

# FINAL PUBLISHABLE SUMMARY REPORT

## Executive Summary

Peace is elusive and the quest for peace is perpetual. In the Middle East and Western Balkans, the transition from war to peace is notoriously complex. In this project, peace and justice is viewed as mutually related and just peace is seen as a precondition for a durable peace. Hence, one overarching aim of the project has been to dissect the complex *interplay* between peace and justice in war-torn societies in order to distinguish the various conceptualisations of the notion of just peace. It distinguishes just peace as an *outcome* from just peace as a *process*. Four divergent perspectives and outcomes of just peace have been explored: (1) order (2) retribution (3) restoration and (4) distribution. Moreover, some specific processes of *just peacemaking and peacebuilding* have been identified as providing space for the construction of an intersubjectively rooted notion of just peace. These processes of negotiation, deliberation and reconciliation are mutually intertwined and most often reinforce each other.



To shed new theoretical and conceptual light on the *problematique* of building just and durable peace and to offer policy-relevant advice, this project has identified three critical challenges. The first challenge focuses on the *quest for justice* in contemporary peace processes, which has become increasingly apparent as several violent conflicts and wars are distinguished by gross human rights violation and ethnic cleansing. The second challenge concerns the *quest for durable peace*. Several contemporary conflicts tend to resist negotiated settlement. Yet, the ones that do reach a peace agreement still have a poor track record on implementation. The third challenge relates to the *quest for effective strategies*, particularly concerning the involvement of international actors in peacebuilding.

This project has utilised an interdisciplinary approach to address these challenges and thus has drawn on insights from peace and conflict research, international law, political science and international relations. The project has four core scientific objectives: (1) to enhance theoretical and methodological conceptualisation of just and durable peace; (2) to analyse legal and democratic accountability of peacebuilding strategies; (3) to examine the effectiveness of general peacebuilding strategies and evaluate to what extent they enhance just and durable peace; and (4) to examine and compare EUs peacebuilding strategies in Western Balkans and the Middle East.



The main result is the systematic refinement of the multidisciplinary paradigm to the study of just and durable peace, which consists of a theoretical and methodological framework. By the use of different theoretical and methodological approaches, new understandings of the complex interplay between justice and peace and how this may produce a self-sustainable peace has emerged. A cornerstone of this paradigm is the conceptualisation of just peace as qualitatively different from the notion of positive peace since it makes no universal claims. Methodologically, the state-of-the-art research is advanced by utilising single case analyses, comparative analyses as well as large-n statistical correlations. Empirically, the project has generated new insights related to the Middle East and Western Balkans regarding the (1) international-local dynamics, (2) hybridity of peace and justice, (3) development of EU peacebuilding framework, (4) narratives of justice and visions of peace and reconciliation; and (5) amnesty provisions in peace agreements and their affect on durable peace

## Summary description of the project context and objectives

In the Middle East and Western Balkans, the transition from war to peace is a slow process with obstacles and setbacks as well as some progress. Hence, the goal of establishing just and durable peace is a fundamental challenge to contemporary peacemakers and academics alike. In order to shed new theoretical and conceptual light on the *problematique* of building just and durable peace in war-torn societies, and to offer policy-relevant advice to practitioners, the research team of JAD-PbP has identified three critical challenges, which constitute the core of the project. The first challenge focuses on the *quest for justice* in contemporary peace processes, which has become increasingly apparent as several violent conflicts and wars are distinguished by gross human rights violation, ethnic cleansing and extensive suffering among civilians. There is an emerging consensus both among scholars and practitioners that we are now witnessing a shift from old to new types of war and conflict. These are characterised by their destructive identity-driven spirals of violence. Even though these conflicts differ in contexts and histories, they share the distinct feature of being particularly resistant to conflict settlement through negotiation and traditional diplomacy. The use of transitional justice mechanisms, for instance, democratic reforms, protection of human rights and the (re)installation of the rule of law, have come to the fore on the peacebuilding agenda. For example, demands for accountability at the negotiation table of one or more parties play a central role, but also beyond with additional demands from civil society, NGOs and the international community. At the same time, transitional justice may create “sticking points” during negotiations due to fear of some parties to lose privileges or being imprisoned because of serious human rights abuses. By granting amnesty to likely perpetrators of gross human rights violations as a way to reach a peace agreement it may in the long-run undermine the prospect of just and durable peace. Thus, there is an in-built tension between justice and peace where in some cases the making of justice may hinder the making of peace.

The second challenge concerns the *quest for durable peace*. Several contemporary conflicts tend to resist negotiated settlement. Yet, the ones that do reach a peace agreement still have a poor track record on implementation. Frequently there is a continuation of resistance, unconventional fighting and low intensity conflicts following peace agreements.



Particularly problematic is the management of spoiler groups, which has begun to receive increasing attention both among policy-makers as well as academics. Spoilers are groups who intentionally act to undermine peace processes with violent means. Consequently, different types of endings of war have bearing on the question of how durable peace agreements are in the aftermath of conflict and the potential risks of relapse to war. One important assumption stressed in JAD-PbP is therefore the existence of multiple continuities rather than simply discontinuities between conflict and peace. Conflict as well as peacemaking is intimately connected and therefore viewed as part of a continuous process.

The third challenge relates to the *quest for effective strategies*, particularly concerning the involvement of external international actors in peacebuilding. A source



of concern to the international community in recent years is how to manage and promote just and durable peace in failed states and conflict-torn societies. Why, when and how peace support operations should be conducted are still questions that lack convincing answers. Moreover, the recent doctrine of the "responsibility to protect" (R2P) has challenged the traditional understanding on the use of force as it presents the idea that it may be used as part of peacebuilding and protection of human rights. But what happens if promoting peace turns into a cause of war? Another important issue concerns the established peacebuilding models that focus on institutions and top-down approaches to political, economic and legal frameworks. They tend to undervalue associated issues of welfare, society and culture, which are in fact complementary to the reconstruction of the social contract in post-conflict settings, as the European experience has underlined on several occasions. Efficient peacebuilding strategies also relates to the legal and democratic accountability of states and international organisations in comprehensive post-conflict peacebuilding. A pressing problem is thus how to create a durable and self-sustaining liberal peace, including rule of law within and between states, democratic institutions, human rights, a vibrant civil society, and free market economy that is more than a rhetorical compromise between local elites and international or regional peacebuilders. As of today, liberal peacebuilding receives much of its material support from international actors, an area of increasing EU engagement. The EU has expanded its peacebuilding efforts particularly in Western Balkans and the Middle East, which provide fertile empirical ground to assess, analyse and draw some significant conclusions on its roles and peacebuilding strategies.

JAD-PbP is convinced that the only way to address these challenges is through an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on insights in peace and conflict research, international law, political science and international relations in order to make significant contributions to science, policy-making and to the cause of just and durable peace.

## **Project objectives**

### *1. Enhance theoretical and methodological conceptualisation of just and durable peace.*

The overall objective is to advance state-of-the-art in peace and conflict research by constructing an interdisciplinary theoretical paradigm and enhance policy-relevant knowledge on the interplay and tension between justice, durability and peacebuilding strategies. By utilising multidisciplinary approaches, which combine complementary quantitative and qualitative methods, it may bring both rigor and comprehensiveness to the study of peacebuilding efforts – a subject that has been subjected to too little systematic analysis.

### *2. Analyse legal and democratic accountability of peacebuilding strategies.*

A second objective is to assess law and theory of accountability in peacebuilding and investigate the development of a new body of law – *jus post bellum* – to manage post-conflict phases. Given the nature of contemporary conflicts where peace and war exist in parallel, the entire law of war may need to be reconceptualised. The impact on international criminal law and on processes of peace of the international Criminal Court is investigated. A new law of "crisis management," which emphasises the continuum between conflict and peace, may provide a more constructive legal framework.

### *3. Examine the effectiveness of general peacebuilding strategies and evaluate to what extent they enhance just and durable peace.*

A third objective is to identify the best practices, mechanisms and strategies in promoting peace while responding to demands for accountability and human rights protection. Demobilisation, Demilitarisation and Reintegration (DDR) and Security Sector Reforms (SSR) in particular will be assessed, and how they are combined with peace negotiations. Mapping how, by whom and to what extent international norms on just and durable peace are diffused in contemporary peacebuilding is examined. Human security as a guiding principle for peace support operations is also explored as the impact of international criminal law on the process of peace. By comparative examination of a range of cases from the Middle East and Western Balkans, grounded theoretical advancement of efficient strategies is forwarded in an attempt to bridge the gap between abstract concepts of peace and policy-relevant strategies for peacemaking.

### *4. Examine and compare EU:s peacebuilding strategies in Western Balkans and the Middle East.*

The last objective is to take stock of EU as a peacebuilding actor, specifically analysing, comparing and evaluating to what extent EU policies and peacebuilding strategies in the Middle East and Western Balkans promote just and durable peace. The cooperation between international actors and local power holders is explored as well as to what extent direct and sensitised engagement with post-conflict welfare and empowerment increases the prospect of just and durable peace. Drawing on these in-depth empirical cases and cross-country comparison, an assessment of CSDP:s focus on conflict prevention and crisis management is made.

## A description of the main S&T results/foregrounds

In the first project period, the major ambition was to generate an overarching theoretical and methodological framework for the systematic comparative empirical analyses conducted in the second period. A guidance paper on the legal framework of *jus post bellum*, commonly known as “law after war” has been developed. *Jus post bellum* refers to the new category of legal rules covering the aftermath of conflict. This legal framework can assist in the transformation from a situation of conflict to a situation of just and durable peace. *Jus post bellum* has also been related to other contemporary legal terms, such as the responsibility to protect (R2P), local ownership and transitional justice, which are accepted legal concepts. The usefulness and necessity of *jus post bellum* however, is much debated. The challenge identified in the project is how to develop a stringent and clear conceptualisation of *jus post bellum* while still have an encompassing legal framework. The main obstacle identified is the political unwillingness to accept the consequences of such a legal framework even though the notion of *jus post bellum* is widely supported and partly put in practice within the European Union and in the United Nations' normative context.

The project also explored how justice relates to the durability of peace agreements by drawing on the theoretical and methodological diversity, which exists within the research team. Three basic approaches have been utilised. The first calls for a tight link between justice and peace as the issue of justice is a major cause of conflict as well as to the foundation of peace. Justice includes procedural and substantive dimensions and both may be integrated in peacemaking efforts and in peace agreements. The second approach has two strands, one that reject any necessary link between justice and peace, and the other which does not negate this link in principle, but objects to the absolute conditional demand of such a link since it may prevent peace. A third approach emphasises the processes of constructing and establishing an intersubjective understanding of just peace. From this perspective, the crucial question is to what extent just peace agreements are more durable than other types of conflict resolution



agreements. Mutual satisfaction with a peace agreement is a precondition for the transition toward durable peace and reconciliation. This, it is suggested, may be accomplished when the parties view the negotiation process and the peace agreement as fair and just. Yet, since fairness and justice are most often not defined in objective terms, conflicting perceptions of what constitutes fair and just arrangements between the parties may create barriers to conflict resolution and in the implementation of peace agreements. These issues were empirically assessed at the regional seminars held in Jerusalem and Ramallah where the research group discussed them with local stakeholders,

academics and policymakers.

Within the project group there is a consensus that peace and justice cannot be separated, but how and when the two should be related is elaborated upon from different theoretical perspectives. One important aspect here is the sequencing of peacebuilding efforts and transitional justice in order to achieve a durable peace. Peacebuilding and transitional justice are multifaceted processes, which often are treated as if they were in opposition. The researchers have mapped out various transitional justice mechanisms and related them to peacebuilding strategies for conflict-affected areas. While recognising the tensions between peacebuilding and transitional justice activities, these various efforts may actually involve shared objectives and synergies to be gained. Yet, it is worth exploring further opportunities for better integrating strategies of peacebuilding with mechanisms of transitional justice. For

example, transitional justice activities could potentially act as inducements to participate in DDR processes and rule of law activities, which can be mutually reinforcing.

Another theme of discussion relates to the dilemma of identifying effective strategies to link justice, durability and peace. Here the project has explored the emergence of a “fourth generation peacebuilding” in contrast to the existing three generations of peacebuilding to end violent conflict. More specifically, the project provides an exploration and investigation as well as an assessment of the emerging EU peacebuilding framework and its potentials and pitfalls from top-down and bottom-up perspectives. A critical approach to liberal peacebuilding is developed, which emphasises social welfare and justice, and stresses the need to engage with the local context as well as with local reactions and responses to peacebuilding. It attempts to identify the authentic local actor with agency, autonomy and



independence in post-conflict environments and semi-protectorates dominated by the presence of international actors with extensive powers.

Around twenty conference papers were written in the first period, presented and peer-reviewed in panels on the theme of just and durable peace at various international conferences (International Studies Association 2008, 2009, British International Studies Association, 2008) and at regional seminars with local stakeholders in Jerusalem and Ramallah, 2009. Members of the scientific advisory board have been asked to act as discussants. The panels have been very well-attended by other scholars

and stakeholders, which indicate the topical *problematique* that the project is exploring as well as providing a great opportunity to inform and disseminate research results. In addition, an internal workshop was held in London to coordinate, communicate and integrate research results. The project has generated different forms of publications in the first period, such as guidance papers, summary reports from Jerusalem and Ramallah, JAD-PbP working Papers, academic articles and policy briefs, which have been published and distributed widely in both academic and policy circles as well as published on the website. Fieldwork was conducted to compile data, conduct interviews and surveys in Israel, the West Bank, Lebanon and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Interviews with local stakeholders have generated new insights into the local perceptions of justice and peace. These empirical insights have contributed to develop criteria first, for assessing peacebuilding strategies and transitional justice mechanisms; second to identify local agency and autonomy; and third for local articulations of peace and justice as well as communication channels.

In the second period, the ambition was to explore the ideas and practices of just and durable peace to enhance science and policy relevant knowledge of how to build a just and self-sustainable peace. The research team has focused in particular on the (1) the dilemmas of justice and peace, (2) the processes of building just and durable peace, and (3) EU:s capacity for peacebuilding. These issues were extensively discussed at a policy-conference in Brussels in February 2010. One important ambition was to push the debate beyond the dualism of peace versus justice. It was recognised that justice and durable peace are closely interlinked in the value-laden notion of just peace. This was extensively analysed in relations to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and to EU



peacebuilding practices in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Even though the researchers hold different views of the sequencing of justice and peacemaking they conclude that just peace does not contain universal claims. Instead, just peace constitutes shared justice principles based on an intersubjective understanding of what the concept entails. An additional finding drawn from the empirical analyses relates to the durability of just peace and highlights the continuities rather than discontinuities between war and peace. This is illustrated by the *problematique* of frozen conflicts and prolonged peace processes where spoiling increases the risks of a relapse to violence, and where peace gaps and lack of progress in a peace process demobilise peace constituencies, which result in peace fatigue.



On the problems of building just and durable peace, the JAD-PbP research team conducted some empirical assessments of transitional justice and peacebuilding strategies in conflict prone and post-conflict societies. One conclusion is that efforts to build a just and durable peace demand good timing, international as well as local efforts and coherent strategies and synergies between peacebuilding and justice strategies. In states emerging from violent conflicts, the populations will generally have experienced significant human rights abuses or violations of international humanitarian law, and they are likely to call for some form of justice, whether juridical or not. Transitional justice is in essence about meeting their demands for justice and accountability for crimes committed during violent conflicts. However, a dilemma emerges as these calls for justice are likely to fuel tensions, exacerbate conflicts and generate renewed violence that have the potential to undermine peacemaking and peacebuilding. Hence, tensions between the two goals of establishing peace and justice in war-shattered societies in the pursuit of justice may delay peacebuilding efforts. How to link peacebuilding policies with policies of transitional justice were therefore analysed in order to explore the contradictions and complementarities between building peace and doing justice. Delayed justice emerged as an important dimension, which once again highlighted the importance of time and timing in peacebuilding and transitional justice.

With regards EU peacebuilding strategies in the Middle East and the Western Balkans it was concluded that the EU has at times difficulties in dealing with the local norms and contexts as well as complex political structures. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the EU struggles with the complexities, but has the potential through the enlargement process to make a positive difference in the region if it develops an approach that transcends a pure form of conflict management. On this topic, a regional seminar was held in Sarajevo where the research group interacted with local stakeholders as well as policymakers.



The EU peacebuilding approaches to the Middle East focused primarily on the EU's main policy programmes – the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) and the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), as well as specific actions in favour of the Middle East Peace Process (MEPP). It was concluded that EU peacebuilding in the region could

benefit from incorporating culturally meaningful forms of resolution and reconciliation at the grassroots level. A policy conference was held in Amman bringing together high-profile scholars and policy-makers from the Middle East region to explore the lessons learnt from

previous mediation and reconciliation attempts and how future third-party interventions may be more effective, reliable and legitimate.

On the role of the EU in peacebuilding, a policy conference was held in Brussels with the ambition to bridge the gap between policy and research and promote dialogue between scholars and practitioners. Some conclusions and recommendations for the EU emerged from this dialogue, such as the importance to (1) invest sufficient time, expertise and money in peacebuilding and transitional justice, (2) invest in political change and empowerment processes, (3) sensitise peacebuilding and transitional justice strategies.

Extensive fieldwork guided by theoretical perspectives, analytical frameworks, and various methodologies has been undertaken during the second period in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Lebanon, Israel and the West Bank as well as in Brussels. The insights from the field work in Bosnia-Herzegovina highlights the complexities of the peace-building process in the Western Balkans, and that any just and durable peace in the region has to be defined from a ‘bottom-up’ perspective. The fieldwork in Israel and the West Bank highlights the discrepancy in EU peacebuilding in theory and practice, which is partially due to the political and institutional weaknesses of the EU. It also relates to the asymmetrical nature of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which inhibits third parties to play more constructive roles in the Middle East Peace Process. Fieldworks in Lebanon as well as in Bosnia-Herzegovina focused on the internationalisation of criminal justice as well as the hybrid tribunals where international and local judicial practices are combined.



In the second period, two edited volumes and three monographs have been completed. Around thirteen peer-reviewed articles have been authored and will be published, for example, in *Security Dialogue*, *Global Governance*, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, and *Journal of Conflict, Security and Development*. Seven working papers in the JAD-PbP Working Paper series, seven Policy Briefs as well as two regional seminar reports and one conference report have been published and distributed widely in both academic and policy circles as well as published on the website during the second period. The website has proved popular as more than 11.000 visitors have visited the website [www.justpeace.eu](http://www.justpeace.eu) during the last two years. Panels have been organised at five international conferences and all the panels have been very well-attended by other scholars and stakeholders, which indicate the topical *problematique* that the project is exploring as well as providing a great opportunity to inform and disseminate research results. Furthermore, the members of the project have been highly active in media disseminating the results to a wide audience outside academia. In addition, two internal project workshops have been held in Bath and St Andrews during this period to coordinate, communicate and integrate research results.

## **Description of work packages**

*WPO (Coordination)* established and implemented the operational, financial and scientific management structure of JAD-PbP. It worked towards a) securing the effective and efficient operational, financial and scientific management of the project, b) to facilitate the internal communication to ensure integration of work packages, theoretical and empirical work, and c) to assure quality within JAD-PbP by securing internal consistence within the project, and by



monitoring the effectiveness and impact of JAD-PbP in relationships to its goals. WP0 was also responsible to edit and publish policy briefs and the JAD-PbP working paper series and an edited volume of the integrated work on the *Study of Just and Durable Peace*. It was responsible for the following deliverables: D1. Internet portal, D2. Submit panel proposal for a panel on just and durable peace at an international conference, ISA D.9. Dissemination and use plan, D10. Summary report from a European conference between academics and policymakers on peacebuilding strategies, D14. European workshop on just and durable peace, ECPR, D18. Edited volume on the study of just and durable peace.

*WP1: Theories and Methods on Just and Durable Peace* occupied a central place in the overall project by examining general conditions and requirements for achieving a just and durable peace. WP 1 was tasked with a) examine general conditions and requirements for achieving a just and durable peace, b) advance policy-relevant theory on the tensions between peace and justice in conflict resolution and peacebuilding, c) utilise interdisciplinary approaches to develop new methods and tools of inquiry to the study of just and durable peace, d) advance new theory and concepts on the *problematique* of just and durable peace. Reports on statistic correlations between justice and durable peace agreements were discussed and integrated into the WP2, WP3 and WP4. The results from WP2 on legal and democratic accountability in post-conflict peacebuilding were eventually integrated in WP1 and the first results were presented at an international peer-reviewed conference (ISA, 2008). Results from WP3 on effective peacebuilding strategies, which promote durable peace as well as accountability, were integrated in WPI and presented at an international peer-reviewed conference (BISA, 2008). Finally, the end results of WP2, WP3 and WP4 were concluded in WP1, where new theory and concepts on the *problematique* of just and durable peace was advanced. Workpackage 1 was responsible for the following deliverables: D2. Scientific papers presented at international peer-reviewed conference, ISA, D5. Report on statistic correlation between justice and durable peace agreement, D7. Scientific papers presented at peer-reviewed conference, BISA, D13. International peer reviewed articles on just and durable peace, D14. Scientific papers presented at European peer-reviewed workshop, ECPR D18. Contributing chapters to edited volume on the study of just and durable peace.

*WP2: Norms, Rights and Accountability* was tasked to a) map and categorize existing international norms on the use of force by states for humanitarian reasons, b) assess legal and democratic accountability of states and international organisations in post-conflict peacebuilding, c) reconceptualise *jus post bellum* and provide a guidance paper for a new body of law – *jus post bellum* – to manage post-conflict phases. These results were integrated with WP3, which also addressed questions of accountability and human rights protection. WP2 was responsible for the following deliverables: D3. Theoretical informed guidance paper for evaluating and comparing effective peacebuilding strategies and transitional justice, D6. Guidance paper on *jus post bellum* and typology of international norms on the use of force for humanitarian reasons, D7. Scientific papers presented at a peer-reviewed conference, BISA, D11. International peer reviewed articles on the legal accountability of states and IOs in post-conflict peacebuilding.

*WP3: Policies and Strategies* was tasked to a) identify best practices and mechanisms in promoting peace while responding to demands for accountability and human rights protection, b) assess coercive strategies in addressing security threats and challenges, c) assess DDR and its contribution to peacebuilding, as well as effects on promotion of human rights, d) analyse to what extent the development of rule of law promotes peacebuilding, e) assess the practical and theoretical connections between political, legal, social, welfare and cultural institutions as

envisaged in the peacebuilding model, f) examine and compare the effectiveness of general peacebuilding strategies, specifically relating to DDR programs, the development of rule of law, human rights protection and demands of accountability. A theoretical informed guidance paper for evaluating and comparing effective peacebuilding strategies and transitional justice was presented, particularly relating to the tensions between peace negotiations and demands for accountability, truth and repatriation. These results were compared and integrated with in-depth empirical case analyses conducted in WP4 in which the EU plays a dominant role as a peacebuilding actor. A European policy conference between academics and policymakers on peacebuilding strategies was held in Brussels (m24) to discuss some of the preliminary findings and results, which provided the basis for policy-oriented documents with recommendations on general peacebuilding strategies. WP3 was responsible for the following deliverables D2. Scientific papers at a peer-reviewed conference, ISA D3. Theoretical informed guidance paper for evaluating and comparing effective peacebuilding strategies and transitional justice, D7. Scientific papers presented at a peer-reviewed conference, BISA, D11. International peer reviewed articles on the legal accountability of states and IOs in post-conflict peacebuilding, D14. Scientific papers presented at a peer-reviewed workshop, ECPR, D15. Policy-oriented documents with recommendations for states, international organisations and donors on general peacebuilding strategies, D18. Contributing chapters to edited volume on the Study of Just and Durable Peace.

*WP4: EU Peacebuilding Strategies in Western Balkans and the Middle East* developed an analytical and methodological framework for evaluating and comparing EU:s peacebuilding strategies. One dimension of this was to explore the cooperation between the international community and local power holders in the processes towards establishing a self-sustainable peace. A second dimension was to evaluate to what extent direct and sensitised engagement with post conflict individual welfare and empowerment increases the prospect of just and durable peace. This was developed in collaboration with W1 and W3 in a guidance paper on an analytical framework for comparing EU:s peacebuilding strategies. Regional seminars were held in Western Balkans and the Middle East with local stakeholders and extensive field works were conducted for the empirical analysis of these two regions. WP4 was responsible for the following deliverables: D2. Scientific papers at a peer-reviewed conference, ISA, D4. Guidance paper on analytical framework for comparing EU:s peacebuilding strategies D7. Scientific papers presented at a peer-reviewed conference, BISA, D8. Summary reports on regional seminars with local stakeholders in Western Balkan and the Middle East, D12. International peer reviewed articles on EU:s peacebuilding strategies in Western Balkans and the Middle East, D14. Scientific papers presented at European peer-reviewed workshop, ECPR, D16. Popular science articles on EU:s doctrine on peace support, D17. Research monographs, PhD dissertation on just and durable peacebuilding in Western Balkans and the Middle East, D18. Contributing chapters to edited volume on the Study of Just and Durable Peace.

## **Main results**

The main result is the advancement of a multidisciplinary paradigm, consisting of a theoretical and methodological framework to enhance the state-of-the art for the study of just and durable peace. Theoretically, it concerns a critical assessment of the complex relationship between the concepts of justice, durability and how these notions interplay with establishing a self-sustainable peace. These results are compiled in the edited volume on the *Study of Just and Durable Peace*, which were peer-reviewed in a workshop at the European Consortium of Political Science Research in Münster, March 2010. By the use of different theoretical and

methodological approaches, new understandings of the complex interplay between justice and peace and how this may produce a self-sustainable peace has emerged. A cornerstone of this paradigm is the conceptualisation of just peace as qualitatively different from the notion of positive peace since it makes no universal claims. The project argues that for peace to take root and become self-sustainable, it needs to generate broader intersubjective understandings among the parties rather than to rest upon objective justice principles. Such a conceptualisation may be compatible with local understandings of peace. Improved policy-relevant knowledge on the interaction between transitional justice mechanisms and peacebuilding has been developed as well as on the new category of legal rules, *jus post bellum*, covering the aftermath of violent conflict. The project finds that important synergies are found if the sequencing of tools and strategies are well planned and in accordance with local understandings of peace and justice.

Empirically, the project has generated new insights to the (1) international-local dynamics and the hybridity of peace and justice, (2) evolving EU peacebuilding framework (3) narratives of justice and visions of peace and reconciliation, (4) to the peace processes in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Middle East, and (5) to amnesty provisions in peace agreements.

Methodologically, the multidisciplinary paradigm is advanced by utilising a variety of methods and approaches, which improve our understanding of justice, peace and durability. The state-of-the-art research is advanced by the application of single case analyses, comparative analyses as well as large-n statistical correlations. Quantitative measures of assessing durable peace agreements have been tested. For example, statistical correlations between amnesty and durable peace agreements depicts the usefulness of statistical methods for mapping various transitional justice mechanisms, which are related to durable peace as well as exploring trends in the relationship between peace and justice. One interesting result from a statistical analysis, emanating from the Uppsala conflict database, concluded that the inclusion of amnesty provisions in peace agreements significantly reduces the risk that a peace agreement will fail in the sense that there is a return to fighting within the first two years after the signing of the peace agreement. However, this is only in cases where the political institutions are authoritarian. In democracies, and in regimes in flux, amnesty provisions have no pacifying effect. Instead peace agreements with amnesty provisions are less likely to last over the crucial two year period if the institutional setting is democratic or in flux than if the setting is an authoritarian regime. Another methodological approach is the narrative one, which highlights the plurality of interpretations and meanings connoted to peace processes and peace in general. Finally, comparative method on peacebuilding has been investigated and outlined in order to guide the evaluation and comparison between various empirical cases for the second period. These insights open up new avenues for exploring the relationships and dynamics between the international community and local stakeholders. The multidisciplinary paradigm has been applied to provide a comparative analysis of the Middle East and the Western Balkans. The plurality of approaches and methodologies used in the empirical analysis provided for in-depth understandings of the individual cases and for comprehensive knowledge through the comparative and quantitative analyses where the Western Balkans and the Middle East were placed in a global perspective compared with African, Latin American and Asian peacebuilding and transitional justice cases. Some of the findings from comparing transitional justice mechanisms in Lebanon, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Cambodia relate to the hybridity of justice, which emerges when international standards meet local practices.

## Potential impact and dissemination activities

From the outset, the project group has witnessed a strong interest both in and outside academia of the *problematique* of just and durable peace. This provides great opportunities for efficient dissemination activities. Research results generated within the project have been presented at various international conferences, which contribute to enhancing the state-of-the-art in international relations, peace and conflict research, and international law. Moreover, it strengthens and widens the interdisciplinary cooperation between researchers in this area of analysis. The goal of establishing just and durable peace is a fundamental challenge to contemporary peace-makers and academics alike. Hence, to overcome the discrepancy between peacebuilding in theory and in practice, and to make theories relevant to the formulation of policy the project group distilled a number of policy recommendations. Policy-relevant knowledge has also been generated and presented in the form of *Policy Briefs* and recommendations about transitional justice, peacebuilding, power-sharing and gender issues in peacebuilding. In addition, the JAD-PbP *Working Paper Series* was established in order to disseminate the results timely and efficiently while awaiting publications of articles in international journals and books. Both the Policy Briefs and the Working paper series contribute to strengthening already well-established networks of local policy makers, diplomats and civil society representatives. It also contributes to improving policy at national and European level of peacebuilding activities towards the promotion of a just and durable peace in war torn societies. Regional seminars have been held in Jerusalem and Ramallah, and in Sarajevo during 2009, which encouraged the involvement of civil society organisations, regional and local stakeholders in research activities, information sharing and bottom up perspectives. The results of these meetings and discussions were published in two summary reports. Two high-profile policy conferences were held to enhance the dialogue with the policy-community. At the well-attended conference in Brussels, new insights to the *problematique* of building just and durable peace were gained and published in a summary report and policy brief. The policy conference in Amman focusing on the role of third-party intervention in regional conflicts in the Middle East attracted the attention of both diplomats and policymakers from the Middle East region. Important policy lessons were drawn from the assessment of third-party interventions, practised for decades, by both regional and western actors in inter-state conflicts with different degrees of success.



Overall, JAD-PbP has had an impact on:

*a) the advancement of state-of-the art in conflict and peace studies as well as knowledge on the transitional justice*

JAD-PbP builds on state-of the-art in peace and conflict studies, international law, political science and international relations, which focuses various peace support strategies and tools used by the international community and local actors to promote security, order and peace. One of the most significant conclusions from this rigorous body of research is that justice and peace are closely interlinked. Yet, even if this intuitively seems highly topical and relevant for any peacebuilding engagement, there is surprisingly little research done in this field.

- JAD-PbP advanced state-of-the-art in peace and conflict studies by constructing an interdisciplinary theoretical paradigm, developed new methods and tools of inquiry, and advanced policy-relevant knowledge on the interplay between peacebuilding and justice.
- JAD-PbP promoted policy relevant knowledge on the effectiveness of general peacebuilding strategies, generated from quantitative and qualitative comparative analyses of cases particularly from the Middle East and the Western Balkans. Important lesson-drawing from existing experiences provided input to the development of empirically grounded theoretical advancement of just and durable peace.
- JAD-PbP deepened the overall empirical knowledge of EU:s peacebuilding capacity by in-depth, comparative case studies from Western Balkans and the Middle East, thereby contributing to the development of an emerging EU framework for peacebuilding. New innovative strategies and “tool-box” for international and local actors alike was developed for the promotion of just and durable peace.

*b) Enhancing cooperation between researchers in Europe and in the areas under analysis*

- The JAD-PbP research consortium has been based on scientific excellence in the fields of peace and conflict studies, international law, political science and international relations, thereby was insights to the nexus of war and peace brought from four different yet interrelated disciplines. Hence, each participant brought his or her academic profile, competence and networks to the project for the benefit of the team members to enhance interdisciplinary research cooperation across Europe. The consortium also established cooperation between European scholars and researchers from the areas under analysis.
- Participants of JAD-PbP cooperated with several internationally recognised institutions and networks in the field of Peace and Conflict Studies where several of the participants hold key positions, such as Network of European Peace Scientists (NEPS), Stockholm Institute of Peace Research (SIPRI), International Peace Research Institute, (PRIO), International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS), International Peace Academy (IPA), International Crisis Group and International Alert, Chatham House, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI), Danish Institute of International Affairs (DIIS), Swedish Institutes of International Affairs, Swedish Network on Peace and Conflict Research, International Human Rights Obligations Network, International Commission of Jurists (IJC), and the American Society of International Law.
- Members of the Scientific Advisory Board were selected on the basis of their outstanding and leading positions in their respective scientific community as well as their extensive experience in large European and international research collaboration, which the participants of the JAD-PbP project took advantage of.
- JAD-PbP created opportunities to widen and deepen research cooperation by organising several panels at international conferences, such as the International Studies Association (ISA), British International Studies Association (BISA), the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), as well as regional seminars in the Middle East and Western Balkans, which provided additional opportunities to engage local research communities.
- The research undertaken may support the development of prescriptions to better

implement the protections of major international and regional human rights and international humanitarian law treaties and conventions in the context of peacemaking and peacebuilding. These include the Genocide Convention, the Convention against Torture, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols of 1977, and the Rome Treaty for the International Criminal Court.

- The information gathering method of JAD-PbP relied partly on fieldwork that contributed to strengthening already well-established networks of local policy makers, diplomats, civil society representatives and scholars. JAD-PbP has collaborative working relationships with policy-oriented peace and conflict and human rights NGOs in the Middle East, Western Balkans, and consults for the United Nations Development Programme on Peace and Governance issues.
- JAD-PbP developed policy for communication between the members of the project and interested scholars from regions outside Europe. For example, the [www.justpeace.eu](http://www.justpeace.eu) website is an effective means of communication and facilitated communication flows and collaborative initiatives between the project and researchers in the areas of analysis.

*c) Allowing the scholarly community to prepare for future steps towards engaging in a significant joint international research effort*

- JAD-PbP developed a sustainable framework for international collaboration on applied research in the field of peacebuilding and justice. The scholars engaged in JAD-PbP are increasingly well connected in European and international academia. The ambition of JAD-PbP was to actively merge these networks to facilitate future joint international research efforts on just and durable peace. The collaboration among the scholars within the JAD-PbP project continues in different constellations after finishing the project.
- JAD-PbP widened the networks in order to develop future joint research projects. One important ambition concerned developing closer cooperation with excellent and internationally recognised scholars from the new member states of the European Union, such as Slovenia, and from candidate countries such as Croatia, Macedonia and Turkey in order to jointly develop future research project. Scholars from this newly established network were invited for the regional seminar in Sarajevo in 2009 and for the ECPR workshop in 2010.
- JAD-PbP broadened the number of in-depth comparative case studies beyond the Middle East and Western Balkans to include, for example, cases from Africa and Asia in order to advance general theory as well as fine-tune EU:s peacebuilding policy.
- JAD-PbP arranged a series of panels (ISA 2008, 2009, BISA 2009, 2010, ECPR 2010, Swedish Peace and Conflict Research Conference in 2010), regional seminars in Jerusalem, Ramallah and Sarajevo, disseminating the results of JAD-PbP to international peers and provided opportunities to establish contacts with prominent scholars in the field. JAD-PbP provided supportive funding for such research participation. The participants of JAD-PbP were also encouraged to apply for membership in academic organisations, networks and councils, which overlap with similar goals and ambitions of JAD-PbP, to widen future collaboration with other

scholars.

*d) Improving the contribution to formulation, development and implementation of policy at European or national level including peace building and transitional justice initiatives*

- JAD-PbP addressed a highly topical and core goal of the contemporary evolution of a European Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), the EU External Action Service and the EU External Relations DG, namely how the EU can promote just and durable peace in war-torn societies. Based on in-depth comparative empirical analysis of the root causes, the triggering factors and overall conflict dynamics of contemporary conflicts in the Western Balkans and the Middle East, the research suggested an innovative model for the emerging EU Peacebuilding Framework.
- JAD-PbP addressed a major problem of the EU, which is the lack of a clear conceptual framework and a framework to guide EU's peacebuilding efforts. A well developed and framework for peacebuilding based on critical evaluations of existing policies, strategies and tools as well as lessons learned from previous operations could function as an umbrella under which central concepts and ideas developed in the CSDP such as conflict prevention, crisis management and peacebuilding can be combined in a coherent manner to provide guidance for future EU peace building efforts. Such a framework could easily incorporate the notion of "human security", "sustainable peace", justice and just peace, which addresses the root causes rather than just preventing the symptoms of conflict.
- JAD-PbP strengthened EU's evolving framework, which guides its engagement in conflict prevention, crisis management and peace promotion. By advancing a theoretically and empirically grounded model for how to promote just and durable peace by the use of both soft and hard powers of the EU four elements were emphasised. First, the dominant contemporary discourses of peace were explored as these clearly affect international as well as local peacemaking efforts. Second, the model presented a conceptualisation of peace relevant to the ambition of establishing a self-sustaining peace in the aftermath of violent conflict. Third, it set out to identify conducive conditions and circumstances under which just and durable peace could be constructed. It also identified the most important stumbling blocs in the process. Fourth, the project identified and assessed the relevance of various actors in peacemaking, evaluated the effectiveness of their strategies and tactics as well as the impact of these measures.
- JAD-PbP contributed to the development, formulation and implementation of national peacebuilding initiatives as well. For example, JAD-PbP has initiated a dialogue with the UK ministry for Foreign Affairs on issues pertaining to peacebuilding and transitional justice.

*e) Devising and testing strategies to involve relevant communities, stakeholders, practitioners in the making and/or diffusion of research*

JAD-PbP organised a number of conferences, seminars and meetings to promote information sharing and cooperation with various stakeholders and bridge the theory-policy gap:

- A European policy conference bringing together academics and policymakers was held on the effectiveness of peacebuilding strategies in Brussels in February 2010.
- Regional seminars in the Middle East and Western Balkans were held engaging with

local actors and regional stakeholders.

- JAD-PbP have well-established and on-going dialogues with policy-makers in the Foreign Offices, Development Agencies and NGOs on how to pursue appropriate and efficient policies and strategies to achieve just and durable peace.
- Some members of JAD-PbP are also experienced in teaching negotiation techniques and will transfer their knowledge to the relevant communities and stakeholders in the regions of analysis.
- Key members of the JAD-PbP consortium are appointed members in high level groups of practitioners and scholars charged with investigating issues of shared international concern and may through these activities ensure the dissemination of research to practitioners.

*f) Encouraging the involvement of civil society organisations in the research activities.*

- The fieldworks in the regions of analyses promoted exchange and collaboration with influential and reliable civil society organisations on information sharing, local support and bottom-up perspectives.
- The regional seminars provided an excellent opportunity to test preliminary results empirically beyond the academic community in close interaction with relevant local policy makers, representatives of local research communities and local stakeholders from civil society who are invited to participate.

JAD-PbP is committed to the dissemination of findings and results to audiences both inside and outside academia and has developed a dissemination plan to ensure the efficient dissemination of the research results. This has been achieved through:

- Presenting results and organising panels, workshops and roundtables at international conferences, such as the ISA conference 2008, 2009, the BISA conference 2009, 2010, the ECPR conference 2010, the Swedish Peace and Conflict Conference 2010.
- Establishing international networks of policy makers, regional and local stakeholders, civil society organisations, etc.
- Arranging regional seminars in the Jerusalem and Ramallah in the Middle East and in Sarajevo in the Western Balkans.
- Organising conference aimed at bridging the gap between scholars and practitioners such as the conference on Peacebuilding and Justice in Brussels February 2010 and on third party engagement in Peacebuilding in the Arab world in Amman, August 2010.
- Publishing articles in international scientific journals, such as *Security Dialogue*, *Global Governance*, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, *Journal of Conflict*, *Security and Development*, *Middle Eastern Studies* and *Journal of East and Southeastern Europe and Black Sea Studies*, an edited volume on *The Study of Just and Durable Peace*, research monographs, such as *Linking Justice to Peace* and *A Post-Liberal Peace* and PhD dissertations soon to be concluded.



## Contact details:

<http://www.justpeace.eu>

### *Project Coordinator:*

Associate Professor Karin Aggestam

Ph. +46 46 222 49 23

karin.agggestam@svet.lu.se

### *Project Manager:*

Associate Professor Annika

Björkdahl

Ph. +46 46 222 01 62

annika.bjorkdahl@svet.lu.se



<b>Beneficiary</b>	<b>Contact person</b>	<b>e-mail</b>
Lund University	Karin Aggestam	Karin.agggestam@svet.lu.se
Lund University	Annika Björkdahl	Annika.Bjorkdahl@svet.lu.se
Lund University	Ander Persson	Anders.Persson@svet.lu.se
Uppsala University	Inger Österdahl	Inger.Osterdahl@jur.uu.se
Uppsala University	Esther van der Zadel	esthervanzadel@hotmail.com
Uppsala University	Peter Wallensteen	Peter.Wallensteen@pcr.uu.se
Uppsala University	Anna Jarstad	Anna.jarstad@pcr.uu.se
Uppsala University	Erik Melander	Erik.Melander@pcr.uu.se
Bath University	Adrian Hyde Price	agvhp20@bath.ac.uk
Bath University	Alex Prichard	a.prichard@bath.ac.uk
University of St Andrews	Oliver Richmond	opr@st-and.ac.uk
University of St Andrews	Stefanie Kappler	sk368@st-andrews.ac.uk
University of East London	Chandra Lekha Sriram	cs79@soas.ac.uk
University of East London	Olga Martin-Ortega	O.Martin-Ortega@uel.ac.uk
University of East London	Johanna Herman	J.Herman@uel.ac.uk
Regional Centre for Conflict Prevention Jordan Institute of Diplomacy	Hasan Al-Mohmani	hasan.momani@id.gov.jo
Regional Centre for Conflict Prevention Jordan Institute of Diplomacy	Sarah-Anne Rennick	Sarah_Anne.Rennick@svet.lu.se
Regional Centre for Conflict Prevention Jordan Institute of Diplomacy	Ruba Zinati	rubaz@id.gov.jo
Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov	msbarsi@huji.ac.il
Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Shiri Tal	shiri.tal@mail.huji.ac.il

