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The African Union (AU) declared 2010 to be the “African Year of Peace and Security,” with the campaign slogan urging people to “Make Peace Happen.” At a meeting in Tripoli in August 2009, African leaders committed themselves to dealing with conflict and violence, saying: “We as leaders simply cannot bequeath the burden of conflict to the next generation of Africans.” The chairperson of the African Union Commission, Jean Ping, said that “of the many challenges facing the AU and Africa, the quest for peace and security is the most pressing” and reaffirmed the AU’s commitment to peacebuilding efforts, in partnership with the international community.

Indeed, Africa has been the site of a large number of international and continental projects to promote peace. In 2011, Africa hosted seven of the sixteen United Nations (UN) peacekeeping missions in the world. The first five countries on the agenda of the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission, established in December 2005, are all African: Sierra Leone, Burundi, the Central African Republic (CAR), Guinea-Bissau, and Liberia. The first four cases before the International Criminal Court (ICC) are also all African: Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Sudan, and the CAR.

The AU’s 2010 declaration therefore appears to be backed by a range of institutions, mechanisms, and programs to help build peace on the continent. Furthermore, the increased attention to peacebuilding in
Africa has occurred alongside an overall decrease in violent conflict on the continent. The 2007 Human Security Brief published by the Human Security Centre shows that between 1999 and 2006, the number of state-based and non-state-based armed conflicts in sub-Saharan Africa declined significantly. The number of battle deaths also declined, with the fatality toll dropping by two-thirds in sub-Saharan Africa between 2002 and 2006. The 2006 Human Security Brief said that the greatest decline in armed conflict was in sub-Saharan Africa, with the result that it was no longer the world’s most conflict-affected region. Both briefs suggested that this decline was related to the major increase in international efforts to end wars and prevent them from restarting, including peacebuilding missions.

This volume is a critical reflection on peacebuilding efforts in Africa. In light of new global and African institutions, initiatives, and activities set up in support of peacebuilding efforts, the time is ripe for a reassessment of peacebuilding concepts, practices, and implications in Africa. The contributors to the volume interrogate whether the optimism reflected in policy reports is merited, and question how and why certain peacebuilding ideas and initiatives are adopted over other ones in Africa.

The volume grows out of a collaborative project between the Centre of African Studies at the University of Cambridge in the United Kingdom, and the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR), based in Cape Town, South Africa, involving Africa-based as well as Western-based scholars with diverse perspectives on peacebuilding in Africa. The volume represents a small selection of the work presented by scholars from a weekly Cambridge seminar series in 2008–9, at the March 2009 Cambridge workshop “Rethinking Peacebuilding in Africa,” and at a large international conference of scholars and peacebuilding practitioners organized by CCR in Gaborone, Botswana, in August 2009, in collaboration with the University of Botswana and the Cambridge Centre of African Studies. Although not all of this work is included here, the contributions of all participants have helped inform the ideas and arguments in this volume.

Taken together, the contributions in this volume show that there is no consensus about the role, aims, and effects of continental and international peacebuilding programs and initiatives in Africa. The contributors highlight that although the local, regional, and global spaces for peace in Africa have been altered through discourses and practices of peacebuilding, these practices play out differently in different locales.
Peacebuilding ideas and initiatives are at various times reinforced, questioned, subverted, or reappropriated and redesigned by different African actors. Thus, the trajectories of peacebuilding programs and initiatives tend to be messy and multifaceted. Procedures and practices established in one venue or by one institution are subjected to thorough reworking as they play out in another venue, such as Somalia, Sierra Leone, or the DRC.

The volume includes contributions from policy scholars and scholars involved in on-the-ground case studies. The contributors adopt a variety of approaches, but they share a conviction that peacebuilding in Africa is not a script that is authored solely in Western capitals and in the corridors of the UN. Rather, the writers in this volume focus on the interaction between local and global ideas and practices in the reconstitution of authority and livelihoods after conflict, showcasing the tensions that occur within and between the multitude of actors involved in the peacebuilding industry, as well as their intended beneficiaries.

Highlighting the diverse expressions and contexts of peacebuilding helps us understand the intended and unintended consequences and limitations of peacebuilding programs in Africa. Contrary to the insular character of much of the peacebuilding discourse and some of the peacebuilding scholarship, the authors in this volume show how peacebuilding cannot be positioned above politics and history.

This introductory chapter briefly traces the evolution of peacebuilding ideas and practices, as well as the growing body of scholarship that has accompanied the rise of the peacebuilding industry. It pays particular attention to the dominant ways of thinking about peacebuilding, including what is often called “liberal peacebuilding,” and the range of critiques that have emerged in the scholarly literature. The chapter then goes on to show why existing frameworks for understanding peacebuilding are largely insufficient. Rather than interpreting peacebuilding as a fixed set of procedures and practices leading to some universally defined end called “peace,” the introduction and the chapters that follow suggest that peacebuilding may be best thought of as a set of multiple ideas, relationships, and experiences that are embedded within hierarchies of power and knowledge. Hierarchies exist within and between peacebuilding institutions, within knowledge about peacebuilding, and within funding for peacebuilding, but the chapters show that these hierarchies are not fixed or immutable.
The Concept of Peacebuilding and its Trajectory in Africa

The idea and the practices of peacebuilding are not new. Conflict is a generative force that alters social norms and institutions in Africa as elsewhere. The experience of conflict typically brings issues of political authority, security, society, and economy to the fore, albeit in different ways in different places. Questions of how to reestablish political authority and security after violence, what to do about ex-combatants, how to renegotiate and manage the changed social relations, mistrust, and destruction that accompanies violence, and what to do about changed patterns of production or livelihoods as a result of conflict have been addressed in a myriad of different ways in different African locales over time. For instance, under the Oyo Empire in Nigeria, the victorious Oyo granted substantial political autonomy to the vassal colonies following wars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as long as the colonies reaffirmed their loyalty to Oyo. Agents from Oyo resided in the colonies to monitor local politics. 

In western Côte d’Ivoire, Mike McGovern describes the historic highly structured social relations between “strangers” and “hosts” that emerged partly as a response to precolonial labor requirements in areas of low population density. Yet if the autochthone “hosts” were conquered by “strangers,” the autochthones often adapted and assimilated and the relationships were recalibrated. Thus, the host-stranger relationship was “an elastic social idiom that facilitated the process of making do and getting on with life, even in the face of endemic violence and insecurity.” In the early nineteenth century, Shaka, the Zulu chief and state-builder, consolidated a number of military innovations. By the mid-1820s, he had a large standing army of over 40,000 people. Shaka did not allow members of military regiments to marry until after they finished their military service, often in their late thirties for men and late twenties for women. After marriage, men and women left the regiments and set up their homesteads, so the issue of a transition from a fighter to a “civilian” was resolved through the social institution of marriage. Thus, examples of “peacebuilding” strategies in Africa are as old (and as diverse) as conflict. Drawing on Derry Yakubu’s research, Tim Murithi argues that conflict resolution and peacebuilding mechanisms in precolonial Africa had a “significant degree of success in maintaining order and ensuring the peaceful coexistence of groups.” Murithi describes various institutions in their historic and contemporary incarnations, such as the jir mediation forum of...
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the Tiv in Nigeria and the *Mato Oput* reconciliation mechanism among the Acholi in northern Uganda, to highlight that peacebuilding is not a new preoccupation in Africa.

International actors also have a long history of attempting to shape war-affected communities and politics. Colonial rulers developed a wide variety of coercive and noncoercive strategies to deal with the effects of war. And external actors continued to influence politics in postcolonial Africa, with the wide-ranging UN operation in the Congo from 1960 to 1964 often described as the precursor to the peacebuilding operations of the 1990s. Yet as a distinctive area of international policy interventions, peacebuilding rose to prominence at the end of the Cold War at the time of the UN operation in Namibia in 1989–90. The end of the Cold War led to a renewed emphasis on the possibilities of international engagement in support of peacebuilding. *An Agenda for Peace*, published in 1992 by the then UN secretary-general, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, provided a coherent conceptualization of peacebuilding for a post–Cold War era. This important report defined peacebuilding as the medium- to long-term process of rebuilding war-affected communities through identifying and supporting “structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.”

Essentially, *An Agenda for Peace* saw peacebuilding as a worthy and distinct area of international attention, and conceived of it as the promotion of activities and structures that reduce the likelihood of violent conflict.

At the time of the publication of *An Agenda for Peace*, the number of UN peacekeeping operations was rapidly expanding, and many of these operations took place in Africa. Peacebuilding came to be an important component of these missions. Yet since the *Agenda for Peace* was published in 1992, three changes with respect to peacebuilding are notable: an expansion of peacebuilding activities, a proliferation of institutions tasked with peacebuilding, and an increase in peacebuilding scholarship.

First, the number and kinds of activities that are considered under the rubric of peacebuilding programs have grown, and peacebuilding has become more intrusive. Whereas the *Agenda for Peace* emphasized state sovereignty, later reports, such as the 2004 United Nations High-Level Panel report *A More Secure World*, focused on the rights of the individual as well as state sovereignty. Peacebuilding therefore expanded to include not only the cessation of hostilities and the rebuilding of infrastructure, but also the protection of human rights, the reconstitution of individual identities and the reforging of individual and community relationships.
This expansion in activities reflected a willingness to conceptualize peace not only as negative peace (the absence of direct physical violence), but also as positive peace (the absence of structural violence). According to proponents of positive peace, focusing only on negative peace is insufficient, as it ignores the multiple ways that people suffer. A narrow focus on negative peace meant that great efforts and resources went into helping to reach cease-fires between belligerent groups, and to guarantee these agreements through peacekeeping missions, but other forms of insecurity, inequalities, and vulnerabilities were left unaddressed. For instance, negative peace does not address the unequal status of women or domestic sexual violence. In 2000, the United Nations Brahimi Report on Peacekeeping Reform explained that peacebuilding consisted of activities to “provide the tools for building on those foundations something that is more than just the absence of war.” Some authors have claimed that peacebuilding entails moving from a condition of negative peace to one of positive peace. The areas of concern to peacebuilders have therefore broadened to include issues and activities that were formerly considered to be outside its scope.

The concept of human security further expanded the types of peacebuilding measures on the agenda of international institutions. Although positive peace is not the same as human security, the two ideas are closely connected. Human security focuses on the security of the individual rather than the security of the state. The concept was first elaborated by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1994 and has since been widely accepted at the United Nations. Nonetheless, there are large disagreements over the scope of the concept. The UNDP uses definitions that are closer to notions of positive peace, and says that human security includes “safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression,” whereas the Human Security Centre uses a definition that focuses on “violent threats to individuals.” The UN Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change in 2004 identified poverty, infectious disease, and environmental degradation as major threats to security, along with armed conflict, terrorism, organized crime, and weapons of mass destruction. Alongside the rise in human security, peacebuilding has therefore deepened to target not only the state and its institutions, but also individuals and their local communities. Social transformation has become an object of peacebuilding concern and intervention, including initiatives to improve individual psychosocial well-being.
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These expanded activities and initiatives to address and prevent violent armed conflict could occur at different phases of conflict cycles. Previously, peacebuilding was usually conceptualized as part of a linear progression, starting with humanitarian relief and conflict management, then settlement, then peacebuilding and reconstruction, then development. Increasingly however, it was acknowledged that transitions from conflict rarely follow such a linear path. Activities to strengthen “peace” can take place before, during, or after conflict. Likewise, “peace” and “war” may exist simultaneously in different parts of the same country. For instance, in Sudan the conflict in Darfur escalated even after the Comprehensive Peace Agreement formally ended the conflict between the North and the South in 2005 (see Srinivasan, this volume). Uganda is typically viewed as a “peaceful” country since the National Resistance Army won the war and brought President Yoweri Museveni to power in 1986. However, this obscures the ongoing conflict involving the Lord’s Resistance Army in the northern part of Uganda and across its borders (see Omach, this volume).

Thus, in the two decades since An Agenda for Peace, the concept of peacebuilding has broadened, deepened and been applied to different points in the conflict cycle. A second important change since the publication of An Agenda for Peace is the proliferation of institutions, units, and programs tasked with peacebuilding in Africa. These include institutions at the global level, the continental, regional, and national levels, as well as local programs led by community and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Several international agencies created special units to deal with postconflict reconstruction in the middle to late 1990s. For instance, in 1997, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) created the Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network to help better coordinate aid agencies’ peacebuilding activities. That same year, the World Bank adopted a framework for World Bank involvement in postconflict reconstruction, and established the Post-Conflict Fund to make fast loans and grants to conflict-affected countries (see Harrison, this volume). In 2001, the UNDP created the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery to “provide a bridge between the humanitarian agencies that handle immediate needs and the long-term development phase following recovery.” In 2005, the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission was established, with the aim of bringing together relevant actors and proposing integrated strategies for postconflict peacebuilding in specific countries (see Olonisakin and Ikpe, this volume).
The AU and subregional organizations in Africa have also developed peacebuilding units, programs, and initiatives at an accelerated pace. Earlier, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) created the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, and Resolution in 1993, and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) established the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Resolution, and Peacekeeping in 1999. More recently, the AU Peace and Security Council was established in 2004 and the AU Panel of the Wise was established in 2007. The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and the AU separately developed postconflict reconstruction frameworks in June 2005 and July 2006 respectively (see Khadiagala, this volume). In 2008, ECOWAS adopted a Conflict Prevention Framework, to strengthen efforts to “prevent violent conflicts within and between States, and to support peace-building in post-conflict environments.”

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) Council of Non-Governmental Organisations has a program for Governance, Peace and Security in accordance with its organizational strategy for 2009–13. In 2002, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) established the Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism, with a particular focus on pastoral and related conflicts. These new continental and regional structures and programs underline a commitment to peacebuilding, alongside their increasing involvement in peace operations. To date for instance, the African Union and African regional organizations have mounted peacekeeping operations in countries such as Burundi, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Sudan. These new institutions and programs in Africa have grown along with calls for “local ownership” in peacebuilding programming.

The third notable development since the publication of An Agenda for Peace is the expansion of peacebuilding scholarship, which has accompanied the broadening and deepening of peacebuilding activities, as well as the proliferation of peacebuilding institutions. A growing but disparate body of academic work has attempted to make sense of peacebuilding efforts and their consequences. A number of specialized scholarly journals focusing on peace and conflict themes have been established since the early 1990s, such as International Peacekeeping (1994), Global Governance (1995), The International Journal of Peace Studies (1996), Civil Wars (1998), African Journal on Conflict Resolution (1999), Conflict, Security and Development (2001), Peace, Conflict and
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Development: An Interdisciplinary Journal (2002), Journal of Peacebuilding and Development (2002), and Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding (2007). Some of this scholarship concentrates on African peace and conflict issues. Indeed, many African universities now offer course programs in peace and conflict studies. Think tanks and policy institutes have followed suit, offering peace research and peace training, often with a vast array of recommendations on how to improve international and continental peacebuilding practice. And yet, as explained below, much of this scholarship fails to fully capture the multifaceted nature of peace and the contested local and global politics of peacebuilding. It treats peace as an uncontroversial, ahistoric “end,” and peacebuilding as the means to get there.

Peacebuilding Frameworks and Debates

There are at least three main frameworks for understanding peacebuilding that are prevalent in the literature. Although there are important areas of overlap between these positions, they rest on different conceptions of power and politics in Africa. Each of these views contains important normative assumptions about the nature of peace and about the identity and motivations of peacebuilders. They lead to different conclusions about the role of the state in peacebuilding, the type of economic policies best suited to recovery, the appropriate ways to encourage societal reconciliation, and how best to ensure security.

Liberal Peacebuilding

The dominant framework for understanding peacebuilding is a liberal framework. A significant amount of peacebuilding scholarship positions itself either within this liberal tradition or against it. According to this view, peacebuilding is understood to be part of a global project of liberal governance, promoted by international and regional institutions and other actors. Certainly, the goal and promise of a liberal peace is found within the pages of many donor documents and institutional reports. An Agenda for Peace described political and economic liberalization as key elements in the transformation of war-torn societies. Paragraph 9 sees new opportunities for peace now that “many States are seeking more open forms of economic policy”; paragraph 56 talks of social and economic development; and paragraph 59 recommends the strengthening of new democratic institutions, the rule of law, and good governance.
The perceived success of (liberal) war-to-peace transitions in Namibia and Mozambique reinforced these ideas. Indeed, the idea of a “liberal peace,” with its roots in European Enlightenment thinking of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has guided much of the peacebuilding programming at the UN and elsewhere. Multiparty electoral democracy and a market economy are seen as inherently peaceful and desirable, and it is thought that all “good things” go together. Peacebuilding therefore consists of activities and initiatives to help bring about and facilitate this desired liberal end. More recently, the 2005 UN report *In Larger Freedom*, produced under the leadership of the then UN secretary-general, Kofi Annan, echoed this view: “Humanity will not enjoy security without development, it will not enjoy development without security, and will not enjoy either without respect for human rights.”

The chairperson of the AU commission, Jean Ping, said that “Africa’s attention to peacebuilding reflects the continent’s recognition that peace is the foundation of prosperity.”

Liberal peacebuilding is thus both a normative agenda, as well as a framework for understanding the diverse activities and initiatives to promote peace on the continent. Even with the expansion of peacebuilding activities and the move toward conceptions of positive peace and human security, the privileged focus on liberal peacebuilding has largely remained intact within the dominant global peacebuilding community. Liberal peacebuilding is assumed to have universal relevance, therefore techniques and lessons can be learned from different parts of the world. A standardized approach that includes multiparty elections and institution-building, constitutional and legal reform, and economic pro-market reform can be applied in such diverse settings as Mozambique, El Salvador, Cambodia, Sierra Leone, and Timor-Leste, with only limited adaptations to suit the “local” context.

The problem, as some scholarship has pointed out, is that the experiences of many countries emerging from conflict do not correspond to these liberal predictions. Already by the end of the 1990s, the achievements of liberal peacebuilding in Africa and elsewhere were being questioned. Even countries that are often judged as peacebuilding successes, such as Namibia and Mozambique, have experienced high rates of inequality and persistent insecurity among some communities. Furthermore, these qualified “successes” were overshadowed by horrendous failures such as Angola in 1992, Rwanda in 1993–94, Sierra Leone in 1999, Sudan in 2005, and Côte d’Ivoire in 2010.

For advocates of liberal peacebuilding, these failures do not represent the limits of liberal peace, but rather, the flawed implementation
of liberal ideas. For them, peacebuilding failures had more to do with improper sequencing or a lack of coordination or insufficient commitment by outsiders, not problems with the liberal idea itself. For instance, in a widely cited argument, Roland Paris notes that rapid political and economic liberalization in postconflict countries can trigger a renewal of conflict instead of a reinforcement of structures of peace. Paris does not criticize economic and political liberalization per se; he simply argues that it cannot be done too quickly in the immediate aftermath of violent conflict. Rapid political liberalization can exacerbate tensions, since elites may use violence to gain electoral support, and rapid economic liberalization can generate tensions through increased unemployment and economic uncertainties. Instead, Paris argues in favor of “institutionalization before liberalization,” meaning building state institutional capacity first, in order to enable liberal values and practices to take hold over time.

This argument and others like it do not fundamentally question the content of liberal postconflict peacebuilding but suggest ways that the international peacebuilding community may improve practices to get to their desired outcomes. Unsurprisingly, many policy practitioners through lessons-learned units and evaluations divisions have adopted similar conclusions about peacebuilding failures. The UN High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, for instance, made a case for greater policy coherence and donor coordination and more careful attention to sequencing.

This approach therefore assumes that peacebuilding is a liberal script authored primarily by outsiders, perhaps with the assistance and input of enlightened locals. Advocates believe that this can lead to optimal peaceful results if the program is properly implemented. All actors in conflict-affected countries are identified vis-à-vis their position on liberal peace, and those who violently disagree with liberal peace are labeled “spoilers” who must be socialized or marginalized. The liberal peacebuilding scholarship tends to be prescriptive, offering advice on how to better deal with these “spoilers.” Peace, development, and governance go hand in hand and reinforce one another in this liberal framework.

**Peacebuilding as Stabilization**

A second position on peacebuilding shares the liberal concern with order, but rather than focusing its attention on order within states, it sees peacebuilding as being primarily concerned with maintaining the international status quo. The view has become increasingly important.
since the 9/11 attack on the United States (US), and the subsequent global “war on terror.” Although this view acknowledges the multitude of activities conducted under the peacebuilding umbrella, the rationale for these activities is to maintain global security and stability.

The recent conflation of antiterrorism measures with peacebuilding is an indication that this way of thinking about peacebuilding may be gaining currency. The language of peacebuilding is indicative. In the United Kingdom, the Post Conflict Reconstruction Unit was renamed the Stabilisation Unit in late 2007, jointly owned by the Department for International Development, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and the Ministry of Defence. Within the US Department of State, the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization was created in 2004–5 to “promote the security of the United States through improved coordination, planning, and implementation for reconstruction and stabilization assistance for foreign states and regions at risk of, in, or in transition from conflict or civil strife.” The UN peace operation in the DRC changed its mission and its name from MONUC (United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo) to MONUSCO (United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo) in 2010. A central part of MONUSCO’s mandate is to assist the Congolese government in strengthening its military capacity, and to support the Congolese government in consolidating state authority (Lemarchand, this volume). With China’s increasing involvement in Africa, including China’s participation in UN peace operations, one can expect that peacebuilding as stabilization will continue to rise in importance, given China’s preoccupation with order and state authority rather than “good governance,” democratization, or civil society.

According to this view, the emphasis for peacebuilders is the creation of stable, secure states with well-policed borders. Although it shares many of the same preoccupations of the peacebuilding as liberal governance view, the stabilization view holds less faith in the possibilities of transformation and socialization. For example, if part of the problem in Africa is perceived as Africans’ stubborn attachment to parochial identities, peacebuilding as stabilization controls the expression of those identities, without seeking to transform them. Low-intensity conflict and localized violence or repression may be acceptable (or perhaps inevitable) under this view, so long as it does not affect international order and stability. Paradoxically then, increased militarization comes to be seen as peacebuilding.
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As with the liberal peacebuilding literature, some of the stabilization scholarship is normatively driven and prescriptive, offering guidelines and suggestions to policymakers on how to stabilize first (and sometimes liberalize later, depending on whether internal conditions are “conducive”). Other scholars are much more critical of these types of peacebuilding practices, seeing peacebuilding as reminiscent of previous forms of external domination in Africa, or as disguised imperialism. For them, peacebuilding is a cover for the political and economic interests of the West, mirroring the role of imperial power in the construction and order of colonial states. This view asks “whose peace” is served by peacebuilding programs and activities. In contrast to advocates of peacebuilding as liberal governance who believe in the shared benefits of liberalism, a peacebuilding as stabilization framework implicitly acknowledges that the benefits of peacebuilding may be unequal and selective. Although much of the peacebuilding as liberal governance literature focuses on African elites and their identities and interests as being the main objects to reshape through peacebuilding, the stabilization literature takes account of the interests of external peacebuilders themselves. It shows that global powers and institutions are not disinterested actors or neutral vessels (see Harrison, Olonisakin and Ikpe, and Nouwen, this volume), and that their peacebuilding programs are not divorced from other political interests (see Lemarchand, Ero, and Clapham, this volume).

Peacebuilding as Social Justice

Like the previous two views, peacebuilding as social justice is both a normative position and a descriptive framework for understanding peacebuilding activities. This position tends to be put forward by people who believe that the previous two views place undue focus on maintaining order. They see peacebuilding as stabilization and/or liberal governance as part of a strategy to maintain the global status quo, with its inequalities and selective privileges intact. In the case of liberal peacebuilding, these intentions may be obscured by the universalist language of human security, peacebuilding, the “responsibility to protect,” and development, whereas in the case of peacebuilding as stabilization the intentions to impose order is clear. For both however, the aim is to subvert radical challenges to the global and national distribution of power and resources and to stabilize the international system. Hegemony and domination are maintained through discursive and material means.
Although stabilization relies more heavily on coercion and on building the coercive apparatus of the state, and liberal governance relies more extensively on building institutions and markets, both share a preoccupation with stability.

In contrast, some authors believe that peacebuilding can and should be based on social justice, rather than liberal governance or stabilization. Structural violence is the problem to be addressed through peacebuilding, and peacebuilding therefore involves programs to encourage inclusive access to resources and institutions, to empower marginalized groups, to end discrimination against women and other disadvantaged groups, and to redistribute income and land ownership.\(^{43}\) In other words, peacebuilding becomes focused on reaching the condition of “positive peace.”

Peacebuilding as social justice addresses international inequalities as well as inequalities within countries. According to this view, peacebuilding cannot be divorced from a discussion of global capitalism and the distribution of the world’s resources. Liberal peacebuilding tends to focus on how to restructure economies internally so that countries can attract foreign investment and be better integrated into the global economy, but the networked economies in the DRC, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Angola, and Sudan show that both violent conflict and violent peace are compatible with markets that are well integrated internationally, albeit unevenly. An emphasis on social justice involves raising questions about international economic inequality. Seeing uneven global capitalist structures as the indisputable and inevitable context for peacebuilding severely limits possibilities.

In calling for a redistribution of resources both within countries and internationally, peacebuilding as social justice echoes earlier claims made by dependency theorists such as Samir Amin.\(^{44}\) But, as Mahmood Mamdani points out, it also involves the deracialization of power, the redressing of systemic group disadvantage, and the formation of an inclusive redefined political community.\(^{45}\)

Within this perspective, however, there are disagreements about the agents of peacebuilding. Although some African governments and African institutions may seek to draw attention to international inequalities, it is debatable whether governments and regional institutions are effective vehicles for the promotion of social justice. Some authors highlight the developmental potential of African-level institutions (Landsberg, this volume), but a key question is whether African-level institutions reflect kinds of knowledge similar to Western-based
ones, or whether they capture different kinds of experiences in their research and programming. The early experiences of the AU, NEPAD, and the African Development Bank (AfDB) suggest that these institutions adopt peacebuilding logics that are similar to those of their international counterparts (Khadiagala, this volume), relying on liberal governance packages. The African Union policy framework provides an overall strategy from which individual country programs can develop their own context-specific plans, but it is unclear that this represents an alternative peacebuilding template. Devolving responsibility to African governments will not necessarily achieve social justice or satisfy the transformative aspirations of other local groups. Elites tend to revert to strategies that reproduce their positions of power, and there is nothing to indicate that there is more of a consensus on issues of social justice among inhabitants within Africa countries.

The Local and Global Practices of Peacebuilding

The three frameworks for understanding peacebuilding are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and indeed institutions such as the United Nations and the African Union use the language of all three. It is possible for the same actor or agency to hold a normative commitment toward social justice, but to encourage stabilization and/or liberal governance. Indeed, despite their stated common goals, different agencies prioritize different activities. Notwithstanding the common use of the term peacebuilding, different institutions show important variation. In a survey of twenty-four governmental and intergovernmental bodies active in peacebuilding, Barnett et al. show that there are great divisions among these bodies regarding the specific approaches to achieve peace, often depending on prevailing organizational mandates and interests.46

Much of the peacebuilding scholarship, however, presumes to know what constitutes peace and sees peacebuilding as a series of activities, initiatives, and policies to help reach predetermined goals, whether those goals are defined as liberal governance, stabilization, and/or social justice. The scholarship tends to be prescriptive, based on the author’s knowledge of peace.47 Even the concepts of social justice and positive peace tend to be defined from the perspective of powerful societies.48 Thus, whether it is understood as liberal governance, stabilization, or social justice, peacebuilding programming is often driven by external ideas and by the disciplining power of external norms rather than by the meanings and values from within African countries and locales.
Academic research is not separate from these systems of power. Perhaps scholars are so concerned with their research being policy-relevant that they tend to focus on operational and technical aspects of peacebuilding. In other words, perhaps peacebuilding practitioners search for knowledge that reinforces their own practices and experiences.

Is it possible to reject these frameworks for peacebuilding, and rely instead on African ideas and alternatives? Claude Ake observed that the problem is not so much that development has failed in Africa as that it has never really been tried in the first place. Ake’s complaint was that development practices were based on earlier European experiences and ignored the specificities of African experiences, and one could argue that African peacebuilding faces a similar constraint. Isaac Albert describes several African conceptions of peace and argues that whereas Western conceptions of peace place heavy emphasis on prosperity and order, African conceptions are based on morality and order. The underpinnings of peace in Africa, according to Albert, can be located in the commitment to cultural values, beliefs, and norms as well as in societal role expectations.

Other authors have discussed the possibility of uncovering peacebuilding alternatives in local societies. Mark Hoffman points out that the emphasis on individual rights, accountability, and transplantation of Western institutions may not sit easily with cultures that emphasize community and family over the individual. Oliver Richmond argues that the pursuit of liberal peace “may be socially atomizing, hegemonic and lead to the valorization of predatory state elites who gain easy access to an international economic and political cartography.” Instead, Richmond proposes “localized everyday peace,” or unscripted conversations between local actors. Alternative practices of peace may be found within the informal economy (see Oyefusi, this volume), within religious groups (see Clapham, this volume), within community groups (see Hutchful, and Omach, this volume), with representatives of ethnic communities and others who may fall outside the parameters of the liberal peace.

This literature on “local peace” has usefully uncovered a range of different ideas about peace and peacebuilding. Nonetheless, it is impossible to separate the “local” from the “international” in Africa, even if one intends to privilege local understandings of peace. It is notoriously difficult to discern who is the “local.” Sometimes, local is used to mean the national country in which a peacebuilding intervention takes place. Yet a national actor from the capital city may be an outsider
when entering into another local community. Furthermore, although power relations are present, the local, regional, and global are mutually constitutive. Politics in Africa is not simply the product of hegemonic external forces, and it is not a failed or incomplete example of something else. This denies Africans of their agency and connections with the rest of the world. Jean-François Bayart argues that through a strategy of extraversion, African states were not passive recipients of structural adjustment. Similarly, African states have adjusted and shaped international peacebuilding strategies. John Heathershaw shows that when peacebuilding takes the form of a rational design or technique to do something to an “other” in order to elicit behavioral change, local actors may subvert its techniques and reappropriate resources to further their own authority.

The Volume

Peacebuilding is therefore not a script authored by outsiders, nor is it a script solely authored by Africans. Instead, peacebuilding is a set of ideas and practices, mediated by the interaction between local communities and international, national, and regional actors. The contest over peacebuilding is not only a contest for funds but also a contest over meanings and interpretation.

In different ways, the chapters in this volume explore the multiple, shifting, and interacting meanings, discourses, and agendas underlying peacebuilding efforts in Africa. The authors do not share a common understanding of the ultimate objective of peacebuilding, and indeed they disagree on whether finding such an objective is productive or possible. They use different approaches and methods, but they all analyze the tensions and debates between various peacebuilding ideas and programs. They agree that peacebuilding is a site of political and social contestation and interaction, which raises questions about power and hierarchy. Given the trade-offs, shifting identities, and multiple meanings of peace and peacebuilding, the chapters in this volume ask which
ideas take hold and to what effect. Because hierarchies in the production of knowledge may mean that certain voices have been privileged in peacebuilding debates and discussions, the authors paid close attention to a range of voices. The authors themselves come from diverse geographic, disciplinary, and intellectual backgrounds and traditions.

Thus, the volume cannot resolve peacebuilding tensions, but it highlights what happens when various peacebuilding logics come into contact with realities on the ground. The contributors analyze key areas typically associated with peacebuilding (political authority, security, economy, society) and the institutions involved in peacebuilding, to illustrate the contested politics of peacebuilding, and to describe how peacebuilding is reinterpreted and reshaped by Africans.

For instance, the very logic of a negotiated peace agreement can be different for outside actors and for local political competitors (see Keen, and Srinivasan, this volume). Peace agreements themselves are replete with tensions. Outside actors may view a peace agreement as a binding commitment between different belligerents that sets out a common vision for a postconflict future, whereas the parties themselves may see it in instrumental and contextual terms. This has happened, for instance, in the DRC and Sudan, where political elites continually adjusted their strategies to a changed context (see Lemarchand and Srinivasan, this volume). Elites that were included or excluded in the peace agreements maintained the use or the threat of violence as a parallel tool in what Alex de Waal calls the political marketplace, where social affinities and patronage networks take precedence over state institutions. Peace agreements may institutionalize violence by giving a share of governance to former military or rebel leaders who have committed human rights abuses or who maintain links to regional and global war economies (see Keen, this volume). Yet excluding these groups, if they retain the capacity for violence, may be equally dangerous. Throughout the peacebuilding process, state elites and former rebels may seek international recognition in order to bolster their own agendas. International actors make intrusive interventions, and local actors engage in their own transnational practices in order to gain political, material, and discursive support from outside parties and networks.

Unlike some of the other literature on peacebuilding, the volume raises doubts about whether the question of political authority can be resolved through the sequencing of peacebuilding activities. Some of the authors of this volume do point to problems in peacebuilding
sequencing and coordination (see Omach, Ero, and Dzinesa), but argue that better coordination and sequencing alone cannot resolve the tensions and contradictions of peacebuilding in Africa. A focus on sequencing ignores the fact that there may be strong political reasons for a lack of coordination, and competing visions and ideas of what peacebuilding is meant to achieve.

Statebuilding is another practice fraught with contradictions and trade-offs. By the early 2000s, most multilateral peacebuilding institutions had agreed that durable peace depended on the construction or strengthening of state institutions. As Khadiagala, Landsberg, and Olonisakin and Ikpe show in this volume, this meant that for many institutions, statebuilding came to be seen as an important aspect of peacebuilding. Peacebuilding therefore involves setting priorities and establishing legitimate institutional hierarchies at the level of the state. The goal is to ensure a regime that is accountable to international norms, that is legitimate, and that has earned its sovereignty. Yet as Dominik Zaum points out in this volume, there are contradictions between vertical legitimacy and horizontal legitimacy in the statebuilding project that may not be possible to reconcile. Zaum shows that identifying relevant societal groups to empower may require a very large external peacebuilding footprint, raising other accountability issues. Similarly, Comfort Ero describes in this volume how in Liberia people who wanted change were allied with international actors against a status quo coalition. Ero highlights a tension between the transformative aspirations underlying the statebuilding enterprise and the idea of local ownership.

Christopher Clapham suggests that international actors have taken for granted that the international system is composed of states, and therefore have no conception of how peace can exist without one. And yet Clapham shows the futility of a peacebuilding through statebuilding approach in Somalia. He argues that the engagement of external actors in Somalia has intensified conflict rather than moderating it, in part because attempts to build peace have assumed the existence of a state in Somalia or the possibility of creating one. Externally driven attempts to negotiate peace led to further factionalism in Somalia, as Somali leaders sought to present themselves as independent operators in order to gain external recognition and a seat at the table. Clapham shows that one of the keys to Somaliland’s peacebuilding success was its insulation from external engagements, whereas the focus on statebuilding in Somalia led to the marginalization of local mediators and elders. More
generally, a focus on the state and on the formal institutions of politics may overlook the local dimensions of authority and conflict (see Lemarchand, this volume). Furthermore, if institutionalized statehood is the assumed goal, local voices that do not use or aspire to that language are disempowered.

Like the reconstitution of political authority after conflict, the re-establishment of security is not uncontroversial. Peacebuilding occurs when security is, at best, unevenly distributed, but there is no consensus that peacebuilding strategies and programs succeed in reducing insecurity for all. Eboe Hutchful shows how security lies in the eyes of the beholder. The question of whether one’s security increases or decreases as a result of peacebuilding programs and initiatives depends on one’s position vis-à-vis the conflict (see Keen, this volume). Security governance that emphasizes ownership as well as formal and informal measures to enhance security may be helpful (see Hutchful, this volume), but the ability to shape the interpretations of peace and conflict is also often a very powerful tool in the struggle.

Disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) programs are indicative of some of the contradictions of peacebuilding. Gwinyayi A. Dzinesa shows how DDR programs in Namibia, Angola, and Mozambique were supposed to contribute to creating sustainable, secure, peaceful transitions. But these programs were affected by a number of different factors, including the synchrony between global, regional, and local actors, and the political context. In Angola in the 1990s for instance, DDR foundered owing in part to the collusion between different actors who sought to undermine the potential of DDR. Paul Omach in this volume points to a disconnect between international DDR programs and local realities, even when local actors do not seek to undermine DDR. For instance, Omach says that the way in which DDR programs define “ex-combatants” does not always reflect the flexible and variable roles played by people involved in conflict.

Peacebuilding strategies to revitalize the economy are also the site of tensions and contradictions, and privilege some interests over others. International peacebuilding programs tend to focus on the formal economic sector, whereas many livelihoods in Africa are based on informal economic activities and exchange. Women in particular may be disadvantaged when peacebuilding programs fail to acknowledge informal economies.

As discussed previously, reinvigorating the market has been a core component of peacebuilding in Africa. In the 1980s and 1990s, key
Institutions, including the Bretton Woods institutions—the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank—blamed the failure of African development on bloated bureaucracies and corrupt leaders. Rather than looking historically at why such leaders emerged and locating the failure of development in the international system, the prescriptions given by the Bretton Woods institutions were rooted in efforts to create more effective markets and to downsize the state, arguably limiting the capacity of these “corrupt” leaders to do damage. The resulting structural adjustment programs often included drastic cuts in public services, liberalization, privatization, and the elimination of subsidies (see Harrison, this volume).

Market approaches to peacebuilding have since been widely criticized for their detrimental consequences on security and well-being, but they are often still promoted in African contexts, albeit sometimes with a longer-term time frame and different sequencing. These efforts, however, often have unintended consequences. In Sierra Leone, for instance, privatization resulted in the transfer of state assets to a small oligarchy, reinforcing interests that were opposed to political transformation (see Ero, this volume).

During hostilities and afterward, the political economy of an area is reshaped, with some beneficiaries and some losers. In conflict, there are profits to be made for the large number of individuals and companies connected to the arms trade as well as for natural resource traders who benefit from weak laws and regulations. As René Lemarchand outlines in this volume, conflict in the Great Lakes region of Africa is sustained through trading and multiple webs of economic networks and interests involving state and nonstate actors. Aderoju Oyefusi in this volume explains how peacebuilding has been stunted in Nigeria’s Niger Delta, due to the continued economic incentives in that region. Thus the effects of peacebuilding cannot be separated from the global and local political economies of war. In some cases, the large amounts of foreign aid that accompany peacebuilding has been used by the holders of state power as an additional rent that can be used for decidedly nonpeaceful purposes.

Last, although authors recognize that conflict affects the social fabric of societies in terms of population dislocation, mistrust, shifting identities, and the erosion and creation of new social bonds, there is no consensus about whether—or how—peacebuilders should address this. Omach, for instance, believes that peacebuilding can be a further way for powerful states and interests to monitor, intervene, and regulate the
peoples of the South. Vanessa Pupavac has shown that peacebuilding programs focusing on healing psychosocial trauma problematically apply models developed in the West to very different local contexts. Furthermore, there may be opportunities for progressive social change arising out of conflict (Hutchful, this volume). Gendered approaches to peacebuilding have usefully highlighted the ways in which women sometimes continue to be marginalized within peacebuilding programs and peacebuilding knowledge, but also how the processes of conflict and peace can sometimes bring new opportunities for women.

Even programs in support of justice or reconciliation may be fragmented, contradictory, and contested. For instance, in 2001 the Rwandan government instituted the gacaca jurisdictions to hear and judge the cases of genocide suspects. Supporters saw this as a homegrown, historically rooted way of achieving postconflict reconciliation and justice in Rwanda. Critics saw it as the reinvention of tradition with the aim of further extending the power of a repressive Rwandan state. In Uganda, mato oput ceremonies have been discussed as a locally appropriate way to address community reconciliation in northern Uganda. Yet critics say that the emphasis on mato oput serves the interests of some foreign aid organizations and older male Acholi who want to reinforce their diminishing power, rather than being something that is universally accepted among the Acholi.

The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of postconflict countries may lead to consequences that do not achieve the goals of their advocates. Tensions between different conceptions of rights complicate peacebuilding. Like the other peacebuilding elements discussed in this volume, rights do not reside “out there,” waiting to be discovered. Rather, they represent areas of contestation and multiple interpretations. The disagreements over the role of the ICC in Uganda and Sudan raise important questions about whose interests are served by emphasizing certain forms of justice over others (see Nouwen, this volume).

Structure of the Volume

The volume is not an exhaustive account of all peacebuilding efforts and initiatives in Africa, but the various chapters provide examples of how global, regional, and local interests, practices, and ideas interact in peacebuilding programming on the continent.

The volume is divided into three parts. Part I deals with peacebuilding themes and debates, exposing the tensions and contradictions in
different clusters of peacebuilding activities. Each chapter explores the myriad of international and local ideas and practices, the challenges and trade-offs that have been encountered, and the alternatives that have been proposed in specific areas of peacebuilding, including peace negotiations, statebuilding, security sector governance, and DDR. The chapters show how and why the consequences of peacebuilding initiatives have not always been as anticipated in Africa.

Part 2 addresses the institutional framework for peacebuilding in Africa and the ideological underpinnings of key institutions, including the African Union, NEPAD, the African Development Bank, the Pan-African Ministers Conference for Public and Civil Service, the UN Peacebuilding Commission, the World Bank, and the International Criminal Court. The chapters in this section address the extent to which these institutions have been successful in achieving their mandates and visions, and the conceptions of peace and peacebuilding on which these mandates rest.

Finally, Part 3 examines how the themes and institutions analyzed in Parts 1–2 have operated in particular African contexts. These six case-study chapters allow for detailed analyses of local constraints to, and opportunities for, peacebuilding in different African locales, highlighting how peacebuilding procedures and activities are reshaped by different actors. Some of the case-study chapters deal with single-country cases, and other chapters adopt a regional approach; some case chapters deal with a single peacebuilding activity whereas others analyze the range of peacebuilding efforts in a specific area. The chapters address the conflicting ideas of peace in the negotiations in Sudan; overlapping networks of conflict and peace in the Great Lakes region; statebuilding in Sierra Leone and Liberia; the political economy of peace and conflict in the Niger Delta; DDR in Namibia, Angola, and Mozambique; and the failure of peacebuilding in Somalia. The case studies highlight the interplay among the local, regional, continental, and global levels, and the ways in which spaces for peace are constantly being rearticulated and renegotiated through particular programs in particular spaces.

One Peace or Many?

There is no denying that violent conflict has horrific costs in Africa, in terms of lives lost, dreams shattered, and livelihoods destroyed. The horrors of violence urge us toward an imagined shared alternative named “peace,” where hope can be reclaimed and livelihoods restored.
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When international peacebuilding programs prove insufficient or inadequate, we look toward African institutions and African agency. Yet African agency, like any other agency, contains worthy elements as well as lamentable ones, and cannot be separated from the world in which it is a part.

Peacebuilding is a political contest involving questions of authority, legitimacy, equality, and knowledge. The chapters in this volume treat peace not as something to be discovered or imposed, but as a number of different and continually contested practices. The political meanings of peace and peacebuilding are subject to negotiation between international, regional, and local actors. Masking the subjective nature of peace disguises ideology and power and may obscure the various ways that peace is understood and experienced in different contexts. Being cognizant of the wide range of interests and views involved in peacebuilding leads to questions about whether peacebuilding should continue to be described primarily in nonideological terms as a force for good.

Thus a single, all-encompassing definition of peacebuilding is elusive. The chapters in this volume show that different organizations, institutions, and actors may have different notions of the foundations for peace, leading to tensions in peacebuilding programming and unintended consequences on the ground. When international or regional peacebuilding projects have failed to achieve their objectives, this is usually blamed on poor implementation or lack of commitment, rather than on the contradictory logic of peacebuilding itself.

When competing conceptions of peace are incompatible, there is no independent perspective that can adjudicate between them. This is not to say, however, that there is no power or hierarchy in peacebuilding. To the contrary, the chapters in this volume show that some conceptions of peace are privileged in Africa, and some activities are emphasized over others. Yet all actors with a stake in peacebuilding bring their own ideas, norms, and practices to a situation that is highly political and that may alter the local landscape in unexpected ways. Likewise, the local context may be refracted back to regional and international institutions. Sometimes this may provide an opportunity for learning and change, but in other instances the consequences may be more problematic. In order for scholars, students, and practitioners to propose peacebuilding change, they must have an awareness of the forces that constrain, obstruct, or give meaning to different peacebuilding practices.
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For instance, Daniel Serwer and Patricia Thomson developed a “standardized framework” for fragile states and societies emerging from conflict that assumes common “ultimate goals.” According to Serwer and Thomson: “While particular circumstances vary dramatically, there is remarkable consensus in the post–Cold War period on the end-states desired, even though there may be a good deal of debate on how best to achieve them.” Serwer and Thomson, “Framework for Success,” 372. It is notable, however, that this was developed using exclusively US sources, including the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the RAND Corporation, and the US State Department’s Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization.

This leads to important questions about the role of African scholars and think tanks in defining the peacebuilding agenda. Is there a risk that African researchers become data collectors for the West, finding evidence to reinforce and justify the prevailing preferred peacebuilding approaches? If so, how can this be addressed?
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