



**Teaching Package for GSUM course on  
MEDIATION AND THE GLOBAL SOUTH**

**Prof. Esra Cuhadar, Bilkent University, Turkey**

---



The **Global South Unit for Mediation (GSUM)** is a learning, research and training platform focused on international mediation. The Unit will promote the diffusion of knowledge and expertise among scholars, diplomats, governmental officials and non-governmental actors from the Global South. The GSUM is the result of a partnership between the Institute of International Relations of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (IRI/PUC-Rio), the BRICS Policy Center, and the Royal Embassy of Norway in Brazil.

Teaching packages are comprehensive teacher's guides prepared by renowned specialists addressing important topics of the contemporary international mediation agenda. Each Teaching Package covers five lessons and aims to assist academics and professionals interested in teaching classes on the following topics:

- Conflict Resolution and mediation as a field of study and practice
- Actors and Processes of Mediation
- Mediation and the United Nations System
- Mediation and the Global South
- Gender and Mediation
- Elements and Reflections on Success, Failures, and Lessons Learned

The opinions expressed herein are the sole responsibility of the author and does not necessarily reflect the position of the institutions involved.

## About the Author

**Dr. Esra Çuhadar** joined the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Bilkent University, in Turkey, in 2006. She was a Fulbright Visiting Scholar at Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University during the 2011-2012 academic year. She also worked as an Assistant Prof. in the Conflict Analysis and Resolution Program of Sabancı University, Istanbul, Turkey. Dr. Çuhadar received her M.A and Ph.D. and an advanced graduate certificate in Applied Conflict Resolution from Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University. Dr. Çuhadar's research interests include mediation, interactive conflict resolution workshops, evaluation of peacebuilding and conflict resolution programs, negotiation and mediation pedagogy, and political psychology with a focus on decision groups and political leaders. Her research has been published in academic journals such as *Computers in Human Behavior*, *Negotiation Journal*, *International Negotiation*, *Journal of Peace Research*, *Mediterranean Politics*, *International Studies Perspectives*, *Turkish Studies and Perceptions* and also in various book chapters. Besides her research in peacebuilding and conflict resolution, she has conducted numerous trainings and consultations in negotiation and mediation for various groups and organizations in Turkey and elsewhere. She has been working as a regional mediator for the World Bank in Turkey and Caucasus since 2011. She was elected as a member of the International Society for Political Psychology Governing Council (2010-2012) and also served as a board member of the European Mediation Network Initiative. She is one of the editors of *All-Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace* published by the Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research of the İhsanDoğramacı Foundation for Peace.



# 1. Course Description

## Context

Recent years witnessed several important developments and consequent discussions in the mediation field. Some of these developments are especially relevant to mediators working in/on the Global South. The practice of 'mediation support' became institutionalized mainly under professional organizations located in the Global North. These organizations grew with "mediation experts" joining in their ranks and providing consulting, process design, and other mediation related services in conflicts worldwide. Such organizations have also become reference organizations for the UN, OSCE, and other international and regional organizations in both helping them with the design of mediation and peace processes in conflicts they are involved with, and also in the establishment of their own mediation support units within their organizational structures. The establishment of mediation support units within the UN, African Union, and the OSCE in the recent years accelerated the trend of 'professionalizing' mediation services. Trainings are held for experts, rosters and databases of mediators are put together and a new institutional capacity is being formed. Yet, almost all mediation support organizations, except a few of them, are located in the Global North. Almost every European government active in the mediation field has its own official or unofficial mediation support center. Even though most of the conflicts and mediation processes take place in the Global South, only a few of these organizations are located in the Global South. It's true that support organizations in the North benefit from 'experts' from or knowledgeable about conflicts in the Global South, but again most of the time these experts are trained to consume and utilize the knowledge on mediation and peace process design produced in the Global North. The relationship can rather be characterized as 'hierarchical' that is, those in the North produce the knowledge and norms about the practice of mediation and others in the South accept these knowledge and norms and apply them.

Another recent important development in global mediation is that despite the dominance of Global North in the production of knowledge and practice norms

in mediation, new intermediary actors, usually called upon as emerging powers, have increasingly become more active in the global scene of mediation. In addition to the traditional intermediary actors such as the US, Finland, Norway, and the UK, we witness a diversification in the number of intermediary states and non-state actors in the last decade. Some of these countries made mediation an important part of their foreign policy agenda such as Brazil, Turkey, S. Africa, Oman, and Kenya. Regardless of the outcome of their initiatives, the visibility of these countries in the mediation domain increased.

These two developments raise important questions concerning mediation. Is mediation at the global level inclusive enough? Is there need for more inclusive mediation? Do the newly emerging intermediary actors bring their different “particularistic” perspective to mediation? Can we talk about a universal approach to mediation? Does this perspective accept the inherent hierarchy in mediation or challenge it? Is there a difference between practitioners from Global North and Global South in terms of practice and norms? Second, do mediation support organizations in the Global North provide a global perspective on mediation or do they provide services particularly for intermediary actors in the Global North? Will the Global South go in the direction of establishing their own “mediation support” centers supporting their own particularistic perspectives on global mediation or will they provide a global perspective on mediation from the Global South?

## Academic and policy literature

The UN Guidance on Effective Mediation named “inclusivity” as one of the normative principles of effective mediation. The policy literature on the topic is highly driven by a normative approach. The academic literature on “inclusive mediation” is sparse. Still, there are several important academic studies conducted on the topic and also by “southern” scholars. There is also a developing literature on non-Western approaches to mediation. The course will rely on a mix of policy and academic literatures to offer a broad and in-depth discussion of the questions listed above.

## Course overview

The Course focuses on some key issues related to the discussion of mediation and Global South. Some of the issues that will be covered are: the principle of inclusivity, participatory processes in mediation, local ownership and mechanisms of local ownership, role of insider mediators, theories of change used by non-Western practitioners, and the mediation activities of newly emerging actors.

The Course will explore the dynamics outlined above through presentations by the instructor, class discussion, and analysis of case studies.

## 2. Prior Knowledge Requirement

Although no prior knowledge is absolutely required in order to succeed in this course, since the topics covered on mediation are somewhat more advanced, an introductory mediation course before this one would be very useful. An academic background in International Relations or Peace and Conflict Studies is also beneficial but not essential. Students who read carefully the required readings prior to the start of the course will be adequately prepared.

## 3. Course Goals and Learning Objectives

### Goals

The Course has the following learning objectives:

- Provide students with an overview of the academic and policy literature on mediation and the Global South

- Provide students with an understanding of the following issues related to Global South and mediation: the principle of inclusivity in mediation, designing participatory mediation processes, importance of local ownership and destabilising mechanisms of local ownership, role of local agents (e.g. insider mediators and civil society), theories of change used by mediation practitioners from Global South, and mediation activities of newly emerging global actors.
- Engage students in the analysis of mediation cases with local ownership and broader participation.
- Teaching students skills in designing inclusive mediation processes with the help of case studies
- Familiarize students with the context specific approaches to mediation from Global South and engage them in the debate on particularism vs universalism in mediation

## Relevance of the course

This course is connected to the other five courses by introducing more advanced and highly debated contemporary topics on mediation. The literature on mediation is heavily shaped by academics and practitioners from the developed world. This course complements this literature by bringing in alternative voices from other parts of the world and also highlights the importance of “local” and “inclusive” in mediation processes.

# 4. Course Breakdown: Topics and Questions

## Day 1 : Introduction, overview of the key concepts

### Session 1

**Topics:** Introduction of the course, schedule, readings, pedagogic approach of the instructor, setting mutual expectations and ground rules for class sessions

**Questions:** What are the expectations of students from this class? Interactive exercise: State one expectation from this class/instructor. State one expectation about yourself/classmates. Go over these expectations one by one and connect them to the course syllabus.

### Session 2

**Topics:** exploring the concept of Global South, characteristics of mediation, international norms concerning mediation and their implications for the Global South

**Questions:** What is “Global South”? What distinguishes Global South from the rest? How useful and valid is this concept? What does it mean in light of mediation? Why do we use it?

### Session 3

**Topics:** challenges of mediation in the Global South; mapping out themes relevant to mediation and Global South, go over the themes and ask students if anything else should be added to this list, rationale for including such topics in this discussion, the debate on particularism vs universalism and its implications for mediation

**Questions:** What themes should be included in the list when we talk about

mediation in the context of Global South? Why? Can we talk about a 'particular' type of mediation in the Global South? Is mediation different in Global South or are we concerned with universal challenges?

## Day 2: Debate on inclusivity and local ownership in mediation

### Session 4

Topics: the principle of inclusive mediation, local ownership in mediation and implications of local ownership

Questions: What are the implications of local ownership (or lack thereof) in mediation processes? What do we mean by inclusive mediation? Why is the principle of inclusive mediation included in the UN Guidance?

### Session 5

Topics: Role of local civil society actors and insider mediators; participatory mediation processes; inclusion of civil society in mediation processes; what kind of mechanisms are there for civil society inclusion and broader participation in peace processes

Questions: What roles do civil society play in mediation processes? Are all civil society roles constructive for mediation processes?

### Session 6

Topics: Coordination and complementarity between outside/international and insider/local mediators

Questions: How are insider mediators different from outside-impartial mediators? What unique aspects do they bring to the mediation process? What are some of the challenges in coordinating the efforts of outside mediators and insider mediators?

## Day 3: Hybridity and localization in peacebuilding

### Session 7

Topics: “particularistic” or culture sensitive approaches to mediation; universalism vs. particularism;

Questions: Can we talk about a universal approach to mediation? Does universal mean “Northern” or “Western”?

### Session 8

Topics: critiques of the liberal peacebuilding paradigm; the concept of hybridity; diffusion of peacebuilding norms

Questions: Can we talk about hybrid peacebuilding? What is the difference between localization and hybridity?

### Session 9

Topics: critiques of hybridity; bringing the top down and bottom up together in peace processes; theories of change used by practitioners from Global South;

Questions: What is a theory of change? How can we bring the top down and bottom up together in peace processes? Is it possible to talk about a completely “indigenous” peace process during the age of globalization?

## Day 4: Case study simulation and group work on designing an inclusive mediation process

### Session 10, 11, 12

Topics: How to design an inclusive mediation processes? Small groups will

be formed to work on a peace infrastructure task. Each group will work on a different case and is expected to design an “inclusive” mediation process for that case. Possible cases for discussion are: Cyprus (as an example of lack of inclusion in 2004 negotiations, failed referendum), Tajikistan, Guatemala (an example of inclusive mechanisms established but not adequate due to elite resistance), Northern Ireland.

Questions: How can we design an inclusive mediation process? What are the mechanisms that can generate local ownership? What are the advantages and disadvantages of a participatory process in each case? What are the obstacles? What are the facilitators?

Notes to instructors on how to conduct case studies:

I divide students into working groups of maximum 4-5 people. Then, I assign a case study to each group. Cases are provided by me and each one is about a negotiation process. Prior to the group work in the classroom, I distribute basic information about the conflict and peace negotiations on that case to each group. They are asked to come to the group having read the information. I also tell them to do more research themselves on the case if they find the information not adequate. Typical cases I choose are: Cyprus, Guatemala, Colombia, Northern Ireland, and Tajikistan. These cases provide a good basis for discussion because they vary in terms of inclusion dynamics, mechanisms of inclusion, and different outcomes. After the groups complete their work, they come back to the large group and present the “inclusive process design” they come up with.

In the beginning of the group work, each group is distributed a set of questions. They have to discuss as a group and come up with a process design for the mediation. They are told that they work as the members of a technical advisor team to the mediator on the case. Their task is to design a mediation process that is inclusive.

These are the questions given to the students for their group work:

- Divide into groups assigned to you
- One case is assigned to each group

- Case study information includes context information, conflict analysis, peace process information
- Suppose you are assigned to the technical advisory team of the mediator in this case
- You are expected to come up with a participation design & strategy
- Answer the questions as a group
- Then present to class in plenary session

As a group you have to answer the following questions:

- Who should be included in the negotiation process? Why?
- What functions are needed from civil society?
- Is there anyone who can perform this function in civil society?
- How? Which mechanism do you suggest? Why? (State the rationale for each stakeholder)
- Implementation strategy (what will be the architecture)?
- What challenges do you expect in the process? From who?
- What facilitating conditions do you expect in the process? How can you use them to support your effort?

I also tell them the following points based on the lecture provided before. I ask them to refer to the inclusion models identified in my joint research with Thania Paffenholz. (See the reading list and references on broadening public participation project report and Thania Paffenholz chapters in the reading list)

- Inclusion does not have to be at the negotiation table. Be flexible as a

mediator!

- Combination of different models lead to more successful cases.
- Quality of influence matters. Do not have inclusion for the sake of inclusion. Can you genuinely include the relevant actor?
- Balancing the normative and strategic/political considerations

## Day 5: Perspectives of mediators from the Global South

### Session 13

**Topics:** Newly emerging mediator states; emerging powers and their mediation agenda

**Questions:** What do mediators from Global South specifically bring to the mediation processes? Do they have different perspectives/theories of change/practices than mediators from Global north?

### Session 14

**Topics:** “the world is bigger than five” new alliances in the international arena and its implications for mediation

**Questions:** What do newly emerging actors want in terms of international mediation?

### Session 15

**Topics:** Examples from the field, mediation by southern states, mediation by southern non-state actors

**Questions:** Do southern actors have different goals? Practices? Agendas?

What is different about them? What is universal about all mediation actors?

Note to instructors on a case study of an emerging power mediator:

I give examples from Turkish mediation during the last decade. I use a classification I came up with where I classify most of the newly emerging mediators as “regional insider mediators” and discuss Turkish mediation as an example of a “regional insider mediator.” (See forthcoming article in the reading list for more information on this classification). I compare/contrast this type of mediation with that of a “neutral outsider” (e.g. Norway) and of a “principal power mediator” (e.g. US). I discuss the opportunities and vulnerabilities of each type of mediator with a particular emphasis on “insider regional mediators”. What are the implications of being situated in this zone? What kind of opportunities and vulnerabilities does this position bring? Examples from Turkish mediation in this sense. Then, I hold class discussion on other regional insider mediators. Why do they think that these actors belong to this category? They give examples from cases they are familiar with.

## 6. Questions for Critical Thinking

There are several underlying themes that cut across all topics covered. The first one is: What are the main assumptions about mediation? Does everyone share the assumptions of mediation? How universal are mediation norms? To what extent and in what sense Global South shares these assumptions?

The second philosophical debate is about the tension presented in the literature as top-down vs local approaches to peace. Can we talk about a pure “local” approach to peace in today’s globalized world? How do norms about peacebuilding get diffused? Is this always a top-down, involuntary, imposed process? Do scholars romanticize the notion of “local” and indigenous? What are the practical advantages of including local actors in a peace process? Who has the ultimate power and control in the design of a mediation process?

The third question is about the theories of conflict transformation used by

practitioners. Do these theories change from practitioner to practitioner, culture to culture? Or can we talk about universally applicable theories of change that are valid for all types of conflict whether in the Global South or not.

## 7. Teaching Methods and Materials

The course will be taught with the help of several different methods. There will be lectures by the instructor on theories and cases. In addition, students will engage in class discussions based on the questions listed in the syllabus. During the fourth day, the students will be divided into small groups to work on a task related to a specific case.

## 8. Required Readings

### Day 1: Introduction and debate on Global South

UN Secretary-General, 2012, *Guidance for Effective Mediation*, New York: United Nations

Lanz, D. and M. Siegfried, 2012, *Mediation Process Matrix*, swisspeace

### Day 2: Inclusivity and local ownership in mediation

Bell, C. and O'Rourke, C. 2007. The People's Peace? Peace Agreements, Civil Society, and Participatory Democracy , *International Political Science Review*, vol. 28, no. 3, 293-324.

Nilsson, D. 2012. Anchoring the Peace: Civil Society Actors in Peace Accords and Durable Peace, *International Interactions*, vol. 38, 243-266.

Cuhadar, E. and T. Paffenholz. Forthcoming. What is a constructive peace process?

Exclusion vs Inclusion in peace negotiations, In B.W. Dayton and L. Kriesberg (eds.), *Waging Peace Constructively*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

### Day 3: Hybridity and localization in peacebuilding

Bleiker, R. and M. Brigg. 2011. *Mediating Across Difference: Oceanic and Asian Approaches to Conflict Resolution*. Chapter 1. University of Hawaii Press.

Elgstrom, Ole and Bercovitch, J. and Skau Karl. 2003. The Effectiveness of Insider Mediators. *Africa Journal on Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 3. No. 1.

Yassine-Hamdan, N. and F. Pearson. 2014. Chapter 4. *Arab Approaches to Conflict Resolution*. Routledge.

McGinty, R. 2010. Hybrid Peace: The Interaction Between Top-Down and Bottom-Up Peace, *Security Dialogue*, vol. 41 no. 4 391-412

### Day 4: Case study simulation and group work on designing an inclusive mediation process

Broadening Participation in Peace Negotiations Executive Summary.

Ropers, N. 2012. Insider Mediation as a Tool of Collaborative Security: Trends, Discourses and Insights from Asia, *International Studies*, vol. 49, no. 3-4, 189-205.

Paffenholz, T. 2014. *Civil society and peace negotiations: Beyond the inclusion-exclusion dichotomy*. *Negotiation Journal* 30 (1): 69-91.

Paffenholz, T. 2010. Civil Society and Peacebuilding. In T. Paffenholz (ed.) *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: Critical Approaches*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Chetan Kumar and Jos De la Haye (2012) Hybrid Peacemaking: Building National "Infrastructures for Peace". *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*: January-March 2012, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 13-20.

## Day 5: Perspectives of mediators from the Global South

Cuhadar, Esra. Forthcoming. Reflecting on the mediation experience in Turkish foreign policy. *Uluslararası İlişkiler (International Relations)*.

Cuhadar, E. and B. Dayton. 2012. Oslo and Its Aftermath: Lessons Learned from Track Two Diplomacy, *Negotiation Journal*, April, 155-179.ejo\_

Altunisik, M. and Cuhadar, E. 2010. Turkey's Search for a Third Party Role in Arab-Israeli Conflicts: A Neutral Facilitator or a Principal Power Mediator? *Mediterranean Politics*, vol. 15.No. 3, 371-392.

Valeri, Marc. 2014. Oman's mediatory efforts in regional crisis. NOREF Report.

## 9. Additional Readings

Mason, S. 2009. *Insider Mediators: Exploring their Key Role in Informal Peace Processes*. Berghof Foundation and Swisspeace.

Cuhadar, E. forth coming. Survey results on the theories of change of peacebuilding practitioners around the world. Unpublished research report.

Beriker, N., J. Wall, S. Wu, 2010. Turkish Community Mediation, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 40, 8 pp. 2019-2042.

Richmond, O. 2015. The dilemmas of a hybrid peace: Negative or positive? *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 50 no. 1 50-68.

Kriesberg, L. 1996. Coordinating Intermediary Peace Efforts, *Negotiation Journal*, vol. 12, issue 4, 341-352.

Fisher, R. Coordination Between Track Two and Track One Diplomacy in Successful Cases of Pre-negotiation, *International Negotiation*, vol. 11, issue 1, 65-89.

# 10. Grading Recommendations for the Course

The following assignments and criteria are suggested for course grading:

## A. Short reflection essays

Students can be asked to write short reflections essays on any theme they choose. Ask students to pick TWO themes that interest them the most in the course. Each essay should be around 6-8 pages and should include one or more of the following:

- (a) A discussion of what they see as conflicting ideas in the literature on that theme especially based on the readings.
- (b) A critical response to some theoretical proposition made in class
- (c) A synthesis of perspectives that are presented as competing or irrelevant.
- (d) A paper relating some ideas from this course to other ideas they encountered in other courses.

## B. Group work on case study simulation (Day 4)

Students can also be graded for their performance in the group exercise they will undertake during the 4th day.