GSDRC Applied Knowledge Services

Governance · Social Development · Humanitarian · Conflict

Statebuilding and Peacebuilding in Situations of Conflict and Fragility

Topic Guide Supplement

Statebuilding and Peacebuilding in Situations of Conflict and Fragility

About this supplement

Statebuilding and peacebuilding, while conceptually distinct, are becoming more closely integrated in academic and policy circles. This Topic Guide supplement is one of two supplements that explore this development:

- **Statebuilding and Peacebuilding in Situations of Conflict and Fragility** looks at the links (and tensions) between statebuilding and peacebuilding, how these activities interact, and how they can be approached in practice.

- **State-Society Relations and Citizenship in Situations of Conflict and Fragility** looks at concepts of state-society relations, civic trust, citizenship and socio-political cohesion in relation to statebuilding and peacebuilding.

The publications highlight key issues and debates for each topic covered and identify relevant references. They are to be read in conjunction with the GSDRC's Conflict and Fragile States Topic Guides, in particular the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding chapters. Links to relevant sections from these and other chapters of the guides are highlighted throughout.

These supplements were written by Huma Haider (GSDRC, University of Birmingham) in 2010. This supplement was updated in 2014 by Anna Strachan (GSDRC, Institute of Development Studies). The GSDRC appreciates the contributions of Alina Rocha Menochal (Overseas Development Institute); Alex Stevens (DFID) and Anna Miles (DFID). Comments, questions or documents can be sent to Huma Haider: huma@gsdrc.org

About the GSDRC

The GSDRC is a partnership of research institutes, think-tanks and consultancy organisations with expertise in governance, social development, humanitarian and conflict issues. We provide applied knowledge services on demand and online. Our specialist research team supports a range of international development agencies, synthesising the latest evidence and expert thinking to inform policy and practice.

Contents

Key Concepts

Peacebuilding, as defined by the United Nations, involves 'a range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict, to strengthen national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and development. Peacebuilding strategies must be coherent and tailored to the specific needs of the country concerned, based on national ownership, and should comprise a carefully prioritised, sequenced, and therefore relatively narrow set of activities aimed at achieving the above objectives'.

Statebuilding, as defined by the OECD, is 'an endogenous process to enhance capacity, institutions and legitimacy of the state driven by state-society relations. Positive statebuilding processes involve reciprocal relations between a state that delivers services for its people and social and political groups who constructively engage with their state'.

While the primary goal of peacebuilding is creating conditions in which violence will not recur, the emphasis in statebuilding is on developing effective government, based on law and general consent. Both statebuilding and peacebuilding are long-term, political processes that do not necessarily follow a linear path. These processes should be participatory and internally-driven, although external actors can play a role in facilitating an enabling environment for reforms.

For discussion and resources on peacebuilding and peacebuilding models, see Chapter 4 (Recovering from violent conflict) of the conflict topic guide:

- **Peacebuilding: Introduction**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-peacebuilding-models-and-state-building#intro

- **Peacebuilding models**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-peacebuilding-models-and-state-building#models

For discussion and resources on statebuilding and statebuilding models, see Chapter 5 (Statebuilding in fragile contexts) of the fragile states topic guide:

- **Statebuilding: Introduction**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/state-building-models-and-prioritization-and-sequencing-#intro

- **Statebuilding models**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/state-building-models-and-prioritization-and-sequencing-#models

Bringing statebuilding and peacebuilding together

The origins of a combined approach and complementarities between statebuilding and peacebuilding

Violent conflict can exacerbate characteristics of fragility. At the same time, weak authority and unresponsive states can increase the likelihood of conflict. Interventions in war-torn countries where institutions of authority have been destroyed or disrupted are exceptionally challenging. They have demonstrated inadequacies with peacebuilding models based primarily on bottom-up, civil society approaches; and statebuilding models based primarily on top-down, institutional approaches.

Bottom-up peacebuilding models have focused on conflict prevention, multi-track diplomacy and the creation of local capacities for peace. There has been growing consensus, however, that transitions from war to peace require the creation or strengthening of governmental institutions, and that this has been under-emphasised in peacebuilding concepts and practice. Top-down statebuilding models have focused on stabilisation, security and the creation of central government institutions. This too has been critiqued for being too state-centric and for under-emphasising civil society, inclusive participation, political community and relationship-building at all levels.

In recent years, concepts of statebuilding and peacebuilding have evolved considerably in international policymaking circles. There are growing convergences and linkages between the two concepts. Statebuilding seeks to transform states and make them more responsive and peacebuilding seeks to transform societal relationships. They converge in their aim to strengthen the relationship between the state and society and to promote representative and inclusive political systems and societies. In practice, both processes take place in complex environments in which every statebuilding or peacebuilding activity has the potential to impact on peace, stability and the relationship between state and society.

Call, C. T., 2008, 'Conclusion: Building States to Build Peace?', Chapter 15 in eds. C. T. Call and V. Wyeth, Building States to Build Peace, Lynne Rienner, Colorado
How can legitimate and sustainable states best be established following civil wars? This chapter considers the dilemmas confronting domestic and international actors seeking to build states while building peace. Peacebuilding and statebuilding can be contradictory as well as complementary processes. To achieve both, it is crucial to manage the tensions that arise between them and to sequence activities in a timely, context-specific way.
Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=3853

Rocha Menocal, A., 2010, '"Statebuilding for Peace" – A New Paradigm for International Engagement in Post-Conflict Fragile States?', EUI Working Paper, no. 34, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute (EUI), Florence
What challenges are common to both statebuilding and peacebuilding? What are the tensions between them? This paper examines the implications for donors seeking to engage in 'statebuilding for peace'. International actors have an important role, but it is accompanying and facilitating domestic processes, leveraging local capacities, and complementing domestic initiatives and actions. With humility, realism and greater political understanding, donors need to determine priorities according to the local context and commit for the long term.
Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=3913

**Interpeace, 2010, 'Voices of Civil Society Organisations on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding',
Background Paper, prepared as an input into the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and
Statebuilding, Interpeace, Geneva**
What are the views of civil society organisations (CSOs) on statebuilding and peacebuilding? This
report presents the findings of a consultation designed to input into the International Dialogue
on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (Timor-Leste, April 2010). CSOs argue that the way that
peacebuilding and statebuilding processes are undertaken is critically important: there is a need
to focus not only on what is done, but how things are done. Inclusive and participatory processes
are essential in order to address conflict and to ensure that statebuilding and peacebuilding can
be complementary.
Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=3878

**Heathershaw, J., 2008, 'Unpacking the Liberal Peace: The Dividing and Merging of
Peacebuilding Discourses', Millennium – Journal of International Studies, vol. 36, no. 3, pp.
597-621**
This paper argues that the `liberal peace' is not a single discourse but *a tripartite international
discursive environment* that dynamically reproduces technical solutions which fail to address the
core issues of conflict in a given place. This disaggregation of the discursive environment enables
a more nuanced understanding of the liberal peace that is able to grasp how critics and criticisms
become incorporated into that which they seek to critique.
http://mil.sagepub.com/cgi/content/short/36/3/597

Tensions between statebuilding and peacebuilding

Although the complementarities between statebuilding and peacebuilding warrant a combined,
holistic approach, there are potential tensions between the two. It is important to recognise that
there are contradictions and that they are not always mutually reinforcing.

While states may be essential to peace, the process of statebuilding can contribute to further
conflict. If the central government is corrupt and predatory and/or was a party to the conflict,
strengthening the state is unlikely to contribute to peace and may fuel resentment instead. In
such circumstances, there is a need to reform the state. Attempts to challenge an exclusionary
political settlement, however, can lead to short-term instability or conflict.

Efforts to end hostilities and consolidate peace can also undermine statebuilding. Peace
settlements can institutionalise divisions in politics. They may also strengthen the role of
repressive rulers where there is a need to appease 'spoilers'. Power-sharing arrangements that
guarantee particular representation are often necessary as a confidence-building measure and
to improve trust among warring parties. They may, however, lead to ineffective state institutions
if those sharing power are unable to agree on issues of governance.

There is also often a desire to rapidly demonstrate 'peace dividends' in fragile and conflict-
affected contexts. Where state capacity is weak, non-state providers may be relied upon in order
to rapidly deliver security and services such as water supply, sanitation, health and education.
This, however, can undermine state legitimacy and long-term capacity building.

**Rocha Menocal. A., 2009, '"Statebuilding for Peace": Navigating an Arena of Contradictions',
ODI Briefing paper, no 52, Overseas Development Institute, London**
How are statebuilding and peacebuilding processes linked, and what are some of the most
significant complementarities and tensions between them? How can donors navigate the
challenges of 'statebuilding for peace' in fragile states? This paper outlines an arena full of
contradictions, arguing that these need to be recognised if they are to be managed. Effective

donor engagement requires humility, better political understanding, greater sensitivity to context, and sustained, long-term commitment.
Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=3914

Call, C.T., E.M. Cousens, 2007, 'Ending Wars and Building Peace?', Working with Crisis Working Paper Series, International Peace Academy, New York
How effective are international efforts to build peace? This paper assesses the status of international peace efforts and highlights chronic weaknesses in peacekeeping processes. In recent years, international and bi-lateral institutions have made efforts to fine-tune their peacebuilding processes. However, systemic issues of international political will and attention, resource allocation and a failure to recognise local contexts continue to affect the ability of international and national actors to establish enduring peace.
Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=2926

Paris, R. and Sisk, T., 2009, 'The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Post-War Peace Operations', Routledge, London and New York
See introductory chapter

Richmond, O. 2013. Failed statebuilding versus peace formation. *Cooperation and Conflict,* 48:3, 378-400.
This peer-reviewed journal article argues that without incorporating a better understanding of the multiple and often critical agencies involved in peace formation, the states emerging from statebuilding will remain failed by design. This is because they are founded on externalised systems, legitimacy and norms rather than a contextual, critical and emancipatory epistemology of peace. Engaging with the processes of peace formation may aid international actors in gaining a better understanding of the roots of a conflict, how local actors may be assisted, how violence and power-seeking may be ended or managed and how local legitimacy may emerge.
http://cac.sagepub.com/content/48/3/378.abstract

Egnell, R. and Halden, P. (Eds.). 2013. 'New agendas in statebuilding: Hybridity, contingency, and history'. Abingdon: Routledge.
How is the study of statebuilding connected to social theory and the historical study of the state? This edited volume uses a wide range of case studies to demonstrate the importance of hybridity, contingency and history in statebuilding. It also introduces new theoretical approaches to statebuilding from the broader social sciences.
http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415660716/

Newman, E. 2013. The violence of statebuilding in historical perspective: Implications for peacebuilding. *Peacebuilding,* 1:1, 141-157.
Has there been a historical transformation in the relationship between statebuilding and peace? What implications does historical statebuilding experience hold for international peacebuilding activities? This paper argues that historically statebuilding has often been violent because it threatens the interests of groups which are on the outside of the process. The consolidation of national political projects is a related process that has often been accompanied by armed conflict as groups with competing political visions vie for control of the agenda. In the twenty-first century peacebuilding and statebuilding are portrayed as complementary or even mutually dependent.
http://www.academia.edu/3331094/

Donor and NGO approaches

Statebuilding and peacebuilding are long-term, internal processes. Local ownership is essential. Although international development actors are often limited in their ability to influence outcomes, they can be vital in facilitating statebuilding and peacebuilding processes. External assistance may prove essential in enabling transitions and in helping to generate the right conditions and incentives for reform. Some of the major donors and international NGOs involved in the promotion of a combined statebuilding and peacebuilding approach include:

<u>United Nations</u>

The vast majority of UN peace operations since 1990 have followed internal conflicts in weak states without credible or effective state institutions. The movement toward pursuit of both peacebuilding and statebuilding is evident in UN policy reports and in practice. Missions are now complex, multi-dimensional and political in nature – spanning a broad range of tasks. This includes the extension of state authority in the short-term, and rebuilding national institutions in the longer term.

Sherman, J. and Tortolani, B., 2009, 'Implications of Peacebuilding and Statebuilding in United Nations Mandates', Centre on International Cooperation, New York University, New York
http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/4997~v~Implications_of_Peacebuilding_and _Statebuilding_in_United_Nations_Mandates.pdf

The UNDP has launched a global initiative on 'Statebuilding for peace', which aims to develop the capacities of national and local actors to implement strategies that address fragilities, enhance responsiveness and promote conflict prevention, management and transformation. Outcomes are measured based on progress toward building sustainable peace.

Sisk, T., n.d. 'Statebuilding for Peace: Lessons Learned for Capacity Development', Presentation, UNDP
http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan032229.pdf

Berdal, M. and Zaum, D (Eds). 2013. 'Political economy of statebuilding: Power after peace'. Abingdon: Routledge
How have statebuilding interventions over the last 20 years had an impact on the political economies of conflict-affected countries? This edited volume looks at a range of international and regional donor approaches to statebuilding in order to answer this question.
http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415604789/

<u>OECD</u>

The OECD's International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding facilitates a global exchange of views on good practice and limitations in effective international support for peacebuilding and statebuilding.

The top priorities identified in country consultations include the promotion of successful political settlements and political processes and the cessation of violence. Other priorities considered important in peacebuilding and statebuilding strategies include rule of law; mechanisms for peaceful dispute resolution; state capacity to raise revenues and provide services according to people's expectations; effective management of natural resources; and inclusive growth.

Critical gaps in national and international peacebuilding and statebuilding efforts identified include strategies to build positive state-citizen relations and capacities and opportunities for peaceful coexistence and social reconciliation within and across communities.

OECD, 2010, 'Peacebuilding and Statebuilding - Priorities and Challenges: A Synthesis of Findings from Seven Multi-Stakeholder Consultations', International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, OECD, Paris
What are the current priorities and challenges for peacebuilding and statebuilding? This report synthesises the findings of seven multi-stakeholder consultations designed to identify key priorities, bottlenecks and good practices in national and international support for peacebuilding and statebuilding. The consultations found that stronger and more coherent national and international engagement is needed to support peacebuilding and statebuilding in the short, medium and long term.
Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=3872

OECD, 2009, 'International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding', Fact Sheet, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/2/58/44788922.pdf

Links to more International Dialogue resources
http://www.pbsbdialogue.org

See also: **The International Network on Conflict and Fragility** (INCAF), established to help improve international responses and document results in challenging environments
http://www.oecd.org/dac/incaf/theinternationalnetworkonconflictandfragility.htm

The International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding led to the establishment of the G7+, a group of 18 fragile states formed in 2010. The G7+ published a 'New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States' at the Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011, which was endorsed by more than thirty governments and a range of donor institutions. The New Deal commits members of the Dialogue to support country-led and country-owned transitions out of fragility.

International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, 2011, 'A New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States', OECD, Paris
This new framework for working in fragile contexts proposes five key peacebuilding and statebuilding goals: legitimate politics, security, justice, economic foundations, and revenues and services. It focuses on country-led, inclusive ways of engaging that increase harmonisation and donor co-ordination. It seeks to build mutual trust and achieve better results in fragile states through increased transparency in both donor and national systems, capacity-building, joint donor risk-sharing, and quicker, more predictable aid delivery.
Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=4234

Wyeth, V. 2013. Knights in fragile armor: The rise of the "G7+." *Global Governance,* **18:1, 7-12.**
What is the G7+ and what is its role in peacebuilding and statebuilding? This paper argues that societies and elites, and not donors, build states. It finds that there are many opportunities for the G7+ to play an important role in peacebuilding and statebuilding in fragile and conflict-affected states. However, it also notes that the grouping is still young and should be given space to decide on its own identity and agenda in order to avoid being suffocated by reform-minded donors.
http://journals.rienner.com/doi/abs/10.5555/1075-2846-18.1.7

DFID's integrated approach to statebuilding and peacebuilding in situations of conflict and fragility is based on four objectives: (i) addressing the causes and effects of conflict and fragility, and building conflict resolution mechanisms; (ii) supporting inclusive political settlements and processes; (iii) developing core state functions; and (iv) responding to public expectations.

The political settlement is considered a crucial element that links statebuilding and peacebuilding and lies at the centre of DFID's approach. During the aftermath of conflict, there is an opportunity to create a new framework for the political settlement that can lead to a more responsive state. The aim is to transform power relations and to promote inclusiveness in order to counter fragility and the likelihood of renewed violence.

DFID, 2010, 'Building Peaceful States and Societies: A DFID Practice Paper', Department for International Development, London
How can support for statebuilding and peacebuilding be integrated? This Emerging Policy Paper outlines a strategic framework for DFID's engagement in situations of conflict and fragility, plus operational implications. DFID's integrated approach to statebuilding and peacebuilding focuses on addressing the (root) causes of conflict and fragility and building resolution mechanisms. This facilitates the further goals of: promoting inclusive political settlements and processes; developing state survival functions; and responding to public expectations. Support across all of these interrelated areas is necessary to help create a positive peace- and statebuilding dynamic.
http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON75.pdf

BRICS

Richmond, O.P. and Tellidis, I. 2013. *The BRICS and international peacebuilding and statebuilding* (NOREF report). Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre.
What role can the BRICS play in statebuilding and peacebuilding? This policy brief shows that in peacebuilding and statebuilding the BRICS can be both 'status-quo' and 'critical' actors. On the one hand, they all engage with the liberal peace paradigm and its often-neoliberal agenda. On the other hand, their involvement has challenged peacebuilding and development's Euro-Atlantic character through the unfolding of their own donor and peace agendas. This report highlights where traditional and emerging actors' agendas converge and diverge and looks at the motivations behind these agendas.
http://www.peacebuilding.no/Themes/Emerging-powers/Publications/The-BRICS-and-international-peacebuilding-and-statebuilding

Interpeace

Interpeace's approach to statebuilding and peacebuilding focuses on state-society relations. It stresses the importance of working not only with the state or with civil society organisations exclusively, but engaging both sides and wider society. Interpeace programmes seek to create multiple spaces for inclusive public debate, discussion, negotiation. They pursue collaborative work in which priorities for a peaceful society are collectively identified and consensus is built on how to address them. The premise is that public participation and debate combined with capacities for negotiation and collaboration are most likely to lead to compromises and moderation and to avoid violence. It can also shape governance relations and contribute to more inclusive and responsive governance institutions.

Van Brabant, K., 2008, 'Peacebuilding and Statebuilding. An Invitation for Reflection: Interpeace's Experiences', Interpeace, Geneva

How can international actors accelerate the socio-political processes of state formation in fragile states? This paper examines the experience of the organisation in statebuilding, focusing on state-society relations as the core concept of state formation. Building democratic culture to support long-term socio-political negotiations is the most effective means of securing peace and building strong states.

Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=3572

The following report presents findings from Interpeace's consultations with 49 civil society organisations (CSOs) working on peacebuilding and statebuilding. Regarding peacebuilding, CSOs advocated for greater focus on conflict prevention, root causes of conflict, conflict transformation and reconciliation. Regarding statebuilding, they stressed the need to recognise different understandings of the 'state', beyond the Western model. CSOs emphasised the importance of process in both and of more attention to how concepts are translated into reality.

Interpeace, 2010, 'Voices of Civil Society Organisations on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding', Background Paper, prepared as an input into the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, Interpeace, Geneva

What are the views of civil society organisations (CSOs) on statebuilding and peacebuilding? This report presents the findings of a consultation designed to input into the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (Timor-Leste, April 2010). CSOs argue that the way that peacebuilding and statebuilding processes are undertaken is critically important: there is a need to focus not only on what is done, but how things are done. Inclusive and participatory processes are essential in order to address conflict and to ensure that statebuilding and peacebuilding can be complementary.

Longer summary: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=3878

Components of an integrated approach to statebuilding and peacebuilding

There are many different approaches and components to an integrated approach to statebuilding and peacebuilding. This section draws upon some of the key areas highlighted by DFID and OECD consultations: understanding the causes of conflict and fragility; supporting inclusive political settlements and peace processes; promoting peaceful dispute resolution mechanisms and capacities for peace; developing core state functions; and responding to public expectations.

State-society relations, citizenship and socio-political cohesion are areas of great importance to statebuilding and peacebuilding and are crucial to an integrated approach. They are discussed in a separate supplement:
State-Society Relations and Citizenship in Situations of Conflict and Fragility
http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON88.pdf

Understanding the causes and dynamics of conflict and fragility

Peacebuilding and statebuilding are not technical exercises. There is a need to understand the historical experiences of state-formation and the specific nature and dynamics of the conflict.

Conflict prevention, conflict management and peacebuilding often seek to identify and address the perceived root causes of conflict, in order to understand the context of reform and to tailor appropriate solutions. Some research stresses that attention must also be paid to the dynamics (actors and motivations) and impact of conflict and fragility; and to the 'causes of peace' (political arrangements necessary to settle power struggles and limit the use of violence).

Many causes of conflict and fragility may be deeply entrenched and are unlikely to be resolved through short-term external interventions. Addressing root causes entails complex processes and transformations that take time. In addition, it is important for peacebuilding and statebuilding efforts to focus not solely on the national level but to also aim to understand regional dimensions of conflict and stability; and international dimensions, such as globalisation, drug trafficking and terrorism.

For discussion and resources on understanding and addressing the causes, characteristics, dynamics and impact of violent conflict, see Chapter 1 (Understanding violent conflict) and Chapter 3 (Preventing and managing violent conflict) of the conflict topic guide:

- **Understanding violent conflict**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-1-understanding-violent-conflict

- **Ending violent conflict: Introduction**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/index.cfm?objectid=31398613-14C2-620A-27B78BA056A8C53C#intro

For discussion and resources on understanding the causes and characteristics of fragility; and on addressing exclusion, see Chapter 2 (Causes and characteristics of fragility) and Chapter 5 (Statebuilding in fragile contexts) of the fragile states topic guide:

- **Causes and characteristics of fragility**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-2--causes-and-characteristics-of-fragility

- **Statebuilding: Addressing exclusion**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/strategies-for-external-engagement#address

Inclusive political settlements and peace processes

Political settlements refer to formal and informal rules, shared understandings and rooted habits that affect how power is organised and exercised and shape political and economic relations. They are subject to change and transformation over time as different state and non-state actors (re)negotiate the rules of the game. The extent to which a settlement is inclusive and perceived as fair is important to state legitimacy and the sustainability of the settlement (Rocha-Menocal, 2010; DFID, 2010).

Peace agreements are formal agreements aimed at ending violent conflict and creating the conditions for durable peace. Peace processes and peace agreements provide an opportunity to transform political settlements, for example through a new constitution that protects the rights of traditionally excluded groups. Peace processes, themselves, should be inclusive and should seek to incorporate broad sectors of society at varying levels of negotiation, with particular attention to marginalised groups. This will allow for greater likelihood of a stable settlement and a stable peace. The process of engaging in joint talks can also contribute to developing trust across conflict lines and foundations for peaceful dispute resolution.

Political settlements and peace agreements are driven by internal dynamics and cannot be imposed by external actors. Promoting inclusive political systems can be especially challenging as it usually requires transformations in power relations that go beyond formal rules and inclusive peace processes. Informal, exclusionary arrangements are often resistant to change. In order to try to enable political transformations, it is important to understand the issues at stake and the incentives and interests of key stakeholders.

For discussion and resources on political settlements and peace agreements, see Chapter 5 (Statebuilding in fragile contexts) of the fragile states topic guide; and Chapter 3 (Preventing and managing violent conflict) of the conflict topic guide.

- **Political settlements**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/state-functions-and-legitimacy#political

- **Peace agreements**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-3-preventing-and-managing-violent-conflict/ending-violent-conflict-peace-agreements-and-conflict-transformation#peace

For discussion and resources on inclusive peace processes and participation in governance, see: Chapter 2 (Living in conflict-affected areas), Chapter 3 (Preventing and managing violent conflict) and Chapter 4 (Recovering from violent conflict) of the conflict topic guide; and Chapter 5 (Statebuilding in fragile contexts) of the fragile states topic guide.

- **Conflict negotiation: Inclusive peace negotiations – women, minority groups, and civil society**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-3-preventing-and-managing-violent-conflict/ending-violent-conflict-conflict-negotiation#neg

- **Women in conflict-affected areas: Participation in peace processes, reconstruction and peacebuilding**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-2-living-in-conflict-affected-areas/women-in-conflict-affected-areas#particip

- **Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons: Involvement of refugees and IDPs in peacebuilding and development**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-refugees-and-internally-displaced-persons-idps-

- **Statebuilding: Addressing exclusion**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/strategies-for-external-engagement#address

- **Peacebuilding – governance programming: Participation and inclusion**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-governance-programming

Peaceful dispute resolution and capacities for peace

The ability of governments and societies to manage tensions and disputes peacefully is critical to preventing violent conflict and promoting a durable political settlement. Stable and inclusive political processes and dispute resolution mechanisms are essential. They comprise a range of local and national institutions, including formal and informal systems. Where state mechanisms are considered weak or illegitimate, informal and/or customary authorities can resolve disputes. Civil society organisations also play a prominent role in conflict resolution.

Capacities for peace often exist and survive in conflict affected and fragile contexts. It is important not to substitute for or duplicate them. Development actors should seek to strengthen existing capacities or to enable them where they are absent. Attention should be paid not only to the state level, but within and across communities. Activities such as dialogue and broad consultations; media programming; and civic education are important areas that can contribute to building trust and the foundation for social reconciliation and peace. Non-state actors, in particular civil society organisations, often play a meaningful role in these areas, especially if they have a strong connection to the citizens at large.

For discussion and resources concerning peaceful dispute resolution, see Chapter 3 (Preventing and managing violent conflict) and Chapter 4 (Recovering from violent conflict) of the conflict topic guide:

- **Direct prevention mechanisms: Peacemaking – dialogue**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-3-preventing-and-managing-violent-conflict/preventing-violent-conflict-early-warning-direct-prevention-and-structural-prevention#direct

- **Conflict transformation**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-3-preventing-and-managing-violent-conflict/ending-violent-conflict-peace-agreements-and-conflict-transformation#trans

- **Non-violence and local conflict management**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-3-preventing-and-managing-violent-conflict/ending-violent-conflict-non-violence-and-peacekeeping#non

- **Peacebuilding: Governance programming**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-governance-programming

For discussion and resources concerning developing capacities for peace, see Chapter 4 (Recovering from violent conflict) and Chapter 5 (Intervening in conflict-affected areas) of the conflict topic guide; and Chapter 5 (Statebuilding in fragile contexts) in the fragile states topic guide:

- **Reconciliation, social cohesion and inclusiveness** (including, social renewal and coexistence programming; education systems and peace education)
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-reconciliation-social-renewal-and-inclusiveness

- **Peace and security architecture: The media**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-5-intervening-in-conflict-affected-areas/peace-and-security-architecture-the-private-sector-and-the-media#media

- **Statebuilding: Working within local contexts and institutions**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/strategies-for-external-engagement#local

- **Non-state actors and peacebuilding**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-non-state-actors-and-peacebuilding

- **State-society relations and citizenship in situations of conflict and fragility** supplement
  http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON88.pdf

Core state functions and public expectations

There is consensus that safety, security, justice and rule of law are core functions of the state. These are considered as essential in order to advance state legitimacy and prevent violent conflict. A range of other important functions are identified in the literature, including basic service delivery, financial and macroeconomic management, inclusive growth and job creation, and human rights protections. In some fragile contexts, the state may provide services, but in an exclusionary manner. This also undermines state legitimacy and increases the likelihood of societal tensions.

The weight accorded to the various functions will vary depending on public expectations in different contexts. Society's expectations of the state are diverse and are shaped by historical and cultural factors and by people's understanding of rights and entitlements. States need to be seen to meet public expectations for legitimacy and stability.

Perceptions may also differ with regard to who are considered 'authorities'. External actors should not make assumptions about the expectations of different groups and about which core

functions should be a priority. In addition, they should seek to work with both state and non-state actors, based on public perceptions of legitimacy and authority.

For discussion and resources concerning state functions, see Chapter 5 (Statebuilding in fragile contexts) and Chapter 6 (Service delivery in fragile contexts) of the fragile states topic guide; and Chapter 3 (Preventing and managing violent conflict) and Chapter 4 (Recovering from violent conflict) of the conflict topic guide:

- **State functions**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/state-functions-and-legitimacy#functions

- **Statebuilding: Security and justice**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/state-functions-and-legitimacy#sec

- **Peacebuilding: Governance programming - rule of law and justice reform**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-governance-programming

- **Service delivery and statebuilding**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-6--service-delivery-in-fragile-contexts/service-delivery-and-state-building

- **Statebuilding: Economic recovery and employment-centred growth**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/state-functions-and-legitimacy#econ

- **Peacebuilding: Economic recovery and growth**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/chapter-4-recovering-from-violent-conflict/conflict/peacebuilding-socioeconomic-recovery

- **Tax and statebuilding**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/fragile-states/chapter-5--state-building-in-fragile-contexts/state-functions-and-legitimacy#tax

- **Peace agreements – sector-specific provisions**
  http://www.gsdrc.org/go/conflict/chapter-3-preventing-and-managing-violent-conflict/ending-violent-conflict-peace-agreements-and-conflict-transformation#peace