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Shilpi Shabdita
Introduction

Since 2000, Women in Security, Conflict Management and Peace (WISCOMP) has engaged extensively with various stakeholders of Jammu and Kashmir in an attempt to open up spaces for trust building and reconciliation. Over the last twelve years, through sustained engagement in the form of trainings and dialogues, it has built a strong network of peace animators in the state. In 2012 WISCOMP decided to deepen its engagement in the educational sphere, especially with youth and educators in the region.

The decision to start an Education for Peace initiative that focused specially on Jammu and Kashmir took root at a consultative workshop with members of civil society of the state in November 2010. Analysing the trajectory of the conflict in Jammu and Kashmir, participants, drawn from civil society, government, media persons and concerned citizens highlighted the lack of trust and sense of alienation from the rest of India, which was deeply entrenched in the youth of Jammu and Kashmir. These factors, it was noted, contributed significantly in fuelling the conflict. The political economy of violence, misallocation of funds, and unemployment in the state¹ which acquired alarming dimensions, particularly for the educated youth, created a sense of acute frustration and disconnect from the story of ‘Emerging India’.

The young people of Jammu and Kashmir did not trust either the Indian government or the civil society in the country which was accused of remaining largely insensitive to the plight of the Kashmiris. ‘They have failed to prioritize the protracted conflict in the mainstream national agenda, earning the bitter resentment of the Kashmiri youth’.²

---

¹ NSS Survey 2011 highlights that Jammu and Kashmir has the highest unemployment rate of 5.3 per cent in comparison to its four neighboring states. All-India figures for unemployment rate stand at only 2.6 per cent.

² For a detailed discussion on insights and recommendations of this consultation see Seema Kakran, Competing Realities: Identity, Culture and Dialogue in Jammu and Kashmir, Stakeholders in Dialogue, New Delhi, WISCOMP, 2011.
The perception of the youth in Delhi about Kashmir/Kashmiris, on the other hand, was not recorded systematically for over one decade. The broad conclusions generated by a survey conducted in 1998-99 with the educated youth in metropolitan cities including Delhi, highlighted a sense of sympathy for the situation in Kashmir. However, there was a general feeling that the reportage in mainstream National media during the summer protests of 2010 impacted this perception negatively.

Against this backdrop, the *Hum Kadam*: Education for peace initiative of WISCOMP and its partner FAEA created space for dialogue between the youth of Jammu and Kashmir and Delhi to help break the vicious cycle of alienation, deficit of trust and negative stereotyping. It sought to build sustained networks between educational institutions in both the states and work in collaboration with the educators at these institutions. By facilitating dialogue and understanding between the youth, WISCOMP hoped to create an ethos of inclusivity, tolerance and the ability and the willingness to address the conflict through non-violent methods.

Recognizing youth as a precious repository, WISCOMP aimed to channelize their energy and passion into constructive avenues. This was facilitated through systematic interventions in the educational spaces that sought to break stereotypes and foster trust across conflict divides of region, religion, caste, gender and class and by initiating young people into a culture of nonviolence, dignity, mutual respect and coexistence. The underlying assumption was that trainings with the youth can have long term impact provided their teachers reinforce the same values in the schools and colleges. Once the ability of the educational institutions is strengthened they can nourish the potential of the youth to become “bridges of peace”.

*Engaging with the Vocabulary of Conflict Transformation* was a flagship workshop under the *Hum Kadam*: Education for Peace Initiative. It was organized on September 29, 2012 at Government College for Women, Maulana Azad Road, Srinagar, to provide space for a group of 19 students and 17 faculty members from the College.
to interact with a group of 10 students and 2 faculty members from Lady Shri Ram College for Women, New Delhi. The participants were introduced to the evolving discipline of Peace and Conflict Studies and they had an opportunity to share their views on Kashmir conflict and the prospects for peace.
Yasmeen Ashai, Professor and Coordinator, Centre for Women’s Studies, Government College for Women welcomed the participants and gave a brief introduction of WISCOMP and FAEA. She expressed hope for sustained interactions between the young women from Delhi and Srinagar who were meeting at the College for the workshop. She said that the process initiated through the workshop discussions could lead to friendships so that the women could collectively work towards shared concerns.

Welcoming the students and faculty members from Lady Shri Ram College to Srinagar, Tanveer Ara, Principal, Government College for Women, foregrounded the significance of allowing spaces for such interactions and encouraged her students to engage in an animated dialogue. She observed that the negative effects of armed conflict were part of the everyday experience of the people in Jammu and Kashmir which they had learnt to grapple with over the years. Noting the myriad impacts of the protracted conflict in Kashmir, Ara established that gender based violence was perhaps the most rampant. While incidents of physical violence in ‘public’ spaces received a lot of media attention, ‘other’ violence that occurred in the private spaces was either neglected or considered insignificant in the larger narrative of human rights. She stressed, that the concerns of structural violence in the Valley were taken up by very few organizations and individuals. This, however, was an issue that instantly established common ground between women from across the political spectrum.

In her view an equally alarming impact of the conflict had been on education due to which the Kashmiri students as well as the teachers encountered unique challenges. It was acknowledged that despite an
intense psychosis of fear and panic created by the cycles of violence emanating from the conflict, students from the Valley had performed well on the academic front. In this context, Ara cited the example of Shah Faesal, a native of Kupwara district who became the first Kashmiri to top the All India Civil Services examination in 2009 and served as a beacon of hope and inspiration for the young people in the Valley.

In view of the resilience shown by the students of Kashmir, Ara suggested that the government should consider providing special support to students from the conflict areas and also extend aid to Muslim women who wished to pursue higher studies. She asserted that while the state had been generous in providing facilities and reservations to the students from various other marginalised social groups, similar support was lacking for the students who are dwelling in areas affected by armed violence.

Following Ara’s comments Shweta Singh, Assistant Professor, South Asian University, New Delhi introduced the participants to the concepts of Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding. As a first step, Singh asked the participants to share three primary identities which they considered vital to their concept of self, thus providing space to the participants to engage in reflection, and at the same time, sensitizing them to the existence of multiple identities. While some participants from Srinagar voiced their Valley-centric ethnic identity, most gave primacy to their religious and gender identities. Some students foregrounded their identity as learners, while one saw herself as “a survivor, a struggler”. Several young participants weaved a narrative of historical suffering of the Kashmiris’ struggle for aazadi with their individual identities. What came out from this discussion was that the religious identity was intrinsically woven into the psyche of the young women from Kashmir participating at the workshop. Similarly, many participants from Delhi foregrounded their gender identity but very few considered their ethnic and religious identity as primary. Largely there was a prioritization of linguistic identities and social class over their religious affiliations.
Through the exercise, Singh reflected on how the surrounding conditions compel individuals to foreground certain aspects of their identity and how the changes in circumstances lead some aspects of identity to get pronounced and others to be subsumed. The discussion highlighted that the conflict had led to the perception among some young Kashmiris that they have been trapped between a Hindu-majority India and a Muslim-majority Pakistan. However, it was the Kashmiri’s ethno-religious identity which was significantly pronounced and easily threatened.

The expression of this threat perception by some participants steered the group into a discussion on the relationship of conflict to women’s sense of victimhood-agency. Growing up during the years of conflict had marred the perception of normalcy and this was reflected in the vocabulary which was used by the Kashmiri participants. The participants from Srinagar avowed that curfews and encounter killings were a familiar part of their vocabulary, even for those as young as five years. Raised as “children of conflict”, an entire generation had grown up in a hostile environment devoid of any experience of coexistence and tolerance, and with perpetual exposure to stationed forces and
militancy. A sense of double victimization was voiced by many as they shared that Kashmiris had become targets of violence which was perpetuated by both the state and the non-state actors and overall militarization of society.

In contrast to this, many faculty members expressed that living in a conflict area had provided them a sense of agency and empowerment. It sensitized them as women towards some of the pertinent issues in their surroundings and enabled them to articulate their concerns in a manner which perhaps was not permitted in normal circumstances. On the other hand, some students viewed the same circumstances as disempowering. There was an expression of desperation that the conflict had left them feeling sub-human or “like a machine”. Expressing concern over external forces hampering their sense of agency, insinuations were made against leaders who promulgated bandhs in the name of protecting Kashmiris’ interests and at the same time emphatic resentment was voiced against the government’s power to impose curfews.

Moving the discussion forward with an understanding of conflict and drawing the attention of the participants away from the discourse of exception, Singh explained that there had been a marked change in the nature of contemporary armed conflicts—from interstate to intrastate. She observed that the Human Security Report 2005 had underscored that more than 95% of all conflicts are within states. In 2003, only 2 of the 59 ongoing conflicts were coded as interstate. Elucidating the concept of conflict, Singh used the framework of Jayne Docherty, The Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, Eastern Mennonite University, who defines conflict as “a state of relationship between parties who have real or perceived incompatible goals, needs, values or aspirations”. The framework is based on the premise that conflict manifests itself in two forms:

---

3 Jayne Docherty, “Workshop Handout” (Handouts given at a workshop organized by the Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, Virginia, June 4 – 14, 2005).
- **Overt conflict**, which happens when the parties explicitly use words or actions to express their incompatibility, violently or non-violently.

- **Latent conflict**, which happens when the incompatibilities are implicit and not expressed openly.

Singh further used the lens of Conflict Transformation to illustrate that conflict is a “natural phenomenon that creates potential for constructive growth”⁴ and allows the suppressed issues to surface which be addressed. Thus, conflict is a “motor of change”⁵ which is intricately connected to social change and therefore it is vital to ask how it is dealt with. When conflict is handled constructively, people develop ways to satisfy the needs of those involved through the use of nonviolent and dialogic tools. The same gets handled destructively when people resort to violence to address their needs, and in the process suppress others’ needs and destroy relationships. It is for a constructive approach towards conflicts that the tools of Conflict Transformation are employed, Singh emphasised.

Illustrating the layered intricacies of a conflict, Singh noted that since no single lens is capable of bringing into focus all the dimensions and implications of a conflict, we need multiple lenses to view different aspects of a complex reality.

Central to this approach is the understanding that conflict is different from violence, and that the two cannot be used interchangeably. She quoted Johan Galtung who defines violence as “avoidable impairment of fundamental human needs or life which makes it impossible or difficult for people to meet their needs or achieve their full potential.” According to him, there are three forms of violence:

- **Direct violence** involves physical force, verbal violence and the threat to use force which occurs in “quick time” as an event.

---


⁵ Ibid.
• *Structural Violence* exists when some groups have more access to resources and opportunities than others and this unequal advantage is built into the very social, political and economic systems that govern societies and states. It is spread over a timeframe defined as “slow time”.

• *Cultural Violence* is any aspect of a culture, like beliefs and attitudes, which can be used to legitimize violence in its direct or structural form. It has a nature of “permanence” and is spread over “deep time”.

Building on the typology of the different forms of violence, Singh then shifted the focus to ‘peace’ and its conceptualizations. The Mennonite religious-ethical framework understands peace to be embedded in justice. Peace defined as an absence of direct violence such as cessation of hostilities, is understood as negative peace. However, this form of peace serves only to put a temporary end to violence and imposes a superficial notion of order without addressing the root causes of a conflict. A more sustainable peace or positive peace is possible when structural and cultural violence are addressed gradually over a period of time. It emphasizes on “the importance of building the right relationships and social structures through a radical respect for human rights and life.”

Presenting peacebuilding from a historical perspective, Singh highlighted that this field traced its origin in the early 20th century. It primarily assumed the role of an anti-war peace movement addressing the key question – “How do we respond to violence and war”. The concept received international attention when the Former UN Secretary General, Boutros Boutros Ghali, in his “Agenda for Peace” (1992) defined post-conflict peacebuilding as “action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict”. She also bought into the discussion how

---

6 Johan Galtung, “Workshop Handout” (Handouts given at the workshop Conflict Transformation: The TRANSCEND Approach held in Manassas, Virginia, November 2002).

7 Lederach, *op.cit.*
the idea of peacebuilding had evolved immensely and embraced the overlapping frameworks of Conflict Prevention, Conflict Management, Conflict Resolution and Conflict Transformation under its purview. She then illustrated the nuances of each of these approaches. Singh explained:

*Conflict Prevention* refers to the anticipation and aversion of conflict escalation and violence. It is addressed at three levels. At the primary level, the focus is on early warning; at the secondary level containment or mitigation are the focus; the tertiary level emphasises on the prevention of recurrence of armed conflict.

*Conflict Management* is “the art of appropriate intervention to achieve political settlements, particularly by the powerful actors having the capacity and resources to bring pressure on the conflicting parties in order to induce them to move towards settlement.” The focus here is to “manage” and “contain” the conflicts. It does not preclude the possibility of the use of force in managing the conflicts.

*Conflict Resolution* refers to nonviolent processes that comprise of a range of tools and approaches, such as those of negotiation, mediation and dialogue, to resolve conflicts and promote mutually acceptable agreements. However, “the resolution carries with itself dangers of cooptation, an attempt to get rid of a conflict when people were raising important issues.”

In this context, *Conflict Transformation* retains its unique character and addresses a different question: “How do we end something destructive and build something desired?” It recognizes the centrality of relationships in conflicts and focuses on building the fractured relationships when the guns have gone silent, facilitating coexistence.

---


9 Lederach, *op.cit.*
and reconciliation. It emphasizes on the tools of *active-listening* and *dialogue* to build trust across divides.

As defined by Lederach, Conflict Transformation is a process that addresses the “content, context and structure of a relationship” by advocating that the three lenses are used simultaneously to view the conflict. The first lens shows us the *immediate* situation. The second one looks beyond the presenting problem towards the deeper, *underlying patterns* and context. The third lens is a *conceptual framework* that holds these perspectives together and permits us to connect the presenting problems with the deeper relational patterns.

Conflict impacts situations and initiates changes in many different ways. Lederach points out that Conflict Transformation intervenes at various levels to bring about:

- **Personal change:** through new attitudes; behaviours and knowledge (trauma healing, coexistence programs);
- **Relational change:** through new or improved relationships between the hostile groups (dialogue programs);
- **Cultural change:** through cultural values that support peace (use of popular media to promote peaceful values);
- **Structural change:** through new institutions, policies and empowerment of a new generation of leaders.

Until the 1990s, the definition by United Nations identifying peacebuilding as post-conflict support shaped the discourse on peacebuilding. However, this narrow view was criticized by the practitioners in the field who highlighted the complexities of peace work as more than post-accord reconstruction. Consequently, the United Nations Security Council (2001) broadened the agenda for peacebuilding, by defining it as activities which are “aimed at preventing an outbreak, recurrence or continuation of armed conflict” and include “a wide range of political, developmental, humanitarian and human rights programs and mechanisms”.
In order to provide the participants a more comprehensive grasp over all the various facets and forms of peacebuilding, Singh shared Lisa Schirch’s map of peacebuilding\textsuperscript{10}. Schirch talks about peacebuilding as a process of building relationships and institutions that support the peaceful transformation of conflict and embodies a range of approaches, which are:

- **Waging conflict non-violently:** Advocates and activists seek to gain support for change by increasing a group’s power to address issues, and ripen the conditions needed to transform relationships. It includes nonviolent direct action, human rights advocacy, among others.

- **Reducing direct violence:** Interveners seek to reduce direct violence by restraining perpetrators of violence, relieving the immediate suffering of victims of violence and creating a safe space for peacebuilding activities in other categories that address the root causes of the violence. It comprises military intervention, early warning programs, strengthening legal and justice systems, among others.

- **Transforming relationships:** The aim is to transform destructive relationships with an array of processes that address trauma, transform conflict and restore a sense of justice. These processes give people opportunities to create long-term, sustainable solutions to look into their needs through trauma healing, restorative justice, transitional justice, et al.

- **Capacity building:** Longer term peacebuilding efforts enhance existing capacities to meet the needs and rights of the people involved and prevent violence. These activities aim to build just structures that support a sustainable culture of peace. It includes economic, political, and social development, training, education, among others.

After the conceptual understanding of Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding, the participants were engaged in a stimulating set of group exercises on conflict analysis that explored the specifics of the Kashmir conflict. After dividing the participants into smaller mixed groups (mix of students from Delhi and Srinagar), Singh asked the participants to begin with a discussion on their idea of peace. It was established that all participants sought a sense of justice which was embedded in peace and defined it as freedom from violence, oppression and subjugation at the personal, social and institutional levels.

They were next asked to define peace using words, symbols, and metaphors from their indigenous cultures. The dominant response from all the groups was colour white and doves as being symbolic of peace. One group mentioned *shikara* (a boat design that is found in Kashmir which is also is a cultural symbol of the region) as a metaphor for peace, symbolizing the need for collective responsibility to maintain stability.\(^{11}\) Interestingly, the colour green manifested itself in each group’s response through different mediums like a flag, *chinar* leaf, Sufi shrines and as the colour itself. This was reflective of the integral relation between the colour green and Islam.\(^{12}\) Contrary to the contemporary stereotyping of Islam as a “religion of the sword”, the participants viewed the colour green as a symbol of hope and peace.

Singh further asked the participants to share examples of direct, structural and cultural violence from their own context. The strong prevalence of violence against women was voiced unanimously by all the groups. Issues of domestic violence, rape, half-widows and denial of access to public spaces to women without fear, insecurity and patriarchal control, surfaced in their responses. There was also a sense

---

11 Traditionally, Shikara is a small, wooden boat with an elongated structure which requires passengers to maintain even distribution of weight throughout the boat to avoid capsizal.

12 Green has a special place in Islam. It is used in the decoration of mosques, the bindings of Qur’ans, the silken covers for the graves of Sufi saints, and in the flags of various Muslim countries. It is believed to have been used by The Prophet’s tribe on its flags. In the Qur’an (Surah 76:21), it is said that the inhabitants of paradise will wear green garments of fine silk.
of bitter resentment against state atrocities that the Kashmiris felt perpetually subjected to. Many noted that in Kashmir security forces often violated individual rights of citizens with impunity, and offered no signs of remorse or reconciliation. This they argued had led to a sense of acute frustration and alienation among the youth. The draconian nature of Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act (AFSPA), fake encounter killings, use of tear gas, unmarked graves, sporadic firings were listed as overt violence by the participants. These state brutalities triggered stone pelting which perpetuated further violence and unrest in the Valley. Many participants felt that due to the baggage of history, conflation of militancy with stone pelting, and inability of non-Kashmiris to comprehend the context of the protests in Kashmir, led to negative stereotyping of the youth from Kashmir.

A persistent grudge of many Kashmiri participants was that the democratic system had failed to hear their pleading voices and address their grievances and they felt humiliated by the same system on a regular basis. A sense of bitterness and helplessness was voiced against the ‘silent violence’ in the Valley. Concerns were raised by the participants over the daily humiliation at the hands of paramilitary forces and a sense of general insecurity which distorted their sense of normalcy.

Owing to the pervasive presence of the state, represented in its most visible form by the stationed security forces, people from the Valley had often not distinguished between the Indian state, the Indian army and ‘Indians’. They directed their rage at the ominous “other” - India.

After acknowledging the reality of these problems, Singh then asked the participants to identify things which could connect people across lines of division. The participants noted religion as a prime connector. Some participants talked about the traditional/ancient form of Islam while others talked of the ziarrats and Sufi shrines that were revered by Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists and Sikhs. These Sufi shrines were symbolic of Kashmiriyat, representing religious and cultural syncretism, propagating inclusivity and tolerance. For many participants this form of spirituality was a harmonious blend of different faiths. However, the participants were also conscious that religion which acts as a
connector and unifying force between people of the same faith, leads to divisiveness too, as had happened between Kashmiri Muslims and those of other faiths, like the Kashmiri Pandits. The Kashmiri language and culture were also voiced as being the connecting thread among the Kashmiris, despite religious differences.

Next, the participants were asked to identify things which caused divisions between people and were sources of tension between groups. Politicians were identified as the key dividers in this context. The belief was that political leaders had been quick to capitalize on the fears and insecurities of the Kashmiris and had contributed little towards alleviation of their grievances, and instead fuelled unrest to further their vested interests and political agendas. Secondly, participants identified regional identity as another significant source of discord. The Jammu and Kashmir state had been dichotomized into three discrete regions – the Valley, Jammu and Ladakh. With the imposition of communication barriers – physical and mental, communities dwelled in isolation and remained suspicious of any kind of engagement with the other community. The bitter memories of the Pandit exodus (1990), differences over political aspirations and the more recent Amarnath Land Row (2008), had compelled people to confine themselves to their own communities. This communalized mindsets and narrowed mindscape, differences in socio-economic status and sectarian divisions were further highlighted as important dividers by the participants.

The session culminated into a discussion on peacebuilding, with Singh urging the participants to reflect over some concrete examples of the ways in which people build peace in their communities and nation. Good governance, inclusive policymaking with a strong civil society dedicated to addressing suspicion, building trust and developing infrastructure were seen as potent peacebuilders by the participants. It was emphasized that intervention was required holistically at every level in the society, with special focus on the grassroots engagement. The spread of education as an imperative tool to raise mass consciousness was equally pressed upon by the participants.
Education opens up alternatives and serves as a catalyst, propelling the society towards a more just, inclusive and humane future. At the same, the unpleasant side of education was also highlighted by the participants. It was also noted that the indoctrination of children through textbooks and lessons imparted by narrow-minded teachers further communalized the institutions instead of inculcating the values of tolerance and inspiring an open and inquisitive mind.

An insightful example of traffic lights as a source of building peace emerged during the discussion. One of the participants brought forth that the installation of traffic lights in Srinagar replaced the chaos and conflict caused by manually directing the traffic flow, thus creating a sense of order and discipline among the people and establishing grounds for peace. The role of Resident Welfare Associations and panchayats as the foundations of peace were also highlighted by the participants. However, setting up of democratic institutions was seen as one of the building blocks of peace, on which the structure of just peace could be built. One of the participants argued that to consider building peace through economic interventions in Srinagar will be a futile exercise as there is a need to understand, acknowledge and empathize with a deeper demand for justice and democracy in Kashmir.

The discussion ended on a note of optimism that many such interactions can be organized so that young people from Kashmir and other parts of India can further explore and acknowledge the differences and build common ground for sustainable peace.
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Shweta Singh (New Delhi, India) is Assistant Professor at the Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social Sciences, South Asian University. She is also a Visiting Professor at the Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding Program at Lady Shri Ram College, New Delhi. Dr. Singh has done her specialized training in Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding from Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, Eastern Mennonite University, U.S.A. She completed her Doctoral research at Jawaharlal Nehru University, focusing on ‘Human Security Approaches to Conflict Resolution Strategies in Sri Lanka’.
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**Ishma Mushtaq** is a student of the Department of English at Government Women’s College, Srinagar.

**Mansha Ashraf** is a student of the Department of English at Government Women’s College, Srinagar.

**Megha Dhillon** is a faculty member of the Department of Psychology at Lady Shri Ram College for Women, New Delhi.

**Mugeesa Farood** is a student of the Department of English at Government Women’s College, Srinagar.
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In addition, 17 faculty members from Women’s College participated in the workshop.