

# Civil society under fire

## Three big questions for peacebuilders working with local civil society

**Rowan Popplewell, March 2015**

Rowan Popplewell is a Researcher at INTRAC. She is also studying for a doctorate at the University of Oxford where she is researching civil society and peacebuilding in the Great Lakes region of Africa. Her doctoral research is funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Doctoral Training Centre at the University of Oxford.

### Introduction

Civil society is an important peacebuilding actor. Around the world, substantial resources are dedicated to strengthening local and national civil society groups as a means of developing peaceful societies and preventing a return to violent conflict. Yet the emphasis on civil society within peacebuilding policy and practice has come under fire in recent years.

Critics have challenged the legitimacy of civil society actors involved in peacebuilding, and highlighted the artificial nature of civil societies in post conflict countries. For these critics, only a more locally rooted civil society – rather than one dominated by externally supported non-governmental organisations (NGOs) – can build a truly sustainable and emancipatory peace<sup>1</sup>.

These arguments raise particular questions for international NGOs, who often work through or with local partner organisations to build such a peace. One implication is that these organisations could do more to support the emergence of a truly local civil society that is more authentic, representative and with greater local legitimacy. However this is much easier said than done. For international NGOs, finding and working with such actors may be challenging.

Many forms of local civil society that existed prior to violent conflict will either not have survived it or have been radically altered by it. Others may have emerged during or in the immediate aftermath of violent conflict. They may face severe capacity constraints, limiting their ability to meet the needs of their constituency. Local civil society groups may also have very different ideas about peace to outsiders, hold values that international actors find unsavoury, and even condone or be implicated in violence.

---

<sup>1</sup> For examples of these critiques see the work of Richmond (2005, 2009, 2011a, 2011b); Pouligny (2005); Fischer (2006); Verkoren and Van Leeuwen (2013); De Weijer and Kilnes (2012); Hellmuller (2013).

Building on recent literature and INTRAC's own knowledge and experience of supporting civil society, this think piece explores these challenges in greater depth. It identifies three big questions international NGOs seeking to work with local groups should ask themselves:

1. **Who should we work with and why?** Choosing local partners is difficult, even more so in contexts affected by violent conflict. Concerns raised by critics around the authenticity and legitimacy of civil society in post conflict contexts may mean that international organisations need to redefine the criteria they use for selecting local partners.
2. **How compatible are our values and ideas?** Different local groups are likely to have different conceptualisations of peace from international actors, and from each other. International actors should seek to identify and understand the vision of peace that local groups are building, their mission, and the values their work is rooted in.
3. **How can we support local groups without undermining them?** Many local civil society groups will require capacity building support as well as financial assistance. The question is how outsiders can provide this support without undermining the legitimacy and sustainability of local partners.

Within this paper local civil society is defined as that which exists largely at the subnational level. It comprises formal and informal groups including organisations, networks, associations and movements that are embedded in communities. These may be geographically based (village or district peace committees), ethnic or clan based (traditional authorities), professional or interest based (farmers or ex-combatant associations), or faith based (church groups and parish councils). Their rootedness often lends these groups a high degree of local legitimacy.

## Background

### Understanding peacebuilding

Over the last four decades, it has become widely acknowledged that peace involves more than the absence of warfare and physical violence. Domestic and international actors working in conflict affected and post-conflict contexts worldwide have sought to promote peace through a range of activities designed to build peaceful societies and prevent a return to violent conflict. These processes and activities are commonly referred to as peacebuilding.

Despite widespread use of the term, there is no agreed definition of peacebuilding. Originally conceptualised by Galtung, it refers to the creation of what he called *positive peace*. Whereas *negative peace* relates to the absence of war and violent conflict, positive peace goes further. It denotes the presence of a social order that promotes human wellbeing and flourishing. Peacebuilding is the means by which this social order is built through creating the mechanisms, institutions, and structures that address the underlying causes of conflict and prevent their transformation into violence<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Galtung (1975) and Boutros Ghali (1992)

## Civil society and peacebuilding

INTRAC defines civil society as the various groups, organisations and associations of citizens that occupy the space or arena between the state, the family and the market<sup>3</sup>. A huge range of civil society groups and organisations are involved in peacebuilding at different scales and levels. These range from global civil society networks and large international NGOs to regional peacebuilding networks, national NGOs and local community based organisations (see Annex 1). More informal groups and ways of organising such as social movements and protest groups may also participate in peacebuilding activities, although there is much less information available about these groups and their involvement in building and consolidating peace<sup>4</sup>.

Civil society actors perform a wide range of conflict resolution and peacebuilding functions. Based on an empirical analysis of experiences in Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cyprus, DRC, Guatemala, Israel and Palestine, Nepal, Nigeria, Northern Ireland, Somalia, Sri Lanka, and Turkey; Paffenholz identifies seven main functions that civil society groups perform in peacebuilding:

1. Protection of civilians against violence from all parties to a conflict
2. Monitoring of human rights violations and the implementation of peace accords
3. Advocacy for peace and human rights, and public communication
4. Socialisation within groups to values of peace and democracy
5. Inter-group social cohesion by bringing people together from different groups
6. Facilitating dialogue between different actors at a local and national level
7. Providing services to conflict populations as an entry point for peacebuilding

She argues that civil society plays an important supportive role in peacebuilding and that civil society groups can make a difference to peace outcomes when these functions are performed in an effective manner at the optimal time<sup>5</sup>.

Civil society organisations are also increasingly involved in the production and publication of research and policy on peacebuilding and related issues; as well as many local and national organisations, engaged on peacebuilding and related areas such as conflict resolution and transitional justice. This work ranges from reflections on the involvement of civil society in peacebuilding to research on specific sectors such as gender, and thematic areas such as capacity building and civil society strengthening and monitoring and evaluation<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Beauclerk, Pratt and Judge (2011)

<sup>4</sup> While there is little literature on the involvement of social movements in peacebuilding there is much more on social movements in fragile and conflict-affected states more generally. See Earle (2011) for more information on this literature.

<sup>5</sup> Paffenholz (2009, 2010). An accessible yet comprehensive summary of Paffenholz's findings are published in an open access report, *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: Summary of Results for a Comparative Research Project (CCDP Working paper 4)*, published by the Centre on Conflict Development and Peacebuilding (CCDP) based at the Graduate Institute in Geneva. An electronic copy is available at the Search for Common Ground (SFCG) website: [https://www.sfcg.org/events/pdf/CCDP\\_Working\\_Paper\\_4-1%20a.pdf](https://www.sfcg.org/events/pdf/CCDP_Working_Paper_4-1%20a.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Such organisations include INTRAC (2006, 2010), Interpeace ('[What is Peacebuilding?](#)' and '[Peacebuilding How?](#)' Series), International Alert (Myrritten et al, March 2014), Peace Direct (2012), Search for Common Ground (Corlazzoli, March 2014 and Corlazzoli and White, March 2013), Saferworld (2004 and Wright, November 2014), Oxfam (Sweetman 2005 and Hughes, February 2012), Cafod, SwissPeace, the Berghof Foundation, the International Crisis Group (ICG) and the Peace Research Initiative Oslo (PRIO).

## Emerging critiques

Peacebuilding activities and programmes are increasingly being planned and delivered by local and national civil society groups in partnership with international actors keen to promote the development of a strong and active domestic civil society in countries emerging from violent conflict. However, in the last decade a number of critiques have emerged around the lack of authenticity and legitimacy of civil society actors involved in peacebuilding and their failure to promote a sustainable peace<sup>9</sup>. Essentially, what these critics are questioning is whether civil society groups and organisations are credible and legitimate peacebuilding actors, supporting real and lasting change in the communities and societies they are aiming and claiming to help<sup>10</sup>.

These critics argue that:

- **International civil society actors lack downwards accountability.**

International peacebuilding organisations and non-governmental organisations involved in peacebuilding, often large professional organisations based in Europe and North America that receive a significant proportion of their funding from these governments, are perceived as being more accountable to their upwards donors than local communities they work with. They have also been accused of lacking legitimacy, transparency and credibility<sup>11</sup>.

- **International civil society actors only work with local partners that look like they do.** Most international NGOs working in conflict-affected and post conflict countries work with or through local civil society groups. However, they tend to only work with actors and structures that correspond with their image of what civil society should look like and share their values, often local or national NGOs<sup>12</sup>.

- **Civil society in post-conflict countries is highly artificial and externally dependent.** Where structures and organisations don't exist that resemble what outsiders think civil society should look like, they create them. The result is a civil society that is highly artificial, dependent on external donors for support. It lacks local rootedness and is largely disconnected from local communities. Many of these organisations are also working towards an externally driven rather than locally owned agenda<sup>13</sup>.

- **International peacebuilders marginalise authentic civil society actors.** By only working with actors that correspond with their image of what civil society should look like (i.e. local and national NGOs), international civil society actors exclude more authentic actors and forms of organising that are more locally rooted and legitimate<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> See the work of Pouligny (2005) and Richmond (2011a, 2011b)

<sup>8</sup> For more information on issues around civil society legitimacy see *ONTRAC 53: Transparent, Accountable, Legitimate and Credible: NGO Responses to Scrutiny*, available online from the INTRAC website: <http://www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=758>

<sup>9</sup> Fischer (2006)

<sup>10</sup> Pouligny (2005), Verkoren and Van Leeuwen (2013)

<sup>11</sup> Richmond (2011a, 2011b), Pouligny (2005)

<sup>12</sup> Richmond (2011a, 2011b), Pouligny (2005)

These critiques raise profound questions for international actors seeking to build sustainable peace through supporting the development of a vibrant national and local civil society, including international NGOs. In particular they require international NGOs to reflect on who they are working with and how, as well as the broader implications these choices might have for civil society at a local and national level, and ultimately, the development of a rooted and sustainable peace.

The rest of this paper explores these critiques, and the questions they raise in greater depth. It is structured around three questions that international NGOs seeking to work with local civil society should ask themselves: Who should we work with and why? How compatible are our values and ideas? How can we support local groups without undermining them?

## Question 1: Who should we work with and why?

The first and most important question facing international civil society actors seeking to work in conflict zones is who to work with. Finding a good local partner is critical, yet it can be an extremely long, difficult and challenging process.

As discussed previously, many international NGOs find it easier to work with local civil society organisations that look like they do. This is because these organisations – often local or national NGOs – tend to have organisational structures that resemble those found in the west, are based in large towns or capital cities so are easy to access, and are run by western educated elites who speak the main international languages. However, they often lack a strong local constituency and are heavily dependent on external funds.

Critics argue that in many conflict-affected and post-conflict countries there is a civil society that exists beyond these organisations, which is comprised of more authentic civil society voices and groups. They believe that it is only this locally based civil society, which is more representative and legitimate than its externally-supported counterpart that is capable of producing a lasting and emancipatory peace<sup>15</sup>. However, these critics often adopt an unproblematic and romanticised view of more locally based forms of civil society.

This means finding potential local partners from among this group is rarely straightforward. Civil societies worldwide reflect the structure and characteristics of the societies of which they are apart. Consequently, local civil societies in post conflict contexts often reproduce the divisions and antagonisms that characterise society more broadly. They may also include actors regarded as uncivil and illiberal. Most locally based civil societies are likely to include customary authorities, clan and family associations, and informal community based groups and networks. This might include groups and associations that are exclusionary, or even violent in character. However, these organisations often play an important peacebuilding role within local communities (e.g. providing security and services to local populations)<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> Richmond (2011)

<sup>14</sup> Verkoren and Van Leeuwen (2013)

That's not to say that it can't be done. International civil society groups can and do work with more locally based groups, such as ex-combatant associations and traditional authorities like the Bashingantahe in Burundi. Discussing civil society in general terms means that critics can overlook examples of effective and locally relevant peacebuilding work undertaken by international civil society peacebuilders working in partnership with local groups that is producing sustainable peaceful outcomes in many conflict-affected and post conflict environments<sup>15</sup>.

International peacebuilders should take their time when choosing who to work with, and think deeply about what they looking for from a local partner and why. For Peace Direct, the most important things to consider when choosing a local partner are their local legitimacy and their commitment to peace. They look for groups that are trusted, respected and listened to by all sides, including decision makers and officials within government and internationally. But perhaps more important, is their desire to build peace:

“The key requirements are that [local partners] must have a deep felt motivation to rebuild peace, whatever their original agenda, and a genuinely altruistic approach – they need to be in the process for greater good, not just their own profile.”<sup>16</sup>

However, a deep rooted commitment to building peace may not be sufficient to build a strong partnership. This is because one group's understanding of peace may differ greatly from that of another, particularly when they come from different places and backgrounds. While local legitimacy and a genuine commitment to building peace are important, values and ideas about peace matter too.

## Question 2: How compatible are our values and ideas?

Peace can mean different things to different people in different places and at different times. A range of approaches to peace and peacebuilding exist. The dominant form of peacebuilding today is liberal peacebuilding, which promotes a particular form of social, political and economic organisation. Essentially it seeks to foster the creation of liberal democracies and market-oriented economies in post conflict societies, on the assumption that this will create the optimum conditions for peace.

A number of multilateral, bilateral and civil society actors are involved in liberal peacebuilding, all largely pursuing peacebuilding strategies based around securitisation, institutionalisation, democratisation, and marketization<sup>17</sup> (Table 1). Liberal peacebuilding is also concerned with the promotion of a vibrant and active civil society that is separate and distinct from the state, and capable of protecting individual rights and holding the post-conflict state to account.

---

<sup>15</sup> An example might be the partnership between International Alert and local partners such as Dushirhamwe, a network of local women peacebuilders in Burundi. See Vernon, P 'Peacebuilding in Burundi: how peace transitions can work' available from opendemocracy.net at <https://www.opendemocracy.net/phil-vernon/peacebuilding-in-burundi-how-peace-transitions-can-work> (Accessed online 03/11/14).

<sup>16</sup> Peace direct (no date)

<sup>17</sup> Paris (2004)

TABLE 1: LIBERAL PEACEBUILDING STRATEGIES

<b>Securitisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Often includes the disarmament and demobilisation of non-state actors and the reform of the security sector.</li> </ul>
<b>Institutionalisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically concerned with building strong democratic and accountable institutions, and ensuring the rule of law.</li> </ul>
<b>Democratisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Often involves holding free and fair multi-party elections, supporting governance and constitutional reform, and the promotion of human rights.</li> </ul>
<b>Marketization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically concerned with liberalising the economy in order to promote economic growth.</li> </ul>

Liberal peacebuilding has been widely criticised for failing to promote a lasting and sustainable peace in many post-conflict countries<sup>18</sup>. More fundamental critiques are concerned with liberal peacebuilding's promotion of western values in non-western environments, its failure to be more context sensitive, and suppression of alternatives to the liberal peace model<sup>19</sup>. Analysts have focused on how local agency and resistance to liberal peacebuilding have resulted in the production of hybrid forms of peace<sup>20</sup>; how local actors have reshaped and subverted top down peacebuilding interventions to produce hybrid outcomes, which are neither wholly liberal nor local in character. Behind these arguments is the assertion that local actors hold very different understandings of what peace entails from international peacebuilders.

Ideas about what peace looks like and how to build it are likely to differ between international and local actors. Understandings of peace among international actors are often informed to a greater or lesser degree by liberal values. While many local groups share these values (in whole or in part), others may have radically different understandings of peace and peacebuilding, underpinned by values that international actors find unsavoury.

For example, a peaceful society for some groups may involve the exclusion of others such as those from a particular ethnic group or tribe, or it may involve the reassertion of traditional patriarchal power structures. In some cases, local civil society groups may also either fail to condone or support – either tacitly or openly – the use of violent strategies and actions instead of or alongside non-violent ones to promote and achieve peace.

<sup>18</sup> Paris (2004)

<sup>19</sup> This includes the work of Campbell et al. (2011), Chandler (2002, 2010), Duffield (2001, 2007), Richmond (2005, 2009, 2011), and Mac Ginty (2006, 2010, 2011) among others

<sup>20</sup> Richmond (2009, 2011), and Mac Ginty (2010, 2011)

It can be that the groups that are most deeply rooted within and fully trusted by local communities, and therefore regarded as most locally legitimate, are those most out of step with the values of international actors. While these groups have a high degree of local legitimacy, which is derived from local rootedness and community support, they may lack international legitimacy which is predicated on values of inclusivity, tolerance and non-violence<sup>21</sup>.

Even where a shared values base exists, different approaches and priorities can also create tensions. In her study of NGOs and peacebuilding in Aceh and Timor-Leste, Dibley discusses the case of World Vision and their local partner 3P. Like many local civil society groups, 3P<sup>22</sup> believed that building peace in Aceh meant addressing highly political issues such as justice for conflict victims and political training of former combatants. World Vision, on the other hand, was more focused on apolitical issues such as peace education within schools.

Conflict arose when the director of 3P wanted to provide political training to former combatants. He suggested to World Vision that this be included in their joint programme of work. World Vision refused on the grounds that it did not want to engage in overtly political activities. Despite this, 3P decided to run these trainings in the evenings, a decision that ultimately led to the termination of the partnership between the two organisations. Dibley argues that the conflict between World Vision and 3P was rooted in their “contrasting ideas about the best way to build peace as well as incompatible ideas about their role in the peacebuilding process”<sup>23</sup>.

Perceptions and understandings of peace may also differ between local groups. In post conflict societies there are often several different, competing and even contested perspectives on the future. Different local civil society groups may subscribe to and promote different narratives and perceptions of peace<sup>24</sup>. While in some cases, these understandings may overlap, in others they can be contradictory and even irreconcilable.

International peacebuilders seeking to forge relationships with local groups must seek to develop a full understanding of the values of the organisation they wish to work with, as well as engage in deeper reflection on their own ideas about peace. Ensuring that both your understanding of peace, as well as ideas about how to build it, are compatible is crucial for building a strong partnership that lasts.

---

<sup>21</sup> Verkoren and Van Leeuwen (2013)

<sup>22</sup> Dibley (2014)

<sup>23</sup> Dibley (2014: p88)

<sup>24</sup> De Weijer and Kilnes (2012)

## Question 3: How can we support local groups without undermining them?

Local and national civil society groups worldwide face capacity constraints and challenges that limit their ability to deliver their mission and related activities effectively and efficiently<sup>25</sup>. Organisations situated in contexts emerging from violent conflict may face additional, specific constraints alongside more conventional capacity development challenges. They are likely to require large amounts of financial and capacity building support, but the question is how this can be done without undermining the legitimacy and sustainability of the group in question.

### *Coping with loss*

Civil society groups are not immune to the effects of war. Violent conflict and the mass population movements that often accompany it mean that local organisations may have lost many skilled and experienced staff and volunteers. Physical infrastructure such as buildings, IT equipment and files may have been destroyed or stolen. As a result many groups may be struggling with the loss of organisational memory, knowledge and skills and will require tailored capacity building support to help them rebuild organisational facilities and structures, such as their financial and management systems.

But it is the human cost that may well be the most profound and challenging issue for organisations to cope with. The loss of valued and loved colleagues, as well as family and friends will have a huge impact on the staff and volunteers of organisations. As with much of the population, staff and volunteers may also be affected by trauma and other conditions associated with violence and conflict, and will require ongoing psycho-social support.

### *Repairing tears in the social fabric*

Organisations may be struggling to cope with weakened social ties at home, in the office, and within local communities. Violent conflict can result in the destruction of trust, confidence, and other foundations of societal organisation. War-related trauma and the tearing or weakening of social relations can leave communities and individuals demoralised and disempowered. Relationship and confidence building activities, including listening and facilitation of dialogue, are essential for supporting individuals and communities to come together and awaken to the possibility of doing something, and re-establish trust, cooperation and solidarity<sup>26</sup>.

### *Working with violence and insecurity*

Many post-conflict societies remain characterised by cycles of violence and insecurity, as well as high levels of uncertainty and risk. Local partners need to be responsive to changes in the security situation, and international partners should provide them with the flexibility they need to do this. Ongoing insecurity can also affect the ability of people to participate in civil society activities. Building a deeper understanding of the impacts of sustained violence on people's lives in a specific context is essential for gaining a more realistic idea of the

---

<sup>25</sup> For more information and resources on civil society capacity building see [www.intrac.org/resources](http://www.intrac.org/resources)

<sup>26</sup> Sterland (2006): p32

ability of citizens to engage in civil society action and supporting them to overcome barriers to participation<sup>27</sup>.

### *Operating in a divided and politicised context*

Post-conflict contexts may also be highly politicised, divided or exclusionary. Within this context governments may perceive civil society as a threat and seek to limit the space available for civil society through a range of legal and extra-legal means, including the harassment and persecution of civil society activists<sup>28</sup>. Civil society itself may be divided and politicised, where individual groups are instrumentalised by powerful actors<sup>29</sup>. In this context, even those groups that remain independent and neutral can be easily discredited by those seeking to undermine civil society for their own political or personal advantage.

Supporting local civil society within these contexts, without becoming embroiled in the local political marketplace is challenging<sup>30</sup>. International actors seeking to support local organisations must respect and develop a strong understanding of the local context, develop and maintain contacts with a range of local civil society groups, adopt a long term perspective, and perhaps most importantly, intervene with a degree of humility<sup>31</sup>.

### *Finding sustainable funding*

In war-damaged economies, limited sources of local or national financial support for local civil society groups mean that institutional funding from external sources is a particularly important and powerful tool for supporting local civil society groups<sup>32</sup>. Yet groups can easily become reliant on external revenues, rather than procuring local or national sources of financing which may be more sustainable in the long term. This is particularly the case in post conflict contexts where local and national resources are scarce, and – following the immediate cessation of hostilities at least – external resources are relatively plentiful. The risk is that locally based organisations become dependent on external resources, which then tail off as the country is perceived to become more peaceful and less in need of international support.

To avoid this, international organisations should support their partners to develop their domestic resource mobilisation capacities, particularly their ability to generate local support from within communities, or from local and national governments or businesses<sup>33</sup>. This will help organisations diversify their revenue streams, improve their financial sustainability, increase their local accountability, and strengthen their ties with local communities, businesses and governments.

---

<sup>27</sup> Hughes (2012)

<sup>28</sup> Hayman et al. (2013, 2014)

<sup>29</sup> Interpeace (2010)

<sup>30</sup> For more information on the political marketplace see De Waal (2009)

<sup>31</sup> INTRAC (2015)

<sup>32</sup> Sterland (2006)

<sup>33</sup> Sterland (2006)

The most important way international partners can help is through providing flexible funding for institutional capacity building support and developing fundraising expertise within local organisations. However this is not enough on its own. In addition to building local fundraising capacities, reducing dependency and supporting sustainability may require international partners to build on existing local capacities, support organisations to be relevant to their local context, take time to build trust and develop enduring relationships, take a long-term vision on what will be left behind, envisage a post-funding relationship, and broker relationships between civil society and other local, national and international actors<sup>34</sup>.

### **When should we not support local groups?**

International civil society groups considering working with more locally based forms of civil society should think carefully about the impact their support might have, particularly what the deeper, unintended and even perverse implications of working with these groups might be.

One such unintended impact might be on how these groups are perceived locally. Evidence shows that external support can weaken local civil society groups by undermining their local legitimacy and contribute to a shift in accountability from local communities to donors<sup>35</sup>. Even where action is taken to prevent this, in highly politicised and divided societies foreign funding can alter local perceptions of a civil society group, and provide powerful critical voices with an opportunity to discredit them. In these extreme cases, the best way of doing more to support locally based forms of civil society, may actually involve doing less. This paradox poses a profound challenge to international organisations keen to do all they can to support societies and communities emerging from violent conflict to find peace.

## **Conclusion**

Choosing local partners to work with is not an easy task, and is arguably even harder in places emerging from war and violent conflict. Needs are great, and the desire to rush in and help is strong. Taking the time to find a partner that has a high degree of local trust and legitimacy, and with whom you share ideas about what peace looks like and how it can be built matters. Once you have found this partner, ensuring that your support enables them to become more sustainable and legitimate, rather than undermining them, is crucial.

This paper argues that those seeking to work with more diverse and locally rooted forms of civil society might find it helpful to ask themselves three big questions: Who should we work with and why? How compatible are our values and ideas? How can we support them without undermining them? Finding the answers to these questions requires international peacebuilders to be more self-aware, reflexive, sensitive and humble, and develop a strong understanding of the local context they are working in. Doing so will help them cultivate strong and meaningful partnerships with local organisations that contribute to the development of a more sustainable, and locally owned peace.

---

<sup>34</sup> Lewis et al. (2015).

<sup>35</sup> De Weijer and Kilnes (2012)

## Bibliography

- Beauclerk, J., Pratt, B., and Judge R. *Civil Society in Action: Global case studies in a practice-based framework*. Oxford, INTRAC, 2011.
- Boutros-Ghali, B. *An Agenda for Peace: Preventative Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*, Document A/47/277 – S/241111, 17 June 1992. New York: Department of Public Information, United Nations, 1992.
- Campbell, S., D. Chandler and M. Sabaratnam. "The Politics of Liberal Peace" in Campbell, Chandler and Sabaratnam (eds.) *A Liberal Peace? The Problems and Practices of Peacebuilding*. London: Zed Books, 2011.
- Chandler, D. *From Kosovo to Kabul (and Beyond): Human Rights and International Intervention*. London: Pluto Press, 2002
- Chandler, D. "Race, Culture and Civil Society: Peacebuilding Discourse and the Understanding of Difference" in *Security Dialogue*, Vol 41, p369, 2010
- Corlazzoli, V. *ICTs for Monitoring and Evaluation of Peacebuilding Programmes*. London: Search for Common Ground and Department for International Development, March 2014. Available online at: <https://www.sfcg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/CCVRI-SSP-ICT-and-ME-Final.pdf>
- Corlazzoli, V. and J. White, *Measuring the unmeasurable: Solutions to measurement challenges in Fragile and Conflict-affected environments*. London: Search for Common Ground and Department for International Development, March 2013. Available online at: [https://www.sfcg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/0812\\_DFID-Measuring-the-Unmeasurable\\_FINAL-2013\\_16-July.pdf](https://www.sfcg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/0812_DFID-Measuring-the-Unmeasurable_FINAL-2013_16-July.pdf)
- Dibley, Thushara. *Partnerships, power and peacebuilding: NGOs as agents of peace in Aceh and Timor-Leste*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Duffield, M. *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- Duffield, M. *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*. London: Zed Books, 2001.
- Earle, L. *Literature Review on the Dynamics of Social Movements in Fragile and Conflict Affected States: Issues Paper*. Governance and Social Development Resource Centre (GSDRC), 2011. Available online at: <http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/EIRS13.pdf>
- Fischer, M. *Civil Society in Conflict Transformation: Ambivalence, Potentials and Challenges*. Berlin: The Berghof Foundation, 2006. Available online at: [http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/fischer\\_cso\\_handbook.pdf](http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/fischer_cso_handbook.pdf)
- Galtung, J. "Three approaches to peace: peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding" in *Peace, War and Defence – Essays in Peace Research, Volume 2*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, 1975.
- Goodhand, J. *Aiding Peace? The Role of NGOs in Armed Conflict*. Rugby: ITDG Publishing, 2006.
- Hayman, R., T. Lawo, A. Crack, T. Kontinent, J. Okitoi and B. Pratt, Legal Frameworks and Political Space for Non-Governmental Organisations: An Overview of Six Countries. *EADI Policy Paper Series*. Bonn: EADI, July 2013. Available from: <http://www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=771>

Hayman, R., A. Crack, J. Okitoi and S. Lewis, *Legal Frameworks and Political Space for Non-Governmental Organisations: An Overview of Six Countries: Phase II. EADI Policy Paper Series*. Bonn: EADI, June 2014. Available from: <http://www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=801>

Hellmüller, S. "The Power of Perceptions: Localizing International Peacebuilding Approaches" in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 20, No. 2, April 2013, pp.219-232.

Hughes, L. *Within and Without the State: Strengthening Civil Society in Conflict Affected and Fragile Settings*. Oxford: Oxfam, February 2012. Available online at: <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/within-and-without-the-state-strengthening-civil-society-in-conflict-affected-a-209789>

Interpeace, *Background Paper: Voices of civil society organisations (CSOs) on peacebuilding and statebuilding*. Geneva: Interpeace, March 2010 Available online at: <http://www.interpeace.org/documents/international-dialogue/86-background-paper-voices-of-civil-society-organizations-english/file>

INTRAC, *ONTRAC 48: Conflict and post-conflict – what role for civil society?* Oxford: INTRAC, May 2011. Available online at: <http://www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=708>

INTRAC, *ONTRAC 53: Transparent, Accountable, Legitimate, Credible: NGO Responses to Scrutiny*. Oxford: INTRAC, January 2013. Available online at: <http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/758/ONTRAC-53-Transparent-accountable-legitimate-credible-NGO-responses-to-scrutiny.pdf>

INTRAC, *ONTRAC 59: The role of INGOS in complex and politically charged contexts*. Oxford: INTRAC, February 2015. Available online at: <http://intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=832>

Lederach, J. P. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace, 1997

Lewis, S., A. Adu-Boateng, and R. Hayman, *Building sustainability of civil society: Debates, challenges and moving forward*. Oxford: INTRAC, January 2015. Available online at: <http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/831/Debates-challenges-and-moving-forward.pdf>

Mac Ginty, R. *No War, No Peace: Rethinking Peace and Conflict*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006.

Mac Ginty, R. "Hybrid Peace: The Interaction Between Top-Down and Bottom-Up Peace" in *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 41, No. 4, 2010, pp391-412

Mac Ginty, R. *International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance: Hybrid Forms of Peace*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Myritten et al, H. *Rethinking Gender in Peacebuilding*. London: International Alert, March 2014. Available online at: <http://www.international-alert.org/resources/publications/rethinking-gender-peacebuilding>

Paffenholz, T. *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: Summary of Results for a Comparative Research Project, CCDP Working Paper 4*. Geneva: The Centre on Conflict, Development and Peacebuilding (CCDP), The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, 2009. Available online at: [http://sfcg.org/events/pdf/CCDP\\_Working\\_Paper\\_4-1%20a.pdf](http://sfcg.org/events/pdf/CCDP_Working_Paper_4-1%20a.pdf)

Paffenholz, T. *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: A critical assessment*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner, 2010.

Paris, R. *At War's End*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004

- Peace Direct, Reflection on Peace Direct's Approach to Evaluating Local Peacebuilding Initiatives. London: Peace Direct, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.peacedirect.org/wp-content/uploads/Evaluation-paper.pdf>
- Peace Direct, How to Choose a Dance Partner: Insight on Peacebuilding. London: Peace Direct, no date. Available online at: <http://www.peacedirect.org/wp-content/uploads/How-to-Choose-a-Dance-Partner.pdf>
- Poulin, B. "Civil Society and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Ambiguities of International Programmes Aimed at Building 'New' Societies" in *Security Dialogue*, Vol 36 p495, 2005.
- Richmond, O. *A Post-Liberal Peace*. London: Routledge, 2011a.
- Richmond, O. "Critical agency, resistance and a post-colonial civil society" in *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 46, Issue 4, p419–440, 2011b.
- Richmond, O. *Liberal Peace Transitions: Between Statebuilding and Peacebuilding*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.
- Richmond, O. *The Transformation of Peace*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Saferworld, Conflict sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding. London: Saferworld, 2004. Available online at: <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/view-resource/148-conflict-sensitive-approaches-to-development-humanitarian-assistance-and-peacebuilding>
- Sterland, B. Civil Society Capacity Building in Post-Conflict Societies: The Experience of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, *Praxis Paper No. 9*. Oxford, INTRAC, June 2006.
- Sweetman, C. *Gender, Peacebuilding and Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxfam, 2005. Available online at: <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/gender-peacebuilding-and-reconstruction-121131>
- Verkoren, W. and M. van Leeuwen, "Civil Society in Peacebuilding: Global Discourse, Local Reality" in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 2013, pp159-172.
- de Waal, A. "Mission without end? Peacekeeping in the African political marketplace" in *International Affairs* Vol. 85, No. 1, 2009
- de Weijer, F. and U. Kilnes, *Strengthening civil society? Reflections on international engagement in fragile states*, *ECDPM Discussion Paper No. 135*. Brussels: The European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), October 2012. Available online at [www.ecdpm.org/dp135](http://www.ecdpm.org/dp135)
- Wright, H. *Masculinities, conflict and peacebuilding: perspectives on men through a gender lens*. London: Saferworld, November 2014. Available online at: <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/view-resource/862-masculinities-conflict-and-peacebuilding-perspectives-on-men-through-a-gender-lens>

## Annex 1: Levels and types of civil society groups involved in peacebuilding

Global	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Global NGO coalitions, networks and platforms</b>, such as the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), a network of INGOs and regional NGO platforms involved in conflict prevention and peacebuilding.</li> <li>• <b>Global advocacy campaigns</b> such as the Control Arms campaign, which successfully campaigned for an international Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), and the Nobel Prize winning International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL). This may also include less formalised social movements and campaign groups.</li> </ul>
International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>International policy institutions, research institutes and think tanks</b> such as SwissPeace, the Berghof Foundation, the International Crisis Group (ICG) and the Peace Research Initiative Oslo (PRIO).</li> <li>• <b>International NGOs that focus specifically on peacebuilding and conflict resolution</b> such as International Alert, Peace Direct, Conciliation Resources, Peace Brigades International, Search for Common Ground, and Saferworld.</li> <li>• <b>International development NGOs that also work on peacebuilding issues</b> such as Oxfam, Christian Aid, Norwegian Church Aid, the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD), Mercy Corps, World Vision, and Cordaid.</li> <li>• <b>International human rights organisations</b> such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch (HRW), who are involved in monitoring human rights violations and campaigning for the defence of human rights within conflict-affected and post conflict countries.</li> </ul>
Regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regional peacebuilding networks</b> such as the West African Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP), which has 500 member organisations across West Africa. Within Europe, regional networks include The European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation and The European Peace Liaison Office (EPLO).</li> <li>• <b>Regional peacebuilding organisations</b> such as The African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), a South Africa based civil society organisation that works on peacebuilding and conflict resolution throughout Africa.</li> </ul>
National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>National NGOs</b> that typically work in partnership with international and regional NGOs, as well as local organisations.</li> <li>• Other forms of civil society operating at the national level may include <b>civil society networks and coalitions, campaign and advocacy groups, interest groups and professional associations, clubs, unions, faith based organisations, traditional organisations, and social movements.</b></li> </ul>
Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the local level, a wide range of forms of civil society participate in peacebuilding activities including <b>NGOs, community based groups and organisations, traditional and clan groups, faith based groups and organisations, and other interest-based clubs, unions and associations.</b></li> </ul>

