

Modernity in the Ancient Methods of Resolving Monastic Conflicts: A Study of the *Sāmagāma-sutta*

G. A. Somaratne

The *Sāmagāma-sutta*¹ of the *Majjhima-nikāya* introduces to the early Buddhist monastic community seven methods for resolving their individual and group conflicts, and it is the aim of this article to examine their universal applicability as modern conflict resolution methods. To achieve this aim, Buddhist definitions of conflict and the methods of resolving them will also be highlighted in relation to the modern understandings of conflict and the methods of conflict resolution.

The *sutta* takes into account a conflict that arose among the followers of Jainism after the death of Mahāvīra, the leader, and prepares the Buddhist monastic community not to fall into a similar situation after the death of the Buddha.² As the *sutta* has it, with the death of the leader, a conflict arose among the Jain monastic disciples over doctrine and discipline. Divided and split into two, the disciples had “taken to quarrelling and brawling and were deep in disputes, stabbing each other with verbal daggers.” Seeing this battle, the white-clothed lay disciples became disgusted, dismayed, and disappointed. The news was eventually brought to the Buddha by his disciple Ananda to obtain his vision in order to check similar occurrences in the Buddhist religion with the demise of the Master.³ Being informed, the Buddha inquired from Ananda whether there existed any conflict among his disciples with reference to the fundamental Buddhist teachings. “What do you think, Ananda? These things that I have taught you after directly knowing them – that is, the four foundations of mindfulness, the four right kinds of striving, the four bases for spiritual power, the five faculties, the five powers, the seven enlightenment factors, the Noble Eightfold Path⁴ – do you see even two monks who make differing assertions about these things?” Ananda assured him that there were none with regard to the fundamental teachings. But he cautioned that some monks who lived with a seeming deference towards the Buddha might, after his *parinibbāna*, create conflicts in the community about livelihood and about the disciplinary rules. The Buddha’s reply was: “A dispute about livelihood or about the disciplinary rules would be trifling. But should a dispute arise in the monastic community about the path (*magga*) and the way (*paṭipadā*), such a dispute would be for the harm and unhappiness of many, for the loss, harm, and suffering of gods and humans.” The

Buddha then began to expound the roots of conflicts and the methods for resolving them.

The *Sāmagāma-sutta* highlights six psychological roots of conflict⁵ as follows:

- One who is angry and resentful lives with a root of conflict,
- One who is contemptuous and insolent lives with a root of dispute,
- One who is envious and avaricious lives with a root of dispute,
- One who is deceitful and fraudulent lives with a root of dispute,
- One who is with evil wishes and wrong views lives with a root of dispute,
- One who adheres to one's own views, holds on to them tenaciously, and relinquishes them with difficulty lives with a root of dispute.

Each is discussed with the following stereotyped paragraph:

Such a bhikkhu dwells disrespectful and undeferential towards the Teacher, the teaching, and the community, and he does not fulfill the training. A bhikkhu who dwells disrespectful and undeferential towards the Teacher, the teaching, and the community, and who does not fulfill the training, creates a dispute in the community, which would be for the harm and unhappiness of many, for the loss, harm, and suffering of gods and humans. Now if you see any such root of dispute either in yourselves or externally, you should strive to abandon that same evil root of dispute. And if you do not see any such root of dispute either in yourselves or externally, you should practise in such a way that that same evil root of dispute does not erupt in the future. Thus there is the abandoning of that evil root of dispute; thus there is the non-eruption of that evil root of dispute in the future.

Though given to the monastic community, the modernity and universality of these roots of conflicts could be affirmed when compared with modern conflicts. Where leaders are not respected, where law and order are violated, these roots of conflict are visible. Not being properly dealt with, the roots of conflicts generate major conflicts causing harm and unhappiness to many. Therefore, the Buddha advises, when one sees the roots of conflict in oneself or externally, he should strive to abandon them. When one does not see the roots of conflict either in oneself or

externally, he should practise in such a way the evil roots of conflict do not arise in the future.

‘Conflict’ and ‘dispute’ are used in this article, more or less, synonymously to mean the perception or the actual occurrence of diverging, opposing, competing or incompatible differences between two or more people as well as the unfriendly situations produced when those competing interests damage relationships, or escalate to rights or power based resolutions. In the Buddhist texts conflict, rather dispute and violence, are defined in relation to its opposite, peace. Peace is to live without hate, hostility or enmity; conflict is to live in hate, harming one another, in hostility and enmity.⁶ As a text has it, conflicting parties embrace the badly proclaimed and badly expounded law and order, which is un-emancipating, un-conducive to peace, expounded by those not wise.⁷ The disputants take up clubs and weapons; they fight, quarrel, dispute, insult and slander.⁸ They become inopportune, untruthful, irrelevant, unrighteous and undisciplined. They consider ‘might is right’ (*balavamhi balavattho*). Under false pretext, they inflict suffering upon each other by way of killing, imprisonment, confiscation of property, false accusations, or expulsion. The irony is that both parties of the conflict, though they really do not wish such effects, have to live in sorrow, harassed, un-freed from life’s fret and fever.⁹ As Buddhism perceives, conflicts show the ignorance of the people as they create conflicts, intending to live in peace and happiness. As it is expressed in a sutta, “though people wish to live without hate, harming, hostility, though they wish to live in peace, yet they live in hate, harming one another, hostile, and as enemies”.¹⁰

As implied by the Buddhist texts on morality, a conflict originates and evolves in stages.¹¹ First it arises in the individual’s mind as mental agitation. Then it manifests verbally and grows into a verbal dispute. Finally it turns into a physical fight. Physical violent acts of killing, theft, and rape represent a conflict in the violent stage. Verbal acts of lying, tale-bearing, harsh speech, and foolish babble represent a conflict in the dispute stage. Mental acts of greed, ill-will and wrong views represent the agitation stage of a conflict. A conflict begins in mind, as pointed out in our *sutta* as “roots of conflict”. As worded differently in another text, the elaborated perceptions and notions cause thinking; thinking causes desire; the desire causes liking and disliking; the liking and disliking cause envy and niggardliness; the envy and niggardliness cause conflicts.¹²

From the Buddhist point of view, a conflict is a human creation, a product, something that has given rise to. Both the past and the present

causes, be seen or not be seen now, have contributed, rather have been contributing to the conflict that we attempt to resolve at present. Hence, in conflict resolution, the history and background as well as the present conditionings of the conflict have to be understood. Since a conflict is a conditioned phenomenon, it is subject to impermanence, is unsatisfactory and unsubstantial in its very nature. Hence, a conflict cannot persist in the same way as it began. A conflict that has arisen 25 years ago, for example, if it were to still continue, should definitely be different from its origins.

Buddhist texts view that a conflict has the potential of finding its own solution; but, that natural solution could be disastrous; it could be the total destruction of all stakeholders involved and caught up in the conflict. Both the conflict and the causes that give rise to it are to be reckoned adhamma, unlawful, unrighteous, unjust, and not fitting with the law of peace; they represent the ill intended human interference with the law of dhamma, justice, righteousness, peace. The law of justice that applies to adhamma is that adhamma leads to further adhamma. Being adhamma, a conflict itself is destructive and harmful, if not handled properly, always grows into further clashes. Ultimately, it destroys everyone caught up in the vicious cycle of adhamma. This is the natural solution that will be brought by the dhamma law concerning adhamma.

If we were to stop the disaster caused by a conflict, intervention or mediation is mandatory. Adhamma could be transformed into dhamma by way of practising righteousness. When righteous causes are assembled, the result is dhammic, that is, peace, harmony, justice, and prosperity. But the worldly solution brought to a conflict is also conditioned and carries with it its impermanent and unsubstantial character; hence no permanent solutions to social and global human conflicts are found; as long as humans are born and die in the world of action conflicts will emerge. Therefore, methods of conflict resolutions should always be set in place. As adhamma implies chaos and disorder and dhamma implies order and peace, to bring back the order to the world, an orderly process, a formal method, should be applied. The parties involved in the conflict themselves are the best to resolve their own conflict. But it is unlikely they understand this or know the process to do this, when they are caught up in a conflict. Hence, a mediator must be there to assist them.

As the *Sāmagāma-sutta* records, the following four conflict types are best resolved by way of a formal process (*adhikaraṇa*), to use a broader term, via mediation. The four are:¹³

- Conflict due to a verbal dispute (*vivāda*): A good example for a verbal dispute could be where monks dispute about the doctrine and discipline; such a dispute should be settled by way of a formal process.
- Conflict due to an accusation (*anuvāda*): An example for such a conflict is the occasion where monks accuse another monk of committing a transgression of the monastic rules. Such a conflict should also be resolved through a formal process.
- Conflict due to an offence (*āpatti*): When a monk who has committed a transgression seeks to exonerate himself from it, a formal conflict resolution method should be applied.
- Conflict due to proceedings (*kicca*): The conflicts that take place when enacting formal functions of the monastic community must be resolved through a formal conflict resolution method.

In the modern context, ‘conflict resolution’ stands for a wide range of methods of resolving conflicts and disputes between two parties. Among these methods are the negotiation (self resolution), mediation (third party assistance), arbitration (third party decision making), conciliation (third party proposing a non-binding solution), and diplomacy. In line with these methods, such names as third party, negotiator, mediator, arbitrator, conciliator, and diplomat are used to identify the party who assists in resolving conflicts. It is believed that one who assists people to prevent, manage or resolve conflicts should be impartial, free from conflict of interest, and perform according to the recommended standards of conduct.

Among these methods, mediation is the most popular form of conflict resolution. It is so called because it involves the appointment of a mediator, a neutral and impartial individual who acts as a facilitator assisting the conflicting parties in communicating, essentially negotiating a settlement. The mediator actively assists parties in working towards a negotiated agreement of a dispute, with the parties in ultimate control of the decision to settle the terms of resolution. The presence of a mediator itself is the key distinguishing feature of this process. In addition, mediation has a structure, timetable and dynamics that ordinary negotiation lacks; it is private and confidential. Mediators use various techniques to open, or improve, dialogue between disputants. As such

much depends on the mediator's skill and training. Therefore, mediators are expected to have thorough training, competency, and continuing education.

Mediation differs from arbitration, so does the mediator and the arbitrator. A mediator does not impose a solution on the parties, whereas an arbitrator does. Mediation is a diplomatic procedure where as arbitration could be considered as a judicial procedure. The parties to the dispute are thus not bound to accept the mediator's recommendation. The mediator thus assists the parties to negotiate their own settlement. In the arbitration process, the parties to a dispute submit their differences to the judgment of an impartial person or group appointed by mutual consent or statutory provision. As such arbitration is the process of resolving a dispute or a grievance outside a court system by presenting it for decision to an impartial third party. Both sides in the dispute usually must agree in advance to the choice of arbitrator and certify that they will abide by the arbitrator's decision. The procedures differ from those used in the courts, especially regarding burden of proof and presentation of evidence. Arbitration avoids costly litigation and offers a relatively speedy resolution as well as privacy for the disputants. The main disadvantage is that setting guidelines is difficult; therefore the outcome is often less predictable than a court decision. Litigation is the process of bringing forward or defending a case before a judge or administrative tribunal.

Conciliation is another form of conflict resolution, and it is neither arbitration nor mediation. In this process, a neutral third-party hears both sides and then issues a non-binding suggested resolution. In other words, the conflicting parties choose an independent third party who hears both sides, either privately or together, and then prepares a compromise which the conciliator believes is a fair disposition of the matter. In some cases, he may express a view on what might be a fair or reasonable settlement, generally where all the parties agree that the mediator may do so. The conciliator's report or conclusions are then put to both sides, who may agree or disagree with it. It is not binding nor is it enforceable unless the parties adopt it. Compared to mediation, conciliation tends to be a more evaluative than facilitative process.

Buddhism has also adopted mediation, conciliation, perhaps also arbitration. Examples could be drawn by examining the discourses of the Buddha and the conflicts in the monastic community where the Buddha and his disciples intervened.¹⁴ Considering these, Buddhist disciples could be considered as the best mediators, facilitators, or conciliators in resolving conflicts. As it is said, Buddhas show the way, it is up to

people to walk along it and find solutions. There is a dhammic responsibility for understanding Buddhists to intervene and to serve as mediators, facilitators and conciliators in resolving conflicts and bringing peace to individuals, families, and communities. For this they should prepare and practice appropriate guidelines (*dhamma-netti*). This is also evident from the *Sāmagāma-sutta*, in which monks are asked to apply their own guidelines prepared in conformity with the dhamma.

The *sutta* presents seven formal conflict resolution methods (*adhikaraṇa-samatha*)¹⁵:

1. Conflict resolution by confrontation
2. Conflict resolution on account of memory
3. Conflict resolution on account of past insanity
4. Conflict resolution by the effecting of acknowledgement of an offence
5. Conflict resolution by the opinion of the majority
6. Conflict resolution by the pronouncement of bad character against someone
7. Conflict resolution by covering over with grass

Model 1: Conflict Resolution by Confrontation

Text:¹⁶

Here bhikkhus are disputing: ‘It is dhamma,’ or ‘It is not dhamma,’ or ‘It is Discipline,’ or ‘It is not Discipline.’¹⁷ Those *bhikkhus* should all meet together in concord. Then, having met together, the guidelines of the dhamma (*dhamma-netti*) should be drawn out. Once the guidelines of the dhamma have been drawn out, that dispute should be settled in a way that accords with them. Such is the conflict resolution by confrontation. And so there comes to be the settlement of some conflicts here by conflict resolution by confrontation (*sammukhā-vinayo*).¹⁸

Modernity:

- ⊙ A conflict takes place between two parties >> Conflicting parties (CPs) meet together in concord >>CPs draw out the guidelines of the Dhamma >> CPs settle the conflict in accordance with the guidelines >>Peace/ conflict resolution is achieved.

Two conflicting parties, who meet in concord, during their initial meetings, draw out the guidelines. Then the conflict should be settled in

accordance with the guidelines. The beauty of this method is that the settlement is arrived at by the conflicting parties themselves. In the modern method of mediation this is emphasized.

Model 2: Conflict Resolution by Majority Opinion

Text:

If those *bhikkhus* cannot settle that conflict in that dwelling place, they should go to a dwelling place where there is a greater number of *bhikkhus*. There they should all meet together in concord. Then, having met together, the guidelines of the Dhamma should be drawn out. Once the guidelines of the Dhamma have been drawn out, the conflict should be settled in a way that accords with them. Such is the opinion of a majority. And so there comes to be the settlement of some conflicts here by the opinion of a majority (*yebhuyyasikā*).

Modernity:

- A conflict takes place between two parties. >> CPs go to a larger third party. >> All meet together in concord. >> All draw out guidelines of the Dhamma. >> All settle the conflict in accordance with the guidelines. >> Peace / conflict resolution is achieved.

In this system, the third party assistant is clearly sought to meet in concord and draw the guidelines. It is also interesting to see that the parties move to a third location to discuss and settle their conflict.

Model 3: Conflict Resolution on Account of Memory

Text:

Here one *bhikkhu* reproves another *bhikkhu* for such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat: “Does the venerable one remember having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat?” He says: “I do not, friends, remember having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat.” In his case conflict resolution on account of memory should be pronounced. Such is the conflict resolution on account of memory. And so there comes to be the settlement of some

conflicts here by conflict resolution on account of memory (*sativinayo*).¹⁹

Modernity:

- ⊙ A conflict takes place between two individuals. >> One accuses another of wrong doing. >> The accused cannot recall any wrong doing due to loss of memory. >> Peace / conflict resolution is achieved.

The settlement is arrived at by directly talking to the other and realizing that he is now normal and used to do things wrong when he was out of mind.

Model 4: Conflict Resolution on Account of Past Insanity

Text:

Here one *bhikkhu* reproves another *bhikkhu* for such and such a grave offence one involving defeat or bordering on defeat: “Does the venerable one remember having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat?” He says: “I do not, friends, remember having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat.” Despite the denial, the former presses the latter further: Surely the venerable one must know quite well if he remembers having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat? He says: I had gone mad, friend, I was out of my mind, and when I was mad I said and did many things improper for a recluse. I do not remember, I was mad when I did that.’ In his case conflict resolution on account of past insanity should be pronounced. Such is the conflict resolution on account of past insanity. And so there comes to be the settlement of some conflicts here by conflict resolution on account of past insanity (*amūlḥavinayo*).

Modernity:

- ⊙ A conflict takes place between two individuals. >> One accuses another of wrong doing. >> The accused cannot recall. >> The accuser presses on. >> The accused confesses his wrong doing is due to his being mad. >> Peace / conflict resolution is arrived at.

As it is evident, this method of conflict resolution is realized when a monk has committed offences due to madness. His madness is determined by considering his inability to recollect his behavior during the period in question.

Model 5: Conflict Resolution by effecting acknowledgement of an offence

Text:

Here a *bhikkhu*, whether reprovved or not reprovved, remembers an offence, reveals it, and discloses it. He should go to a senior *bhikkhu*, and after arranging his robe on one shoulder, he should pay homage at his feet. Then, sitting on his heels, he should raise his hands palms together and say: “Venerable sir, I have committed such and such an offence; I confess it.” The other says: “Do you see?” “Yes, I see.” “Will you practice restraint in the future?” “I will practice restraint in the future.” Such is the effecting of acknowledgement of an offence. And so there comes to be the settlement of some conflicts here by the effecting of acknowledgement of an offence (*paṭiññāta-karaṇaṃ*).

Modernity:

- A conflict takes place within an individual. >> The individual confesses committing an offence to a senior and promises not to commit such offence in future. >> Peace / conflict resolution is achieved.

Buddhism encourages an awareness of conflicts within, and one who confronts such a conflict should seek the help of a mediator.

Model 6: Conflict Resolution by the Pronouncement of Bad Character against someone

Text:

Here one *bhikkhu* reprovves another for such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat: “Does the venerable one remember having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat?” He says: I do not, friends, remember having committed such and

such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat. Despite the denial, the former presses the latter further: Surely the venerable one must know quite well if he remembers having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat? He says: I do not, friends, remember having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat; But I remember having committed such and such a minor offence. Despite the denial, the former presses the latter further: Surely the venerable one must know quite well if he remembers having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat? He says: Friends, when not asked I acknowledge having committed this minor offence; so when asked, why shouldn't I acknowledge having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat? The other says: Friend, if you had not been asked, you would not have acknowledged committing this minor offence; so why, when asked, would you acknowledge having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat? Surely the venerable one must know quite well if he remembers having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat? He says: I remember, friends, having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat. I was joking, I was raving, when I said that I did not remember having committed such and such a grave offence, one involving defeat or bordering on defeat. Such is the pronouncement of bad character against someone. And so there comes to be the settlement of some conflicts here by the pronouncement of bad character against someone (*pāpiyyasikā*).

Modernity:

- ◎ A conflict takes place between two individuals. >> One accuses another for committing an offence. >> The accused first denies; but when pressed he accepts his committing a minor offence. >> When pressed further he accepts having committed a major offence. >> Peace / Conflict resolution is achieved.

It is said that a monk who creates strife and quarrels in the monastic community, who is ignorant and full of offences, or who lives in unbecoming association with householders is to be dealt with by applying this method of conflict resolution.

Model 7: Conflict Resolution by Covering Over with Grass

Text:

Here, when *bhikkhus* have taken to quarreling and brawling and are deep in disputes, they may have said and done many things improper for a recluse. Those *bhikkhus* should all meet together in concord. When they have met together, a wise *bhikkhu* among the *bhikkhus* who side together on the one party should rise from his seat, and after arranging his robe on one shoulder, he should raise his hands, palms together, and call for an enactment of the *Sangha* thus: “Let the venerable *Sangha* hear me. When we took to quarreling and brawling and were deep in disputes, we said and did many things improper for a recluse. If it is approved by the *Sangha*, then for the good of these venerable ones and for my own good, in the midst of the *Sangha* I shall confess, by the method of covering over with grass, any offences of these venerable ones and any offences of my own, except for those which call for serious censure and those connected with the laity.” Then a wise *bhikkhu* among the *bhikkhus* who side together on the other party should rise from his seat, and after arranging his robe on one shoulder, he should raise his hands, palms together, and call for an enactment of the *Sangha* thus: “Let the venerable *Sangha* hear me. When we took to quarreling and brawling and were deep in disputes, we said and did many things improper for a recluse. If it is approved by the *Sangha*, then for the good of these venerable ones and for my own good, in the midst of the *Sangha* I shall confess, by the method of covering over with grass, any offences of these venerable ones and any offences of my own, except for those which call for serious censure and those connected with the laity.” Such is the covering over with grass. And so there comes to be the settlement of some conflicts here by the covering over with grass (*tīṇa-vatthāraka*).

Modernity:

- ◎ CPs meet together in concord. >> A wise person from one party formally requests for the wellbeing of both parties to forget and forgive all wrong doings done by the members of that party during the conflict. >> Similar request comes from the other party. >> Peace / conflict resolution is achieved.

This method of conflict resolution is resorted to when the monastic community has been involved in a dispute in the course of which the monks committed many minor offences. If charges are to be pursued for such minor offences, the conflict might prolong, so the conflicting parties agree to forget and forgive. In this context too, the involvement of a mediator is obvious.

In conclusion, the *sutta* presents six principles of cordiality.²⁰ As it is said, each helps in creating love and respect, and conduces to cohesion, to non-dispute, to concord, and to unity:

1. One maintains bodily acts of loving-kindness both in public and in private towards his companions in the holy life.
2. One maintains verbal acts of loving-kindness both in public and in private toward his companions in the holy life.
3. One maintains mental acts of loving-kindness both in public and in private toward his companions in the holy life.
4. One enjoys things in common with his virtuous companions in the holy life; without making reservations, he shares with them any righteous gain that has been obtained in a righteous way, including even the mere content of his alms bowl.
5. One dwells both in public and in private possessing in common with his companions in the holy life those virtues that are unbroken, untorn, unblemished, unmottled, freeing, praised by the wise, ungrasped, leading to concentration.
6. One dwells both in public and in private possessing in common with his companions in the holy life that view that is noble and emancipating, and leads the one who practices in accordance with it to the complete destruction of suffering.

Those who undertake and maintain these six principles of cordiality, the *sutta* confirms, could endure any course of speech, trivial or gross, which in turn leads to their welfare and happiness for a long time. In such an ideal Buddhist monastic community, we could assume, conflicts will not occur, and conflict resolution methods will not be required. But, in the *Sāmagāma-sutta*, anticipating conflicts to take place in the monastic community in his absence, the Buddha presented the seven methods of conflict resolution, which bear universal applicability and also compatibility with the modern methods of conflict resolution.

NOTES

- ¹ MN II 243—251 (The references given to Pāli texts are those published by PTS).
- ² The opening of the *sutta* is the same as that of the *Pāsādika-sutta* (DN III 117—141).
- ³ It seems that Ānanda was well aware of the dispute that had broken out among the monastic community at Kosambī, see the *Kosambiya-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya*.
- ⁴ These seven sets in early Buddhism, identified in post-canonical Buddhist literature as *bodhipakkhiyā dhammā*, represent the core of the Buddha's teaching. See for the best study on the topic, *The Buddhist Path to Awakening: A Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiyā Dhammā* by R.M.L. Gethin, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1992.
- ⁵ MN II 245—247.
- ⁶ DN II 276—277.
- ⁷ MN II 243—251.
- ⁸ DN II 58.
- ⁹ AN I 201—202.
- ¹⁰ DN II 276—277.
- ¹¹ This could clearly be seen in the listing of physical, verbal, and mental unwholesome acts.
- ¹² DN II 276—277.
- ¹³ Bhikkhu Bodhi translates the word *adhikaraṇa* as “litigation,” and Horner as “legal questions.” For detailed explanation, see Vin II 88—93. These seven methods are so recognized that they form the last seven rules for the monastic disciples (*pātimokkha*). See C. Prebish, *Monastic Discipline*, Pennsylvania, 1975, pp. 106—109.
- ¹⁴ The *Kinti-sutta* (MN II 238—243) which precedes the *Sāmagāma-sutta* is the best discourse on the Buddhist methods of conflict resolution.
- ¹⁵ See also, Vin II 93—104.
- ¹⁶ Translations of the quoted paragraphs of this article have been either directly or indirectly taken from *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*, translated by Bhikkhu Ñānamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, Wisdom Publications, 1995.
- ¹⁷ This evidently comes under the first conflict type whose settlement requires the use of a formal method as introduced here.
- ¹⁸ See also, Vin II 93.
- ¹⁹ See also the discussion at Vin II 80.
- ²⁰ MN II 250—251.