INTRODUCTION

SPECIAL ISSUE: CONFLICT RESOLUTION
AND CLASSICAL LITERATURE

The content of this special issue derives from a Global Challenges Research Fund Networking Grant administered by the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council on Conflict Resolution through Classical Literature (AH/S003835/1). This research funding has allowed us to organize a series of workshops at partner universities in Colombia (Universidad de los Andes, Bogota) as well as Brazil (Amazonia State University, Manaus) and the United Kingdom (King's College London). The papers of this issue mainly derive from presentations given at a panel in Bogota in 2019 with two additional papers commissioned. We thank the editors of Classica Journal for allowing us to guest edit this special issue and Ricardo Vela Rábago for his formatting and copy editing skills.

Conflict Resolution through Classical Literature focuses on exploring how Classics and War Studies research can contribute to conflict resolution and peacebuilding education in Brazil and Colombia. Ultimately follow on projects focused on impact and engagement will produce and trial material on how Classical Literature communicates conflict resolution skills to conflict-affected youth and/or disadvantaged communities. However, first and foremost we must examine ancient literature and the classical world in general for conflicts and conflict resolution strategies (or indeed lack of the latter) before we can feed these findings into developing outreach programs with our partner universities in São Paulo, Juiz de Fora, Manaus, Brasília and Bogotá.

Ancient literature is especially suited to engaging students in dialogue about conflict resolution. Without making explicit references to contemporary crises in Brazil and Colombia, it introduces sensitive themes in a non-controversial manner. In addition, incorporating Classical learning into conflict resolution education enables our project to cross disciplinary boundaries and thereby set a precedent for future pedagogical and research initiatives.

THINKING ABOUT CONFLICT RESOLUTION

> Conflict exists when one person has a need
> of another and that need is not being met.

The concept of positive peace involves the elimination of the root causes of war, violence, and injustice and the conscious attempt to build a society that reflects these commitments. Positive peace is filled with positive content such as the restoration of relationships, the creation of social systems that serve the needs of the whole population and the constructive resolution of conflict.

Negative peace, on the other hand, is defined as a peace without justice. Negative peace refers to the absence of violence. When, for example, a ceasefire is enacted, a negative peace will ensue. It is negative because something undesirable stopped happening (e.g. the violence stopped, the oppression ended). True conflict resolution thus initiates a process towards positive peace.[1]

However, it remains to define what exactly is conflict resolution and how may it be achieved. The term *conflict resolution* refers to the facilitated analysis of the underlying sources of conflict situations by the parties in the conflict.[2] This is a process of facilitation and must be distinguished from *mediation*. Traditional mediation is usually regarded as suggesting reasonable compromises by seeking agreement moving from one party to another in the process. Facilitation on the other hand seeks to help parties arrive at a common definition of their relationship and define their own goals in the situation. However, often mediation is used as an umbrella term to describe any conflict resolution. Similarly, a settlement is distinct from a resolution – it is possible for a settlement to be arrived at for a power-bargaining result – just as a court has power to settle a dispute. However, achieving a *resolution* should not be *conflict management* but *conflict resolution* since conflict management has a wider application from deterrence strategies to propaganda. It usually is an attempt by the status quo party to the dispute to avoid escalation of a conflict while maintaining control without giving way. This position is typical of the policies of non-legitimized authorities under threat. Conflict resolution, on the other hand, seeks to resolve the problem, even though this requires change. It is thus not the result of a compromise or an enforced decision but the outcome that develops out of an analysis of the total situation by the concerned parties to meet their needs.

Generally, we find seven categories of conflict resolution outlined (though categories may partially overlap) and I encourage the readers of this issue to keep those in mind when sampling the chapters provided here:

- **Avoiding**: Someone who uses a strategy of *avoiding* mostly tries to ignore or sidestep the conflict, hoping it will resolve itself or dissipate.
- **Accommodating**: Using the strategy of *accommodating* to resolve conflict essentially involves taking steps to satisfy the other party's concerns or demands at the expense of your own needs or desires.
- **Compromising**: The strategy of *compromising* involves finding an acceptable resolution that will partly, but not entirely, satisfy the concerns of all parties involved.
- **Competing**: Someone who uses the conflict resolution strategy of *competing* tries to satisfy their own desires at the expense of the other parties involved.

---

[1] This terminology was first outlined by Galtung (1964). Grewal (2003) offers a history and critique of this terminology: https://www.academia.edu/744030/Johan_Galtung_Positive_and_Negative_Peace
[2] In what follows I use the terminology suggested by Burton (1986).

- **Collaborating**: Using *collaborating* involves finding a solution that entirely satisfies the concerns of all involved parties.
- **Appealing:** One party imploring/ asking the other to meet their needs and end the conflict
- **Commanding:** One party which is of a higher rank/status orders the other to do what they have asked and the lower status party complies.

In what follows I provide a brief overview over the content of each paper to guide the reader.

Whetham examines how the ancient concept of just war sits uneasily alongside modern positions of realism and nonviolence and in itself forms a compromise between these two positions. Whilst the latter position argues that resorting to war and violence to resolve any issue since to act morally cannot entail the deliberate taking of life that fighting a war requires. One cannot do evil to prevent evil; a position often motivated by religion. The realist on the other hand will argue that moral values are only made possible inside a state for those who live within its boundaries and under its protection under a social contract where each individual gives up a portion of their freedom in exchange for the protection offered by the state. Laws and values only exist because of the state's ability to protect them. Values, morality and ethics are not protected internationally since there is no power beyond that of a state to guard them. The Just War Tradition then agrees with the pacifist view what war is morally questionable but also takes on board the realist position that sometimes war is better than the evil that might ensue without it. By tracing the origin and permutation of this idea from antiquity to the present day, Whetham reflects on the attitudes towards war through the centuries.

Guarin Robledo and **Bromberg** both advocate the relevance and utility of ancient materials and sources in theorizing and implementing contemporary peacebuilding methods. In particular, they examine sports and athletics as tools for transitioning combatants from wartime to peacetime, for mitigating the negative social consequences of warfare, and for developing a resilient, interconnected transnational community. **Bromberg** offers transcultural comparison of approaches to conflict resolution through athletic competition and for using sport as an interventionist tool in post-conflict societies. He focuses on source materials from ancient Greek athletics and makes connections between ancient and modern practices to draw useful lessons for today's practitioners. **Guarin Robledo** refers to Hesiod's *Works and Days*, Hesiod's didactic poem, and Friedrich Nietzsche's reading of the passage in which the double nature of Eris is explained, two passages which speak about the neutralization of conflicts and their substitution through non-violent rituals associated with sports. In addition, he examines the biographic writings of Hermippus of Smyrna about Likurgos and his role in achieving the Olympic truce (*ekeicheria*) as well as a short story written by Robert Graves, a British veteran of World War I, dedicated to the football matches played during the Christmas Truce in 1914. These two texts showcase how sports competition constitutes a valuable tool in conflict resolution.

Molano Parrado analyses how the tears that Achilles and Priam share in book 24 of the *Iliad* enables the resolution of the struggle over the body of Hector. Furthermore, it in a way provides a model for solving the violent conflict between Trojans and Achaeans. She suggests that weeping acquires a social function in Homeric epic, as it operates like a motif in the negotiation between Achilles and Priam. Weeping has therapeutic effects on the characters and achieves shared recognition of their suffering. Finally, she explores how the hospitality in this scene, which is the consequences of the shared emotions and the recognition of common sufferings, makes both characters capable of empathising with each other.

Dos Santos contribution is concerned with the role played by *clementia* (mercy/clemency) as a particular peacebuilding tool in the Late Roman Republic and Early Principate. He investigates some of the historical and philosophical conditions that determinate the change of *moderatio* or temperance into *clementia* (mercy). Mercy becomes a concept closely related to the new era of autocratic political power derived from Civil Wars, and therefore not only justifies the authority of the *princeps* but also prepares the ground for the *Pax Romana*. Concentrating primarily on Pseudo-Sallust, Cicero, August, Seneca and Tacitus writings, he demonstrates that *moderatio* and *clementia* are interrelated virtues applied to different historical contexts.

References

BURTON, John. The theory of conflict resolution. *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, v. 9, n. 3, p. 125-30, 1986.

GALTUNG, Johan. An editorial. *Journal of Peace Research*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 1-4, 1964.

GREWAL, Baljit. *Johan Galtung: positive and negative peace*. School of Social Science, Auckland. University of Technology, 2003. https://www.academia.edu/744030/Johan_Galtung_Positive_and_Negative_Peace2003. Access on: Feb. 28, 2023.

Martin T. Dinter
Reader in Latin Literature
King's College London
martin.dinter@kcl.ac.uk
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2876-6994