don’t, because I’m not part of it. And if I were, I probably couldn’t comment. Not that I’m ambivalent about violence, but I don’t know what I could do about it.

Mark and William, both outsiders who grew up outside of Northern Ireland, agree that the state has committed unjust acts of violence. They also agree that these injustices must be discussed in order to satisfy the ethical demands of fairness, and in order to move society toward peace. However, whereas the Mark has found a way to act on those beliefs, William and Henry tend to avoid the topic.

**Conclusions**

This study inquired about the relationship between peacebuilding clergy and pacifism. However, none of the clergy self-identify as pacifist; they seem to find the moral and logical inconsistencies such as Jan Narveson describes in *Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis* persuasive. While all of these clergy renounce violence as sinful, they believe that sometimes authorities need to use coercive power to protect citizens from lawless violence. Furthermore, they recognize that the Catholic community experienced injustice, i.e. physical, structural, and cultural violence, at the hands of state sanctioned coercive forces. All of them nonetheless condemn all paramilitary violence, despite varying degrees of sympathy for the Republican perspective and individual paramilitary members. As with Just War theory, they reject non-state violence as inherently unacceptable. Both Catholic and Protestant clergy also tend to consider the

---

goals of the Republican movement insufficient justification for violent actions. The aspect of Just War theory most clergy discuss is the tenet that where nonviolent alternatives have been exhausted and violence can succeed, clergy condone its restrained, proportionate use by state actors. Interviewees tend to believe that paramilitary members did not exhaust nonviolent avenues of change. For clergy, the preservation of a stable, peaceful society from the lethal violence of non-state actors qualifies as a legitimate end to justify coercive force by the state.

Clergy attitudes toward violence contain elements of what William Ascher calls, “dispassionate instrumentalism,” wherein they accept violence as an acceptable (though sinful) means to achieve legitimate ends when peaceful methods fail.316 Clergy tend to agree with some version of Just War theory: where nonviolent alternatives have been exhausted and violence can succeed, clergy condone its restrained, proportionate use. For clergy, the preservation of a stable, peaceful society from the lethal violence of non-state actors qualifies as a legitimate end to justify coercive force by the state. While paramilitary members and their supporters also exhibit dispassionate instrumentalism, they include goals such as independence/reunification or the preservation of group identity as legitimate ends. In order to justify violence, paramilitary members define the conflict as a war in which both parties use violence as a dispassionate instrument to achieve political ends.317 In contrast, clergy believe strongly in the power of nonviolent
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methods, and most of them consider Republican or Loyalist goals of independence or group identity preservation insufficiently urgent ends to justify violent coercion.

Some clergy, such as Richard, also display strains of Asher (1986)’s “aggrieved moralism,” which denounces all violence in principle but justifies its use for self-defense only.318 For Richard and the other clergy, self-defense refers to immediate protection from obvious physical harm. Paramilitaries and their supporters also exhibit aggrieved moralism; however, they equate general discrimination and harassment against their group as a form of violence that, when severe enough, inevitably causes violent self-defense. While most clergy probably agree that discrimination and harassment qualify as violence, they refute the inevitability of a violent reaction.

For the most part, people who support any acts of violence believe the ends justify the means in those cases. Non-pacifists may measure what constitutes justified ends by different criteria, but once they categorize an end as justified, they support violence to achieve it. Despite some similarities between the “dispassionate instrumentalism” and “aggrieved moralism” of peacebuilding clergy and paramilitary members or supporters, clergy frequently describe themselves as “almost pacifist” or “aspiring pacifist.” James Sterba (1992) describes “just war pacifism” as a synthesis of Just War Theory and pacifism, by which very few wars meet the criteria necessary to classify as legitimate.319

I conclude that further study should examine peacebuilding clergy training and views about the detailed criteria of various forms of pacifism and Just War Theory, and
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how their beliefs about pacifism and violence have shaped and been shaped by their experiences in a conflict zone.
CHAPTER FOUR: INFLUENCE AND FORMAL EFFORTS

Clergy peacebuilders try to influence society on three main levels: individual, structural, and communal. At the individual level, they work to help parishioners, students, or prisoners overcome their fears so they can embrace the changes necessary for sustainable peace. This basic movement from fear to trust provides the stability required for peace to withstand challenges. At the structural level, clergy advocate for the needed changes by modeling and promoting their vision of peace and justice. This construction of a more equitable society gives content to positive peace and can serve to prevent future conflict. At the communal level, clergy build bridges across the sectarian divide to break down the hostility, prejudice, and distrust that prevent society from achieving cooperative unity. Increased harmony allows peace to grow stronger and more stable, as cycles of enmity give way to expanding cycles of good will. These three modes of influence arise from the theological and ethical commitments that inform clergy dedication to faith-based peacebuilding. This chapter explores how each type of influence connects clergy beliefs with their desired outcomes, and how each effect contributes to conflict transformation and peacebuilding.

Roles of peacebuilding

Quaker Adam Curle first distinguished between two main roles religious peacebuilders play in conflict transformation: advocate and mediator. Curle designated advocacy work appropriate for early stages of conflict, which typically exhibit a high imbalance of power and a low awareness of injustices. In contrast, mediation work belongs in later stages, when parties have responded to their newfound awareness of
injustice by balancing power relationships and seeking just solutions. Mennonite John Paul Lederach builds upon Curle’s work with the assertion that advocacy and mediation complement each other in an integrated, mutually dependent approach to building sustainable peace. Lederach also maintains that a religious actor can perform both functions in her/his peacebuilding efforts.

Cynthia Sampson expands upon Curle and Lederach and presents four roles for religious peacebuilders: advocate, intermediary, observer, and educator. In Sampson’s system,

Religiously motivated advocates are primarily concerned with empowering the weaker party(ies) in a conflict situation, restructuring relationships and transforming unjust social structures. Intermediaries devote themselves to the task of peacemaking, focusing their efforts on bringing the parties together to resolve their differences and reach a settlement. Observers offer themselves as a physical and moral presence in a setting of conflict, in hopes of preventing violence and transforming the conflict dynamics. Educators lay the groundwork for conflict transformation by conveying to others—whether in the classroom, the training seminar, or experientially—the knowledge and skills of conflict transformation and peacebuilding. In practice, the roles most associated with—but not restricted to—the different stages of conflict are advocate during the confrontation stage; intermediary during the negotiation stage; observer during the confrontation, negotiation, and postconflict stages; and educator during the entire conflict progression, including the latent

stage—before a conflict has come to full awareness and has become manifest in society.322

Sampson’s system does offer a useful structure to organize the various types of clergy peacebuilding activities, and in fact my interviewees exhibited all of these roles. However, after examining these three systems, I have developed a new taxonomy of roles based on observations of how theology and religious resources shape clergy motivations.

Interviewees attempt to exert influence for peace and reconciliation in three main ways: pastoral, prophetic, and bridge-building. Every stage of the conflict requires some form of each of these activities, though the form varies with the stage. For example, sometimes bridge-building involves secret negotiations between politicians and paramilitaries during the active stage of conflict. But once that bridge has formed and the politicians openly negotiate with paramilitary representatives, peacebuilding clergy continue to build bridges across divisions in society.

As discussed in previous chapters, clergy both shape and are shaped by their theological convictions. These three main roles reflect that synergy between belief and context, such that each role correlates with a particularly attractive and relevant aspect of how the clergy see Jesus Christ, whom they seek to emulate. Pastoral efforts, which attempt to build trust between the clergyperson and h/her parishioners, model “Jesus the Good Shepherd,” who cares for every sheep in the flock. Prophetic activities, which try to lead people toward the kingdom of JustPeace (clergy use the term “Kingdom of God” or
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“Kingdom of Heaven”), 323 imitate “Jesus the Prophet,” who spoke Truth to Power even at the cost of his life. Finally, _bridge-building_ activities, which seek to bring together communities of people divided by sectarian strife, follow “Jesus the Reconciler,” who offers reconciliation with God and all the earth, and heals every sin.

Furthermore, each role attempts to build or strengthen a particular link. Pastoral work builds a link between the clergyperson and h/er “flock” through relationships of mutual trust and empathy. In addition, Christian believers often expect their clergy to represent and model Godly behavior. Thus, the pastor’s compassion represents and symbolizes a compassionate God, and pastoral activity also builds a link of trust between parishioners and God. This link contributes to individual change: it helps parishioners to overcome emotional and psychological obstacles in their ability to move forward and accept a new and different reality. Although many structural changes need to take place for society to support sustainable and just peace, clerical exemplars help parishioners overcome their fear and resistance and support progress.

---

323 These clergy uniformly use male God-language, which is represented in quotations from their interviews. In analysis, I describe the “Kingdom of God/Heaven” as the kindom/Reign of JustPeace. This Reign is portrayed by Jesus in the Gospels as a new order marked by economic and social justice and harmony. The term _kindom_ has caught on among many Christian scholars and theologians as a more accurate representation of the Reign Jesus describes, in which kinship binds all creation in right, egalitarian relationships of wellness and mutual flourishing. Because I align with the theological camp that prioritizes choosing language to best reflect accurate theology, my analysis uses these egalitarian terms. The word _peace_ can sometimes refer simply to a lack of open warfare. Because _peace_ can describe such minimalist ideas, scholars and practitioners of peacebuilding have explored alternative terms, such as “positive peace” and _JustPeace_, which include stronger ideals of the content necessary for peace to characterize a community or society. The term _JustPeace_ has caught on among scholars and practitioners of religion and conflict transformation as a comprehensive description of the positive peace characteristic of the Reign of God.
Prophetic work builds a link between people and a realized vision of the kingdom through strengthening shared values of JustPeace, which creates a growing body of believers. Through prophetic work, clergy advocate for justice and promote the institutional changes necessary to move beyond a sectarian society. This link advances change at the structural level in order to create a deep peace that will last.

Bridge-building work links the congregation to the outside world, and it focuses on uniting divided communities. Through various forms of bridge-building, clergy help parishioners accept and understand the perspectives of the other community so they can replace prejudice and suspicion with respect and trust. These efforts operate at the communal level to create a united society that can move forward in harmony.

While these three links build upon each other and strengthen each other, many clergy assert that the pastoral link and the trust it creates provide the foundation for the other two types of activity. With the combination of these roles, clergy peacebuilders try to contribute the essential elements needed for stable peace: acceptance of change, structural and institutional justice, and intercommunal unity.

**Pastoral work**

Because pastoral work ideally serves to mitigate perceived threats, many clergy claim that this work comprises the essential, foundational basis for all other peacebuilding efforts. If their parishioners trust that they will not betray or abandon them, clergy feel much more leeway to push a peacebuilding agenda. The least active clergy peacebuilders confine their efforts to this type of work because they never feel sufficiently trusted to proceed to prophetic or bridge-building activities. It takes a
significant investment of time and effort to build trust with individuals, and clergy often do not have the time or access to reach everyone in their parish. As Mark pointed out, “Some people I see a whole lot of; I know their views intimately. Others I see infrequently, so it is far more difficult to be a direct influence on a face to face level.” Nonetheless, many clergy make it a priority to visit the families in their parish, as well as individuals and families who experience sectarian violence, regardless of their religious affiliation. To reduce perceived threat and increase trust, pastors employ theological resources, such as the message of Divine love, and psychological tools, such as non-judgmental empathy.

Clergy utilize theological resources to reduce anxiety and increase trust. To varying degrees, parishioners grant their clergy the authority of one who officially represents God and Jesus. Clergy intentionally attempt to display acceptance, compassion, and genuine concern for the well-being of students, prisoners, or parishioners, in order to represent the inclusive God they describe in Chapter 2. Carl states, “Every person who is created, is deeply loved.” This theological message shapes their approach to pastoral work with challenging, sometimes-hostile parishioners, students, or paramilitary members. Clergy peacebuilders reach out constantly through individual conversations to offer comfort and caring. They understand the importance of trust to “create space” for any and all prophetic work. Gary said,

I think we need to speak to truth, but I think we need to speak to truth in love. If your congregation knows you love and care for them, you can say a great deal. But if they don’t believe that, no matter what you say it’s not
gonna ring true for them. It’s not just a question of standing up for what is right and speaking the truth; it’s a question of how you present it.

The issue of “how you present it” arises repeatedly when clergy discuss the “minefield” aspect of their work in Chapter 5. Clergy wrestle with how to “speak the truth in love” so that the trust they build can survive such conversations. For example, Carl mentioned that while he broaches volatile topics in small group meetings, he is careful to “talk with people, rather than lecture at them.” Carl stated, “If someone says something ’raw,’ I talk to them later individually.” Several clergy echoed the directive to “speak the truth in love,” which comes from a Biblical instruction in Ephesians 4: 11-16 on how to overcome parish disunity. Clergy believe in the fundamental importance of love as a force for unity and healing in fearful communities. They strive to imitate Jesus the Good Shepherd: by showing love to their people, they reveal and witness to God’s love. Pastoral care communicates faith in a God of love, and it urges people to release whatever fear prevents them from moving forward.

Clergy also use psychological techniques to reduce anxiety. More than any other goal, pastoral work attempts to replace fear with trust: trust in the Pastor, and by
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324 The gifts Christ gave were that some would be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until all of us come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Human One, to maturity, to the measure of the full stature of Christ. We must no longer be children, tossed to and fro and blown about by every wind of doctrine, by people’s trickery, by their craftiness in deceitful scheming. But speaking the truth in love, we must grow up in every way into Christ who is the head, into Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body’s growth in building itself up in love. (NRSV, edited)
extension, trust in God. Simon’s degree in Pastoral Care taught him the power of empathy and non-anxious listening. Simon notes,

Build relationships. Find out what it is that’s hurting them, what it is that makes them aggressive about things, and take the time to work that through with them one to one. Get into their homes with them. Sit at their firesides, and talk about their photographs. …We have a ministry even to the difficult people: we have to help them. It does no good to beat people up and judge them. You find there’s something that is causing them to be like that, and they need to be helped. The one most important thing I learned from my pastoral care and counseling context was the whole thing about non-judgmental empathy.

Simon’s words represent the sentiments of many clergy peacebuilders about the central necessity of compassion and trust. Simon asserts,

I say, “There are three steps in this process – talk, truth, trust.” The three T’s: those are Gospel values. As you read the Gospel stories, Jesus was talking to anybody and everybody. He didn’t care who it was; he didn’t care what anybody said about it. He talked with people… he also was truthful with people, and he believed they should be helped. …I don’t think you’ve any business in ministry if you don’t love people. If I was interviewing candidates for ministry nowadays I’d only ask them two questions… 1) Are you open to learning? 2) Do you love people? If you don’t love people, go and sell insurance or something. Don’t come into ministry.

Simon applies this relational approach to his parishioners and also to his work with paramilitary volunteers. Ben espouses a similar philosophy in his work with both his parishioners and paramilitaries:
Once you have earned trust, as I think we have in [my area], the trust of your community, you then create space in which you can operate in public. One thing fascinated me in the world of paramilitaries and Loyal Orders that I move in: they do not expect me to agree with them. They do not expect me to buy into where they are. What they do expect is for me to be honest and open with them, to stand with them, and go with them on the road they’re on. The metaphor I use comes from a guy, now a missionary in Nepal, who was Deputy Head of Mediation in Northern Ireland: …When your community is going a way you can’t go, he said—and I use this—“I will walk with you as far as I can. I’ll have to part company and leave you on your own, but I’ll be waiting for you at the other end of the road.” Now that’s good — you say that to those guys, and they clapped. “I’ll pick up with you middle of next week.” They’re OK with that, because you’re not shafting them. You’re not despising, devaluing, or dismissing them. You are saying, “We’ll do as far as we can together. We may not be able to do it all together, but we’re not going to fall out over this.” You earn that trust, and that creates the space.

Just as Carl and Simon built a foundation of trust to “create space” in their work with paramilitary volunteers, Ted utilized the same basic beliefs in his work as a chaplain to paramilitary prisoners. Ted’s sincere compassion, humility, and sincerity “created the space” to build honest, mutually respectful relationships that could withstand disagreement. Ted recounts,

I remember once going in, there’d been firebombs destroyed Sprucefield Retail Park. I told them, “That’s appalling.”
[They responded,] “You don’t think much of our work.”
“No, I don’t.”
“We had to do it.”
“Lots of people have lost their employment.”
“Yeah, but they’re the wrong people, the other side.”

I could say my views. They knew where I stood, but they knew I respected them as human beings.

Like his colleagues, Ted employs a blend of theology and psychology to gain the trust and respect of paramilitary prisoners, some of whom have become his intimate friends. Pastoral care creates “earned trust,” which “creates space” for progress. Another way to describe the process involves the bases of social power as defined by John French and Bertram Raven (1960). When a person is attracted to a social agent (such as a pastor) or social group (such as a church congregation or denomination) and desires to be like that agent or be associated with that group, then that agent or group has referent power over the person. People often do not realize that the agent or group has power to influence them; they simply feel a desire to behave or believe as that agent or group. The stronger the attraction, the stronger and broader range of referent power results, and the more the influenced changes have the potential to persist independently of whether the agent or group is present. Effective pastoral work increases a clergyperson’s referent power. This increased power manifests in increased influence, such that a person will adopt more of a clergyperson’s views about justice and reconciliation, even when the clergyperson is no longer present. For example, Ted’s approach gave him the referent power to influence ex-prisoners’ choices about violence and crime, as discussed in Chapter 6.

Furthermore, of all power types, referent power generally has the broadest range.\textsuperscript{326} In other words, if a person is attracted to h/her pastor, s/he will accept the pastor’s authority on a broad scope of ideas and issues. When clergy help their parishioners replace fear with trust, their parishioners can better cope with uncomfortable changes in society and accept their pastor’s influence about ethical matters. In this way, successful pastoral work can build a foundation of trust and influence that allows clergy to engage in controversial prophetic activities at the structural level.

**Prophetic work**

Active peacebuilding clergy understand that societies need to change unjust structures and institutions in order to create sustainable peace. They work at the structural level to influence the organization of society and the norms of their community, to promote changes in its formation, arrangement, and constitution. Each form of direct, indirect, physical, and psychological violence contributes to the sectarian system. Prophetic work challenges systemic sectarianism and its broad range of manifestations, from personal prejudice to discriminatory laws. Clergy find many ways to act prophetically: they model a non-sectarian reality, speak or write about sectarian issues, advocate politically, endorse the peace process, and renounce violence.

As with pastoral work, peacebuilding clergy engage in prophetic work because they interpret their religious beliefs to require it of them. They also choose prophetic resources within their religion to support and inform their work. In religious language, the word *prophet* describes several kinds of advocacy. In the Christian tradition, prophets

\textsuperscript{326} Ibid., p621.
witness to “Divine Truth,” in order to move people from what is to what should be. Prophets paint a vision of God’s purpose for the world, and they urge people to reach for that vision. Prophets try to model courage in the face of opposition, conviction in the face of doubt, and hope in the face of despair. As described in Chapter 2, clergy gravitate toward scriptures that paint a vision of God’s inclusive kingdom and call them to put their faith in action. In the blending of these two activities – witnessing to God’s vision and acting on their convictions – clergy seek to emulate Jesus the Prophet. The Christian scriptures portray Jesus as a prophet who announced the Reign of God and denounced the injustices of his current social context.\textsuperscript{327} Interviewees describe many forms of prophetic activity, which range from quiet visibility to overt advocacy.

If pastoral work forms a foundation, prophetic work tests its strength. The history of Christianity includes countless examples of prophetic leaders, including Catholic clergy in Northern Ireland who supported human rights protests and marches as advocates and peacekeepers in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{328} Mitchell (2006) casts activist clergy in a decidedly non-prophetic light, as calculating politicians who spin public relations to gain power and resources. She argues that while the Catholic Church consistently denounced the IRA, its leaders endorsed the SDLP and occasionally even Sinn Fein to give the appearance that they represented the interests of their community and gain leverage to pressure politicians to preserve denominational education.\textsuperscript{329} That assessment surely gives an accurate portrayal of many church leaders, but it does not do justice to the

\textsuperscript{327} For example, see Mortimer Arias, \textit{Announcing the Reign of God : Evangelization and the Subversive Memory of Jesus}(Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
\textsuperscript{328} McElroy.
\textsuperscript{329} Mitchell, p42.
difficult, courageous efforts of peacebuilder clergy to lead their people to peace. These clergy often press for unpopular changes that frighten large segments of their communities. Their prophetic role places them at professional and personal risk, as discussed in Chapter 5.

When they work with politicians and government agencies, clergy peacebuilders engage in a dual-advocacy role. They do not seek theocratic relationships; rather, clergy try to promote their ethical views of justice and peace to the politicians, and they try to help their congregations understand the pragmatic realism of politics. For example, Simon argues that despite distaste clergy may have for Sinn Fein or the DUP, church leaders must voice support for the decision by Ian Paisley and Martin McGuinness to work in government together:

Leadership through statement and by example is important, very important. When Sean Brady, the Catholic archbishop had a meeting with Ian Paisley, that meeting had a big impact. And the Methodist Council of Social Responsibility recently had a meeting with Martin McGuinness, Gerry Adams, and the others. And we put that into the paper, into a press statement. …The press statement said the things we had said to them, what we focused on – all encouraging, positive things, challenging things. It’s important to let people see we’re not going to resist this or be begrudging of this. On the contrary, we welcome this. …Peace is more than the absence of violence; peace is Shalom, peace is about a just, fair society. And it’s not about a begrudging society; it’s about a generous society. And I think we’ve got to define what we mean by all those things and be hugely supportive of our political representatives, who are now showing us a new way. We must be affirming them as well as the process, but also be the guardians and challenge them – never be in their pockets, never too
cozy a thing, just all very nice. When they get it wrong, we’ve got to tell them they got it wrong, and the other way around – an honest relationship.

Simon, Ben, Richard, Philip, and other peacebuilding clergy who negotiate with political leaders do indeed seek to represent their community’s perspectives to the politicians. However, they do so not to increase or preserve communal power or to gain leverage for favors. Ideally speaking, they hope to give leaders a clear and thorough understanding of complex communal sentiments ‘on the ground,’ in order to maximize sustainable progress. Clergy do encourage their congregations to support the peace process and its participants. But that support has nothing to do with swapping political favors. These clergy meticulously balance the affirmation necessary to preserve the fragile concord with the moral imperative to hold political representatives accountable for ways they undermine justice. Clergy peace activists publicly support politicians who work to further peace and reconciliation. This support does not mask a power grab or angle for their churches’ approval. Instead, clergy continually challenge their congregations to take new and sometimes frightening steps to break down sectarianism and build a just and peaceful community. These negotiations thus involve both prophetic advocacy and bridge-building, which is discussed in the next section.

Sometimes prophetic work means placing oneself in a certain setting. Sampson separates the two categories “advocate” and “observer.” However, this dissertation’s taxonomy, arrived at through interviews, groups Sampson’s “observer” as a type of “advocate”: observers make themselves visible in order to promote a particular idea. David Steele defines four types of advocacy: promotion of a party, particular outcome,
process, or activity. Clergy peacebuilders place themselves in volatile or violent situations as observers, to advocate for the process of non-violence. Sometimes, as when Ben stood with his arms folded while his community engaged in rioting, clergy observers condemn their own community’s choice to behave violently. However, observers such as Ben understand that sometimes passive prophetic witness can “create more space for dialogue” than more assertive forms, such as speaking out against the riots. Had Ben actively condemned his community, he would have alienated them and lost the ability to lead them. Because he stood with his community and condemned the violent behavior simply by folding his arms, he earned the trust to represent Protestant and Loyalist groups and interests in various types of subsequent cross-community negotiations and mediations. He made himself visible as an example of non-violence, which symbolically condemned the violence of his community without rejecting them.

Joseph followed a slightly more active observer role when he and his friend drove around on the Vespa to calm riots. Joseph spoke to both parties and advocated for the process and activity of non-violence, and for the outcome of dispersal. However, like Ben, Joseph’s main objective was to be visible. In his case, he tried to give the rioters something on which to focus their energy, in order to distract them from their hostility toward the opposing group. Joseph believes that his presence, more than any specific words he said, diffused the tension and promoted non-violent behavior.

Prophetic visibility often includes the element of “setting an example.” Galtung (1959) argues that peacebuilders should operate according to the norms they wish to

---

achieve, in order to make their goals visible, live according to the beliefs they promote, and experience the satisfaction of achieving their goals in the present time rather than waiting for future gratification. With this method, a low-activism clergyperson such as Mark advocates peace and reconciliation by acting as though they are ordinary. Mark says, “I don’t do too much dwelling on the past in my own context. Instead, I move forward and say, ‘This is normal.’ Doing that may be setting some example of normality, and it gives permission for [my parishioners] to come to a more middle of the road approach.” Longitudinal analysis confirms Mark’s belief that when clergy normalize outgroup contact, that behavior causes parishioners to change their attitudes. Hewstone et al. (2008b) demonstrates that this kind of “indirect contact” reduces ingroup anxiety about meeting outgroup members, increases the perceived “overlap” between the ingroup and the outgroup, and causes ingroup members to view higher levels of outgroup interaction as accepted and acceptable.

Other clergy engage in similar concertedly visible cross-community work in order to exhibit such behavior as natural and standard. As Stan asserts, “I think if you can give a lead just in your own relationships, and people know that some of your best friends are from the other community, and you’re seen regularly socializing, chatting, and talking about serious issues, and all the rest, and yet the sky doesn’t fall in.” Additional examples include Luke’s meeting with his local Roman Catholic curate and Presbyterian assistant “for coffee every Wednesday, in full view of everybody, in a coffee shop on Main

---
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Street,” or other clergy groups, cross-community prayer groups, Bible studies, worship services, missions to foreign countries, and secular community groups. Many clergy also attend funerals of people from both communities who have been killed by sectarian violence, in an attempt to be a visible symbol that promotes non-violence and reconciliation. Ted regularly attends Protestant church services. He finds those services spiritually enriching, and he understands that his presence alone communicates a powerful message of inclusivity and unity to the churches he attends and his Catholic community.

Richard set a particularly potent example when he organized the first public Protestant meetings with Sinn Fein. He asserts,

We bear the scars that paved the way for the DUP to do what they did. And most of those scars ironically were caused by Ian Paisley and the DUP, who attacked us for doing what we did, for holding public meetings with Sinn Fein. We were the first Protestant group of any description, liberal or evangelical, to publicly invite Sinn Fein to address a public meeting. Lots of people had been doing it privately; but we held a public meeting… inviting Sinn Fein to address it. About 3-400 people turned up. It was a very interesting evening – a lot of anger in the room, yet we managed to hold the line. Sinn Fein were welcomed, treated with respect, etc. And so but Paisley calls a press conference the afternoon before that meeting, condemned us for betraying our faith, coming out for being separate, shouldn’t do this, blah, blah – yet here he is 12 years later …it was normalized. We had Christian Citizenship Forums organized over a …4 year period, [which] …then created a model for local congregations to pick up. So coming up to elections, congregations would hold forums in their churches where they would invite local candidates. More often than not,
they invited Sinn Fein candidates as well as Unionist candidates. Or even for Protestants to invite SDLP candidates into a church hall was a big thing. So we made it normal. And therefore, while it is still shocking that Paisley is sitting in government with Sinn Fein, there was a normality in another section of the population that was saying, “Well, this is going to be inevitable.” …In that extraordinary ordinariness, things and patterns are normalized, risks taken, little steps – such as the “One Small Step” campaign – it all creates a permissive environment. The church managed at various times to create a sense of space and permission for politicians to do certain steps.

These clergy often “bear scars” from attacks on their prophetic work, such as Richard described. Clergy often lament that their parishioners desire them to act as chaplains to their community (pastoral care) rather than as prophets for the Reign of God. Richard encountered considerable resistance among many evangelical churches he visited, when he led ECONI programs advocating for the peace process. Thus, the decision to engage openly in peacebuilding work constitutes, in itself, a distinct form of prophetic witness. Clergy want to present a visible, tangible example of a new life. They hope that this visible modeling and indirect contact will give people the gift of hope by presenting a reality in which Northern Ireland can choose not to be trapped in old patterns of enmity and division, but to move forward together toward a peaceful future.

Clergy also use church structures to make prophetic statements, such as when they alter the presence or placement of flags, forbid or take control of Orange Order services, or invite members of the outgroup to attend or speak at their church services. Sometimes, denominational structures give clergy a format within which to frame advocacy, such as the Church of Ireland’s “Hard Gospel” and “Think Again” movements,
and ECONI Sundays. Clergy engage in other forms of prophetic witness as well: they challenge sectarianism when they preach sermons, pray, lead various types of small groups, and teach courses or seminars. For example, Simon tries to help Protestants accept that the Unionist community shares the blame for the violence in Northern Ireland. He argues,

I wouldn’t center a sermon round trying to make my congregations feel guilty as Unionists, but when an opportunity comes along… We’re always trying to find somebody to blame. Maybe we have to look at ourselves, what we could’ve done differently, and then maybe we can engage in the luxury of looking at the other person. But we’ve got to accept responsibility ourselves. That’s been a hard thing for Unionist people here to understand; because it’s always been assumed if you’re Unionist here you’re the right thing, you’re on the right side of the state. More and more people are now beginning to realize that there were things done in the name of the Protestant/Unionist community that could not be condoned, which were unacceptable. So we have a great phrase, called “what about-ry” – I’ll say to you “Don’t you forget what your people did to my people in 1972!” And you will say, “Ah, but what about what your people did to my people in 1969?” And I will say, “Well, what about what happened in 1945?” – This “what about-ry” – So whatever I will bring up, you will say, “But what about,” and we could go on endlessly in our “what about-ry.” And I think the church has to—ministers and priests and clergy have to identify and spell out what is wrong and what is unacceptable from wherever it comes.

Simon works to challenge bias and promote a more honest and constructive perspective within his community. In like manner, Jean said, “I’m blunt straight about not demonizing the other community, if we're to be followers of Jesus.” Philip once said a
prayer during worship for an IRA member killed as a traitor, for the men who killed him, and for the Army and the police. Frank also preaches and publishes these messages, such as the following:

I’ve quoted Maya Angelou, an Afro-American: “History despite its wrenching pain cannot be unlived, but if faced with courage need not be lived in vain.” If we take Angelou at her word, we’ve got to be prepared to face that history, however painful a process it may be, or however strong be our personal inclination to disown it. As Christians we must realize that reconciliation comes with a price. The price is sorrow, confession, repentance, forgiveness. And the end result it’s clear to see that violence, physical or verbal, is always wrong no matter who perpetrates it. If our/their/my side has a hand at the party, we are wrong. Reconciliation must always be creative, bringing in a new situation, a new possibility, a new beginning, a new recognizable reality. We all need to be renewed spiritually, politically, psychologically, economically, equitably. The key is to be found in the new recognizable reality we see in reconciliation: a concept of the heart, of the Christ corporate.

Through messages such as Frank’s, these clergy combine symbols and doctrines of their faith with other psychological and social tools to show their communities where they as individuals and as parts of a sectarian system may contribute to sectarianism and suffering. This emphasis on the need to address our own culpability forms the heart of the Moving Beyond Sectarianism project by Joseph Liechty and Cecelia Clegg through the Irish School of Ecumenics. Clergy prophetic messages attempt to guide people through the painful stages of confession and repentance to a healing and hopeful vision of a happier tomorrow.
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Clergy also try to dismantle structural sectarianism when they speak in the public and political spheres. Public statements (including individual or group statements, such as “For God and His Glory Alone” from ECONI), publications (such as Catalyst from the Church of Ireland), and media work (such as columns or news commentary) represent a more focused form of visibility. Clergy undertake numerous such activities to promote particular entities, outcomes, processes, or activities by representing specific positions to the media, politicians, government agencies, or parades commissions. For example, Philip helped organize hundreds of clergy to sign a statement in support of the peace process and then to gather at Stormont to urge the leaders to keep moving forward.

The choice to enter the public sphere announces that clergy prioritize peace and reconciliation work. This type of advocacy uses visibility in two ways. First, it demonstrates to parishioners and communities that their clergy support structural changes that promote peace (and so should you!). Second, it demonstrates to politicians that clergy will encourage their parishioners to support these changes (thus, your constituents will expect you to support it, too!). These types of deliberately provocative, proactive visibility focus advocacy more intensely and specifically: they attempt to influence the structures of society in order to strengthen society’s ability to sustain peace.

In each type of prophetic activity, clergy blend their pragmatic understanding that they need to work at the structural level with their theological commitment to imitate Jesus the Prophet and witness to their vision of the kingdom of God. Furthermore, prophetic activities can build trust between clergy and the outgroup, which then opens
doors for them to build bridges across divides. The following section explores bridge-building work and its significance in peacebuilding.

**Building Bridges**

This section describes the myriad bridge-building efforts clergy pursue, and how these activities operate to ameliorate sectarianism and promote peace. In many of these activities, clergy expose members of their church, or ingroup, to members of the “other” community, or outgroup. The well-established contact hypothesis of outgroup exposure\(^{334}\) supports the clergy belief that structured cross-community experiences, such as ecumenical clergy support groups and joint activities for laity, reduces prejudice and increases tolerance. These orchestrated exposures to the outgroup help people respect the validity of outgroup faith commitments as they de-emphasize boundaries and promote common interests.

These interviews reveal that clergy possess a unique ability to maximize the potential of the contact method, because the church setting preserves the prominence of Catholic and Protestant identities. This high identity salience allows people to broaden the more positive feelings they gain toward individual outgroup members to a general increased tolerance toward the wider outgroup. Clergy also provide opportunities for forgiveness to take place, which helps move individuals and communities toward reconciliation. In addition, they engage in embedded work within communities and perform local and high-level political mediation.

---
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When asked about which religious resources inform their work, clergy offer a definition of the good, or the meaning of life, which corresponds well with Galtung’s holistic concept of positive peace. In addition to justice and truth, interviewees often mention people, doctrines, and scriptures that describe inclusivity: inter-personal and communal harmony, the all-encompassing kingdom, and the reconciliation of God with the entire world. According to these clergy, Jesus of Nazareth preached and modeled an inclusive kingdom, which overcomes worldly divisions. Furthermore, they believe Jesus acts to reconcile all of humanity to God and to each other. Some clergy define the disunity and antagonism among Christian denominations as sinful. Their conviction that they must translate faith into action motivates clergy to engage in activities that bring together divided people and groups. Through this work, they try to emulate Jesus the Healer, who reconciles all people to each other and to God. These bridges attempt to foster a harmonious, cooperative society of positive peace.

Outgroup contact

Clergy often attempt to build bridges with other clergy. For example, Luke recalled his dismay during a Belfast riot, when he learned that the local Church of Ireland priest had never met his Catholic counterpart across the street. He immediately enacted a policy that all clergy in his diocese must meet their counterparts from the other churches. Several interviewees testified to the benefits of inter-clergy bridges to model inclusivity,

break down stereotypes, and provide a buffer of solidarity and protection for clergy who desire to engage in open peacebuilding work.

Active peacebuilding clergy also attempt many varieties of laity bridge-building work, which include some of the prophetic activities described above, such as Richard’s “Christian Citizenship Forums.” Other activities focus on getting people together from Catholic and Protestant parishes for ecumenical religious activities such as prayer, Bible study, worship services, choral recitals, mission trips, Alpha courses, Summer Madness (a Church of Ireland run and inspired, but “widely embracing” youth festival), and recreational activities. These religious efforts endeavor to build bridges in two ways: First, they bring people from opposing camps into direct contact with one another—people who otherwise may never meet. Northern Ireland remains a highly segregated society, wherein people live, work, shop, and attend school, sporting events, or entertainments almost entirely with others from their own community. Clergy believe that positive exposure to the outgroup can help break down fear, distrust, and stereotypes caused by ignorance and isolation. Studies confirm the power of outgroup contact to break down the barriers to trust and forgiveness, both of which precede reconciliation. Specifically, contact reduces anger, increases empathy, and helps people see outgroup
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members as more human.\textsuperscript{337} Many studies now demonstrate the importance of outgroup contact in Northern Ireland efforts to build sustainable peace.\textsuperscript{338}

Second, clergy hope these activities will build parishioner respect and understanding for the religious commitments of the outgroup. Several interviewees relate that their parishioners do not consider people from the other community to be true Christians. Research demonstrates that ingroups perceive outgroups as less human; specifically, people view outgroup members as less capable of certain human emotions.\textsuperscript{339} Clergy find that by exposing their parishioners to religiously similar outgroup members, who exhibit devoted, sincere faith, their parishioners gain respect for the validity of the outgroup’s spiritual commitment. Parishioners begin to see their cross-community neighbors as fellow Christians, and their own religious identity broadens as a result.

The two goals of clergy bridge-building efforts align with the scholarly consensus that intergroup contact is probably the most reliable and robust way to reduce prejudice.\textsuperscript{340} Hewstone et al. (2008) summarize research that demonstrates how people who have higher levels of intergroup contact also exhibit more empathy toward the outgroup: they differentiate less between the humanity of their ingroup vs. the outgroup,

\begin{flushleft}
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and they feel less angry and more forgiving toward the outgroup.\textsuperscript{341} The contact hypothesis demonstrates that extended interaction between societal groups improves their attitudes and behaviors toward each other, especially when group members cooperate in joint efforts toward shared objectives, meet in informal settings where they experience equal status, and where the context strongly endorses equality and intergroup interaction.\textsuperscript{342,343,344,345}

Scholars have refined additional conditions under which outgroup contact achieves maximum positive effects. On the one hand, data based on “categorization theories” and “balance theory,” demonstrate how intergroup contacts that de-emphasize boundaries and promote common interests help diminish perceived differences, bias, and discrimination between groups.\textsuperscript{346,347} Therefore, bridge-building efforts should deconstruct perceived differences and underscore commonalities. On the other hand,
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other scholars encourage contact that preserves high group salience.\textsuperscript{348} High group salience occurs when something in the situation causes people to think about \textit{this} group membership rather than others. Everyone is a member of multiple groups – by race/ethnicity, gender, nationality, age, etc – and all identities cannot be salient at one time. When people engage in intergroup contact, if they can somehow keep their ingroup identities prominent as part of the structure of the contact, the contact will produce greater positive effects because people will generalize. They will make assumptions that other people from the outgroup are also good people. When contact occurs under low salience conditions, people may decide that the individual they have contact with is a nice person, but they have no basis for generalizing that positive attitude to other members of the group.

Clergy bridge-building activities incorporate each of these criteria. They de-emphasize boundaries and promote common interests or goals when they focus on common Christian beliefs and behaviors, common cultural norms, and the basic common humanity of the two groups. They maintain high group salience by virtue of the fact that these contacts occur in the designated religious spaces of the communities, with ingroup cohorts who usually gather in those spaces. Morrow et al. (1991, p.20) assign particular significance to worship in Northern Ireland because of its high degree of social and theological exclusivity.\textsuperscript{349} A group of coreligionists who regularly worship together can also preserve high group salience if they gather in neutral locations, due to the presence
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of ingroup members with whom they frequently meet for an exclusively ingroup experience. Moreover, if a parishioner visits an outgroup church for a wedding, funeral, or other event, that parishioner would feel h/her denominational identity quite strongly. Well designed outgroup exposure under these conditions both preserves the prominence of religious identity while it simultaneously reduces boundaries and emphasizes commonality.

Interviewees described numerous examples of just such interactions and their positive effects. To de-emphasize boundaries, clergy use symbols and rituals of the Christian faith to promote unity. Simon describes how he handles Catholic-Protestant marriage ceremonies:

I had a couple say to me, “We’ve been thinking of getting married, but we have a problem: we’re of two different religions.” And I say, “Which of you is the Buddhist?” They say, “No, no, neither of us. I’m Catholic; he’s Protestant.” “But,” I say, “Sorry, I misunderstood: I thought you said you were of two different religions.” They say, “We are, aren’t we?” I say, “Who told you, you were from two different religions?” I do weddings; it’s a great opportunity to say, “We are all the family of Christ.” I involve the priest such that nobody can tell who exactly married whom, and we serve no Eucharist at the wedding.

Any cross-community wedding provides a form of outgroup contact. However, such weddings can use liturgies and symbols to express quite different messages regarding identity, inclusivity/exclusivity, and harmony/division. Simon uses the liturgy of the ceremony to express a message of inclusive identity and harmony. The Catholic Church forbids Catholics to take Eucharist from Protestant clergy and does not welcome
Protestants to take Eucharist from Catholic clergy. Thus, the doctrinally divisive nature of joint Eucharist leads Simon to exclude it from joint weddings. Simon engages in other prophetic and bridge-building activism regarding Eucharist:

I use every opportunity I can to practice what I call “ecclesiastical disobedience,” just as civil disobedience brought change. Civil disobedience is by people saying, “If it’s going to be right in twenty years time, it’s got to be right now.” I’m not going to be here in twenty years’ time to enjoy it. So whenever I can, I exercise ecclesiastical disobedience, which means I will take communion when I get the opportunity at any Christian church, and I will offer it to anybody from anywhere. And that is a crucial thing as a way of demonstrating our oneness in Christ. We’re not going to be truly one in Christ until we can break bread together.

Simon advocates for inclusivity, unity, and equality when he breaks ecclesial rules regarding Eucharist. In this way, Simon engages in prophetic activity during bridge-building events. In order to build a stronger bridge, Simon advocates for the removal of obstacles to unity. Sometimes, fragile cross-community bridges cannot support this level of prophetic activity:

We had an ecumenical center here in Belfast called the Columbanus community. It was a small group of Catholics and Protestants: very, very important, very meaningful, very special. And they would invite one of us every Friday morning from different traditions to come and conduct communion service according to our own rite. And I shocked them all the first time I did it. I found that the Catholics sat in their pews and wouldn’t communicate. They went through all the words, but... the next time I did it, I didn’t partake myself. I said, “The table is here for all who wish to come,” and the Protestants came, Catholics didn’t, and I didn’t. So I then said, “I wondered if you’d noticed,” I said, “I will have to tell you why: I
feel like somebody who has invited my friends to a supper. And some, for whatever reason, feel they cannot partake of my supper. But I could not partake if my friends could not partake. I could not eat: a good host waits until everybody has partaken before they themselves partake.” So I was never invited back, because the leader was a Catholic. It was just too painful for them. It wasn’t that they fell out with me. They said, “Would you do this again?” I said, “Yes.” I knew it was too painful for them. I said, “Until we share pain—it’s painful for me, and until we share that pain, and really share that pain, we’re not going to get change. By not going forward, you are saying that whatever we are sharing is invalid. And by not receiving me at your table, you are saying there is something invalid about my faith, my practice.”

Eucharist presents a particularly difficult challenge in outgroup exposure settings, because it restricts the ability to deemphasize boundaries. The Columbanus community tried to build bridges through ecumenical worship; yet, they included the divisive Eucharist ritual without challenge or critique. This form of outgroup contact thus contained a heightened awareness of boundaries. Simon experiences this boundary, and its exclusive message from Columbanus Catholics, as a painful rejection. For Simon, outgroup contact must build bridges through honesty, trust, and inclusivity. Some Catholic priests agree with Simon:

I’ve Catholic priest friends who feel the same. In front of a packed church in County [----], where I was preaching… The young priest who was celebrating [Eucharist] had to come from behind the table, and he had to look at me as he passed. And suddenly I could see he stopped with the plate, and I could see—it felt like ten minutes. It was only like ten seconds. And I was struggling, “Do I say to him, ‘Just go on,’ or do I just sit and see what he’s going to do?” I felt this very strongly: just wait, give
him space here. And I’m sure it was only ten seconds, but it felt like ten
minutes. He leaned forward to me and said, “Would you like to share our
bread?” And I said, “With joy!” In front of all those folks, packed with
people. The choir, in honor of this occasion, had learned Wesley’s hymns.
And I thought, “How could we go through all of that and then, come to
that moment, not share bread?” That would have been a denial of
everything we had done before. That was a special moment.

In this case, the priest also practiced “ecclesial disobedience” by offering
Eucharist to a Protestant during a bridge-building event. This activity served as a
prophetic advocacy of inclusivity in front of the parishioners, and it also deemphasized
the ingroup-outgroup boundary. While this priest hesitated, Ted routinely invites
Protestants to participate in Eucharist in his services:

I say, “Those of you who are from other traditions are very welcome! And
I hope you’ll feel at home in this worship, and that you’ll feel free to take
a full part in our worship.” If anyone challenged me afterward, just say,
“Oh, I meant singing the hymns!” The rule in our church is you can’t
invite people; but if somebody presents themselves, you can’t turn them
away at the altar rail. You must give them communion. So it always
delights me if I see someone. Occasionally, my own parishioners say, “We
were in London or somewhere at an Anglican service; we just felt we’d
take communion there.” I always say, “You were right; you did the right
thing.” My colleagues would be horrified.

Within a setting of high group salience, Ted tries to remove boundaries and
promote commonality. Protestant exposure to a priest such as Ted under these high
salience circumstances ought to increase positive feelings towards Catholics in general.
Carl operated under similar logic when he introduced his congregation to the local priest:

In [town] the priest was atypical, easy to get along with, relaxed. I invited him to things socially in the church. People were taken aback – he arrived, sat down among them, had a yarn. He was good craic, easy to be with. Therefore, people for the first time actually talked to a priest and found he was normal. Whereas their impression – a lot of people have never talked to a priest, just as Catholics never talk to Protestant ministers. It was quite significant, being able to work with him. He was willing to come as an ordinary person in ordinary clothes, sat in the congregation for service, had a cup of tea and chatted afterwards. It disarmed people hugely.

Carl exposed his parishioners to an outgroup contact in the heart of their congregational life, a context of high group salience. By his easygoing demeanor, his ordinary clothing, and his relaxed willingness to worship and participate in their activities, the priest deconstructed boundaries and emphasized points in common. Sometimes, such as in Carl’s situation, the transformation happens gradually, over an extended period of regular meetings. At other times, one encounter can act as a powerful catalyst, and transformation takes great leaps. Jean describes such an event:

My people are set in their ways, very stressful of the Catholic Church. They see it as not Christian. I brought in two nuns to a women’s meeting. They were the first Catholic clergy ever in [that church]. There were twenty-five women there. At the beginning, they were all quite standoffish. At end, they were totally won over. It was brilliant! They want to go down this year to where the nuns stay. That’s a big difference; they’ve never done that. They were definitely won over. It’s a big break. Those two nuns—you have to meet them. It’s like the Grace of God is
hanging over them. I knew if I was to bring them into this congregation, those two women just standing there, they wouldn’t be able to resist the fact that Love was hanging out of them. Once you meet Catholics who evidently show the Love of God in them, you can’t go back and look at them, and say, “You’re not a Christian.” I remember now asking, “Are you going to tell me now they’re not Christians?” They couldn’t say that [anymore].

As with Ted and Carl, Jean organized an outgroup contact designed to preserve high group salience, de-emphasize boundaries, and promote common interests. Many clergy relate similar stories wherein exposure to genuine faith from people of the “other” community transforms attitudes, whether in their own church buildings or in outgroup locations. Peter described a time when he convinced a dozen members of his Shankill parish to visit the Benedictine Retreat Centre in Rostrevor. He observes, “They were overwhelmed. They’d never been in that surrounding, and the welcome and generosity of spirit just melted their heart.” Interviewees reported significantly improved attitudes toward the outgroup as a result of these well designed contact experiences.

Sometimes outgroup attitudes also improved in parishioners who heard about positive contact experiences secondhand. A series of dramatic leaps occurred after Luke decided to hold a joint Maundy Thursday service. Luke recalls,

I said to [my rector], “On Maundy Thursday we usually have washing of feet. I’ve an idea: let’s have six northern Protestants wash the feet of six southern Catholics, and vice versa. How do you feel?” He said, “I’m not sure how they would react to that.” I said, “Tell you what, I’ll not even ask you the question; we’ll just do it.” I said, “Now there is one woman Susan,” – she gives this testimony herself – “she’s very bitter; make sure
she’s one of the six. The church was packed full. That Maundy Thursday night, six southern Catholics sit down at the front, and two northern Protestants come along, wash their feet, all very nice, very moving. Then we do a swap: six northern Protestants sit down, and 2 southern Catholics are about to wash their feet. One is the local hairdresser; she says, “Can I say something?” I say, “Of course you can.” She eyeballs the northern Protestants, and says to them, “We’ve been talking before we came here tonight, and we want to say something to you. We want to ask your forgiveness for all the things that have been done to you in the name of our community, which have hurt you over the years.” It became quite emotional; all of a sudden you could feel the tears in people’s eyes. She goes to wash Susan’s feet, and Susan literally bawls her eyes out. She just couldn’t stop weeping and weeping and weeping, grabbed [the southern Catholic woman] – I thought, “How am I going to get this back on track?” And yet I realized it was a very important moment. So anyway, when they were leaving, Susan said to me, “This just transformed me. I don’t know what to do with this. I can’t tell anybody when I get home.” I just left at that and thought it was sad.

I was doing a parish weekend at that parish the following November, and we were about 100 people. I was expounding the book of Jonah. I came to chapter four, and I said to Susan’s husband David, “Do you think Susan would be able to tell her story there? It illustrates with chapter four, about how all the warring people were converted...” He said, “I think she might.” She stood up, and I was worried how it would be received. They gave her a standing ovation. Then somebody had a prophetic word – I’d been talking about the dividing wall of hostility being been broken down. Someone said, “The Lord has given me a picture …not only is the dividing wall of hostility broken down, but the Lord is asking us in [this town],” (which is the most divided town in Northern Ireland,
equally half Catholic/Protestant from one end to the other) “The Lord is asking us in [this town] to walk across the rubble.” And the rector, and the leaders of that parish committed themselves in that morning service, and these are the words they used: “Even if we are crucified, we’re going to walk across the rubble.” And that became the driving force for that parish. And it’s continued like that—so much so that they dared to do things that were unthinkable – moved flags – Union Jacks flying out over the tower all of July. They said, “No, that can only happen on the anniversary of the Somme on the first of July; they have to come down that evening.” And I’ll tell you, getting them down that first year, …there was a woman who was curate. They got the flags down, and all the Orangemen were gathering in the main street to protest about this. And she went to the door of the church, opened the door of the church. They didn’t know who was inside, or who was talking to this – young woman in her early 20’s, folded the flags up and handed them to them, the Orangemen. And they said, “Why are you taking the flags down?” [The young woman] said, “The vestry made a decision the flags could only fly on the first of July.” [The Orangemen said,] “Those flags shouldn’t be taken down, they always fly the whole of July.” [The young woman] said, “Sorry, did you not understand what I’ve just told you? The vestry made a decision: the flags are to be taken down on the first of July.”

She waved goodbye to them. The fellows who had taken them down had to escape from the church at midnight. But the flags have never gone up since, except on the first of July for the battle of the Somme. It used to be for the whole month. …And then they moved another [Union Jack flag] inside the church from hanging out over the sanctuary to inside the war memorial. They also created a thing called PAKT – “Parents and Kids
Together,” where parents and kids from the Catholic and the Protestant community, parents trained kids in skills they have. The church hall is used for that ministry all the time. They created a community center, which works together with the Roman Catholic community center.

Luke’s account reveals the potential of positive outgroup contact, and particularly the forgiveness it can inspire, to bring about significant change in individuals and also their communities. Harbored anger such as Susan’s significantly impedes the ability to forgive.\(^{350}\) Susan seemed to release some of her pent-up emotions during the above interaction. In general, such intergroup contact reduces anger and promotes group forgiveness.\(^{351}\) Hewstone (2008a) notes that forgiveness has the power to break the cycle of revenge and retaliatory violence, facilitate prosocial changes, improve relationships between groups, and move people on from past atrocities. If people perceive an apology to be sincere, it can improve their perceptions of the outgroup.\(^{352}\)

Moreover, clergy possess the ability to maximize the positive effects of forgiveness. Group forgiveness has particular value in conflict zones: “In societies consumed by ethnopolitical conflict, forgiveness is best thought of as a group rather than an interpersonal phenomenon.”\(^{353}\) Clergy and politicians function as the two main types of group representatives in Northern Ireland. However, Peter Shirlow notes that politicians generally refuse to acknowledge that their community has inflicted harm on the other, because they base their political legitimacy on a claim to sole victimhood. This

\(^{350}\) Tam and others., p307.  
\(^{351}\) Ibid., p310.  
\(^{353}\) Ibid., p207.
approach significantly impedes progress and undermines their ability to engage in meaningful cross-community dialogue. Clergy bridge-building efforts that increase group forgiveness may contribute an essential component of the peace process. Eileen Borris & Paul F. Diehl assert:

Forgiveness is a prerequisite for reconciliation. Reconciliation enhances the process of forgiveness by structuring it into the web of the societies once in conflict. Forgiveness at a transformational level helps break through personal barriers and lift the veil of illusions that may blind individuals, groups, and states to the potential for cooperation. When disputants are able to embrace the suffering of our enemy, then a reconciliation process can begin. Forgiveness and reconciliation requires community and participation; they cannot be accomplished in isolation.

Forgiveness has the potential to add significantly to clergy bridge-building efforts. Tam et al. (2008) demonstrate that forgiveness can release individuals and groups from the grip of past wounds and grievances toward a shared future. However, McLernon et al. (2002) found that people generally find group forgiveness much more difficult than forgiveness of an individual. Moreover, many people react with hostility to the idea of forgiveness; thus, overt attempts to promote forgiveness or trust may feel like an imposition and backfire. Tam et al. (2008) recommend that community leaders organize increased intergroup contact, which effectively breaks down the barriers to

---

group forgiveness and allows it to develop naturally from within individuals and communities.\textsuperscript{357}

While attempts to urge forgiveness may backfire, sincere apologies can inspire forgiveness unprompted, and that forgiveness can extend beyond the person who apologized. Wells (2005) notes that apologies, when they demonstrate sincere repentance, have the power to move people beyond their anger and even inspire peacebuilding work.\textsuperscript{358} Apologies may have increased potency in the context of a positive outgroup contact experience. The southern Catholic woman who apologized to Susan and her coreligionists had likely not committed any direct acts of physical or psychological violence against Susan, the other Protestants present, or perhaps any Protestants at all. Her lack of personal culpability did not prevent her apology from having an effect; she spoke as a representative of the outgroup, which sufficed to move Susan and many others beyond their anger to embrace radical peacebuilding measures.

Philip also asked forgiveness from a Presbyterian congregation on behalf of the Catholic Church. Specifically, he apologized for the execution of three leaders of the English Reformation: Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, Bishop Hugh Latimer, and Bishop Nicholas Ridley, who were burned at the stake in sixteenth century England because they refused to accept Catholic Eucharist theology and other Catholic doctrines. Philip and many of the Presbyterian parishioners wept at his apology. In Philip’s case, the event for which he apologized occurred centuries before in another country to members of a different denomination. Nonetheless, Philip symbolically represented the Catholic
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Church and community, the executed bishops symbolically represented the Protestant Churches and community, and the Eucharistic dispute symbolically represented the many ways the Catholic Church, its leaders, and Republican paramilitaries have perpetrated direct and indirect physical and psychological violence against Northern Ireland Protestants. The parishioners’ widespread, intensely emotional response indicates that Philip’s apology achieved the potential of representative apologies to reduce anger, increase forgiveness, and promote communal reconciliation.

Clergy also organize off-site outgroup contact experiences, which offer somewhat different benefits; each format has strengths and weaknesses. Sometimes, these initiatives tackle the issues of identity, sectarianism, and the violent history of “The Troubles” head on. For example, clergy organize, promote, and take parishioners or students to dialogues and programs at The Corrymeela Community, Cornerstone, and other such para-church organizations that bring Protestants and Catholics together to address sectarian strife. Richard worked as an advisor on the “Moving Beyond Sectarian” project by the Irish School of Ecumenics, which examines the roles churches played in exacerbating or ameliorating sectarianism. Liechty and Clegg found that ecumenical groups exhibit their own form of sectarianism when they deride or exclude charismatic or evangelical Christians who turn to them in search of a healing and reconciling community. In like manner, any patronizing statement by a person who has been long involved in ecumenism or reconciliation toward relative newcomers can damage the ability to move forward together.\textsuperscript{359} In this way, parachurch organizations sometimes erect obstacles to bridge-
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building that impede the positive effects of outgroup contact. Cross-community activities with members of parishioners’ home churches involve people who have already built relationships of trust with each other and thus have a lower potential for derision or exclusion. On the other hand, neutral territory can create opportunities for different benefits. While neutral ground may somewhat reduce group salience, these off-site encounters meet many important criteria for effective outgroup contact listed at the top of this section. Participants cooperate in joint efforts toward shared objectives and meet in the informal settings of parachurch peacebuilding organizations, which strongly endorse intergroup interaction, and where they experience more equal status than they would in the setting of the ingroup or outgroup church building.

Other off-site efforts intentionally avoid discussion of religion, politics, or other partisan topics in order gradually to build trust within a particular region, such as with ecumenical conferences or recreational activities. Clergy sometimes organize non-religious groups to build such trust. Stan started an historical society in his town, which met for a long time before it eventually began to discuss contentious issues. In like manner, Michael organized a community partnership to hold events, courses, themes, and other experiences whereby he hopes to “build up the capacity of the community through education and building confidence.” These non-religious groups likely involve lower group salience than religious events or activities at churches; similar to parachurch organizations, they mainly de-emphasize boundaries and promote common goals under conditions of equality in order build trust between the two communities. Moreover, these concertedly non-religious discussions of less controversial topics probably allow for
feelings of forgiveness to develop more naturally than they would at a meeting where participants felt pressure to forgive, even subtle pressure from the mere act of meeting to discuss sectarian issues.

Clergy bridge-building work influences society at the communal level by reducing outgroup hostility and increasing forgiveness. Without the benefit of guidance from social psychologists, peacebuilder clergy design and implement outgroup contact experiences that contain combinations of the elements necessary for successful impact. Analysis of clergy efforts may reveal missing elements or ways these programs fall short of the ideal. However, Dixon et al. (2005) argue that social scientists who compile ever increasing laundry lists of optimal contact conditions to maximize benefits sometimes lose touch with the reality of what feasible outgroup exposure and cross-community efforts look like in the real world. Furthermore, each context will require different kinds of contact parameters to match the uniqueness of the situation. Equality of status and cooperative interdependence occur only rarely, and many cross-community efforts do not last very long. They also point out that for social scientists to understand how contact affects participants and the meaning they create from these encounters, scholars must listen to participants’ voices and perspectives and pay attention to what they say about it. Unlike most social scientists, clergy listen to lay perspectives far more than they read research data. Clergy hope that over time, these different varieties of positive encounters will build a bridge strong enough to bear the journey out of a history of division and strife.
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Some clergy embed themselves in the opposing community in order to build bridges of trust from within. Rachel believes God called her to volunteer in a café in a Republican area, to demonstrate her respect for Catholic people and their beliefs. She recounted,

I couldn’t actually get through to the women, because they knew I was Protestant, and they were suspicious. That’s the whole thing, by the fear, “Why would she want to volunteer? Why would she want to mate with us? What does she want to know? Who is she telling?” One day it just happened I was there during the day instead of evening, and there was a Mass. And I just went to Mass with them … just very naturally. I couldn’t do all the things they were doing in terms of what they believed, but sharing in what they believed, and respecting what they believed. And we had a breakthrough in being able to work with them, because they knew I respected them. And they knew I was there because I wanted to be with them: no criticism, just accepting who they were.

Embedded work such as Rachel’s has similar high group salience to when clergy invite religious outgroup representatives into their own parishes. Furthermore, the presence of long-term embedded clergy has particular potential to deconstruct boundaries and emphasize the common goals of their work or project. Over time, clergy can gradually break down negative stereotypes and distrust among the outgroup members until they form a bond of mutual respect.

Embedded work may also build bridges by strengthening local efforts. Jason’s entire ministry structure consists of traveling embedded work all around Ireland. His group attempts to build bridges between the Nationalist and Unionist communities, and
also “North/South divisions, urban/rural, travelers, asylum seekers, West coast, settler people.” His ministry seeks to bring together many groups and individuals who are divided from one another. To that end, he and his colleagues spend significant time on the streets, drink soda in pubs, break up fights, talk people down from suicide, help people escape whom paramilitaries have targeted as “legitimate hits,” and work with local clergy and politicians to enhance cross-community efforts in their communities. Jason noted, “I go to clergy and say, ‘I’m not saying this is a model for you; but if we can work together, we can serve you. We can do stuff you would get the sack for, and instead we get the flack.’ We must be shrewd: loving as doves, clever as serpents.” Jason’s embedded work tries to supplement and bolster local efforts, so that community leaders and groups can move forward. In some cases, they fill a large deficit; Jason noted,

The Parades Commission got word to us saying, “You’re the only significant thing happening in [this town] in a cross-community way.” Some areas with parade issues, great conflict, everyone says, “You couldn’t reach them “taigs” or them “fenians” in that situation.” Yet, we’re going up twice a month doing children’s work and youth work, and everyone thinks its great, except Protestants of course. The Protestant minister we do it with is taking great risk being identified with us.

Jason’s embedded ministries build bridges by establishing long-term credibility, as Rachel did. While Jason’s ecumenical order provides relatively low group salience, he maintains a measure of diplomatic immunity by locating outside the communities in which he works. This immunity allows his efforts to complement local clergy efforts and enhance overall effectiveness. Moreover, while Jason is Protestant, he finds the Catholic community more receptive to his cross-community work and ecumenism in general:
Catholics would be more embracing; they just would be. Protestants would be more threatened by it. There would be obviously large sectors of Protestantism, which would be very relieved by it and see it as a way forward. Even elements within the Orange Order are very content with it, surprisingly. But quite a lot of Protestantism – is gutless, genetically. We’ll talk out of school but not engage with the issue.

Jason’s perceives that his efforts appeal more to Catholics, who find his brand of ecumenism less threatening than do Protestants. Perhaps Protestants have more trouble trusting that the structure of his programs gives them equal status to Catholic participants. They may suspect that they will be expected to repent and ask forgiveness of Catholics, or they might believe the Catholic priests in Jason’s group secretly wish to convert Protestants to the “One True Church” under the guise of ecumenism. It would be interesting to examine why Jason’s particular form of embedded bridge-building work seems more effective with one community than the other, and how his work fits with studies of Catholic and Protestant attitudes toward different types of “mixing,” such as Boal et al. (1997) provide.361

Negotiation and mediation

Sometimes, clergy participate in negotiation or mediation activities that involve governmental agencies, politicians, schools, or other secular entities. Claire Mitchell (2006) argues that most Protestant clergy mediators have attempted to represent and ensure Unionist interests to politicians, in exchange for which clergy try to persuade parishioners to support political change. (Mitchell, 2006, 52) However, these
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peacebuilding clergy try to convince their parishioners to support change regardless of whether politicians want them to; they work for the interests of peace rather than of preserving communal power. Clergy may feel the need to explain Protestant or Unionist perspectives, but they do that to help the process go smoothly rather than to curry favors.

Ben, who works in a particularly contested parade route, organized a negotiating table to help mediate discussions about the yearly marches. He relates,

I’m part of the Protestant/Unionist delegation, in the sense that’s where my seat comes from, but everyone acknowledges that I am not there to argue an Orange/Protestant view. I have said to the Republican side, “Frankly, I don’t care if the Orangemen never walk down this road! I’m not one bit interested in them walking down this road, but I am here.” I’m involved in these discussions, which are extremely difficult, because of their impact on community relationships. That’s why I’m there. So if I can contribute in terms of oiling the wheels of communication and understanding to help that dialogue process get somewhere, that inevitably has benefit for both communities.

Ben tries to smooth difficult negotiations by locating himself both within and outside of his community. He builds a bridge from the middle outward, to connect his community with the outgroup via indirect contact. As Chapter 5 reveals, peacebuilder clergy continually navigate volatile issues, fraught with sensitivity, trauma, and intense opposition. Often, bridge-building work can involve very careful diplomacy. Ben organizes these sorts of negotiations, “between groups who don’t talk to each other or understand each other. It is different from mediation, which involves trying to get to common goal. My role fundamentally is to help each side to understand where the other lot are.” For example, he tried to help Martin McGuinness understand the sentiments of
Protestant/Unionist residents of Shankill Road, who had no (Unionist) elected representative from West Belfast. He also works to build understanding between Loyalists and other groups (such as churches or Nationalists), and he acts “as communicator to and from government quite often about all sorts of weird and wonderful things.” This sort of bridge-building contains elements of the dual-advocacy prophetic activity discussed above; yet it also builds relationships between divided groups so that they can learn to work together. These bridges influence society at the communal level; they help each community inch toward cooperation, trust, and unity.

One of the most fascinating types of clergy bridge-building involves mediated secret negotiations between high-ranking leaders from the two communities. A few of the clergy I interviewed managed to establish sufficient trust with both the IRA and Protestant religious, paramilitary, or political leaders, such that they could function as intermediaries between the groups. Simon gradually grew to understand the importance of this type of “engagement” after a group of Catholics on the Falls Road invited him to meet with them and help them better understand the Protestant/Unionist perspective. He and some of his colleagues subsequently started to arrange meetings between Sinn Fein representatives and Unionists, which grew in significance over time. Simon recounts,

We got to focus on building some kind of communication with these people. We were kind of facilitators for them. If there were other people within the Protestant/Unionist community they’d like to meet, or people we’d like to meet with Sinn Fein quietly, discreetly. Some key people within the Protestant/Unionist community we identified, took some of them out for lunch, said we need to engage, we need to talk. We had the feeling fairly early on that there were people within the Republican
movement who wanted an alternative to violence—who wanted to be helped to find a way, but could not bring their movement in a new way unless there was some reason. They couldn’t just say, “Let’s just shut up shop and go home.” Nor could they say, “Let’s stop doing it this way; we’ve got to try that way.” They needed to know that if they were going to try to move their people in a new direction, that there would be real engagement, that there would be reciprocity, a response. So we tried to get some key people. And I remember being turned down several times by some of these key people. They just said, “No we can’t talk to terrorists; we are not going to talk to their political representatives. However dressed up they may be, they’re still part of this terrorist machine.” Etc, etc etc. But there were those who did, and we met in quiet places. My manse was one of the places, my parsonage. The chaplaincy at the university—I remember very dearly one of these conversations. The chaplaincy is an old house down on Ellenwood Avenue; maybe you’ve been in it, an old building. The room we were in, the door wouldn’t close. It wasn’t like this one – every time you’d close it, it would tick open. And somebody got up to try to push it closed, and I remember one of the Sinn Fein representatives saying, “You’re wasting your time: it’s a Methodist door, and it doesn’t close.” Well, I thought, “If nobody ever says anything nicer, that’s nice. We can live with that, we can live with that one.” And so we built a relationship with these folks, so much so that whenever there was something that was really serious about to happen, they would come and ask our help to communicate something that they felt needed to be communicated at whatever level. Simon’s story illustrates how trust can provide the foundation for bridge-building mediation work. The nature of trust makes it much easier to destroy than to create or sustain, and intergroup trust presents even more challenges due to the suspicion people
adopt toward a perceived competitor outgroup. However, trust greatly improves intergroup negotiations: it fosters more cooperation, more conciliatory strategies, and more honest, open communication of information. Through these mediated dialogues, Sinn Fein representatives and Unionist politicians gradually built bridges of mutual respect and understanding. Those bridges enabled them to look together toward a shared vision and find a way forward to sustainable peace. Eventually, Sinn Fein selected Simon to witness and verify the process of decommission of IRA weapons in 2005.

Like Simon, Philip organized and mediated high-level dialogues between Sinn Fein and Unionist Protestants. Philip notes,

> We created an alternative route to the violence, conversations around sources and causes of conflict. Northern Ireland is small, so these contacts were significant – they created a pool of people who had hope, and individual contact to dissuade people from war... All of these contacts made for credibility.

Philip’s approach to mediation, like Simon’s, attempts to build trust and mutual respect. As he describes in Chapter 2,

> Condemnation really doesn’t solve anything, really is what alienates. And maybe public judgment is important, creates a structure, a theory that we work towards. But pastorally if you condemn people, you sever your relationship with them more than likely. The only hope for transformation is to stay in relationship with people.

---
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Philip brought Sinn Fein representatives into contact with UDA representatives and with Protestant clergy such as Richard, who tried to help Republicans understand the Unionist perspective. Richard remembers telling the IRA, “The British presence in Northern Ireland is one million Protestants who believe themselves to be British; and you’re not gonna get anywhere with them while you keep killing them.” In that conversation, Richard acted to improve communication and help groups understand each other; in other settings he acted as a mediator, as did Philip and Simon.

Discussion

Outgroup exposure, embedded work, and negotiation/mediation operate at the community level to build bridges across the dividing walls of segregation, distrust, hostility, and misunderstanding. These efforts help communities edge closer to a view of society where rather than glaring at each other across a battlefield, they stand side by side, face the same direction, and work together to build a mutually beneficial social order. Liechty and Clegg advise that denominations should make bridge-building efforts a top priority: “Strong communities are more likely to be reconciled than weak ones, so community-building will continue to be necessary. But the balance will need to shift. In some circumstances, perhaps developing one initiative across the sectarian divide should count as success as much as ten intra-parish initiatives.”364 Clergy peacebuilders use these efforts to help parishioners embrace the peace process and reduce outgroup hostility. These community-level efforts may help the “zero-sum” mentality so prevalent

in conflict zones evolve to a more inclusive approach, wherein parishioners and politicians believe that both communities can work together to build a sustainable peace.

Conclusions

Clergy peacebuilders believe their job includes a duty to ameliorate hostility between Catholics and Protestants, reduce sectarian violence, and cultivate positive peace. They endeavor to influence society at the personal, structural, and communal levels. However, Mitchell (2006) asserts that clergy engage in prophetic work in order to increase their referent power within their community. Mitchell says such clergy “…are seen to be at the heart of the community’s struggles, their pastoral roles deepened and widened by the necessities of dealing with conflict.”\(^{365}\) Mitchell also suspects bridgebuilding clergy mediators of ulterior motives because mediation provides “…excellent PR for the church… [and] creates an image of the Church as having something to say about politics, and being influential enough to get their voice heard.”\(^{366}\) Mitchell correctly asserts that many clergy want their churches to perceive them as communal leaders who accurately represent their constituents and have a relevant, valuable contribution to make. Certainly a number of clergy in Northern Ireland fit her description of sly, power-hungry political conspirators out to protect their own interests at the expense of the peace process.

However, even these calculating clergy augment peace efforts if and when they support truth, equity, and harmony. Churches usually contain an array of diverse opinions regarding various aspects of the peace process, outgroup relations, and equitable
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structures. While these clergy may seek merely to represent their communities, rather than to take risks and lead them, their communities nonetheless almost always contain resistant elements. Clergy support for peace will help diminish the size and influence of those opposing elements. Moreover, what Mitchell casts as sly maneuvering may often involve simple risk aversion, as clergy attempt to protect their professional and personal security yet align with peacebuilding factions. Chapter 5 discusses the effect of risk aversion on clergy activism.

Different goals motivate clergy peacebuilders: they risk their professional interests to seek the common good of all. As clergy peacebuilders try to follow their faith convictions, they engage in these three roles when opportunities and situations arise. They also create situations and opportunities: they reach out to hurting individuals, insert themselves into volatile and controversial situations, and explore new ways to connect divided groups. They construct a three-legged stool, which relies on pastoral, prophetic, and bridge-building work for balance. The stool has a foundation of trust, which strengthens and connects the three types of activities. Each form of influence unites to a common goal at the top: positive peace, or as some Christians say, “JustPeace” - a stable, harmonious, peaceful, equitable society.

These forms of clergy influence affect the cycles of violence and peace. Galtung observes that violence breeds violence, and peace breeds peace.\(^{367}\) This type of self-reinforcing system involves a “positive feedback loop,” wherein the processes interact to strengthen each other. In the cycle of violence, cultural violence often causes and gives

legitimacy to the structural and direct violence, though each form can instigate conflict, and they all reinforce each other.\textsuperscript{368} Sociologists and peace scholars also find that fear, distrust, antagonism, hostility, and violence reinforce each other to increase ingroup cohesion and exacerbate conflict.\textsuperscript{369,370,371} The cycle of violence can reinforce itself with these factors, which require no direct connection with the initial causes of the conflict.\textsuperscript{372} Fear of the outgroup contributes to intergroup division, which then contributes to various forms of conflict. The following figure depicts the self-reinforcing cycle of violence.

\begin{itemize}
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Because the cycle of violence reinforces itself, non-peacebuilding clergy, who do nothing to interrupt that cycle, actually exacerbate the conflict. Lederach (1997) observes that leaders benefit from outgroup hostility because it enhances ingroup cohesion, decreases ambiguity, and reduces criticism of ingroup leaders. Some non-peacebuilding clergy hold exclusive or fundamentalist beliefs, such as Ian Paisley’s Free Presbyterians. However, other non-peacebuilding clergy may subscribe to some of the same inclusive beliefs as peacebuilding clergy. These clergy may have levels of risk-aversion that render them prohibitively frightened of the consequences of peace work. They may perceive the risks of intergroup harmony – ingroup disunity, increased ambiguity, and increased criticism of leaders – to outweigh the benefits of peacebuilding work. Nonetheless, these clergy cannot define themselves as neutral. Clergy who do not
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challenge the cycle of violence necessarily endorse the status quo of injustice and hostility. Clergy who build no bridges sanction division and segregation. While non-peacebuilding clergy engage in pastoral work and build trust with parishioners, that trust feeds back into the cycle of violence. As the following figure illustrates, these clergy influence parishioners to maintain the cycle of violence.

**Figure 4.2 Non-Peacebuilding Clergy Reinforce the Cycle of Violence**

Galtung also notes that the virtuous spiral of peace can break the vicious spiral of violence. Galtung finds the process of peace flows from cultural peace through
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structural peace to direct peace. These forms of peace also reinforce each other and bring about positive peace. Clergy peacebuilders interrupt the cycle of violence and enable some of its energy to flow to the cycle of peace. Even the least activist clergy peacebuilders contribute to cultural peace via individual conversations and/or gentle messages of inclusivity, outgroup tolerance, and peace. Their willingness to challenge the cycle of violence interrupts that cycle. Their messages of cultural peace add strength to the cycle of peace. Clergy also pave the way for their predecessors to start where they left off and take additional steps in peacebuilding. The following diagram depicts this process.

**Figure 4.3 Clergy Peacebuilders Interrupt the Cycle of Violence and Reinforce the Cycle of Peace**

![Diagram](image)

Even for less activist clergy peacebuilders, pastoral work encourages tolerance and support, which stabilizes the peace process. More activist clergy peacebuilders also
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contribute to positive peace via their other modes of influence. As clergy peacebuilders engage in pastoral work with their parishioners, they build a relationship of trust. This earned trust increases the ability of clergy to engage in more activist forms of peacebuilding work. Prophetic work strengthens structures of truth, equity, and justice. Bridge-building work strengthens harmonious, cooperative ingroup-outgroup relations and contributes to reconciliation. Continued pastoral work fosters tolerance, acceptance, and support of the peace process. Together, these three forms of work and influence combine to build and strengthen JustPeace, or positive peace. The following figures illustrate the mechanisms by which clergy peacebuilding influences the cycle of peace.

**Figure 4.4 Mechanisms of Clergy Peacebuilder Influence: The JustPeace Trilateral**
As denoted by (+) signs in the above figure, clergy peacebuilding work also contributes to the self-reinforcing nature of the cycle of peace. Structures of justice and equity also strengthen intergroup relations: as groups begin to normalize life in a more evenhanded society, they can also begin to release their identities of victimhood or ascendancy and see each other as partners in a shared future. When bridge-building work fosters positive intergroup relations, that positivity reinforces the referent, legitimate, and expert power of peacebuilding clergy, which strengthens trust in those clergy as well. That augmented trust and power continues to enhance the ability of clergy to increase their level of activism and further bolster the three ingredients of stable peace.

Each component of clergy influence adds a necessary ingredient to JustPeace. Without pastoral work, parishioners would lack the trust necessary to support or participate in potentially risky steps such as structural changes, forgiveness, or reconciliation. Pastoral work also continues to provide stability as communities experience drastic changes and upheavals along the road to peace. Prophetic work builds and supports the structural changes such as truth, equity, and justice necessary to create and maintain cooperative relationships. Bridge-building work constructs and fosters the relationships needed to move forward to a shared future. The combination of these different components constitutes positive peace, or JustPeace.
CHAPTER FIVE: STRATEGIES IN THE MINEFIELD:
THE EFFECTS OF PERSONALITY AND CONTEXT ON
CLERGY ACTIVISM LEVELS

The previous chapter discusses the mechanisms by which clergy peacebuilding efforts influence the peace process. However, clergy with similar theoretical commitment to peace exhibit significantly different levels of activism. Greater understanding of the factors that constrain clergy activism may help overcome these constraints and maximize the potential of clergy contributions to peace. This chapter explores the personal and professional risks clergy peacebuilders face and how the factors of personality type, leadership style, context, and support each affect clergy activism. The chapter compares more vs. less activist clergy and examines their responses to risk and their strategies to overcome parishioner resistance.

Minefield: Risks and resistance

Peacebuilding activity in a conflict zone creates both professional and personal risks, wherein clergy jeopardize their job security and their safety. These clergy minister in the context of the long-term conflict in Northern Ireland, which directly affects everyone in their congregation. Parishioners and clergy have experienced direct and indirect, physical and psychological, cultural and structural violence, in some cases over the course of several decades and generations. As James says, “Now that context of fear, to talk about some of the things that we might feel we ought to talk about – it was just the wrong context. You had to work in a totally different way.” As clergy attempt to protect
their lives and have compassion for the fears and wounds of their parishioners, the context of fear shapes their approaches to peacebuilding.

Interviewees frequently note that whenever they address any topics related to conflict, peace, or sectarianism, they continuously navigate the intense sensitivities, power struggles, and traumatic wounds of their congregations. Many clergy expressed a strong feeling that they cannot say what they truly think about topics related to the other community or the political situation. As they try to engage in pastoral, prophetic, or bridge-building work, they must constantly take care not to push their congregations too fast, for fear that they will sever relationships and alienate their community. From my perspective, their experience can be likened to a “minefield,” where if they make one misstep, they may find themselves embroiled in a firestorm of controversy. Many clergy appreciated my metaphor. Mark said, “Minefield—that’s a good word, actually: sometimes it blows up in my face.”

In addition, clergy peacebuilders genuinely want to maximize their effectiveness. Many interviewees perceive that if they push too hard, congregations will feel overwhelmed and dig in their heels. However, a few clergy claim never to restrict or censor their words or actions. These clergy also set an ambitious pace for progress and convince their congregations to tolerate or endorse radical changes.

*Risks to Clergy*

As Chapter 3 discusses, clergy who engage in peacebuilding activism sometimes experience death threats and other forms of violent intimidation. Highly activist clergy such as Simon, Luke, and Frank, as well as less activist clergy such as James and William
received direct threats of violence or death. While not every clergyperson experienced such overt intimidation, the context of the conflict includes a high level of direct, cultural, and structural violence, especially to those who break accepted community norms. This context creates a shared sense among clergy that peacebuilding activism puts one’s life at risk.

In addition, clergy also risk their professional security. Interviewees share a common canon of cautionary tales, which strike fear into the hearts of Northern Ireland clergy. Several Protestant clergy mentioned the story of David Armstrong, a Presbyterian minister who attended the dedication of a new Catholic Church building, after a bomb destroyed the previous building. Ian Paisley’s Free Presbyterians whipped up opposition to Armstrong, which spread to his own congregation and eventually resulted in his resignation. Another Protestant minister invited the local Catholic priest to a Christmas service and was subsequently forced out of his congregation. Catholic interviewees noted that in the early 1960s, a Catholic who attended a Protestant service would be automatically excommunicated, a punishment that could be lifted only by the bishop. Clergy feel keenly aware of the precarious nature of their job security: one wrong step could cost them their entire career. Some clergy support a spouse and children and provide for their sustenance and well being. Professional risk thus includes risk to the health and prosperity of their families.

Clergy correctly perceive that their parishioners have the power to damage their professional status, and they understand that congregations sometimes punish clergy who engage in prophetic work. Harold Quinley (1974) notes that in contrast to other
professions, a clergyperson’s clients (parishioners) have extraordinary power to influence clergy attitudes and conduct; parishioners thus pose a major obstacle to clergy activism. Quinley observed this phenomenon among activist clergy in U.S. Civil Rights issues. While some laity support clergy activism, in balance clergy suffered far more losses in membership and financial support; moreover, 20% of clergy who advocated fair housing faced attempts to have them fired, some of which succeeded.

The following sections discuss scope of clergy duties, distrust, and leadership style as possible reasons parishioners resist clergy peacebuilding efforts.

_Congregational Resistance: Scope of clergy duties and expertise_

Part of the tension between clergy and parishioners may involve a disagreement about the accepted scope of clergy expertise. A social agent has “expert power” relative to how much knowledge and information a person attributes to the agent and how much the person trusts the agent to tell h/er the truth. Ministers and parishioners may disagree about the proper range of clergy expert power: clergy see themselves as divinely called to build the kindom of JustPeace, while parishioners limit clergy expertise to the personal spiritual needs of their flock. The clergy-lay relationship includes both a professional and a highly personal, intimate dimension. Clergy enter congregations that have preexisting goals, expectations, and preferences about clergy professional and personal attitudes and behaviors, and they expect their clergy to conform.
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376 Quinley., p166-7.
377 Ibid., p214.
378 French and Raven., p621.
congregations prefer their clergy to avoid peacebuilding work and concentrate on ‘saving souls’ or ministering to the needs of parishioners. Any clergy who try to engage in activism will likely encounter resistance from such congregations. As with legitimate power, if a social agent attempts to exert influence in an area outside the range of their perceived expertise, the agent’s overall expert power (and ability to exert influence) will diminish. Thus, if a clergy tries to engage in activism in such a congregation, s/he risks an overall decrease in h/er ability to exert any form of influence within that group. Indeed, numerous interviewees mentioned that some congregations resisted peacebuilding and activism much more than others. With such congregations, clergy and denominations must first convince parishioners that the scope of clergy duties and expertise includes activism and peacebuilding.

Even when clergy and parishioners agree about the importance of reconciliation and peacebuilding, parishioners may resist clergy efforts to implement those ideas with concrete programs and changes. Boal et al. (1997) found that almost half of Catholic and Protestant Churchgoers support increased social and religious cooperation between the communities. Moreover, two thirds of Catholic and (especially mainline) Protestant churchgoers say churches should “be much more active in trying to improve relations between the communities in Northern Ireland.” However, while laity may support the general idea of clergy activism, they often oppose specific activities, such as sermons or
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demonstrations, especially if those behaviors support a position laity oppose. Luke mentions this phenomenon: “The middle of the road parishes, seems to me, would always say that reconciliation is important; but apathy rules.” Even congregations that seem to endorse the idea of clergy peacebuilding may cause serious professional problems for clergy who try to enact uncomfortable changes or engage in prophetic truth-telling and advocacy.

Congregational Resistance: Distrust

Much parishioner resistance to reconciliation efforts arises because anxiety prevents them from trusting clergy. Particularly in a context of conflict, which includes perceived high risk from the outgroup, people find it very difficult to trust each other. Parishioners feel insecure and anxious, which diminishes their ability to trust that clergy peacebuilding efforts will not render them more vulnerable to direct or indirect physical or psychological violence. Because Protestants outnumber Catholics in Northern Ireland, and because Catholics vastly outnumber Protestants in the Republic of Ireland, both Catholics and Protestants self-identify as threatened minorities. Moreover, as the country has withdrawn into increasingly segregated communities, many churches feel ever more surrounded by the growing outgroup. Hewstone et al. (2008) show that when people who identify strongly with their religious group perceive that their group is under threat from
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an increasing population of the outgroup that surrounds their enclave, they feel particularly anxious when their leader extends trust to the outgroup. They perceive such trust as risky to their in-group.\(^{387}\) Parishioners identify more strongly with their religious group than the wider population. Thus, clergy work with a subset of the Northern Ireland population whose identity and situation render them especially prone to resist clergy peacebuilding work.

All of the interviewees shared the view that churches should engage in reconciliation and peacebuilding activities. The less active clergy curtail their efforts not from fear of the outgroup; rather, they fear their own community. Liechty and Clegg also found a “significant sectarian dynamic” in which many clergy and laity fear their own community more than the outgroup.\(^{388}\) This trend represents a common psychological phenomenon: people judge members of their in-group as untrustworthy or deceitful more quickly than they do members of the out-group. Hewstone et al. (2008a) note that while people readily judge ingroup members to be competent, educated, or intelligent, they have trouble confirming ingroup members as trustworthy. Furthermore, people readily confirm a judgment that an in-group member is untrustworthy. Also, in-group members have more trouble overcoming a judgment that they are untrustworthy, than do out-group members.\(^{389}\) Trust takes many forms, and each form involves distinct emotions and consequences. Attitudes (how much a person likes another person) toward the out-group
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tend to exhibit strong in-group bias. However, trust demands much more from in-group members because of the potential risk and threat involved.\textsuperscript{390} As ingroup members and as representatives of their communities, peacebuilding clergy face significant challenges in their efforts to win parishioner trust. Some congregations may have more difficulty trusting their clergy, and some clergy may have more difficulty earning the trust of parishioners.

Predecessor clergy also affect the current clergyperson’s ability to build trust. Henry mentions that his predecessor caused a great deal of turmoil with his somewhat liberal views of scripture. The congregation viewed him as a heretic. Experiences such as this one can make it harder for parishioners to trust clergy. James notes that in one of his congregations, people had somehow found out that his predecessor had not voted for the local Unionist. According to James, “His life was made absolutely miserable.” In those congregations, clergy work from a trust deficit and proceed slowly, with meticulous care. In contrast, Carl notes that in one of his congregations, his predecessor had built a strong foundation and paved the way for him to have a much easier time with peacebuilding activities.

\textit{Congregational Resistance: Leadership style}

Clergy peacebuilders often possess the opposite leadership style to that preferred by groups experiencing intergroup conflict. Intergroup conflict predisposes groups to favor aggressive, militant leaders who represent ingroup interests and exhibit
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competitive, hostile behavior. Ronald Fisher (1990) notes, “Although the leader cannot afford to be seen as being “soft” in dealings with the out-group, the leader is not immune from sanctions if too great a deviation in any direction from group norms occurs. …any transgression in the direction of perceived weakness will expose the leader as a traitor.” When clergy peacebuilders engage in activities that encourage reconciliation with the outgroup, these behaviors deviate radically from the above leadership style. Thus, peacebuilding activities put clergy at risk of intense personal dislike, or negative referent power. The stronger a social agent’s negative referent power (in other words, the more the agent repels a person), the more that person will resist or reject anything the agent says. In other words, when clergy engage in peacebuilding, they risk their ability to have any influence with their parishioners. If parishioners feel the clergyperson has betrayed their trust and assign h/er negative referent power, they will reject h/er subsequent efforts to convince them otherwise. Indeed, this phenomenon occurred in each of the cautionary tales in which clergy had to leave their churches after they deviated from group norms. The violent context of Northern Ireland fosters a
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predisposition for leaders with a radically different leadership style to clergy peacebuilders, such that their parishioners may ignore their attempts to promote peace and reconciliation. Thus, clergy peacebuilders must simultaneously balance their efforts to build peace with their need to avoid the perception of betrayal or weakness. They must preserve sufficient referent power and trust to protect them from banishment.

**Summary: Effect on peacebuilding**

This minefield context for clergy significantly impedes their ability to engage in peacebuilding efforts. Clergy experience considerable personal and professional risks, which constrain their ability to work for peace. Liechty and Clegg (2001) assert, “Such a scenario makes brave and prophetic outreach to the ‘other side’ at least a costly, and potentially a disastrous, course of action” – especially for Protestant ministers, whose employment depends on the approval of their congregations. “Their efforts to break [the sectarian system] require them to engage in such complex balancing acts that a good deal of their creative energy, which could be directed towards reconciliation, is absorbed in surviving and remaining ‘just acceptable enough’ in their church to continue to be heard and heeded.”396 Congregations may want clergy to ignore sectarian issues and minister only to their personal spiritual needs. Moderate congregations may support peacebuilding in theory only and resist uncomfortable changes. Congregations may struggle to trust clergy and associate peacebuilding with betrayal of the ingroup. Frightened parishioners may perceive a gentle leadership style as weak and prefer strong leaders who can provide
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a sense of protection from threats. The following interview narratives illustrate the balancing act clergy undergo as they attempt to survive professionally yet work for peace.

**We can’t say what we really think**

Many interviewees expressed a feeling of vulnerability and the need for extreme caution in what they say and do. They fear the consequences of angering their congregations, and they work hard not to alienate people. Sometimes, clergy feel so intimidated by sectarian sentiments, that they more or less abandon reconciliation efforts. Others of these clergy feel that God has called them to continue reconciliation work despite opposition; however, they feel a keen sense of the risky nature of that call. As Carl puts it,

> I remember thinking, “I firmly believe this enough that I have to put my neck on the line, and as a preacher I can’t not tackle this. I have to both speak it and live it out.” …Seeing how entrenched and bigoted some people were – not all, but some – and thinking, “This is so wrong, and this is where it goes to.” Not people who would lift a gun and shoot someone, but someone who with their words and attitudes was equally destructive. It was very painful. I remember thinking, “I have a responsibility to do something about this.” So therefore taking the risk, becoming unpopular, pushing the thing out.

Despite his discomfort with the risks and vulnerability of advocating unpopular ideas and programs, Carl effected significant change in his congregations over time. For example, he started a joint Catholic/Protestant Alpha course in one of his churches, which caused “a lot of backlash in the church; people were very unhappy. But I thought it important to try to push on anyway.” Carl relates other stories of how he has promoted
reconciliation in the face of significant opposition; however, he always uses great caution when he speaks about divisive issues. Jean also notices an undercurrent of dissent and anger whenever she tries to talk about sensitive issues. She has learned to take an increasingly careful and cautious approach over time. Furthermore, William claims to feel more pressure than he did before the 1994 ceasefire. He observes,

> Since the ceasefire in ‘94, community relations on the ground have polarized very badly, in my understanding, because one could no longer say, “That’s the paramilitaries.” Because there was a great deal of Republican pressure on parades, which this community holds very important, relations at the community level nosedived. At times it could become very uncomfortable and rocky. I certainly would have felt personally very vulnerable and very cautious about what I would say. There were times when things had to be said: at an Orange service, I called for principled restraint. Once I had to call on someone during the rioting, and I didn't want the press to see me.”

These clergy feel compelled to proceed with extreme care, lest they ignite a blaze of controversy, which may undermine their entire ministry. They fear that if they act rashly, they will bring down a torrent of censure, dispute, and upheaval upon themselves and their families. Furthermore, they do not know how much support they can expect from their ecclesial structures or the reconciliation-minded people in their communities. Ben notes,

> In the Presbyterian system, I’m not accountable to the congregation; I’m accountable to the presbytery, the diocese. So there is a buffer. Having said that, you would be very unwise to get yourself away out on a limb; but even within the Anglican situation, you would be very unwise to get yourself out on a limb.
Some of these clergy did indeed “get themselves out on a limb,” and the ensuing unpleasantness convinced them to scale down reconciliation efforts. For example, Henry recalls being reprimanded for “being impatient with the Orange Order.” His congregational leaders interrogated him about his beliefs, and he felt forced to dodge their questions. Henry feels compelled to “repair the damage done by the previous, somewhat liberal minister.” While Henry does discuss sectarianism with small groups, youth fellowship, and some individuals, “who are doing some thinking of their own,” he avoids sensitive topics in sermons or general conversation. He never preaches about Catholics and Protestants or his views on Scripture. He explains, “I would rather focus on important issues, such as poverty and war, than argue about silly things… People ignore and reinterpret sermons.” Clergy such as William and Henry feel limited power to influence their congregations. However, even clergy who avoid active peacebuilding cannot dodge every mine: mixed couples request to marry in their churches, children from mixed marriages need baptisms, and acts of sectarian violence occur in their communities. Henry spoke with trepidation about a parishioner who wanted to marry a Catholic man. He expressed considerable anxiety about how to handle the issue in order to prevent serious fallout.

Strategies

Clergy try to find ways to talk about sectarianism that do not cause perceptions of betrayal or destroy trust and referent power. Some clergy generally avoid potentially divisive topics, but they occasionally feel compelled to speak out – albeit carefully – in response to specific incidents or issues. Often, they take advantage of particular settings
such as William did with the Hard Gospel campaign and the Orange service. Clergy also use the theological themes and resources discussed in Chapter 2. Carl says,

A lot of people do not know that’s my view; I explicitly haven’t stated it. Over time things are said, when there’s an opportunity in preaching to say something more clearly. One Sunday… I said something very clearly. You know that motto, “For God and Ulster”? I was saying, “That cannot be; it’s for God alone. Our allegiance is to God and God alone. Our citizenship is that we are citizens of heaven. Earthly citizenship has a value, but it is a very minor thing compared to our Christian standing.” So that was more explicit. But I would like to think that gradually people would realize the way I view things.

Carl develops strategies for how to navigate the “minefield” with a careful, deliberate approach to sensitive issues and calculated use of commonly held theological beliefs. Other clergy employ similar tactics, such as strategic communication style. Stan mentioned the need to be “sensitive, gentle, and humble,” especially in the country. Mark describes his tactic always to speak positively rather than negatively. He notes,

Rather than talk negatively against something I don’t want, I talk positively for something I think we should be doing, because it’s so easy to allow negative talk. If you ignore negativity, that’s when the cancer starts to set about trying to move forward. People will always see a negative to things. If that starts to spread, then a general negative attitude grows within whole community, which is difficult to overcome. I try to talk positively. But you have to be careful: if you’re talking positively about things everyone else feels negatively about, they stop listening. That’s your minefield again: you have to be careful about whom you’re talking to, find your opportunities, watch what you say.
Mark also employs this positive approach in conversations with parishioners. He noted, “The relationship you have may be at a sensitive stage; you want to build on that with what is positive, not be picking on the negative.” This strategy of positive communication contrasts with Carl, who tries to provoke his parishioners with subtle comments over time. Carl describes his strategy as follows:

Chipping away, almost saying things I know are going to irritate, because I think that irritant – you know with pearl formation, that wee bit of grit inside the shellfish – yes, the oyster, and then the wee pearl comes as a result of that. Sometimes I would see myself a bit like that: chipping away, throwing in a wee comment that I know will annoy, not letting up – not being in the person’s face, not putting them against a wall and saying, “You’re wrong.” – But just irritating, throwing in a comment every so often. I remember one time in preaching, being confronted at the door of the church. It was Bible Sunday, because you know in our church we have this proud reputation of the open bible. We’re Protestants, we’re proud of our Bible, and Catholics being denied the Bible for so long. And I said, “But if truth be told, there are many Catholic people who put us to shame, because they love their Bibles and read them every day. How many of us love our Bibles and read them every day?” This man was furious and devoured me at the door. I just calmly said, “Oh that’s fine, sure maybe we’ll meet and talk about that.” I wouldn’t rise to that. Let him get – he can say what he wants to me. And then I met up with him later and said, “What is this about?” I told him my view. I said, “I do know Catholic people who read their Bible, and I know lots of people in our church who never lift their Bible.” He said, “Yes, but have they repented of the doctrine of Rome?” And I said, “I don’t know if they have or not, I haven’t asked them that. But I know they seem to love Jesus, and they love the Scripture.” So things like that: knowing it’s going to cause
offense, but trying to do it in a way that is not alienating, but irritant – so that over a period of time, people are caused to think.

Carl uses several strategies in the above narrative. He utilizes a commonly held theological belief in the value of the Bible to de-emphasize the boundary between ingroup and outgroup (messages: the ingroup and outgroup share common faith traditions; the outgroup follow a valid form of the ingroup faith). He deconstructs a negative stereotype of the outgroup and challenges prejudice (message: outgroup members follow ingroup faith values more than some ingroup members; prejudice against outgroup faith is untrue and unjust). He remains calm in the face of a verbal attack (messages: I am a strong leader; I am not afraid of your disapproval or aggression; I am willing to remain in respectful relationship with you despite disagreement; you do not need to be afraid of my message; you can trust me to remain strong when threatened). Finally, Carl follows through with pastoral care and a personal conversation, in which he respectfully but resolutely maintains his ideas of de-emphasized boundaries and deconstructs prejudicial stereotypes (messages: we can remain in relationship; I respect your right to your opinions; you can trust me to continue to speak honestly even when you disagree or find my ideas uncomfortable; I will not abandon or betray you). These messages also address the above reasons for clergy resistance: they assert that the scope of Carl’s expertise and duty includes peacebuilding activity, try to maintain a relationship of trust, and demonstrate a strong but not aggressive leadership style.

When sources of legitimate power send the message that clergy duties and expert power include peacebuilding work, that message grants clergy sufficient expert power to help them engage in higher levels of activism. For example, Henry expresses great
appreciation for how the Church of Ireland “Hard Gospel” program gave him denominationally sanctioned structure and permission to talk about sectarian issues – something he feels otherwise unable to do. With that anti-sectarian program, the denomination sent the message to parishioners that their clergy should engage in prophetic peacebuilding activity and advocate for peace. Perhaps more such denominational messages could support clergy such as Henry and William and increase their level of activism in these difficult congregations.

Other clergy from within a community can also provide a source of legitimate power to express the message that clergy duties and expertise include peacebuilding. Carl relies on this form of ecclesial legitimacy to protect himself against opposition to his messages and programs of reconciliation (such as his joint Alpha course). Rather than support from his church, he finds solidarity with the other clergy from his town:

Our group of clergy all worked together, so when people gave us grief, we were all there together as a united front – all the different ministers and priests from different denominations. It wasn’t one church breaking ranks. So if people were saying, “You’re doing this, and you shouldn’t because this other church isn’t doing that,” – we gave them no opportunity to say that (except the Free Presbyterians didn’t join in).

Carl represents many clergy, in that while he does feel vulnerable and intimidated by the “minefield” of opposition and antagonism to reconciliation messages or efforts, he nonetheless tries hard to find strategies to move his congregations forward.

Some clergy conceal some of their activities to preserve a good relationship with their congregations. As Ted explains, “Not everyone needs to know everything. When I visit a murderer, I would hide that fact from the victim’s family.” Clergy hide their views
and efforts to varying degrees, depending on their perception of the level of tolerance in their congregations.

The above strategies illustrate some of the different tactics clergy use to promote reconciliation yet minimize divisiveness. They want to move people forward, but they do not want to pull the rope so hard that it breaks and thus alienate their community. In fact, the issue of pace strategies arose quite frequently among these clergy; the next section explores the tempo of the “minefield” in depth.

**Don’t push too quickly**

Some clergy feel constrained in how quickly they can move their congregations toward greater reconciliation. Scholarship confirms this caution, especially in the context of a conflict zone. Donna Hicks (2001) points out that people can integrate only a limited amount of new information that challenges their existing meaning and identity constructs. If people encounter dramatic changes too quickly, their ability to process these challenges breaks down, and they become cognitively and psychologically overloaded. Their beliefs about identity and meaning freeze in order to resist change, and they experience intense primitive-brain survival emotions, such as fear, anger, and exhaustion. In the context of communal conflict, this overload/freeze mechanism also creates negative beliefs about the outgroup, which resist disconfirming input.397 These clergy have a deep desire to be as effective as possible and to maximize their ability to bring peace. Thus, they often try to tailor their approach to each situation. They gauge each context and determine which strategies will work best given the congregational context and specific situation.

397 Hicks., p135-137.
Context

Clergy describe the importance of context as a key factor in the pace of peacebuilding activities. They describe great differences among different age groups and different parishes where they have served. Stan took the youth of his church around to visit different churches in their town and encouraged them to choose which church seemed the best fit. He remarked, “I couldn’t have done that in [my country parish]; they’d run me out of town!” Other clergy similarly found some churches far more rigid and hostile to the outgroup than other appointments. Liechty and Clegg describe this phenomenon as “the level,” a commonly used phrase, which characterizes the wide range of what cross-community behaviors are acceptable in different locations and towns. When newcomers arrive, they often blunder socially when they misunderstand the unspoken rules of the area and disturb its equilibrium.\(^{398}\)

Clergy constantly gauge the freeze-point of each person or group and adjust accordingly. Some interviewees mention that certain congregations can move much more quickly than others, or that different congregations can handle different kinds of changes. Clergy try to keep their finger on the pulse of whether their congregation has assimilated and adjusted to their current pace of activism in order to determine when they can introduce yet another step forward.

Some congregations and communities pose more resistance to clergy peacebuilding than others because they have already been pushed near their threshold by previous clergy activism or by heightened threat levels in the wider community. Henry

\(^{398}\) Liechty and Clegg., p206.
feels hindered by the residual distrust from his controversial predecessor, and William feels similarly constrained by worsened community relations. William remarks,

There’s been no improvement, not over the past 14 years. We’ve most of this to do. The last 14 years, at the politically and community level, have been years of continuing division and polarization. Very seriously, more peace walls have been built, more houses have changed hands. There have been times I thought in keeping [the tiny monthly Catholic-Protestant prayer meeting] going was at times all we could do, because all community pressures were against that sort of contact.

William feels severely limited by community pressure; it seems to him a major victory simply not to lose ground. Liechty and Clegg (2001) note that discouraged clergy such as Henry and William usually perceive that they have inadequate training and lack the skills to address sectarian issues, and they often receive insufficient support from their denomination and colleagues. These clergy fear disapproval and even attack from their congregations if they engage in prophetic or bridge-building work. They revert to tribal chaplaincy out of “despairing resignation that sees the situation as totally intractable.”

As mentioned above, increased support from denominations or community clergy could help mitigate these feelings of resignation and empower clergy to move forward more easily. Training and denominational or colleague support could increase both clergy and parishioner perceptions of clergy expert power, which may improve clergy abilities and contextual receptivity.

\[399\] Ibid., p307.
In addition to community levels, each church contains internal subgroups with their own sublevels. Ben uses a significantly more subtle, less overtly reconciliation-oriented approach with older members than with younger ones:

Younger people under forty are much more alert to this than older people, because older people lived through the trauma of the Troubles. They were burned out of their homes, they had to flee, and they have a whole host of nasty, nasty stuff that is left behind to some extent. Therefore, the whole prospect of engaging with the community who they feel burned them out, or shot at them, or intimidated them, isn’t on the radar. And I respect that. I really have no difficulty with that to be honest. My congregations are very working-class. This is very much paramilitary land, so the nuances of theology are a bit hard to get over. But what I tend to say to folks is, “God’s purposes for the future have to be a lot better than what we had to endure in the past. I don’t think the Lord would want us to remain trapped or hijacked by the sin of evil of the past. It’s not a question of moving on but of discerning what God’s purposes are. We’ve got to seek the welfare of the city, of the whole community, so your grandkids will actually have a future and won’t need to leave the place as tens of thousands have done.”

These clergy shift their strategies according to what they perceive different groups or individuals can handle. Ben’s younger churchgoers embrace reconciliation more than his older members, which contradicts the findings of Boal et al. (1997): Protestant churchgoers under 24 years of age express more socially and religiously conservative and evangelical views than do more elderly members, even more than that age group exhibited ten years previous. People under age 24 also express less support for religious
and social cooperation with Catholics.\textsuperscript{400} As Ben’s narrative illustrates, churches have their own demographic variations, which sometimes deviate from wider trends. Even a seemingly model clergy peacebuilder such as Ben, who engages in very high levels of activism at the individual, structural, and communal level, tones down his message to particularly frightened and rigid groups of parishioners. Like the other clergy, he continuously alters his strategies according to each unique situation.

\textit{What works}

Clergy develop tactics of communication and programming in order to move their congregations along as quickly as they can manage. These tactics involve the above issues of expert power, trust, and leadership. For example, when Mark feels heavy resistance, he tries to introduce change at a pace that will not overload and freeze people. Mark focuses on the obstacle of distrust and works to build trust with a gentle leadership style:

\begin{quote}
You have to work gently. You can only challenge from a position really of trust and where you have a strong relationship. Otherwise, all you do is create a break between yourself and that person, and you can’t bring any influence after that. So you have to be very gentle, and perhaps gently challenging in little bits. Bite away at it rather than sledgehammer it. Maybe it’s the wrong way of going about it, but it’s the way I do it. You’re sort of working a careful road: you want to challenge where you can challenge, but at the same time maintain relationship so you can continue to challenge. It’s a very difficult and gray area.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{400} Boal, Keane, and Livingstone., p97-8.
As this description illustrates, Mark concentrates on pastoral work to build a foundation of trust. Based on his perception of the strength of that foundation, he adjusts the pace at which he expands the scope of his expertise and voices potentially threatening ideas.

When clergy experience intense resistance to change, sometimes they shift methods and try an alternate approach. Jean does not want her church to carry the Union Jack into the worship service every week. She notes, “I see it as not Christian.” She says her congregants “are Christian people: deep down inside, they think they shouldn’t be [so anti-Catholic]. But the folk can’t pull themselves away from the hatred. They can’t abandon carrying in the Union Jack into the service. There was trouble over that: disruptions. I had to withdraw.” She switched tactics and, as described in a previous chapter, she invited two nuns to visit her women’s group. The new method proved much more successful: the nuns eventually won over the hearts of the entire group, and the event caused a big breakthrough in the congregation’s overall attitude toward the outgroup and peacebuilding. Jean did not possess a sufficient reservoir of trust or referent power to convince her congregation to take the controversial step of not carrying in the Union Jack. Her parishioners likely also did not agree that her expert power extended to include decisions about venerated worship traditions, particularly traditions that contained enormous symbolism as a protection of ingroup identity against outgroup threat. However, Jean succeeded with a less controversial tactic, which required less trust and did not extend the scope of her expert power beyond accepted boundaries. The positive results likely increased her referent and expert power as well.
This constant attempt to gauge how best to work effectively within a particular community illustrates the feeling of being in a minefield, which so many clergy express. Clergy constantly weigh the pressure from their sense of Christian duty to build peace, against the pressure of wounded sensitivity, intolerance, and tradition in their congregations. Carl summarizes the minefield nicely:

There are always power groups, powerful people. You’re trying to gauge what your congregation is like, what its needs are, where you can move them. You try to get the pace in all areas: styles of worship, changing that. You’re trying to work out with the people and your strategy, what you think is right. Explain why you bring change, why you think something is important, and bring them with you. At times some very clearly are not going to go with you. You look for wisdom, trying to decide, “Is this an individual or a few? How much weight does their argument hold? How much are you going to be swayed by that?” Some clergy, if one or two usually outspoken people confront them, they back down on any issue. Some of us decide, “No, we’re going ahead.” You work out the wisdom of that. You also encounter power struggles in larger groups, like the Orange Order, weighing all that up …it depends on what they’re like locally. Sometimes they’re absolutely fine; in other settings, they’re not. Some settings I’ve been in, there have been severe difficulties. Sometimes there is that impression that you can tinker round the edges; but if you start to tackle something more significant, there is pressure in the background not to go ahead with it.

Carl’s narrative addresses each of the above topics. Different contexts require different approaches. Changes necessitate various levels of trust and expert power. Leadership styles can overcome some resistance. Clergy try to factor in these variables and optimize their abilities to navigate the minefield.
Summary

There are many explanations of why the clergy I interviewed feel the need for caution in their speech and in how strongly they promote peacebuilding and reconciliation. Clergy exhibit great compassion for their parishioners, whom they know to carry the wounds of a traumatized society; they do not wish to cause further pain. They also balance passion with pragmatism, as they seek to find effective strategies to maximize their potential for good. Clergy sometimes do not feel secure in the support of their church structure, and they may feel the need to protect their job security and their families from upheaval. And perhaps some of them simply possess a high level of risk-aversion, which prevents them from having the courage necessary to “put my neck on the line,” as Carl has it. Ministry in the context of a conflict zone involves a truly intimidating “minefield,” for these clergy. Nonetheless, as the next section reveals, some of the more outspoken leaders navigate the rough waters with comparative aplomb.

Telling it like it is

While some clergy express that they rarely speak their honest views about controversial topics, other clergy claim that they always feel free to express their true thoughts about sectarianism. These outspoken clergy sometimes lament what they see as lack of courage among their colleagues. Joseph remarks, “People are always playing it safe, fitting in to this culture of keeping your head down.” A greater understanding of what separates these highly activist clergy from their more cautious associates could help increase the overall activism level of local clergy. Is this attitude a matter of personal talent, and personality type? Or did these clergy have the good fortune to serve less
resistant parishes? Can the more wary priests and ministers learn anything useful from these bolder folks, or does this degree of caution have to do with factors beyond anyone’s control, such as where they grew up or their innate reaction to hostility? Interviewees expressed all of these views. Some clergy believed that their particular national or communal identity gave them the leverage to speak more bluntly than their colleagues could. Others trusted their denomination to protect their professional security. And some clergy seemed comparatively untroubled by disagreements and/or somehow managed not to alienate people who found their opinions highly offensive.

**Scope of Expertise: Identity**

One factor that separates the two groups of clergy is that regardless of background and identity, bold clergy claim that the scope of their expert power includes peacebuilding. Cautious and bold clergy often cite the same factor as justification for opposite behaviors. While clergy such as William and Henry declare themselves unqualified to speak about sectarianism because they come from the outside Northern Ireland, Michael and Philip cite that very same factor as an excuse to say what they want. More activist clergy believe that their status as an “outsider” actually gives them more leeway to speak openly, because their parishioners take less offense at statements coming from a “blow-in.” In like manner, clergy such as Peter, Jason, and Richard state that because they were raised in working-class Protestant areas, they have the leverage to speak out to their Protestant churches. Peter notes, “I was trusted because I come from Ballymena, and I’m an Ulster Scot – like Paul using his Roman citizenship, I can say it. If you were from the South or a more middle class background, you couldn’t get away
with it.” These clergy believe that their backgrounds give them credibility, leverage, and immunity to speak openly and press for change. However, James also grew up in a “traditional Orange” family, but he does not perceive any particular leverage to speak bluntly. Highly activist clergy also defy Peter’s classifications: Stan, Frank, Michael, and Philip all come from the Republic of Ireland, and Simon, Luke, and Ben come from middle class, moderate Northern Ireland families. Thus, perhaps the bolder clergy would speak out no matter where they grew up. Their outspokenness and effectiveness seem to arise from factors other than their national/communal identity. Despite their varied backgrounds, these highly active clergy peacebuilders believe they possess sufficient expert power to lead their congregations in matters of sectarianism and peacebuilding.

**Professional security**

Ecclesial structure plays a significant role for some clergy peacebuilders. Denominational support both expands expert power and reduces the professional risks of activism. Church of Ireland interviewees such as Luke, Frank, and Joseph say that they speak honestly because they feel assured of support from their ecclesial structure. They believe that blunt speaking and high activism will not jeopardize their positions and the support of their superiors. Ben observes that the Presbyterian system offers fairly strong job security to activists because congregations have less power to hire and fire clergy. Simon considers the Methodist denomination particularly supportive of peacebuilding because of its history. He notes, “Methodists are more open, freer, a minority. We don’t have the baggage of history. The Presbyterians are descendents of settler people; the Anglicans are descendents of the ascendancy. Methodists weren’t identified with either of
those. We’re not better; but we didn’t have baggage of history.” Simon felt particularly empowered in his secret mediation efforts by the Methodist Committee on Social Responsibility, which gave him and some other clergy the freedom to meet IRA representatives without the need to report or disclose their activities. While less active peacebuilders believe peacebuilding risks their jobs, highly activist clergy peacebuilders cite denominational support as a factor that allows them the professional security to engage in peacebuilding work.

The structural difference between parish ministry and other clergy seems to affect professional risk and impact support and activism. Ted works with parish ministry and schools, which may involve more professional risk than the Redemptorist structure. Unlike Ted, who censors his words and hides some activities from parishioners, Matthew and Philip work in the Redemptorist community. In addition, clergy such as Michael, Richard, and Jason belonged to independent churches or parachurch entities. These clergy work alongside numerous other churches and groups, and they always feel more secure in their support and mission than the local clergy with whom they work. Jason describes how his traveling ministry of cross-community work occasionally angers local churches:

One Presbyterian minister became really alone because of his association with us. His eldership board wrote a four-page letter damning me. They had a meeting to go through the issues with me, to their credit. That’s okay. I’m not beholden to them; my support comes from my family – I have 9 children; it’s not gonna get cut. My support comes from individual believers throughout Ireland who really believe in what we’re doing. We’ve been pressed by some Protestants about being ecumenical, whether
we're truly Bible-believing: "Do you believe this?" We say, “Yes, probably more than you!” They say, “Then you shouldn’t be doing that!” We say, “Who says we shouldn’t be doing that? You?” We’re not causing offense; we’re honoring local understanding and faith expression. Then by so honoring, that gives us a chink of space or a huge room of space to be able to work.

Non-parish clergy such as the Redemptorists and parachurch leaders seem to have sufficient job security to speak more openly about sensitive topics despite resistance. When Richard worked with the parachurch organization ECONI, he encountered significant opposition:

A lot of those who are evangelical wouldn’t like what we say. When ECONI started, what we were trying to say is, “Look, it’s okay to be evangelical, Protestant, and Irish Nationalist.” What we were heard to say was that we were being liberal do-gooders who said it wasn’t okay to be evangelical and a Unionist anymore. That’s what our own community heard us say; therefore, we had a lot of resistance to it. The irony is that a lot of our own community now recognizes what we were saying was right. Richard feels empowered by his organizational locus to continue to promote an unpopular message. Like many other clergy, he also manages to hold a broader perspective of the long-term impacts and gradual nature of change, which strengthens his resolve to keep working despite the resistance of his wider community. Clergy whose professional base situates outside a local congregation have enough professional security to speak bluntly and push for radical change.

When non-parish or parachurch clergy partner with parish clergy, their combined efforts may strengthen the ability of local parish clergy to increase peacebuilding without
severe repercussions. Jason notes that a Presbyterian minister lost referent power due to association with Jason’s ecumenical order. However, parishioners likely find such an association far less threatening than if their own clergyperson engaged in the kinds of radical ecumenical activities typical of Jason’s order. These non-parish clergy pose somewhat less threat because they do not represent the congregation. Associations with non-parish clergy peacebuilders may expand the scope of clergy expert power to include peacebuilding in a way that preserves trust between clergy and parishioners.

Personality

Some interviewees exhibit lower levels of risk aversion than others and seem to possess comparatively thick skin. In contrast to the minefield experience expressed in the previous section, these clergy say that experiences of resistance or antagonism do not bother them. Luke recalls,

I came here at a point in which I was really, really frustrated with the church leaders for becoming tribal leaders, beating the drum that their own tribe wanted to hear. And for the first few years I was here, I said several things that got me into trouble… I remember coming back home with an American [colleague]. I pressed the answering machine on the phone, “You have 15 new messages.” The first new message was, “If I’d been there today, I’d have just taken you and thrown you in the river.” I said, “You probably want to listen to those messages, you probably haven’t heard anything like them in your life!” I just pressed delete, delete, delete. Just “get rid of it.” It didn’t bother me particularly. I can kind of brush those things off. I’m not saying they don’t have any effect on me; but overall, I get on to the next thing, you know?
Luke manages not to let hostility affect his commitment to advocacy. Whereas William significantly reduced his peacebuilding activities due to threats of violence, Simon, Frank, and Luke continued their work apace despite such threats. While the above narrative describes his work as a bishop, Luke displayed the same attitude when he served as a local priest:

When we started [monthly joint Catholic/Protestant worship gatherings], we were told people would be beaten up and things like that; it never happened. Every Wednesday, the Roman Catholic curate, the Presbyterian assistant, and myself met for coffee …in full view of everybody in a coffee shop on Main Street… We were quite intentional about it. There was a threatening air that something might happen, but nothing ever did. Opposition, hostility, and even threats seem to bounce off the armor of Luke’s self-assurance and commitment to reconciliation work. Joseph, who also seems unfazed by opposition says, “I was amazed with what I could get away with” when he preached sermons that were “certainly very radical.” Some of his congregants, such as the Chief Volunteer of the Black Order, would occasionally object: “but only once or twice, and not aggressively so. We would talk about it and end up friends.” He also describes teaching Religious Education courses:

Every now and then someone would object and argue with me. I encouraged them to do so. I think I was quite a good teacher. I was open with them, and I challenged and provoked them. I had to put up with being challenged and provoked by them, as well. Once they realized it worked both ways, it was okay. Sometimes the language got a bit blue. It was fine, very interesting. I loved it. It was great for 15-16 years.
Joseph seems to enjoy even very passionate debate and to have the ability not to alienate people with whom he disagrees strongly. His personality type and personal talents may contribute significantly to his ability to sail serenely through heated disputes that would make some of his colleagues quail. Joseph wondered why he never experienced the “minefield” sensation so common to other clergy, and he suggested that perhaps he had easier, more liberal contexts. However, he also admits, “Sometimes I think I’m a bit forbidding to people. I don’t know why. Sometimes think people are a bit afraid of me.” Joseph seems to express a contradiction, which concerns the two statements “We would end up friends” (non-alienating) vs. “People are afraid of me” (alienating). Surely man clergy would love to understand exactly how his personality allows him to speak so openly yet not disaffect listeners. Joseph can remain friends with opponents and gain the acceptance and respect of his students. This ability reveals that he does not estrange those with whom he disagrees, even if he has not built an intimate personal or pastoral relationship with them. He also seems to imply that people may have felt too intimidated by him to express their disagreements.

How can this combination of personality traits prove effective? Perhaps Joseph has such self-confidence that those people who might bully a timid clergyperson leave him alone. As discussed above, conflict zones predispose people to prefer militant, aggressive leadership style. In Joseph’s case, his very toughness may earn him the trust or respect of the people most disposed to oppose him. In addition, perhaps his self-confidence gives him referent power. If he exhibits relaxed openness toward others, that attitude may help people who do disagree with him to feel genuinely respected in the
process of talking it through. In like manner, perhaps his self-confidence also allows him to feel comfortable with the kinds of heated arguments he experienced as a teacher.

**Summary**

The most activist clergy peacebuilders self-report that they do not censor their true opinions or hide their peacebuilding activities in order to protect professional security or prevent a loss of reverent power and influence. The interviewees in this section include all eight of the clergy who exhibit the highest (“Very High”) levels of activism, though Jason and Richard do not serve as local parish clergy. The section also includes two clergy ranked “High” (Frank and Gary) and one “Moderate” (Matthew). These eleven clergy believe the scope of their expert power includes peacebuilding regardless of their national or family background, and they perceive that their parishioners accept that expertise as well. These interviewees also report a lower perceived professional risk than their colleagues and they tend to trust their denominations to support them in their efforts. With the exception of Matthew, the one “moderately” active peacebuilder, they exhibit a comparatively low level of risk aversion and a comparatively strong leadership style. Matthew tends to prefer supportive rather than leadership roles, but he reported a blunt style of speech in his narratives.

**Let’s get on with it**

The clergy who feel comfortable speaking openly also convey no hesitation about setting a brisk, ambitious pace for moving their community forward. They generally express that miraculous change has come, more progress is in the air, and it is their job to keep the momentum going. Unlike William, who laments that Catholic-Protestant
relations have worsened in recent decades, these clergy laud the “big changes” of the past twenty years. They point out that they more frequently baptize children from mixed marriages and assert that increasing numbers of their parishioners view people from the other community as Christian. These clergy often express affinity and respect for other local examples of clergy, missionaries, and religious leaders who “get alongside people,” “can open any doors,” or “manage to bring people along with the idea” of various individual, communal, ecclesial, and parachurch reconciliation efforts. These interviewees feel inspired by bold activists and try to follow suit with ambitious efforts.

Rather than slow down to maintain relationships, outspoken clergy tend to describe strategies for relating to people that allow them to set their own pace. As with the above sections, these strategies involve expert power, trust, and leadership style.

Scope of expertise

As mentioned above, these outspoken clergy perceive that they possess the appropriate scope of expert power to engage actively in peacebuilding work, and they seem confident in their ability to convince their congregations of their expertise. Simon asserts,

People are just longing to be led. We underestimate our people by thinking that they’re going to oppose us. We’ve assumed people don’t want to move, want to stay where they are, people are threatened by the suggestion that they need to look at themselves and attitudes and relationships across community. We’ve assumed in a society like ours you can’t bring reconciliation into the life of the church and local community without bringing the roof down on yourself. People absolutely long to be led: “Please take us to a new land.”
Simon believes that congregations desire their clergy to wield expertise in peacebuilding, and he employs careful tactics to augment his expert power. Simon uses commonly accepted theological resources from within his tradition to transmit a clear vision of the JustPeace/positive peace “Promised land” to which he wants to lead them. He encourages his parishioners to hope in God’s promises and quotes Isaiah’s vision: “Wait for the new thing I am doing. If you’ve eyes to see, it’s happening already; it’s in your midst.” While he asserts that the majority of people want to help build a more peaceful, just society, Simon acknowledges that a vocal minority of individuals opposes progress. However, he emphatically insists that clergy should not allow these individuals to slow the pace and progress of the community:

And like the journey to Israel, there are times on the journey when they say, “It is tougher than we thought.” But I try to get that across to younger ministers: “You’re going to hear from some very vocal, difficult, awkward customers sometimes that will give you the impression they are representing the congregation. You bet your bottom dollar they’re not! They’re representing themselves, the hurts of their fathers, some bad experience, something in their past; but they’re not representing the congregation.” [verbal emphasis his]

Like Simon, other outspoken clergy agree that some parishioners offer significant resistance. However, they refuse to allow those parishioners to limit the accepted scope of their expert power or to represent the congregations. Rather, these clergy assert that parishioners generally support clergy activism.
Trust

These clergy also discuss the importance of trust as a foundation for progress. The need to “take people with you” arises frequently among both the cautious and the bolder clergy. However, the two groups employ different tactics to achieve support. The cautious clergy may hide some of their more controversial activities or beliefs, change strategies, or scale down activism. In contrast, the bolder clergy tend to promote a transparent approach coupled with an emphasis on sensitive communication. Ben asserts, “You’ve got to pastor these folks. No matter what you’re doing out there, you’ve got to at the very least bring them with you and communicate with them, rather than be schizophrenic about it and do your community stuff out there and your church stuff in here.” These clergy believe there are pastoral approaches and communication tactics that can build sufficient trust to prevent the freeze/overload mechanism and/or alienation of parishioners.

Simon employs deliberate strategies to set a brisk pace and manage contrary individuals. He combines a lack of condemnation with an emphasis on pastoral care to build relationships of trust:

If people know you care for them, even though they don’t understand what you’re saying or doing, they’ll either do one of two things: they’ll either follow you, or they’ll forgive you. I start my ministry in every place by building relationships. If you don’t do that, you’ll not take people places. They’ll be wondering about you. But if you let them know you care, if you’ve been with them through the valleys, with the shadow, and you’ve walked with them wherever they walk, and you haven’t shouted at them, haven’t preached at them, and you haven’t made them feel guilty about
something they said – you’ve tried to understand what they said rather than blame them – people get to know that. …They trust you if they know you care for them. As you build those relationships, you begin to take people with you on the journey.

Simon believes his training in pastoral care and counseling gave him the necessary skills to build sufficient trust for his progressive activism. Like Simon, Philip avoids condemnation in order to build a foundation of trust. As mentioned previously, when Philip tried to turn IRA volunteers from violent to peaceful methods, he never condemned the IRA; rather, he works for a “transformation of awareness”:

Nobody wants to be in war, except a psychopath. War is an unnatural state of being for people, and people want to get out of it—but get out of it in a just and appropriate way. I think if you’re trying to stop the war, stop fighting, you will always get a hearing from people who have any degree of sense. All of these contacts made for credibility. The Sinn Fein cause was a just one, but their method was wrong. I could identify with Sinn Fein as committed to the transformation of society to make society just and fair. I could never really identify with the arms presence, though I’ve never really condemned them – basically because condemnation really doesn’t solve anything, really is what alienates. Maybe public judgment is important, creates a structure, a theory that we work towards. But pastorally, if you condemn people you sever your relationship with them more than likely. The only hope for transformation is to stay in relationship with people.

Philip’s approach allows him to speak openly about the need for peace, and to push hard for quick and drastic change without breaking relationships. Like Simon’s belief, “People absolutely long to be led,” Philip states a strong opinion that the IRA volunteers desire peace and progress as fervently as he desires it for them.
Summary

These more outspoken clergy take a distinct approach to set an ambitious pace with their congregations. They employ accepted theological resources to inspire groups with a vision and reinforce the scope of their expert power. They use pastoral care and nonjudgmental empathy to gain the trust of individuals who disagree with them and neutralize potential troublemakers, who try to manipulate the power dynamics of a community. They generally exhibit a strong leadership style, which does not include aggressive communication or condemnation.

Discussion and Conclusions

Clergy peacebuilders work in a minefield of personal and professional risks, which significantly hinders the activism of some clergy. Because clergy genuinely desire to optimize their peacebuilding efforts, they develop strategies to maximize their effectiveness. Some clergy peacebuilders walk the tightrope with relative ease, while others struggle tremendously. Some clergy take a more cautious approach and tend to hide controversial beliefs and activities and restrict peacebuilding work to a pace and style parishioners approve. These clergy tend to exhibit lower levels of activism. Other clergy take a bolder approach and tend to rely on pastoral care, open communication, and a strong leadership style to maintain support for their activism. These clergy tend to exhibit higher levels of activism.

Clergy tend to have impressively perspicacious understanding of how their parishioners and denominational officials view controversial issues, and this
understanding shapes their behavior.\textsuperscript{401} Mark Lichbach (1995) says all social activists must calculate whether the benefits of activism outweigh the personal costs.\textsuperscript{402} Parishioners, colleagues, and denominational leaders each possess power to damage a clergyperson’s career, and activism may antagonize those parties.\textsuperscript{403} Quinley (1974) summarizes the cost/benefit dilemma:

On the one hand, if the churches do not speak out on public issues that are important to others, they risk being charged with moral hypocrisy and social irrelevance. They will be seen as ignoring their own moral teachings and principles and, through their inaction, giving tacit support to the status quo. On the other hand, if the churches become too involved in such issues, they risk alienating church members who disagree with their positions or who feel the church should stay out of politics altogether.\textsuperscript{404} Parishioner resistance affects the level of activism of some clergy but not others.

Why do clergy with equivalent beliefs about peacebuilding respond so differently to opposition? The personalities of the clergy offer one explanation, and differences in leadership style and risk aversion probably account for part of the discrepancy. For example, Joseph seems remarkably at ease with passionate disagreement, and Luke manages to shrug off intense criticism with aplomb. Some highly activist clergy may have better innate ability to build and maintain expert and referent power. However, other factors matter as well. Fillmore Sanford (1951) observes,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Quinley., p161.
\item Quinley., p166.
\item Ibid., p19.
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There is no need to argue that it is important to study the leader. The leader’s behavior will obviously have something to do with the degree to which his (sic) followers are willing to follow. But there is good reason to believe that it is not enough to study the leader alone. The personality or pattern of behavior that wins followers in one situation will alienate followers in another.\textsuperscript{405}

Clergy narratives support this view since the same clergy had greater or less success with peacebuilding activism in different congregations. Launor Carter (1951) states similarly, “A person who might make an effective leader with one group of individuals might do very poorly with another group, or two groups of equal ability may perform very differently depending on the extent to which the members’ personalities conflict or fit harmoniously.”\textsuperscript{406} For this reason, factors such as context and denominational support may also separate the more activist peacebuilders from their less active colleagues.

Sanford (1951) notes that three factors affect leadership: the leader, the situation, and the follower. Each culture contains a general pattern of expectations and needs about authority, which both arises from and shapes the context and determines which leaders will succeed.\textsuperscript{407} Discussion of context includes both the situation and the followers. As previously mentioned, conflict zones predispose people to prefer aggressive leaders.\textsuperscript{408,409,410,411} Perhaps conflict escalates more easily than it resolves\textsuperscript{412,413} partly

\textsuperscript{405} Sanford., p158.  
\textsuperscript{406} Carter., p153.  
\textsuperscript{407} Sanford., p158.  
\textsuperscript{408} Fisher, \textit{The Social Psychology of Intergroup and International Conflict Resolution.}, p82-83.
because conflict causes people to reject the leaders who try to build peace. Groups with high average authoritarianism also tend to respond better to strong leaders.\footnote{Blake, Mouton, and Mouton.} Children in Northern Ireland do not exhibit more conservatism or authoritarianism than children in Dublin or London,\footnote{Sanford.} but perhaps churchgoing children or Northern Ireland adult churchgoers exhibit more authoritarianism than their Dublin or London counterparts. A preference for strong leaders might explain the success of clergy such as Luke or Joseph, who forge ahead regardless of controversy. While they may not qualify as authoritarian, they certainly exhibit strong determination to proceed in the face of opposition. Simon’s approach, while gentle and respectful, includes an undercurrent of steely resolve and a staunch refusal to allow naysayers to slow him down.

The situational context also affects which clergy struggle to gain approval for peacebuilding. The context involves both the level of perceived denominational support and the level of opposition to peacebuilding within congregations. These two factors help define the level of professional risk and expert power clergy perceive. While the more cautious clergy discuss significant differences in their success with different congregations, bolder clergy such as Simon, Luke, and Joseph seem to inspire support for
high activism levels in all their congregations over decades of ministry, despite varying levels of opposition. Perhaps a conflict zone such as Northern Ireland creates a general context more conducive to the success of bold leaders. Within that broader context, individual congregations and may present greater or lesser challenges to more risk-averse clergy. In addition, bolder clergy seemed more certain of denominational support than more cautious clergy from within their own denomination. Thus, the same level of denominational support may provide sufficient expert power and risk reduction for bolder clergy but fall short of the endorsement and security needed by risk-averse clergy. Thus, context may shape the success of different personality types in different ways.

Carl presents an especially interesting example of a cautious-yet-active clergyperson. Carl perceives significant professional risk and carefully monitors his speech and actions to minimize opposition, yet he also presses on with controversial changes despite significant resistance. Thus, while Carl falls in the category of “cautious” clergy, he exhibits a high level of activism. He may possess a higher level of risk aversion or a softer leadership style than the bolder clergy, or he may engage in less pastoral care. Carl may also perceive less denominational support than his colleagues; he cites local ecumenical clergy support groups as his main source of professional risk management and validation of expert power. Carl also discusses the dramatic differences in resistance among different congregations he has served. However, he attributes those differences to the preexisting level of opposition to peacebuilding present in different communities rather than to his compatibility with certain groups over others.
Trust levels also factor into context and leadership. Clergy report the importance of distrust as a constraining factor and the necessity of pastoral work to build sufficient trust for activism. Congregations possess different levels of trust for clergy, and clergy possess different abilities to build trust with parishioners. However, Quinley (1974) found that United States clergy who spent the most time visiting and counseling their parishioners experienced no less hostility from their congregations in response to activism on controversial issues.416 Quinley’s data are quantitative only; they do not reveal the quality of the pastoral care or any other information about how clergy approached controversial issues. In addition, Quinley’s study does not take place in a context of long-term, protracted violent conflict such as Northern Ireland. To build trust, pastoral work must effectively lower the level of threat parishioners perceive from the outgroup and from leader bridge-building activities. According to Simon, such trust can be built through a combination of non-judgmental empathy and a superior version of “the good”: the portrayal of an inspiring vision of a peaceful, harmonious world.

The ability of clergy to increase and maintain referent power probably affects the quality of their pastoral care and the level of trust it engenders. As mentioned previously, referent power has the broadest range of any power type.417 If certain personalities or kinds of strong leadership and pastoral care increase clergy referent power, parishioners may trust those clergy more and accept their influence. Parishioners will more likely agree with or tolerate those clergy’s views about the outgroup, the scope of clergy expert

---
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power, the appropriateness of clergy peacebuilding activities, and the benefits of progress.

In sum, all of these clergy desire to maximize their ability to build peace. Risk-averse clergy employ numerous, careful strategies to optimize their peacebuilding efforts in the face of daunting resistance and even hostility. However, they must preserve their employment and their expert power to maintain their influence and effectiveness. Clergy with higher innate levels of risk aversion, less forceful leadership styles, or lower ability to inspire referent power may struggle to preserve sufficient trust and expert power to garner congregational support for their activism. These clergy may also perceive higher risks to their personal and professional security, which discourage them from activism. The personality qualities of risk aversion and weaker leadership style may themselves diminish a clergyperson’s ability to inspire trust and expert power. Risk aversion may actually shape leadership style, such that those two behaviors stem from the same source. Perhaps strong, confident leaders who calmly stand up to opposition actually help their parishioners feel reduced threat from the outgroup, progress, peacebuilding, and other challenges to their meaning construct. Increased denominational support and training in leadership and pastoral care could improve the ability of more risk-averse clergy to inspire referent and expert power, trust, and support for activism. A better understanding of how the factors of personality and context affect clergy activism in conflict zones would allow a broader range of clergy personalities to succeed in the minefield of peacebuilding efforts.
CHAPTER SIX: EFFECTIVENESS:

DID YOU MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Increasing research now points to the importance of civil society actors in peacebuilding. If one measures successful peacebuilding by the sustainability or durability of peace, studies now show that civil society actors play a crucial, necessary role. Anthony Wanis-St. John and Darren Kew (2008) survey conflicts and find a strong correlation between the participation of civil society actors in the peace process and the durability of peace. Desirée Nilsson (2012) similarly observed a statistically significant improvement in peace durability when civil society actors participate in peace settlements, particularly in combination with political parties and in nondemocratic societies. They and other scholars hypothesize that civil actors provide more legitimacy for peace agreements compared with an exclusively top-down approach: such broad ownership stabilizes peace.

This need for grass roots legitimacy is particularly the case in Northern Ireland, where the conflict involves a significant identity component and requires civil society participation to stabilize peace efforts. Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis (2000) find that top-down (such as UN) peace efforts often cannot end violence in identity conflicts. They advise peace operations to enhance local capacities in order to reduce hostility, because, “Enforcement operations… alone… cannot promote durable, democratic peace.”

Doyle & Sambanis (2006) also find that when spoilers control the conflict or when the parties do not possess sufficient willingness to make peace, the UN cannot effectively enforce peace. Despite major progress in the Northern Ireland security apparatus, Cathy Gormley-Heenan (2008) finds that attitudinal change does not automatically follow structural improvements. Persistent sectarianism threatens the stability of peace: distrust has repeatedly collapsed the Assembly.

This chapter examines the effectiveness of clergy influence at the individual, congregational, communal, and political levels. It discusses the synergy of these levels, which impact each other and spread in a ripple effect that adds momentum to the peace process. It also describes how clergy work affects the ripeness of the conflict. Finally, the chapter notes that the types of power clergy employ have particular effectiveness in terms of the identity aspects of the conflict.

---


Clergy perceptions of their effectiveness

When interviewees were asked whether their work “made a difference,” they gave a wide variety of responses. Many clergy aver that they choose to work for peace because “it is the right thing to do,” regardless of whether they can point to easily quantifiable results. This response reveals typical clerical humility consistent with moral requirements for meekness in their faith traditions. Surveyed ministerial candidates in the US agree that ministry should not aim for personal success or credit; rather, it should rely on God’s grace and serve others.428 The requirement for clergy modesty also includes an element of pragmatism: their efforts rarely receive acclaim. Douglas Johnston (1994) calls clergy peacebuilders “by nature self-effacing. They recognize that their ability to contribute to a just and lasting solution is often inversely proportional to the credit and recognition that they receive.” Johnston also notes that because they do not seek fame or rewards, clergy peacebuilders have greater success building trust with parties in conflict.429 While humility may enhance clergy effectiveness, it hinders the ability of scholars to quantify that effectiveness: as a matter of principle, clergy do not measure deliverables or use quantifiable metrics of success. Indeed such measures may undermine the perception of humility required to inspire trust and referent power.

When pressed to assess their effectiveness without reference to humility, interviewees tried to give some indicators of their impact. Modesty aside, clergy express widely disparate views about their own significance, from one extreme to the other. At one end of the spectrum, Gary claims that intensive prayer efforts achieved the entire

428 Schuller, Strommen, and Breke, eds., p37.
429 Johnston, "Review of the Findings.", p263.
peace process. In the middle, most clergy assert that they have seen dramatic changes as a result of their peacebuilding efforts, especially with individuals, parish communities, and mediations; they express hope and excitement about the progress they’ve seen and their part in it. Others agree that clergy helped society to accept the Good Friday Agreement, but they lament the limited ability of religious leaders to influence politics. William, who perceives a post-agreement intensification in communal sectarianism, perceives that the his congregation’s bridge-building activities have gradually achieved increasing warmth and normative status. Finally, Richard dismisses any religious efforts as mere “mood music” in the realpolitik world of powerful sponsor states and international agendas.

Interviewees were asked whether their peacebuilding efforts made a difference. The broad question did not specify different levels of impact or give metrics within which to measure deliverables or outcomes. Interviewees thus responded with a broad range of answers; some responses addressed different levels of influence, while others tried to paint a more qualitative picture. The following table attempts to translate interviewee responses into a somewhat measurable format. While the table categorizes the types of impact clergy report, it does not report the amount of change within each type. Activism level, from Chapter 2, represents the frequency of attempts to have influence and whether those efforts target individuals, congregations, communities, or structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Activism level</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Impact on individuals</th>
<th>Impact on congregations</th>
<th>Impact on communities</th>
<th>Impact on politicians/paramilitaries</th>
<th>Impact on peace process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Redempt-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>torist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local Clergy, Jesuit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local Clergy, Sr Leader</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Para-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>church</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Local Clergy, Educator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Local Clergy, Parachurch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Local Clergy, Sr Leader</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Local Clergy, Sr Leader</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Redempt-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>orist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Local Clergy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Ecu-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>menical Traveling Order</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 Self-reported perceived effectiveness
Within this broad range of opinions, a few patterns emerge. First, clergy clearly perceive noticeable change at the individual and congregational level. Many clergy claim that their efforts made a significant impact on individual parishioners, congregations, denominations, and/or local communities. In addition, clergy who engaged in civic efforts, such as media engagement, high-level mediation, or collaboration with politicians or other public servants, generally express great satisfaction with their level of influence on the political peace process.

Within these patterns, four potential implications come to light. First, when clergy peacebuilding efforts help individuals to transform, such transformation causes ripple effects, which positively impact congregations and communities. Second, when individuals, congregations, and communities embrace reconciliation, they change cultural norms and exhibit constituent pressure. These processes build momentum and create an atmosphere in which political and social peace processes can take root and move forward. Third, when a deficit forms from the breakdown of political modes of operation and communication, clergy often possess unique credibility and leverage to operate in this vacuum, both in their communities and as mediators with political entities. Finally, the interplay among these three factors—ripple effect, momentum, and leverage in the political vacuum—combine in a synergistic manner, which enhances the overall movement of Northern Ireland from open conflict to cease-fire, from impasse to the Good Friday Agreement, and from deep sectarian instability to increasingly stable, positive peace.
This chapter examines the spectrum of opinions on individual, communal, and political influence as well as influence on the peace process. Some people in Northern Ireland blame church leaders for helping to cause or exacerbate tensions, conflicts, injustices, and violence. However, Richard argues that the churches have far too little “real” power to have made, or to make, any significant contribution to the peace process. The final section examines what kinds of power clergy have and how those powers had/have an impact. It reviews scholarly analysis of the contributions of grassroots efforts in peace processes and argues that clergy contributions made a significant difference in Northern Ireland.

**Influence on individuals**

Clergy find it easiest to gauge their impact on individuals, as measured by attitudinal changes toward the outgroup in response to clergy peacebuilding efforts. Almost every interviewee had stories to tell about individuals s/he saw transformed as a result of h/er peacebuilding efforts, even if s/he could not understand exactly how or why. Mark explains,

I’ve got to let myself be led by the Lord in some of these things as well; trust in his grace and power in what I’m trying to do. There’s an element of the mysterious. I don’t know what I’m doing. I can be involved in a situation and think I did no good there. Then someone comes later and says, “I appreciate what you did for me.” What did I do? I don’t know, but in some way you brought Christ into that situation in your own presence, brought his power to bear, responding to his call to be there and to do something and to be yourself really. So there’s a sense of that. It’s not a
deliberate intellectual, “This is what I must do.” I just see if I can bring
Christ into it and encourage other people to do that as well.

Mark’s account represents typical clergy perceptions that their pastoral, prophetic,
and bridge-building efforts described in Chapter 4 affect the way individuals perceive the
role of their faith in community relations, their identity, the conflict, the other
community, the peace process, or some other aspect of the context. Bridge-building
activities seemed particularly effective at transforming people’s views. Philip explains
the way most clergy see the process: “The human contact changes people, breaks down
stereotypes. People discovered a common humanity in a deep way, realized if they had
been born on the other side they would be no different from the people whom their
contention – as they say, ‘Religion or political opinion is almost an accident of birth,’ –it
is here, anyway.” Longitudinal analysis of the contact hypothesis by Hewstone et al.
(2008b) confirms that contact causes reduced prejudice over time. Chapter 4 contained
several examples of this bridge-building phenomenon.

Pastoral work also changes individuals. Peter recounts a typical tale:

I led a Bible study with a big fella, card carrying Rangers fan, really
strongly anti-Catholic. It was a Bible Study on Romans – about “coals on
your enemy’s head.” I said, “How’s this apply to us?” It was an epiphany
for him. Within three months, we had a united prayer time in [our town]
with all churches. He was at it – with the Catholic Church. It was a
massive move for him. It was the scriptures. He felt God was speaking to
him, broke down barriers for him, moved him in a completely different
direction. That’s the power of the Word.

430 Hewstone, Hughes, and Cairns, "Can Contact Promote Better Relations? Evidence
from Mixed and Segregated Areas of Belfast."
Clergy efforts such as the above example often persuade individuals in their congregations to think, feel, and act differently toward the other community. Except William, every clergyperson recounted similar narratives. But how much do these isolated revolutions matter? Clergy did not keep track of the number of individuals who displayed verbal or behavioral evidence of change, and they did not survey parishioners to determine the number or degree of parishioner transformations throughout their tenure. Clergy such as Richard believe that while church leaders and programs can inspire individuals to a change of heart, they do not significantly impact communities, politicians, or the peace process. Richard says he observed, “…lots of impact on individuals. For example, one couple asked for gifts to ECONI as their wedding present, and I remember a Sinn Fein representative who said our dialogues really changed his way of thinking.” Nevertheless, Richard doubts that these changed individuals exerted any meaningful impact on the overall level of sectarianism or the course of progress.

However, most clergy disagree; they believe that these individual transformations did dramatically affect the overall community and the success of the peace process. For instance, Jason’s traveling ministry works with family issues, sexual abuse, poverty, and of course sectarianism. He notes, “We exert influence one person or family at a time, and we have almost a non-failure rate.” Jason believes their work has gained his group communal leverage: politicians and community leaders frequently call his ministry for advice on local problems. Jason explains,

They say, “It just makes sense. You make sense. Your order makes sense; you’re doing stuff the church should be doing.” We’re very upfront about
what we do. It’s a small part, ‘pissing in the wind’ in terms of the need that’s out there, but somehow in the economy of God…

What does Jason mean by “the economy of God?” Jason’s narrative introduces the topic of how small changes can have communal consequences: individual transformations bring about leverage for influence at the communal level. The next section discusses the mechanisms by which clergy affect individuals and how those solitary impacts expand.

*The power to make a difference*

As I have already mentioned, in addition to referent power, clergy possess ‘expert power’ and ‘legitimate power.’ A social agent, such as a clergyperson, has expert power relative to how much knowledge and information a person attributes to the agent and how much the person trusts the agent to tell the truth. Clergy also possess expert power in that they work in a professional capacity – they have gained specialized knowledge and expertise at specialized schools, which they then apply to the problems of their clients. Peter’s narrative about the effect of his Bible study on the anti-Catholic parishioner demonstrates the use of expert and legitimate power to persuade someone to change h/her views. Peter’s parishioner accepts Peter as an institutionally sanctioned religious authority and trusts Peter accurately and truthfully to interpret Scripture, another source of religious authority. In consequence, when Peter chose a scripture passage that instructs followers to treat enemies kindly and applied it to the context of the outgroup, his parishioner accepted Peter’s right to proscribe reconciling beliefs and behaviors.

---
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Clergy have ‘legitimate power’ based on societal values and structures. People have attitudes or beliefs about what they and others “should” or “have a right to” do or not do, even if they cannot remember or define the original source of those rules. Legitimate power arises from those internalized values, which grant a particular social agent the authority to influence a person and dictate to that person that s/he ought to consent to such influence. Legitimate power can also cause a person to believe that everyone else should also accept the influence of that social agent and behave accordingly.\textsuperscript{433} In addition, legitimate power can arise from an accepted social structure. To the degree that a person accepts the structural hierarchy of authority in h/er society or organization, s/he will accept the influence of those persons in leadership roles.\textsuperscript{434} When a social agent uses h/er influence to enact change in a social system, s/he activates the values people already hold internally and relates them to the current situation. People’s values are more stable than their environmental situations. Therefore, the changes inspired by legitimate power have the potential to produce a stable, lasting difference, which does not depend on the presence of the instigating social agent.\textsuperscript{435}

Religious teachings and ideas can influence how people define their identities and how they approach politics.\textsuperscript{436} Through referent, expert, and legitimate power, peacebuilder clergy persuade parishioners to see the outgroup in a more positive light and to support the peace process. Evans and Duffy (1997) show a negative correlation
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between church attendance and support for Sinn Fein or the DUP,\(^4\) while higher church attendance correlates with increased support for the GFA.\(^5\) Perhaps the correlation reveals merely that people who choose to attend church tend to value peace accords and cross-community cooperation; however, clergy narratives reveal that sometimes their parishioners change their minds in response to clerical influence. As discussed above, clergy influence arises from parishioners’ internal value systems, a factor which renders changes particularly stable and independent. Parishioners who change their minds due to clergy influence likely believe and behave according to their new perspective when they leave the church building, interact with ingroup and outgroup members, and vote.

*The ripple effect*

Clergy perceive that when a parishioner transforms, the impact of that change can reach beyond an isolated individual. The effect expands for several reasons, including increased power and indirect contact. When political leaders see Jason’s successes, they assign him increasing amounts of expert power. Furthermore, insofar as political/community leaders hold legitimate power, they transfer some of that power to Jason and his team. When an accepted authority sanctions the behavior, leadership role, or authority of another social agent, it gives that agent legitimate power. People who accept the authority of the first social agent may thus accept the authority of other social agents that s/he delegates.\(^6\) Through the expansion of these types of social power, Jason’s influence extends beyond individuals to communities. Jason explains the

\(^4\) Evans and Duffy., p71, 69, 74.
\(^5\) Mitchell., p34.
\(^6\) French and Raven., p617.
phenomenon as the mysterious “economy of God,” in which seemingly small events can have large effects.

Gary, also a supernaturalist evangelical, provides a more pragmatic explanation:

One of the things I would see [the Renewal movement] bringing about was a new understanding of the need for reconciliation and unity at all levels: not just church but in society as well. And for transformation—you see, if you know somebody who has had an experience that transforms him or her, you can see that in their lives. And whether you recognize it or not, it’s going to have some effect on you, a ripple effect.

Gary’s version of Jason’s “economy of God” credits a “ripple effect”: individual transformation inspires more individuals to change, which multiplies and expands the results to the communal level. This ripple effect arises from expert power and indirect contact. In Chapter 4, I noted the significance of referent power: when we find a person attractive, we want to be like that person, and that person can influence our opinions even after s/he is no longer present. The “transformation” Gary describes increases the referent power of the transformed persons, such that others near them want to emulate them, and they open their minds to more positive views about the out-group. The next section reviews some examples of how referent and expert power in individuals can cause communal change. Also, longitudinal analysis by Hewstone et al. (2008b) reveals “A causal effect, over time, from indirect contact to direct contact. When people at time 1 view other members of their community involved in cross-group contact, this leads to increases in their own cross-community contact at time 2. Thus indirect contact has value
and potential as a means of ‘preparing’ people for direct contact.\textsuperscript{440} Jason and Gary use their own terms to describe a documented psychological phenomenon, in which transformed individuals impact people around them and affect wider communities.

Clergy influence on individuals may have even more far-reaching effects. In addition to the worshipping community, many people who do not attend worship use church buildings for community events and organizations. Mitchell (2006) asserts, “No institutions, organizations or political parties can claim to have such regular contact with such a breadth of community members as the churches.”\textsuperscript{441} Of all types of influence, clergy express the most confidence about their ability to persuade individuals to adopt more positive attitudes and behaviors toward the outgroup. The following section explores how these individual changes helped lead to broader communal shifts.

\textbf{Influence on church and local communities}

Most clergy have stories of how their work brought their congregations to a more reconciliatory attitude. Many of them described how breakthroughs with individuals helped lead an entire community forward. Luke describes this phenomenon in Chapter 4 with his tale of the bitter Protestant woman Susan, who was transformed when a Catholic woman washed her feet at a Maundy Thursday service; Susan went on to inspire her church to take bold steps toward reconciliation. Jean’s account of the two nuns who “totally won over” her women’s group, Carl’s story about the Catholic priest who “disarmed” his congregation, and Peter’s description of how a visit by members of his

\footnote{Hewstone, Hughes, and Cairns, "Can Contact Promote Better Relations? Evidence from Mixed and Segregated Areas of Belfast.", p4.}

\footnote{Mitchell., p87.}
parish to the Benedictine Centre in Rostrevor “melted their hearts,” all illustrate how peacebuilding programs can effect a ‘sea change’ in individuals and then the culture of an entire congregation. In each case, individuals with high levels of referent power inspired those around them to emulate their views and reduced the overall level of perceived threat or anxiety toward the other community. As Chapter 4 mentions, this kind of “indirect contact” reduces ingroup anxiety about meeting outgroup members, increases the perceived “overlap” between the ingroup and the outgroup, and causes ingroup members to view higher levels of outgroup interaction as accepted and acceptable.442 Sometimes clergy notice a dramatic difference during their tenure, such as Carl’s perspective:

There’s always a core of people who will go with you, and others who gradually get drawn in stepping out in that direction. Certainly people surprised me - some became involved when I wouldn’t have imagined they would. They came from conservative Prod backgrounds, and through involvement took risks, got involved, came to events they previously wouldn’t have any experience of. …Getting others involved in barbecues, churches together organizing this, people mixing – this was a significant change. There were those who were very uncomfortable, but people did move. So having Catholic people coming to church events was a major change in my five years that by the end people wouldn’t bat an eyelid.

Clergy frequently echo Carl’s sentiment: congregations have accepted as commonplace bridge-building activities (such as joint worship), which would have “been unheard of ten years ago.” Methodist and Church of Ireland clergy mention

442 Hewstone, Hughes, and Cairns, "Can Contact Promote Better Relations? Evidence from Mixed and Segregated Areas of Belfast."
denominational programs, which enabled and enhanced congregational progress. Luke credits Church of Ireland programs such as the “Think Again” campaign, and the recent policy of holding retreats for new priests and deacons at the Benedictine monastery in Rostrevor, for effecting a “change of mindset” over the years. He notes that evangelical parishes, which started out opposing these programs, have “become the real supporters.” As bishop, Luke instigated denominational programs and retreats, which gave clergy increased support for peacebuilding activities. As Chapter 5 discussed, denominational support reinforces the idea that clergy expert power includes peacebuilding and reduces the perceived professional risks of clergy activism. Thus, Luke’s work as bishop probably enabled more risk-averse clergy peacebuilders to increase the level and intensity of their efforts.

Joseph, another Church of Ireland priest, describes the influence of a group of committed clergy who published pamphlets and letters under the title “Catalyst.” Joseph mentions that Catalyst bypassed the current bishop and wrote a letter directly to the Drumcree church to condemn the contentious Orange Order parades there. They persuaded 162 Church of Ireland clergy to sign the letter. As a result, the Church of Ireland set up a subcommission in 1997 or 1998 to examine the role of the Church of Ireland in sectarianism, and Catalyst helped to craft committee policy with its submissions and recommendations. The prophetic activities of the Catalyst clergy group increased the expert power of clergy peacebuilders throughout the denomination and fostered support for the programs Luke mentions, which further increased clergy expert power and decreased professional risk. In this way, the structure of denominations can
magnify the efforts of local clergy and create a synergistic momentum among clergy, senior leaders, and parishioners.

Referent power also adds to the synergistic momentum. Most clergy sense a general communal impact, though they do not have metrics by which to quantify it. For example, Rachel asserts that the Forthspring Intercommunity Group made a difference in the communities on the Belfast Peace Line – its presence and ministries ameliorated the tension. Almost all clergy express an overall sense that communities have moved forward dramatically, and they believe church leaders deserve some credit for this progress. Groups, as well as individuals, can have referent power, which influences their communities. As more churches in Northern Ireland sign on to reconciliation, surrounding churches and the wider community feel the influence of their appealing, positive energy. These churches may possess referent power because they express lower levels of perceived outgroup threat. That perspective of security may well hold appeal in a war-weary society battered by decades of conflict. In the pre-ceasefire stage, these churches likely attract people who long for the fighting to end, while in the post-ceasefire stage, people may hunger to attain increased normalcy. Individuals and groups feel drawn to be more like the attractive reconciling churches, and this attraction inspires them to join those churches or to support reconciliation ideas, policies, and projects in their own groups and communities. The ripple effect of referent power, along with synergistic increases in expert and legitimate power, magnifies transformed individuals to impact their acquaintances, congregations, and communities.

443 French and Raven., p618-60.
Churches seem to have attributes that render them particularly well suited to maximize the spread of outgroup contact benefits. Contact alone, such as in an integrated neighborhood, does not suffice to reduce sectarianism; exposure must occur under conditions such as those discussed in Chapter 4, wherein many clergy bridge-building programs were shown to meet various combinations of those conditions – equal status, shared goals, and institutional support for reconciliation. Hewstone et al. (2008b) finds that people with closer relationships, such as friends and family members, experience greater impact from indirect contact than do more distant contacts such as work colleagues or neighbors. They note that while indirect contact works particularly well with individuals who have little direct outgroup contact, segregated areas provide few opportunities for indirect contact. Hewstone et al. (2008b) conclude that policy makers should encourage community leaders to collaborate in cross-community efforts in order to increase indirect contact exposure among their members. Church communities, which often consist of people from segregated areas who have little outgroup contact, foster more intimate relationships than many other non-family groups. In the context of a “church family,” an individual transformed by outgroup contact may exert particularly effective indirect contact influence on other parishioners.

In contrast to the confident optimism the above clergy relate, a few clergy take a much more negative view of the situation and their own impact. As documented earlier, William stated that, “since the ceasefire of ’94, community relations on the ground
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polarized very badly... because one could no longer say, ‘That’s the paramilitaries.’ ... Relations at the community level nosedived.” In the face of increased sectarian pressure, William has often felt barely able to prevent regression in his congregation’s peacebuilding activities: “Been times I thought in keeping the [local Catholic congregation] link going was at times all we could do because all community pressures were against that sort of contact.” He tried several times to organize additional bridge-building programs, but those efforts failed. William celebrates that his parish has increasingly accepted their Catholic-Protestant prayer group, and they’ve had a handful of Catholics come to speak in worship. However, he believes that his best efforts, which he admits employ more caution than zeal, merely prevent his church from losing ground and normalize the existing bridge-building programs. The relationships between his congregation and the local Catholic congregation have grown closer and warmer, but William takes little credit. While William occasionally makes somewhat prophetic statements, he rarely challenges his parishioners. He hopes that if he listens to parishioners, that foundation of nonjudgmental empathy will build sufficient trust to help them move forward.

William seems at first glance to typify the type of clergy Morrow et al. (1991) observe, who try to represent and speak for their communities rather than to lead or change them. However, that assumption does not sufficiently consider the communal context of increasing sectarian hostility. When William started the Catholic-Protestant

---
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prayer group, the community responded with violence. In a statement cited earlier, he says,

There were subtle threats to burn the church. A fuel line of a car was cut one night, fuel spilled around the place, fire brigades called at all times of the night. That’s the community saying – I was far too green at the time, didn’t understand this at all. It had to be pointed out to me: I had to take the [Catholic] connection much more quietly. So we did; we kept it going but did it very quietly.

In a community such as William’s, which experiences increasing sectarian hostility, the cycle of violence reinforces itself with segregation and cultural expressions of hostility toward the outgroup. William used pastoral work to build trust with his parishioners. He also preached inclusive theological messages, led small groups based on denominational anti-sectarian Bible studies, started a bridge-building program, maintained that program despite intense resistance and threats of violence, and encouraged and supported all parishioner ideas or activities that might contribute to peacebuilding. All of these activities utilize the trust he built to promote cultural peace.

While William’s activism level falls in the Very Low category, Thomas (2005) notes that religions do not espouse one monolithic perspective; rather, they contain multiple narratives, which form internal dialogues and debates and offer competing definitions of ‘the good.’ Because these narratives affect policymaking, diplomats and peacebuilders should find and support the intrareligious strands and voices that espouse ideas conducive to positive peace.447 In effect, William both represents one such voice and encourages

those voices within his congregation. While his results appear in some ways modest, his ability to establish, encourage, and strengthen voices of cultural peace within a context of clamor for cultural violence may actually have had an important impact within his congregation and community.

Richard expresses the deepest pessimism regarding any communal progress or clergy influence. Despite his above statements about the influence he had on individuals, including a Sinn Fein representative, Richard avows,

If you’d have asked me in the mid to late 90’s, I would’ve said we’re having influence. Since then, I’ve learned some hard lessons. ...I think what the church does in this society doesn’t count with what happens politically, in the public space, and hearts and minds. ...Sectarianism and the political division is so covert that ministers can preach themselves blue in the face about love of neighbor and love of enemy, and people still choose to hate. There is more influence in home life. Paramilitary volunteers were former churchgoers. You could spot the ones who were able to march, and you’d say, “Oh, they were in the boys brigades.” Thousands of people were catechized in our churches, and because the ethic of loving enemy was not effectively taught or lived out or demonstrated, they still went on to get involved in the conflict... There is a real middle class scorn and disgust of paramilitaries, yet that's where a lot of the bravest steps for peace come from. The middle class churches are full of nominal Christians, who aren't engaged – they have bad theological underpinnings. Though, in defense of those churches, they kept some people from joining the paramilitaries, because they joined legitimate forces instead. The churches did try to advocate against murder. Also, the violence that came from Protestant and Catholic communities basically came from people who had already given up on church: working
class Protestants who went to church to get baptized but that was it, or middle class and working class Catholics who joined the IRA and told the church to fuck off. This was about politics, the national struggle. The church used incorrect theology. They were disengaged. It was all about saving souls; help the foreign poor but not locals. Even good theology didn’t affect people. They live without reference to Christianity.

Richard communicates overall disillusionment with any impact his ECONI programs or other clergy efforts may have had on reducing individual or communal sectarianism or violence, and he articulates a distinctly cynical assessment of any supposed progress on the individual, communal, or political level. He argues that people are “disengaged,” and paramilitary violence arises from people who barely attended or rejected church. He seems to believe that churches have no ability whatsoever to influence their parishioners about much of anything, whether clergy have “good theology” or not. Thus, despite occasional nods, his general message conveys a distinctly feeble assessment of clergy referent or expert power. Richard did not pastor a local congregation, but he visited many congregations through ECONI. His attitude typifies the burnout, doubt, disillusion, and retrenchment experienced by activists who throw themselves into intense struggles but do not achieve their aspirations to the degree they had hoped.448

Paramilitaries

However, Richard assigns some credit to churches. For example, he notes that churches “kept some people from joining the paramilitaries,” which ameliorated the
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conflict. He also says that paramilitary members “were catechized in our churches,” and made an unrelated statement that those same paramilitaries have made “a lot of the bravest steps for peace.” Peter also mentions the paramilitaries: “The ironic thing is some of the most Christian theology you get based on healing within community and victim caring is coming out of the paramilitaries. The churches – and some here class themselves as good theologians in Presbyterian and Anglican circles – it’s not coming from them.” Could catechism have had an effect on paramilitary members? Perhaps churches indirectly contributed to the paramilitaries’ “bravest steps for peace” through the previous catechesis of their members.

Scholars confirm movement toward nonviolence in Loyalist paramilitaries. For example, Monaghan and Shirlow (2011) found:

From Restorative Justice schemes through to former prisoner groups that undertake intercommunity social economy projects there is now a significant body of positive and meaningful nonviolent loyalist paramilitary intervention. This is not to deny the negative impact of previous violence or to under-estimate the transition of some loyalist paramilitaries into criminal gangs but there has been an undoubted shift both in terms of practice and intent within the wider body of loyalism.⁴⁴⁹

Loyalist paramilitaries do seem to be taking “brave steps,” and it would be worthwhile to study whether former catechism plays any role in these developments. In interviews with former paramilitary members, Brewer et al. (2013) found that regardless of church attendance, interviewees did not perceive that their faith or their churches

---

encouraged them to choose violence or to renounce paramilitary activity and transition to nonviolence.\textsuperscript{450} If we take them at their word, religion has nothing to do with paramilitary violence or paramilitary peace efforts. However, people may make subconscious associations. Mitchell (2006) points out that while some Protestant Unionists and Loyalists attend church with primarily secular motives to hear political messages that reinforce their unionist opinions, sometimes these Loyalists subsequently embrace the theological messages they encounter.\textsuperscript{451} Hickey (1984) notes that theology helps to shape religious adherents’ attitudes and actions toward social and political issues.\textsuperscript{452} Personal or political crises can also reactivate religious identities.\textsuperscript{453} Mitchell reviews studies of people who attend church as children, retain religious ideas into adulthood, and use those ideas to construct moral and political meaning, especially in times of crisis.\textsuperscript{454} Studies also describe the ways in which religious identity and ideology persists despite lack of overt indicators of religiosity, such as church attendance.\textsuperscript{455,456,457} Mitchell argues that religion does more than simply demarcate the identity boundary. Rather, it gives meaning and content to communal identity such that adults who stop attending services or renounce church doctrines place value on religious affiliation. They may choose to
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resume attending as parents or send their children, so their children can learn church beliefs, structures and practices.\textsuperscript{458} Childhood theological input, particularly from a source of expert and legitimate power, can affect how people view relevant social issues over time.

Given this evidence, it would seem that Loyalist paramilitary members sometimes do exhibit symptoms of subconscious religiosity. Steve Bruce (2001) notes that while most Loyalist paramilitary members do not practice Christianity, many become born-again Christians while in prison.\textsuperscript{459} Loyalist paramilitary members also maintained Protestant rituals and symbols they had previously learned elsewhere, classified Protestants religiously as superior to Catholics, and bragged about the religious piety of their wives. Bruce observes, “Although many prisoners have become born-again Christians, this change has invariably been part of the pietistic retreat from loyalist terrorism. Within loyalist circles, ‘getting saved’ is widely accepted as a good reason for leaving the UVF or UDA”\textsuperscript{460} These behaviors indicate that Loyalist paramilitary members go beyond empty religious labels, which mask secular motives. Rather, they retain respect for some of the content of their religion, including its commitment to peace. They may understand at a subconscious level that the faith they defend, when taken to a level of passionate commitment, results in the renunciation of terrorist violence. Religion, especially when taught as a tribal identity in need of defense, likely contributes to the factors that motivate Loyalist paramilitary violence. John Fulton (2002) lists the
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“negative relational beliefs” promoted by churches in Northern Ireland, and how these theologies contribute to division and conflict.\textsuperscript{461} By the same token, religious messages of peace and inclusivity likely prevent people from joining the paramilitaries, help paramilitary members turn from violence, and contribute to the factors that motivate Loyalist efforts to build peace.

\textit{Communal Power and Influence}

Richard’s stark pessimism contrasts notably with most clergy opinions. These opposing views construct a confusing picture of whether and how much clergy and their modes of influence effected communal change. Richard works in a parachurch organization rather than as a local clergyperson, but his efforts target churches and attempt to influence parishioners to reject sectarianism and embrace peacebuilding. His cynicism reflects his assessment of his organization’s lack of efficacy as well as his frustration with parishioners, clergy, and denominations. Perhaps optimistic and pessimistic opinions have validity despite their apparent contradictions. Ben’s view adds another dimension to the debate and strengthens the argument that clergy influence matters:

The stance of the denominations has lengthened and deepened conflict, whilst individual clergy in those denominations have been doing their utmost under God to shorten the conflict and bring a degree of hope. Last year a number of us on the local level were up on [___] Road, meeting with David Hanson, Minister of State. In the next room, the Anglican archbishop, the Presbyterian moderator, and the President of the Catholic
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primate were meeting with the Secretary of State. I finished our contribution with David Hanson by saying, “Can I say something here not for the minutes? If you want something done, talk to us. Give [the senior church leaders] the photo op, but talk to us at the local clergy level.” …And that was replayed to me recently by a civil servant in the room. He said, “You were right.”

Ben’s narrative adds complexity to the picture by implicating senior church leadership as previously complicit in the conflict and currently ineffective in accomplishing progress toward peace. Some senior church leaders deserve this critique. McElroy (1991) notes that senior Catholic leaders such as Cardinal Thomas O Fiaich and Bishop Joseph Duffy lobbied for a united Ireland, and Fulton (2002) outlines the scope of indirect physical and psychological violence perpetrated by the institutional churches in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. These negative contributions exacerbated power struggles and intercommunal hostility. As Joseph mentions, the Catalyst clergy felt the need to bypass their bishop in order to move forward on the problem of Drumcree and sectarianism in the Church of Ireland.

However, church leaders have also attempted to contribute to peacebuilding. Luke and some other Church of Ireland clergy mention that the Hard Gospel and Think Again campaigns and the retreats for new clergy helped create a “new mindset” within the Church of Ireland. Methodist clergy name similar programs promoted by their leaders. Furthermore, McElroy (1991) argues that Bishop Cahal Daly contributed to the signing
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of the 1988 Anglo-Irish agreement because he consistently pressed for consent, dialogue, and respect for both traditions and identities.\footnote{McElroy.}

Mitchell (2006), McElroy (1991), and Fulton (2002), who condemn church efforts to pursue partisan interests, each ascribe churches significant power at the communal level. Thiessen et al. (2010) attribute both religious and secular civil society leaders significant sway to promote peace in their communities. They assert, “The willingness of international donors to circumvent traditional political structures, and empower civil society groups provides these organizations with significant political and social weight. Civil society leaders …are emerging as strong voices in forging social process which address conflict related tensions in Northern Ireland.”\footnote{Chuck Thiessen and others, "Civil Society Leaders and Northern Ireland's Peace Process: Hopes and Fears for the Future," \textit{Humanity \& Society} 34, no. 1 (2010), p42.} However, Mitchell (2006) argues that churches have the most power:

…the churches continue to be much more important than other interest groups in Northern Ireland because of their central role in the organization and representation of the two main communities. These roles were deepened and widened by the politics of conflict. As churches comforted and serviced Protestants and Catholics through troubled times they became more embedded in community structures. In turn, they capitalized upon their central social position to maintain their influence in other areas of life, not least in politics. By occupying this position at the heart of the community, the churches are still in a unique position to argue for their own ideological agendas. Indeed, the churches are powerful agencies in society, not just neutral communal mediators. They are organizations with beliefs, goals and strategies. Churches have clear ideas on the difference
between right and wrong, and the meaning of the good life. Their purpose is to influence people. It is not necessarily that priests and clergy tell people how to vote, but rather, by addressing the issues that affect Protestant and Catholic communities, the churches have a platform from which to promote their own perspectives and values.\footnote{Mitchell., p56.}

Mitchell argues that churches gained expert and legitimate power through their embedded work “at the heart of the community,” where they try to influence people about ethics in a way that affects voting patterns. The scope and magnitude of this power seem to depend on the amount and quality of clergy visible community engagement, and how much referent power clergy build as a result. Mitchell’s description appears to reference local clergy, who operate in close contact with their communities, rather than more remote senior leaders. In his comments, Ben also distinguishes between local clergy influence vs. that of senior church leaders:

I don’t want to rubbish senior church leadership, but the days have long past, and rightly so, when simply being moderator, president, or archbishop means you have clout. Those days have gone, and rightly so, and I personally feel that whatever clout you should have should be earned rather than simply assumed or given because you happen to be some sort of church dignitary.

This statement highlights the contrast between the types and amounts of authority clergy and denominational leaders have historically wielded vs. what social power they have today. French & Raven (1960) note that people have attitudes or beliefs about what they and others should or have a right to do or not do, even if they cannot remember or define the original source of those rules. As discussed above, legitimate power arises
from these internalized values, which grant a particular social agent the authority to influence a person and dictate to that person that s/he ought to consent to such influence. In addition, legitimate power can cause a person to believe that everyone else should also accept the influence of that social agent and behave accordingly.\footnote{French and Raven, p616.} When legitimate power arises from cultural values, its range can extend quite broadly and include the right to prescribe general behavior.\footnote{Ibid., p617.} Jackson Carroll (1981) notes that churches grant their clergy varying levels of expert power over laity, both informational and spiritual, based on both the particular church ecclesiology and the level of egalitarian vs. authoritarian values in the societal and historical context. The more strongly a community identifies with its traditional local church, the wider the range of authority they allow clergy, as leaders who represent them both internally and to outside groups.\footnote{Jackson W Carroll, "Some Issues in Clergy Authority," \textit{Review of Religious Research} 23, no. 2 (1981), p112, 110.}

Clergy roles used to include a much broader range of secular leadership such as clerical, policing, almoner, healthcare, politician, and teaching duties. As clergy roles shrank in scope over time to encompass mainly their official charter of preaching, sacramental, pastoral, and catechism duties, the socially accepted range of clergy legitimate power narrowed and marginalized accordingly.\footnote{Russell, p248-9. c.f. Carroll.} However, the amount of perceived expertise within that scope increased, as clergy emphasized their spiritual leadership.\footnote{Martin, \textit{A General Theory of Secularization}.} As people increasingly choose whether or where to attend church based on
their personal interests, clergy scope progressively narrows such that clergy tend to rely on personal influence rather than broadly acknowledged communal authority.472

As Ben observes, senior church leaders in Northern Ireland today possess less legitimate power than they formerly wielded, and at a much smaller accepted range. Denominational leaders can still have an effect, for example when they implement clergy training programs or study materials for clergy to use with laity. Within their own denominations, they may still maintain higher expert and legitimate authority about certain matters than local clergy. They also have the ability to affect the professional success of clergy under their jurisdiction. Nonetheless, if the scope of clergy authority has shrunk to spiritual matters rather than the authority to prescribe general behavior, senior church leadership may well hold far less social power in a community than do the local clergy, who “earn clout” in their communities with intimate, regular contact. McElroy agrees that Catholic priests have much more influence in their communities than bishops, as seen by their role in the civil rights movement of the 1960s.473 Furthermore, the fact that Catalyst and its 162 clergy signatories had the temerity to bypass their bishop and communicate a message that contradicted their bishop’s wishes illustrates that the bishopric may hold reduced legitimate power within its denomination. Local clergy have the continual contact necessary to build trust and referent power, both of which enhance the scope and strength of their legitimate and expert power.

Ben also asserts that local clergy “get things done,” and he quotes a civil servant who agrees with him. Perhaps Richard correctly surmises that individual sermons or
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ECONI Sundays rarely, by themselves, dissuade otherwise sectarian or paramilitary-inclined laity. However, Richard represents a parachurch organization. As such, he does not engage in the triad of pastoral, prophetic, and bridge-building efforts and long-term intimate relationships characteristic of clergy peacebuilders. He may not have the close, long-term connection with churches and parishioners needed for an accurate sense of their overall movement; though, he does mention progress:

What we were heard to say was that we were being liberal do-gooders, who said it wasn’t okay to be evangelical and an Unionist anymore. That’s what our own community heard us say; therefore, there was a lot of resistance to it. The irony is that a lot of our own community now recognizes that what we were saying was right.

If “a lot of” the evangelical community now accepts ECONI’s message, perhaps Richard underestimates the impact his organization had. Perhaps ECONI’s effect took an indirect, less traceable route: it increased the expert power of local clergy peacebuilders and strengthened peacebuilding narratives within congregations. While congregations may not have immediately jumped on ECONI’s bandwagon with enthusiastic endorsement of its proposals, it is plausible that Richard’s work gradually enabled clergy to strengthen the flow of energy from the cycle of violence to the cycle of peace.

Luke also observes that the evangelical churches in his diocese, which resisted peacebuilding most, have become its staunchest supporters. Most clergy peacebuilders who pastor local congregations believe the combination of prophetic messages, such as sermons, Bible studies, and ECONI Sundays, along with pastoral and bridge-building methods of clerical influence have indeed changed the tenor of communal sentiment and
accomplished real progress at the community level. According to Jason and Ben, some civic leaders agree.

**Influence on politicians**

Clergy exert influence on politicians in three main ways: conversations, prayer, and mediated dialogues with politicians and/or community and paramilitary leaders. These three methods sometimes overlap with each other, but they also offer distinctly different forms of influence. Conversations can influence individual politicians and create the similar sorts of ripple effects discussed above. Prayer may contribute to constituent pressure or awaken reconciling theological content of politicians’ religious identities. Mediations open channels of communication, improve the relationships between the negotiating parties, and use moral authority to persuade representatives to make conciliatory moves.

**Conversations**

Section 1 of this chapter discusses conversations with individuals, such as the Sinn Fein member Richard mentioned. Johnston (1994) notes that church actors establish personal relationships and change individual attitudes. Through these methods, clergy peacebuilders have “a special ability to influence the attitudes and actions of political leaders.” When individual conversations change the views of a politician, the ripple effects can spread to the extent that a politician possesses referent power and political influence, and exposes other people to indirect contact. Because politicians possess distinct types of power and modes of influence, the ripple effects will also operate in
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distinct ways, which reach different cohorts of people and effect different kinds of structural changes. While an affected layperson may inspire others to embrace h/her outgroup neighbors or vote for peace accords, a politician can endorse legislation that respects outgroup needs and perspectives.

Prayer

As Chapters 2 and 3 illustrate, prayer strengthened the resolve, vision, and fortitude of clergy peacebuilders to continue their arduous, practical efforts. However, some evangelical clergy believe that supernatural divine intervention, in answer to prayer, broke through the stalemates and ultimately brought success to the Peace Process. Gary argues, “Politicians, they were the people for whom we were praying – our ‘targets’ – because there was complete impasse before that. The Republican side, the Protestant Loyalist side – the two wouldn’t meet, wouldn’t really talk to each other. The only thing I think that really broke through that was prayer.” On the other hand, clergy such as Simon, Richard, and Philip, who arranged and participated in secret, high level political dialogues, offer a much more pragmatic view of how these meetings transpired and what they accomplished. Remember Richard’s colorful account,

God intervenes by sending peacemakers: Christians living their faith. I have a wonderful ongoing conversation with some charismatic friends in England. They are so patronizing. They say, “[Richard], we’re so glad you’ve peace in Ireland. We were holding this prayer meeting every week for x years in our nice suburban house in England, and we prayed into that situation, held onto the demonic powers and bound the meaning of Christ, and we delivered! That’s where the real battle was, that’s where peace was won for Northern Ireland!” And I said, “Well, while you were praying
over those years, I was going off into Republican areas at one o’clock in
the morning to meet with leaders of the IRA and talk to them. Do you
think what I and countless others like me were doing had anything to do
with it?” They say, “Well, that was all very helpful, but it was the prayer
that won it!” Ach! I could punch them!

Richard believes in a supernatural response to prayer; however, he frames the
locus of prayer’s effectiveness differently from Gary. For Richard, prayer helps Northern
Ireland indirectly: it convinces God to motivate clergy such as himself to do the difficult,
painstaking work of building peace on the ground. To Richard, the supernatural influence
of prayer exactly equals the political/communal influence of clergy peacebuilders.

Some peacebuilders testify that they worked in fertile soil. For example, Simon
and Philip both insist that the parties involved, including politicians and paramilitaries,
very much wanted to find a way out of the violence. They also note the importance of
psychological strategies: they used a nonjudgmental, intimate setting, within which
individual politicians learned to understand and respect the perspectives of their
opponents and find a way forward. Though Simon and Philip certainly believe in the
power of prayer, they emphasize social and psychological factors as the crucial elements
in their influence on politicians.

Regardless of supernatural beliefs about prayer, Gary’s account raises some
interesting questions about whether prayer had an effect in other ways. Gary continues,

One thing I found, the Transformations Global Day of Prayer was held
first in about 2004, 5 – That had a profound influence. It started in Cape
Town South Africa, spread throughout Africa, and spread to the rest of
world. We had people on those two years for a day of prayer on Pentecost
Sunday. In Stormont grounds etc, the public park, we had anything between 5-10,000 people of all backgrounds—church and non-church—all with the desire to see something happen in the country. I think that brought about a breakthrough. …Yes, [the politicians] knew we were praying for them. Some said, “Please don’t stop, go on praying for [us].” We had to get permission for someone to sponsor us to go into the building and pray there. So there was support for that; they recognized the need for prayer in the situation.

Gary’s story raises two questions about the influence of this type of prayer: 1) What sort of pressure do politicians experience from the sight of thousands of people gathered to urge their leaders to end the current violence or stalemate? 2) What sort of psychological effect do politicians experience when they know people are praying for them? In response to the first question, constituent pressure does affect group representatives. However, such pressure usually promotes ingroup interests and makes group representatives more reluctant to compromise or acquiesce than isolated individuals who do not represent a group.475,476 The kind of broad-based, ecumenical constituent pressure Gary describes promotes reconciliation rather than ingroup protection. When clergy invite individuals and communities to attend mass demonstrations of public prayer, the resultant constituent pressure expands clerical influence from individual and communal levels into the wider political sphere.

With regard to the second question, for politicians who grew up in a faith tradition, the presence of masses of people praying for them to make peace can revive
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and add salience to internalized values of their tradition. In particular, these mass
demonstrations of prayer or assembled clergy promoted religious messages about
inclusivity, as described in Chapter 2, and the legitimate power of clergy. These
heightened religious values may persuade the politicians to accept the influence of clergy
and their views, including their right to prescribe behavior. Richard acknowledged this
method of influence: “At various key moments, the church managed to muster a
constructive voice to give permissive space for Unionist politicians to take some risks.”
Through constituent pressure with a message of religiously-based reconciliation, prayer
may have directly and/or indirectly influenced politicians in the peace process.

Mediation

Chapter 4 discusses a third way clergy influenced politicians, wherein clergy
arranged and mediated meetings, with varying degrees of openness or secrecy, between
members of opposing political parties. These meetings seemed to influence the politicians
involved, though Richard expressed caution about the degree:

The more politically engaged I got, the more powerless I felt – because
fundamentally, I didn’t have a vote behind me. I wasn’t in the room when
decisions were being made. I could only hope and pray that when people
were sitting in rooms making decisions, that the conversations I’d had
with them or with their parties, or the encounters I created for them – that
somehow as they sat and negotiated and argued, that they would
remember that, and it would change their perspective. Many say it did.
…Political mediation work, talking to parties, bringing them together,
engaging in all the debates… My political friends say, ‘all you guys have
done has been invaluable.’
According to Richard, “many” politicians have told him that clergy mediators such as himself had an “invaluable” influence on their perspectives and actions. Simon and Philip express strong conviction that these sorts of meetings drastically changed the course of the peace process by transforming the perspectives of key politicians and leaders. Ronald Wells (2005) provides a vivid description of secret meetings among Sinn Fein leaders, Catholic and Protestant clergy, and Unionist leaders, which continued throughout the entire process until the 1998 Good Friday Agreement. Wells argues that over time, these meetings helped both sides to understand and accept each other’s needs and perspectives. Sinn Fein came to understand that Protestants considered Ireland their home, and Republicans must acknowledge and respect the Unionist point of view in order to create a democratic society.\footnote{Wells., p 125.} Through the mechanisms of outgroup contact, trust, and perhaps latent theological identity content in support of peacebuilding, clergy mediation efforts may well have led politicians toward a more mutually respectful, cooperative relationship and approach. The next section addresses the question of how clergy efforts translated into an effect on the peace process as a whole.

**Influence on the peace process**

In addition to the cumulative effects of individual, communal, and politician influence, clergy made an impact on the peace process itself. The political deficit caused by government dysfunction gave clergy peacebuilders increased opportunities to influence the political sphere. Clergy operated in three main capacities to influence the peace process. In the context of the political vacuum, clergy possessed the expert and
legitimate power to 1) bring together groups who otherwise refused to meet or speak; 2) build trust over time; and 3) normalize political cooperation among fractured communities.

*Filling in the deficit*

When normal political structures fail, clergy can step in and function to resolve an impasse or provide alternative forms of governance. Recent decades in Northern Ireland constituted a volatile period, wherein normal political processes broke down. Michael Brown explains, “Governmental instability is a typical concern within weak states who are especially prone to violent internal conflict because of a lack of both political legitimacy and the ability of state institutions to control its territory.” In these circumstances, clergy have the credibility, authority, and resources to function more effectively than politicians. Clergy peacebuilders sometimes find themselves uniquely positioned to help overcome political stalemate or provide institutional support. Cynthia Sampson notes,

> In societies in which the government is widely viewed as illegitimate, or centralized authority has broken down altogether, organized religion may be the only institution retaining some measure of credibility, trust, and moral authority among the population at large. Perhaps most significant to peacebuilding, religious actors who are indigenous to conflict situations
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are long-term players who come from and work with the peoples and groups in the conflict throughout its life cycle.⁴⁷⁹

The “Troubles” in Northern Ireland exhibited exactly this sort of governmental vacuum, wherein clergy can make a difference. Political unrest prompted the British government to dissolve Stormont in 1972 and govern Northern Ireland directly from Westminster. John Morison (2006) notes that the democratic deficit in Northern Ireland during more than twenty-five years of direct rule allowed the voluntary sector to play a significant role in policy development, provision of services, and conflict resolution. Citizens considered the voluntary sector to have local expertise and to be un politicized, which qualities allowed it to engage in a uniquely effective form of civil governance. Morison further argues that despite currently active political and governing structures of the NIE, the voluntary sector continues to provide crucial forms of service provision and policy development. Moreover, the voluntary sector addresses issues of social exclusion, human rights, equality, planning, and peacebuilding. These contributions bolster consultation and participation; thus, they strengthen democracy.⁴⁸⁰ Morison advocates for “alternative spaces” to help democracy function effectively:

If political discourse is to be widened beyond the debating chambers of the Northern Ireland Assembly, where politicians register their tribal affiliation and must struggle to act in ways that transcend it, then a widening of the political space is required…We must look instead at ways of thinking about public power that cut across the traditional boundaries and reflect better how governance now actually occurs. Ideas of governmentality, developed from the work of the French theorist Michel

⁴⁷⁹ Sampson., p275.
⁴⁸⁰ Morison., p244-5.
Foucault, inform us that power is exercised indirectly and at a distance by a whole range of active subjects who not only collaborate in the exercise of power but actually shape and inform it.\textsuperscript{481}

According to Morison, active subjects such as clergy can collaborate and influence the governance of their political entity. Through their peacebuilding efforts, especially at the structural and communal level of mediation, advocacy, and bridge-building, clergy participated in nontraditional forms of governmentality, which helped to shape the political sphere. Several clergy testify to this phenomenon, such as the following description from Philip:

Church efforts really were helping contribute to the ending of violence and the ceasefire. All the contacts built credibility, with everyone working toward same democratic agenda. Clergy helped repair the ceasefire after it broke down, as well. The Church helps—it has an urgent role—where politics breaks down, and people aren't talking. Once you have a ceasefire, a peace process, it is up to the politicians. Churches broke the deadlock so it could move forward. Northern Ireland is small; these contacts created a pool of people who had hope.”

Philip’s account describes how clergy worked in the alternative spaces of governance in Northern Ireland. The political situation in Northern Ireland from the 1960s through the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 involved such poor leadership, so much partisan distrust, and such ineffective governance, that increasing space opened in the sectors of voluntarism and community organizations. Feargal Cochrane (2005) observes, “To put it simply, those who wanted to make a contribution in the areas of social or economic policy during the 1970s and 1980s were more likely to be attracted to

\textsuperscript{481} Morison, 2006, p248.)
NGOs rather than to political parties, which were deadlocked and relatively powerless, their focus almost exclusively on the constitutional debate." Cochrane argues that civil society made important, long term contributions to the peace process via the progressive social and political changes it achieved. As a powerful part of civil society, clergy stepped into the void and worked for progress toward a stable peace.

**Three capacities: Bridges, trust, and cooperation**

Other clergy accounts further develop and concretize how clergy operated in several key capacities in the political vacuum: 1) they brought together groups who otherwise refused to meet or speak, 2) they built trust over time, and 3) they normalized political cooperation among fractured communities. The following section discusses Capacities 1 and 2, with related clergy narratives. Previous sections have already discussed the ability of outgroup contact to normalize further cooperation through indirect exposure; clergy narratives provided below also exhibit this capacity 3 effect.

As mentioned in previous chapters, clergy worked to convince political, paramilitary, and community leaders to meet and negotiate. This Capacity 1 bridge-building work overcame a major impasse common to peace processes. Hampson (1996) notes that the early stages of peace processes frequently stall out due to the inability to get the parties to sit down together, negotiate, and build momentum toward an
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agreement. Luttwak (1994) and Johnston (1994) similarly argue that religious actors have a unique potential to mediate in the context of a debilitating impasse, and this ability contributes a vital contribution that can significantly affect the length and overall success of the settlement.

Capacity 2 involves trust-building, which also significantly impacts the peace process. Clergy develop the ability to foster trust in their pastoral work, which helps their parishioners feel less frightened or threatened by efforts to move them toward reconciliation. In addition, the trust clergy cultivated during secret meetings between representatives of the two communities directly impacted negotiations. As I have already shown, high quality out-group contact increases trust because it reduces negative emotions toward the out-group, increases positive emotions, and involves reciprocal self-disclosure. Johnston (1994) asserts “Without the higher level of trust elicited by [religious actors’] involvement, breakthroughs to settlement would undoubtedly take longer or might not take place at all.” Trust also affects the post-agreement stage of the peace process, in which the parties and their communities must continue to cooperate to restructure a divided society. Borris & Diehl claim, “The key factor for the reconciliation process is trust. If for whatever reason trust is not established, reconciliation will not
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In the unstable political stalemate, clergy mediators earned the trust of representatives of the two communities and also helped them trust each other. That trust made possible important breakthroughs and progress, both before and after the ceasefire and peace accord.

Earned trust can combine with legitimate power further to enhance the negotiations. Luttwak (1994) notes that in a political impasse, clergy peacebuilders improve the quality of the negotiations. To the degree that clergy peacebuilders have legitimate and expert power as religious authority figures, negotiating parties can make concessions in deference to that authority rather than to their opponents. While concessions to an antagonist often feel like a betrayal and may alienate one’s constituency, concessions to mutually accepted and respected religious values and their representatives can avoid the perception of weakness. By this influence, clergy peacebuilders expand the range and quality of negotiating positions and solutions, and enhance the probability of agreement.

Philip’s continued account illustrates Capacities 1 (bridge-building) and 2 (trust-building): “Sinn Fein were so ostracized and marginalized that nobody would talk to them. We brought together the three strands of Sinn Fein, SDLP, and Dublin on one democratic project, so then they could deal with the Unionists and British.” Here, Philip names two important accomplishments: First, clergy helped bridge the social and political taboo that prevented anyone from talking to Sinn Fein. Second, this bridge slowly
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generated enough trust to unify the three strands of Nationalism, which could then negotiate effectively and participate in a peace process.

Richard’s also develops Capacity 3 (normalized cooperation): “We paved the way for the DUP to power-share with Sinn Fein because we were the first ever to have a public conversation with Sinn Fein. And Ian Paisley condemned us loudly, etc, but it became normalized twelve years later. These dialogues with Sinn Fein helped Gerry Adams make his case with the IRA.” Simon describes those same themes, and he further explains Capacities 2 (trust-building) and 3 (normalized cooperation):

We broke the taboo of talking to Sinn Fein… We built trust over time, so people could come to us when they were ready to take the next step… These were crucial, key facilitated meetings… In a peace process, when you go to the theatre, and the curtain is pulled, you see leading players on stage: leading man, leading lady. But in order for that moment, before that moment takes place, you’ve had people shifting the scenery, moving the furniture around. You’ve had people adjusting the light to bring light in to dark corners, you’ve had people helping to write the script and rewrite the script, so that when the curtain is pulled, the focus goes on the leading players as is rightly there. And it doesn’t matter a button really who moved the furniture, who rearranged the scenery, who fixed the lights, and who helped with the script. The main thing that happens is, we’re now ready for the show to move, and that’s to me the image that I share. And there were all sorts of people in behind the curtains helping all of those different tasks, in order for those people to come to the front stage. So Martin MacGuinness and Ian Paisley appear on stage: leading man, leading lady, whatever; there are a whole lot of people behind those curtains who enabled those roles to happen.
Simon’s description of “theatre workers” who set the stage refers partially to his secret, “behind the scenes” meetings where top-level politicians negotiated the terms of peace. Moreover, it also refers to the way these meetings built trust and gradually normalized the idea of power sharing.

However, Simon’s modest statement, “it doesn’t matter a button who moved the furniture” gives insufficient credit to his contributions. Simon earlier quotes a Sinn Fein leader, who said, “It’s a Methodist door, and it doesn’t close.” According to George Mitchell, lack of trust posed the biggest obstacle to forming and implementing a peace agreement, especially regarding decommissioning. The strong trust Simon built with Sinn Fein eventually led the IRA to choose Simon to oversee the decommissioning of their arms. Colin McInnes (2006) calls decommissioning the most “critical and controversial” facet of the peace process, because it encapsulates the issues of violence and trust. John Darby (2006) labels the decommissioning issue a severe recurring threat to the peace process. Darby notes, “The stubbornness of the UUP in demanding decommissioning and of Sinn Fein in rejecting it, however irritating, arose from the need of each side to keep its primary constituency on board and from the symbolic association between decommissioning and surrender.”

Simon also described the importance of decommissioning, both symbolically and as an obstacle to a stable peace:

[Decommissioning] was a very difficult thing for the Republican movement to deal with. Within the constitution of the IRA, there are two crimes in their view, which are punishable by death in the old constitution:

---

492 McInnes.
493 Darby., p221.
one is to inform, and the second is to surrender your arms. So how do you get a movement to come to the place where it will deal with its arms in a way that is verifiable and acceptable both to your movement and to your enemies? That’s a huge challenge. General de Chastelain and the International commission had to work for years with the IRA to find a formula that would be acceptable to the IRA, acceptable to the British and the Irish governments, and acceptable to the Unionist people. And they came up with such a formula: put your arms beyond reach and beyond use. But it could not be seen as surrender, it must be something they had to voluntarily do, choose to be a part of. That was a huge challenge.

But then the suggestion was, “How do we believe it?” Unionists wanted photographs. Paisley in particular said, “We’ve got to have photographic evidence; there’s no way we can believe this unless our eyes can see it.” We found a compromise. Paisley didn’t consent, but he didn’t have any choice. It was agreed if there were 2 clerical witnesses: one Catholic and one Protestant, to oversee this, to come back and verify it, that that should be sufficient. So it would be three years ago now all of this was to happen, because I was supposed to go out to – there was big guessing as to who should be the Protestant minister. All sorts of well-known people were being guessed. My name never got guessed. I used to sit here and watch television and hear all these names. I knew I had been asked, but my name never came to the surface because what I’d been involved in was all so discreet, that Republicans trusted me in a way that they weren’t quite so sure about all these other people who were always talking about this that or the other thing. And again, I think it’s the value of just quietly getting on with it, building your relationships, meeting quietly in places, not shouting about it, not telling everybody about what you’d done and all the rest of it. They asked me.
Only a social agent with significant earned referent and expert power can achieve that high level of trust. The IRA must have believed that Simon acted without any agenda beyond his commitment to build JustPeace.

**Discussion: How much did it all matter?**

Despite these dramatic stories, clergy contributions can still seem insignificant in the world of sponsor states, military might, and high political maneuvering. Authors such as Frank Wright (1987) discuss Northern Ireland power dynamics entirely in terms of international power brokers, armies, and threats of violence.\(^\text{494}\) For many years, as I have shown in my introduction and elsewhere, diplomats and scholars of International Relations resisted the idea that psychology or grassroots and middle-tier peacebuilding efforts could make any valuable contribution.\(^\text{495},\text{496},\text{497}\) William Davidson (1981) and Joseph Montville (1981, 1987) began to change the attitude toward unofficial peacebuilders with their discussion of “Track Two diplomacy.”\(^\text{498},\text{499}\) Davidson & Montville (1981) argue that psychological strategies in workshops by unofficial, middle tier or grassroots actors can complement official, high level diplomatic conflict resolution efforts. Montville (1987) later expanded the concept to include any strategic efforts to improve perceptions of the outgroup, support conciliatory measures, and cooperate to enhance the attractiveness and economic benefits of conflict resolution. After decades of
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study, practitioners have moved on from the question of whether Track Two diplomacy helps conflict resolution; now they work to refine exactly how to maximize its important contributions through careful coordination with Track One efforts.500,501,502

The conflict in Northern Ireland has many facets, and the causes scholars identify shape the solutions they propose. As I have discussed, some scholars view the conflict in Northern Ireland as primarily ethnic/national,503,504,505,506,507,508 others as colonial509, territorial,510 economic,511,512 psychological,513,514 or religious.515 Scholars describe a range of ways and degrees to which religion caused or exacerbated the conflict.516,517,518,519 If identity forms a key component of the conflict, which many
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scholars agree that it does, solutions must incorporate strategies to address identity issues. While coercive and reward power may suffice to settle purely economic or territorial conflicts, they have less ability to ameliorate the cultural violence inherent to an identity conflict. Clearly, the legitimate, referent, and expert power of clergy can help to deconstruct cultural violence and build cultural peace, especially when the identity conflict has a religious component.

*Types of power*

While most clergy believe their efforts had a moderate, but important, impact, Richard and Ben present almost polar opposite perceptions of whether/how much clergy affected the peace process. Although Richard mentions that “A handful of individuals like Lloyd Eames and Roy McGee, Ken Newell – have been effective mediators between paramilitaries and government or political leaders,” he nonetheless maintains the Realist view that clergy efforts make no difference in the world of dominant state and international interests. Moreover, Richard prefers that separation. He self-identifies as Anabaptist and says, “I want the church to be marginal. I don't care about church influence, only faithfulness.” In contrast, Ben argues that grass-roots, local progress accomplishes much more to achieve a society capable of peace than the rhetoric of high ranking leaders. Consider the difference: Richard asserts,

> Our identity as Christians involves loyalty to the Kingdom of God, tolerance – not power. Fundamentally, we have a political agreement
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today on the one hand because the British state so compromised the IRA through agents and so on, and because the British state held onto a view of what the final settlement would look like, and buttoned/bolted this place down until we got to a place where our political leaders were prepared to accept it, herded us all towards that point. People say, "We're only here because of the violence." Paisley discovered what every Unionist leader has known since 1968: there’s only one way out of this – and nobody, not the British, the international community, Americans, Europeans, all the people with power here, nobody is going to tolerate any other way, other than sitting down and sharing power with your Catholic neighbors. In that world of high politics, and of economic clout, and power, and the legal use of violence, and the illegal use of violence, the church is totally marginal. During the early 70s to late 80s – that 15-20 year period, essentially the condemnation of the church, the marching of the Peace People – made not one iota of difference to the amount of violence the IRA and Loyalist paramilitaries carried out. They just got on with it. What made the difference was – and this is the nature of the terrorist campaign here – their own judgments at times that to push this any further would spill this over into an all out civil war, and the capacity of the paramilitaries on either side to conduct that sort of campaign was limited.

When Richard calls the church “marginal,” he refers to the idea that churches have little ‘coercive power.’ Coercive power arises from a perceived ability to mediate punishments. How much coercive power a social agent has depends on how big a punishment s/he can inflict for disobeying the agent’s wishes, and whether a person can avoid the punishment by conforming to the agent’s wishes. Richard may also refer to ‘reward power.’ Reward power comes from a perceived ability to mediate rewards, such
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as resources or conformity to group norms in order to gain acceptance. Richard is correct – churches and clergy do not have big carrots or sticks. The use of coercive and reward power by Great Britain, the Republic of Ireland, the USA, and the IRA certainly shaped and stabilized the GFA. Stefan Wolff (2001) points out that if the GFA fails, rather than return to direct rule (a reward for unionists), the two countries would jointly govern the province, a situation both unionists and nationalists wish to avoid.  

My argument is that clergy do not use coercive or reward power; rather, they use legitimate, referent, and expert power to influence their communities and the higher level agents who do have power to reward or punish. Richard referred to this process when he previously identified some individual clergy who acted as effective mediators. In the midst of his discussion of realpolitik power, he specifically mentions Catholic Father Alec Reid:

Al Reid helped Adams set up a pan-nationalist front and set up meetings with Hume. The security forces opened up a dialogue through Brendan Duddy and Denis Bradley in Derry with Martin McGuinness. So they were talking directly to the IRA, while Al Reid was facilitating two dialogues. One was a political dialogue across the Irish government, while Sinn Fein were having their dialogue with Irish America, the Irish government, and with John Hume. That got Hume, Adams, the Irish government, and Irish America on board. It was two armies talking to each other. And so those two axes were where all the power was. And the church conversation was an identity conversation, primarily, with an element of power to it, if that makes sense.
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Clergy mediators strengthened and improved the relationships among the parties who do have coercive and reward power; they also affected which parties sat at the table. Several clergy brought paramilitary representatives into the negotiations, without which the GFA would likely have collapsed as Sunningdale did. Wolff (2001) argues that in light of its somewhat shaky popularity in the Unionist political parties, the support of the loyalist paramilitaries lent crucial strength to the GFA. In contrast, Sunningdale excluded Republican and loyalist paramilitaries, who continued active campaigns of violence and further radicalized the two communities. The IRA and the loyalist paramilitaries helped to design the GFA, which gave them incentive to maintain cease-fires and sanction the final product.\footnote{Ibid., p12.}

The importance of identity

International actors, political leaders, and paramilitary leaders play an obvious and important role in the Northern Ireland peace process. However, exclusive focus on those levels ignores other noteworthy types of power in society, which can make or break an accord. Dixon (2006) argues that International Relations scholars such as Frank Wright, Adrian Guelke, and Michael Cox have over-emphasized the international dimension in Northern Ireland, which Dixon claims was not actually necessary to the process or the passage of the GFA. Dixon agrees with the general consensus that international political actors contributed significantly to the peace process and the establishment of a joint government. However, persisting, strong sectarianism continued
to threaten to destabilize the peace. Michael Cox (2006) declares, “the wonder is not that the executive finally fell when it did, but that it lasted as long as it did.” Even Wright (1987) admits that any power sharing agreement will work only if it has the support of both communities.

Moreover, because clergy mediators understand the importance of identity, trust, and agency, their contributions to the peace process helped shape the GFA into a much stronger accord, with greater chance of success than the Sunningdale Agreement of 1973. As Joseph Montville (1987) says, “There is a major difference between settlement of a conflict, and resolution of a conflict.” The “identity piece” Richard mentions is far from marginal; it undergirded the entire peace process. For example, while the two agreements include almost identical core structures for a consociational settlement, the GFA contains important additional safeguards, such as veto powers, to reassure unionists that they would have a say in future decisions. Another significant difference involves the method of execution. A government decree implemented Sunningdale, whereas the populations of Northern Ireland and the Republic voted on the GFA referendum. The increased sense of ownership the referendum provided helps buffer disgruntlement. These alterations address the importance of identity; in so doing, they help stabilize the peace process.
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Mitchell (2006) agrees that the churches influence the situation in matters of identity rather than in matters of coercive and reward power: “The churches have little participation in political structures, administration and decision making, but play a continued role in tone setting, consultation and diagnosis of the political situation.”\textsuperscript{529} Richard echoes this assessment and describes the “identity piece” contributions from ecumenical, religious, and community sectors as follows:

Our influence was with individuals, identity, mood – not power or political players. Fundamentally, the peace accord we have was made up of British and Irish governments holding their position, of people, parties like the Alliance Party holding their position, of more ecumenical groups like Corrymeela holding theirs, then us coming in from the evangelical position to comment on faith, politics, national identity as well, the community sector, bridging community groups – between those 5 groups: governments, parties like alliance and SDLP, the ecumenical world, the evangelical world represented by ECONI, and the wider community sector – they created the space through which the agreement was eventually reached. Of course, the harder part is getting the more extreme parties to buy into that, which is now all done. Now they have political supremacy, which is very hard to watch, but it’s the right thing.

Richard agrees that clergy influenced the political process in the above three capacities (bring together opposing groups, build trust, normalize cooperation). He also says those activities “created the space through which the agreement was eventually reached.” He nonetheless assigns clergy influence marginal importance in the overall

\textsuperscript{529} Mitchell, p55.
peace process because he attributes the important progress to the parties who hold coercive power.

Ironically, Richard states previously that God answers prayers by sending Christian peacemakers. That statement reveals his conviction that clergy peacebuilders did influence the peace process; otherwise, why would God send them? Later, he argues that clergy peacebuilder activities, which by definition include his secret IRA meetings, had no effect on the peace process. Taken together, Richard’s theological construct seems to give very little power to prayer, or to God’s ability to intervene in human affairs in any way: an uncommon view for an evangelical! As mentioned above, he exhibits the disillusioned burnout common to activists whose achievements fall short of their hopes. He admitted as such and told me I had caught him “on a bad day,” and “in a bad mood.”

Also, Richard tries hard to give a nuanced view, which includes complicated perspectives on a confusing and multivalent situation. He acknowledged, “I’m all over the place.” Richard’s true opinion about how much ECONI programs and local clergy influenced the peace process lies somewhere between his strong personal convictions and his pessimistic Realist burnout.

As Track Two diplomacy gains traction, scholars also assign more importance to the ‘mood’ and ‘tone’ contributions of peacebuilders, as well as the types of influence they employ. Hampson (1996) discusses several factors that contribute to the success or failure of peace agreements. One such factor, the “ripeness” of the situation, refers to the level of openness to settlement the parties exhibit. Hampson argues that this ripeness depends on many factors, which include cost benefit analysis of violence vs. peace as a
means to achieve goals. However, ripeness can also develop when parties change the way they view the conflict, from a zero-sum game to a more cooperative understanding of how they may work together with the opposition to achieve mutual benefit.\textsuperscript{530} Montville (1987) asserts that Track Two diplomacy can develop ripeness: it can sway public opinion, pressure politicians to make peace, and create a favorable climate for Track One negotiations.\textsuperscript{531} Hemmer et al. (2006) explain that negotiations take place in a dynamic, negotiable context; Track Two diplomacy improves this context when it enhances communication between the parties and influences public opinion. As individuals, and especially community organizations, negotiate peaceful intercommunal relations, these coordinated activities unite the society and produce increased democratization and increased grassroots power to influence official negotiations.\textsuperscript{532}

Some scholars and practitioners rate the ‘mood’ contributions of Track Two diplomacy as among the most crucial factors in peace processes. Frederic Pearson (2001) argues that the two structural dimensions that most affect the success of an ethnopolitical peace process are how well it handles identity issues and whether it proceeded in a top-down or bottom-up fashion. Without grass-roots participation throughout the process, constituents may refuse to accept the bargains made by their representative negotiators.\textsuperscript{533} Doyle & Sambani (2006) measure the success of peacebuilding by its sustainability; they name the degree of intergroup hostility in the postwar environment as the first of three
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With regards to the ‘mood’ in Northern Ireland, Richard specifically mentions the “Peace People,” a movement during the early 1970s in which Mairead Corrigan, Betty Williams, and Saidie Patterson organized thousands of Protestants and Catholics to march for peace in protest of increased sectarian killings. While Richard correctly observes that the Peace People marches did not end the Troubles, Henderson (1994) notes that the movement directly caused a short-term reduction in sectarian violence.\footnote{Michael Henderson, \textit{All Her Paths Are Peace : Women Pioneers in Peacemaking}(West Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press, 1994).} Sean Byrne (2001) further asserts that the Peace People shaped a new generation of grassroots peace activists.\footnote{Byrne., p340.} Cochrane (2006) also asserts that though civil society had only an indirect impact on the political process, it contributed to a constructive climate, alleviated the suffering of affected people, and supported politicians who sought to reach a settlement –
all vital roles to the survival and movement of the peace process. The combined ‘mood’ efforts of peacebuilding clergy, parachurch organizations, and secular civil society groups allowed a critical mass of citizens to redefine their identities from hostile exclusion to cooperative inclusivity. This inclusive identity created a constructive mood, which gave the peace process strength to reach and survive past the agreement stage.

The power of soft power

Richard argues that clergy peacebuilders have no power to influence the peace process. In contrast to Richard’s analysis, Ben rates the bases of power differently. As a result, Ben places the locus of both power and progress solidly at the grassroots level:

Duncan Morrow, who is Chief Executive of the Community Relations council, and a Presbyterian elder, said, “I have a council. I have a budget. I have staff. I have an organization. And there’s nothing we can do in your part of the world, nothing. The only people who can do anything about it are the churches.” Which begins to connect with our comment about the role of the local church. We live there, move, have our being. And Duncan has always been very, very supportive of churches; he’s a fine Christian man. But heading a government council, he’s now overtly saying increasingly in public, “Churches are the only people who can oversee the reconciliation processes, the building of community relations in these fractured communities.” Now, that doesn’t go down well with the community activists or political leaders, so there are all sorts of sensitivities there. But he’s now saying that. You sow ideas in people’s minds, and you leave them to gestate for a wee while. Then you get back to them, and they think they’re their ideas – not because churches have a
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monopoly on the truth, but because they are the only stable, local, long-term, value driven constituent part of those communities.

Ben’s perception of the power and influence of clergy peace efforts stems partly from his own work and partly from the testimony of government officials, who express confidence in the churches’ unique ability to further community relations and reconciliation. Mitchell (2006) observes clergy-politician relations with suspicion and argues that these relationships entail a mutual power-grab:

Politicians recognize that the churches play a unique social role in their respective communities and have an ability to reach a wide audience. Thus, most politicians have prioritized their relationship with the churches, remaining on friendly terms, consulting with them on political and cultural issues and often working in partnership with them. This adds legitimacy to political actors who in return often shy away from introducing policies that would incur the churches’ opposition.540

According to Mitchell, statements such as Morrow’s reveal sly political maneuvering to preserve political power and church partisan interests; this assessment doubtless applies to some clergy. However, clergy peacebuilders carefully protect their earned trust, which preserves their legitimate power. Ben recalls:

I remember a senior public servant rang me up a couple of years ago. She was talking, “You know why we use you so much in our office? You are the only person we talk to who doesn’t have an agenda.” I said, “I do have one.” She said, “You don’t have a political agenda. You’re not out to get something from us or get one over on the other side.” I said, “I do have an agenda.” Even the police are not independent – they want the quietest life
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possible. Politicians want power, paramilitaries want territory, and I think it is in the nature of Christian ministry to start—it ought to be the nature of Christian ministry—to start humility, service, valuing people, trying to bring the mind of Christ into whatever situation is around you.

Ben asserts that clergy peacebuilders have the referent and legitimate power best suited to influence their communities precisely because they reject coercive or reward power. Clergy peacebuilders promote the wider good rather than partisan interests. Not all Track Two diplomacy maintains idealistic purity, and their referent power suffers in consequence. Civil society contains many diverse types of organizations, which operate differently and have different kinds of effectiveness. These organizations sometimes separate means from ends in a way that diminishes their referent and legitimate power.

The ‘YES’ Campaign started as an idealistic group dedicated to positive, inclusive messages and an uplifting, hopeful vision. However, they abandoned their visionary approach and resorted to intentionally negative, manipulative campaign techniques in order to counter similar techniques from obstructionist politicians.\textsuperscript{541} The ‘YES’ Campaign likely bolstered support for the GFA, which gave the accord a stronger mandate and more lasting stability.\textsuperscript{542} However, the Campaign’s choice to enter the sphere of political power maneuvers forced it also to promise that it would close down
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operations immediately following the referendum.\footnote{Richard A. Couto Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations Vol. 12, No. 3, The Third Sector in Ireland, North and South (September 2001), pp. 221-238.} In contrast, the hundreds of clergy who added their support to the ‘YES’ Campaign, including the well known Ken Newell,\footnote{Online Network BBC, "Churchmen Back Yes Campaign," (1998).} had the freedom to continue their long-term peacebuilding efforts unabated.

Richard expresses the same sentiment about the need to reject coercive and reward power:

There is real power and economic disparity; all the church can do is subvert it. There’s a wonderful powerfulness in its powerlessness. I will always be at the margin of that conversation. Because the history of the Church has shown that once the Church says, “We will grab hold of that power, and we will manage it,” it also then becomes corrupted by it. But neither does my Anabaptism run to the sense of that because you’re Christian you shouldn’t participate in any institutions of the state or business. How do you then relate your religious values to a public square that is contested – that is no longer sacred, nor is it totally secular?

Richard perceives that because clergy peacebuilders do not employ coercive and reward power for professional gain, as politicians do, they possess “a wonderful powerfulness” to subvert injustice at the hands of coercive power. In a review of Track Two religious diplomacy case studies, Douglas Johnston (1994) describes the interplay between these different sources of power:

Strategic nonviolence is inherently corrosive to a violence-based system. It is also useful in fostering a spirit of self-examination and confession that can mitigate the tendencies toward intolerance and self-righteousness that often lead to violence… the church functions most effectively as an
advocate for social change when it possesses and exploits the following attributes: institutional stability and moral authority, a capability for empowering individuals to act, a commitment to nonviolence.  

Even huge amounts of power, if they operate in violent ways, cannot guarantee peace. Doyle & Sambani (1996) observe that when “peace enforcement” uses coercive power, such as the United Nations actions in Bosnia and Somalia, it can amount to “war-making.” Unlike the zero-sum nature of Track One diplomacy, Track Two efforts build relationships so that communities can work cooperatively to find solutions to their shared problems into the future. When churches renounce coercive powers such as violence and political authority, they gain referent power and add to the legitimate power of their institutional stability and moral authority. These powers corrode the coercive dominance of violent systems. Johnston notes that clergy peacebuilders possess a combination of assets that strengthen these forms of power, such as a record for humanitarian efforts, community respect for religious values, earned trust, leverage for intercommunal mediation, the ability to mobilize support locally and through national and international denominational connections, and an embedded, local, long-term presence for post-settlement peacebuilding.

Despite their commitment to non-coercive forms of power, Track Two actors such as Richard often lament their lack of clout. Johnston (1994) notes, “the realpolitik aspects of any given situation always loom large, if not overwhelming; but these studies show
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that religious factors can also be significant. In all probability, their special contributions could not have been achieved by comparable secular efforts.\textsuperscript{549} Richard’s hopes and frustrations represent the feelings of other Northern Ireland peacebuilders from the civil sector. Thiessen et al. (2010) found that NGO leaders expressed significant pessimism about the effectiveness of upper level political peace processes. They strongly feared that the macro-level politics would fail, and they felt frustrated by their powerlessness to affect that level. Like Ben, NGO leaders expressed most hope and optimism in the effectiveness of micro-level, grassroots peacebuilding work, in which they saw the most promising potential for building stable, lasting societal peace.\textsuperscript{550}

\textit{The need for multi-track efforts}

Some scholars now argue that to separate Track One from Track Two diplomacy implies a false dichotomy and denies the connected nature of social reality. Practitioners of geopolitics increasingly move away from a sole focus on elite leaders, who move pieces on a map to protect territorial security interests. Geopolitics now includes a robust discussion of how violence and security operate simultaneously at multiple levels: international and personal, global and local/intimate.\textsuperscript{551,552,553} Koopman (2011) provides a review of how critical, feminist, anti-, and alter-geopolitics recognize the power of
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grassroots activity, wherein people take responsibility for their own security. Grassroots activities change the rules, choose a different game, and arrange their own bodies on maps in ways that have global and international consequences.\textsuperscript{554}

Many scholars and practitioners of International Relations, diplomacy, and conflict resolution now agree that successful peace processes must include both Track One and Track Two diplomacy. Montville (1987) points out that elite leaders face considerable constituent pressure to guard the interests of their ingroup; constituents perceive concessions or even contact as betrayal.\textsuperscript{555} As mentioned above, Pearson argues that the success of an ethnopolitical peace process depends largely on whether it proceeded in a top-down or bottom-up fashion. Agreements between elite representatives often fail to garner acceptance among constituents.\textsuperscript{556} Lederach (1997) notes that top-down approaches to peacebuilding erroneously assume that successful peace agreements between elites will translate into peaceful relationships in the entire population.\textsuperscript{557}

Just as the levels of clergy influence interact synergistically to create ripple effects, build momentum, and enhance the overall movement from the cycle of violence to the cycle of peace, so also the cooperation of multi-track peace efforts increases the effectiveness of each track. In his book \textit{Making Peace Last}, Robert Ricigliano (2012) notes that the cooperative efforts of the range of peacebuilding actors interact to create an impact larger than the sum of their isolated activities. Ricigliano notes that increased
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cooperation will improve this synergy and raise the effectiveness of peace efforts. To this end, he advocates interdisciplinary collaboration and a systems approach, which can optimize the potential of the many, complex actors and components to build peace.\textsuperscript{558}

Top-down efforts alone did not succeed in Northern Ireland. Scott Appleby argues that earlier attempts to make peace in Northern Ireland failed because they neglected to include grassroots peacebuilders: “top-down structural processes devised, negotiated and implemented in the political area are unlikely to succeed in the absence of parallel and coordinated cultural initiatives designed to build the social infrastructures of peace.”\textsuperscript{559}

Byrne (2001) similarly states that between 1972 and the 1990s, the British and Irish governments tried to impose a power sharing consociational democracy through elites, with little middle-tier or grassroots participation. Byrne notes that international actors and elite representatives managed to contain and regulate the conflict, but not to build successful peace.\textsuperscript{560}

A number of authors agree that the power to build a stable peace generally eludes political leaders. Paul Bew (2006) outlines the three strands of the GFA, the types of coercive and reward power each major political actor holds in the post-GFA period, and how those powers cannot sufficiently protect stability or preserve the executive.\textsuperscript{561} Peter Shirlow (2006) argues that Northern Ireland politicians cannot make progress or bring about improved communal relations because they consistently promote atavistic loyalties
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in order to preserve their positions and policies. Shirlow observes, “Politics, despite change, still works on the mobilization of unionist-loyalist and republican-nationalist communities and, in some instances, on exploiting the narratives of violence and harm that have been created over the past thirty odd years of political turmoil.” Because coercive and reward power create systems that depend on punishments, prizes, and constant oversight, they cannot create the trust, cooperation, and unity required to build independent, self-sustaining peace. Wolff (2001) asserts that the success of the ongoing peace process in Northern Ireland depends on factors that politicians in Belfast, Dublin, and London have limited ability to influence, because it rests on the ability of the two communities to overcome their differences and cooperate.

Just as the Northern Ireland peace process needed clergy peacebuilders to work toward ripeness and overcome impasse, it needs clergy to continue their efforts to stabilize and strengthen peace. Cochrane (2006) finds that despite a sense of disenfranchisement and disempowerment, civil society and community groups continue to exert important influence on politics in Northern Ireland and affect peace, conflict, and stability in the region. Byrne (2001) states that middle-tier professionals, who can influence elites and grassroots, must engage in a complementary effort with elite power-sharing and grassroots participation in order to build sustainable peace in Northern
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Ireland. Track One and Track Two can work together to maximize overall effectiveness in complementary ways.

As my interviews show, in contrast to politicians, clergy peacebuilders refuse to exploit sectarian narratives; rather, they offer alternative narratives of a shared vision and future, which can help move communities to a more stable peace. When clergy peacebuilders renounce coercive and reward power and demonstrate their commitment to the greater communal good, they build referent power with government officials, civil servants, and their communities. This referent power maximizes their expert and legitimate power, and it broadens the accepted scope of their authority. These qualities contribute to the perception that clergy make the most effective peacebuilders ‘on the ground,’ in their communities. These types of power also give clergy peacebuilders the ability to ameliorate the identity component to conflicts, especially conflicts with a religious dimension. While Track One actors can construct strategically savvy accords and enforce structurally equitable policies, clergy peacebuilders have an uncommon, perhaps unique ability to develop and maintain a stable, deep, lasting peace.
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CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Summary of the content

This dissertation has used extensive interview material from twenty-one activist clergy of various faiths and personal backgrounds, along with a critical review of the academic literature on the topic, to explore the motivations, beliefs, behaviors, influence and effects of clerical peacebuilders on the peace process in Northern Ireland. The thesis has demonstrated the importance of clergy contributions in the long-term movement from conflict to peace agreement to sustainable peace. It has also examined the constraints on clergy efforts to build and maintain peace and has considered strategies to optimize clergy endeavors.

Research aims

This study set out to reveal how the interplay between religion and context shapes clergy activism for peacebuilding. It also scrutinized the effect of parishioner resistance on clergy attempts to lead congregations toward intercommunal reconciliation and positive peace. It sought to examine the activities by which clergy influence society and understand how clergy influence operates to achieve change. It asked to what degree clergy efforts made a difference in the peace process, and how to optimize the potential for clergy to build peace. Patterns common to all the clergy, as well as differences, were outlined. These patterns included the features that led these clergy to embrace inclusive ideals and an investigation of what separates bolder activists from their more timid colleagues. While referring to and critiquing scholarly literature, this study also recorded clergy contributions on their own terms, listened to and reported their perspectives, and
considered their opinions about what works and does not work, and to what degree. Through combining scholarly and human perspectives, this paper provided new insights about the constraints, scope, and potential of clergy peacebuilding efforts in Northern Ireland and, by implication, in other conflict zones.

**Summary of the findings**

All but one of these peacebuilder clergy have lived or traveled extensively outside of Northern Ireland and encountered compelling faith commitment in members of the outgroup and/or messages of inclusivity from authority figures of their own faith. One of the more significant findings to emerge from this study is that clergy with equally inclusive theological approaches exhibit significantly different levels of activism. These findings suggest that aside from a minority of particularly bold individuals, many clergy who believe in the importance of peacebuilding possess levels of risk-aversion that hamper their desire to engage in increased levels of activism. Parishioner hostility, a lack of denominational support, and an absence of colleague solidarity contribute to low clergy activism. However, some clergy seem to exhibit high risk-tolerance and strong leadership, which allow them to overcome these obstacles. The results of this investigation also suggest that clergy engage in a range of activities related directly or indirectly to peacebuilding. These pastoral, prophetic, and bridge-building activities influence society at individual, structural, and communal levels. While interviewees generally agree on their perceived effectiveness at the individual, congregational, and communal levels, only the most activist clergy believed they had the ability to affect the political peace process.
Implications

The results of this study indicate that perceived lack of expertise and perceived personal and professional risk, in the form of insufficient denominational or collegial support, constrain clergy activism. In particular, high levels of parishioner resistance greatly limit clergy peacebuilding efforts. Personal histories and character are additional factors that affect activism levels and effectiveness. Taken together, these results suggest that despite adhering to inclusive theology, risk-averse clergy prioritize congregational unity and professional, institutional, and personal survival over activist peacebuilding. The findings also suggest that clergy experience significantly different degrees of success in different parish settings. The implication is that a combination of leadership style, inherent risk-aversion, training, denominational and colleague support, and parish context determine the actual activism level of clergy who share similar theological commitments to inclusivity and peace.

The evidence from this study suggests that clergy employ referent, legitimate, and expert power in their attempts to influence individuals, structures, and communities. The results indicate that these forms of influence effect change in individuals, congregations, communities, politicians, negotiations, “ripeness” for peace, and peace maintenance. In particular, clergy possess distinct potential to provide optimal parameters for beneficial outgroup contact.

Significance of the findings

Although the current study uses a relatively small sample of participants, the depth and insights of the interviews, combined with analysis of the theoretical literature,
strongly suggest that insufficient training in strategic leadership and insufficient denominational and colleague support hinder clergy ability to build positive peace. Increased training and support would probably enable risk-averse clergy who hold an inclusive theological orientation to enhance their use of referent, legitimate, and expert power, strengthen their influence at individual, structural, and communal levels, and contribute increased levels of activism toward positive peace.

Despite its exploratory nature, this study offers insight into how the exceptional and everyday activities of a range of clergy peacebuilders affect various aspects of the Northern Ireland peace process. It confirms previous findings about the importance of civil society and religious actors in Track Two diplomacy and, by providing a comprehensive understanding of the beliefs, behaviors, and efficacy of a range of clergy peacebuilders, it contributes additional evidence that local clergy contribute more to positive peace than had been previously assumed. This is the first study to demonstrate through extensive interviews with activists that local clergy do possess the advantageous ability to use a unique combination of referent, expert, and legitimate power, and a holistic, intimate, deeply embedded relationship with constituents. The study of the importance of different types of social power provides support for the idea that while these clergy seem comparatively insignificant, they do in fact possess noteworthy levels of power to impact society. By identifying these advantages, we can optimize clergy peacebuilder potential in conflict zones. The current findings also add to our understanding of the interplay among various levels of influence and how different roles
and types of activism can interact synergistically to enhance “ripeness” for peace and peace maintenance.

Based on the findings, this study proposes that through contact hypothesis, indirect contact ripple effect, and the synergistic effect of the various types of activity and levels of influence, clergy peacebuilders in Northern Ireland increased “ripeness” for peace in the pre-agreement phase, improved the quality and success of negotiations and agreements, and strengthened positive peace and stability in the implementation and post-agreement period. In this way, clergy efforts complement (and are themselves complemented by) Track One peace work. Even relatively “passive” efforts wherein less activist clergy promote tolerance, forgiveness, inclusivity, love of one’s enemies, and other such general values, contributed to the growth of widespread forbearance and resistance to civil war and built a context conducive to the acceptance of the agreement. In these more passive cases, significant parishioner resistance constrained activism levels, and clergy likely provided the gentle, gradual persuasion needed to build “ripeness for peace” among their parishioners and communities. Clergy peacebuilders at all levels of activism possess sufficient referent, legitimate, and expert power, and sufficient access to society, substantially to impact the peace process.

The methods used for this in-depth interview-based ethnographic analysis of clergy attitudes and behaviors may be applied to other clergy peacebuilders elsewhere in the world. The current findings add to a growing body of literature on the highly contextual nature of peacebuilding efforts and the importance of local, embedded actors who can refine “bottom up” strategies to match the situation on the ground. Taken
together, these findings suggest an enhanced role for denominational structures and seminaries in promoting clergy peacebuilder activities, and a role for clergy in each stage of a peace process. The study has enhanced our understanding of how religion can contribute to peace.

**Limitations of the current study**

Finally, analysis of these findings needs to consider a number of important limitations. First, the relatively small number of interviewees limited quantifiable validity of the current investigation. The project used a convenience sample, which requires caution in attempts to transfer the results to any sort of broader representation. Moreover, the study included only one Presbyterian, and the three Catholic participants worked mainly in Redemptorist, Jesuit, and chaplain roles rather than as parish priests. Thus, the generalizability of these results extends mostly to Methodist and Church of Ireland clergy.

Specific aspects about the Presbyterian and Roman Catholic churches could significantly affect the levels of activism among their clergy. The Presbyterian Church has faced difficult challenges as the result of Ian Paisley’s decision to split from that church to form the fundamentalist Free Presbyterian Church, which espouses vehemently anti-Catholic, anti-ecumenical, and anti-power-sharing views. Moderate Presbyterian clergy have watched in dismay as their parishes bleed members to these more extremist congregations, which have opened doors all across the region. Presbyterian clergy may well constrain their activism compared with other Protestant denominations in the face of this continuing challenge.
The structure of the Roman Catholic Church may also constrain parish clergy more than Protestant churches. Catholic parish priests may feel more pressure than their Protestant counterparts to conform to official polity and to proceed through sanctioned methods and structures. Of the three Catholic interviewees, only Ted, who alone had done some parish work, expressed concern for his professional security and the need for secrecy regarding some of his views and actions. Moreover, parish priests may consider peacebuilding the provenance of Jesuits and Redemptorists and feel less responsible for it themselves. The presence of those more independent, activist orders, which engage in valuable prophetic and bridge-building activities, may persuade priests that their own scope of expertise lies primarily with pastoral work. These orders may resemble parachurch organizations more than local congregations; however, the connectedness of the Catholic ecclesial structure may provide these orders with levels of access beyond what most parachurch organizations enjoy.

On the other hand, several clergy mentioned joint bridge-building activities with their local parish priests. My inability to find more Catholic peacebuilders does not necessarily mean Catholic priests engage in less activism. Perhaps the Orders actually inspired greater activism among parish priests. With more time available to gain the trust of that community, I may well have discovered numerous Catholic clergy who exhibit equal activism levels to Protestants. The time constraints on field research limited my ability to enter the Presbyterian and Catholic communities, and the resultant small number of interviewees limits the scope of comparison in this study.
In addition, clergy with exclusive theology refused to grant interviews. Thus, the current study also could not analyze variables of theological commitment to inclusivity in order to examine the differences between inclusive vs. exclusive clergy. For that reason, this study did not address the differences in background, beliefs, and behaviors of clergy with different levels of theological inclusivity toward the religious outgroup. Another important limitation lies in the lack of lay survey data, which would have tested clergy perceptions of their influence against parishioner perceptions of clergy influence. Therefore, while this study compared clergy perceptions and evaluated the veracity of clergy perceptions based on scholarship, it had no means to measure differences between clergy opinions vs. the views of their parishioners. In addition, this study did not interview Track One actors to gauge their perceptions of clergy influence and thus examine the potential complementarities between Track One and Track Two efforts.

**Recommendations for further work**

This research has raised many questions in need of further investigation. For the debates about the significance of Track Two diplomacy, civil society, and religious peacebuilding efforts to move forward, scholars must develop a better understanding of the relationships between Track One and Track Two, and how clergy influence plays a role in that relationship. Considerably more work will need to be done to determine to what extent this study provides representative information and to assess the hypotheses of clergy contributions to “ripeness” for peace, synergistic influences, and contact exposure effects. Social scientists should examine the particularities of clergy-based outgroup exposure and what unique advantages or disadvantages those programs offer. Additional
work needs to be done to establish how well these results correspond to the clergy of different denominations across Northern Ireland and elsewhere. Further research should also investigate a broader range of clergy in order better to understand how clergy come to embrace or reject inclusive theology toward the religious outgroup, and how those differences affect their approaches to peacebuilding. A more detailed analysis of clergy peacebuilder theology would also determine whether theological differences correlate with differences in activism.

More information on lay perceptions of clergy influence would help establish the degree to which clergy impact their parishioners. Comparing experiences of individuals within the same churches would be useful for assessing trends and variations. In addition, studies of parishioner resistance and leadership style will provide insight about how clergy can build sufficient trust and referent power to engage in activism. Studies should also assess the effects of clergy efforts in longitudinal investigations of parishioner attitudes over time. Further research about the parameters and effectiveness of secular vs. clergy-led outgroup contact would help to determine whether and to what extent religious actors possess unique advantages for outgroup exposure benefits. In addition, the a study of the similarities and differences between clergy and secular civil society actors, such as visiting nurses and social workers, could shed light on how these different parts of civil society can best coordinate and complement each other. More broadly, a cross-national study ought to compare the similarities and differences in the beliefs, behaviors, and influence of peacebuilder clergy in other conflict zones including, for example, Christian and Muslim clergy activists in the Middle East. Further investigation and experimentation
into the effect of denominational support, inclusive theology, and seminary training in leadership and change theory is strongly recommended, to assess whether such programmatic changes affect clergy activist behaviors.

**Implications/recommendations for practice or policy**

These findings suggest several courses of action for denominations, seminaries, and Track One actors, in order to enhance the complementarity of their efforts. In addition to inclusive theology and ecumenical programs, denominational and seminary leaders should incorporate study of change theory, leadership theories, and the bases of power to clergy training, and provide stronger support for clergy to use their individual gifts to their greatest potential. By so doing, churches can maximize the capability of clergy activism to build positive peace in individuals, communities, and countries, and yet preserve the ability to for churches to “be church,” rather than be managed for secular or political interests. More denominational support and training in leadership strategies to implement change should be made available to seminary students and clergy. There is a definite need for denominations to reduce the perceived risk to clergy peacebuilding. Unless denominations adopt increased measures to reassure clergy that peacebuilding activities will enhance, rather than threaten their professional well being, only the least risk-averse clergy will engage in high levels of activism, and many clergy will continue to shape their efforts to represent, rather than lead, their congregations. This information can be used to develop targeted interventions intended to improve clergy capability to implement changes and address controversial issues, increase levels of intra- and
interdenominational support for clergy activism, and provide resources to help various forms of clergy leadership style and risk aversion.

Analysts should also take into account multiple types of clergy activity and levels of clergy influence when assessing the roles and effects of civil society religious peacebuilding. Unless governments adopt policies that consider non-coercive types of power, they will struggle to attain sustainable peace. Therefore, Track One actors, social psychologists, sociologists, and other social scientists should coordinate with local clergy in order to maximize “ripeness” for peace, contact exposure, and levels of influence. Track One and Track Two efforts need each other to succeed, and both can learn valuable insights from each other.

Another important practical implication involves the need to consider variation among churches, communities, and clergy personalities in order to design contextually appropriate strategies. A plausible option for tackling these issues might involve regular, structured meetings among local clergy, civil society actors, politicians, and analysts to discuss the multiple empirical, theoretical, and ethical factors within communities and how to optimize strategies and coordinate efforts. A key policy priority should therefore be to plan for the long-term inclusion of local clergy in peacebuilding efforts.

Discussion

Peace scholars such as Sean Byrne & Loraleigh Keashly (2000), Louise Diamond & Ambassador John McDonald (1996), and Thiessen et al. (2010) note that civil society peacebuilding works most effectively as one of multiple models, levels, and “tracks” of
interventions, which work together to transform conflict. In addition, Sampson (1997) observes that religion almost always contributes to successful peacebuilding efforts, but it operates by improvised and informal mechanisms. However, Sampson warns that secular efforts to harness religion for peace will backfire. While this study supports the idea that clergy should coordinate with parallel peace workers, it does not support recommendations to absorb or appropriate clergy peacebuilding into parachurch or secular efforts. Rather, parish clergy efforts contribute distinct elements that can complement Track One, secular, and parachurch work. Clergy operate in a unique personalized moral space in their communities. Attempts to manage religion from above destroy or delegitimize these on-the-ground activists.

Moreover, while religion can contribute to peace efforts, a better understanding of the power employed by religious actors and institutions will help clarify its potential and limitations. For example, analysts understandably assert that the denominations in Northern Ireland should have responded more quickly to the onset of the Troubles and changed the way they trained clergy, clearly defined the theological and ethical imperative for peace, and emphatically supported peacebuilding efforts. However, church leaders, seminary professors, and local clergy often have to overcome their own sectarianism, resistance to change, and a very understandable fear of social, professional,
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and physical punishment before they can lead others to do likewise. Moreover, churches and denominations must change slowly enough to preserve their legitimate power with their parishioners. Rapid change can cause the perception that a church is no longer the same known, trusted, historically situated and communally embedded institution.

Churches also have to make changes at a pace that will not make members feel abandoned and alienate large swaths of their membership, which would significantly undermine referent power and perhaps create negative referent power. Clergy also need to make changes in a way that will not split their congregations. Sometimes clergy push too hard, divide the community into factions, and then move on and leave the congregation in shambles. Clergy have a responsibility to help a congregation full of diverse members form an integrated community, maintain relationships when they disagree, and find ways to live with each other long after the clergyperson has moved to h/her next appointment. These obligations restrict the pace at which clergy and denominations can mobilize their members.

At the same time, these factors also ensure that clergy and denominations retain the continued capability to reach and influence their members. Thus, churches with large membership can contribute substantially to positive peace over time. Many people resist even positive change, and people especially resist change that calls into question the ethos that shapes their sense of worth and place. Successfully to implement broad changes entails enormous trust and “ripeness” for peace on the part of the members. The growth of sufficient trust requires time, painstaking effort, and enormous, widespread, long-term pastoral and bridgebuilding work. Clergy and denominational leaders must
maintain and build sufficient expert power, in a relationship of trust with the congregation, to convince a critical mass of members to follow them into unknown territory.

As these intersecting dialectical processes of change in clergy, denominational leaders, seminary professors, and parishioners happen simultaneously and gradually, they steadily build momentum. Denominational leaders and activist clergy persuade their institutions to move beyond sectarianism and embrace peacebuilding and vice versa. Clergy also encourage and enable parishioners to move beyond sectarianism and embrace peacebuilding work. Simultaneously, activist parishioners and parachurch organizations pressure denominations to change. These processes all reinforce each other over time, but each progress faces opposition. Scholars criticize churches because only a few “maverick” or “independent” leaders put their careers and lives on the line to work for peace.\(^{571}\) These judgments do not consider that just as only a small percentage of civilians feel comfortable with high-risk, progressive social activism and dramatic change,\(^{572}\) so also only a subset of clergy and denominational leaders possess the fortitude to risk everything for the sake of an ethical ideal. The most activist clergy helped their own institutions change so that these institutions could persuade the wider membership and communities over time. But the entire process requires sufficient trust to accept radical, vastly uncomfortable, threatening change. Churches can build this trust only if they preserve their legitimate, referent, and expert power. These forms of power and strategic
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pacing, while slow, nonetheless did produce some activist peacebuilders who were far ahead of their political counterparts.

Secular groups frequently want to harness the potential of churches and their far-reaching networks for ethical projects such as environmentalism or social justice. However, unlike many peacebuilders, clergy have numerous, wide-ranging additional duties. While clergy understand the importance of activism, their professional responsibilities require them to dedicate enormous time and energy to other demands. Clergy are rarely trained in activism or conflict transformation, and they mainly function as executive director to an institution and spiritual advisor or psychotherapist to their parishioners. While holistic definitions of positive peace align well with religious goals, activism constitutes only one facet of what it means to “be church.” No matter the context, churches always involve much more than one ethical issue. Even in a conflict zone, politicians ought not try to reduce religion to a project. If church becomes a humanist social justice venture, it is no longer church, and it will lose the broad referent, legitimate, and expert power that enables it to influence people, structures, and communities.

Practitioners must also avoid reducing clergy to mere ethical exemplars or social activists. An overemphasis on prophetic work, without the foundation of trust and referent power built by pastoral work, jeopardizes a clergyperson’s legitimate power. On one hand, clergy engage in prophetic work to paint a compelling vision and inspire parishioners to embrace change. On the other hand, clergy also understand that parishioners must take steps at a pace they can manage, so they will not freeze.
Parishioners look to their clergy to provide more than ethical guidance. They also seek spiritual enrichment, emotional replenishing, and comfort about the frightening parts of life. They come for healing and hope, and they often come exhausted and terrified. Intense pressure to get involved in a moral project will drive many people away. Talented clergy understand the need first to meet people where they are, and then to help them find courage to move forward. Clergy have the pastoral responsibility to minister to the whole person, which includes the need to treat parishioners with sensitivity and foster their spiritual, emotional, and ethical growth.

Too much orchestration can also inhibit creativity and limit the discovery of new and effective solutions. Sometimes leaders should allow people to discover the next steps for themselves, rather than hand them a script. Heavy-handed attempts to direct religion can restrict the creative ability of clergy and their parishioners to envision, build, and strengthen holistic, positive peace from the bottom up. Track One actors, civil society organizations, and even denominational leaders may also tailor their goals to preserve certain inequities of the status quo. Clergy peacebuilding requires sufficient independence to preserve its underlying ethical commitments. The preservation of legitimate power requires this autonomy, such that clergy do not develop too cozy a relationship with the purveyors of coercive and reward power.

In the end, peace efforts must find a balance that optimizes the potential for clergy to build peace while it preserves the very aspects of religious leadership that give clergy the power and influence to build peace. Carefully planned support, training, and coordination can achieve this balance. Politicians, analysts, and Track One actors can
include local clergy in broader peace processes in order to increase the effectiveness of each level and approach. Seminaries and denominations can investigate programmatic changes to incorporate useful scholarship, enhance clergy skills, and improve support mechanisms. In this way, clergy can take the benefits of such coordination and programs with them into their congregational work, where they have the influence to help implement and maintain peace. Moreover, Track One efforts will benefit both from greater understanding of the lived realities of constituents and from the increased efficacy of improved clergy peacebuilding.

_Scholars and politicians_

When peace efforts restrict religious interface to occasional input from denominational leaders and secret mediations by a handful of activist clergy, that narrow perspective limits potential benefits to the peace process. Politicians and analysts from various disciplines can help to optimize the combined efficacy of multiple types and levels of peace efforts if they maintain open and frequent communication with a variety of local clergy. Regular exchanges of information and perspective among various tracks and types of peacebuilders can increase awareness of how the local, communal, national, and international efforts affect each other, and to what degree secular plans and approaches align with local religious ethos. Track One actors can benefit from the in-depth perspectives of local clergy, who tend to have their finger on the pulse of communal sentiments. Analysts and Track One diplomats can strengthen clergy efficacy with theoretical and empirical information about the broader structures, implications, and objectives that surround and shape their congregational context and religious
peacebuilding efforts. When scholars and Track One actors take clergy peacebuilding efforts more seriously, clergy will likely respond with increased commitment and attempt to incorporate scholarly and political information that will help them to develop and improve their own efficacy. A mutually respectful partnership has the potential to benefit all associates and enterprises.

_Seminaries_

Many seminaries already teach inclusive theological underpinnings, though this training can always improve and strengthen. Theology can also incorporate increased study of ethics and praxis to demonstrate the holistic nature of ministry and show how all levels of clergy influence connect to change society and build positive peace. Prophetic and Pastoral work are not mutually exclusive, but complementary. Seminaries can teach clergy the sources and mechanisms of their power and agency, and their unique ability to make a difference. They can train clergy in pastoral care of traumatized persons, change theory, and leadership strategies. Training can present a variety of personality and leadership styles to discuss how each one can effect change, and how all clergy, regardless of personality or background, and all types of work can contribute to peacebuilding. Educators can train clergy in communication techniques for controversial topics, interpersonal disputes, and community divisions. Seminaries can provide examples for students and clergy of how to paint a compelling vision for their parishioners. They can offer continuing education opportunities and workshops to keep clergy abreast of current scholarship regarding peacebuilding. This thesis, based on interviews with activists, is meant to contribute to that process.
Denominations

Denominations can pair up more cautious clergy with bolder colleagues for mentoring and support. Clerical leaders and educators can list a variety of steps clergy and congregations can take to build holistic, positive peace, from the most simple and individual changes along to more radical and structural alterations, and encourage creative additions to the list. This kind of information would give clergy and congregations options from which to choose, so they could move forward at a pace and in a direction they feel works best. These steps could include a variety of communal missions, such as work with immigrants, access to healthy food, unemployment, youth work, or environmental issues. In each case, congregations could choose the issues that compel them most, and incorporate cross-community elements or other peacebuilding activities into the mission. Denominations can honor clergy and congregational efforts, especially difficult attempts to change, as well as reward successes. Denominations can also provide feedback mechanisms in order to listen to clergy perspectives and ideas. This feedback should particularly solicit opinions from working class clergy, who sometimes perceive that the ecumenical movement sneers at and ignores their perspectives and lived realities due to academic elitism. In addition, denominations can explore the relationship between parishes and other forms of ministry, such as the Catholic Orders, to maximize their complementarity and efficacy.

In 1985, Czech political dissident Václav Havel asked, “Is it within the power of the ‘dissidents’ – as a category of subcitizen outside the power establishment – to have any influence at all on society and the social system? Can they actually change
anything?"\textsuperscript{573} This study applies Havel’s query to local clergy in Northern Ireland and concludes that apparently powerless dissident clergy peacebuilders do indeed make an important difference. The optimization of their capacity to build peace requires further study. While analysts build helpful theories, these local field workers carry on their daily struggle in the gritty trenches of peacefare. Increased support, training, and collaboration can help clergy peacebuilders apply their unique blend of power and access to the construction of positive peace. Clergy peacebuilders continually help their societies walk toward a peaceful future: their door does not close. Their knowledge should be shared.

\textsuperscript{573} Václav Havel and John Keane, \textit{The Power of the Powerless : Citizens against the State in Central-Eastern Europe}\textit{(M.E. Sharpe, 1990).}, p23.
APPENDIX A: CLERGY INTERVIEW

Do you believe the world is divided into good and evil? Where does your religious community fall in that division, and where does the other religious community fall?

Do you believe your faith is ever worth dying for? Worth fighting for? In what situations? What is your view of violence? When is violence justified? How do you speak about violence to your congregation? What is your congregation’s view of violence and when it is justified? How do their views affect you?

What do you believe God’s purpose is, for your religious community in interacting with the other religious community? Is it conversion, repression, dialogue, mutual enrichment? How should people from your community go about working to achieve that purpose? What Bible stories, faith traditions, symbols, or doctrines are most relevant and useful in describing this relationship?

How do you speak about the other religious community to your congregation? What do you say, in describing them? What Bible stories, faith traditions, symbols, or doctrines are most relevant to talking about them? Do you believe conflicts between your communities are primarily religious or political?

How does your worship reflect your views on your role vis-à-vis the other religious community? What hymns, prayers, or other activities deal with this topic? How often do you preach about it? What sermon topics are most common for you?

What are your parishioners’ views of the other religious community? How do you respond to their views? How do their views affect you?

Have you or your congregation ever been involved in a dialogue with leaders or laity from the other religious community? If so, what was the result? Did it change your views of the other community? What did you communicate about this experience and your views to your congregation?

If not, why not? Would you be interested in such a dialogue at some point? Would you share the experience with your congregation or invite them to participate? Would you have any qualms about sharing the experience or inviting them?

How active in politics are you? Is your congregation aware of this activity, and do they approve of it? How much do you speak about sectarianism or politics to your congregation? What is the proper role for religion and religious actors in politics? Do you think your peacebuilding efforts made a difference? How much influence or effect did they have? Why do you think that is?
What should a person’s primary identity be? How loyal should a person be to the state? Can the state represent different religious communities equally? How would this look? What changes must take place in order to bring about peace and justice within the state? What sort of democracy or other system would best bring about a peaceful, just state? How would you/go you go about trying to influence its formation?
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