



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

<http://muse.jhu.edu>

# PeacePlayers International: A Case Study on the Use of Sport as a Tool for Conflict Transformation

*Brendan Tuohey and Brian Cognato*

*Since 2001, PeacePlayers International has helped over 50,000 young people overcome deep ethnic, religious or social divides in their communities through basketball. The authors describe PPI's theory of change, which draws on Gordon Allport's "Contact Hypothesis," Muzafer Sherif's notion of "superordinate goals," and John Paul Lederach's arguments in favor of relational approaches to conflict transformation. PPI has identified four key program components as integral to its success: local leadership; a balance between sport and educational content in programming; maintaining frequent, long-term integration; and structures for internal leadership development. Long-term monitoring and evaluation; securing consistent, flexible funding; and coping with political change outside the control of the programs remain challenges.*

## Introduction

As early as 2008, Bruce Kidd could claim the emergence of a new, worldwide "sport for development and peace movement," distinguished from previous efforts by its rapid rate of growth, the substantial involvement of youth volunteers, significant financial support from international sports federations, and enthusiastic endorsement by the United Nations and its agencies and partners.<sup>1</sup> In the intervening years, this "movement" has continued to grow, fueled by high-profile popular successes, such as the film *Invictus* and a growing proliferation and professionalization among practitioners. In 2008, for example, Kidd found 166 organizations listed on the

---

Brendan Tuohey is the Executive Director of PeacePlayers International, which he cofounded with his brother, Sean, in 2001. A graduate of Colgate University, Brendan is a Term Member at the Council on Foreign Relations and an Adjunct Professor at Georgetown University's School of Sport Management. Brian Cognato is PeacePlayers International's Development and Communications Associate. A native of Norristown, Pennsylvania, Brian graduated from the University of Maryland in 2009. The authors would like to thank Chad Ford, Director of the David O. McKay Institute for Intercultural Understanding at Brigham Young University Hawaii, and the local Managing Directors of PeacePlayers International for their assistance developing PPI's present model.

International Platform on Sport and Development, a networking tool for “sport-for-good” practitioners founded in 2003.<sup>2</sup> As of November 1, 2010, the Platform’s database listed 234.

Fully sixty-nine of these organizations claim to have some relationship to “peace-building.” In October 2010, the U.S. Institute of Peace organized a “Sports and Peacebuilding Symposium,” the first academic event to the authors’ knowledge focusing exclusively on the intersection of sport and peacebuilding organized by an institution not itself directly involved in the field.<sup>3</sup> Though a modest event in the peacebuilding world as a whole, the Symposium marked a significant milestone for sport-for-peace practitioners—the first step to establishing a theoretically rigorous and empirically sound framework for sport-based peacebuilding that can catalyze policy support, harmonize practitioner efforts, and ultimately aid the efforts of all those working to prevent, mitigate, or end conflict worldwide.

As Kidd wrote in a literature review in 2008, practitioners and policy-makers need to “add to our growing knowledge of the precise circumstances under which sport may result in positive outcomes for gender relations, disability inclusion, youth development, mental health, peace and conflict resolution . . . for different populations and individuals.”<sup>4</sup> Little enough progress has been made since then that two years later, Fred Coalter could still persuasively argue for a new focus within the sport and development field that strives to understand “the social process and mechanisms that *might* lead to desired outcomes for *some* participants or *some* organizations in certain circumstances” (emphasis in original).<sup>5</sup>

This article is an attempt to begin answering Coalter’s and Kidd’s challenges by sharing one qualitative case study, the experience of PeacePlayers International, using sport as tool for conflict transformation and peacebuilding in four locations: South Africa, Northern Ireland, Israel and the West Bank, and Cyprus. It begins with a brief overview of PeacePlayers International’s theory of change and programmatic structure, followed by an outline of 1) the programmatic components that the organization has found to be most critical for success, and 2) the persistent challenges that its staff around the world face in their work.

### **PeacePlayers International: An Overview**

PeacePlayers International (PPI), though relatively well established in the field of “sport for peace” (formerly known as “Playing for Peace,” it was one of the organizations highlighted by Kidd in 2008), is still young by the standards of many international development organizations. Founded in 2001 by two brothers, Brendan and Sean Tuohy, PPI first began operations in Durban, South Africa, followed by expansion to Northern Ireland in 2002, Israel and the West Bank in 2005, and Cyprus in 2006. The organization launched its first US-based branch in New Orleans in 2008, emphasizing general youth development instead of “peacebuilding” as such, before transitioning the program to local management in 2009, the result of a strategic recommitment to peacebuilding, funding challenges, and the unique needs

of post-Katrina New Orleans. That program continues to operate independently today under the name of “ELEVATE: New Orleans.”

The size and scope of each of PPI’s sites varies considerably according to local context; as we will see, this flexibility has been key to the organization’s success thus far. In Northern Ireland and South Africa, for example, PPI focuses specifically on relatively small geographic areas (Belfast and Lurgan, and Durban and its surrounding townships and rural communities, respectively). In Cyprus, by contrast, activities reach from the Karpaz Peninsula in the north to the port of Limassol in the south, and in the Middle East areas of operation include East and West Jerusalem, Jaffa, Beit Shemesh, and a single-identity project in the West Bank. While PPI’s oldest sites, South Africa and Northern Ireland, both have about one thousand registered participants each year Cyprus, its youngest, has less than 150.

### *Theory of Change*

PPI’s work is perhaps best captured in the organization’s founding maxim: “Children who play together can learn to live together.” At the most basic level, PPI believes that by facilitating constructive, guided interaction between children in divided communities, it can equip those children to lead their communities to a new status quo, favoring cooperation and mutual respect over mistrust and hostility. That belief derives from Gordon Allport’s “Contact Hypothesis,” which posits that the interaction of individuals from two different groups can lead to significantly decreased prejudice when four criteria are met:

1. The activity is guided and has a purpose beyond mere “goodwill.”
2. The groups in question have “equal status,” at least within the context of the interaction.
3. There is a realistic opportunity for deep, meaningful relationships to form. Allport called this “friendship potential.” In practice, it means that interaction is frequent and/or long-term, and more than superficial.
4. The activity is sanctioned by some form of authority figure, for example a religious group or government body.<sup>6</sup>

Subsequent research, most famously Muzafer Sherif’s “Robber’s Cave” experiment, has placed particular emphasis on the first of these criteria, the need for interaction to be structured in pursuit of something beyond “goodwill.” Sherif coined the term “superordinate goals” to denote goals that “are compelling [to parties in conflict] but cannot be achieved by the efforts of one group alone.” Pursuit of these superordinate goals can bind members of two competing groups into a functional unit, tangibly reducing intergroup conflict, hostility, and their by-products.<sup>7</sup>

Allport’s and Sherif’s ideas remain influential, though they have been refined over the years. Perhaps most notably, Allport’s four conditions now appear to be primarily *enhancements* to intergroup contact’s ability to mitigate prejudice, as opposed to *requirements* for contact to have its intended effects.<sup>8</sup> Their relevance to team sport—in particular one where all players collaborate on both offense and defense, and where a small group of indi-

viduals work closely together at the same time, such as basketball—is obvious. As Chad Ford writes:

If the creation of superordinate goals can help bring people together, create a new dual shared identity and reduce existing conflict between the groups, a sports program that brings together two conflicting groups and molds them into a team has the potential to be an excellent way to get people of different groups working together toward superordinate goals.<sup>9</sup>

This grassroots-level reduction of prejudice is linked to the reduction of conflict at the society level by John Paul Lederach’s reformulation of peacebuilding as a process engaged in not only by high-level political actors, but also by entire populations, focusing “on the restoration and

---

Peacebuilding, he says, should seek to help those in conflict imagine themselves in a web of relationships with others, including their enemies.

---

rebuilding of relationships” alongside the construction of political structures conducive to peace.<sup>10</sup> Peacebuilding, he says, should seek to help those in conflict imagine themselves in

a web of relationships with others, including their enemies. Crucial to this process is the location and provision of “hubs,” spaces where individuals can engage with those whom they might think of as enemies:

Remember, we are thinking social spaces and watching for where things meet, even when those meetings are seemingly unimportant. Think spaces of relationships and localities where relationships intersect. Those are the spaces that create multiple coordinated and independent connections that build strength . . . In peacebuilding, relational centers that hold, create, and sustain connections are key.<sup>11</sup>

A basketball team is not only a space where ten or twelve individuals can come together to work towards “superordinate” goals individually, it is also a relational hub: as players interact, they invite the participation of their parents, families, and friends. Imagine two sets of parents who come to a game to watch their child play on an integrated team. They may speak different languages, practice different religions, and have profoundly different, even incompatible, views of local history and politics. At a game, however, as they cheer on their own children, they will cheer on each other’s children as well. In a seemingly peripheral space, they can begin to build a network of connections that will ultimately support a durable peace. Such indirect treatment of conflict, if relied on exclusively, will ultimately not be enough. True relational peacebuilding requires true reconciliation, and true reconciliation, in Lederach’s formulation, requires an honest coming to grips with the past and a forthright addressing of present differences, alongside the cultivation of interdependency and communal cooperation. It requires “truth,” “mercy,” and “justice” as much as it does “peace.” Consequently, PPI claims only a limited role in peacebuilding—its method is

best implemented as part of much broader efforts to bridge divides within communities. Its niche, though limited, is crucial, however. Early research “suggests that the program is engaging the participants who may otherwise not be open to interaction with the out-group.”<sup>12</sup> That is, integrated sports programs can reach individuals that other programs might not. They can start discussions where otherwise there would be only silence. Players come for basketball, not “peace,” and though this necessitates a delicate balance within programming, it provides peacebuilders with a powerful tool to engage communities typically resistant to such processes.

### *Program Structure*

From a simple starting point—a basic belief in the ability of sport to transcend divisions—PPI’s local sites have evolved to include a wide array of programs designed to maximize the potential for cooperation and relationship building among children. The local context of each area where PPI works is unique; therefore, PPI’s precise suite of programming is unique as well. What works in Northern Ireland, where a popularly endorsed, formal peace agreement has been in place for over twelve years, may not work in the Middle East, where military occupation, final status issues and periodic bursts of violence are still prominent concerns. They are all, however, variations on a common template, what PPI calls the “Twinned Basketball Clubs.” The core components of the Twinned Basketball Clubs are as follows:

1. PPI recruits participants via community partners, commonly schools. In some instances, such as within primary schools in Northern Ireland, PPI works with entire classes of youth during school hours. In others, as in the Middle East, PPI activities are primarily extra-curricular, with activities after school and on weekends. Most participants are between ten and fourteen, with some as young as six in the Middle East and as old as eighteen in a special program for teens called the “Leadership Development Program” (see #5 below).
2. Participants’ first interaction with the program is typically in a “single-identity” context; that is, with only children from their own ethno-social group (for example, Palestinians first play with Palestinians, Jewish Israelis with Jewish Israelis). This allows them to get to know the program in a safe setting, under the guidance of a coach from the same community, before engaging in what is often their first meeting with someone from the “other” side.
3. After a period of “single-identity” work, two teams meet for a “twinning”—an integrated practice featuring basketball drills, games and teambuilding activities that facilitate the formation of inter-group bonds. For example, players from two different communities might be tied together in integrated pairs for a cross-court dribble race. To win the race, players in a pair will need to coordinate their pace and rhythm. Trained coaches link these seemingly simple activities to broader lessons about cooperation and respect using locally tailored curricula. In Northern Ireland, for example, the curriculum explicitly addresses religious differences and the region’s history, whereas PPI’s curriculum in the Middle East focuses instead on personal relationships and recognizing others’ innate humanity, regardless of their religion or ethnicity. In South Africa, the program’s primary focus has evolved to embrace HIV/AIDS prevention. KwaZulu-Natal, the province in which PPI’s South Africa programs are based, has the country’s highest rates of HIV infection.<sup>13</sup>

4. Teams continue to “twin” as frequently as possible over the course of a nine-month long season, and, ideally, for several seasons in succession. The exact frequency of twinings varies based on both the comfort of the communities in question and logistical factors—in Northern Ireland and the Middle East, “twinning” communities may lie literally across the road from one another, whereas in Cyprus, they may be separated by both long distances and the island-wide “Green Zone.” Given enough time with the program, twinned teams can eventually merge into a single integrated unit that plays against outside opponents. For example, PPI’s program in the Middle East recently enrolled the very first teams with players from both East and West Jerusalem in Israel’s National Basketball League, the highest level of youth basketball in the country. Both teams consist of veteran PPI participants who have gotten to know each other well over multiple years of PPI activity. The objective of this prolonged, repetitive form of integration is to catalyze meaningful friendships that extend beyond the basketball court, a process actively encouraged by PPI coaches and staff.
5. PPI encourages children to stay involved with the program as they mature and provides them with opportunities to exercise increasing responsibility as they do so. Teen participants can join a “Leadership Development Program” (LDP), in which they receive additional training, work closely with PPI’s adult coaches, take part in community service activities, and act as role models for younger participants. LDP graduates, in turn, are encouraged to return as coaches themselves and even to apply for full-time staff positions, ensuring that the communities served have active, informed voices in organizational leadership.

### **Keys to Success and Remaining Challenges**

PPI’s methodology is characterized by nothing so much as flexibility and inclusiveness, based more on the lessons of everyday, on-the-ground practice than ideological orthodoxy. What, then, are its truly indispensable elements, those aspects of programming that PPI has found to be equally applicable across all of the contexts in which it works? Likewise, what challenges persist, despite this flexible approach, emerging as generally predictable obstacles to success?

PPI has identified at least four programmatic components crucial to all its activities: local leadership; a balance of sport and educational content; integration that is both frequent and long-term; and an internal leadership development process. In addition, it has identified at least three recurring challenges: long-term monitoring and evaluation; securing flexible, consistent funding; and coping with political changes outside its control.

#### *Key Component 1: Local Leadership*

Third parties have important roles to play in peacebuilding, whether as good-faith brokers or as architects of neutral spaces for interaction and reconciliation. However, while third parties can *help* create peace, local communities themselves must guide the process. Outsiders lack the networks, the intuitive understanding of local histories and sensitivities, and the credibility to sustain peacebuilding interventions themselves. One of the most common questions PPI faces when working with a community for the first

time is, “Where will you be in ten years? How do I know your commitment is long-term?” This is a question community members themselves hardly need to answer at all: they will be there, with their children and their family, living with the same outcomes as a program’s beneficiaries. Outsiders cannot make the same claim convincingly.

When discussing PPI’s work with local employees, the concept of so-called “gatekeepers” emerges again and again. “Gatekeepers” are the individuals who can secure or deny access to the youth of a community. They are teachers, principals, religious leaders, or other prominent figures who enjoy the trust of broad swaths of their neighborhood or town. Lying at the intersection of Lederach’s “middle-level” leaders and the grassroots, they are rarely impressed by the acronym soup of international aid organizations or the support of multinational corporations.<sup>14</sup> They are, however, often impressed by strong local reputations, shared backgrounds, and absolute clarity of intention. They are wary of entrusting their youth to those who may be less committed than themselves to their well-being, and rightfully so. Local leadership establishes a fundamental confluence of priorities as the baseline from which to start, not as an uncertainty that must be proven anew with the introduction of each additional outsider to the process.

### *Key Component 2: Balancing Sport and Educational Content*

Though PPI is a peacebuilding organization first, and only a youth sports organization in the service of peacebuilding, children typically come to the program (and parents allow children to come to the program) because of their love for sport, specifically basketball, not because of a pre-existing desire to partake in “conflict transformation.” Indeed, PPI has come to identify its ability to engage skeptics as one of its most important contributions to broader efforts for peace and reconciliation. To recruit and retain participants, then, PPI cannot relegate the sports aspects of its program to a bait-and-switch, promising children basketball only to provide something else. The vast majority of PPI programs are free of charge, but it still effectively operates in a marketplace, competing with other outlets for a community’s time, passion, and trust.

This is not to say that PPI is an “elite” program, catering to and designed to create skilled athletes. In contrast, it means that PPI aims to offer the highest quality training possible to all participants, regardless of skill level, with “highest quality” defined to include fun and personal fulfillment alongside skill improvement.

The delicacy of this balance played out recently within PPI’s site in the Middle East, which designed and introduced a new curriculum in 2009 in partnership with the Arbinger Institute and the Laureus Sport for Good Foundation. The curriculum takes the lessons of “The Anatomy of Peace,” a method of conflict transformation developed by Terry Warner of Yale University and Brigham Young University, and explores it through interactive on-court activities, supplemented by guided discussion.<sup>15</sup> As originally conceived, PPI implemented the curriculum in a highly structured step-by-step process, specifying particular lessons for particular weeks.



Coaches found, however, that players would “go through the motions” during curriculum activity, viewing it merely as something to tolerate so that they could enjoy the rest of practice. Without active engagement, its lessons fell on deaf ears.

To adjust, PPI now implements the curriculum in two separate steps. First, players attend an intensive, three-day retreat, where coaches introduce them to the curriculum in full. Then, throughout the course of the season, coaches have broad freedom to draw on the curriculum as they see fit, waiting for teachable moments to re-emphasize a particular curriculum skill or activity. The specialness and rarity of a retreat ensures a captive audience, and giving coaches the freedom to plan their own lessons enables them to teach when children are most apt to listen. Throughout the year, coaches attend trainings to better equip them to maintain this balance and deliver both aspects of programming effectively.

### *Key Component 3: Maintaining Frequent, Long-term Integration*

Realistically, PPI itself can only exert a limited, if significant, influence on participants, who will always interact more often with their friends and families. To help counteract this imbalance, PPI aims to embed its own work

---

Over time, children can develop the shared histories that support true friendship, creating lasting relationships in the service of inter-communal reconciliation.

---

in participants’ broader webs of relationships by specifically emphasizing “friendship potential” in its program design through repeated, long-term integration. Children “twin” with the same set of peers over and over again, for nine-month long seasons and for multiple years if possible.

Over time, children can develop the shared histories that support true friendship, creating lasting relationships in the service of inter-communal reconciliation.

The same logic applies to participants’ families. By making PPI an important part of their lives, participants make PPI an important part of their families’ lives as well. Parents see each other again and again at PPI activities, and, as their children become friends, they can form their own relationships to supplement their children’s. The ability of PPI to catalyze these off-court friendships has been enhanced dramatically by the rapid spread of social media over the past two years. For example, in a recent ten-minute television piece about a PPI tournament in Cyprus, a country where the obstacles to friendship include not only a language barrier but also a significant physical distance, several participants cited their ability to stay in regular touch with friends from the other community via “MSN and Facebook.”<sup>16</sup>

### *Key Component 4: Internal Leadership Development*

Finally, PPI has come to rely heavily on an internal system of leadership development. The unique nature of its programming requires a deep

pool of coaches who are 1) skilled as basketball trainers, 2) skilled teachers and intergroup facilitators, and 3) committed to supporting processes of conflict transformation in their communities. Finding that the available supply of such individuals generally lags behind communities' demand, PPI has developed a system that grooms participants to one day become coaches themselves.

The process starts with PPI's curricula, which help all participants develop the basic skills to cope with their communities' unique challenges, be they the threat of violent conflict, the legacy of a frozen or recently concluded conflict, or the dangers of HIV. When participants become teenagers, PPI begins to implement training that more explicitly focuses on "leadership development" (the "Leadership Development Program" described above), including both training as basketball coaches and youth mentors. For example, PPI's twenty-four Leadership Development Program participants in the Middle East recently attended a three-day intensive retreat based on PPI's curriculum, helped coordinate a two-week summer camp for eighty of PPI's younger participants, and assisted an adult PPI coach at a minimum of one event each week. Two Leadership Development Program graduates (one Jewish and one Arab) also completed Israel's national coaches' certification course, which they attended on a scholarship from PPI, becoming fully licensed youth basketball coaches in the process.

PPI likewise emphasizes the ongoing training of coaches and staff. In South Africa, for example, where PPI has had operations since 2001, all of the program's full-time staff members, aside from its Managing Director, have previously worked with PPI as coaches or participants. These structures create what a draft evaluation by the Institute for Conflict Research, speaking specifically of PPI's work in Northern Ireland, has called "virtuous circles," meaning "connections are being made between programmes . . . [in which] the whole is greater than the sum of its parts."<sup>17</sup>

### *Challenge 1: Long-Term Monitoring and Evaluation*

These keys to success are by no means sufficient for beneficial outcomes, but PPI has found them to be necessary elements in each of the areas in which it works. Similarly, the challenges that follow should not be taken as comprehensive. Each community will have its own assets and needs, and a range of challenges unpredictable from afar. These three particular challenges, however, have arisen consistently throughout PPI's history, without regard to location or timing, and the organization continues to diligently work to find new solutions to the problems they pose.

First, as mentioned above, PPI is very cognizant of the fact that its impact can only be evaluated and proven over the long-term—not just a single season, or even multiple seasons, but many years after its participants have left the program. Monitoring and evaluation in the short-term is challenge enough, limited by the difficult-to-quantify nature of any social intervention, the lingering resistance among donors to funds spent on anything other than "program activity," and the sensitivity of the issues PPI treats. The organization has, however, devised a relatively robust short-term sys-

tem, combining quantitative analysis of surveys testing attitudinal change with external partnerships to certify results. The feedback thus far has been encouraging. To quote an evaluation of PPI’s work in Cyprus completed in January 2010 by a group commissioned by PeacePlayers:

The program is also having an unmistakable impact on bridging divides and helping children overcome their mental barriers for the other community. Children who are participating in bicomunal events are changing their thinking about each other, and changing their attitudes towards the other community. Children who were negative in the past are becoming neutral. Children who were neutral are becoming positive. And a small number of children that were negative in the past are becoming positive.<sup>18</sup>

The same study also identified several areas in which PPI’s Cyprus operation could improve, including right-sizing staff, honing local vision and values, and specifying a more complete long-term strategy, all recommendations which PPI’s local staff have begun to implement.<sup>19</sup>

This kind of information is invaluable, but also incomplete. Are those shifts from “neutral” to “positive” permanent? Does the frequency of perception change increase along with years enrolled in the program? Does length of time in the program correlate at all with the durability of attitude change? How do those same variables apply to changes from “negative” perceptions to “neutral” ones? None of this is meant to fault the evaluators, who incorporated all available data in their report. The relevant information simply does not exist.

Such questions can only be answered through sustained, resource-intensive work, capturing data from controls as well as participants over several years. New innovation—streamlined data collection systems, management structures, and tools for coaches—will help, but the only sustainable solution is for PPI to convince both current and new funders that such activity is worth investment, which puts the organization in the awkward position of describing to those donors the uncertainties that still surround its impact. It is a chicken-and-egg dilemma: PPI must raise funds to support expensive monitoring and evaluation work, but well-documented results are crucial to fundraising.

### *Challenge 2: Securing Consistent, Flexible Funding*

To say that a particular form of community development work requires more funding is so commonplace that it is practically cliché, but that does not make it any less true. Poorly implemented programs—which are not the same thing as under-resourced programs, but certainly correlated—can actually cause more harm than good in the end, bringing groups together in such a way that their interaction only exacerbates social division, or fuels skepticism within target communities towards the intentions of would-be peacemakers.

Though the clear endorsement of efforts to “address the problems of fragile states” in the U.S. State Department’s inaugural *Quadrennial Development and Diplomacy Review* augurs well for resources devoted to peacebuild-

ing worldwide, the nature of funding is nearly as important as the size of funding to practitioners, who have the unenviable job of pursuing long-term goals with funds promised only for short-term activities.<sup>20</sup> Conflict transformation work aims to impact generations; most funders rarely guarantee support for more than a few years. Even when consistent funding can be secured, donors are likely to restrict its use for particular activities, inhibiting programs' abilities to build the capacity necessary to professionalize and sustain success.

### *Challenge 3: Coping with Political Change*

Coaches are not soldiers, and children not politicians. PPI takes as its highest priority the safety and security of its staff and participants, though, by their very nature, communities in need of peacebuilding are subject to greater than average likelihoods for violence and political upheaval. In some cases, these instances of violence make PPI's work even more indispensable. For example, only a few days after a dissident bombing in Lurgan, Northern Ireland in 2010, PPI held a pilot "summer scheme" for children in the area. The event, planned before the bombing occurred, was held only after the area was deemed entirely safe. In the end, it wound up serving as a stirring contrast to the desperate attempts of a dwindling dissident population in Northern Ireland to upset peace.

As Meghan Houlihan, a PPI staff member, explained on PPI's blog the next day, "I was a bit nervous about the event occurring on the heels of some pretty disheartening news, but in the end, it was a huge success. I am continually impressed by the resiliency of those most affected by the conflict and their willingness to come together during times like these."

That is, of course, not always the case. In the Middle East, where "peace" and "coexistence" are more controversial topics, the rising and falling of community tensions continually influences programming. For example, during the Gaza War in 2008, staff had to re-allocate duties so that international employees would not travel to areas where they might be temporarily unwelcome. Though the strong relationships developed among the local community by PPI's staff during the Israel-Lebanon War, allowed operations to continue uninterrupted during that conflict in 2008, in 2006 PPI elected to cancel a summer camp in deference to heightened tensions at the time. With each stutter and failed attempt at peace, the stakes become slightly higher, and an outright renewal of violence between Palestinians and Israelis such as the Second Intifada could significantly threaten the future of PPI's activities in the region.

Other practitioners will most likely not find these challenges or key components surprising. They broadly echo John Sugden and James Wallis's discussion of their long-running football project in northern Israel, Football for Peace,<sup>21</sup> and Marion Keim's examination of sport's role in integration in South Africa.<sup>22</sup> Hopefully, as the field continues to mature, these individual case studies can coalesce into established best practices, supported by a wide body of rigorous quantitative and qualitative evidence. Ultimately, discussions of "sport for peace" as a field unto itself, while necessary and helpful,

neglect the most relevant question: how can sport-based interventions be most effectively incorporated into comprehensive efforts for peacebuilding and conflict transformation?

---

PPI's experience and a growing body of evidence suggest that sport can serve as a useful and reliable tool for all those working to prevent, mitigate, and transform communal conflict worldwide.

---

Though no one intervention is likely to meet all of a community's needs, PPI's experience and a growing body of evidence suggest that sport can serve as a useful and reliable tool for all those working to prevent, mitigate, and transform communal conflict worldwide. It is only in the mapping of the various strengths and weaknesses of sport, however—just as any coach must learn how to best employ the

various talents at the disposal of his or her team—that peacebuilders can ultimately maximize the potential of sport to make the world a safer place.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Bruce Kidd, "A New Social Movement: Sport for Development and Peace," *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008): 371.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 370. As Kidd points out, this Platform should by no means be considered comprehensive, and registration numbers should be used only as an indication of relative growth.

<sup>3</sup> Mimi Wiggins Perreault, "Sports as a Metaphor and Tool for Peacebuilding," United States Institute of Peace (November 2010), <http://www.usip.org/publications/sports-metaphor-and-tool-peacebuilding> (accessed 1 December 2010).

<sup>4</sup> Bruce Kidd and Maggie McDonnell, "Peace, Sport and Development," in *Literature Reviews on Sport for Development and Peace*, ed. Bruce Kidd, Peter Donnelly, Aaron Yarmoshuk. (Toronto: Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group, 2007), [www.righttopplay.com/international/news-and-media/Documents/Policy Reports docs/Literature Reviews SDP.pdf](http://www.righttopplay.com/international/news-and-media/Documents/Policy%20Reports%20docs/Literature%20Reviews%20SDP.pdf) (accessed 1 December 2010).

<sup>5</sup> Fred Coalter, "The Politics of Sport-for-Development: Limited Focus Programmes and Broad Gauge Problems?" *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 45, no. 3 (2010): 310.

<sup>6</sup> Gordon W. Allport, "The Effect of Contact," *The Nature of Prejudice* (New York: Anchor Books, 1958), 250–267.

<sup>7</sup> Muzafer Sherif, "Superordinate Goals in the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict," *American Journal of Sociology* 63 (1958): 355–356.

<sup>8</sup> Walter G. Stephan and Cookie White Stephan, "Intergroup Relations Program Evaluation," in *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport*, ed. John F. Dovidio, Peter Samuel Glick and Laurie Rudman (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2005): 431–446. See also Thomas F. Pettigrew and Linda R. Tropp, "Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes: A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90, no. 5 (2006): 751–783.

<sup>9</sup> Chad Ford, "Peace and Hoops: Basketball as a Role Player in Sustainable Peacebuilding," *Willamette Law Review* 42 (2006): 723–724.

<sup>10</sup> John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington: United States Institute of Peace, 1998), 24.

<sup>11</sup> John Paul Lederach, *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Peacebuilding*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 85.

<sup>12</sup> Ephraim Tabory and Ruth Gaunt, "PeacePlayers International – Middle East Evaluation Results: Participants, 2006–2008, Twinned Basketball Clubs" (2008, unpublished). Contact PeacePlayers International for more information.

<sup>13</sup> South Africa Department of Health, “National Antenatal Sentinel HIV and Syphilis Prevalence Survey in South Africa” (2009), <http://www.doh.gov.za/docs/reports> (accessed 1 December 2010).

<sup>14</sup> Lederach, *Building Peace*, 38–42.

<sup>15</sup> The Arbinger Institute, *The Anatomy of Peace* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2006).

<sup>16</sup> CyBC TV, “BIZ/Εμείς,” aired 10 October 2010. Available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MnflGYLJGGw>.

<sup>17</sup> John Bell, “An Interim Evaluation for PeacePlayers International Northern Ireland – ‘From Policy to Practice,’” (Belfast: Institute for Conflict Research, 2010), 6. Unpublished draft. Contact PeacePlayers International for more information.

<sup>18</sup> Idil Seytanoglu and Stalo Lesta, “Evaluation Report: PeacePlayers International – Cyprus” (January 2010), 11. Unpublished. Contact PeacePlayers International for more information.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, 12–13.

<sup>20</sup> United States Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development, “Leading Through Civilization: The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review” (2010), 12.

<sup>21</sup> John Sugden and James Wallis, *Football for Peace? The Challenges of Using Sport for Co-Existence in Israel* (Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport, 2007).

<sup>22</sup> Keim Marion, *Nation Building at Play: Sport As a Tool for Social Integration in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport, 2003).