

**New Paths to Peace: Integrated Approaches to
Building Sustainable Peace and Development**

NOTES FROM PLENARY SESSIONS

**November 6-7, 2003
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee**

The New Paths to Peace Conference featured three main plenary sessions: a discussion of Peace Writ Large and its implications for the practice of peacebuilding across different fields; Summary reports from learning labs on implications for Peace Writ Large, learnings/surprises regarding cross-sectoral collaboration, and issues for a future agenda; and a final plenary on reports from the action planning groups.

Discussion of Peace Writ Large

Framing Questions for Thursday morning (10am) Working Group Discussions:

What is Peace Writ Large?

- Who defines it?
- How do we know it when we see it?
- What are the goals?
- Are there boundaries (things that it's not)?

How can it help us?

- What are the advantages of using the Peace Writ Large concept?
 - How can it move us forward toward our goals?
 - What are we holding ourselves responsible for?
 - What are we obligated to?
-
- Conversion of peace school in the heart of Milwaukee
 - Structural changes that took place within the institution.
 - Built network - people working on their own for peace.
 - Civil society in the republic of Georgia on the rights based approach
 - Notion of empowerment at a grassroots level that has a ripple affect at the structural level.

- New access to the political system
- Awareness raising and training about the flexibility of conflicts
 - Training for the government people
 - International community was very attracted to getting into the government system – GTZ had access...
 - Network within the international community created – organizing the first national conference on Federalism, conflict and peacebuilding...
 - Pushed forward the whole discussion in Ethiopia and who is doing what
 - The media carried it live
 - Galtung was there, and it was enlightening for them
 - More people and key people issue – videotaping consultation and presenting in public.
 - No one thought it was possible – impact that was more than what we had started out with.
- Helped hold people accountable for their impact on the peace process
 - Example of the ICG report – donors were able to use it to deliver more aid and move the process forward.
- Child soldier work
 - Increase their resistance to violence – level of coercion has increased dramatically.
 - The voice of the youth in Liberia in the peace process – the young people who, if they are not included in that process, can be spoilers.
 - Complement the informal work with a formal political peace process.
 - Bringing the people into the peace process in a meaningful way.
 - Because of the SCF – we are able to build on the experience and advocate for the children and bring them into that process, which they would not have
 - Community, national and international level
- Cote D'Ivoire
 - Identify key people in a prefecture, but also bring together youth groups. A process of people identifying the issues, and the contested resource issues.
 - We did this process and created a peace committee at a community level, but it was later when issues of conflict arose and we went back to the institutions created, they would go to them to help prevent the conflict, or rather resolve the conflict – bringing in the peace committee as negotiators.

- Seeing groups have the capacity to work on these issues without the external catalyst.

What is the potential to use this concept in what we are doing? Where is the line of what we are obligated to do drawn?

- Don't like it. We might condemn our work if it doesn't have an impact on peace writ large. The situations are so complex. Destructive concept in terms of evaluating our work.
- One of the reasons why the RPP project went toward those criteria of effectiveness is because everything can't make large-scale peace. Get a handle on the impact of the smaller on the larger.
- The way you teach things you can teach them in a way that contribute to peace.
- What is this link between doing a good program and a peace program.
- It is almost just about good programming.
- There are three additional questions:
 - Is it big enough and proportional to the conflict? Or is it so micro that it has no impact?
 - Is it fast enough?
 - Is it sustainable? (are the results sustainable?)
- The peace writ large concept is useful. There is an amazing consensus of the basic fundamental human rights in the world. Throughout every human rights instrument there are 4 core values – participation in decisions affecting their lives, accountability – hold power accountable, allowing people to work for change and affirming dignity. A useful concept to look at. The purpose of the universal declaration to prevent human rights is to prevent war.
- Rights based approach
- The peace approach brings us all to a common goal and opens up room for collaboration. The words are scary, but the structure that it provides is helpful.
- Once we define it here, we have to find worlds to use to talk about it in our work – different words. It is the translation part that is more difficult. The peace writ large concept is scary. What is the broadest term? We don't want the language to scare people off.
- There is a move toward not liking lofty goals. As a development practitioner, we always aspire to lofty goals. Our goal at the top of our logframe is a lofty goal. We know that our one nutrition intervention will not reach that goal. In collaboration with other health interveners we can reach it together. I like the fact that they are lofty goals, whether they are phrased in a human rights language or whatever.
- Not being able to measure is not a reason to change the lofty goals.

- Lofty goals inspire.
- How do we sit with both of the concepts – having them be an invitation to a failure, or as a motivation of what we are trying to do.
- Maybe we need to lobby more with donors to change the way that they measure.
- Donors are puzzled by it too, and are not sure what to hold people accountable to. How do you do that in a smarter way. Can the community as a whole come up with understanding what constitutes significant progress and not as significant progress.
- Need to think in terms of interim goals and ultimate goals. Ultimate goals in terms of peace writ large. Have some guidelines for what are effective interim goals. Something to measure your progress against.
- You can go from place to place. People want security and health system. If you were to talk to them and use the word peace, then the discourse and language of peace is not useful – a day to day in bringing them together in terms of shared values and goals. When you are doing programming in active violent conflict on the front lines then you can't really talk about peace in the same way.
- The child soldier project is not necessarily a peace writ large project. Think about what the longer-term gaps are going to be – helps with log frame design and helps to think about better design. 6 criteria help to think about it.
- Over the shared value they were able to come together.
- We don't know enough about the peacebuilding process to take that forward.
- Language of articulation:
 - Between program goals and the loftier systemic goals
 - Articulated in a conceptual way.
- Measure it
- Needing Interim and ultimate goals – take that linkage and take out some places in it – ultimate goals.
- Helps us to find ways to leverage our work.
- How can we do this in practice?
 - It would not be helpful to label my work in peace writ large, but the 4 squares help, then look at the weak points of the project and how to widen the project. NO way to label it, but you have to go into cooperation with others. Nothing came up with networking – can it work. We all have certain tasks to fulfill with our company and this is not the way that they want to do it, with incorporating others. They wanted to be the first one doing it, particularly in a context of competitive funding.
 - Missing the practical approach with the challenges that exist within our own companies.

- Should we call it peace or should we call it something else. Is all good development work good peace work? There are some places where it is good to use peace, and where is it more appropriate to change the language.
- DRC work – the part where you are linking protection of the world heritage sites to mediation of ceasefires is too political, but we will fund part of it. Knocking your head against these divisions.
- Want to see more donors. When we want to take a more integrated approach, and if the donor is not more interested. USAID is really moving forward toward these large consortium proposals. They want to link everything to everything. Can the NGOs do this?
- There is a huge change at State dept, and in general with donors, while they would not define our work as pb work – having these 6 indicators in our work would not have been possible 5-6 years ago. They see the value now and we can contribute to the momentum.
- When do you measure success? You can see the incremental differences. At an individual level yes, and then it takes longer to see the societal changes.
- Stealth programming – what you say and don't say – incomplete transparency???
- What is the process of change? How will the donor shift to looking at PWL goals.
- We are looking at that process trying to apply this here. Trying to push the donors to establish peace writ large as a criteria.
- Once you start focusing on the causes, and the analysis, you see that they could have an impact on doing something about the conflict. Cause and effect...
- The concept is good because once we all start analyzing our work and how they play in, that is how the collaboration can play in. Showing cause and effect and how everyone can do that, how to play that in your work. We can do a lot more about analyzing our own effect. What causes are we addressing that could potentially lead to another effect, having a positive influence on a cause or effect.
- The whole proposal process for co financing – how have you thought about the process that you are using (SIDA and Norway – programs written up and judged in relationship to this). Foundation funders may be more structured in saying what they do and don't do.
- The process is not a static one about donors first or NGOs first – it is this dialectic – conflict sensitivity, gender awareness – they link to each other. We don't want to accept your definition of accountability so we will make our own.
- Cause and effect – puzzle issue – would never have thought to cause a project a peace writ large project. The whole point of RPP was to ask the question of effectiveness about really big problems. This was trying to make it a better world with this going on. It really is an effectiveness question.
- How do we all come together with our different approaches to this big goal? See more of my impact as being on just and sustainable peace. Look at what are we

holding ourselves responsible for and moving forward toward the goals. Just and sustainable peace goal and what this means for the interim steps. Whether it is through peace education or conflict prevention. More fuzzy on how we work on the sustainable peace side of the goal?

- Do these criteria go far enough in contributing to peace. There are other criteria that take it toward just and sustainable peace.
- In the concept, is it an end point, or is it a means to an end. You have been talking about it in both ways – in development world it is used as a means to an end. If the concept is to achieve peace, then that is a whole different way of looking at the conflict.
 - How many different ways there are to get an avenue into this issue...
- We haven't done nearly as well as holding ourselves responsible in the development community for outcomes as this group of peace people has. Does it make a difference or not. We have said in development programs that we have to assume that
- The concept was for people working on conflict.
- Conflict sensitivity does incorporate others. This is not a business for amateurs and the development and humanitarian community does and they need to learn from the conflict people.
- For a lot of the people we are not peace practitioners, we are humanitarian and development people working on development.

Summary Reports from Learning Labs

Implications for Peace Writ Large

- How to translate what we know to influence structural change?
- What is the interdependence between justice, peace and development?
- Does “interfield” collaboration lead to “peace writ large”?
- How to target our goals so that we recognize individuals, groups and societies?
- Is there an economic structural difference between those who are already coordinating and the conflict resolution field?
- Organic coordination process – it's hard to have a structure given the context of the conflict.
- Scaling up individual efforts and stories (re: Identity-based work) for understanding and for donors.
- Coordination to avoid overlap and duplication of efforts is needed (at first coerced by UCI donor)
- Articulate what you are working on, and what you choose not to work on.

- Does Peace = development or development = peace?

Insights, Surprises and Open Questions

- We have to influence US policy to get to PWL (in many cases)
- Making our assumptions explicit will make us more effective.
- Looking at our theories of change across the fields, we may find similarities.
- Critical entry points into networks.
- Communicate externally (re: what you are/are not doing)
- Re: land rights – how can peacebuilding community be of help, be a resource?
- Can constitution building provide answers, experiences or insights for post-conflict property rights?
- Extending network reach to local actors.
- Not a focus on policy options from the beginning – thinking dialogue is a-political.
- How to get investment from private sector without compromising property and resource rights (commercialization and modification).
- Sustainability? When organizations come and go, continuity is problematic.
- Is coordination or complementarity more important?
- Natural formulation of informal coordination groups across multiple agencies and NGOs.
- Development practitioners do not acknowledge the influence that they have on the process.
- When in the cycle of violence is the right time to address the property issue?
- Change is risky, but unstable environments require change = vicious circle.
- Use Do No Harm as an evaluation tool.
- Connectors/dividers approach to considering networks.
- There are lessons but no “cookie cutter”.
- LCP is relevant and applicable in a developing context.
- It’s “local” involvement stupid
- Positive needs to be emphasized.
- Where should the institutional memory reside?
- Ownership re: mainstreaming is critical.
- How do you find/train staff for integrated approaches?
- The complexities of our current world require us to adapt our paradigm.

- Look for allies – even in unexpected places.
- Networking outside the comfort zone.
- Power in collective voice.
- Theories of change are both personal and organizational processes.
- Are we impartial? Can we be/ Should we be?
- Good collaboration can reduce competition between people and organizations (key to conflict).
- Interfield work needs structure and skilled facilitation.
- Does striving for justice contribute to burnout?
- We have to be ready to deal in the political arena.

Future Agenda

- Leadership needs legitimacy and credibility.
- Mainstreaming conflict sensitivity as organizational change/architecture.
- Why not use “peace” or “conflict”?
- Peace gaming.
- How to coordinate and bring outside help to bear (university consortium –long term relations, research help)?
- Coordination models and mechanisms from the relief/development community can be useful to the conflict resolution field.
- Use our power to convene – hear stories.
- Create export office – advice to Congress.
- More joint strategizing and resource sharing and lobbying (w/ donors, policy makers and planners).
- Develop more effective networks to influence policy (mapping of peace networks).
- Use ex-military discontent with abuse of the military.
- Figure out how the military fits – role, space, and accountability.
- Language – whose are we speaking? What does it mean?
- How can we understand what each other is talking about?
- Coordination is a skill and may require training/ capacity building.
- Language is an issue in explaining conflict and defining fields.
- Organizations doing peace dialogues need to develop indicators to measure impact (joint).
- Development from empowerment – strategic linkages – OAS conflict resolution and deliberative training.

- One of the ways we achieve interfield collaboration is by recognizing issues (i.e., identity) that cut across.
- Working group to figure out how to widen the network.
- Looking at our theories of change can influence our entire paradigm – need to examine this.
- Need for new skills in peacebuilding and justice with ongoing support.

Reports from Action Planning Groups

- 1) Peace Gaming
 - a. Inter-agency post-conflict scenario
 - b. Need to get input about past experiences, and modules
 - c. Funders, contacts in the Bush Whitehouse
 - d. Contact:
 - i. Lorelei and Bill
- 2) Series of Interfield Workshops
- 3) Community Development
 - a. Develop a regionally-based network of people
 - b. Looking for a community of practitioners to discuss what works:
 - i. How do you use community-driven approaches in conflict scenarios?
 - ii. What is the impact of doing community-driven approaches on conflict?
 - c. Need:
 - i. Case studies, impact assessments, tangible evaluations
 - d. Kim Maynard – kmaynard@worldbank.org
- 4) Cross-sectoral Collaboration in the DRC:
 - a. Practical organizational impediments to organizational work
 - i. Funding issues
 - ii. Competition
 - b. The purpose is to provide it as immediately as possible to an ongoing real issue. Example of DRC.
 - i. IFES, WV, National Peace Corps Association
 - c. Meeting before Thanksgiving as a framing meeting, follow-on

- d. Contact information: stevenasmith@earthlink.net
- 5) Conflict Sensitivity:
- a. List to continue these conversations
 - b. saji@american.edu
- 6) Conflict Resolution and Humanitarian Assistance/Development cooperation/interaction.
- a. Education processes is necessary
 - b. Transitions, Conflict and Peacebuilding group of interaction to keep the dialogue going.
 - c. See Peter with any questions.