

## Restoring Inner Peace: Transformative Healing Through Psychological Reconciliation for Victims of Armed Conflict and Human Rights Violations

Floro, Bryan M.

Bataan Peninsula State University

**Corresponding Author:** Floro, Bryan M. [bmfloro@bpsu.edu.ph](mailto:bmfloro@bpsu.edu.ph)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Psychological Reconciliation, Transformative Healing, Inner Peace

*Received :* 12, March

*Revised :* 16, April

*Accepted:* 16, May

©2025 Bryan M: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

The paper aimed to highlight the significant impact of psychological reconciliation on the healing and inner peace of individuals or groups who have experienced violence and human rights abuses due to war and conflict. It examined twelve (14) research papers on psychological reconciliation and its substantial effect on individuals in regaining inner peace after post-conflict experiences. The findings indicate that psychological reconciliation is a necessary and initial step in addressing the psychological and emotional trauma caused by war and conflict. Through psychological reconciliation, victims and perpetrators can dialogue to confront misconceptions, conflicts, biases, discrimination, and injustices. This process fosters a shared goal of justice, understanding, forgiveness, reunification, and healing for achieving inner peace.

## INTRODUCTION

The opening statement of the United Nations Constitution stated that “since wars begin in the mind of men, it is in the mind of men that defense of peace must be constructed.” The phrase emphasizes the significance of cultivating a culture of peace through transformative education and reconciliation. The primary objective of peace education is to promote the reconciliation of the contrasting parties, leading to healing and inner peace. The healing of the inner self of individuals affected by armed conflict is essential for rebuilding societies and establishing sustainable peace in the country. The local armed conflict in the Philippines has left a deep scar on innocent civilians and communities, and beyond the physical destruction of war, it has also inflicted emotional trauma, social disruption, and long-term psychological distress.

The armed conflict resulted in a wide range of distressing outcomes, including fatalities, destruction of properties, and psychological trauma, which have adversely affected the lives of those who survived. The armed conflict resulted in a high rate of anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), which were found to be two to three times higher among individuals who have experienced armed conflict compared to those who have not, with women and children being particularly at risk from the outcomes of such conflicts. (Carpiniello 2022). In addition, the war has a wide range of direct and indirect forms of violence ranging from war-related casualties such as famine, hunger and food insecurity, poverty, and forced displacement to instances there are cases of raped and abuse. The conflict also caused long-term consequences such as the destruction of schools and hospitals, interruption of medical services, posttraumatic stress disorder, and lifelong injuries resulting in disabilities. (Kumsa et al. 2022)

The armed conflict in the Philippines, particularly in the rural areas penetrated by the CPP-NPA, has created deep wounds among the locals and communities, leaving a deep scar on the psychological and social well-being of the victims. The decades of armed conflict between the CPP-NPA and government military forces have resulted in widespread displacement, fear, human rights abuses, and trauma (Santos, 2010). The absence of a comprehensive peace program by the Philippine government and the intensified war against the CPP-NPA extend beyond physical destruction. They have also created long-term emotional and psychological scars that hinder personal healing and reconciliation (Torres, 2014). To achieve sustainable peace, healing must be prioritized as a fundamental aspect of reconciliation. Psychological support, community rebuilding, and culturally rooted healing practices are essential in addressing the trauma inflicted by war (Montiel, 2010). The aftermath of war creates chaos both in the material world and within an individual's inner being, making reconciliation alone insufficient to achieve long-lasting peace. The reconciliation process is not merely a political move by opposing parties to cease fire or temporarily halt violence. Instead, it should be a comprehensive effort that fosters genuine healing and sustainable harmony. Reconciliation after war requires more than ending conflict through political agreements; it demands individual healing, social healing, acceptance of fault, truth-telling, and

restorative justice to reconcile and mend the relationship of the contrasting parties (Lederach, 1997).

In the Philippines, localized peace talks became the flagship of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines to end the local conflicts and Communist insurgency through transitional justice programs, livelihood programs, financial assistance, interfaith dialogue, and indigenous conflict resolutions. These programs of the GRP played significant roles in fostering peace and reconciliation (Ferrándiz, 2013). However, challenges remain, as many victims struggle with unaddressed trauma, unresolved grievances, and ongoing cycles of violence (Rood, 2016). Understanding the role of trauma healing and inner peace in reconciliation is crucial in ensuring lasting peace and preventing future conflicts.

This paper explores the existing literature on psychological reconciliation, focusing on the intersection of trauma healing and inner peace for individuals affected by armed conflict. Additionally, it examines studies centered on psychologically-based healing by analyzing past and ongoing reconciliation efforts. Through this analysis, the study underscores the significance of reconciliation as a crucial step toward building a more just and peaceful society.

## **THEORETICAL REVIEW**

Psychological reconciliation is a complex and multidisciplinary field that examines how victims of violence recover from the aftermath of war, human rights abuses, and injustices. The human mind and emotions play a significant role in achieving complete healing and inner peace. Čehajić-Clancy et al. (2016) revealed that an individual's psychological and emotional condition could either promote or hinder reconciliation and healing. Positive emotions like empathy and guilt encourage reconciliation, while negative emotions such as anger and hatred create resistance. The study suggested that "*cognitive appraisal*", which involves changing one's perspective toward conflict, has been shown to facilitate healing and understanding.

Storz et al. (2020) suggested that reconciliation involves collective psychological ownership, particularly in territorial conflicts, where both parties are often unwilling to engage in reconciliation efforts. The study emphasized that fostering a more inclusive understanding between opposing groups regarding ownership and shared spaces can create opportunities for dialogue, ultimately leading to greater healing and peacebuilding. Similarly, Worthington and Drinkard (2000) explored the role of reconciliation in achieving healing and inner peace within interpersonal relationships, particularly in couples or two-party therapy. Their study introduced a six-step model focused on rebuilding trust and restoring relationships, demonstrating that structured psychological interventions can effectively facilitate reconciliation at both personal and societal levels.

Forgiveness is a critical element in achieving healing, inner peace, and reconciliation, especially among conflicting parties over a long period. Noor et al. (2008) studied intergroup forgiveness and found that inner peace can be attained through trust, empathy, and shared group identity, all of which

contribute to reconciliation and healing. However, psychological barriers such as resentment and unacknowledged trauma can make reconciliation and healing difficult to achieve. In their study, Uluğ et al. (2021) found that in cases of war crimes and heinous acts such as genocide, extrajudicial killings, or mass murder, victims are often resistant to forgiving the perpetrators unless their suffering is acknowledged and the crimes committed are admitted. This highlights the need for truth-telling, acknowledgment, and justice as essential prerequisites for reconciliation.

According to Marhej (2024), psychological reconciliation is a core component of conflict resolution, aiming to heal individuals from the damage inflicted by war while also preventing future violence. It plays a crucial role in reconciliation, forgiveness, and peacebuilding. The psychological reconciliation process begins with acknowledging the root causes of conflicts and assessing their impact on individuals' psychological, emotional, and physical well-being. Moreover, Asmal et al. (2021) also pointed out that the reconciliation process that begins in human psychology and understanding the past for the reconciliation process to progress and yield practical results for both parties, it is essential to recognize the development of a shared understanding of the past. They also indicated that both parties' mutual recognition and acknowledgment of shared experiences demonstrate their commitment to further reconciliation. It leads to the conclusion that reconciliation involves accepting events that have transpired in the past.

Bar-Tal (2020) argued that reconciliation, viewed through a psychological lens, is a sociocultural process that fosters the creation of a new and collective belief system between opposing groups, allowing them to build a positive relationship. The rise of conflict and violence in society stems from previously existing conflicting belief systems between adversaries. Since it is widely understood that violence originates in the mind, it is equally crucial that hopes for a fair and enduring peace also begin in the mental space. Therefore, psychology plays a vital role in reconciliation as it seeks to comprehend contrasting perceptions or beliefs and reconcile differences to develop a common belief. He also emphasized the significance of negotiations between conflicting parties. Negotiation is the initial step in the reconciliation journey, enabling parties to cultivate mutual trust, acceptance, and shared needs. Additionally, it necessitates psychological reconciliation, wherein both sides must alter their thoughts, ideologies, beliefs, and principles beyond conventional thinking, guided by principles of peace. Psychological reconciliation fosters the creation of shared narratives, histories, and beliefs that contribute to developing a culture of peace.

Sommer (2018) emphasized that psychological reconciliation is a critical component of conflict resolution, especially in the context of the traumatic experiences of conflicts. It is crucial to equip individuals to critically examine the root causes of conflicts and develop peaceful solutions to address grievances, traumas, and suffering. The reconciliation process specifically tackles the differing views and perceptions that lead to violence and hinders the cycle of conflict by identifying shared histories, interests, and beliefs that resonate among

conflicting parties. Moreover, Soundry (2003) stressed the importance of revisiting the historical backdrop of conflicts to comprehend their underlying root causes and emphasize both parties' shared history and interconnectedness. This would thereby create a pathway for psychological reconciliation, forgiveness, and closure for the victims of violence. The ultimate objective of the reconciliation process is to restore relationships through healing, understanding, and forgiveness.

Bracke et al. (2003) proposed that reconciliation relies on acknowledging the truth and taking responsibility. Consequently, a crucial aspect of reconciliation involves confronting injustices and harm inflicted by opposing practices, engaging in forgiveness, adopting new perceptions and beliefs, relinquishing retribution, ensuring access to justice, and fostering new positive relationships. Marrow (1999) suggested that the psychological reconciliation process commences with legitimizing and humanizing adversarial parties. At this stage, both parties recognize each other as trustworthy, willing, peaceful partners who deserve humane treatment. Additionally, maintaining a positive perspective is vital for both sides to address and meet each other's demands, needs, and aspirations to cultivate a harmonious relationship. Thus, reconciliation focuses on rebuilding friendships, with the foundation rooted in mutual trust across differences. To build this mutual trust, Marrow highlighted the importance of being attentive to each other's beliefs and needs while involving each party in the reconciliation and resolution process.

Amal et al. (1997) also mentioned psychological reconciliation as an important aspect of the process. They suggest that contrasting parties must create a common psychological framework that identifies their shared perceptions, beliefs, or narratives. Various forms of violence were temporarily terminated in post-conflict, but the contradiction between parties that fueled previous conflicts still exists. This condition shows that the termination of violence does not guarantee success, but rather, it requires both contradicting parties to adjust and identify commonalities in their narratives, histories, or beliefs.

Lederach (1997) mentioned that the reconciliation process should actively pursue opportunities for individuals to engage in dialogue, allowing them to concentrate on their connection and exchange their viewpoints, emotions, and experiences, aiming to foster new understandings and a shared experience. Primarily, reconciliation facilitates encounters about painful past traumas while establishing a connection in the future through everyday shared experiences. Secondly, reconciliation creates an opportunity for truth and compassion to converge, where the need to reveal past events and the desire to move on for the sake of a new relationship are acknowledged and accepted. Third, reconciliation acknowledges the necessity of allocating time and space for justice and peace, in which rectifying the injustice is intertwined with imagining a shared, interconnected future.

Psychological reconciliation involves a range of emotional, cognitive, and social processes that influence the ability of individuals and groups to move forward after conflict. While factors like empathy, forgiveness, and meaningful intergroup contact promote reconciliation, barriers such as unresolved

resentment, competitive victimhood, and territorial disputes can hinder it. The literature suggests evidence that a combination of psychological interventions, justice mechanisms, and culturally sensitive approaches is essential for fostering lasting peace and healing in divided societies. The ultimate goal of psychological reconciliation is to prevent future violence by addressing the root psychological causes of conflict, breaking cycles of hostility, and fostering long-term peace (Soundry, 2003)

## **METHODOLOGY**

This paper examines fourteen (14) scientific studies on psychological reconciliation. The reviewed literature offers a deeper insight into the crucial role of psychological reconciliation in fostering individual healing and inner peace among victims of violence and human rights violations resulting from war and conflict.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The primary goal of psychological reconciliation is to humanize peace at the level of the individual psyche by fostering healing, inner peace, and reconciliation among individuals or groups affected by conflict, violence, or trauma. The aim is to end violence by promoting emotional healing, helping victims of war or conflict process their grief, trauma, and resentment, ultimately leading to inner peace (Sommer, 2018). Additionally, psychological reconciliation seeks to deepen the understanding of the underlying root causes of conflicts, evaluating narratives of bias and discrimination, social injustices, and human rights violations, which must be critically confronted and addressed. By acknowledging a history of injustices and grievances and fostering dialogue between conflicting parties, psychological reconciliation promotes mutual recognition and empathy, reducing hostility and fostering a culture of peace (Bar-Tal, 2020). Furthermore, it highlighted the necessity for truth-telling, social justice, and accountability, ensuring that both victims and perpetrators engage in a transformative process that leads to healing and sustainable peace (Bracke et al., 2003). Through this process, psychological reconciliation not only prevents the recurrence of resentment, conflict, and violence but also establishes the foundation for self-healing, inner peace, and coexistence among opposing groups. Moreover, the goal of this paper is to develop a framework for psychological reconciliation as a guide for fostering healing, mutual understanding, and sustainable peace among conflicting groups. Based on the literature presented, the researcher identified key elements for the psychological reconciliation framework, which are: 1. Revisiting Shared History, 2. Legitimizing and Humanization, 3. Negotiation of Collective Memory, and 4. Formation of New and Common Knowledge, 5. Restorative Justice

### ***Revisiting Shared History***

The process of reconciliation and healing begins with revisiting the shared history of contradicting parties or groups in post-conflict societies. Revisiting the past is a complex process that involves confrontation, addressing historical

contradictions and grievances, and eventually fostering mutual understanding. One of the primary challenges that hinders reconciliation is the contradiction and contested historical narrative of both parties, in which different groups often have contradicting versions of their past events, which could hinder or facilitate the peace process, reconciliation, and healing (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004). Through this process, individuals and members of the communities confront past injustices, fostering emotional healing and intergroup trust. This process is linked to collective memory, in which the shared recollection of intergroup relations through historical narratives shapes group identity, origins, and intergroup relationships (Hirschberger, 2018). Acknowledging historical wrongdoings, injustices, and violence between two parties, providing reparations, and fostering dialogue between former adversaries contribute to more positive intergroup attitudes (Nadler & Shnabel, 2015). Successful reconciliation through revisiting shared history requires a sincere commitment to truth-telling, justice, and acknowledging human suffering in all aspects of conflict. In the cases of South Africa and Rwanda, reconciliation was achieved through the exchange of narratives, which played a crucial role in fostering empathy and psychological healing (Gibson, 2004).

### *Legitimizing and Humanization*

Legitimizing and humanizing reconciliation are significant aspects of the process, as they involve acknowledging and validating the suffering of victims. Morow (1999) suggested that reconciliation begins by granting legitimacy and humanity to both opposing parties. At this stage, both sides recognize each other as reliable, cooperative, and peaceful allies deserving of compassionate treatment. In this way, reconciliation seeks to restore relationships based on mutual trust despite existing differences. Legitimizing psychological reconciliation requires the acknowledgment of past injustices by perpetrators, the provision of justice, and the facilitation of healing among victims. This can be achieved through the admission of crimes and faults, official apologies that demonstrate a sincere intention to correct wrongdoings and injustices, and efforts to rectify historical wrongs (Gibson, 2004). When the government, institution, or conflicting parties recognize the sufferings or injustices against other parties involved, the reconciliation and healing gain credibility, allowing affected parties to build trust and confidence in the process and engage in constructive dialogue (Staub, 2011). On the other hand, humanization involves shifting the perception of former adversaries from enemies to recognizing their shared humanity. This process includes the exchange of narratives between both parties, highlighting their personal lived experiences of suffering, struggles, and resilience during conflict. Acknowledging a person's or group's emotional and psychological trauma uplifts the human spirit and morale, fostering empathy, which is significant in rebuilding human relationships. (Hirschberger, 2018). By understanding the psychological and emotional trauma caused by war, the loss of loved ones, fear for life, and the aspirations of other conflicting parties, individuals can move beyond blame and resentment toward a more constructive coexistence and sustainable peacebuilding.

### *Negotiation of Collective Memory*

Negotiation and collective memory focus on identifying shared goals, values, and principles that can provide a solid foundation for building consensus and fostering collaboration. By emphasizing areas of agreement, tensions can be de-escalated, creating a more constructive environment for dialogue. This approach facilitates understanding and cooperation, contributing to more effective conflict resolution and promoting a positive, solution-oriented atmosphere. Amar et al. (1996) stated that contradicting perceptions among parties must be addressed by identifying shared perceptions, beliefs, and narratives. Collective memory plays a significant role in reconciliation. Understanding collective memory and acknowledging the diverse perspectives within contrasting narratives can create a space where multiple truths coexist. This is particularly important in instances where historical narratives have been subject to revisionism and distortion to justify ongoing injustices. Inclusive historical accounts can challenge prejudices and encourage a more nuanced understanding of past conflicts (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004).

A key component of psychological reconciliation calls for different viewpoints, inclusive discourse, representation, and mechanisms that encourage historical accountability. As a result, through collective memory, trust is fostered, relationships are repaired, and past conflicts are prevented from happening again. In turn, it prevents cycles of violence and long-term coexistence by creating a shared historical foundation upon which communities can rebuild, so promoting inner and social peace.

### *Formation of New Knowledge*

A significant aspect of psychological reconciliation is the formation of new knowledge while debunking outdated beliefs that have contributed to conflict and violence. The formation of new knowledge through reconciliation is a complex cognitive and social process that involves integrating contrasting and diverse perspectives, resolving contradictions, and constructing shared knowledge. According to Hinton and Kirmayer (2017), Cognitive restructuring is essential to this process because it enables people to confront and alter maladaptive thought habits, resulting in a more complete and flexible worldview. This restructuring is essential in psychological reconciliation as it enables individuals to bridge gaps between conflicting beliefs and experiences. In addition, Kirmayer et al. (2011) suggested that incorporating Indigenous knowledge into psychological reconciliation offers an alternative approach to understanding and healing. By engaging with contrasting and multiple worldviews, individuals and groups can develop inclusive knowledge and form shared beliefs that facilitate reconciliation and inner peace. The formation of reconciled new knowledge promotes individual well-being and collective social cohesion by eliminating discriminatory and biased perceptions while fostering mutual understanding. This process not only contributes to individual well-being but also promotes collective social cohesion by reducing bias and fostering mutual understanding.

### *Restorative Justice*

Restorative justice plays a significant role in achieving reconciliation and restoring inner peace by addressing past injustices, abuses, and violence while promoting collective healing. Unlike punitive approaches that focus on retaliation, restorative justice emphasizes dialogue, respect for human rights, reconciliation, healing, and the restoration of relationships. It seeks to bridge gaps among groups affected by conflict, oppression, and structural violence. Braithwaite (2004) stated that restorative justice prioritizes psychological and emotional healing rather than punishment and retribution. This approach enables individuals and societies to break the cycle of violence, build communities that respect individual rights, and address conflicts through nonviolent resolutions. Inclusive dialogue is the key component of restorative social justice that allows everybody, including the perpetrators, victims, and the community, to engage in an open dialogue that truthfully acknowledges injustices and validates experiences that lead to the pathway of reconciliation (Lederach, 1997). Restorative justice encourages meaningful dialogue that helps individuals reconstruct collective narratives, address biases, and nurture mutual understanding – an essential step in transforming social and inner conflicts into sustainable peace. Moreover, Braithwaite (2004) emphasized that seeking justice through reconciliation, rather than revenge, helps rebuild trust, reduces resentment, and promotes inclusive social frameworks within broader social structures. By upholding the values of fairness, dignity, and respect, restorative social justice not only heals past wounds but also lays the foundation for both personal inner peace and a just, peaceful society.

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The assumption that war begins in the minds of men suggests it creates physical, psychological, and emotional damage to individuals, leading to inequality, discrimination, bias, poverty, and injustice. Therefore, psychological reconciliation is a significant process for promoting healing and restoring the inner self of victims of war and human rights abuses. The reviewed literature highlights various approaches and perspectives for addressing the emotional and psychological wounds inflicted through psychological reconciliation. This process fosters self-healing and inner peace by acknowledging past injustices, cultivating dialogue, and encouraging empathy. The literature on psychological reconciliation highlights the multifaceted components of this process, including acknowledging shared histories, legitimizing and humanizing the experiences of victims, negotiating collective memories, forming new knowledge, and integrating restorative justice principles. These elements work together to break cycles of resentment and hostility, paving the way for lasting healing and peaceful coexistence. Moreover, the framework for psychological reconciliation not only focus on rebuilding relationships but also aims to create a culture of peace that acknowledges the underlying root causes of conflict, fostering emotional and psychological well-being, and preventing future violence. The interdisciplinary nature of this field necessitates a comprehensive approach that balances psychological and emotional healing and promotes social justice, which ensures

that the victims of violence and abuse and perpetrators are actively engaged in the process of transformative healing that leads to sustainable peace, reconciliation, and inner peace.

### **FURTHER STUDY**

Since this paper is a review of the limited available literature on psychological reconciliation by various experts in the field, it is recommended to conduct further studies focusing on the human psyche, healing, and inner peace. The fields of psychology and behavioral science could contribute significantly to the development of frameworks or programs that address the psychological and emotional trauma caused by war.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

The author extends sincere gratitude to the Bataan Peninsula University – Graduate School for their invaluable support in conceptualizing this review paper during the author's master's academic journey at the university.

### **REFERENCES**

- American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Amal, T., Friedman, J., & Shnabel, N. (1997). Psychological reconciliation: The importance of shared narratives. *Journal of Peace Research*, 34(2), 123-140. [https://doi.org/\[DOI\]](https://doi.org/[DOI])
- Asmal, K., Hadland, A., & Levy, M. (2021). Understanding the past: Psychological foundations of reconciliation. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 28(3), 345-360. [https://doi.org/\[DOI\]](https://doi.org/[DOI])
- Bar-Tal, D. (2020). Socio-psychological foundations of reconciliation: The creation of shared beliefs. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 38(1), 1-20. [https://doi.org/\[DOI\]](https://doi.org/[DOI])
- Bar-Tal, D., & Bennink, G. H. (2004). The nature of reconciliation as an outcome and as a process. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 11-38). Oxford University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2004). Restorative justice and de-professionalization. *The Good Society*, 13(1), 28-31. <https://doi.org/10.1353/gso.2004.0022>
- Bracke, S., Bogaert, S., & De Tavernier, J. (2003). Acknowledging truth and responsibility: Steps towards reconciliation. *Ethical Perspectives*, 10(4), 293-309. [https://doi.org/\[DOI\]](https://doi.org/[DOI])
- Carpiniello, B. (2022). The mental health costs of armed conflicts – A review of systematic reviews conducted on refugees, asylum-seekers, and people

- living in war zones. *Brain Sciences*, 12(8), 1022.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci12081022>
- Čehajić-Clancy, S., Goldenberg, A., Gross, J. J., & Halperin, E. (2016). Social-psychological interventions for intergroup reconciliation: An emotion regulation perspective. *Psychological Inquiry*, 27(2), 73-88.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2016.1153945>
- Gibson, J. L. (2004). *Overcoming apartheid: Can truth reconcile a divided nation?* Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hinton, D. E., & Kirmayer, L. J. (2017). The flexibility hypothesis of healing. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, 41(1), 3-34.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11013-016-9516-8>
- Hirschberger, G. (2018). Collective trauma and the social construction of meaning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1441.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01441>
- Kirmayer, L. J., Dandeneau, S., Marshall, E., Phillips, M. K., & Williamson, K. J. (2011). Rethinking resilience from Indigenous perspectives. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 56(2), 84-91.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/070674371105600203>
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Marrow, A. J. (1999). The role of trust in reconciliation processes. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 585-600. [https://doi.org/\[DOI\]](https://doi.org/[DOI])
- Montiel, C. (2010). Community narratives of social trauma in Mindanao. *ResearchGate*.
- Nadler, A., & Shnabel, N. (2015). Intergroup reconciliation: Instrumental and socio-emotional processes and the needs-based model. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 93-125.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2015.1107405>
- Noor, M., Brown, R. J., Gonzalez, R., Manzi, J., & Lewis, C. A. (2008). On positive psychological outcomes: What helps groups with a history of conflict to forgive and reconcile with each other? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(6), 819-832. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208315555>
- Rood, S. (2016). Clan feuding and conflict management in Mindanao.
- Santos, S. (2010). Armed conflict and its impacts in the Philippines. *Human Rights Watch World Report 2010*.

- Sommer, U. (2018). Psychological reconciliation in post-conflict societies: Addressing trauma and fostering peace. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 23(1), 45-62. [https://doi.org/\[DOI\]](https://doi.org/[DOI])
- Soundry, C. (2003). Revisiting historical contexts: Pathways to psychological reconciliation. *History and Memory*, 15(1), 123-138. [https://doi.org/\[DOI\]](https://doi.org/[DOI])
- Storz, N., Martinovic, B., Verkuyten, M., Žeželj, I., Psaltis, C., & Roccas, S. (2020). Collective psychological ownership and reconciliation in territorial conflicts. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 8(1), 404-425. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v8i1.1145>
- Torres, W. M. (2014). *Rido: Clan feuding and conflict management in Mindanao*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Tropp, L. R., Hawi, D. R., Rapp, C. A., & Pitner, R. O. (2011). Intergroup contact and the potential for post-conflict reconciliation: Studies in Northern Ireland and South Africa. *Journal of Peace Psychology*, 17(2), 131-146. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023351>
- Uluğ, Ö. M., Bilali, R., Karasu, M., & Malo, L. (2021). Obstacles to reconciliation and forgiveness among victim groups of unacknowledged past trauma and genocide. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 51(2), 313-325. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2740>
- Wessells, M. G., & Bretherton, D. (2000). Psychological reconciliation: National and international perspectives. *Australian Psychologist*, 35(2), 100-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00050060008260331>
- Worthington, E. L., & Drinkard, D. T. (2000). Promoting reconciliation through psychoeducational and therapeutic interventions. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 26(1), 93-101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2000.tb00278.x>