Sources and Trends of Peace and Conflict Studies:
An Examination of the Framework of Peacebuilding and Strategic Relevance of Ownership

SHINODA Hideaki

1. Concept of Peacebuilding

2. UN Understanding of Peacebuilding

3. Principle of Peacebuilding

4. Implementers of Peacebuilding

5. Evolution of International Peacebuilding Activities

6. Planning Peacebuilding

7. Categorization of Peacebuilding

8. Strategy of Peacebuilding

Concluding Remarks

This article is intended to provide a succinct sketch of basic discussions that should be covered by those who study peace and conflict issues in the contemporary world. While there are numerous approaches to peace and conflict issues, there are some key issue areas that are regarded as basic knowledge items regardless of specific expertise. Without common grounds, it is not easy to share constructive dialogues among those who pursue peace and conflict issues from various perspectives. The understanding of "peacebuilding" is in the first place such a matter of common knowledge.

This article argues that what is crucial is the linkage between peace and conflict in a policy-oriented understanding of peacebuilding in academic explorations. The article identifies "peacebuilding" as the concept that generically addresses the agenda of peace in contemporary policy-oriented discussions in the international context in particular. The article also identifies conflict analysis as the matter that directly shows how peacebuilding is designed to respond to contemporary armed conflicts in the world.

1. Concept of Peacebuilding

What is peacebuilding? It is not easy to define "peacebuilding" clearly. Peacebuilding can be understood to be a set of activities for peace in such environments as post-conflict societies where needs for building peace are of high importance. Peacebuilding is set to aim for building peace; we can say that any activities aiming for peace can be recognized as peacebuilding activities.

But peacebuilding is usually defined as a more specific conceptual device. The concept of peacebuilding has evolved from the question "what should be done for building peace?" Thus, activities aiming for peace only subjectively or superficially or pointlessly may not be seriously recognized as peacebuilding activities. There is a question about whether a simplistic concern about the absence of war may really lead to building real peace. Our understanding of peacebuilding depends upon what we mean by peace and what kind of peace we are aiming for.

Peacebuilding in any case aims for durable and stable peace. It is thus indispensable for peacebuilding to create a durable and stable foundation that does not let a new war happen in a society or societies in order to achieve durable peace as its ultimate goal. It is widely believed that in order to achieve the goal, various kinds of problems ought to be dealt with in a comprehensive way. Peacebuilding is thus defined as various activities to create a social foundation for durable peace.

This implies that when we speak of peacebuilding, we usually do not talk about temporary short-term peace; we aim to achieve long-term sustainable peace. We also imply that such "durable peace" will never be achieved at a superficial level. There must be a solid foundation in society that sustains peace in face of difficult conditions. So the above mentioned definition is quite broad in the sense that it does not specify any operational activities, which are dependent upon specific circumstances in reality and open to policy deliberation. But at least we can safely share as common understanding that the goal for peacebuilders is not temporary peace, but durable peace. Peacebuilders should not be satisfied with a superficial maintenance of fragile peace; rather solidify the social foundation for durable peace.

Johann Galtung, pundit of Peace Studies, remarked that there were, at least, two meanings of peace. One is "negative peace" and the other is "positive peace." [Galtung 1973] In order to explain these two conceptions of peace, Galtung also distinguished between "physical violence" and "structural violence." Negative peace means peace as the absence of war. This is the absence of physical violence. Negative peace is the opposite idea of war and constitutes the very core of

the concept of peace. Positive peace means peace as the absence of structural violence. Structural violence does not concern visible physical violence, but instead points to social structures providing structural violence against men. For instance, minority groups suffer from structural violence in a state where there is an ethnically discriminate law. The structural violence applies to those who suffer from abject poverty.

It is true to say that abolition of all forms of structural violence at once is not easy in fact. It is understandable for peacebuilding activities to concentrate upon building a society in which a war will not happen again. But the perspective of positive peace is important for preventing a war as well. It is quite often the case that serious social contradictions that structural violence creates like ethnic discrimination and abject poverty could be hotbeds of armed conflicts.

The concept of "root-causes of conflict" is used in order to point to these circumstances. A trigger of an armed conflict might be a reckless action by a handful of people. But it is quite often observed that social contradictions of structural violence might, directly or indirectly, affect the spiraling process of involving a society with a war. The structural causes of war are called "root-causes of conflict." In order to eradicate "root-causes of war," we continuously make efforts to prevent "structural violence" from fostering war conditions. It is significant to keep the interest in peacebuilding after or before a war. It is necessary to continue peacebuilding activities even when the state of war in a physical sense does not exist.

While it is important to keep a general insight of peacebuilding, we cannot assume that there is such a thing as a universal prescription of peacebuilding applicable anytime and anywhere. There are always distinct circumstances in areas where peace is lost. There is a clear limit of the approach that imposes the same content of peace and the same method of peacebuilding by ignoring specific backgrounds of war-torn areas. We ought to consider a vision of peace in concrete contexts by looking at divergent issues and searching for broad and flexible understandings and approaches of peace. By broadly grasping the content of peace as a goal, we should carefully examine what is serious and how it is so in concrete terms.

2. UN Understanding of Peacebuilding

In addition to this general observation of "peacebuilding" efforts, a more specific concept of peacebuilding exists.[1] In 1992 the then United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali issued a report entitled *An Agenda for Peace*, which intensively discussed the way international

peace operations should proceed. The report had a significant impact in many circles. Boutros-Ghali defined "peacemaking" as "action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means as those foreseen in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations" and "peace-keeping" as "the deployment of a United Nations presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well." He then defined "post-conflict peacebuilding" as "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict." [Boutros-Ghali, 1992: paras 20-22]

Boutros-Ghali's definition of "peacebuilding" was innovative in the sense that the UN agencies in economic and social fields which had not been recognized as peace organizations were understood to be able to contribute to peace in the "post-conflict" phase. In the Cold War the United Nations established its status as the organization of "peace keeping missions." The UN's role in "peacemaking" to negotiate to stop armed conflicts had been highly recognized. But his definition made clear that the UN had a greater role in "peacebuilding" in the post-conflict phase.

Boutros-Ghali established a legacy in discussions on peace operations. First, "post-conflict peace-building" was recognized as social and economic activities in contrast to political or military activities of peacemaking or peacekeeping. Second, "peacebuilding" was confined to the "post-conflict" stage and thus became entangled with eternal debates on when the "post-conflict" stage begins. Third, while the newly created Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations were given the tasks to deal with peacemaking and peacekeeping respectively, other specialized agencies were supposed to conduct "post-conflict peacebuilding." This was indeed a very clear systematic comprehension of peace operations from the perspective of the system of the United Nations. However, this systematic comprehension led to some corresponding problems as a result.

First, while it is totally true that peacebuilding should include non-political and non-military activities, the impression that peacebuilding is by definition non-political and non-military would be wrong. There are always political and even military aspects in peacebuidling, which Boutros-Ghali's discussion tended to underestimate. Second, it would be simplistic to say that peacebuidling is always implemented only after the termination of conflict and that anything taking place before and during conflict should not be peacebuidling. But his discussion looks too mechanistic in terms of chronological demarcations of spheres of various peace operations. Third, these categorizations of nature and timelines of peace operations are intrinsically linked

to operational needs of the division of labor within the UN system. But these too clearly and too bureaucratically defined organizational lines may not be helpful when various different organizations engage in complex situations by seeking flexible efforts for coordination and cooperation.

As the former head of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Boutros-Ghali's successor, Kofi Annan knew the bitterest experiences of UN peace operations during the 1990s. Upon assuming the office of the Secretary-General in 1997, he launched critical examinations of two of the most tragic failures of UN peace operations in the first half of the 1990s, namely, Srebrenica and Rwanda. [United Nations 1999a; United Nations 1999b] He then commissioned a new panel to thoroughly reexamine UN peace operations by appointing Lakhdhar Brahimi, well-known diplomat and senior official of UN peace operations, as its chair. The report of the "Panel on United Nations Peace Operations" issued in 2000 then came to be called the "Brahimi Report." [United Nations, 2000]

The Brahimi Report took a more comprehensive perspective by emphasizing the overall nature of "peace operations," while it kept the basic understanding of various categories established by Boutros-Ghali. It stated that "United Nations peace operations entail three principal activities: conflict prevention and peacemaking; peacekeeping; and peacebuilding." "Longterm conflict prevention" addresses "the structural sources of conflict in order to build a solid foundation for peace." "Peacemaking addresses conflicts in progress, attempting to bring them to a halt, using the tools of diplomacy and mediation." "Peacekeeping is⋯primarily military model of observing ceasefires and force separations after inter-State wars, to incorporate a complex model of many elements, military and civilian, working together to build peace in the dangerous aftermath of civil wars." Then the Report defines "Peacebuilding" as "activities undertaken on the far side of conflict to reassemble the foundations of peace and provide the tools for building on those foundations something that is more than just the absence of war."

What is significant is the emphasis by the Brahimi Report upon "strategy" of peace operations by introducing more doctrinal aspects beyond discussions on definitions. The Report stated, for instance, that "Among the changes that the Panel supports are: a doctrinal shift in the use of civilian police and related rule of law elements in peace operations that emphasizes a team approach to upholding the rule of law and respect for human rights and helping communities coming out of a conflict to achieve national reconciliation." "Peacebuilding includes but is not limited to reintegrating former combatants into civilian society, strengthening the rule of law

(for example, through training and restructuring of local police, and judicial and penal reform); improving respect for human rights through the monitoring, education and investigation of past and existing abuses; providing technical assistance for democratic development." With such an attitude the Brahimi Report avoided strict chronological demarcations of the spheres of various categories of peace operations. It did not artificially allocate tasks to various organizations by institutionally distinguishing between political, military and social and economic categories of peace operations. For instance, the Report stressed that complex peace keeping operations for internal wars were highly associated with peacebuilding by remarking that peacebuilders cannot function without assistance of peacekeepers and that peacekeepers do not have an exit without peacebuilders' work. Peacekeeping may be deployed even when the conflict has not been finished and peacebuilding may be initiated even when the UN does not seek a termination of conflict. The roadmap for conflict resolution is to transit an unfinished conflict from the military sphere to the political sphere, whether the conflict has been really terminated or not.

　　The Brahimi Report was welcomed by most of the UN member states including the United States. It was because the Report seemed to show the desirable course of reform the UN ought to take. More specifically, the strategic linkage between peacekeeping and peacebuilding was a crucial point that appealed to many member states. But countries like China and India were somehow skeptical about the implications of the Brahimi Report to the inviolability of the principle of sovereignty.

　　Prior to the Brahimi Report, Annan discussed peacebuilding in his report on Africa in 1998 by mentioning the issues of promotion of reconciliation, respect for human rights, political inclusiveness, national unity, repatriation of refugees/internally displaced people, social reintegration of ex-combatants, small arms management, economic reconstruction, and so on. [United Nations, 1998] And he summarized by illustrating sustainable development and good governance that respect for human rights and rule of law, transparency and responsibility in administration, capacity development in administration, strengthening democratic governance are key to peacebuilding. By referring to human rights and rule of law, Annan highlighted the importance of institution building and development of law enforcement agency and the judiciary.

　　According to Annan, peacebuilding is essentially home-grown. Its fundamental nature is political. Effective peacebuilding strategies are comprehensive and need to tackle root-causes of conflict by incorporating measures to promote good governance, rule of law, democratization and human rights as key factors of sustainable peace. While Annan encouraged long-term

international assistance in peacebuilding, he also noted the paradox of peacebuilding that made a society dependent upon external aid. He paid attention to countries that were worried about violation of non-interference by stressing that peacebuilding was fundamentally home-grown. Within this framework, he illustrated the negotiation and implementation of peace agreement, security, good governance/democratization/human rights, justice and reconciliation, humanitarian aid and sustainable development as the five key areas of peacebuilding.

3. Principle of Peacebuilding

There are some principles which are highly significant in peacebuilding. One of the most important principles among others is the principle of the ownership of local society. It is an indispensable principle for peacebuilding that aims to establish durable peace. It is impossible to achieve durable peace without local actors acting as peacebuilders. International society often carries a significant role, but in no case can international efforts become effective without a system of responsible commitments by local society. The UN Peacebuilding Commission has an institutional channel to involve governments of post-conflict states in their meetings. The overall direction of peacebuilding is in most cases determined by a peace agreement or the sort of agreement signed by conflict parties when they terminated an armed conflict. This shows that the course of actual peacebuilding is expected to accommodate the positions of local people.

Yet, it is not an easy task to establish the principle of local society's ownership coherently. Because in many situations that require peacebuilding activities there is no governmental authority legitimately representing "local society." Or there may be no authority which is capable of smoothly implementing policies. In the first place, one major goal of peacebuilding could be to establish such an authority. Then the issue of how to secure the ownership of local society cannot easily be solved.

If a desire to respect local society's ownership leads to overestimation of local authorities, the possibility of smooth progress of peacebuilding to be advanced by local society could stagnate. It is thus critically important to have a broader vision of peacebuilding in which various stakeholders of local society including community and civil society organizations independent of governmental authorities are sufficiently engaged. It is also indispensable to assist local people who strive to reform and strengthen capacities of governmental agencies by continuously engaging in the government.

Assistance by international society is, of course, not contradictory to the ownership of local society. It is rather necessary to develop potential capacity of local society. International society's assistance is often required to supplement their insufficient capacities temporarily and to eradicate factors that hamper the development of their capacities. But international society's assistance is required only when local society is not sufficiently capable of conducting peacebuilding activities. In the end, international society's assistance is always valued according to the principle of the ownership of local society. It must be systematized with regard to the short-term, middle-term and long-term prospects of constructive relations with local society.

This does not simplistically and automatically mean that international assistance should adopt "the principle of consent." Dependence upon the local government only in form could risk taking peacebuilding policies out of the hope of the people who live in local society. It cannot be fundamentally denied that there is a possibility of outsiders' active measures eradicating stumbling blocks to durable peace. International society's assistance in accordance with the ownership of local society would become meaningless, if it does not have a broad and long-term prospect for peace.

From these perspectives, desirable peacebuilding activities by international society are to contribute to the development of the capacity for peace. Capacity development of local society is always one major goal in the field of developmental aid. What is significant from the perspective of such a big objective as building peace is the capacity of local society to create and maintain peace by itself. We often observe that a war-torn society lacks this capacity. Therefore, the ultimate task of peacebuilding assistance by external actors is to develop the capacity for peace of local society. We ought to assess peacebuilding activities in accordance with the criteria of how much peacebuilding assistance contributes to the "development of the capacity for peace" of local society in general and long-term perspectives.

4. Implementers of Peacebuilding

The most important implementer of peacebuilding in order to secure local ownership is the local/national state mechanism. Of course, theoretically speaking, the creation of the modern state is not the only method of peacebuilding, at least theoretically speaking, and a state mechanism does not have to always keep playing a leading role. In the actual modern world, however, complete rejection of a state mechanism would not lead to a permanent social

system, even if many differences could naturally arise due to local circumstances. It is common for political communities to act in modern international society as states in accordance with international law. Therefore, a local/national state mechanism is normally recognized as the central player of peacebuilding.

Local/national state mechanisms do not work in the same manner. The function which a local/national state mechanism can shoulder in the peacebuilding process is naturally different. The understanding of how much local society should share burdens with international society also changes. The form and the degree of centralization which local society thinks appropriate differ due to such factors as racial distributions, the size of the country, historical circumstances, and so on. In spite of that, we must still prioritize public authorities represented by the state mechanism, if we want to build peace through the process of establishing "a modern nation."

Other local peacebuilding organizations than national ones including smaller public administrations and civil society groups at the community level are also always important. When the central government is fragile and/or its capacity is limited, the roles of other actors become more important. The role of implementers of peacebuilding at the community level needs to be visible to the local population, who are expected to feel the ownership of peacebuilding. It is still necessary to properly keep the role of the central government to secure people's ownership in the structure of the modern nation and in relation to other nations. After all, peacebuilding will fall into a crisis, if local people cannot identify the national government as their own. Therefore, the way various local implementers of peacebuilding are put in order, institutionalized, and coordinated is a very important issue of peacebuilding.

On the side of international society, the existence of the United Nations stands out among various implementers of peacebuilding. It is natural for the UN to have an interest in the problem of peacebuilding, because it is the organization established for the purpose of the maintenance of "international peace and security." The United Nations can start peace operations with the authority of almost entire international society, although its 193 member countries have divergent interests.

The United Nations Security Council has main responsibility to the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore, mainly the Security Council talks about the problem of armed conflicts. The best highest decision making is made in the form of resolutions of the Security Council. Most of the peacekeeping missions of the United Nations in the past 60 years were established by the resolutions of the Security Council. The Security Council has the

institutional limitation that five permanent members of the Security Council have "veto." This system is intended to prevent the Security Council from fostering confrontations between great powers. When they are united, resolutions are really strong. The Security Council can invoke Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to provide peace operations with the authority of coercive measures. In other words, it has the power to decide whether threat or use of force is necessary or ought to be allowed. This symbolizes the special position of the UN Security Council with the huge authority which any other organization in international society does not have. The authority of "coercive measures" is given not only to the military force, but also to institutions like international war crimes tribunals in the judicial field too.

The United Nations has the Economic and Social Council too as well as various specialized agencies. For example, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) concentrates on support for governance in post-conflict areas, working as one of the major implementers of peacebuilding. Many specialized agencies such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), World Food Program (WFP) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) are engaged in peacebuilding from the side of humanitarian aid.

One of the recent trends of international peace operations is the active roles regional organizations are taking, when United Nations alone cannot cope with problems. In Europe, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Union (EU), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and other European organizations have become eminent implementers of peacebuilding. In western Africa, Economic Community of West African States: (ECOWAS), in central Africa, African Union (AU), in southern Africa, South African Development Community (SADC) have sent peacekeeping forces, prior to the deployment of United Nations peacekeeping missions, in order to cope with regional conflicts. Even when peace operations are not deployed, it is very common that regional organizations play important roles in mediating peace agreements in the Middle East, Asia and Africa. The advantage of regional organizations is that they are familiar with the conflict area. But there are many cases that countries closely involved in the conflict are members of regional organizations.

Various other international organizations participate in peacebuilding activities. The organizations providing financial support like the World Bank are important in particular. Since it is always difficult to raise financial resources for peacebuilding activities, many peacebuilding activities are introduced as "projects" that have certain specific budgets to be funded by reliable financial sources. Thus, the Bretton Woods institutions play key roles when we translate

peacebuilding plans into concrete implementable projects.

It is not exceptional any more that individual donor countries support peacebuilding activities independently. It is not rare to see that main donor countries pledge the amount of help at donors' meetings held after a conflict. While a certain rate of the pledged amount goes to international organizations, each country also conducts bilateral assistance too. Bilateral assistance has the decisive role especially when the process of peacebuilding is started after military activities by the powers like the United States. When the power with a military presence and a great political influence promises a large sum of support, peacebuilding begins to move around such a power. Groups called "coalition of the willing" or "contact group" and so on are sometimes formed in accordance with the purpose of peacebuilding. For instance, in Afghanistan after the Bonn Agreement of 2001, Japan was active in the field of Disarmament and Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) as "lead nation," while the United States was in charge of formation of the new national army, Germany in charge of the police reform, United Kingdom in charge of narcotics, Italy in charge of judicial reforms.

The NGOs, not only civil society groups of local society but also international NGOs, are among major implementers of peacebuilding. The range of activities conducted by NGOs is very wide. In many areas ranging from humanitarian aid and development aid to landmine removal, their activities are indispensable. In should be noted and recently well emphasized that with the increase in the number of implementers, coordination among the local government, civil society groups, local NGOs, international NGOs, international organizations and donor countries is a challenge.

5. Evolution of International Peacebuilding Activities

Even before the end of the Cold War and formal introduction of the concept of peacebuilding, similar kinds of activities existed without being called peacebuilding. Reconstruction after war can be regarded as peacebuilding in a broad sense. The fact that Security Sector Reform (SSR), a major component of today's peacebuilding, was conducted on a large scale in post-war Japan is a typical example. Public sector reform such as reorganization of the armed forces combined with the purge from public office of members of the Nazi party was carried out in Germany as well.

As the occupations after World War II were rather exceptional, most reconstruction cases were conducted without direct participation of international society. With the pressing seriousness

of the Cold War soon after World War II, even the cases of post-war reconstruction of Japan and Germany were not fully examined from the viewpoint of peacebuilding. The cases of reconstruction after regional wars such as the Korean War and the Vietnam War were interpreted usually only from the perspective of the Cold War system. Even those who were engaged in reconstruction did not consciously have the perspective of peacebuilding.

The United Nations succeeded in discovering and establishing a new form of peace activity, peacekeeping, in the period of the Cold War. But peacekeeping operations during the Cold War period simply deployed neutral military forces to monitor ceasefires and hardly had the divergent elements of peacebuilding. It was perceived to be impossible to conduct unified peace operations in the Cold War period in which international society was split between the two superpowers.

But the world changed with the end of the Cold War. First, the balance between the superpowers collapsed. Instability came to appear in many states due to the collapse of the Soviet Union. After 1989 the number of regional conflicts drastically increased. 40-50 armed conflicts existed every year in the first half of the 1990s, even when we define an armed conflict as a confrontation that kills more than 1,000 persons. [Uppsala Universitet, 2014] Second, international society rather easily responds to regional conflicts after the end of the Cold War. It is because the structural confrontation disappeared. The United Nations Security Council, which had remained dysfunctional during the Cold War due to veto powers, began to pass the resolutions to invoke enforcement actions based on Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter from around the time of the Gulf War of 1991. This is one of the trends that symbolize changes in the nature of peace operations since the end of the Cold War.

In other words, while armed conflicts happened frequently with the end of the Cold War, international society could somehow manage to respond. As a result, the number of international peace operations increased dramatically. 15 PKO missions were established in about 40 years from 1948 until 1988. By contrast, 54 peacekeeping missions were established from 1989 up to 2014. The United Nations spends 7 billion dollars at present for peacekeeping operations. Military and police personnel of more than 97,655 from 122 countries work as UN peacekeepers at the time of August 2014. About 5,247 international civilian staff members in addition to 1,824 UN Volunteers and about 11,714 locally hired staff members are also being engaged in peacekeeping missions. [United Nations, 2014a] The missions with no military force like peacemaking missions have also been developed and about 11 cases of such UN missions exist at the time of April 2014. [United Nations, 2014b]

It is not only the number of peace operations that has expanded since the end of the Cold War. The qualitative change in international peace operations has also taken place. Since the time of Ghali's *An Agenda for Peace*, many agencies of United Nations and other organizations have begun to engage in international peacebuilding activities. Peacekeeping operations expanded in the number of people. Sometimes one mission possesses several hundred civilian staff members. It is also the case that the mandate of many missions surpasses the traditional framework of peacekeeping. In other words, peacekeeping missions quite often functioned as peacebuilding missions too. Now peacekeeping operations often take charge of electoral assistances, maintenance of law and order, security sector reform, protection of staff and local populations, humanitarian aid, DDR, the protection and promotion of human rights, judicial reform, support for democratization, and so on.

As a result, there appeared several distinctive trends. First, coherent implementation of divergent components of peace operations is now a key issue. Peacebuilding activities are planned and carried out in association with peacemaking and peacekeeping. The contents of the activities carried out as peacebuilding activities have become diverse. Various activities ranging from security operations to developmental aid are systematically understood in a broad picture of peacebuilding. Military, police and various civilian experts are even more strongly encouraged to work coherently. Multiple agencies are involved with peace operations. Coordination, coherence, communication and integration are among the issues to be enhanced as matters of capacity development of peace operations.

Second, so-called robust operations are now rising in number and in quality. Most of the peacekeeping operations have the Chapter VII mandate for protection of civilians, if not for coercive measures or transitional authority. [United Nations, 2009a] The doctrinal change from neutrality to impartiality symbolizes the transition of conceptual frameworks. The use of advanced levels of weapons like unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) has begun to be introduced and debated. Formed police units are now indispensable aspects of contemporary international peacekeeping.

Third, civilians are involved in peace operations at each stage on a large scale and as a result play leading roles for planning and implementing peacebuilding. [United Nations, 2011b] Civilian experts may contribute by exerting their own expertise in their own expert fields as part of peace operations. But doctrines like the rule of law requires has emerged as a policy framework for many agencies to make collective contributions and requires more policy-oriented experts. [United Nations, 2006; United Nations 2010b] Flexible use of intelligence and support for logistical affairs

are matters of ongoing debates, which would also require different kinds of civilian experts. [United Nations, 2010a]

Fourth, while the United Nations remains the important implementer of peace operations, regional organizations, individual states and NGOs came to be actively engaged in various peace operations including peacebuilding. In particular, the partnership with regional organizations like AU, EU, NATO, OSCE, etc. with UN is now one of the most critical issues in the field of peacekeeping and peacebuilding. [United Nations, 2008c]

Fifth, no matter how paradoxically it may sound, there is a growing consensus that the will and the capacity of local society will eventually decide on the course of peacebuilding, which mainly aims to functionally develop local ownership for peace. [United Nations, 2008a]

6. Planning Peacebuilding

It is important to imagine what kind of peace we wish to attain when we plan peacebuilding. Then, it is necessary to analyze the concrete conditions of conflict exactly in a post-conflict society. It is important to analyze factors of a past conflict as well as factors of a potential future conflict in order to plan peacebuilding to respond to them. It is needless to say that there are always circumstances which are peculiar to each conflict. Therefore, before implementing peacebuilding, we must work to analyze the particular nature of each conflict. The work to build peace is pointless if it does not respond to the threats of conflict in the past, at the present and in the future. Where there is no understanding of conflict causes, there will be no direction of peacebuilding. In other words, the condition of peacebuilding planning is an analysis of conflict causes.

Most armed conflicts have deep historical and social backgrounds. We must be careful that various factors are involved in the background of the conflict. We also need to take into consideration the factors which created the current structure of international society in the modern age, which created the situation in each region in the past decades, and which directly caused an armed conflict. We can distinguish between these stages as a state mechanism formation process, a conflict structure occurrence process and a conflict outbreak process.

Conflicts can occur even where there is no state. Therefore, it is theoretically incorrect to think that there is always a state mechanism where a conflict takes place. However, the entire world is now covered by certain forms of states. Most of these states are recognized as independent

nation-states. A state mechanism must take some countermeasures when an armed conflict happens within its territory. Therefore, when an armed conflict actually happens, the government becomes a conflict party or at least an ambiguous third party between conflict parties.

When we think about the structural factor of the conflict, we need to think about the origin of the nation state. Of course each state has the history of each peculiar origin. But it is possible to analyze the tendencies that can be observed in quite a many areas of conflict. Most of the areas where armed conflicts happen in today's world have the experience of colonization. If not colonization, some of them have the history of being amalgamated or threatened by a bigger power like an empire. Therefore, the history of colonization and decolonization has very important implications in the context of peacebuilding.

There are many countries in Asia and Africa which have the experiences of being colonized by the European powers in the past several hundred years. Most of those countries achieved independence one after another in the storm of "decolonization" which blew hard after World War II. However, the newly independent states did not simply restore political systems that had existed before colonization. Through the process of colonization, those states adopted a modern nation state system. They became the participants in international society. But most of the newly independent states did not have a historical foundation as an independent state. "Decolonization" was not just a breakaway from colonization, but it necessarily entailed the work of creating a new state.

Creating a new state is a terrible business. The process entailed considerable difficulties in any state. Sufficient preparation was not made in most of the newly independent states. They became independent in a hasty manner when the political campaign for decolonization in international society was so high. In many cases, the independent states lacked physical infrastructures, bureaucratic state institutions and human resources. It was rather natural that those newly independent states were very fragile.

With the poor capacity of the state, the ability to prevent political domestic confrontations and the ability to maintain social stability are all weak. Or it might have extremely perverse power structures as a result of turmoil at the time of independence, as in the case of one ethnic group dominating the central government, and so on. Such conditions hamper the development of "the capacity for peace" to ease and stop conflicts. In such states a conflict occurs very easily. The fact that most contemporary armed conflicts happen in the newly independent states tells that the history of decolonization is highly relevant to contemporary peacebuilding activities.

As regards Africa where the degree of instability is more or less very high, it is pointed out that "structural adjustments" imposed by international organizations like the IMF and the World Bank seemed to have weakened the political structure of each state. The potential fragility erupted in the form of internal armed conflicts as indirect results of such organizations' policies when the Cold War ended

The number of regional conflicts increased after "the Cold War" ended in 1989. However, there were some other conflicts which came to an end at the end of the Cold War. The structure of usual stability collapsed in the area where the stability was based on the Cold War system. The structure of usual conflict collapsed in the area where the conflict due to the Cold War system went on. The end of the Cold War was the big event which, at any rate, converted political structures in many areas.

The region which went in the direction of destabilization is Europe. Some republics of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia tried to become independent. The confrontation between the pro-independence force and the anti-independence force was triggered by the collapse of the Soviet Union that marked the end of the Cold War. A delicate balance had been maintained in the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia between the federal system based on the ideology and local communities based on ethnic bondages. With the end of the Cold War, some republics succeeded in keeping stability by achieving independence. But the declaration of independence was not an instant solution in a republic like Bosnia and Herzegovina where there was a complicated ethnic composition. By contrast, in countries like Cambodia, the disappearance of the superpowers supporting conflict parties at the end of the Cold War rather facilitated the political environment of ending the conflict. In such countries as Angola and Afghanistan, however, the conflicts continued in other forms despite the disappearance of the involvement of the superpowers at the end of the Cold War.

An armed conflict cannot last for a long time, if financial sources are controlled. If the government gets financial resources through the usual state mechanism, another source of the fund for the anti-government side would exist for an armed conflict to take place. It was common during the Cold War that one superpower supported the government side, when the other superpower backed the anti-government side. In such areas the end of the Cold War facilitated the end of the conflict. However, it is found that the superpower was not the only financial source for war. Some countries in the surrounding area or with cultural and religious connections could have strong interests in internal conflicts and might support a certain conflict party. Another

criminal kind of fund-raising is sometimes planned by the anti-government side when they control and exploit rich profitable natural resources like diamonds. Such agricultural products as narcotics could also be strong financial sources. The structures of armed conflicts after the Cold War are more complex than in the past. But the problem of financial sources is always the very crucial topic when we plan the course of peacebuilding.

In our contemporary world there are some areas in which an armed conflict has not occurred but the great degree of instability exists. It may be the case, for instance, that in such areas there are possibilities of conflicts, but there is simply a limited flow of the fund available for military purposes. Before an armed conflict happens, it is necessary to get rid of sources of instability and social contradictions. Such "conflict prevention" activities constitute part of peacebuilding in a broad sense. All the components of peacebuilding can be applied as measures for "conflict prevention."

We need to start with analyzing causes of conflict before planning peacebuilding activities. It is necessary to examine various fields comprehensively and to take historical backgrounds into consideration. Then, we can think of the direction of peacebuilding that corresponds to causes of conflict. One organization is not expected to meet all the needs. The limit of financial and human resources affects the planning of peacebuilding activities. But all these matters ought to be considered in terms of concrete policies. The strategy of peacebuilding ought to be planned prior to the principles and the circumstances of organizations engaged in peacebuilding.

7. Categorization of Peacebuilding

Since peacebuilding covers a wide range of areas, it is useful to categorize various activities of peacebuilding in order to understand it systematically. An armed conflict necessarily becomes a political problem, once it happens. So the political dimension of peacebuilding is always a central issue. Political negotiations are always important not only at the level of peacemaking to discuss peace agreements, but also for the process of peacebuilding as well. Consultation between conflict parties and coordination between local governments and international organizations are among the important political issues that repeatedly emerge in the process of peacebuilding.

We can find a clearer direction to think about the way peacebuilding ought to be conducted in a broad framework. The important direction in the process of peacebuilding is empowering those who aspire for peace and forming the political framework to strengthen those people.

This realizes the principle of ownership of local society in the context of peacebuilding. It is not fruitful for peacebuilding to support those power holders who obstruct peace, even when they are popular in local society. Therefore, the implementers of peacebuilding try not to empower those who are against peacebuilding. At the same time, the implementers of peacebuilding need to identify those who can become the bearers of peace and help them gain more power. Peacebuilding ought to promote political processes in which those who pursue peace will prevail over those who obstruct peace by establishing a solid foundation of peace.

Then, what is the social system for such a peaceful society? In political-legal fields, the principle called "the rule of law" in international peace operations draws attention of practitioners in political and legal aspects of peacebuilding. "The rule of law" at the level of the political system means that the administration should respect the law established by the legislature and the legislature should follow the constitution established by the people. Moreover, because the constitution stipulates the way a country is ruled, any members of society should comply with the principle of "the rule of law."

To emphasize this spirit of "the rule of law" and to raise the culture of respecting "the rule of law" is thus a very important guideline in political and legal aspects of peacebuilding. It is important to clarify what legal principles ought to be respected in order to attain "the rule of law." When international society intervenes to do peacebuilding, International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law which concern the very core of human dignity are given weight. These legal norms have very important meanings in peacebuilding, because this is the attitude which each administration as a member of international society shares. But international society is prepared to recognize the initiative of local society, if it is within the framework of legal norms of international society concerning human dignity.

Peace agreement is made when an armed conflict ends or stops by mediation. Generally, then the route of the political process to create a new state mechanism is established. A provisional government is formed, a constitution plan is drafted, a referendum or an election is held, and members of the parliament and the president are elected. It can be said that the purpose of this route is to create a society based on "the rule of law." The society in which a conflict happened is in the condition that a "social contract" between the members of society collapsed. This "social contract" must be remodeled. A constitution to express it must be confirmed. The legislature, the administration and the judiciary ought to be created, which would protect the constitution to achieve steady peacebuilding. A series of political processes after a peace agreement are

decisively important for peacebuilding which aims at the goal of "the rule of law."[2]

There are some peacebuilding activities which are particularly important in realizing "the rule of law." One typical example is the reform in the security field. This type of activities is nowadays categorically called Security Sector/System Reform (SSR).[3] More concretely speaking, for instance, this includes a reform in the military organization to deal with external security. It is indispensable to reform the arrangement of the military force from a war society to a peaceful society. As for the peaceful society, the number of weapons and soldiers which existed in the wartime is unnecessary. The necessity to work for the qualitative improvement of the military force comes out when it has the tendency to be exploited by power holders who tend to ignore legal norms. As for the circumstances of a civil war, because the regular army and the non-regular army coexist, the necessity to create an integrative military force after the conflict is especially critical. It is very important to create a legitimate integrative military organization for the establishment of "the rule of law" as peacebuilding.

DDR (Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration) is quite often carried out in peacebuilding.[4] The form of DDR varies in each area. But the common needs of peacebuilding to put military force in order are supposed to exist in each case. It is decisively important to create a unified military force in the strategy of peacebuilding to establish "the rule of law." SSR does not exclusively focus on the military organization. Even greater attention would quite often be paid to the law enforcement agency, namely, police, as well as other security related sectors including prison system. The police force has significant roles in creating conditions for war as well as social stability for peace. Once police mechanism or individual behaviors of policemen are brutal, for instance, a healthy social condition of peaceful society will not be achieved. The police (law enforcement) agency takes responsibility in maintaining domestic security. This is another pillar of "Security Sector Reform: SSR."

The next is the economic field. There are not a few cases that the economic field of peacebuilding has a critical meaning. It is because economic conditions prepare a hotbed or a cause of conflict. What kind of economic regime is useful for peace? Economic development in the normal sense may contribute to peacebuilding by stabilizing a volatile post-conflict society. In short, the consideration to strengthen the capacity for peace and not to obstruct peace is required in the economic field as well. From the perspective of peacebuilding, it is not suitable to say that a certain specific economic regime is the most desirable. It is because whatever economic system is adopted, once it works properly, it can contribute to stabilization. What is not desirable

from the perspective of peacebuilding is an economic mechanism to work in a discriminate way. The examples include racial discrimination in corporate management and economic policies inappropriately disadvantageous to specific regions. [Stewart, 2008]

The flow of the fund used for conflict must be cut off, so that illegal economy is prevented and does not encourage conflict in any case. In other words, illegal profits are often flown into armed groups through illegal economic activities. It is important to introduce the system to control illegal acts such as cultivation and circulation of high-value crops including opium poppies. The exploitation of expensive natural resources like diamonds is a serious issue. The disclosure system of illegal dealings of resources and the control of the borders are also important points. [UNEP, 2009]

We can also highlight the category of cultural peacebuilding. While war is encouraged by many social factors, it is always human beings who start and continue war. Therefore, war never occurs, theoretically speaking, when there are only human beings who intend to strengthen peace, even if there are external conditions to incur war. Therefore, one of the fundamental peacebuilding activities is to bring up the human being who looks for peace. It is probably more difficult to create the human being who advances peace in large quantities than to reform a social system. But peacebuilding is ultimately always human-made. It is correct to say that any kind of peacebuilding that ignores this point is confined to a shallow thing. In this sense nurturing the feeling to look for peace in people's heart should be recognized as an important peacebuilding activity in the cultural field.

Peace education can be carried out even if it takes the form of a class for adults. It is supposed to be acceptable to carry out peace education against the class of persons who were engaged in war. Reflecting upon the past would be an important peacebuilding activity in terms of mental or psychological affairs. The support of public institutions is effective to provide a class of adults with the opportunity of peace education. By connecting it with vocational trainings for adults, it would be possible to carry it out with the initiatives of civil society groups.

8. Strategy of Peacebuilding

Strategy was a key term in the doctrinal shift in the new discussions on peacebuilding. This article argues that while contents of peacebuilding are wide and open, it ought to address social foundation for durable peace. If so, we shall never be satisfied by implementing any narrowly

specified project. Peacebuilding rather requires many activities in political, legal, social, economic, and cultural fields by many divergent organizations and individuals. Peacebuilding should not exclusively focus upon the post-conflict phase, since strategic views of peacebuilding may demand activities before the end of conflict or preventive actions. This broadness is inevitable since we are more interested in complexity of reality than refined academic definitions. Peacebuilding is a set of activities to create social foundations for durable peace and thus requires comprehensive and integrated strategies that are expected most appropriately to tackle particular root-causes found in particular conflict-torn societies.

Listing activities and organizations involved in peacebuilding is not strategic. The systematic making of the comprehensive and integrated strategy must be pursued from a really strategic perspective beyond organizational demarcations. But is it not impossible to discuss such a strategy in general terms? Is it not true that without specific contexts we cannot identify any strategies? This is certainly true to some extent. Nevertheless, while each peacebuilding case ought to have its own distinct strategic orientation corresponding to each distinct conflict situation, general patters may be prepared in response to quite common patters of contemporary armed conflicts.

We know that many a conflict in the contemporary world have root-causes in governance. When public authorities in a society are fragile in terms of its legitimacy or capacity, the society is vulnerable to the risks of instability and even armed conflicts. There must be a debate concerning the necessity of public authorities for durable peace. It is certainly Western commentators who tend to emphasize institutional settings for peacebuilding based on the modern state system. But as long as we are committed to conditions of the modern state system and international society, it seems true to say that we cannot dispense with public authorities with responsibility to maintain social mechanisms for long-term stability of society as a whole. When such public authorities are missing or abusive, we find it very difficult to create social foundations for durable peace.

In order to clarify the implication of strategy-making for peacebuilding, it may be instructive to exemplify three orientations for strategies of peacebuilding. First, once we recognize root-causes of conflict as an inherent confrontation between identity groups, we need to foster mutual confidence building leading to reconciliation between identity groups. Diplomatic negotiations and grass-roots dialogues as well as such attempts as cultural exchanges and meetings for mutual understandings and compromises will then be required. [Smock, 2012; Ryan, 1996] The mainstream international community surrounding authoritative institutions like the UN Security

Council seldom set peacebuilding strategies derived from such aspects, partly because solutions to these cultural, ethnic, religious, historical and psychological issues involved in confrontations between identity groups often seem to be beyond the capacities of diplomatic circles.

Next, when we find root-causes in economic structures or policies, it would be crucial to reform and eradicate such perverse economic structures or policies through domestic measures and/or international development aid. Such measures are probably targeted toward those who are most dissatisfied with the ongoing economic situation and vulnerable to mobilization for social instability. The control and proper management of natural resources is indispensable in peacebuilding strategies in economic fields. [Boyce and Pastor, 1998] Humanitarian aid is also contextualized in peacebuilding for various strategic reasons in certain circumstances where people are too vulnerable to sustain stable lives, while it may not always have good impacts. [Pugh, 1995]

The rule of law approach of peacebuilding is understood as another kind of strategic perspectives of peacebuilding. It is a strategy of peacebuilding to create a social foundation for durable peace by assisting in establishing a legitimate and effective public authority in a society after identifying the lack of reliable public authority as a root-cause of conflict. This is indeed a strategy to transform military conflicts into political ones. While such a cultural approach as reconciliation aims to abolish serious confrontations. The rule of law approach aims to institutionalize confrontations. This implies the rule of law approach is intended to transform violent conflicts into non-violent ones. Most fundamentally, it is a strategy not to abolish conflicts but to institutionally manage them. The rule of law approach is based on the philosophy of conflict management instead of ultimate conflict resolution.

It may be noted that this approach is really rooted in the Western philosophy of liberal democracy. The principles of balance of powers and checks and balances, for instance, in American constitutionalism are based on the philosophy that human society inevitably becomes full of conflicts of interests and should only be institutionally managed. The system of representative democracy based on party politics is an expression of the philosophy. Liberalism that respects individual rights necessarily creates conflicts among individuals on a daily basis. But this is in theory a mechanism to transform military conflicts into political ones by institutionally guaranteeing individual rights and translating and hopefully alleviating all conflicts in a legal manner. Successful implementation of the rule of law will not be identified by the lack of conflicts, but by institutionalization of conflicts.

For the purpose of explanation, it is possible to locate these examples in the table below.

Table 1: Examples of Peacebuilding Stretegies

Conflict Causes	Strategic Goals	Strategic Means
Hatred between identity groups	Reconciliation between the groups	Dialogues, meetings, cultural exchanges, peace education, psychological treatment, etc.
Distorted economic structure	Eradication of structural inequlity	Social infrastructures, poverty reduction, social security, job creation
Lack of legitimate and effective public authority	Social order based on rule of law	Institutional reforms, capacity building of administrators, promotion of human rights

Concluding Remarks

This article sought to provide an examination of the concept of peacebuilding in order to explore a foundation of peace and conflict studies. In so doing, the article looked at general trends concerning armed conflicts and peacebuilding in the contemporary world. The article illustrated that the linkage between conflict and peacebuilding is a crucial point, since it is the connection between problem and solution. Unless there is a logically solid linkage between conflict and peacebuilding, causes and countermeasures, and problems and solutions, the entire attempt of peacebuilding will fall apart. Studying circumstances of conflict and practices of peacebuilding is to learn how we can solidly apply logical solutions to the problem of war.

Notes

1) The basic documents on the concept of peacebuilding officially published by the United Nations, for instance, include Boutros-Ghali, 1992; Boutros-Ghali, 1995; United Nations, 2000; United Nations, 2009b; OECD/DAC, 2005; OECD/DAC, 2001; OECD/DAC, 2012."

2) The rule of law is discussed by peacebuilding related agencies in various ways. See United Nations, 2013a; United Nations 2011a; United Nations 2006; United Nations 2004; UNDP, 2011; UNHCHR, 2009.

3) For general discussions on SSR, see OECD/DAC, 2008; United Nations 2013b; United Nations, 2008b; United Nations, 2012.

4) For general discussions on DDR, see United Nations Inter-Agency Working Group on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration, 2006; United Nations Inter-Agency Working Group on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration, 2010.

References

Boyce, James K. and Pastor, Mannuel Jr. 1998
    "Can International Financial Institutions Help Prevent Conflict?"
    World Policy Journal, vol. 15, no. 2.
Boutros-Ghali, Boutros 1992
    An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping
    (Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the Statement Adopted by the
    Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992),
    New York:UN Document A/47/277-S/24111.
Boutros-Ghali, Boutros 1995
    Supplement to An Agenda for Peace,
    New York: UN Document A/50/60-S/1995/1.
Galtung, Johan 1973
    Peace: Research, Education, Action,
    Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.
OECD/DAC 2005
    "Preventing Conflict and Building Peace: a Manual of Issues and Entry Points"
    Paris: OECD.
OECD/DAC 2001
    "DAC Guidelines: Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation,"
    Paris: OECD.
OECD/DAC 2008
    "OECD DAC Handbook on Security Sector Reform,"
    Paris: OECD.
OECD/DAC 2012
    "Rethinking Policy, Changing Practice: DAC Guidelines on Post-Conflict
    Transition, 2012,"
    Paris: OECD.
Pugh, Michael 1995
    "Peacebuilding as Developmentalism: Concepts from Disaster Research," *Contemporary Security Policy*,
    vol. 16, no. 3.
Ryan, Stephen 1996
    "Peacebuilding Strategies and Intercommunal Conflict: Approaches to the Transformation of Divided
    Societies,"
    Nationalism & Ethnic Politics, vol. 2, no. 2.
Smock, David R.　(ed.) 2005, *Interfaith Dialogue and Peacebuilding*,
    Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
Stewart, Francis 2008
    Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies,
    London: Palgrave Macmillan.
UNEP 2009
    "From Conflict to Peacebuilding: The Role of Natural Resources and the Environment,"
    <http://www.unep.org/publications/search/pub_details_s.asp?ID=3998>.
UNDP 2011
    "2010 Global Programme Annual Report: Accelerating Access to Justice for Human Development- A

UNDP Rule of Law Initiative,"

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/access_to_justiceandruleoflaw/2010_global_programmeannualreportacceleratingaccesstojusticeforh/>.

UNHCHR 2009

"Rule of Law Tools for Post-Conflict States: National consultations on Transitional justice,"

<http://www.ohchr.org/documents/Publications/NationalConsultationsTJ_EN.pdf#search='Rule+of+Law+Tools+for+PostConflict+States%3A+National+consultations+on+Transitional+justice' >.

United Nations 1998

"Report of Secretary-General on the Cause of Conflict and the Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa,"

New York: UN Document, A/52/871-S/1998/318.

United Nations 1999a

"Report of the Secretary-General on The Fall of Srebrenica,"

New York: UN Document, A/54/549

United Nations 1999b

"Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Action of the United Nations during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda,"

New York: UN Document, S/1999/1257.

United Nations 2000

"Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations,"

New York: UN Document A/55/305-S/2000/809.

United Nations 2004

"Report of Secretary-General on the Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-conflict Societies,"

New York: UN Document, S/2004/616.

United Nations 2006

"Report of the Secretary-General on Uniting Our Strengths: Enhancing United Nations Support for the Rule of Law,"

New York: UN Document, A/61/636-S/2006/980.

United Nations 2008a

"Capstone doctrine": United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines,

DPKO/DFS,<http://www.peacekeepingbestpractices.unlb.org/Pbps/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf>

United Nations 2008b

"Report of the Secretary-General on Security Peace and Development: the Role of the United Nations in Supporting Security Sector Reform,

New York: UN Document, A/62/659-S/2008/39.

United Nations 2008c

"Report of the Secretary-General on the Relationship between the United Nations and Regional Organizations, in Particular the African Union, in the Maintenance of International Peace and Security"

New York: UN Document, S/2008/186.

United Nations 2009a

"Report of the Secretary-General on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict,"

New York: UN Document, S/2009/277.

United Nations 2009b
    "Report of the Secretary-General on Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict,"
    New York: UN Document A/63/881-S/2009/304.
United Nations 2010a
    "Global Field Support Strategy: Report of the Secretary-General,"
    New York: UN Document, A/64/633.
United Nations 2010b
    "Strengthening and Coordinating United Nations Rule of Law Activities: Report of the Secretary-General,"
    New York: UN Document, A/65/318.
United Nations 2011a
    "Report of the Secretary-General on the Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-conflict
    Societies,"
    New York: UN Document, S/2011/634.
United Nations 2011b
    "Independent Report of the Senior Advisory Group, 'Civilian Capacity in the Aftermath of Conflict'"
    New York: UN Document, A/65/747–S/2011/85
United Nations 2012
    "The United Nations SSR Perspective,"
    New York: UNDPKO.
United Nations 2013a
    "Report of the Secretary-General on the Measuring the Effectiveness of the United Nations System's
    Support to the Promotion of the Rule of Law,
    New York: UN Document, S/2013/341.
United Nations 2013b
    "Report of the Secretary-General on Securing States and Societies: Strengthening the United Nations
    Comprehensive Support to Security Sector Reform,
    New York: UN Document, S/2013/480.
United Nations 2014a
    Department of Peacekeeping Operations website, <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/>
United Nations 2014b
    Department of Political Affairs website, <http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/undpa>
United Nations Inter-Agency Working Group on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration 2006
    "Briefing Note for Senior Managers on the Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
    Standards,"
    UN DDR Resource Centre, <http://www.unddr.org/iddrs.aspx>.
United Nations Inter-Agency Working Group on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration 2010.
    "Operational Guide to the Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standard,"
    United Nations DDR Resource Centre (UNDDR), <http://www.unddr.org/uploads/documents/
    Operational%20Guide.pdf >.
Uppsala Universitet 2014
    Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala Conflict Data Program,
    <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/>

紛争・平和研究の基盤と傾向
－国際平和活動の枠組みとオーナーシップの戦略的関連性の検討－

篠田　英朗

　本稿は、平和・紛争学（Peace and Conflict Studies）における基礎的な議論の枠組みを提供するものである。紛争に関する研究および平和構築に関する研究には、様々な多様な種類が存在する。しかし本稿が示そうとする基本的な知識の共通理解は、どのような研究方向に進むとしても、必須である。本稿ではそこで、特に「平和構築」の概念の理解について論を進める。紛争分析に対応した平和構築を構想するためには、政策論の観点から平和構築の概念を理解する必要がある。平和構築は、平和を目指した一連の政策の総称として用いられることが多いが、そのためには紛争分析と平和構築の結びつきが決定的に重要になる。

　本稿では、平和構築の概念の枠組みを精査することから始めて、特に国連の平和構築をめぐる議論の変遷をたどる。それによって国連を中心とする国際社会が、現実の紛争問題と活動の内容の向上を目指して、様々な枠組み設定をしてきたことを示す。こうした事情を見るには、確立されている平和構築の原則の現状を見るのが有益である。特に平和維持活動の分野では、劇的なドクトリンの変化が起こっており、それはいずれも実際の活動上の必要性に対応したものである。本稿ではこうした事情を、さらに平和構築に従事する実施組織の多様化や、歴史的変遷、立案、範疇などの観点から、示していく。

　現在の平和維持・平和構築活動は、冷戦以後の時代というだけでなく、過去 10 年ほどの間にも大きく変遷してきている。活動は多様化し統合化され、軍事行動の範囲は広がり、文民職員の活動範囲が広がって活動調整の機会が増え、地域機構などの他の組織と国連との間の連携の度合いが拡大した。中でも特に重要なのは、現地政府との関係の戦略的構築の重要性である。

　これらの要素を考慮に入れながら、本稿では、紛争分析と連動した平和構築の戦略策定が重視されることを論じた。法の支配アプローチが様々な機関を統合する戦略的ドクトリンとして重視されるのも、法の支配の欠落を深刻な構造的問題とする紛争があるからである。平和構築をめぐる議論の精緻化は、紛争分析の精緻化に依拠していると言ってよい。そしてそれは、現地社会のオーナーシップを、平和構築の戦略の中にどう位置づけるかという問題に直結していく。