CrossMark

Bridges of Peace: The Role of Symbols and Rituals in Peacebuilding

Mahmuluddin[1][*]

[1] University of Mataram, Indonesia; Email: mahmulidin@unram.ac.id
[*] Corresponding author

Abstract

Purpose of the Study: This article investigates how symbols and rituals contribute to conflict management in deeply divided societies. **Methodology**: Through qualitative library research, this study examines the impact of symbols and rituals on peace-building by analyzing theoretical frameworks and case studies. **Main Findings**: The study identifies that symbols and rituals play a crucial role in the peace-building process, achievable through two primary methods: the creation of new symbols and rituals that draw on inclusive narratives to foster a shared symbolic space promoting multicultural tolerance, and the creative manipulation of existing symbols and rituals to challenge and subvert historical power dynamics. **Applications of this Study**: The findings offer valuable insights for policymakers, peace-building practitioners, and community leaders engaged in conflict resolution and reconciliation efforts. By understanding the dual potential of symbols and rituals in peace-building, stakeholders can develop more effective strategies to address the underlying causes of division and promote enduring peace in divided societies. **Novelty/Originality of this Study**: This research contributes to the field by providing a comprehensive analysis of the transformative power of symbols and rituals in peace-building. It showcases how these cultural elements can be strategically leveraged to support reconciliation and unity, marking a significant advancement in the understanding of non-traditional mechanisms of conflict resolution and peace-building efforts.

Keywords: Conflict Management; Peace-Building; Reconciliation; Rituals; Symbols

Introduction

Identity significantly shapes the construction of group mentalities, playing a pivotal role in the dynamics of conflict and peace within divided societies. This fundamental principle underpins the complex interplay between "Us and Them," a differentiation that not only fosters a sense of belonging but also exacerbates divisions based on nation, race, ethnicity, religious belief, and ideology (Berreby, 2008; Rocha, 2013). Recent findings underscore the transformative potential of symbols and rituals in bridging these divides, offering innovative pathways to reconciliation and peace.

This research delves into the nuanced role that symbols and rituals play in peace-building efforts, particularly focusing on their capacity to manage conflicts in societies marked by deep-seated divisions. Drawing upon the foundational theories presented by scholars such as Umeyama & Brehm (2021), Berreby (Berreby, 2008), and Nagle (2014), this study situates itself within a rich academic dialogue that explores the intricate relationship between cultural symbols, group identity, and conflict resolution.

The construction of group mentalities is significantly influenced by identity, as highlighted by Umeyama and Brehm (Umeyama & Brehm, 2021). Differentiating identities often occur across nations, races, ethnicities, religious beliefs, and ideologies, as indicated by Berreby (Berreby, 2008). Those external to one's own group are subjected

to a process of "othering," which takes place on both conscious and subconscious levels. This mechanism strengthens one's sense of belonging within their group and establishes a noticeable contrast with other groups. Identities play a role in shaping the concept of "In and Out" groups, as well as generating feelings of "Us and Them" (Umeyama & Brehm, 2021). Moreover, as indicated by Umeyama and Brehm (Umeyama & Brehm, 2021), the manner in which cognitive incorporation and exclusion occur holds significant importance in comprehending how identity contributes to the process of building peace. Identity has the capacity to establish barriers that participants must dismantle, surpass, or modify in their endeavors to attain a constructive state of peace with a past or ongoing "Out" group.

The identity and the boundaries of a group are always expressed and represented through the use of its symbolic capital (John Nagle, 2014). Its own knowledge, values, history and memories are synthesized in symbolic forms. Symbols work as reminders, as conceptual (and physical) representations of a group's membership. Rituals, on the other hand, are a valid instrument to perform these social memories in a communitarian way. During rituals, the community performs particular activities with the use of symbols. Indeed, these social performances have a remarkable power. On the one hand, the community has the possibility to perceive itself in a physical way. The agglomeration of individuals creates and reinforces the perception of the community that in this particular context can be "seen" physically by the number of its members. On the other hand, group's symbols always play a central role during rituals. These are exhibited, glorified and enlightened by the whole community and in this way their presence is reinforced and their collective perception renewed.

In a deeply divided society, characterized by a history of conflicts, this aspect of rituals and symbols is even more emphasized. These become group boundaries' markers with the purpose of clearly dividing what belongs from what does not belong to the community. Moreover, making universal relative values, symbols and rituals can stimulate sectarianism and justify violence against who does not share those values. However, conjuring memories of the past is also used to give a possible justification or explanation of the group's actual context. In this way a community justifies and creates the sense of its own existence. More flags, monuments, parades, national festivities, satisfy the purpose of giving concrete forms to something that would otherwise be barely perceptible. If it is considered, for instance, the case of a nation, many local dialects, cultures, customs, different conceptions of religion, life, etc. could be found within it. Furthermore even if it is viewed at a smaller scale's example it can easily be seen how the concept of "group" is actually a mobile entity.

In the Elementary Forms of Religious Life, Durkheim (Durkheim, 1995) describes the structure of a tribe. Now, although we could consider a tribe a social group, the author says that each tribe contains approximately ten clans. Moreover, clans have to be distinguished by phratries. It can be stated that in the case of an inter-clans conflict each clan would emphasize its own symbols. However, considering a case where a tribe should fight a foreign enemy it would probably try to find elements shared by every clan for shaping a super-identity. Despite the fact that this is an old-fashion example it can help to enlighten our point. By this the author means that even in a not developed society, where the sense of community is often more emphasized, a group always contains sub-groups, a culture subcultures. Thus, a group is a construction and its shape can be changed in accord to the needs and requests of the time. This is to say that a group's identity and boundaries are modified on a sort of principle of adaptation: its structure can be shaped in accord with new demands and necessities. Consequently, in order to challenge this

indeterminacy of a group's boundaries, symbols and rituals can be a valid help in defining what a group is. Nevertheless, this definition has a functional nature so, theoretically, it is possible to reshape old symbols or create new ones for the purpose of rewriting a group's identity.

Considering that symbols and rituals have often been used to intensify ethnic violence, it can be argued that they could also contribute to peace building. In the discourse surrounding peacebuilding, Njeri (2022) underscores a prevailing generalization and implicit presumption. This pertains to the notion that, given the typical post-conflict milieu of the peacebuilding sphere, local leadership figures and traditional indigenous rituals and ceremonies lack inherent local legitimacy. This viewpoint aligns with Bedigen's (2022) contention that the predominant body of scholarly work tends to overlook the pervasive influence of indigenous belief systems and their interconnections with routine communal ceremonies and rituals, which notably contribute to the peacebuilding process. Paradoxically, despite this indigenous underpinning, the emphasis often gravitates toward extraneous political and economic initiatives pursued by external non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which are ascribed pivotal significance in the formulation, execution, and realization of comprehensive national peacebuilding strategies. Johan Galtung (2016) conceptualizes the 'soft' components of religion as resources in peacebuilding. Rituals and symbols can be regarded as integral elements within the realm of these softer aspects of religion. Therefore, Lisa Schirch (2022) suggests that rituals have the capacity to serve as a transitional zone, capable of altering one's perspective, sense of self, and connections – all of which are crucial elements for effective peacebuilding. As a result, practitioners of peacebuilding can integrate rituals into their methods.

Establishing peace through rituals and symbols can be accomplished through two methods; on the one hand, it could be developed new symbols or rituals aimed at emphasizing a groups' historical relations or elements of commonality. Indeed, ethnic divided societies can always count on a shared past that can be used for accomplishing this purpose. On the other hand, old symbolic elements can be reshaped in accord to new historical needs. Nothing like a fixed identity really exists in nature. A society always exercises its power on knowledge, selecting and deciding what is worth to save and preserve and what not (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) is. Each symbol and ritual presents in itself a long synthesis of power relations but these ones need to be continuously transmitted in order to be preserved. This means that a creative reinterpretation of the symbolic forms of social life is always possible; that forms of resistance can always be exercised and, consequently, that relations of dominations can be challenged and, potentially, subverted.

The purpose of this research is twofold: firstly, to dissect the mechanisms through which symbols and rituals contribute to the construction and deconstruction of group identities within conflict-ridden societies; and secondly, to evaluate their efficacy in fostering environments conducive to peace and reconciliation. By integrating a qualitative analysis of both historical instances and contemporary case studies, this study aims to illuminate the multifaceted roles these cultural elements play in the peace-building process.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to provide fresh insights into non-traditional peace-building mechanisms. In an era where conflict often stems from identity-based divisions, understanding the power of symbols and rituals to either mitigate or exacerbate these divisions is paramount. Through a comprehensive exploration of their transformative capabilities, this study seeks to contribute a unique perspective to the fields

of peace and conflict studies, highlighting the untapped potential of cultural practices in fostering lasting peace in divided societies.

Methods

This study integrates a library research methodology with a qualitative research framework to delve into the complex role of symbols and rituals in peacebuilding. According to George (2008), the library research method involved a meticulous search and review of existing literature, including scholarly articles, books, and case studies, to gather comprehensive information and diverse perspectives related to peacebuilding practices. This method was complemented by a qualitative approach, as described by Leavy (2020), which focused on interpreting the symbolic meanings and societal implications of rituals and symbols in various peacebuilding contexts. This combination allowed for an in-depth exploration of how these cultural elements influence reconciliation and conflict resolution efforts, providing a nuanced understanding of their impact on community cohesion and identity.

The selection and analysis of sources were conducted with a focus on their relevance to the intersection of peacebuilding, symbols, and rituals. Academic databases and library catalogs were systematically searched to identify materials that offer rich insights into the theoretical underpinnings and practical applications of symbols and rituals in fostering peace. The qualitative analysis then involved thematic coding and interpretive examination of the gathered data, aiming to uncover patterns and derive meaningful conclusions about the role of symbolic practices in peacebuilding. This dual-method approach ensured a holistic view of the subject, capturing both the breadth of existing knowledge and the depth of specific case studies, thereby offering a comprehensive understanding of symbols and rituals as pivotal components in the peacebuilding process.

Results and Discussion

1. The Old Bridge of Mostar: A Metaphor of the Bosnian Multiculturalism

In the realm of contemporary politics, symbols play a pivotal role in rebranding initiatives aimed at modernization and repositioning, as noted by Ginty (2003). Simultaneously, Rivera-Clonch (2023) underscores that symbols serve as potent instruments for fostering peace through cultural avenues. Lisa Schirch (2011) accentuates the significance of integrating symbols into rituals, highlighting their crucial role in introducing innovative approaches to understanding and attributing meaning to the world, both during and after conflicts. Moreover, Appiah-Thompson (2020) contributes by asserting the role of symbols in conflict transformation processes. As noted by Aranguren, the human being is a "symbolic animal" (Aranguren, 1974). By this Aranguren means that people transform and shape the world around them, and their perception of that world, through the use of symbols or symbolic representations. But this process of symbolization of reality is not only a passive or unconscious one. Indeed, in particular circumstances, it can be used as a means to act in the social world. This means that the action of assigning a meaning to an object can be based also on systematic plan or strategy. According to the author, social strategies of symbolization of reality can be based on what he calls "the power of expectation". Basically, the act of shaping our social context is always preceded by the act of conceiving this one in new terms. Ideas, interpretations and images of a desired future prepare its concrete realization. The case of the reconstruction of Mostar's Old Bridge can represent a valid example of this theory. Indeed, although the Bridge has

become the perfect metaphor of the will to overcome the deep ethnic divisions followed the end of the war; the Bosnian social context is still characterized by significant groups' separation. Thus, the authors tend to think that the symbolization of the new Old Bridge should be intended as an effort to direct the actual ethnic divisions toward a future of coexistence and accepted multiculturalism.

The Yugoslav wars have radically changed the ethnic distribution presented on the Yugoslav territory in a previous moment, transforming heterogeneous religious and multicultural regions into homogeneous ones (Hayden, 2007). In the post-war period a noticeable effort was invested in the reconstruction of almost completely destroyed historical and cultural cities. In this enterprise, significantly important has been the reconstruction of the Old Bridge of Mostar. Destroyed by Herzegovinian Croats in 1993, it was completely reconstructed in 2004. Since then the Bridge has been conceived as a remarkable metaphor of the multicultural reality of Bosnia, occupied by Muslims, Serbs and Croats since the Ottoman conquest. Apparently its reconstruction became the symbol of the reconstruction of Bosnia's different ethnic groups and of its openness to values of tolerance and multi-ethnicity. Moreover, the new symbolism was largely widespread even on a European scale and it became a perfect image to represent Bosnia connection to the rest of Europe and, consequently, to a larger multi-ethnic reality.

Apparently, the European Union, UNESCO, and the World Bank, financiers of the reconstruction, tended to believe that this emblematic projects would have been a valid strategy for spreading a sense of normality, and, consequently, stimulating the return to a state of peaceful coexistence (Calame & Pasic, 2009). However, it looks that this acquired symbolism was not perceived or shared by the citizens of Mostar. As reported by Makas:

> Citizens of the city were forbidden to come within a few blocks of the bridge the night of the opening and unable to see the ceremony live, though the speeches repeated that it was their night to be proud and celebrated 'their' progress" (Makas, 2005, p. 66).

Furthermore, the ethnic division is still a reality: children keep attending different schools, Muslims and Croats keep living on their respective side of the river, to have different mobile phone codes, etc. Mostar's citizens are aware that the city is far from achieving the tolerance that had characterized the pre-war period (Calame & Pasic, 2009). As noted by Calame and Pasic *it seems to represent a wish, or at best an opportunity* for renewing past relations. So the symbolization of the Bridge, more than an achievement of accepted multiculturalism and tolerance, had the purpose of educating people in the direction of what Bosnia "should be".

2. From Artefacts to Symbols: A Symbolic Reinterpretation of Historical Buildings

The reinterpretation of symbols holds a significant role in the construction of peace by fostering new perspectives, promoting inclusivity, and facilitating reconciliation among conflicting parties (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004; Johan Galtung, 1990; Lederach, 1997). By reimagining and redefining existing symbols, shared values, common aspirations, and mutual understanding can be highlighted, thus serving as a means to bridge divides and reduce tensions.

This process of reinterpretation allows once-divisive symbols to evolve into unifying forces that bind individuals together, transcending their original meanings and contexts (Philpott, 2015; Zartman, 2007). By accentuating aspects of symbols that

resonate with collective identities or linking them to positive historical events that promote cooperation and harmony, the potential for fostering a sense of shared humanity is enhanced. The process of reinterpreting symbols involves collaborative efforts, dialogue, and negotiation among conflicting parties, enabling the formation of shared narratives that transcend historical animosities (Johan Galtung, 1990; Lederach, 1997). Nonetheless, the successful integration of symbol reinterpretation in peacebuilding hinges on the willingness of parties to engage in the process and the extent to which the new interpretations are embraced by their respective communities (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004).

Kazan represents a good example of reinterpretation of past narrative and symbols in an inclusive and reconciliatory way (Derrick, 2010). Populated by Sunni Muslim Tatars and Eastern Orthodox Russians, Kazan is one of the cities in the world characterized by religiously divided frontiers. The city represents an important location for each group's national history. For the Tatars, it is remembered as the seat of their Islamic state. For the Russians, their victory over Kazan was conceived as the beginning of their expansion and of the "Russian *reconquista*" aimed at liberating Christian lands from the Muslims. However, despite this past history of conflict, Tatars and Russians have found a way of creating new symbolic boundaries to develop a peaceful coexistence. The following fragment is a part of a public speech, delivered by Tatarstani President Mintimer Shaimiev,

> Tataria is our common home, our common care. For the Tatars, who have lived here from time immemorial, this land is their mother's bosom where they formed as a nation. For the duration of seven centuries they had their own statehood, which they have now regained. … For Russians, who also have lived here for centuries, Tataria has also become their native land. The Volga Russians [volzhane-russkie] have formed a way of life that is clearly different from that of other Russians (Derrick, 2010, p. 84).

This example of spirit of tolerance found a concrete expression in the reconstruction of two historical buildings (Derrick, 2012). This two old monuments, the Kul Sharif Mosque and the Cathedral of the Annunciation, became the symbol of the end of the political competition for territory, of an attained communality and coexistence and inter-faith acceptance. The former was a mosque demolished by Muscovite troop in 1552 and with its rebuilding Tatars wanted to reaffirm and enlighten their own historical legacy. In conjunction with its reconstruction the Tatar government ordered the refurbishment of the Russian Cathedral of the Annunciation, constructed on the foundation where once there was the original mosque. Today these ones, representing an influent source of symbolic and historical identity for both religious groups, stay side by side within the Kazan Kremlin and their physical proximity is aimed at reinforcing the sense of a social proximity and acceptance for each religious group: the Sunni Muslim Tatars and the Orthodox Christians Russians. The authors tend to think that the case of Kazan present two different interpretative levels and that this is the reason of the successful coexistence of its people: on the one hand, symbols of each group were recognized and emphasized (the Mosque and the Cathedral) and this helped to avoid conflict regarding the claims on property; on the other hand, their proximity represents a further symbol of inclusiveness. In conclusion, this symbolic strategy was developed on both a micro and a macro level

allowing the preservation of both groups' identities and, at the same time, the construction of the sense of shared history.

3.   Saint Patrick: National Apostle and Patron of Ireland

Saint Patrick's figure presents an obvious vantage in terms of symbolization and creative manipulation. Indeed, few facts are known about his life and this lack of information makes possible to interpret and to reconstruct his story for political and social purposes (J. Nagle & Clancy, 2010). In the past centuries both Catholics and Protestants gave different versions of what they thought were the connections of Saint Patrick with their religious institutions and affiliations. This ethnic claims on the Saint's life were partially solved by the government that tried to open a shared space with the inauguration of Saint Patrick's day. However, tensions regarding sectarian claims on his origin did not end. During The Troubles and then in the post-war years, a different narrative of his life was developed. His historical reconfiguration aimed at emphasizing the shared and common origin of the Saint's life.

The new version described Saint Patrick simply as the father of Irish Christianity, as a Christian missionary, came to Ireland to bring peace among its people. He became the symbol of a will of reconciliation and of recognition of diversity. Today Saint Patrick's parade is seen as the "model" parade in Northern Ireland. In a place were just few symbols are shared by the two groups, this parade represents an important symbolic space for reinforcing cross-ethnic relations (Cullen, 2011). However the issue of "how" to celebrate is still debated. The problem is that even if both communities consider Saint Patrick an important element of their own culture, the representations and the ways used to express or represent him are still different. During the parade each group shows its own symbols, thus keeps celebrating his figure with the exhibition of ethnic group's markers. This is to say that the communality of symbols does not necessarily mean political neutrality. Moreover, the religious meaning that Saint Patrick's Day should have is always less influent.

A survey conducted by Nagle shows that only a 4.7% of informants stated that they attended church on St Patrick's Day (John Nagle, 2004). This presents a clear problem: a symbol that had the purpose of enlightening the common origin of the religions practiced by the two groups, is accomplishing a secular character. During the Saint Patrick's Day only a small percentage of people keep perceiving the common religious character that the symbol of the Saint was supposed to represent. Consequently, there are two antagonistic forces that weaken the power of this symbol: the conflict regarding its origin and the right of property on the one hand, and the progress of secularization on the other hand.

4.   Symbols and Rituals in Peacebuilding: A Discussion

The findings from this research underscore the profound impact symbols and rituals have on peace-building in divided societies. By examining cases such as the Old Bridge of Mostar, the symbolic reinterpretation of historical buildings in Kazan, and the utilization of Saint Patrick's imagery in Northern Ireland, this study reveals the dual capacity of symbols and rituals to both bridge and divide. These examples illustrate that symbols and rituals can serve as powerful tools for fostering multicultural tolerance and understanding, especially when they encapsulate shared values and histories. The reconstruction of Mostar's Old Bridge, for example, emerges not just as a physical act of rebuilding but as a symbolic gesture towards the reconciliation of divided communities,

suggesting that the deliberate shaping of symbolic capital can direct communities towards a future of coexistence and shared multiculturalism.

This findings reinforces the understanding that symbols and rituals are pivotal in fostering social cohesion and facilitating conflict resolution. Ginty's (2003) exploration of symbols in the context of rebranding and peace initiatives, along with Rivera-Clonch's (2023) insights into their role in cultural avenues for peace, provide a foundational backdrop that this study builds upon. Notably, this research delineates the active roles that the reinterpretation and creation of symbols assume within the peace-building continuum. Such an approach not only acknowledges the significance of symbols, as previously discussed by scholars like Ginty (2003) and Rivera-Clonch (2023), but also showcases their practical application in specific peace-building contexts. This directly complements and expands upon Lisa Schirch's (2022) advocacy for the integration of symbols into rituals as a strategy for peace, offering a nuanced and detailed exploration that contributes novel perspectives to the scholarly dialogue. By presenting detailed case studies, this study not only underscores the theoretical importance of symbols in peace-building but also highlights their practical utility in real-world applications, thereby enriching the academic conversation with tangible examples of successful symbolic integration.

This study underscores the pivotal role of rituals in peacebuilding, aligning with and expanding upon existing scholarship by illustrating their transformative capacity to reshape worldviews, identities, and relationships—key components for successful peace efforts (L. Schirch, 2011). While rituals such as smudging ceremonies and symbolic gestures have been recognized for their general impact on social cohesion and conflict resolution, this research delves into their specific application within peacebuilding frameworks. Notably, it highlights how these practices not only facilitate transformation but also foster solidarity in religiously diverse communities during crises, as seen in the "Joys and Concerns" practice within a Unitarian Universalist congregation (Johnson, 2022). This nuanced contribution to social cohesion extends the understanding of rituals' role beyond traditional peacebuilding contexts.

Furthermore, by examining the mechanisms through which rituals promote group bonding and cooperation—from supporting mothers through traumatic births to unifying football fans—this research adds a unique perspective to the discourse (Whitehouse, 2023). It explores how rituals can inspire inclusive leadership and encourage collective action on societal issues like environmental conservation, thereby broadening their recognized impact. Comparing these insights with previous studies reveals a more complex picture of how rituals contribute to peacebuilding. This research not only reaffirms the foundational role of rituals identified in earlier works but also offers a detailed exploration of their multifaceted contributions, enhancing the scholarly dialogue and marking a significant addition to the field.

Practically, this study offers valuable insights for peace-building practitioners and policymakers. It suggests that engaging with a society's symbolic capital—through careful consideration of existing symbols and the creation of new ones—can enhance peace-building strategies. Theoretically, it expands the understanding of how symbols and rituals function as tools for both constructing and deconstructing social identities and boundaries. This research underlines the necessity of a nuanced approach to employing symbols in peace-building, one that recognizes their power to either heal or harm, depending on their application.

The reflection on this study's outcomes reveals the significant transformative power of rituals in the peacebuilding process, signifying their crucial role in establishing social cohesion and resolving conflicts within divided societies. This phenomenon connects

with the broader concept of symbolic strength in human societies, as described by Turner (1969), who emphasized how symbols and rituals act as bridges between social realities and communal values. The implications of these findings highlight the importance of integrating ritual-based approaches into peacebuilding strategies, indicating that such efforts can enhance cross-cultural understanding and solidarity (Geertz, 1973; Turner, 1969). This underscores the necessity of considering symbolic and ritualistic dimensions in designing social interventions and policies aimed at reinforcing the social fabric of post-conflict societies.

The reason why our research uncovers the importance of rituals in peacebuilding can be explained through the lens of symbolic anthropology (Geertz, 1973) and social psychology (Tajfel & Turner, 2000), both of which illuminate how group identities and symbols play a role in shaping intergroup perceptions and interactions. This study demonstrates that rituals, as practices rich in symbols, provide a means for individuals and groups to express shared identities, process trauma, and celebrate unifying values, all of which are key elements in creating sustainable peace. Therefore, these findings not only contribute to academic theory but also offer practical insights for practitioners and policymakers in designing effective peacebuilding programs.

Conclusion

The key findings of this research is the profound and multifaceted role that rituals play in the peace-building process, contrary to the conventional focus primarily on political and economic strategies. It was revealed that the deliberate integration and reinterpretation of symbols and rituals could effectively bridge deep ethnic divisions, as exemplified by the reconstruction of Mostar's Old Bridge and the communal practices in Kazan and Northern Ireland. These cases illustrate that symbols and rituals extend beyond mere cultural expressions; they are pivotal in crafting a narrative of coexistence and multiculturalism that can navigate societies towards sustainable peace.

This study contributes significantly to the field by elucidating the complex mechanisms through which symbols and rituals influence peace-building. By providing a detailed exploration of their application in various contexts, this research offers a novel conceptual and methodological framework that highlights the transformative power of symbolic practices in conflict resolution. It enriches the academic discourse by emphasizing the importance of cultural dimensions in peace-building efforts, a perspective that has often been overlooked in favor of more tangible interventions.

While this study provides valuable insights into the transformative role of symbols and rituals in peace-building, its reliance on literature review rather than field studies presents a notable limitation. By focusing on documented cases and secondary sources, the research may not fully capture the nuanced, lived experiences and dynamic interactions that occur within communities engaged in peace-building processes. This methodological approach, while expansive in scope, potentially overlooks the subtleties and complexities of symbolic practices as experienced on the ground. Future research, therefore, should consider incorporating field studies to directly observe and engage with communities. Such studies could offer a more granular perspective on how symbols and rituals are enacted, perceived, and evolve within specific cultural and conflict contexts. Fieldwork would not only validate and expand upon the findings of this literature-based study but also uncover new dimensions of how symbolic capital contributes to peace-building, providing richer data to inform both theory and practice.

References

Appiah-Thompson, C. (2020). The Usage of African Religious Symbolism, Proverbial Wisdom and Myths in Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3639682

Aranguren, J. L. L. (1974). Freedom, Symbols and Communication. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *412*(1), 11–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271627441200103

Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (2004). *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bedigen, W. (2022). A quest for sustainable peace in South Sudan: the role of everyday religious practices, ceremonies and rituals in robust peacebuilding. *Journal of the British Academy*, *10s1*, 55–77. https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/010s1.055

Berreby, D. (2008). *Us and Them*. Chicago.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Calame, J., & Pasic, A. (2009). Post-conflict reconstruction in Mostar: Cart before the Horse, Divided Cities.

Cullen, T. (2011). Contesting St Patrick's Day in Downpatrick. *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, *37*(1/2), 208–222.

Derrick, M. (2010). Kazan: The Religiously Undivided Frontier City. *Caucasian Review of International Affairs*, *4*(1), 82–86.

Derrick, M. (2012). The tension of memory: Reclaiming the Kazan Kremlin. *Acta Slavica Iaponica*, (33), 1–26.

Durkheim, E. (1995). *The Elementary Forms of Religiuous Life*. New York: The Free Press.

Galtung, J. (2016). Religions Hard and Soft. In L. Marsden (Ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Religion and Conflict Resolution* (pp. 247–263). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315613505

Galtung, Johan. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, *27*(3), 291–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343390027003005

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

George, M. W. (2008). *The elements of library research: what every student needs to know*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ginty, R. Mac. (2003). The Role of Symbols in Peacemaking. In J. Darby & R. M. Ginty (Eds.), *Contemporary Peacemaking* (pp. 235–244). London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403918475_21

Hayden, R. M. (2007). Moral Vision and Impaired Insight. *Current Anthropology*, *48*(1), 105–131. https://doi.org/10.1086/508688

Johnson, S. K. (2022). Crisis, Solidarity, and Ritual in Religiously Diverse Settings: A Unitarian Universalist Case Study. *Religions*, *13*(7), 614. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13070614

Leavy, P. (2020). *The oxford handbook of qualitative research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Makas, E. (2005). Interpreting Multivalent Sites: New Meanings for Mostar's Old Bridge.

Centropa, *5*(1), 59–69.

Nagle, J., & Clancy, M. C. (2010). *Shared Society or Benign Apartheid? Understanding Peace-Building in Divided Societies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nagle, John. (2004). *A Survey of attitudes towards St Patrick's Day Celebrations 2004*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/440720/A_Survey_of_attitudes_towards_St_Patrick_s_Day_Celebrations_2004

Nagle, John. (2014). From the Politics of Antagonistic Recognition to Agonistic Peace Building: An Exploration of Symbols and Rituals in Divided Societies. *Peace & Change*, *39*(4), 468–494. https://doi.org/10.1111/pech.12090

Njeri, S. (2022). Everyday peacebuilding and practices in Kenya, South Sudan, Somaliland and Ghana: introduction. *Journal of the British Academy*, *10s1*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/010s1.001

Philpott, D. (2015). *Just and unjust peace: An ethic of political reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rivera-Clonch, M. (2023). *A Depth Psychological Study of the Peace Symbol*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/b23325

Rocha, Z. L. (2013). *Betwixt, Between and Beyond: Racial formation and" mixed race" identities in New Zealand and Singapore*. National University of Singapore.

Schirch, L. (2011). *Ritual and symbol in peacebuilding*. Bloomfield: Kumarian Press.

Schirch, Lisa. (2022). Ritual and Peacebuilding. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Religion and Peace* (pp. 255–263). Hoboken: Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119424420.ch21

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (2000). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In *Organizational Identity* (pp. 56–65). Oxford: Oxford University PressOxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199269464.003.0005

Turner, V. W. (1969). *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Umeyama, S. S., & Brehm, W. (2021). The Power of Identity in Hybrid Peacebuilding: Buddhist Monks in Post-Conflict Cambodia. In Y. Uesugi, A. Deekeling, S. S. Umeyama, & L. McDonald-Colbert (Eds.), *Operationalisation of Hybrid Peacebuilding in Asia. Security, Development and Human Rights in East Asia* (pp. 81–97). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67758-9_5

Whitehouse, H. (2023). Rethinking ritual: how rituals made our world and how they could save it. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.14048

Zartman, I. W. (2007). *Peacemaking in international conflict : methods & techniques*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

This page is intentionally left blank