PEACEBUILDING AND CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION – STRATEGIC ASPECTS

Aleksandar Pavleski[43]
Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Institute for Security, Defence and Peace

Emil Dimitriev[44]
PhD Candidate, Faculty of Philosophy-Skopje

Abstract: Today, in the 21st century, we can still talk about countries and regions around the world, with weak, unproductive and highly corrupt governing systems, with "social" systems in which basic human freedoms and rights are not respected, with weak or destroyed economies, with uncontrolled poverty, etc. Failed states provide ideal grounds for emergence and development of civil strife, criminality, and other updated or new security risks and threats that in general target civilians and commit massive human rights violations. On the one hand, such "updated", redesigned and new security risks and threats easily extend beyond national borders, while on the other hand, the capacity of the International community for successfully intervening and dealing with them behind the borders, remains questionable. In this regard, the paper analyses perhaps the most promoted instruments of the International community on this plan in the past 30 years, i.e. peace building and conflict transformation. In fact, paper aims to identify what is distinctive about strategic aspects of the peacebuilding and conflict transformation as well as to identify their key dimensions. The paper does agree that such approaches and mechanisms need to be continually adjusted in response to the changing nature of threats, risks and conflicts, as well as that current theories must be adapted in order to take proper account of the globalization of conflicts and conflict interventions. Moreover, the paper highlights the need for a strategic approach of peacebuilding and conflict transformation that would consider both the factors that promote peacebuilding and those that exacerbate conflict at these different levels over an extended period of time from before the outbreak of violent conflict to well after its resolution.

Keywords: peacebuilding, conflict-transformation, International community, peace, conflict

Introduction

The experience so far between states, groups and people, shows that it is all too easy to promote violence, and all too difficult to create and building peace. Even groups who have coexisted peacefully for a long time can watch their tranquillity vanish because of

---

[43] Contact address: pavleski@fzf.ukim.edu.mk

[44] Contact address: emil.dimitriev@yahoo.com.mk

some small symbolic transgression. Violence is probably part of the negativity bias, or the tendency for humans to respond more to negativity, excitement, and drama than to peace and harmony (McCauley & Bock, 2004).

Therefore, the issues about peace, conflict and security have always been perceived as ambitious concepts that in different periods of time cause different and serious scientific and political debates. Some of the causes in this regard can be located in the fact that peace, security and conflict research is a rapidly developing field.

However, in historical point of view, there is no doubt that in the past period these debates intensified after the end of the Cold War and they can actually be perceived as a continuation of the traditional debate between the representatives of the realist and idealist paradigms regarding this issue. While within international relations science (and the realist interpretation) peace is usually posited as a consequence of security, within peace studies (and the idealistic interpretation), the concept of peace extends beyond the elements of the traditional (negative) understanding of security. More specifically, peace is interpreted as a prerequisite for security, not as its consequence. The concept of peace absorbs security and is conceptualized by including broader social values. As a result of such understanding, various instruments and mechanisms for promoting and achieving peace, have been developed in the past period. Actually, based on the conflict resolution aims, we have witnessed implementation of a range of mechanisms, instruments and tools, predominantly as a third party intervention in conflict zones. This includes varieties of peace-making, peace-keeping and peace-building missions, diplomacy and mediation, negotiation, interventions, sanctions etc. Actually, from the operational level point of view, those approaches and mechanisms were referred to as a multidimensional conflict resolution that consist of early-warning systems, peace-making, preventive diplomacy, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, and peace-enforcement operations. Moreover, different missions have been launched with the aim of dealing with complex aspects of the post conflict challenges.

In this regard, it became obvious that "long-term commitment to post-settlement environments, including disarmament, the repatriation of refugees, the restoration of order, election monitoring, the protection of human rights, reforming and strengthening government institutions, formal and informal process of political participation", are more complex and demanding (Richmond, 2001). Therefore, there is no clear consensus or agreement about the successfulness, as well as about the economic justification of such kind of mechanisms and interventions.

The paper focus is specifically directed to the analysis of the aspects and challenges of the peace building and conflict-transformation mechanisms. There is no doubt that as a result of the current security environment and the new security dynamics, the importance of this mechanism will increase even more in the next

period, hence the need for its more appropriate strategic conceptualization and its maintenance.

Peacebuilding and conflict transformation understanding and perspective

Certain crucial changes in the nature of the contemporary conflict and security threats and risks, has stressed the need about supplement or redesign of the current approaches in dealing with it. As example, contemporary violent conflicts are asymmetric, marked by inequalities of power and status. Additionally, many contemporary conflicts are protracted, crossing repeatedly into and out of violence, warp the societies, economies and regions in which they are situated, creating complex emergencies fuelled on the one hand by local struggles and on the other by global factors such as the arms trade and support for regimes or rebels by outside states (Miall, 2004). The complexity of such situations imposes the need of applying an adequate and comprehensive approach in overcoming them. Therefore, conflict transformation theorists argue that contemporary conflicts require more than the reframing of positions and the identification of win-win outcomes. The very structure of parties and relationships may be embedded in a pattern of conflictual relationships that extend beyond the particular site of conflict.

On other side, the most current debate about the creation of a new world order, after the escalation of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, brought up again the issue of peace and security as the foundation of that order, as well as the foundation of the new relations between the states too. In this regard, the development of the peace and security understanding through the prism of their integral qualities in the past period (especially after the end of the Cold War), is again seriously faced with the challenges and threats related to the military dimension. In fact, the current situation in Ukraine has largely re-actualized the priority and position of military security and traditional threats to peace. As a result, it could expect a re-actualization and extension of the mechanisms and instruments aimed at promoting peace and at transforming and resolving conflicts, in the past 30 years. It is characteristic in this sense that these mechanisms and instruments in the past period were generally understood and developed within the framework of the UN, which directly speaks about the absence of indigenous, national capacities in this sphere.

During the 1990s, peacebuilding was mostly understood in the UN as post-conflict peacebuilding. Actually, former UN Secretary General, Boutros Boutros – Ghali, introduced the term in his 1992 report Agenda for Peace to the Security Council, which also talks about conflict transformation as a strategy of conflict prevention. Both term have since gained popularity within and beyond the UN. In this regard, such position firstly changed in the 2000s, with the adoption of Security Council Presidential Statement (S/PRST/2001/15) and the following 2007 Policy Committee decision that defined peacebuilding as aiming to prevent the outbreak, the recurrence or the continuation of the armed conflict. This position was reaffirmed in the new resolutions A/RES/70/262 and S/RES/2282 in the preamble, when it states that "sustaining peace encompasses activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict." (UN, 2016). In this sense, sustaining peace should in practical terms not be distinguished from peacebuilding. On

other side, it also highlights the interrelationship between peacebuilding and conflict transformation, by defining the current role of peacebuilding in the various stages and levels of conflict prevention and conflict de-escalation. On 27 April 2016, the General Assembly and the Security Council adopted substantively identical resolutions on peacebuilding (A/RES/70/262 and S/RES/2282), which are the most comprehensive and far-reaching resolutions about this issue (UN, 2016). Actually, with such resolutions, member States demonstrated their commitment to strengthening the United Nations' ability to prevent the "outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of violent conflict, address the root causes and assist parties to conflict to end hostilies in order to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" (UN, 2016).

It can be pointed out that theoretical peacebuilding understanding, largely corresponds with the indicated projections about this issue in the UN. In this regard, crucial position of the peacebuilding concept is described as a means of preventing the renewal of hostilities, reconstructing economic and social infrastructure and facilitating conflict resolution (Fetherstone, 1996).

Still, peacebuilding should be distinguished from international assistance or aid in the form of humanitarian and development aid, as it should be a long-term process aimed at eliminating the essential roots of the conflict. Hence, there is a need for creation of a clear distinction and understanding of the various mechanisms in this sphere. It is specific for such instruments and mechanisms that they are mostly described and understood as separate but with a series of interdependent activities aimed in conflict transformation and conflict resolution.

In this regard, peacekeeping in general is a sphere of activity in which diplomats or specially appointed senior representatives of the UN Secretariat, act as mediators and/or negotiators in conflict situations. The experience so far, shows that peace-making mechanism can act in parallel with the peace-keeping mission, to enable a conflict resolution package, which will be realized through the peace-keeping operations, and then to continue the action in the applied phase. Among others, clear confirmation about this correlation between peace making and peace-keeping is the example of the operation in Cyprus, in which both processes have been worked in parallel. On the other hand, the UN good offices mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP), represent a suitable example of acting in a peace-making operation, but without relying on a peace-keeping operation.

Parallel to the indicated approaches and their interdependent activities, the peacebuilding mechanism is implemented by many diverse UN agencies. Regarding their activities, it can be stated that there is a closely coordination between them, but on the other hand, it is often also absent. Building peace in exceptional situations is explicitly related to the peace-making process, but there are still noticeable exceptions to this plan. Confirmation example in this context are activities in Cyprus and Cambodia in which the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), closely cooperates with peacekeeping forces (UN, 1996).

However, the peacebuilding mechanism presupposes separate activities in relation to the peacekeeping mechanism, although they may in certain cases act in conjunction. Experience so far shows that the concept of peace building is

mostly applied in the post-conflict phase of the conflict and its role is specifically aimed in societies that have already survived the violent or destructive phase of the conflict. In that sense, peacebuilding is applied after first allowing space for peaceful engagement.

When applied within the state, peacebuilding often aims to strengthen and institutionalize peace structures that are assumed to be sufficient to prevent a return to violence. However, on the other hand, according to certain theorists and experts, peace building needs to be expanded and directed to the issues of: the rule of law, basic human needs for social security, the development of economic opportunities, standards and identity, and through assistance to provided society with the ability for non-violent conflict transformation (Georgieva, 2007). Such a definition further confirms the mutual connection between peace building and conflict transformation.

As a specific strategy, peacebuilding can have a significant role in all phases of conflict and depending on the objective, as mentioned above, it can be applied to: prevent conflict, support the peace-making process or post-conflict reconstruction. It often happens that the period from the conclusion of a peace agreement to the establishment of a stable peace is covered by peace building activities. In this regard, conflict transformation approach should focus on regular attention to building harmony and remaining vigilant with respect to hostility and aggression. Actually, conflict analysis and transformation theory and practice recognizes the complexity of conflicts, permeating and playing out in multiple dimensions of social life, and with multiple causes and abetting factors. Hence, peacebuilding and conflict transformation must take into account that conflicts (especially contemporary ones), include both tangible (structural) and intangible (psycho cultural) dimensions that determine the successful restoration of peace and security.

Therefore, peacebuilding and conflict transformation can be accepted as an ongoing process of preventing internal threats to individual security from causing prolonged, violent conflict. In this regard, more specifically conflict transformation can be accepted as a process of engaging with and transforming the relationships, interests, discourses and, if necessary, the very constitution of society that supports the continuation of violent conflict. Constructive conflict is seen as a vital agent or catalyst for change. People within the conflict parties, within the society or region affected, and outsiders with relevant human and material resources all have complementary roles to play in the long-term process of peacebuilding. Additionally, it is significant to pointed out that building peace and conflict transformation are gradually process, through which a series of smaller or larger changes as well as specific steps by means of which a variety of actors may play important roles. According to Lederach in this context: "...conflict transformation must actively envision, include, respect, and promote the human and cultural resources from within a given setting. This involves a new set of lenses through which we do not

primarily 'see' the setting and the people in it as the 'problem' and he outsider as the 'answer'. Rather, we understand the long-term goal of transformation as validating and building on people and resources within the setting (Lederach, 1995).

Such a concept includes four important factors that contribute to the success of the approach: 1) operational focus on the basic causes of the conflict; 2) adequate assessment of the specificity of the situation and the context of the conflict; 3) persistence of the process or long duration of the activity, and 4) mobilizing the endogenous potentials in society that originally produce stabilizing and peaceful activity (Cockell, 1998). These factors are additionally confirming the peacebuilding complex role in the process of conflict transformation.

However, contemporary conflict, as well as its complexity in the post-conflict phase is a serious challenge for determining the right and most acceptable methods and approaches for building peace, and even more so for the preservation of traditional, indigenous potentials for the development and promotion of peace. The reason for this is due to the fact that the conflict, passing through the stages of the escalation and de-escalation process, reduces the confidence in the participants in the conflict to find an acceptable peaceful solution and to a certain extent reduces the peace initiatives. Therefore, peacebuilding represents a complex strategy that can begin with the assistance of the international community, but still, the ability of society itself to establish and strengthen the system of the state on stable peaceful foundations will play a decisive role. The scope of such strategy, depends on a wide range of activities and actors, at all society levels, oriented towards the past, the present, and the future as well.

Heaving in mind the interdependence of such actors and activities, the goal of strategic peacebuilding should be precisely focused in overcoming that independence by connecting and linking various sectors and actors that would otherwise remain isolated or in conflict. Actually, the intentionality of such efforts is what gives force to the adjective strategic, or as Daniel Philpott, noticed that strategic peace builders are like doctors who understand that the body is composed of interconnected systems and then specialize in certain regions of connection with the conviction that these subsystems crucially sustain the entire anatomy. A feature of this medicine is its interest not only in laws, institutions, and policies but in emotions, attitudes, beliefs, legitimacy, and broadly speaking, the wide range of relationships among citizens (Philpott, 2010)

As mentioned above, since academic and expert communities have become critical towards understanding the structural or immediate causes and factors that fuel violence and conflicts, and started to challenge the opinion about the successfulness of conflict resolution strategies, it was reasonable to expect innovative and more thoughtful alternatives and conceptualizations. Such alternatives, on the small scale, are presented through the critical approach that strategies of conflict resolution delivered as third party intervention are less successful in containing violence, that intervention could in addition fuel violence or to reduce local capacity for peace building or prevent local ownership (Georgieva, 2016).

Paris argues that "...without exception, peacebuilding missions in the post-Cold War period have attempted to 'transplant' the values and institutions of the liberal democratic core into the domestic affairs of peripheral host states" (Richmond, 2013). Such argumentation toward peacebuilding practice after the Cold War is that international

agencies became more open proponents of liberal political and economic principles in pacification of conflicting societies through the practice of 'transmission mechanisms' that could be divided in four categories: instrumental role in shaping peace agreements; impact on implementation of settlement solutions, guidance and assistance; conditionality for financial arrangements and support; and practicing quasi-governmental functions by serving on behalf of local authority (Paris, 2002). It means that peacebuilding as a conflict transformation strategy, aims to generate a liberal market democracy model that will fit domestic governance, or as it is covered by the UN (A/RES/70/262 and S/RES/2282) resolutions, sustainable peacebuilding should not be viewed as rebranding existing work, but rather as a more practice-oriented comprehensive concept to prevent violent conflict, by addressing drivers of conflict, patterns of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law and underlying root causes of conflict, including different kinds of exclusion, systemic discrimination and marginalization with renewed energy, based on joint analysis of conflict dynamics and joined-up strategic planning (UN, 2016).

Hence, peacebuilding and conflict transformation should be understood as a long-term processes aimed at solving structural causes of conflicts and violence. In this regard, the Social Policy and Resettlement Division of the World Bank has also recognized the strong correlation between poverty as a structural cause and conflicts and therefore there are six identified basic elements in a reconstruction post-conflict peacebuilding strategy: 1) Jump starting the national economy; 2) Decentralized community based investments; 3) Repairing key transport and communications networks; 4) Demining (where relevant and linked to other priority investments); 5) Demobilization and retraining of ex-combatants; and 6) Reintegration of displaced populations (Holtzman, 1996). Still, even these 'minimalist' goals are unlikely to reach fruition unless accompanied by processes which restore open and free communications, rebuild trust, help parties understand how to overcome past enmities, enable an accurate diagnosis of problems and generate new kinds of interactive frameworks. This, just confirms the complex nature of peacebuilding and conflict transformation as well as that there are multiple aspects that play a key role in successful peacebuilding and in transformation of hostile relationships.

Peacebuilding and conflict transformation – strategic aspect

Such a description and understanding of peacebuilding and conflict transformation comprehensive approaches, refers to the finding that their focus should be on achieving sustainable peace and solving the structural causes of the conflict. As it was above mentioned, a sustainable peace in this regard, requires long-term, ongoing activities and operations that may be initiated and supported for a time by outsiders, but must eventually become the ordinary practices of the citizens in institutions of the society in question. Or, in words of Lederach and Appleby: "...peacebuilding occurs in its fully realized mode when it addresses every stage of conflict cycle and involves all members of a society in the non-violent transformation of conflict, the pursuit of social justice, and the creation of culture of sustainable peace. Accordingly, activities that constitute peacebuilding run the gamut of conflict transformation, including violence prevention and early warning, conflict management, mediation and resolution, social reconstruction and healing in the aftermath of

armed conflict, and the long complex of reconciliation throughout the process..." (Lederach & Appleby, 2010).

On other side, sustainable conflict transformation requires more than the (necessary) problem solving associated with mediation, negotiated settlements and other elements of conflict resolution as well as requires about redress of legitimate grievances and the establishment of new relations characterized by equality and fairness according to the dictates of human dignity and the common good (Ledarch, 1999).

The indicated aspects of the sustainable peace and of the sustainable conflict transformation, point to the conclusion that these are processes that are closely related, that involve a wide range of actors and activities and that should strive to set their final results over a long period of time. Hence, arises the need for strategic design of both processes, which should include a more specific determination and clarification of the activities, phases, goals, tasks, as well as the responsibilities of all foreseen actors in their implementation. Hence, the strategic design of peacebuilding and conflict transformation processes, should provide clear answers to the question who, when and what types of approaches will be needed to initiate, develop, and sustain the desired transformation in a specific context or situation. Moreover, the new security environment with the new set of circumstances interrelated with regional conflicts, genocides, ethnic cleansings and etc., open new spectrum of challenges and opportunities for all involved actors in peacebuilding and conflict transformation. Actually, they should respond to all these new circumstances by greater capacities for strategic thinking and action as well.

As a result of previously mentioned, it can be noted that in its core, peacebuilding aims to create constructive human relationships and to provide the post-conflict conditions that make the inhabitants of a society secure in life and dignity in present time and for the foreseeable future. It also means that the different elements of peacebuilding have to be clearly identified and related to one another. A task of a strategy of peacebuilding is to arrive at an interaction among all these factors, creating the sustainable conditions that yield the basic security needed (Wallensteen, 2010).

It is no doubt that to be relevant in this regard, it must do so strategically, at every level of society and across the potentially polarizing lines of ethnicity, class, religion, and race. It means that strategic peacebuilding should be directed to the development of capacities for maximizing the positive overcomes of efforts and activities for constructive change within this complexity. Or in the words of the John P. Lederach "it focuses on transforming inhumane social patterns, flawed structural conditions, and open violent conflict that weaken the conditions necessary for a flourishing human community" (Lederach, 2010).

Strategic peacebuilding therefore denotes an approach to reducing violence, resolving conflict and building peace that is marked by a heightened awareness of and skilful adaption to the complex and shifting material, geopolitical, economic and cultural realities of our increasingly globalized and interdependent world. Accordingly, peacebuilding that is strategic draws intentionally and shrewdly on the overlapping and imperfectly coordinated presences, activities, and resources

of various international, transnational, national, regional and local institutions, agencies, and movements that influence the causes, expressions and outcomes of conflict. Strategic peace builders take advantage of emerging and established patterns of collaboration and interdependence for the purposes of reducing violence and alleviating the root causes of deadly conflict. They encourage the deeper and more frequent convergence of mission, resources, expertise, insight and benevolent self-interest that characterizes the most fruitful multilateral collaborations in the cause of peace.

As a result of all previously mentioned, several significant aspects of strategic peace- building emerge. As first it is no doubt that strategic peacebuilding is and should be based on comprehensive approach. Actually, a wide range of actors (local, national, international) and activities that will contribute to the efficient realization of the set goals (long-term and short-term) of strategic peace building must be included in its realization. Such approach does not necessarily mean creation of new entities in charge of strategic peacebuilding, but strengthening of the awareness and promotion of the role that the various already existing (state and non-state) entities and actors should have in this regard. As an example, the role of educational institutions can be pointed out, which, in addition to their educational role, can and should also play a significant role in restoring broken communication, reducing prejudices, re-establishing and strengthening mutual trust, etc., especially in societies that are in the phase of conflict transformation or post-conflict reconstruction. However, strategic peacebuilding in this regard, must be based on clear vision and design involving wide range of peacebuilding actors with precisely defined tasks, activities and responsibilities.

Still, such different actors and activities should not be perceived and analysed separately from each other, but through the prism of their necessary interdependence. In this regard, strategic peacebuilding is a system of interconnected actors, roles and activities that should be capable in designing and providing peace. So, the desired positive changes that should be achieved through peace building and conflict transformation are only possible through existence of quality mutual relations and activities of the actors involved. Actually, peacebuilding infrastructure can be linked to the foundation and pillars that hold up a house (Lederach & Appleby, 2010). In this context, the foundations are all involved actors, their relationships, and the social spaces needed to support the processes of change from division, violence and conflict, to increased ownership and responsibility for the peacebuilding.

The next significant strategic peacebuilding aspect is related to the need for sustainability, or in other words to the need for initiation of long-term positive, structural and sustainable changes which should be achieved through the wide range of activities of the various actors involved. In this sense, peacebuilding should be perceived and accepted as a set of activities aimed at creating capacities that will be able for effectively dealing with the various challenges that peacebuilding

or conflict transformation may face in the long term. In this regard, the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015), recognizes that there can be no sustainable development without (sustainable) peace and no peace without sustainable development. Actually, article 35 of the Agenda, points out that sustainable development cannot be realized without peace and security; and peace and security will be at risk without sustainable development (UN, 2015). Therefore, it recognizes the need to build peaceful, just and inclusive societies that provide equal access to justice and that are based on respect for human rights (including the right to development), on effective rule of law and good governance at all levels and on transparent, effective and accountable institutions. As the main challenges and factors which give rise to violence, insecurity and injustice in this regard, are addressed: inequality, corruption, poor governance and illicit financial and arms flows. Hence, the need to intensify efforts in resolving or preventing conflict, as well as to support post-conflict countries, including through ensuring that women have a role in peace-building and state-building is strongly recognized. It follows in this aspect, that the sustainability of peace building is connected to the processes of structural reforms, state building and development, which should eliminate the structural reasons for the emergence of conflicts or the recurrence of violence.

Conclusion

During past 40 years, especially after the end of the Cold War, the international community (primarily the UN) initiated the application and development of many new instruments and mechanisms for the preservation and maintenance of peace and security. Among them, peace building and conflict transformation are of particular importance. The analysis in the paper shows that although we are talking about two different terms and instruments, there is still a certain interconnection and complementarity between them, especially when referring to the peace and security objectives. Actually, both of them in general aim to strengthen and institutionalize (civil) peace and state structures that are assumed to be sufficient to prevent a return to violence as well as to eliminate structural causes of conflict. Therefore, both of them present a challenging and complex dynamic process of change, involving different sectors, levels and actors. In fact, both of them are based on comprehensive approach, addressing a range of dimensions (micro- to macro- issues, local to global levels, grassroots to elite actors, short-term to long-term timescales), and aiming in developing capacity and supporting structural change, rather than to facilitate outcomes or deliver settlements.

Moreover, as it was mentioned above, all of the involved actors and institutions should be able to make systematic analyses of complex problems related to issues of conflict, war and peace, and should be able to draw up sustainable and feasible solutions for the needs identified in the current field. In fact, this is one of the more serious challenges faced by both approaches, up to today. Namely, in contrast to

the created (to a certain extent) structure of the International community (primarily in the UN, EU, OSCE) in relation to the issues of peace building and the conflict transformation, we are witnessing the absence or insufficient development of such a structure at national and local level. It means that national and local institutions (especially in underdeveloped and developing countries) are still challenged to recognize and accept the realization of their roles in peacebuilding and conflict transformation approaches. Considering the importance of all actors (including national and local) in both approaches, it is necessary to overcome this so-called strategic deficit and a much clearer definition of the roles of all actors involved.

An additional (strategic) challenge about the successful implementation of both instruments stems from the concrete military and geo-political context in which the instruments need to be applied, as well as from the dilemma of choosing the most productive activities in a given period.

For example, despite the initial positive impacts of both instruments, especially through UN missions in Africa (Namibia 1989-1990, Cambodia 1992-1993, Mozambique 1992-1994, Sierra Leone 1999-2005, Côte d'Ivoire 2004-2017, Mali 2013-,), and in Europe (R. Macedonia 1995-1998, 2001-2005, E. Slavonia/ Croatia 1996-1998) etc., unfortunately today we are witnessing the absence of the application of these instruments in Ukraine for almost a year now. In fact, on the one hand, we are witnessing that for a whole year, armed fights have been going on (with great human and infrastructural losses on both sides) on Ukrainian territory, and at the same time, on the other hand, apart from the sanctions taken, there is no other instrument of the International community that would initiate a reduction of the conflict intensity and would open the space for post-conflict peace building. The given example highlights the need for a possible strategic redesign of the application of the both instruments in different geographical, military and geo-political contexts.

However, a positive peace as a main goal of peacebuilding and conflict transformation should be accepted as a fundamental prerequisite for development. As such, it is a responsibility of all (local, national, regional and global) actors. On other side, conflicts that have reached a peaceful settlement may arise again unless underlying causes are removed. Therefore, peacebuilding and conflict transformation efforts should be used strategically, not just to prevent and settle conflicts, but also to consolidate peace after reaching settlement. Therefore, both of them, peacebuilding and conflict transformation should be accepted as long-term efforts in changing structures that are conducive to conflict, as well as to include development during and after armed conflicts. In strategically point of view, such long-term efforts should be directed to the several fields: 1) security; 2) institution building; 3) socio-economic development; and 4) reconciliation and justice. It means that their activities should be covered by security, political and economic dimensions that will provide security through demobilizing and disarming troops (Macedonian

case, 2001), training new police forces (Mali 2013-,), and adopting and enforcing laws (EULEX mission in Kosovo). Regarding to the second segment, a system of governance must be built in direction that ensures representation of all social groups with providing sufficient guarantees of human, cultural and other rights. This especially applies to situations in which we are talking about internal conflicts, between different groups in a concrete society. In this regard, the third or so called socio-economic development approach should aim at avoiding any marginalization, as well in providing socio-economic opportunities for all the groups that have been involved in conflict.

In fact, peacebuilding is what most developed societies do spontaneously - namely develop effective national and international rule making regimes, dispute resolution mechanisms and cooperative arrangements to meet basic economic, social, cultural and humanitarian needs and to facilitate effective global citizenship.

References

- An Agenda for Peace – Preventive Diplomacy, Peace-making and Peace-keeping (1992). Report of The Secretary General on the work of the Organization, adopted by the Security Council, A/47/277.

- Azar, E.E., Burton, J.W. (1986): International Conflict Resolution – Theory and Practice. Wheatsheaf, Brighton.

- Brown, M.E. (1996): The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict. The MIT Press, Cambridge.

- Clements, K. (1997) "Peace Building and Conflict Transformation", Peace and Conflict Studies: Vol. 4: No. 1, Article 2.

- Fetherston, A.B. (1993): Towards a Theory of United Nations Peacekeeping. In: Peace Research Report, No.31. University of Bradford, Bradford.

- Георгиева, Л. (2007). Творење на мирот – мирот, безбедноста и конфликтите по Студената војна. Филозофски факултет, Скопје.

- Holtzman, S. 1996. Post Conflict Reconstruction. Washington: Social Policy and Resettlement Division of the World Bank.

- Lederach, J.P. 1995. Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation across Cultures, New York: Syracuse University Press

- Lederach, J. P. 1997. Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies, Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press

- Lederach, J. P. (1997). Justpeace: The Challenge of the 21st Century, in: People Building Peace. Utrecht: European Centre for Conflict Prevention.

- Miall, H. (2004). Conflict Transformation: A Multi-Dimensional Task. Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management.

- Mitchell, C.R. (1994). The Structure of International Conflict. Macmillan, London.

- Picciotto, R., Weaving, R. (2006): Security and Development: Investing in Peace and Prosperity. London: Routledge.

- Tonnesson, S. (2006). Strategic deficit in peace building and conflict prevention. In Picciotto, R., and Weaving R. (eds.) Security and Development: Investing in Peace and Prosperity. London: Routledge.

- Wallensteen, P. (2010) Strategic Peacebuilding: Concepts and Challenges. In Daniel Philpott & Gerard F. Powers ed.: Strategies of Peace – Transforming Conflict in a Violent World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.