



COLLABORATIVE LEARNING PROJECTS

DO NO HARM PROJECT: TRAINER'S MANUAL
WORKSHOP MODULES

A Manual of the Do No Harm Project (Local Capacities for Peace Project)
A project of the Collaborative for Development Action, Inc.
and CDA Collaborative Learning Projects

(revised November 2004)

Table of Contents

Workshop Modules

Module I: Introduction to the Do No Harm Project and the Workshop	1
Module II: Case Study	7
Module III: The Framework	9
Module IV: Dividers	14
Module V: Connectors	17
Module VI: Assistance Programmes	21
Module VII: Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages	23
Module VIII: Options #1: Options Game	29
Module IX: Options #2: Programming Alternatives	32

MODULE I

Introduction to the Do No Harm Project (the Local Capacities for Peace Project) and the Workshop

Purpose

The purpose of this session is to:

- Set the tone for the workshop
- Give background to participants about the overall DNH Project and what they can expect from the workshop

The Tone

Because the DNH Project has been designed as dependent on broad involvement of NGOs, donors and field-level assistance providers and recipients, and because workshops provide another way for more people to become involved and add their own insights and understanding to the Project, the tone of the opening session should be relaxed, serious, friendly, open, inquiring, and inviting. In addition, it should convey the idea that the participants' experience and knowledge is as critical for the discussions and for the learning that will take place as are the materials brought by the trainers. Opening sentences should, therefore, make clear that the workshop will:

- Be highly participatory
- Be open and exploratory
- Deal with real-world problems encountered daily by assistance providers in many parts of the world

Part of this process, therefore, will be to invite participants to introduce themselves, saying a few words about their own experiences in assistance work in conflict settings and their concerns for how the workshop can be helpful in their work.

Introduction to DNH Project and Role of Workshops:

Following participant introductions, the workshop leaders should also introduce themselves and, then, the DNH Project. This should take a very short time (no more than fifteen minutes, maximum).

Background/History

- In late 1994 the DNH Project was launched to answer the question: *How may assistance be provided in conflict settings in ways that, rather than feeding into and exacerbating the conflict, help local people disengage from the violence that surrounds them and begin to develop alternative systems for addressing the problems that underlie the conflict?*
- The DNH Project is a collaborative effort, organized by the Collaborative for Development Action in Cambridge, Massachusetts, involving a number of donor agencies (DANIDA, Sida, CIDA, UNHCR, DHA, OCHA, German EED, Foreign Ministry of Norway, OFDA of USAID, DEZA with more being added all the time), international NGOs (over 100 of them) and local assistance workers.
- The approach taken by DNH was inductive, learning from local field experiences. Thus, fifteen case studies were conducted in fourteen conflict zones to examine the interactions of humanitarian and development assistance and conflict.
- From the cases, lessons-to-date were compiled in a booklet entitled *Do No Harm: Supporting Local Capacities for Peace through Aid* (published by CDA in 1996). This booklet represented the knowledge at that stage and it formed the basis for over twenty-five feedback workshops carried out with assistance workers in a number of countries in which practitioners “tested” the lessons against their own experience, added to and amended them and, thus, improved them. The learning from these efforts was published in a book entitled *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—Or War*, (Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, Colorado, 1999).

(The 1996 booklet is now outdated, it represented “work in progress” and the state of discussion at that stage. CDA no longer stands behind all the statements. The 1996 booklet should no longer be quoted or used in workshop!)

- On the basis of the lessons learned from the case studies and the responses of more than 700 practitioners working in humanitarian relief and development assistance in areas affected by violent destructive conflict a planning tool – the “*Framework for Considering the Impact of Assistance on Conflict*” was developed. 12 organizations tested this planning tool over a period of up to three years in projects implemented in conflict areas. The learning from this testing phase are documented in the booklet *Options For Aid in Conflict: Lessons from Field Experience* (Mary B. Anderson (ed.), published by CDA, Cambridge 2000)
- This workshop is part of a broad and ongoing dissemination effort. In addition, the DNH Project works with operational NGOs that are carrying out projects in conflict areas to apply the DNH lessons in “real time and space.” DNH staff and volunteers work with NGO field and headquarters staff to use the methods and approaches of DNH to analyze the interactions between their assistance programmes and the conflicts where they work and, then, to make appropriate adjustments to projects in order to ensure that assistance does not do harm but supports local efforts toward non-war existence.

DNH Timeline

- The Issue Identified: Assistance workers around the world identified an issue: how can we provide assistance in a conflict setting without exacerbating the conflict?
- **Phase I: Case Studies** (1994 - 1996)

15 case studies from 14 conflict zones; ranging from large international NGOs to small, local NGOs; dealing with different types of conflict, from “hot” war to post-conflict situations to situations of low-scale, but endemic social violence; asking the question in the context of relief and in the context of development.

Booklet produced: *Do No Harm* (called the “red and black” book)
- **Phase II: Feedback Workshops** (1996 - 1997)

25 feedback workshops, held in the field and in organization headquarters; over 100 organizations represented and over 400 assistance workers tested the lessons of the booklet

Book produced: *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—Or War* (called the “blue” book), with the final version of the Framework
- **Phase III: Implementation** (1997 - 2000)

12 organizations operating in conflict zones implemented the use of the Framework in program analysis, program design and redesign and program planning.

Book produced: *Options for Aid in Conflict* (called the “Options Manual”)
- **Phase IV: Mainstreaming** (2001 - present)

Many organizations are engaged in an ongoing process of learning through the dissemination of the Do No Harm principles and approach through workshops and wider implementation of the use of the Framework.

Other Clarifications

- In this manual – and, hence, in the workshop –, the word “conflict” refers to negative, destructive, often violent, group interactions. It does *not* refer to the variety of intergroup disagreements and other forms of constructive struggle by which social change occurs.
- Also, in this manual and in the context of DNH workshops “Assistance” is a shorthand to refer to the various forms of humanitarian or development assistance provided by international and local non-governmental as well as governmental and international

organizations. The use of the term “assistance” has led to various misunderstandings. For example, many people assumed that the use of the term “aid” signals that the empirical evidence of the DNH project came only from the context of humanitarian or emergency aid – and therefore the tool was relevant only for programming humanitarian emergency interventions. In fact, experience of agencies working in development cooperation has contributed to the learning process throughout the entire project. Development organizations have been part of process all the time.

- It is for this reason, that the thrust of the workshop’s “message” of how humanitarian aid and development assistance interact with conflict is to push for assistance agencies not to worsen *destructive* conflict. However, *this does not imply that constructive intergroup struggles or social change should be avoided - or that agencies should attempt to prevent constructive intergroup struggles from happening*. Clearly, in all societies in the world, injustice continues to exist and we must be continuously engaged in working for greater, inclusive justice. The focus here is on how we can be aware of – and avoid – *inadvertently worsening destructive interactions* that do not serve to promote and strengthen justice.
- In addition, this workshop is not directed toward urging assistance agencies to change or add to their mandates and become, also, peace agencies. Rather, we focus on how assistance agencies – both those that provide emergency assistance and those that are involved in supporting development – can do what they do best (relief and development) and, *at the same time*, ensure that their assistance does nothing to exacerbate tensions or feed into violence but rather helps local people find options and alternatives to violent conflict.

Closing

In closing the introduction, trainers might reiterate that the participants in the workshop are the experts in their local situation. (*Very often, the trainers are not.*) The workshop (and DNH) does not provide a set of programme design answers or a formula for how assistance agencies should work. It does open up lessons learned from many other people’s experiences in other places and an opportunity for participants to use these to think creatively about how to ensure that their own assistance does not have negative effects but is better able to achieve what they mean for it to do.

Notes For A Presentation on “The Do No Harm Project”

The objective

- 1 to study in a systematic way the *impact of humanitarian and development assistance interventions* (relief and development) by outside agencies *on situations of violent, destructive conflict*
- 2 to *identify patterns* in how assistance interacts with conflict
- 3 and to *learn lessons* for future programming

The approach

- collaborative learning
- based on the experience of assistance workers
- firmly based on field evidence

The process

- 15 case studies in 14 conflict situations (different types of conflict; different types of interventions; different types of actors) 1994 - 1996
- 25 feed-back workshops (more than 400 persons with experience of working in conflict situations) 1996 / 1997
- 12 cases of up to 3 year implementation (practical testing) 1997 - 2000
- Mainstreaming Phase 2001 - present

Lessons learned

- #1 assistance in a situation of violent conflict becomes part and parcel of that conflict
- #2 the context of conflict is always characterized by two types of factors / two realities:
 - dividers and sources of tension
 - connectors and local capacities for peace
- #3 assistance interacts with both types of factors in a positive or in a negative way
- #4 transfer of resources through assistance constitutes one way by which assistance impacts on conflict
- #5 implicit ethical messages are another set of mechanisms through which assistance interacts with conflict
- #6 it is the *details* of an assistance project which determine the project's impact on conflict

7 Experience has shown that *there are always options!*

DNH

- ⇒ was not designed as a peace building tool and, therefore, does not *expect* humanitarian and development assistance organizations to add a peace-building mandate;
 - Several agencies working *on* conflict do use the tool to add to their programming
- ⇒ intends to help relief and development organizations improve doing what they are mandated to do.

Agencies are encouraged to integrate the DNH-tool into their existing planning and implementation procedures.

MODULE II

Case Study: Beginning the Analysis by Focusing on an Assistance Programme in a Distant Setting

In most situations, the session of the workshop that immediately follows the Introduction will be a Case Study to get people thinking about the various relationships of outside assistance with internal conflict. Trainers should use a case from a place that most participants do not know. This is because such a case can get participants to grapple with issues without being threatened by what they may perceive as “outsider (trainers’) criticism” of their own circumstances. If you use a case that is familiar to many participants, they will spend most of their time discussing whether or not the case is “accurate.”

Pedagogical objectives

- 1 To encourage participants to analyze systematically the relationships between assistance and conflict;
- 2 To encourage participants to consider how assistance may have negative and positive impacts on conflict;
- 3 To set the tone for both challenging and inquiring discussion in which all ideas and experiences are valued while rigorous analysis is expected.

Introduction

To introduce this session, the trainer might note that we will move directly into a case study, based on assistance programming in another region of the world, as a way of using others’ experience to get into the discussion about the participants’ local situation.

In introducing the case, the trainer should indicate that people almost always criticize case studies as not having sufficient information. However, we answer this by noting: “That’s life!” In our kind of work, we always have too little information, but we also always have to make the best programming decisions we can based on whatever information we have. In this way, use of a case study is a way of simulating real circumstances and helping participants develop the skills to use information well and to identify clearly what else they need to know.

In addition, discussants will be surprised at how much information actually is in what appears to be a very short case. They should be advised to read it very carefully because there is more there than they may think.

The trainer should then hand out the case study and give an appropriate amount of time for participants to read it. Be sure to be clear about how much time they have. In some situations (where there is sufficient time and, especially, where people have difficulty with English), it is also useful to have people discuss the case in small groups before a plenary discussion.

It is always a good idea to give the participants some “study questions” to guide their reading of the case. These are suggested in the attached case studies and teaching notes.

MODULE III

The Framework

Introducing the “Do No Harm Framework for Analyzing the Impact of Assistance on Conflict”

Usually, this session either follow immediately after a case study or, in a shorter workshop or briefing, become the opening session. However, this session can be done at any time in the course of a workshop. It can also stand alone as an introduction to the concepts.

In general, this session should consist of a lecture followed by questions from the participants. While most of the Modules of a DNH workshop lend themselves to some form of group participation, this Module works better without trying to get the participants to “build” the Framework themselves. After all, that is why the trainer is there.

Pedagogical Objectives

- To provide a tool to systematize information (facts) about a situation of conflict;
- To identify those facts that are relevant for project planning;
- To help assistance workers see how assistance programmes affect conflict;
- To provide a tool for planning better assistance programmes in the future;
- To present the Framework as a practical tool.

Presentation Plan

A full explanation of the Framework requires a lecture type presentation. If it follows the Tajikistan (or any other) Case Study, the trainer should begin by referring to the fact that the participants have already seen the Framework in use in that discussion.

S/he should go on to note that the lessons learned through the DNH Project have been captured in a picture or graph which is the Framework.

[The trainer should hand out the Framework chart either at the beginning or end of this presentation. If handing it out before, the trainer should still use a board, drawing the columns and labeling them and drawing the arrows, etc. as s/he introduces the various parts. A danger of handing it out before drawing it is that people will not listen as carefully to the presentation. If English is a problem, however, it may be advisable to give each person a copy of the Framework to refer to.]

Among the lessons learned through DNH are:

1. That the Context of Conflict is characterized by two sets of things:

- b) The Divisions and Tensions between groups and what might be called War Interests or Capacities for War that we all know exist in conflict settings.
 - c) Surprising and far more interesting is the fact that the context of conflict is also characterized by things that connect the sides at war and by what can be called Local Capacities for Peace. The reason this is important (and this should be clearly emphasized) is because we all expect conflicts to have divisions and tensions and war interests, but we do not expect to find connections and peace capacities. Thus, very often, as we provide assistance in conflict settings, we direct the assistance so that it reinforces the divisions and, because it is unaware of them, undermines connections. If we are aware of this, then we can think more clearly about how to design assistance programmes.
2. When assistance is given in the context of conflict, it becomes a part of that context and, as such, either reinforces and exacerbates the divisions and tensions or supports and strengthens the connectors/capacities for peace.

Board Layout: the basic framework

At this point, the trainer may go to a Board and draw the beginning of the Framework. Across the top, s/he should write **“CONTEXT OF CONFLICT”** and below that, to the left of center, write **“Divisions/Tensions/War Capacities”** and, to the right of center, write **“Connectors/Capacities for Peace”**.

As s/he does this, s/he should note that *the heading for the whole Board* is “Context of Conflict.” That is, that what we are saying is that both dividing things, and connecting things, exist in the context of conflict. Peace is not on this chart. It is somewhere else. This is a chart only about conflict and all conflicts have these two sets of elements in them. Thus, when assistance is given in that context, it affects what is already there one way or the other.

Drawing an arrow up on the left side under “Divisions/Tensions” and an arrow **down** on the “Connectors/LCPs” side, the trainer should note that humanitarian and development assistance can worsen war in two ways: either by feeding into and exacerbating divisions/tensions or by ignoring and undermining connectors/LCPs.

Drawing an arrow down on the left (Ds/Ts) and an arrow **up** on the right (Cs/LCPs), s/he should go on to say that assistance can have a positive influence in two ways as well: by reducing intergroup divisions and tensions on the one hand or by supporting and strengthening connectors/LCPs on the other.

In this sense, humanitarian and development assistance can never have a neutral impact on conflict. It may be entirely neutral with regard to the contending parties, but experience shows that, given these characteristics of conflict, assistance interventions always affects them either up or down.

This is the fundamental Framework.

Adding more details

1 The Elements of an Assistance Programme

The trainer should note that assistance programmes are multi-layered. Involved in the “package” of assistance are headquarters, policy makers and field activities. Assistance programmes reflect an agency’s mandate, its headquarters arrangements and styles, and its fund-raising approaches and successes (or failures). In addition, an assistance programme involves decisions about whether and why to intervene in a given situation; about when and for how long to do so; about where to work; with whom to work; what kind of staff to hire and how; and finally, about how to carry out the programme. Each of these decisions has its own effects on the Divisions/Tensions and Connectors/LCPs.

[The Trainer may write the words underlined above into the center column of the chart as s/he talks about these aspects of assistance programming so that the Framework is being developed in front of the workshop participants. See attached format.]

2 How Humanitarian and Development Assistance Affect Conflict

From looking at many different projects in many different settings, it has been possible to identify clear predictable patterns of how assistance affects conflict. There are two basic ways this occurs:

- a) Through **Resource Transfers**. Assistance involves provision of some resources and these can become a part of the conflict as groups vie for their share or try to keep others from getting access to them.
- b) Through **Implicit Ethical Messages**. Assistance carries the explicit message of caring about suffering. By the ways in which it is given and the actions of staff, it also carries several implicit or tacit messages and these can affect the context of conflict.

There are two ways for drawing this on the board:

- § The trainer may draw the thin extra columns between the center Assistance column and the two sides, and write in “**Resources Transfers/IEMs**” to add this aspect to the chart.
- § S/he may draw two broad arrows pointing to the left and to the right from the center “Assistance” columns and write in “**Resources Transfers/IEMs**” into both arrows.

More can be said about Resource Transfers at this point, or this can be postponed until a later session depending on the length and plan for the particular workshop. (See page 37 for the ideas to include under this section.)

More can be said about Implicit Ethical Messages at this point, or this can be postponed until a later session also depending on the length and plan for the workshop. (See page 38 for the ideas to include under this section.)

3 Programming Options

Before leaving this presentation about the Framework, the trainer should always note that, when the impacts of humanitarian and development assistance on conflict become clear, if some of these are negative (i.e. worsen divisions or weaken connectors), then there are always programming options that can be tried to avoid having these impacts. Or, if the programme seems to be missing opportunities to have a positive effect (i.e. reducing divisions or supporting connectors), there are always options to improve impacts.

Adding the two additional columns on each side of the chart, the trainer should point out that experience shows options do exist and that creative assistance workers have, in fact, developed many of these that improve projects in context. However, while the patterns by which assistance interacts with conflict are predictable and show up across different contexts, the options for ensuring that the impacts are positive rather than negative always must be designed by taking the specific, local circumstances into account. Thus, it is impossible to generalize about “what works.” Using the ideas and clarification of relationships that the DNH Project has gathered, assistance workers can apply them to any local situation and come up with a relevant and appropriate set of ideas for their own circumstances.

The trainer **must** also add the extra arrows across the bottom of the chart to emphasize that any option found to reduce a negative impact or to enhance a positive one must be checked, again, against the other side of the chart. The process of programme design and redesign is a dynamic, rather than static (once and for all), process. It is also important to remind participants that conflict, itself, is dynamic so that a “divider” today may be a “connector” tomorrow and vice versa. The tool can and should be used iteratively and repeatedly as a check on programme effects.

Use of Illustrations

It can be helpful to provide examples from project experiences to illustrate the points being made in this presentation. Section III (Material II) provides a number of vignettes from actual field level assistance programming experience that trainers can use to illustrate various points. Be sure to look through them and select some to strengthen and spice up your presentation. Or, better still, use examples that come from your own experience. However, if you have worked in only one or two places, it is always wise to add some examples through the course of a workshop from other places. Participants begin to feel uncomfortable if all examples come from only one or two other locations.

Closing

After this presentation and some discussion, the trainers should note that the remainder of the workshop will involve looking at the components of the Framework in more detail and using the steps of the Framework to analyze a project or programme with which participants are personally familiar.

MODULE IV

Dividers

Identifying Dividers, Tensions and Capacities for War

Pedagogical Objectives

- 1 To expose participants to the possible categories for understanding dividers, sources of tension and war capacities.
- 2 To enable participants to apply this step of the Framework to their own circumstances and, thus, to understand them better.

How to Organize this Module

This session may be run on its own or combined with the session on connectors and local capacities for peace if time is limited. The trainer should set the tone with a few opening remarks. If the focus is only on Dividers, Tensions and War Capacities, these should include:

- A reminder that, in the presentation of the Framework, we noted that the context of conflict is characterized by two sets of things--divisions, tensions and capacities for war on the one hand and connectors and local capacities for peace on the other hand.
- At this point, we are going to turn to more detail about how to identify and understand the divisions, tensions and war capacities.
- A first step in doing this is to identify **WHO** is divided in any particular conflict area. In all areas, there are a number of intergroup or interpersonal tensions and differences. We are not equally interested in all of these; many represent healthy pluralism and differences. Rather, what we want to focus on are those divisions and intergroup tensions that either have in the past, or might in the future, turn into intergroup destructive conflict or intergroup violence. (Very often in workshops, groups will list endless conflicts including localized family feuds, arguments between siblings, etc. These may be negative and destructive but, also, are not apt to result in intergroup warfare.) The point here is to try to identify those schisms that are important both in terms of the type of destruction they can produce and in terms of the numbers of people who are involved.
- When the important groups that are (or may be) divided are identified, then it is important to consider what are the sources of tension between these groups, how and why are they divided, how do the divisions and tensions show up between them.
- In addition, very often there are people who have an interest in warfare and who gain from it. There are also structures and systems that represent capacities for dividing people. These are the War Capacities that we refer to. Groups should be alert to these and try to identify them in context as well.

When these introductory comments are made, the group may be asked to identify **WHO** is in conflict. The whole group may discuss this together. In some situations, it will be easy and obvious. In others, there will be a great deal of discussion about where the important cleavages are in a society. For example, if there has been an open war between two groups, it will be fairly straight-forward to name these two as divided. In such situations, however, it may also be worthwhile for the group to consider whether there are other, sub-groups that are also likely to erupt into violence.

In other situations, warfare may have been long-term and generalized and it may be difficult to identify who is likely to fight in the future. (For example, in Afghanistan, we had a great deal of discussion with local NGO staff people about this issue. In the early Taliban period, many of the previous schisms between groups were quieted. There was a great deal of disagreement as to whether previous alliances still mattered and might erupt again or not. It was important for the group to go over this in detail in order to think, later, about how their programme was or was not feeding into and exacerbating intergroup divisions.)

Once the group has identified the groups that are in, or potentially in, conflict, then the focus should move to understanding the divisions, tensions and war interests.

At this point, the trainer may note that the DNH Project found some categories useful for understanding divisions, tensions and war capacities. These include:

Systems and Institutions

For example, the ways in which fighters are organized. Militia structures might be formed in situations where the central government is weak. Police departments can be organized to use one group to police another. Legal systems can discriminate against the rights of one group. Wells and energy supply systems can be controlled by one side of a conflict.

Attitudes and Actions

For example the violent acts that daily maintain the tensions in a society such as terrorism, like grenade attacks or bombs in marketplaces. Or the acts that explicitly target one group. These can be the police stopping one group at a checkpoint while letting another group go through. Racism can also.

(Different) Values and Interests

For example, agriculturalists and pastoralists treat land use very differently. Also, religious values can be used to promote dividers, such as religious laws that are imposed even on people not of that religion.

(Different) Experiences

For example, history can be interpreted and selectively used to highlight the times when groups were fighting one another rather than referring to times when they cooperated. Conflicts can also arise out of situations where groups have very different lifestyles, whether those differences are cultural, religious, economic, etc.

Symbols and Occasions

For example, one group can impose their holidays on the other. Or, alternately, they can prevent a holiday from being observed. Monuments might be destroyed or boundaries crossed.

These five categories are illustrated in many of the vignettes (See Material).

If all participants are working in the same area, they may do the identification of local dividers/tensions/war capacities in plenary or in small groups. If many different areas are represented, small groups should be formed of people who are working in the same area.

The task for the group(s) is to list things that divide the groups, the sources of tension between them, and to identify whose interests would be served by intergroup conflict. As they do this, or subsequently, they should identify which of these are the most important for their situation.

The Workbook (see Material) may be used by participants to facilitate this process.

Reporting Back

If everyone has worked on the same area, the reporting back session should be given sufficient time for small groups to share their thinking and for the whole group to come to agreement on a complete, categorized list.

If many areas are represented, a report back session cannot go into full detail of each area. Thus, people should be encouraged to tell whether they found the exercise useful, what were the difficulties they encountered, what they discovered they needed to go back and find out, etc. That is, the plenary discussion should focus on how to use the tool, rather than go into specifics of any one situation.

Closing

The trainer should bring this session to a close by summarizing both the conclusions of the group and pointing out the importance of continuing to consider the dynamics of conflict situations. S/he could end by noting that this list is a complete and useful one for now; it will be important to continue to reflect on these categories as we go through the other aspects of the Framework because we may want to add or change some elements when we see them in a new light.

MODULE V

Connectors

Identifying Connectors and Local Capacities for Peace

Pedagogical Objectives

1. To emphasize the fact that factors that connect people and local capacities for peace exist in every conflict situation;
2. To expose participants to the possible categories for understanding connectors and local capacities for peace.
3. To enable participants to apply this step of the Framework to their own circumstances and, thus, to understand them better.

How to Organize this Module

Opening remarks

The trainer may refer back to the discussion of the case study and remind participants that a contexts of conflict is characterized by two realities: the reality of divisions, tensions and violence which is immediately obvious, but also the reality of “Connectors” and “Local Capacities for Peace” which is often less obvious.

“It is important, always, to remember that:

- More countries do not go to war than do;
- More people, even in war zones, do not fight than do;
- More people do not kill their neighbors than do;
- More would-be leaders try to excite people to intergroup violence than succeed in doing so.”

“Non-war attitudes and actions, non-war factors are, apparently, much more common and more “natural” than war. There are many ways that people manage differences, disagreements, suspicions, etc. other than through destructive or violent conflict.”

“However, we should not be naive or romantic about capacities for peace or connectors. In a society where open conflict does erupt, the non-war factors are clearly not strong enough or effective enough to prevent violence. They have failed by definition. Nonetheless, they have existed and some continue to exist even where we don’t see them; they provide a base on which future non-war or peace can be constructed.”

What Are Local Capacities for Peace?

Every society has both individuals and many other factors that prevent every disagreement from breaking out into war and that help contain and move away from violence if it begins. These include justice and legal systems, police forces, implicit codes of conduct, elders groups, church or civic leaders, etc. The roles of conflict prevention and mediation are assigned to some people and institutions in every society. These are what we mean by capacities for peace.

- ◆ The trainer should caution the group against “easy” identification of connectors or peace capacities. For example, many people assume that “women’s groups” are connectors or peace capacities. But experience shows that women’s groups can either be connectors or deeply committed dividers. Similarly, churches can serve to connect groups or they can serve to divide. One must always look, in context, for who is being connected and who is being divided and how this is occurring in order to do this analysis accurately. If people within one group are being effectively “connected” in order to oppose other groups with greater strength, it would be a mistake to identify this connection as one that is promoting intergroup harmony.

What Do We Mean By Connectors or Local Capacities for Peace?

In the midst of warfare, especially in situations of civil war where former fellow-citizens are fighting each other, there continue to exist a whole series of things that connect - or can connect - people who are fighting. These include:

Systems and Institutions

For example, in all societies where civil war breaks out, markets continue to connect people across the lines of fighting. Sometimes these involve formal inter-enemy trade; sometimes they involve women meeting at the market by the river-side one morning a week. Communications systems can provide linkages (for example, we have been told by many people that they value the BBC because they know that everyone on all sides of a war can hear the same information about what is happening); in some cases, irrigation systems, bridges, roads and electrical grids connect people in spite of war (in some cases, they are destroyed by warriors intent on separating people).

Attitudes and Actions

For example in the midst of war, one finds individuals and groups who continue to express attitudes of tolerance, acceptance, even love or appreciation for people on the “other side.” One finds people who act in non-war ways, doing things that the war would dictate were wrong such as adopting abandoned children of the “other side,” linking across lines to continue a professional association or journal, setting up new associations of people opposed to the war. They do these things because they seem “normal” or “right.” Often, they do not think of them as extraordinary or, even, as non-war.

(Shared) Values and Interests

For example, the common value placed on children's health has been the basis for UNICEF's success in negotiating days of tranquility for inoculations against childhood diseases. Sometimes a common religion can bring people together.

(Common) Experiences

For example, war itself can provide linkages among different sides. Citing the experience of war and suffering as "common to all sides," people sometimes create new anti-war alliances across boundaries.

Symbols and Occasions

For example, stories abound of the soldiers in the trenches in WWII who, on Christmas eve began to sing "Silent Night" together, and then, they returned to war. National art, music, historical anniversaries, national holidays, monuments can bring people together or link them across differences.

These five categories are illustrated in many of the vignettes (See Material).

The categories are not meant to be conceptually tight and mutually exclusive; rather, they are meant to open up our minds so that we actually see how many things do continue to connect people even in warfare. To be able to recognize these and support them offers options for humanitarian and development assistance programmers in conflict settings.

Small Group Work

Once the idea of "Connectors and Local Capacities" has been introduced, the group may work either as a plenary or in small groups to identify some in the contexts in which participants work.

The Workbook (see Material) may be handed out at this point to help people do this work.

Reporting Back/Plenary

As was true with Dividers/Tensions, this session can focus on substance if all participants are familiar and working with the same area, or on the process of using the tool for analysis if people are working in different areas.

Closing

As in the Dividers discussion, it is always important to bring a session to closure both to keep the group aware of its progress and to encourage continuing hard work. It also provides the chance to remind people that conflict environments are dynamic; thus they need to keep doing and re-

doing their analysis of any given situation if they wish to stay alert about how their assistance project is interacting with the conflict.

In this session, one could also point ahead to the what comes next—namely, a close look at each of the assistance programmes that participants are involved in, as the next step of the Framework.

MODULE VI

Assistance Programme

Assistance Programmes: Disaggregating and Analyzing

This session involves a brief lecture, with examples of each the elements of an assistance programme. When this has been done, participants may divide into small groups and discuss their own experiences and programmes. This discussion can involve doing an actual in depth analysis of a programme.

Pedagogical Objectives

1. To highlight all of the elements that, together, make up a field level assistance programme.
2. To encourage participants to look carefully at all the aspects of their own assistance programmes as a step toward analyzing their impacts on the context.

How to Organize this Session

Opening

The trainer may open this session by reminding people of the words put on the Board in the Case Study Discussion under the column of “**Assistance.**” In doing so, s/he can outline the multiple elements of an assistance programme:

- Why
- Where
- What
- When/How Long
- For Whom (beneficiaries)
- By Whom (staff)
- How

S/he should note that every one of these involves decisions made at headquarters and/or field levels and that each decision has the potential to affect whether and how the assistance programme interacts with the context of conflict.

Some illustrations may be given. For example, if (as in Tajikistan) the targeting of assistance to the most needy causes one group to gain more benefits from assistance than others, this can worsen intergroup tensions. Or, if staff are hired through a given institution (such as the local agricultural college or because they speak English), and historically only one group in the society

has attended this school or acquired this skill, the assistance programme may favor one group over another in a way that exacerbates intergroup tensions. (See Material)

For this reason, it is important to trace each of the elements of an assistance programme in this context to determine how it might be interacting with the realities in this context.

The trainer should then draw a box with the following three elements in it:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Mandate✓ Headquarters organization✓ Fund-raising Policy and Effectiveness |
|---|

The reason why these three elements are put in a box is to emphasize that these factors limit - or facilitate - making choices and better programming decisions at field level. They are part and parcel of the programming procedure but often can not be directly changed by field staff. Other levels of the organizational structure (apart from the field staff) come into focus here.

Section 2 in the Workbook (see Material) can be handed out to participants and they should be given the task of outlining, in full, their own assistance programme. They may do this individually or in small groups if enough people are familiar with and involved in the same programme.

If people are working on different programmes, this may be given as an overnight homework assignment because it is not necessary that everyone know the details of everyone else's programme. If everyone is involved in the same programme, this assignment should be done as a group and everyone should thoroughly agree on the description of the programme components.

MODULE VII

Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages – How Assistance Affects Conflict

This module may be covered in either one or two sessions depending on time. It is presented here as one session. The basis for this module is Chapters 4 and 5 of the book, Do No Harm.

This session involves a brief lecture that describes and illustrates the patterns by which assistance affects conflict. When this has been done, participants may divide into small groups and discuss their own experiences, examining the ways that they have seen assistance programmes interact with conflict. This discussion will increase the participants' "ownership" of the ideas as they use their own experience to illustrate the patterns identified through the DNH Project.

Pedagogical Objectives

1. To inform the participants about the patterns by which assistance interacts with conflict.
2. To enable participants to anticipate and analyze the impacts of their assistance programs on the contexts in which they work.

Background/Introduction

The DNH Project's work with agencies providing assistance in conflict has found very clear *patterns* in the ways that assistance interacts with conflict. Rather than being discouraged by the repetitiveness of these patterns, we are heartened, because *if we can identify patterns of relationships, then we can anticipate them in different settings*. If we can anticipate how humanitarian and development assistance affect conflict, then we can think of ways to avoid the negative, reinforcing impacts and encourage the positive, violence-reducing impacts. This is what this session is about.

Assistance Interacts with Conflict through Two Media:

- **Resource Transfers**

All humanitarian and development assistance programmes involve the transfer of some resources--food, health care, training, etc. Experience shows that when outside resources are introduced into a resource-scarce environment where people are in conflict with each other, the local people see these resources as representing power and wealth and, thus, they become a part of the conflict. People in conflict attempt to control and use assistance resources to support their side of the conflict and to weaken the other side.

- **Implicit Ethical Messages**

Additionally, by the ways in which it is offered, assistance carries a series of implicit messages that, also, have an effect on conflict.

The trainer should note that s/he will outline these two categories briefly and, then, participants will divide into small groups to reflect on examples of each of the patterns that come from their own experience.

A Resource Transfers

There are five patterns by which resources feed into, prolong and worsen conflict.

These include:

Theft

Very often goods provided through humanitarian or development assistance are stolen by warriors to support the war effort either directly (as when food is stolen to feed fighters), or indirectly (as when food is stolen and sold in order to raise money to buy weapons).

Market Effects

Assistance affects prices, wages and profits and can either reinforce the war economy (enriching activities and people that are war-related) or the peace economy (reinforcing “normal” civilian production, consumption and exchange).

Distributional Effects

When assistance is targeted to some groups and not to others, and these groups exactly (or even partially) overlap with the divisions represented in the conflict, assistance can reinforce and exacerbate conflict. The Tajikistan case illustrated this.

Assistance can also reinforce connectors by crossing and linking groups by the ways it is distributed.

Substitution Effects.

Assistance can substitute for local resources that would have been used to meet civilian needs and, thus, free these up to be used in support of war. There is a political substitution effect that is equally important. This occurs when international agencies assume responsibility for civilian survival to such an extent that this allows local leaders and warriors to define their roles solely in terms of warfare and control through violence. As the assistance agencies take on support of non-war aspects of life, such leaders can increasingly abdicate any responsibility for these activities.

Legitimization Effects

Assistance legitimizes some people and some actions and weakened or side-lines others. It can support either those people and actions that pursue war, or those that pursue and maintain non-war (peace).

B Implicit Ethical Messages

DNH Project has identified seven types of negative implicit ethical messages. The trainer should note that, while it is clear that the impacts of assistance through resources transfers can be quite important for conflict, it is much less clear about the actual impacts of the seven implicit ethical messages that we will describe. However, *these ideas have come from humanitarian and development assistance workers* who think they are quite important; they do not come from some “external evaluation” of how assistance gets it wrong! Thus, it seems useful and even essential to consider them carefully and think about our own experiences with this kind of impact.

It can be beneficial to emphasize that assistance workers do in fact do good and certainly they are attempting to do so.

Arms and Power

When assistance agencies hire armed guards to protect their goods from theft or their workers from harm, the implicit ethical message perceived by those in the context is that it is legitimate for arms to determine who gets access to food and medical supplies and that security and safety derive from weapons.

Disrespect, Mistrust, Competition among Agencies

When agencies refuse to cooperate with each other, and even worse “bad-mouth” each other (saying things such as “we don’t work the way they work; we are better and they get it wrong), the message received by those in the area is that it is unnecessary to cooperate with anyone with whom one does not agree. Further, you don’t have to respect or work with people you don’t like.

Assistance Workers and Impunity

When project workers use the goods and support systems provided as assistance to people who suffer for their own pleasures and purposes (as when they take the vehicle to the mountains for a weekend holiday even though petrol is scarce), the message is that if one has control over resources, it is permissible to use them for personal benefit without being accountable to anyone else who may have a claim on these resources.

Different Value for Different Life

When agency policies allow for evacuation of expatriate staff if danger occurs but not for care of local staff, or even worse, when plans call for removal of vehicles, radios and expatriates while local staff, food and other supplies are left behind, the message is that some lives (and even some goods) are more valuable than other lives.

Powerlessness

When field-based agency staff disclaim responsibility for the impacts of their assistance programmes, saying things such as “You can’t hold me accountable for what happens here; it is my headquarters, or the donor, or these terrible warlords who make my work have negative impacts,” the message received is that individuals in complex circumstances cannot have much power and, thus, they do not have to take responsibility for what they do or how they do it. And, of course, this is what is heard from people involved in civil wars--i.e. “I can’t help what I do; someone else makes me do it.”

Belligerence, Tension, Suspicion

When project workers are nervous about conflict and worried for their own safety to such an extent that they approach every situation with suspicions and belligerence, believing for example that these soldiers at the checkpoint “only understand power” and “can’t be trusted to be human,” their interactions with people in war zones very often reinforce the modes and moods of warfare. The message received is that power is, indeed, the broker of human interactions and it is normal to approach everyone with suspicion and belligerence.

Publicity

Finally, when NGO headquarters use publicity pictures that emphasize the gruesomeness of warfare and the victimization of parties, they can reinforce the demonization of one side in a war and, thus, reinforce the sense that all people on that side are evil while everyone on another side is an innocent sufferer. This is seldom the case and undermines the humanitarian principle. This, too, can reinforce the modes and moods of warfare rather than helping the public, or the agency’s own staff, find an even-handed way to respond to those on all sides who seek and want peace.

Note: The trainer may want to use more illustrations of these kinds of impacts as s/he presents the categories. If so, some may be found in Chapters 4 and 5 of the book. However, since the next step of this exercise is to get participants to think of their own examples, the trainer might want to limit illustrations from other places to a minimum at this point and only use some of them later if people have trouble coming up with any examples of their own.

Small Group Discussions

After the presentation of Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages categories, the trainer should divide participants into small groups to discuss these. The assignment should be: Go around the room so that each person in your small group tells at least one story of an assistance programme that he or she is familiar with where at least one of the impacts described can be seen. It is best if these come from personal experience.

The trainer should note that the purpose of this approach and of going around the room so that each person tells at least one story is to help the participants see these categories as not merely theoretical. The atmosphere should be easy and “safe” so it is possible to talk about errors of the past without shame. Such outcomes have been common in all our experience. No one should deny them; our task is to identify them and, then, find ways (in the next module) to prevent them.

Sending the participants into small groups, the trainers may leave the discussion open so that anyone can describe events in any category, or s/he may give each small group as assignment to illustrate one (or two) specific categories only. The trainer should hand out a sheet on which each of the categories is described (see Workbook) to help the participants in these discussions.

Plenary Discussion

When participants come back from small group discussions, the trainer should invite people to tell some of the most interesting, and/or, poignant stories they heard. The mood should, again, be easy, open, inquiring and “safe” for people to consider even the worst things they have been involved in.

Closing

At the end of this session, the trainer should reiterate how common these patterns are and how the point is not to become depressed or to feel shame. Instead, we will now move in the next session into examining these patterns and what options exist for breaking out of them and avoiding negative, improving positive, impacts.

MODULE VIII

Options #1: Options Game

Background

Experience shows that assistance workers are usually very able to take the DNH Project tools and use them to analyze their situation, and the positive and negative impacts of their project on conflict. However, very often, even with this awareness, they have difficulty thinking of programming options. There is a strong tendency to think that there is only one way to do things or to assume that the way that programmes have been done in the past cannot be altered. The purpose of this session is to break people out of such “traps” and to provide experience in generating a wide range of options and, then, considering the impacts of these.

Pedagogical Objectives

1. To illustrate that programming options always exist;
2. To provide an opportunity to “*think outside the box*” in a non-threatening context;
3. To provide experience in imagining a wide range of options for achieving a specific programming purpose;
4. To demonstrate that the more people involved in thinking of programming options, the greater the number, and the more creative, the options are.

Introduction

Little introduction is needed for this very speedy, gamey session. The trainer should only note that people very often have difficulty thinking of programming options. We all get trapped into believing that the way things have been done is the only way to do them. This session will help us break out of this assumption.

Then the trainer should set out the Problem as follows:

“We are in a situation of violent conflict and one group is badly in need of food. We have the resources to provide assistance. However, our problem is that we are at this point A and the people who need assistance live over there at point C. (The trainer should mark these two points on a board as s/he speaks.) And, here in area B (between points A and C) is a conflict.”

“Our question is: How can we support the people in need at C?”

Then, telling the group to break into teams of two, keeping them sitting around the table where they are, the trainer should give them this **assignment**:

⇒ *“List as many ways of supporting C from A as you can think of. The top team who thinks of the most options will win a prize.”*

The trainer should specify that the teams have five (or two if that seems better) minutes only to do this job. Do not give too much time; the point is to get people to generate many ideas in a short amount of time.

At the end of the appointed time, the trainer should ask all teams who listed more than ten options to raise their hands. Then to ask those with more than eleven to do so, until the team with the most ideas has been identified. (If two teams have the same top number, ask one to read their list first; then ask the other team to add ideas they had not mentioned by the first team.) **No ideas are disallowed.**

When the winning team has read out their ideas, other teams should be asked to add options they had that were different. The trainer should record all ideas briefly on the board so the whole group sees a long list growing.

Then the prize should be given. Preferably, it should be a box of candy. It should be open and it should have to travel from the participant farthest away from the winning team past all other participants to the winning team. This creates a wonderful sense of fun, and illustrates how people feel if food goes past them. At this point, the trainer should whip out another box of candy and pass it around to the whole group, illustrating that one option may be to provide enough for everyone “Glut the market!” (not very reasonable in most emergency circumstances!).

This entire exercise should take only twenty minutes from beginning to end. It is an effective one to use just after lunch since it is lively and engaging of the entire group.

Closing

The trainer should close the session by complimenting the group on its creativity and, pointing to the list on the board, note that what can seem like a problem with limited options often turns out to have many options. S/he should remind the group that some of the options they thought of would not work; others might. Once a range of options is generated, the next job is to assess them against the reality and to analyze what will work, and not work, and **why**. This is, of course, what the whole framework allows us to do.

Options Game #2

This is a second Options Game. The trainer could use this instead of the first or in a later session to revive flagging spirits. The trainer should set out the Problem as follows:

“There has been a conflict between A and B (mark these two on the board in large letters). A has won and B has lost. People from B have fled across a border into refugee camps in C (mark a line across the board and mark the side opposite from A and B as C; then draw an arrow from B across the line and mark in 2 or 3 small “B”s).

“We are in charge of the refugee camps. We have just received word that A believes that B is using the camps to train and organize soldiers to continue the war and that A believes the camps are being used by B to stage raids across the border. A is planning to attack the camps.”

“What do we, as the agency in charge of the camps, do?”

See next module for additional options work.

MODULE IX

Options #2: Programming Alternatives

Whether you have used the first Module on Options or not, it is important to get the workshop's participants to *consider actual, real-time options* for the dilemmas in programming that they have identified in their areas.

Thus, after the Modules on the impacts of humanitarian and development assistance on conflict (through Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages), trainers should always schedule a time slot for small group or plenary consideration of programming options to address issues raised by the specific examples that participants have given from their own experiences of impacts on conflict.

Such a session could be introduced with the “Options Game” of the preceding Module as this will spark enthusiasm and encourage creative thinking about solutions to problems.

It may be useful to open this session with a full, but brief recap of the entire Framework, reminding participants that the real gain in using the Framework is in the generation and testing of practical options.

Assignment

In giving the assignment for this session, it is important for the trainer to remind the group that most of the impacts of assistance projects on conflict have several dimensions. We have found in many places that it is important first to “*unpack*” the problem (that is, analyze why and how assistance is having the identified impact) in order to come up with a “package” of solutions that involves several different steps to be taken to address the issue realistically. **The way to do this is to use the Framework**, looking at *the details* of an assistance programme in its context in order to identify all the ways in which that programme interacts with the conflict.

Once this is clear, then the next step is to think of options, in that context, for delivering the same goods without having the identified negative impact and, where possible, enhancing the positive impacts.

To set the group up for this assignment, one option is to have a brief plenary discussion in which the full framework is outlined sufficiently for each participant to work in the way described above. Another option is to assign to each small group one person who knows the “problem” to be solved so that he or she can fill in the Framework for the rest of the small group so they can come up with options.

Working on workshop material

If time is limited, the trainers may either refer to the Tajikistan case study analysis done at the beginning of the workshop or list some of the examples provided by the participants from their own experiences. The trainers may then give this assignment for small group work or as the discussion topic in plenary:

“Choose one (or a specified number) of the examples of a negative impact of an assistance project on conflict which we have identified in our discussion and generate as many ideas as you can for realistic “programming options” – that is different ways of doing what your project is mandated to do that avoid that negative impact.”

Working on own projects

One way that this exercise has worked well in other workshops has been to assign two small groups to one issue and two others small groups to another issue. When the groups report back in plenary, this keeps interest high as each group listens to see if the other group working on their problem came up with ideas that their group did not think of.

The most effective way of getting participants to use the Framework and to begin working on “programming options” is by providing an opportunity to work on their own projects. If time permits and if participants have been advised to bring one of their own projects trainers may instruct participants to do a “Do No Harm” analysis of their own project.

Warning: experience has shown that you will need almost a full workshop day for this exercise including sufficient time for a thorough de-briefing. Trainers will have to give participants detailed time schedules for the various steps of a DNH analysis. Trainers should also walk around and visit the working groups towards the end of each time block to move the process forward.

Participants should be instructed to follow the seven-steps of a Do No Harm analysis. Participants should also be advised that the analysis of

- the context (steps 1 to 3),
- the project (step 4)
- and the impacts (steps 5)

should be sufficiently detailed to allow for “realistic” planning / programming – but it could naturally not be as detailed as in “real life”. Participants should also be reminded that “generating options” involves two steps:

- generating a number of options, selecting those which can realistically be applied (step 6)
- and testing them (step 7) based on previous experience.

(See “*The Seven Step Approach to Aid Programming in the Context of Violent Conflict*” in this manual.)

Plenary

The report back on this session is very important. It is important to allow enough time, especially if participants have worked on their own projects. Reporting should focus on the experience of using the tool and the process rather than the concrete options generated. If participants have worked on their own projects reporting back will need more time as participants have to (and often will want to) describe the project and its context before presenting the finding of their analysis and the options generated.

In managing the reporting back trainers have to be careful not to allow other participants to discuss the validity or usefulness of individual options. It is important to run this session in a way that encourages participants to continue using what they have learned.

Closing

In closing the plenary, the trainer should highlight one or two of the most creative and promising ideas and, at the same time, acknowledge the range of ideas that arose from the groups. The purpose of this session, and of the closing, is to enliven people’s senses that there really are options and that many of them are realistic and doable.