

[View video](#)



Artisans of Glo-cal Peace: Emerging Perspectives on Interfaith Youth Peacebuilding

*A Paper Presented at the International Conference on Youth and Interfaith Communication.
Organized by New Era Education and Charitable Support Foundation, Jos, Nigeria, from
October 22 – 24, 2010.*

Augustine Duru, M.A., M.Div., BCC.
Chicago, IL USA.
gusduru@yahoo.com

Introduction

Generations of young people have often been characterized as mere potential, the so-called “next generation of leaders,” although there is some truth to this assertion, current perspectives on interfaith peacebuilding is gradually shifting away from this narrow rhetoric of potency to a broader and more pragmatic view of the youth as actual stake holders in the ongoing international and local dialogue on peace and justice.

The fate of this generation, more than any previous generations, is bound together in a global context that is becoming increasingly less isolated and virtually smaller. On multiple fronts new technologies are transforming lives. At the same time, the need for proactive youth involvement in peacebuilding has never been more critical. Global peace questions now require grassroots responses, and individual artisans of peace must partner with others to address common concerns on the local, national and international levels.

This paper explores the concept “Artisans” and the meaning of “Glo-cal” in response to the changing dynamics around the current conversation on peacebuilding and youth involvement in the peace process. It contends that the question of peace and justice is a human question and a deeply moral one. It also interrogates the real danger in the excessive privatization of faith and the lack of outrage against situations of injustice, stressing the urgency to build credible bridges of peace.

Attempt is made to clarify the role of the youth as the face of grassroots peace movement, and to identify important strategies for “Glo-cal” peacebuilding and leadership development. It articulates ways to connect and collaborate with other passionate young men and women around the world who are eager to develop new partnerships with Africa and bridge the wide cultural and contextual gap.

Becoming a bridge

The future of peacebuilding is now. This oft-repeated maxim is no less true today, especially as situations of violent conflict escalate around the world. Violent forces such as political propagandists, radical religious fundamentalists, and conflict driven media, as was the case in Rwanda, continue to instigate more chaos and strife. Such senseless assault on peace and mutual coexistence threatens to further disintegrate already fragmented communities and stifle peace efforts among the most vulnerable populations across the globe. As new and broader fault lines appear, so must committed and credible individuals rise to bridge the threatening gap, and build peace among groups and communities. Bridge-building happens everyday around us, in schools, at meal tables, at work or at home, we are all engaged in building bridges. Building bridges of peace, however, is an intentional way of being, an exercise in living as an embodiment of peace.

Peacebuilding debate has been ongoing since the founding of “the Hague peace conference in 1898, followed by the foundation of the League of Nations and resulting in the creation of the United Nations at the end of the World War II with the objective to monitor and support world peace through mediation, facilitation, good offices and arbitration between states.”ⁱ However, since the 1990’s the concept of “peacebuilding” has been re-introduced in the contemporary discourse on global conflict, violence, peace and war. It aims to introduce a new paradigm as a holistic response to the questions of peace and social justice. Unlike earlier discussions that tend to focus on peacekeeping, conflict resolution or conflict transformation, peacebuilding aims to “address not only the resolution of conflict, but how to build a culture that includes the prevention of conflict that leads to war, humane intervention during conflict, and perhaps most importantly, the rebuilding of a just society and a lasting peace after conflict.”ⁱⁱ

In a sense, the bridge-building that produces peace is a process, a consistent and sustained effort at building peaceful relationships that lasts. The rationale behind this understanding of peacebuilding acknowledges that peace and conflict are not mutually exclusive. Robert Schreier articulates this well, “peace is not something that comes exclusively from outside a conflict; rather seeds of peace can be found in the actors and events of conflict, and need to be elicited and brought forth.”ⁱⁱⁱ The view that even in the most hopeless situations of conflict seeds of peace can be found, makes the task of peacebuilding more complicated and challenging; thus requiring an openness and willingness to hope, to be keen observers and perceptive interpreters of the signs of the times. Peacebuilders, in the words of Lisa Sowle Cahill, should “be able to name injustice when we see it, to name it in a way that others will recognize, and to work on a religious or theological base to combat it, and combat is successfully.”^{iv}

Building bridges of peace is a tedious and complex work, sometimes exposing the agents of peace to severe vilification and often serious risks. The dangers involved in peacebuilding is often a deterrent factor and could render people indifferent to the plight of the afflicted, and discourage many from active engagement in the effort to preserve peace and mutual existence. Silence or inaction in the face of violence or injustice do not protect from harm or free from culpability, rather it renders one guilty and accountable to the sufferings of those who might have been spared from harm through a collective denunciation of and collective action to combat situations of violence or stifles the initial stirrings of conflict. In summary then, the main work of peacebuilding is the on-going effort to construct bridges of love, solidarity, mutual coexistence

and peace at the grassroots, daily. At this grassroots level, the youth of our nation and of the world have important roles to play on both the local and the global levels.

The Glo-cal Village: Building Peace from the Local to the Global

The word “glocal” was used in 1997 by Roland Robertson, a well known anthropologist to describe the “juncture where the global and the local meet.”^v In the process of glocal peacebuilding, the local concerns and the global issues intersect in a profound way. The language of “glo-cal” peacebuilding comes from the concept of “glocal theology.” In his book, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1997), Robert Schreiter, an internationally acclaimed systematic theologian, believes there is an interaction between the local and the global. He uses the term “glocalization” to describe this interaction. Schreiter argues, “Some of the most salient features of religion and theology today can best be described from the vantage of the glocal.”^{vi} Religion and theology both have tremendous influence on peacebuilding, and peacebuilders therefore draws on these sources of wisdom for their work.

The use of a hyphenated “Glo-cal” in this paper underscores the tension that exists in the effort to reach out to both audiences at the local and the global levels, a tension which I believe is constructive. For instance, emphasis on the global tends to reinforce existing power relations, which does not necessarily always facilitate peace; whereas emphasis on the local alone would lead to isolation. On the other hand, the inherent tension is an acknowledgement that in the process of glo-cal engagement there is some element of give-and-take, a willingness to draw on the experience on the local praxis to enrich and inform the conversation on the global context, and vise-versa.

In the difficult task of peacebuilding, certain questions emerge. Why should the conflict in far away Rwanda concern you? Why must you be concerned when a young man from Nigeria attempts to blow up a plane in America? Why must we be interested in the oil spill in far away Gulf of Mexico? Should we be outraged at the kidnapping of innocent people in the Niger delta? Such questions bring to mind how events in recent years that took place at distant places can frustrate peaceful coexistence locally. We cannot assume that Nigerian citizens are immune to the effects of the seeds of violence planted elsewhere in the world. In the end, we all have a responsibility to promote peace beyond our borders, and this requires becoming aware of some of these global and local issues. The success of peacebuilding is predicated upon the praxis of cooperation and solidarity at the local level; and the opportunity for partnership and optimism for success at the global level. L. S. Cahill points out this important fact, “peacebuilders keep working at grass roots levels to create solidarity, work of justice, and sow seeds of hope.”^{vii}

In the process of peacebuilding, the actors in fact, “bridge particularity and universality, i.e., to bridge the gap between particularity of standpoint and the necessarily universal character of justice claims that aim at a global audience.”^{viii} It is not far fetched to conclude therefore that at the heart of peacebuilding is the virtue of justice. I am reminded here of the prophecy of Isaiah, “Justice will bring about Peace” (Is. 32:17). Pope Paul VI also reiterated this in his message to mark the celebration of the day of peace on January 1, 1972, “if you want peace, work for Justice.”^{ix} The pontiff wrote in his message, “we believe that the idea of peace still is, and still must be, dominant in human affairs, and that it becomes all the more urgent whenever and

wherever it is contradicted by opposite ideas or deeds... Its nature is that of an aim, and as such it is at the base and at the goal of our activities, be they individual or collective.”^x In a country like Nigeria, “grass-root peace-building involves grass-roots justice.”^{xi} In effect, the meaning of peace for a young Nigerian also reflects the meaning of justice. This justice at the grassroots emphasizes empowerment, education, opportunities, dignity, a desire to survive and a promise of a secure future.

On the other hand, peacebuilders wear multiple hats; they function in such capacities as mediators, bridge builders, prophets, facilitators, etc. In a situation of conflict, they are able to speak prophetically and listen compassionately to both victims and perpetrators alike; they engage compellingly and collaboratively to heal individuals, groups, nations or the environment. Robert Schreiter writes, “While priority may be given to victims, wrongdoers are not outside the circle of healing and hope.”^{xii} This integral component of peacebuilding does not happen without rigorous training and empowerment of reliable *artisans* of peace.

Cultivating Credible *Artisans* of Peace

It is in fact impossible to promote peace when violence is being communicated. The work of building peace is not for everyone. It is a carefully honed skill, hence requiring *Artisans*. The word *artisan* comes from the Italian *Artigiano*, it refers to a highly skilled manual worker. Artisans are humble, creative, innovative, able to adapt, keen observers, detailed, and largely optimistic and resilient.

Artisans of peace are ordinary people who “bend swords, blunt blows, or build bridges of understanding, they forge grounded hope for a more peaceful world.”^{xiii} These are ordinary women and men who refuse to be discouraged by widespread violence, are committed to the ideal of peace, and use their gift to secure peace in their communities and around the world. Young people are most likely to become artisans in and advance the peace ideal. In fact, “young people are understood as unique contributors, indeed the likely leaders, of successful peacebuilding efforts; and they are, in fact, the primary enablers of social change. The traits of creativity, openness to new experiences, and desire for change, combined with the energy and vitality that we associate with youth, are all elements of the distinctive capabilities of youth to build peace.”^{xiv} The effort to effectively empower young people has led to a shift in the trajectory of the conversation on peace and peacebuilding, as a result, new peace movements and programs have emerged that favor the youth, and cutting-edge thinking on ways to deliver peace have equally surfaced. Let us now look at some of the emerging perspectives in youth peacebuilding.

Emerging Perspectives

Studies and research have shown that young men and women as agents of change stand to gain from sustainable peacebuilding initiatives. Unfortunately, disproportional resources invested in the prosecution of war globally have a tendency to deplete resources that could be dedicated to the pursuit of peace. The vision of peacebuilding therefore, is to capture the imagination, energy and potentials of the youth and channel these towards sustainable peace. Although the effort to establish the youths as important actors in the process of building peace is rather new and evolving, it hold critical seeds of hope. Broadly speaking, two main perspectives are discernable in the contemporary conceptualizations of youth peacebuilding, namely - the **Didactic model** and the **Pragmatic model**. Both acknowledge that ill prepared, uninformed and untrained

peacebuilders could pose huge risks for the peace effort. They could in fact, do more harm than good.

On the one hand, the **Didactic model** seeks to identify the ultimate value of education to sustainable peace. It identifies the values of arming young people with new data, current research and suitable information for effective peacebuilding. Programs here are geared towards education, research, rigorous intellectual exercise, theories and conceptual frameworks for peace. Issues of gender differences, gender roles and identity questions are often addressed here as potential avenues to consolidate peace efforts. The didactic model seeks to get into the brain of the key actors in a conflict and possibly analyze them by looking at the underlying factor and mindset. It examines conflict situations, isolate key issues and possible factors that precipitated a conflict and make conclusion based on the findings. It is largely intellectual in its construct. It separates the issues that led to a conflict from the conflict itself in the hope of learning something new. Role-plays, negotiation skills, national and international laws, and human right instruments are important learning tools in this model. It draws on the socio-psychological to demonstrate that peaceful or violent responses can be learned, thus justifying the significance of educating the youth for peace. This model attempts to professionalize peacebuilding. It tends to be overtly rigid, analytic and diplomatic.

The **Pragmatic model** on the other hand is predicated upon a certain pragmatic instinct relevant to peacebuilding. It looks at conflict as a series of interconnected events, orchestrated by human actors, however evil or sinister. It is more socio-centric in its appeal to the human spirit and the intrinsic good in all people. Programs developed from this perspective highlights the capacity of young people to transform their communities while acting as independent social agents. The social context of young people is believed to facilitate developing networks of support as active social catalysts. This model believes not only in arming the young people with facts, but also in empowering them to get involved in concrete hands-on experience of peacebuilding. It elevates peacebuilding not only as a carrier, but as a way of life. Questions of religion, faith, meaning and purpose often emerge here. Nonviolent resistance, individual commitment to action for peace, and creative imagination are essential assets. Access to social institutions and participation in communal improvement are implied and encouraged. It is a more optimistic view of the endless possibilities of peace in a violence prone world. Both the didactic and pragmatic models have their strengths and weaknesses. But they hold a promise of hope for the future of peacebuilding.

Empirical studies have in recent years shown great benefits for youth engagement in social transformation. In a conceptual study of inner city youth involved in non-formal youth organizations, Leonisa Ardizzone shares her findings, “involvement in a prosocial organization had an impact on personal growth, on interest in learning, in a desire to ‘get their word out,’ and in reinforcing an ethic of social responsibility.”^{xv} Ardizzone adds critical information for those who develop and implement youth programs, “This research supports the creation of bottom-up education programs that incorporate the voices of youth in their design and development.”^{xvi}

However, for peacebuilding to be effective, it is not an either-or situation. Peacebuilders should not be too comfortable with either the Didactic approach or the Pragmatic approach, they are essentially complimentary. This is substantiated by the empirical research done by Mary Ann Cejka and her colleagues, which renders a sobering, but hopeful report on both the need to

educate and empower young peacebuilders and the urgency for a hands-on engagement in peacebuilding. In their findings during a cross-cultural survey of grassroots peace builders across the world, I have identified four important points that have practical bearing on young peacebuilders. These are summarized as follows:

1. Young people are less likely to be motivated by religious reasons to engage in peacebuilding. Ideological and relational motivations draw more youth into involvement with peacebuilding.
2. There is a correlation between higher levels of motivation and lower levels of formal education. The implication is that schools are more likely to impart educational information about peacebuilding, but fail to empower young people to become actively engaged in peacebuilding.
3. Those who pray for peace generally believe in a just world (most of these are the youth). Those who believe in a just world, the study shows, are less likely to engage in active service or building relationships of peace.
4. Teachers and mentors are effective in passing on education and appropriate skill for understanding situations of injustice and violence across the globe. Yet, very few of the youth with appropriate skill set are positively motivated to directly engage in peacebuilding.^{xvii}

The implication of these findings for interfaith peacebuilding is significant. It could be argued that some of the points raised by Mary Ann Cejka and her colleagues are uniquely western and as such may not apply in a deeply religious society like Nigeria. However, the evidence in favor of collaborative effort is overwhelming. Educators, local groups, individuals, civic groups, religious and community leaders, and youth groups, all have an obligation. They must rally to effectively develop and implement peace programs for young people. Youths, in turn, must take advantage of the many opportunities and resources available to them to re-engage the process and learn from one another. They must learn what works for them, what others are doing and how they can collaborate to be more efficient and effective co-creators of a world free of war or violence.

Co-Creators of a Peaceful World: Frameworks for Effective Peacebuilding

Young people in Nigeria, unlike most of the youth in Europe and America, face a mountain of problems that can stifle their efforts to excel. Nkiruka Stella Nnamego, founder and CEO Fresh and Young Brains Development Initiative, identified some of these issues in a paper presented at the 2009 International Conference on Youth and Interfaith Communication, here in Jos.

General obstacles to youth development include: conflict/war, cultural biases (especially against females), discrimination, few formal sector jobs, lack of cooperation between private sector/government/NGOs/Grassroots organizations, lack of credit, lack of educational opportunities, lack of knowledge, lack of materials/resources, lack of mentoring, lack of school-to work programs, lack of self-confidence, lack of skills, lack of training and lack of work experience, limited support systems, no market for goods, no or limited access to information and communication technology, poor economic

conditions in the country, poor or no employment policies, poor social conditions, poverty, discrimination and violence against youth, gender inequality and gender violence, HIV/AIDS stigma, unemployment, forced migration (for prostitution, drug abuse, forced labor).^{xviii}

Although Nnamego's choice of words in describing the general obstacles locally is slightly exaggerated, it non-the-less highlights in broad strokes some of the issues that often lie beyond the control of the average Nigerian youth. In spite of these systemic problems, the case could be made that these issues make the quest for peace and equity more compelling.

The question then focuses on how to turn these mountains of despair into stepping stones of opportunity and growth? In what ways can the youth use what they already have to attain what they hope to accomplish? Any answer to these questions will undoubtedly highlight the value of collaboration.

Collaboration for Peace:

In the words of Thomas Bamat and Mary Ann Cejka, "...peacemaking take place not under Christian auspices per se but rather in cooperation with non-Christians (as in the Philippines, Sudan, and Sri Lanka) or in tandem with or under the aegis of secular or nonreligious organization (as in Northern Ireland, Guatemala, Rwanda, and the United States). Partnership with others appears to be a hallmark of this peacemaking, enhancing its reach and strength."^{xix} Collaboration requires healthy dialogue. In the process of dialogue, new perspectives emerge and horizons broaden. Collaborative peacebuilding is undoubtedly one framework for engaging in peacebuilding with others equally passionate about creating a peaceful world.

Passion for Peace:

Young men and women in Nigeria can learn a few things from the youths in the western world. In my experience working with passionate young men and women in Chicago and other parts of America, I have often observed certain traits that distinguish these young people from their peers. They have a great missionary spirit, a desire to learn or try something new, and a great sense of optimism and playfulness. I also found in them an inner resolve to excel, a free spirit and a keen awareness of their individuality. Other traits include, a generous spirit and a hunger to know or understand the other, a genuine interest in learning about other cultures and people, an awareness of their world and their ability to influence it positively, a sense of autonomy and self esteem, awareness of their limitless potentials, an ease to connect with and develop new relationships, and above all, a passion for a peaceful world. This is not to say that young men and women in Nigeria do not possess some or all of these qualities and more, rather, it acknowledges these qualities are inherent in all, and can be enhanced and encouraged where latent. These are traits necessary to excel in peacebuilding and needs to be intentionally developed and carefully polished.

Make your Voices Heard:

The youth in Nigeria have a lot to offer the world. Young people in other part of the world are eager to know and befriend you. Make yourselves visible and begin to contribute to the international conversation. Conferences, workshop, lectures, peace activism, social transformation, intellectual exchange, awareness of global issues, etc; all of these are important ways to remain engaged with the conversation with your peers around the world. It is often said

that charity begins at home. Locally, young people have an obligation to contribute to the national and regional peace efforts. For your peers around the world to take you seriously, you must meaningfully work to eradicate violence and conflict locally. The transformation of the local situation, though difficult, is quite possible. I strongly believe we already have the structures in place to educate and empower the youth to work for peace. The National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) is a good example of youth involvement in the life of the nation. Perhaps the NYSC could serve as a platform for launching a national campaign for peacebuilding at the grassroots by emphasizing education for peacebuilding in the NYSC curriculum. Above all, Nigerian youths must remain true to their identity; they should also begin to share with others the rich traditional resources for peacebuilding and conflict resolution already present in the culture.

Prophetic Leadership:

Peacebuilders are in fact leaders. They innovate and generate new ideas to transform or challenge the status quo. In Nigeria, the existing cultural and religious diversity can be harnessed by the youth to affirm their strength and commitment to peace. This calls for prophetic leadership. In the words of Bishop Jaime Soto, the emergence of youth leadership is a “prophetic symbol of what is possible.”^{xx} However, “unless the mind is fundamentally changed, youth leadership will seldom work... the youth in Nigeria have to make a radical U-turn from the present leadership mindset in Nigeria. They have to redefine what is noble and pursue it with a sense of sacrifice... A true leader is one who is first a true servant.”^{xxi} A friend once observed that this is a universal principle that does not require interaction with American youths to apply.

Inter-Religious Cooperation:

The need to work collaboratively with other religious and civil groups to achieve a lasting peace in Nigeria has already been highlighted earlier in this presentation. But a presentation of this nature, held in a multi-religious city like Jos will not be complete without a reference to the place of Religion in conflict and peace, and in the process highlight some of the unfortunate role religion has played in our young history as a nation, to further strengthen the argument for the non-negotiability of peace and mutual co-existence. In the last fifty years millions of lives have been lost in a civil war, inter-ethnic/tribal wars, intense religious violence and other forms of violent clashes across Nigeria. Between 1991 and 2006 alone, there have been twenty-six intense violent confrontations in Nigeria. The bloody ethno-religious crisis on September 7, 2001 here in Jos is only one example. It gives me hope to see various religious groups represented here. That this inter-faith (I would prefer Inter-religious) conference is taking place is in itself a powerful sign of hope.

A friend once asked, “Do you think religion which has often been a source of division can turn into an instrument of peace?”^{xxii} To this question, my response is in the affirmative. I am optimistic that the power of religion to influence people’s lives and conduct can be harnessed for peace. This is the only way to demolish the danger of the excessive privatization of religion that often leads to religious fundamentalism. Unlike many western countries, Nigeria is blessed to have young women and men that are still interested in religion and take their faith practice seriously. Therefore, this ongoing conversation on peace should not stop here. It must move to the next level of action and implementation of the fruits of these deliberations. Anything less will simply sabotage all the effort.

Conclusion

We have explored the many dimensions of youth engagement with peace and social justice, its promises and challenges. We have also examined the complexities of building lasting bridges of peace in a violent prone world, often exposing peacebuilders to serious risks of injury or death in the process. The argument here is that there is a need to deliberate globally about peacebuilding while working locally to achieve it.

The contemporary meaning of peacebuilding in the conversation on peace and justice, has unearthed the need to empower you - young men and women and arm you with the knowledge and courage to stand for peace and work for justice; in the immediate community at the local level and collaborate with others around the world, to eradicate conflict and violence where it already exists or where it might rear its ugly head around the world. Granted this is a lofty ideal, but at the same time, it is a humbling task and a practical proposition. It calls for the trust of the elders and other adult community, a trust that the youth of Nigeria and the world are capable and can deliver the goods. It is appropriate to call for a radical rethinking of the current structure of power brokers in the peace process, beyond diplomatic and huge international power structures that are stifled by their sheer size and bureaucratic wrangling.

In conclusion, it must be stressed that any response to the glo-cal peace questions must be contextual, drawing from the rich fountain of wisdom within the diverse religious groups and springing from a deep conviction rooted in a rich spiritual tradition; this ought to be capable of reawakening the public conscience towards sustainable peaceful communities.

¹ Thania Paffenholz and Christoph Spurk, "Civil Society, Civic Engagement and Peacebuilding," *Social Development Papers: Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction*, Paper No. 36 (World Bank, October 2006) 16; (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCPR/Resources/WP36_web.pdf; accessed 09/01/2010).

¹ Robert Schreiter, "The Future of Catholic Peacebuilding," closing remarks at the Conference on the Future of Catholic Peacebuilding, (University of Notre Dame, April 15, 2008); (<http://cpn.nd.edu/topics-in-catholic-peacebuilding/religion-and-peacebuilding/>, accessed June 6, 2010).

¹ Robert Schreiter, "The Future of Catholic Peacebuilding."

¹ Lisa Sowle Cahill, 2010. "Religious Identity, Justice, and Hope: The Case of Peacebuilding," *Criterion*, 47:3, 2-9.

¹ Collen Mary Mallon, 2007. "Reclaiming Hope, Recovering Dialogue," *Review for Religious*, 66:1, 40-57. This article cites Roland Robertson, "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity," in *Global Modernities*, ed. Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (London: Sage, 1995).

¹ Robert Schreiter, *The new catholicity: theology between the global and the local*. (Mary Knoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1997) 8-14. Schreiter draws on the ideas of Peter Bayer and Roland Robertson in formulating his views on the intersection of globalization and theology.

¹ Lisa Sowle Cahill, 2010. "Religious Identity, Justice, and Hope," 2-9.

¹ Ibid.

¹ Pope Paul VI, 1972. "Message of his Holiness Pope Paul VI for the Celebration of the Day of Peace, 1 January, 1972." (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/messages/peace/documents/hf_p-vi_mes_19711208_v-world-day-for-peace_en.html, accessed September 2, 2010).

¹ Ibid.

¹ Isidore N. Obi, personal e-mail to the author, October 3, 2010.

¹ Robert Schreiter, "The Future of Catholic Peacebuilding."

¹ Mary Ann Cejka and Thomas Bamat eds. Introduction to *Artisans of Peace: Grassroots Peacemaking among Christian Communities* (Mary Knoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2003), 1-18.

¹ Roshan Danesh, "Youth and Peacebuilding." (http://www.tc.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/DaneshYouthandPeaceBuilding_22feb08.pdf, accessed July 12, 2010.)

¹ Ardizzone, L. 2003. Generating Peace: A Study of Nonformal Youth Organizations, in *Peace & Change*, 28:420-445.

¹ Ibid.

¹ Mary Ann Cejka and Thomas Bamat eds. Introduction to *Artisans of Peace*. 2003, 1-18.

¹ Nkiruka Stella Nnaemego, "Breaking Social Barriers through Youth Engagement and Participation." Paper presented at the International Conference on Youth and Interfaith Communication, Jos, Nigeria, October 2009 (<http://interfaithdialogue.cfsites.org/custom.php?pageid=1840>, accessed August 15, 2010).

¹ Mary Ann Cejka and Thomas Bamat, eds. Introduction to *Artisans of Peace*. 2003, 1-18.

¹ Bishop Jaime Soto of Sacramento, in a speech at the Catholic Cultural Diversity Network Connection on May 7, 2010 at Notre Dame University, Indiana. For further reading see, Barbara Mangione, 2010. "Celebrating the Church's Diversity," in *St. Anthony Messenger*, September 2010, vol.118, no.4, 22-27.

¹ Peter Amah, personal e-mail to the author, September 13, 2010.

¹ Isidore Nnamdi Obi, personal e-mail to the author, October 3, 2010.
