AID: Helpful or Harmful?

The “do no harm” ethic of aid comes under scrutiny

KUP WOMEN FOR PEACE

A group of women in Papua New Guinea use their tears to make peace.

THE ROAD TO PEACE:

Reconciliation and restorative justice between Timor Leste and Indonesia
T
here is no single model of peacebuilding that can be unilaterally applied to conflict situations. Put simply, peacebuilding is essentially about the efforts undertaken to create a peaceful environment. The ultimate goal of peacebuilders must surely be to put themselves out of a job. Peacebuilding can happen at the grassroots level, driven by those immediately affected by conflict, such as in Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Bougainville, and Palestine, as described in this issue of Just Change.

Top-down peace efforts in the form of external aid and intervention, however, are more contentious. Are external parties “being a good global citizen” or is the motivation inherently political – and far from neutral?

Despite UN resolutions and countless other efforts demanding equal participation of women and men, men have typically dominated formal peace processes – particularly at the negotiating table. Yet on the ground, it seems to often be women and young people – those who are always impacted most by violence – who initiate peacebuilding activities. It is interesting that twice as many women as men replied to our call for contributions for this issue of Just Change. Whether walking across enemy lines with open hands, or empowering youth to take responsibility and make decisions, women and youth living in conflict situations continually create new ways of responding non-violently to the violence that surrounds them.

Let’s say, for the sake of argument, that everyone wants peace. When I spent a month in the occupied Palestinian territories, both Israeli soldiers and Palestinian children told me, “We just want peace; they don’t want the peace”. It begged the question; what is peace? For those on either side of a conflict, does peace mean the same thing? How do those born into conflict imagine peace? Do concepts of peace vary from one culture to another? Does peace mean the same thing for women as for men? Is peace purely the absence of war, or does it include all forms of violence? Must peace incorporate social justice? Can peace exist without human rights?

We are right in the middle of the UN International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World (2001-2010). Are we halfway to achieving a Culture of Peace? Does the Hobbesian belief that human beings are ‘nasty by nature’ eliminate all possibilities for peace? Or can we pin our hopes for eventual peace on the UNESCO Seville Statement on Violence, which states that, “the same species who invented war is capable of inventing peace”.

The concept of “making peace” raises a lot of questions. I hope you’ll find the answers to some of them within these pages.

ALIA LEVINE
Editor, Just Change

COVER PHOTOGRAPH: Palestinian children’s graffiti on the Palestinian side of Israel’s eight-metre high “apartheid wall”. Abu Dis, West Bank, Occupied Palestinian Territories.

A barrier to peace: Israel’s construction of the wall illustrates a “divide and rule” strategy of land confiscation, preventing the viable development of a healthy, cohesive Palestinian state co-existing equally with Israel. When completed, the 730 km wall will annex some 47% of the West Bank, isolating communities into bantustans, enclaves, and “military zones”.

The wall cuts illegally into Palestinian land, prohibiting Palestinian access and mobility, isolating families, communities, and villages from their land, jobs, essential services and water, and from each other. It places some Palestinian olive groves, a vital source of livelihood, into the backyards of illegal Israeli settlements. Journeys which would usually take a few minutes now take Palestinians hours, or in some cases, days.

Israel’s construction of the wall breaches international humanitarian law, and has been condemned by the UN and members of the international community, including New Zealand (see, “New Zealand Voting Record on Palestinian Resolutions,” and statements by the New Zealand Permanent Representative H.E. Mr Don Mackay, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. www.mfat.govt.nz). For more information about the wall, go to www.pengon.org.
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FEEDBACK
We think that if the articles in Just Change elicit responses, positive or negative, that’s fantastic. A key motivation for publishing Just Change is to encourage critical thinking and to generate discussion about the crucial issues associated with global development. If you disagree wildly with what one of our contributors has said, or if you’ve had your mind expanded, write Just Change a letter and tell other readers about it. We don’t agree with everything we publish in these pages and we don’t expect you to either. Dev-Zone is guided by our values of promoting people-centred, sustainable and holistic development, although we do make an effort to publish a variety of views. We are limited, however, by the submissions we receive. We’d like to see our readers more involved in Just Change! The next issue is about Food. Write to our editor alia@dev-zone.org for submission details.
NEW ZEALANDERS MAKING PEACE NORTH AND SOUTH

Educating for peace in Aotearoa

MARION HANCOCK

Peace education is about helping students to understand and transform conflict in their own lives, in the community and in the world at large. It is also about helping them to understand what the prerequisites are for peace and people to flourish, what sustains and fosters peace and what mitigates against it.

The Peace Foundation came into being in 1974, at a time when campaigning for peace was far from fashionable. From its inception, the Foundation has concerned itself with promoting peace and non-violent conflict resolution at all levels, whether between two individuals or two superpowers. During its first decade, the focus was very much on international relations and the nuclear arms race. It arranged the speaking tour for anti-nuclear campaigner, Dr. Helen Caldicott, in 1983, who was a vital contributor to awakening public concerns about nuclear weapons. Her visit played a key role in making this country nuclear free.

In the mid-eighties, the Peace Foundation began focusing more of its energy on promoting peaceful relationships at home. It has concentrated on making information available to community groups, schools, decision-makers, churches, and, more recently to parents and parent centres. It has developed the largest peace education resource centre in the country with over 80 video titles, books, films, posters, teaching units, articles etc. These are available for anyone to use.

Our next major development (2006) is to introduce a Canadian schools-based programme called “Roots of Empathy”. Combining two crucial elements necessary for creating a peaceful community - good parenting and empathy – “Roots of Empathy” brings a local parent and infant into a classroom. The programme provides students with an understanding of the real responsibilities of parenting, so it has the potential to break intergenerational cycles of violence.

Marion Hancock is the Director of the Peace Foundation. For further information go to www.peace.net.nz.

The Peace Foundation Disarmament and Security Centre (DSC)

DSC (www.disarmsecure.org) is run from the home of Kate Dewes and Robert Green in Christchurch, which was the Peace Foundation’s South Island office from 1980. The Centre focuses on promoting nuclear and conventional disarmament while raising awareness about non-military solutions to conflicts. Over the past 25 years it has helped establish and teach Peace Studies courses at the University of Canterbury, promoted peace education in schools and provided a library of peace resources to students, teachers and the local community. It took a pioneering role in the World Court Project – an initiative to have the question of the legal status of nuclear weapons tested at the International Court of Justice in the Hague.

In more recent years, it has published booklets on nuclear deterrence, the World Court Project, and 11 stories of Pacific women about the need for independence and denuclearisation. The DSC website contains many articles about the history and outcome of the World Court Project, details of publications and outlines the work of Maori kuia Mrs. Pauline Langiora.

NO WARP!

WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT THE NZ COMPANIES INVOLVED IN MILITARY CONTRACTS AND WEAPONS PRODUCTION?

- Which company tests grenades on Foxton beach?
- Which company is currently being investigated by Customs for exporting military equipment to Israel after they were refused an export permit to do that?
- Which company that manages NZ military bases is part of a multinational which makes nuclear weapons overseas?

For more information about No WARP! the Network Opposed to Weapons and Related Production, check out www.converge.org.nz/pma/nawarp.htm or write to No WARP! c/o Peace Movement Aotearoa, PO Box 9314, Wellington.
Preventing Armed Conflict and Supporting Civil Society: WHAT’S THE CONNECTION?

AUBREY CHARETTE

In Mindanao, the Philippines, Bantay Ceasefire, a network established by civil society to monitor the 2003 ceasefire in the civil war, sends out teams to investigate reports of violence and skirmishes; helping civilians to safety, communicating needs to aid agencies and the media when necessary, and educating local people about the ceasefire agreement in the area. They have helped to popularise, support and solidify what was a shaky ceasefire agreement.

An Israeli woman, having dialled a wrong number, spoke to a Palestinian man she didn’t know for twenty minutes, transforming the way they both thought about those on the opposing side of the conflict. This encounter led to the Families Forum “Hello Peace” Project, which allows Palestinians and Israelis to phone anonymously and speak to someone on “the other side.” Since late 2002, nearly 500,000 conversations have taken place.

In Liberia, after a decade of war, 200,000 casualties and the displacement of 1.5 million people, women’s groups, under the auspices of the Liberian branch of Women in Peacebuilding Network (WIPNET), mobilised themselves in large numbers, peacefully marching down the streets and staging sit-ins to pressure politicians into an immediate and unconditional ceasefire. Mainly due to their efforts, including their blockade of the negotiating room when peace talks threatened to fail, a comprehensive peace agreement was reached 78 days later.

These cases, from the forthcoming publication, People building peace II: successful stories of civil society, highlight the important, and usually unrecognised, role civil society can and does play in preventing and resolving conflict. As the local people who are closest to, and directly affected by, local conflicts, civil society actors are often able to generate effective, long-lasting solutions.

People building peace II is a key component of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, a network of hundreds of civil society organisations all over the world who are working together to change the way in which conflict is perceived and dealt with. That people build peace is one of the key messages of the network. Conflict prevention is vital, in today’s world more than ever: millions of lives and livelihoods are taken every year, and millions more are scarred for generations to come. The civil wars and conflicts, of this era especially, are too complicated to be handled by the United Nations or governments alone; what is needed is cooperation at all levels, from regional organisations, local and national governments, the United Nations, and the people closest to the source: civil society. Given the right support, people will build peace; they must be given a chance to do so.

The Global Partnership is trying to promote and entrench civil society’s role in conflict prevention, by mobilising civil society around the world around their key priorities for change and support. Organised into 15 regions, civil society networks of the Global Partnership have been built and developed regionally since 2002, and have developed Regional Action Agendas of their recommendations for conflict prevention. In July, much of the global network will meet at the UN headquarters for the Global Conference to present a unified Global Action Agenda on the Prevention of Armed Conflict to Secretary-General Kofi Annan, and to determine implementation plans for the agenda. The Global Action Agenda is a key step in identifying the steps to achieve a shift from reaction to prevention in the way that conflict is addressed, and will serve as a voice and a platform for civil society actors around the world for future action.

The Global Partnership acknowledges that is but one of the many essential steps on the long road to peace. However, in an era when there is widespread acknowledgement of and derision at the United Nations’ failure to prevent conflicts from Iraq to Darfur, and the calls and proposals for reform are being heeded, there is clearly a need for fresh thinking and new solutions in conflict prevention at high levels. What is fresher or more powerful than a unified voice and movement for civil society actors around the world?

We want YOU to get involved in this process. Go to our website, www.gppac.net, sign up for updates and join the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict.

-- Aubrey Charette works at The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), an international network of organisations working in conflict prevention and peacebuilding worldwide. If you are interested in learning more about People building peace II: successful stories of civil society, or if you would like to place an advance order, please visit the “Research” section of our website, www.gppac.net, or contact Malin Brenk at mbrenk@conflict-prevention.net.

Given the right support, people will build peace; they must be given a chance to do so.
Vox Pops: Is “Peace” a Sustainable Sentiment?

WE ASKED THE DEV-ZONE COMMUNITY THEIR THOUGHTS ON “MAKING PEACE”.

**Vijay Naidu** is Professor and Head of Development Studies at Victoria University of Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.

1. It depends on how this ‘war on terror’ is defined. The way the United States and Britain has gone about it will not bring about long-term peace. War has brought peace when countries led by megalomaniacs and fascists have sought to impose their will widely. For example, the aggression by Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito which led to WWII. Their defeat meant so much to people the world over and in one sense contributed to peace in most places for 50 years. The right to take up arms against an external aggressor is justifiable war!

2. Economic growth needs to be accompanied by redistribution of wealth. Without the latter the likelihood of conflict would increase. Socially responsible corporations can play a significant role in peace processes (including in helping to bring down overly racist regimes as in South Africa), however their incessant search for more profit fundamentally contradicts both social and environmental responsibility.

3. Both peace and conflict/war are possibilities for human beings. People, groups and governments make choices. Human nature can be moulded to work for peace or for war!

4. The control over natural and human resources has always been a factor in most wars. The ‘war on terror’ as it is being enacted in Iraq and Afghanistan is a purely disguised quest for control over oil and gas reserves.

5. Generating awareness about what those in power are up to and engendering civil society movements and networks in countries and across the world to promote humanism, justice, empathy and peace.

---

**Marion Lienert** is the Dev-Zone librarian. She has been involved with the Pacific Institute for Resource Management (PIRM) and the Nuclear Free Pacific Movement. She is a member of Amnesty International.

1. This is a ‘Bushism’ used for scaremongering and to make the US seem like a protective big brother, removing the responsibility for creating peace away from each individual on the planet. This is where peace must begin.

2. Economic growth will end as the world’s finite resources run out. To create peace we need to learn ways of sharing these resources. Corporations must become aware of human and environmental rights. They need to respond to international conventions and laws, and not be “laws unto themselves”

3. Peace is always possible - I believe human beings strive to achieve a balance in their lives and that this is part of our human condition. Conflict can occur if a situation appears hopeless and unjust.

4. War is about control of anything and everything - usually by the powerful against the weak. We can make ourselves strong by forming groups and communities to support the causes we feel most passionately about.

5. Until we provide a fair means for trade and distribution of resources, and acknowledge of human rights, peace won’t be possible. What happens in one country affects other countries and the whole planet. We must accept individual and national responsibility to conserve and share the resources that are left.

---

**Valerie Morse** is a disdiant American and radical librarian based in Wellington.

1. The ‘war on terror’ is a war on people and civil liberties in the name of security. This security can never be achieved because it is based on the flawed premise that denying people freedom somehow makes them safer. I don’t believe that war can ever achieve peace.

2. Peace will not be achieved through western neo-liberal economic growth, but rather through an equitable distribution of resources throughout society. Corporations have no role in that whatsoever; they exist to make the most possible money with the least possible risk. That is fundamentally in opposition to the requirements for peace.

3. I believe that human beings are fundamentally good. I do not believe that war is a natural or inevitable state.

4. War is largely about control of resources although it is frequently clothed in rhetoric about religion, culture and ethnicity. This is a tactic by the elite to encourage the mass of people to support wars which benefit a few.

5. Eliminate corporations as legal entities: the power that they wield is a stumbling block to an equitable society which is one of the first requirements for peace.

---

**Siaka Coulibaly** is an independent law and development consultant and Executive Secretary of the Civil Society Organizations Network for Development (RESOCIDE), Ouedagoudou, Burkina Faso (West Africa).

1. As terrorism is a threat to peace and life, war against it gets legitimacy, but only if selective, well-researched, precise and justified. Reaching or not innocent people are the criterion which separates an unjust war from a just one.

2. Economic growth should build peace. However, one condition remains; the social justice in the distribution of the wealth. That makes corporation’s role more important, if the international community is able to impose on corporations a sense of social responsibility.

3. Peace is possible only if the political philosophy of the major Western societies is changed to human-positive values. The raising of the neo-conservatism in USA bears some interesting aspects.

4. Current wars are not for control of natural resources because these questions were resolved at the beginning of the 20th century, during the industrial revolution and after the two world wars. The challenge we face now is cultural and religious intolerance, and a will of global domination.

5. Only global mobilisation and action can mitigate the trend of violence. Access to information, organizational skill and financial support is the strategic aim of a global action for peace. Social and civic groups are best responses to rights abuses and the final masons of social peace.
Quakers Educating for Peace with Indonesian Police

ROBERT HOWELL

Modern conflict mainly occurs in the developing world. Mixed motives and uneven commitments characterise most wars. Often there is at best a tenuous link between war and justice as its motive. Many of the modern conflicts are not perpetrated by failed diplomatic or mediating efforts. Trying to promote stable peace requires a multi-level approach with actors with different skills and capacities, and with agencies from numerous government and non-government sectors. Often aid efforts have the outcome of unintentionally assisting or reinforcing the conflict. However, conflicts are also characterised by local capabilities for peace and by connectors that interlink the people who fight.

The Quaker Indonesian Police Project

We had found that no overseas agencies were doing any peace education work with the Indonesian police. We established links with the Centre for Interfaith and Peace Studies (CSPS) at Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta. CSPS had previously been asked to carry out an attitudinal study of the police force with both police and civilian participation. They had also carried out a three day workshop on conflict resolution with Central Java police.

In 1998 QF SANZ began a nonviolent conflict resolution project with the Centre for Security and Peace Studies in Yogyakarta and the Indonesian police. Funding was supplied in 2000 from the NZMFAT (New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade) Good Governance Fund for three workshops with the police in nonviolent conflict resolution training. The workshops were held in the Malukus, Nusa Tenggara Timur, and Riau in 2001. The following case study documents the Malukus workshop:

Police selected 27 participants, with a balance of sub-distriicts and religions to participate in the workshop. The first day was very tense. It was the first time for two years that all sub-district police Heads from Maluku and North Maluku had got together. By the second day the tensions had gone and the CSPS were asked to extend the workshop to five or six days.

The workshop format included introductions and personal experiences of conflict; knowledge and skills for analyzing conflict; roles and techniques for intervention, problem solving and partnership (community policing); and action plans to implement after the workshop. The CSPS team used a variety of techniques, including small group discussions, role plays, games, as well as lectures and videos. At the end of the workshop the participants agreed to work together in the following ways: arisan (a monthly social meeting); daily patrols (usually in a car through neighbourhoods); videos. At the end of the workshop the participants number 600 - 750. The workshops will be similar to the three workshops carried out in 2001. After MA graduation, alumni will teach at the national police schools for at least two years. There are discussions between the University and the Jakarta Embassy about similar courses for police in Acheh.

Excerpt from Quaker Statement on Peace:

“We totally oppose all wars, all preparation for war, all use of weapons and coercion by force, and all military alliances; no end could ever justify such means. We equally and actively oppose all that leads to violence among people and nations, and violence to other species and to our planet.”

For the full statement, go to:

www.quaker.org.nz/whoweare/peace.htm

Robert Howell is a management consultant; a contract university lecturer; and company director. He consults and teaches in governance, strategic planning, management systems, and business ethics. His Quaker concerns have involved him in many community organisations. He was the instigator and project leader (with Indonesian partners) of the nonviolent police training programme that was the subject of this article. He is the Chair of the Council for Socially Responsible Investment.

M.K. GANDHINSTITUTE FOR NONVIOLENCE was founded by Arun Gandhi (Mahatma Gandhi’s grandson) and his wife Sunanda, to promote and apply the principles of non-violence locally, nationally and globally, to prevent violence and resolve personal and public conflicts through research, education and programming. www.gandhinstitute.org

THE METTA CENTER FOR NONVIOLENCE EDUCATION works to inspire and support the study and practice of non-violence. By providing resources and other educational activities, the centre empowers themselves and others to deal with the legacy ofMahatma Gandhi, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and those who have blazed a trail to the “beloved community” and a non-violent future for humanity. www.mettacentre.org

NONVIOLENT PEACEFORCE facilitates the creation of a trained, international civilian nonviolent peaceforce. The Peaceforce will be sent to conflict areas to prevent death and destruction and promote human rights, thus creating the space for local groups to struggle nonviolently. http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org

PEACE BRIGADES INTERNATIONAL maintains international observer/accompaniment teams in areas of conflict. The association of local organisations. International accompaniment is a way of transforming the conflict, where armed parties can help create the conditions necessary to find solutions. www.peacebrigades.org

THE DALAI LAMA FOUNDATION supports the development of our shared global capacity for ethics and peace, based on a non-dogmatic ethic of compassion. It supports the work of the 14th Dalai Lama to reduce conflict and suffering, and promote peace and happiness in the world. www.dalailama-foundation.org

CODEP, THE CONFLICT, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE NETWORK. A multidisciplinary forum for academics, organisational practitioners involved in exploring the causes of conflict and its impact on people’s lives. Sharing ideas about policy and practice helps members challenge existing international responses to conflict and contribute to the development of good practice. www.codep.org.uk

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CONFLICT MANAGEMENT provided training to develop and disseminate theory, research and experience that is useful for understanding and improving conflict management in family, organisational, societal and international settings. www.iacm-conflict.org

JUST CHANGE MAKING PLantz 7
Fighting over Flags

EWAN MORRIS

In Ireland we only hoist flags with a view to irritating our enemies. G.A. Birmingham, The Red Hand of Ulster, 1912

O f all the things that can be fought over, flags and other symbols will strike many as being one of the silliest. How can sane people be roused to great passions over a piece of multicoloured cloth? Surely this is a sign of some kind of primitive mentality, some kind of atavistic tribalism unworthy of a modern, “civilised” society? Don’t people who fight over such trivia need to get a grip, get a life?

Ireland is one country where people have come into conflict, and at times come to blows, over flags and emblems. Fighting over flags has a long history in Ireland, but in recent decades it has largely been restricted to Northern Ireland, whose people continue to be divided by questions of national identity and allegiance. To nationalists, symbols of Irish nationality and Irish national struggle, such as the tricolour flag, represent a common Irishness that can embrace all the island’s inhabitants. To unionists, symbols of the United Kingdom and the British heritage, such as the Union Jack, represent a Britishness shared by all the peoples of the UK. Each side sees its own symbols as unproblematic and sees no reason why anyone should object to them. Yet each side finds the other’s symbols objectionable and offensive.

For fifty years, unionists controlled Northern Ireland, ensuring that the peoples of the USA (pp.132-3). There is very little mention of the kinds of rituals and symbols that we would be up to, but we don’t come to blows. However, these debates are largely going on between people who share a common sense of national identity. Think of Hone Heke chopping down the flagpole at Kororārea, and how it sparked the Northern War in the 1840s. Now imagine a future in which the Browning of New Zealand society leads to the election of a Māori sovereignty party, which promptly declares the tino rangatiratanga banner to be the national flag. Don’t tell me that many Pākehā wouldn’t be up in arms, perhaps literally!

Symbols are important because abstract entities like nations can be imagined through symbols. Symbols are used to mark boundaries of inclusion and exclusion; who is “us” and who is “them”. That is why they can lead to conflict, particularly in countries deeply divided along ethnic/national lines. And that is why peacebuilders cannot afford to ignore them.

If symbols play a role in stirring conflict, however, they also have a part to play in the search for peace.

If symbols play a role in stirring conflict, however, they also have a part to play in the search for peace. The peace process” in Northern Ireland has acknowledged the importance of symbols and the need to find new ways of dealing with conflict over symbolic questions. The repeal of the Flags and Emblems Act in 1987 was one attempt to create “parity of esteem” between the nationalist and unionist traditions. The removal of partisan symbols from workplaces has been an important part of efforts to end discrimination in employment.

The Good Friday Agreement, endorsed by voters in both parts of Ireland in 1998 as a framework for resolution of the Northern Ireland conflict, explicitly recognises the sensitivity of the public use of symbols. It talks of the need, in creating new institutions, “to ensure that such symbols and emblems are used in a manner which promotes mutual respect rather than division”. What this means in practice is an issue that is still being worked through by the people of Northern Ireland. One example of the search for new institutions with new symbols is the creation of the Police Service of Northern Ireland to replace the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC). The new police service has a new badge, designed to represent both major traditions, replacing the old RUC badge that was seen by most nationalists as a unionist symbol.

None of this, however, answers the question of why people in Ireland are so precious about their symbols. After all, when we in Aotearoa New Zealand have differences of opinion about the flag, we do “civilised” things like organising petitions. Sure, some of us might get a bit worked up about it, but we don’t come to blows. However, these debates are largely going on between people who share a common sense of national identity. Think of Hone Heke chopping down the flagpole at Kororārea, and how it sparked the Northern War in the 1840s. Now imagine a future in which the Browning of New Zealand society leads to the election of a Māori sovereignty party, which promptly declares the tino rangatiratanga banner to be the national flag. Don’t tell me that many Pākehā wouldn’t be up in arms, perhaps literally!

Symbols are important because abstract entities like nations can be imagined through symbols. Symbols are used to mark boundaries of inclusion and exclusion; who is “us” and who is “them”. That is why they can lead to conflict, particularly in countries deeply divided along ethnic/national lines. And that is why peacebuilders cannot afford to ignore them.


Ritual and Symbol in Peacebuilding,
Lisa Schirch, Kumerian Press, 2005

Reviewed by S.W. LAUTENSACH

‘Building peace with ritual is like dancing in the dragon’s jaws. Ritual is a circle of women standing firm against the tides of patriarchy… Ritual empowers people to be free even while in the grip of conflict’ (p.161).

This book is rich in examples, such as those alluded to above, and largely eschews simplistic solutions. In this respect, it is quite unlike some of the more “pop psych” texts that are found in the literature on conflict resolution, even though some of these (such as Fisher and Ury’s Getting to Yes) are cited approvingly. It is most useful for providing a series of examples (pp.3-13, 173-4) of the use of ritual and symbol in peacebuilding, and demonstrates how such rituals and symbols remind participants in conflict of their shared humanity with the other side, create incentives to build peace, and sometimes show a way through the parties’ disagreements. A handshake, a meal, throwing horse-shoes and passing a Native American peace pipe are all examples that are discussed in this book, as are more elaborate, but nevertheless improvised, feminist rituals such as the Take Back the Night ritual—a response to domestic violence in the USA (pp.132-3).

Analysis of ritual or symbol, however, barely goes beyond the average Cultural Anthropology textbook (see pp.141-3). There is very little mention of the kinds of rituals and symbols that we would associate with the world religions. This is strange, because the world religions have been factories of ritual and symbol—they are the multinationals that produce the best-known brands. Although their role in conflict is well known, so is their role in peacemaking. It would be interesting to reflect on how they mobilise their rituals and symbols in such efforts.

In addition, the author seems to take a strangely starry-eyed view of the role of the United States in peacebuilding around the world. While there are discussions of the history of slavery and the treatment of Native Americans, the US position on Israel has clearly influenced the author leading her to analyse Camp David as providing for Israeli “needs”
Pauline Tangiora Q.S.O., Q.S.M. is a Māori elder from the Rongomaiwahine tribe on the East Coast of the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. She has affiliations with many other tribes. She is a Justice of the Peace, a former President and currently Vice President of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (Aotearoa), the former Regional Women’s Representative for the World Council for Indigenous Peoples, an Earth Charter Commissioner and a member of the Earth Council. She is a life member of the Māori Women’s Welfare League and a Patron of the Peace Foundation. She has represented Aotearoa at many international fora and was a Consultant to the International Steering Committee of the World Court Project, a legal challenge to nuclear weapons.

How do you define peace?
I don't think there is a definite definition of peace. Peace is something that comes from deep within. You can have peace around you; which is by the beauty of what you see, or the feeling you get up in the morning with the birds and the bird calls, you can find peace in the middle of a group of children laughing, you can also find peace in the middle of the war, when you see somebody when they are first struck down can still pick themselves up and they have such a tranquility that it is also peaceful.

How do you believe peace can exist in the world?
I am hoping that with respect for one another and allowing other people to see the boundaries that they need to be in or outside of, that we may not agree with that person but that we can respect that is where they are at.

I feel as a young woman beginning on a journey of peace work that although there are many things to feel positive about I can feel overwhelmed at times with the state of the earth and I find myself getting cynical and depressed.

Don't lose hope, Annie! That is what being young is all about. Youth is about knowing that there must be peace around the corner. It is not defined what moment peace will come into the world, but you know that by being alive you can participate in that peace work. Hope is something that is a part of that spirit of yours - and young people must always believe it is a spirit. Hope is not something you can see or touch, it is something that comes from deep within; and holding onto that is actually the important issue. Otherwise life would become very depressing. With 40 odd wars going on as we are talking, we have to believe in peace. Otherwise I don't want to live.

You have done much work with indigenous peoples (especially women) internationally: do you think we have a lot of work to do here with the indigenous Māori in Aotearoa?
I believe we do have a lot of work to do. It must come with the unification of Māori working together as Māori because we are a greater force if we go under our Māori nationality rather than as separate tribes. In Aotearoa we have so much, but we expect so much more. Sometimes we are not prepared to move on and to take what is there and use it for better things. I believe that is what colonisation has done to many of our peoples in this country, and they do not call out as easily.

You visited Iraqi communities to be alongside the women, children and families living with the fear of looming war by the United States. How did you and those you were supporting cope with that fear and find the strength to keep on living?
My observation was that they knew there were other people in life that also had hope and that there is another day to be lived. They had a knowing that there were other people who really cared. Each group inspired each other because if you look to the left or to the right there is always somebody holding onto something. This would help the next person along to think, “Well they are not throwing it in, so I'll hang in there”.

In your prayer for world peace ("Ceremony for the inter-religious prayer for world peace") one line reads, “peace comes not from contemplation but action!”. In your experience what actions have been valuable in terms of creating peace?
To go to places where there is a lot of fear. When people can actually see that fear doesn’t stop one from trying to bring a peaceful resolution for something.

– Annie Boanas has recently started working at the Peace Foundation in the Wellington office. Annie has known Pauline Tangiora since she was a child and is one of the many 'mokopuna' that Pauline or 'Nanny Pauline' has answered these questions personally, and not on behalf of any organisation. For more by Pauline Tangiora, visit the Disarmament and Security Centre website, www.disarmsecure.org/Pauline/index.htm.

Photo courtesy of David Robie, Asia-Pacific Network.

The Little Book of Conflict Transformation,
Reviewed by EMILY BENEFIELD

It is interesting to hear conflict described as an opportunity for positive change within a community. Lederach coined the term “conflict transformation” in the 1980s while working in Central America where people were suspicious of the term “conflict resolution”, as it suggested a quick solution to complex problems.

Conflict transformation, as opposed to conflict resolution, is an approach that examines the “bigger picture” of a conflict and seeks to discover the “epicentre” of the problem. Conflict is viewed as a catalyst for change, an opportunity to address the deeper issues behind the conflict and work towards long-term solutions rather than just slapping a band-aid on a violent situation. The book makes useful comparisons between the two approaches of conflict transformation and resolution.

This book is part of the Little Books of Justice and Peacebuilding series and at a mere 74 pages is not long enough for an in-depth discussion yet too long for a simple definition. A fast read, it is an excellent book for anyone studying conflict and peacebuilding. I found the use of metaphor excessive and preferred the real life examples, which were fewer.

– Emily Benefield is a stay-at-home mum with a keen interest in human rights. She is a member of Amnesty International.

Photo courtesy of David Robie, Asia-Pacific Network.

22 March 2003: National Day of Action against the War.
AID: Helpful or Harmful?

GERALDINE CANHAM-HARVEY

Aid is often typified as a politically neutral and impartial intervention, provided when humanitarian emergencies arise. When these emergencies are caused or exacerbated by civil wars, maintaining aid’s neutrality and impartiality is problematic, for such emergencies do not occur within a political vacuum. Aid cannot and does not operate in isolation from the political context of such humanitarian emergencies. In reality, aid operations in civil wars are inherently politicised activities.

Typically, a humanitarian emergency is created and sustained by a multitude of political, social and economic factors. These interrelated factors form a complex situation in which a seemingly benign intervention, such as aid, can have unintended consequences, and be perceived as anything but politically neutral and impartial. This is particularly true in the case of a civil war, also known as a “complex political emergency”. When aid is introduced into situations of instability and lawlessness (which civil wars typically exemplify), it can affect power differentials within the conflict, creating shifts or consolidations of power among warring factions, and between militia and civilians. For this reason there is an inherent advantage for warring factions to control the distribution of aid for their own political purposes.

The abuse and misuse of humanitarian assistance for political and economic gains of warlords, war entrepreneurs and militia groups is well-documented. It has led some of the most war-hardy agencies to withdraw aid; in 1994 for instance, several agencies ceased operations in Rwandan refugee camps in Zaire due to the repeated seizure of aid by Rwandan Hutu militia. The militia were using the camps as a rear base, commandeering aid to feed troops and deliberately withholding relief to refugees affiliated with opposing forces. The agencies judged it better to pull out than to indirectly aggravate suffering and support injustice.

Aid agencies can indirectly assist warring parties to upgrade or enhance their own operational capabilities by constructing the infrastructure necessitated by relief operations, such as roads and radio communications. By providing food and essential health services, agencies have been accused of releasing factions from the financial and humanitarian responsibility to provide for the material needs of civilians; instead, warring factions are enabled to channel finances into the war effort.

By providing food and essential health services, agencies have been accused of releasing factions from the financial and humanitarian responsibility to provide for the material needs of civilians; instead, warring factions are enabled to channel finances into the war effort.

There is an inherent advantage for warring factions to control the distribution of aid for their own political purposes.

In 1998, the then British Secretary of State for Development, Clare Short, summed up the problem: 2

Thoughtful humanitarians have already realised that, in the eyes of many people, humanitarian aid has lost most of its moral currency. Once an undisputed symbol of solidarity with those struck down by misfortune and adversity, humanitarian assistance is now vilified by many as part of the problem: feeding fighters, strengthening perpetrators of genocide, creating new war economies, fuelling conflicts and perpetuating crises.

There is an important proviso to consider, namely that there is little empirical evidence that presents a clear causal relation between aid and its supposed detrimental effects on conflict. In order to prove a direct relation, a study would need to compare situations where aid was and was not given, to rule out a multitude of other independent variables that could be intensifying or prolonging conflict. This would prove a difficult undertaking.

Furthermore, when weighed up against other political and economic forces underpinning a war, the potential for aid to aggravate conflict would appear minimal. For instance, the exploitation of aid by warring parties for economic and political benefit is eclipsed when compared to other activities that finance civil wars, such as the smuggling and trafficking of narcotics, precious stones, minerals, and small arms, and illegal logging. 3 Additionally, civil conflicts result from a combination of historical and political processes, including development and state building.

Nonetheless, the fact that aid might indirectly prolong or intensify a conflict indicates that aid agencies must seek to mitigate these effects. The classic view that aid must be delivered in any manner, without consideration of the context or consequences, has long been viewed by the majority of aid agencies as naïvely destructive. The “do no harm” concept is instead now standard policy. 4 Humanitarian agencies attempt to ensure they are “conflict sensitive” through the use of conflict analyses and peace and conflict impact assessments that appraise and evaluate the potential impacts of aid operations in a complex political emergency, both positive and negative.

In terms of the positive impacts of aid, the theory that aid can not only address humanitarian suffering but also potentially build peace has gained increased credence amongst the aid community since the 1990s. Proponents of this “maximalist” perspective propose that agencies should “work on conflict, rather than working around it”, by developing aid operations that moderate protracted conflicts, or exert leverage in peacebuilding processes.

“Working on conflict” in practice can involve closer co-ordination of humanitarian, political and military interventions to provide a coherent approach to managing the causes, catalysts and consequences of civil wars. There is a risk, however, that co-ordination will heighten the politicisation of aid. The safety and access of aid operations can be jeopardised if warring parties perceive aid operations as being politically motivated, and thus non-neutral and partial. In practice, many aid agencies have sought to maintain a strict separation of their operations and those of security forces, to uphold the perception of neutrality and impartiality of their aid. This is complicated by their need to draw on such forces for protection when transporting and distributing aid, or running clinics. The situations in Iraq and Afghanistan have demonstrated that this is not a problem with any easy solutions.

A further challenge is that combining neutral and impartial aid operations with peacebuilding projects could require agencies to prioritise between objectives that, in some contexts, may not be compatible. This begs the question of whether aid should be seen purely as an end (addressing humanitarian need), or a means to an end (such as peacebuilding, or conflict resolution). In other words, should the fundamental objective of the humanitarian response be to relieve suffering, or to resolve conflict?

When weighed up against other political and economic forces underpinning a war, the potential for aid to aggravate conflict would appear minimal.

1. The term “aid” in this article refers to funding and resources given as humanitarian assistance or “relief”, as distinct from development projects. In practice the distinction is often negligible, for practical and theoretical reasons.


KUP WOMEN FOR PEACE: Women Taking Action to Build Peace and Influence Community Decision-Making  

SARAH GARAP

Women have played, and continue to play, a prominent and critical role in conflict resolution and peacemaking processes in many different parts of the world. Women in the highlands of Papua New Guinea (PNG) are no exception.

KUP Women for Peace (KWP) was built on the collective effort of women activists in Kup Sub-District to address the issues of tribal fighting and violence against women and children, and to build peace among the various clans and tribal groups. They used their tears as weapons for peace and through this brought about a process of re-thinking by the men who were involved in the fighting. They have worked with local police, churches, the Tribal Watch Group, Village Courts and others for peace, to safeguard people’s human rights, and to promote civic pride and self-employment opportunities. It is a big task in an area known not only for continual tribal fights, but also for violence against women and witch-hunts. It is in the absence of a government presence, or the lack of the processes of law and justice, that these women mobilized their available resources, in particular ‘their social roles as mothers and carers’. At great personal risk, they continue to work to prevent violence and to build peace.

Background

The Kup Sub-District is part of Simbu Province in the rugged PNG highlands. Kup is a comparatively undeveloped area. The major cash crop is coffee, but due to road problems and lack of proper market infrastructure, it is difficult for people to get their produce to markets; the majority of incomes are low. Hold-ups by raskols (criminals) are sometimes a problem, and often involve the stealing of coffee bags.

KUP’s under-development is also due to another major problem, tribal fighting. There has been a succession of major fights since 1971. The tribal fighting in 1999 was worse than past tribal fights. Many people were killed. Whole villages were burnt down and women were raped. Women and even children were killed and public servants ran away as they too were attacked. Schools, the health centre and police station were closed and roads were blocked to prevent people from entering enemy territory. People began to migrate out of Kup. The village courts ceased operation due to the tribal fighting and also because the magistrates had not received their allowances since 1997.

 Violence against women

In the Kup area, and in Simbu Province as a whole, many people, particularly women, are unaware of their basic human and legal rights. Women are often targets of revenge for tribal fights and rape is quite common; two or three cases of rape are reported each week. The use of firearms, damage to property, and the loss of husbands and sons all contribute to the suffering of women and children. Women run for fear of their lives, sometimes pregnant or with babies, and taking what little property they are able to carry with them.

KUP women for peace: how the work for peace began

In early 2000, at a women’s meeting in Kerowagi, women from Kup met for the first time after a devastating tribal fight in 1998, which according to them was the ‘worst ever experienced’. Many had lost loved ones, houses and properties were destroyed, and villages around Kup government station became a total desert as vegetation were also destroyed. Meeting after so much suffering, women from four different ‘enemy tribes’ had to hug each other and cry. Other women present also openly cried with them. Three women declared, ‘we are already victims of warfare. It cannot get any worse. Let us give our lives to work for peace.’ KWP started with four women. The group now has ten women and seven men who are the key people in its work and progress. The women, in particular, have been greatly empowered by their involvement in the KWP.

Extending peace across borders

On 13 December, fighting erupted between two clans within the Minj District of Western Highlands Province. Now, for the first time in the history of KWP movement, and for the very first time in Simbu Province, members of the KWP decided to walk onto the battlefield and stop the fighting.

The KWP members, seven women and four men, spent two weeks camping on the battlefield, using their printed t-shirts to identify themselves and their loudhailer to call for a truce. They stayed in villages belonging to the warring clans. They talked peace, using their tears to cry about the bloodshed and destruction of properties. This was a new phenomenon for the men who were fighting. They had never seen or heard strangers, especially women, talk about peace in this way. This was a ‘new message they were hearing’ and both parties decided to stop fighting. Both parties agreed that the women would initiate peace and facilitate the compensation payments. In their words, ‘The police and the government have forgotten us. But these women cared for us enough to be with us for two weeks’.

The peace workers then walked for many hours to Minj, the district’s government station to organise the signing of declaration forms normally recognised by the formal courts. The peace workers took into account demands from both parties and went back and forth to negotiate and to confirm agreements. On 26 December, KWP facilitated the payment of compensation. The community leaders, women and youth leaders expressed interest in KWP’s work; KWP’s process of peacebuilding has been taken over the border to help people from another province.

Beyond tribal fights and war: challenges for the future

KWP feels strongly that their next task is to concentrate on gender issues and to allow the men and the community at large to keep the momentum going in stopping tribal fights. Their new direction involves working with the Village Courts and community leaders to help set up a local justice system where lawlessness, particularly violence against women, is controlled.

Peace workers such as the KWP still have a long way to go before they can achieve social justice for women. The peace process must continue, and it needs support from members of the community and the government, as well as a sympathetic ear from aid donors. As responsible citizens we need to echo Martin Luther King’s idea that ‘Peace is about socio-economic justice. It is not the opposite of war’. Every social actor needs to readjust their behaviour and attitudes towards social justice issues.

An emphasis on strong and equitable partnership between men and women is required to reduce violence and discrimination against women, to alleviate poverty, and to promote sustainable development. Sustainable peace will not be achieved without the full and equal participation of women and men.

SARAH GARAP is a prominent community development worker and human rights activist who has worked in a number of non-government organisations and community programs in different parts of Papua New Guinea. Her work has been aimed at promoting the rights of women and children in the highlands of PNG. She is on the coordinating team of Kup Women for Peace and is currently the director of MERI KIRAP SAPOTIM, a group she formed in the aftermath of the 2002 national elections.

This is an excerpt from “Kup Women for Peace: Women Taking Action to Build Peace and Influence Community Decision-Making”, State, Society and Governance in Melanesia, Discussion paper 2004/14, pp1-16. Canberra: research school of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
When Indonesian President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono visited Aotearoa New Zealand in April, an important question was asked: would Aotearoa New Zealand restore military ties to Indonesia? Had the time come to “close the chapter” on East Timor? The Government replied that Aotearoa New Zealand would keep military ties to Indonesia “under review”.

The crimes committed in East Timor during Indonesia’s brutal occupation must be considered in the same light as the crimes committed in Bosnia, Iraq and Rwanda. It is unthinkable that Aotearoa New Zealand would turn away while the perpetrators remain unaccountable.

To its credit, the Aotearoa New Zealand Government has until now supported the establishment of an international tribunal to consider the East Timor war crimes, but restoration of defence ties would undermine this commitment.

In the topsy-turvy world of pragmatic politics, the East Timorese government has opted for a compromise – a proposal for a joint human rights and truth commission with Indonesia. The proposal would ensure that no one was prosecuted, and has been accompanied by a call for the United Nations to end its involvement in the matter.

Meanwhile, a UN Committee of Experts has been appointed by the Secretary General to examine the justice process that has taken place so far in East Timor and Indonesia. Indonesian human rights leaders went to East Timor to join their Timorese colleagues in meetings with the UN Committee. This was just as well, because when the UN experts directed the mayhem in East Timor they have simply moved on to new command posts in the killing fields of Aceh and West Papua.

Shortly after the US and Australian decisions to resume defence ties, Major General Safie Syamasuddin was appointed to the post of Secretary General of the Ministry of Defence. He has a human rights record of infamy that includes a key command role at the time of the 1999 atrocities in East Timor.

The Indonesian Commander in Chief has also announced a major enlargement of the country’s military forces with the establishment of 22 new territorial commands and a new division for troubled West Papua, bringing the total troop strength there to 50,000.

In Aceh, the international media spotlight has turned away in the months since the immediate aftermath of the tsunami and things are said to be getting back to “normal”. Aguswandi, an Acehnese human rights activist who toured Aotearoa New Zealand in January says that Aceh before the tsunami could only be compared with North Korea or Burma for the level of repression imposed under the euphemistically named “state of civil emergency”. Several areas of Aceh are still under direct military control while the “civilian” authority is in the hands of the police. Military posts outnumber medical centres and schools.

Yet the people show amazing resilience. Aguswandi relates a joke from the refugee camps: “Sukarno, Suharto, Susilo and tsunami” – they are the same bringers of tragedy for the Acehnese.

Both East Timorese and Indonesian human rights and victims groups are angry and insist that past atrocities cannot be swept under the carpet.

Unfortunately, both Australia and the United States have taken the ‘reconciliation’ message to mean that it is time to resume military ties with Indonesia. Australia and Indonesia conducted a big bilateral maritime defence exercise in April, and the US has wasted no time resuming military training support.

The Indonesian military has been virtually untouched by post-Suharto reforms and its ongoing arrogant abuse of power continues to be the biggest threat to democratic progress.

As western nations “close the chapter” on past abuses it is easy to see the impact of this “green light” to impunity. Some Generals who are believed to have planned and directed the mayhem in East Timor have simply moved on to new command posts in the killing fields of Aceh and West Papua.

There is cautious optimism about the peace talks under way in Finland between the Free Aceh Movement (GAM) and the Indonesian Government. However, these peace talks have excluded representation from civil society and have not been accompanied by a ceasefire.

Aotearoa New Zealand could do a lot to help the people of Aceh by calling for a ceasefire and for the negotiations to be broadened to include representatives of all sectors of society. Of course, we should also continue with our aid programmes, and shift the emphasis to helping to build the capacity of Aceh’s NGOs – they need lots of support after so many years of living with isolation and repression. Contrary to some rumours, the people of Aceh want the foreigners to stay and work alongside them.

Aotearoa New Zealand should not “close the chapter” on past abuses or restore defence ties and印尼, but it should develop its people to people ties and extend positive support to the peace building process.

– Maire Leadbeater (maire@clear.net.nz) is the spokesperson for the Indonesia Human Rights Committee, Box 68-419 Auckland.
The youth of Nepal face innumerable challenges. Deficiencies in education, health, security, employment and access to resources are encountered in every community, leading to low levels of civic participation and opportunities for young people and their families. The political instability giving rise to and arising from years of civil war between Maoist insurgents and government forces has meant democratic government has not been within the life experience of young people in Nepal.

Against this somber scenario, groups of young people have come together from various educational backgrounds, ethnic groups and geographic regions to form a new non-profit organisation – Youth Action Nepal (YOAC). Run and led by youth, YOAC’s aim is to enhance opportunities for youth involvement in nation-building, to help Nepalese youth make a positive difference in our war-torn society. The vision is a future for Nepal where peace and democratic freedom, compassion and respect, will ultimately prevail.

YOAC’s mission is, “To enhance youth involvement in the nation-building process”. Nation-building means educating people to increase their effective participation, building nominal consensus among youth and engaging young people in their communities as a way of helping them understand their social and cultural potential.

YOAC works at the grassroots village and neighbourhood level where most young people do not have access to good quality information, empowering education and effective communication. We have also concentrated our work in conflict-affected regions, where youth are isolated.

YOAC runs its activities with the volunteering spirit of YOAC governance group and community-based educators. We have only accepted members who can contribute their time to community education and youth development in very difficult situations. A major factor of our ability to conduct a wide scope of activities in a short period of time is our personal motivation and collective enthusiasm.

Youth activities and involvement in peace-building

YOAC provides a platform for youth to develop themselves and to make positive changes in the communities where they live. YOAC leaders have developed considerable experience as community educators and activists for sustainable peace. Unless and until youth are working with the issues of country and government, this conflict cannot be resolved.

In July 2004, YOAC organised a national workshop in Kathmandu dealing with conflict management in the protracted civil war. The workshop was attended by university students, conflict victims, other NGOs and journalists. There were presentations, discussions, and experience sharing. Participants learned practical tools to utilise in resolving and managing conflict in Nepal.

YOAC organised the “Leadership, Human Rights and Conflict Management Regional Level Training Programme” in Itahari in December 2004. The objectives were to initiate human rights education and advocacy programmes, and to empower, inform and involve youth on human rights, conflict management and leadership issues. The training sensitised youth to the current armed conflict situation of Nepal and its impact on human rights. YOAC members also held peace rallies on International Youth Day.

YOAC is currently running a project with the support of Te Ora Hou Aotearoa (an Aotearoa New Zealand-based NGO) and NZAID. The project focuses on organisational capacity building, and human rights and peace education among young people, providing information about the steps needed to build a just and peaceful society. The support is provided by the public of Aotearoa New Zealand through Te Ora Hou Aotearoa has been pivotal in the establishment and development of our organisation.

Problems we are facing

Running a youth organisation has been a challenging task in a country as currently unstable as Nepal. We have limited access to resources, and people lack time and energy to be engaged in voluntary action.

The political insecurity and existing armed conflict is a major challenge for youth participation in terms of where we can work. We face regular challenges from the rebels as well as the government. The country is under a State of Emergency; our constituency guarantees fundamental rights have been suspended, and we are not permitted to organise any public events without pre-approval from the administrative authorities. The Maoists are calling for indefinite blockades of main roads and strikes, which has restricted freedom of movement out of fear of rebel attacks on dissidents. In this climate of fear, it is increasingly difficult to travel around the country and organise events.

Another problem is core funding. Nepal is one of the five poorest countries on the planet; we are always concerned about the sustainability of our activities and the future of the organisation. The government has no scheme to fund organisations that work for the welfare of young people and communities.

Request for international solidarity

The support of Aotearoa New Zealanders is of immense value in this difficult situation, and we welcome more interest: assistance with the enhancement of our organisational capacity and skills development; working as a YOAC volunteer; and increasing awareness about the situation of Nepal in Aotearoa New Zealand.

– Prakash Bhattacharai is the General Secretary and Roshni Rai is the Secretary for Youth Action Nepal. For more information: www.youthaction.org.np.
The current Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories has created numerous structural and social inequalities inhibiting development, including economic collapse and poverty, lack of infrastructure, a public health crisis, and increased discrimination, social exclusion, and trauma.

The UN and many Member States (including Aotearoa New Zealand) have condemned Israel’s recent actions, including the construction of an eight-metre high concrete wall throughout the West Bank; the destruction of houses, harvests and infrastructure; mass population removal and curfews; school and university closures; and the denial of urgent medical treatment.

Theisheh refugee camp is located just outside the city of Bethlehem in the occupied West Bank. Dheisheh camp’s 11,000 residents, 6,000 of whom are children, live on less than one km² of land. Dheisheh is one of 59 Palestinian refugee camps established after the founding of the state of Israel in 1948. Six million Palestinian refugees remain displaced around the world today.

In Dheisheh two under-resourced schools serve the entire camp. Unemployment has skyrocketed to more than 70%, as the Israeli closures and curfews have nearly wiped out economic activities in the occupied territories. Today, two-thirds of the population live under the poverty line (US$2/day) and for the first time in history, malnutrition among Palestinian children is rampant.

There is nowhere for children to play, other than the rubble of the camp streets. Their daily lives are stressful and unpredictable. Children in the camp sleep through nights of gunfire. They may commute to school amidst Israeli tanks and soldiers, walk down the streets with guns pointed at their bodies, or struggle every day to pass through military checkpoints to get to class. Young people are born and live under repeated curfew (house arrest). They are guaranteed to have witnessed or experienced violence on numerous occasions, with at least one family member killed by Israeli military and other family in Israeli jails, often held without charges.

Ibdaa, which means “to create something out of nothing”, is a grassroots organisation that provides social, educational and cultural programmes to the children, youth and women of Dheisheh refugee camp. Forced by their circumstances and immediate surroundings to witness extreme violence from a very young age, Dheisheh youth articulate concerns, desires and fears that go far beyond their years. At Ibdaa, these young people address issues of displacement, violent conflict and hardship through innovative programmes.

Working with over 1,500 children, youth and women in the camp per year, Ibdaa works to empower young people and instil in them the confidence, strength and tools to cope with the difficulties of their daily existence. Volunteers from the West Bank and all over the world conduct a range of classes.

“We can’t sit down and talk about peace with someone who will be carrying a gun the next day and facing us at the checkpoint.”

Children playing soccer in the cramped streets of Dheisheh refugee camp. Photo: Marcelle Hopkins
from sports to music to film making. Ibdaa’s dance troupe has toured over 35 countries to communicate and raise awareness, through dance and testimonials, the experience of life in a refugee camp under occupation.

Upon first glance, there appears to be little opportunity for youth in Dheisheh to “build peace”. One young person told me, “We can’t sit down and talk about peace with someone who will be carrying a gun the next day and facing us at the checkpoint. Or with someone who has shot my brother or my mother”. Another said, “We cannot negotiate with Israel while we are made to live the way we do. We have no power to truly negotiate because we have no rights”. Ziad Abbas, Ibdaa’s co-director told me, “You cannot expect the victim to sit down and talk with the victimiser”.

However, Ibdaa’s initiatives are not based on models of peacebuilding that emphasise dialogue and mediation, but on peacebuilding as “learning alternative ways of behaving to the violent role models around them”.

Leadership training provides youth with the tools to cope with their difficult lives, and forms the central basis of Ibdaa’s peacebuilding work. Ibdaa’s work helps maintain young people’s mental health and confidence, building fair-minded individuals capable of shaping a secure and peaceful society – if the occupation ever ends.

Youth at Ibdaa told me that for them, peacebuilding was part of non-violent resistance and global education. It meant an alternative to throwing stones; building peace by communicating with the international community and breaking down Arab/terrorist stereotypes through discussion, radio, documentaries and dance. Whether on tour, on film or online, these young people speak to audiences worldwide to encourage an international network in support of a just reso-

lution between Palestine and Israel that acknowledges the human rights (and the right to development) of both sides.

I asked many of the young people at the centre, “What do you think peace means?”. Almost every reply involved being able to move freely. One teenager told me that peace meant being able to go to school without being afraid. Another answered, “This is a hard question because I’ve never lived in peace. I’ve never seen freedom. So peace for me is everything I can do in my own land, my own home, without any difficulties”.

Ibdaa youth are enthusiastic and eloquent public speakers and performers. They are also grimly realistic about their status and their lives. As third generation refugees, they cannot travel freely in their homeland, and many have no expectation of seeing an end to the Israeli occupation in their lifetimes.

**Peace and development are synonymous; both symbolise the progressive realisation of human rights.**

---

Education for Children Affected by Armed Conflict

JOANNE DEAN

More than half of the world’s children are growing up in conflict or post-conflict zones. Experts estimate that these children account for approximately 60% of the 104 million school-age children who are not enrolled in school. In Afghanistan, for instance, more than 70,000 school-age children must work on city streets to survive – despite the fact that hundreds of schools have been repaired since the 20-year conflict subsided.

Education plays a vital role in peacebuilding and is increasingly recognised as an important part of humanitarian response. Uneducated young people often face a future of poverty and violence and can lack the more complex skills needed to contribute to their society’s peaceful reconstruction and development. Without the stability and structure of education, the impact of conflict is intensified and children are more vulnerable to exploitation and harm, including abduction, child soldiering, and sexual and gender-based violence.

EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AFFECTED BY ARMED CONFLICT is a joint programme effort within 27 Save the Children member organisations, including Aotearoa New Zealand, to realise a change for children’s education on a global scale. The first phase will target conflict and post-conflict countries in which Save the Children already operates, including Nepal, Sudan, Afghanistan, Uganda, Democratic Republic of Congo and Indonesia.

SAVE THE CHILDREN HAS SET OUT TO ACHIEVE THE FOLLOWING FOUR KEY OBJECTIVES BY 2010:

1. ACCESS: Three million conflict-affected, out-of-school children gain access to education;
2. QUALITY: A further five million conflict-affected children benefit from improved quality of education, emphasising relevance, learning and participation;
3. PROTECTION: Education is established as a recognised means for protecting children affected by armed conflict;
4. FINANCING: The international community mobilises significantly increased resources for education in children in countries affected by conflict.

– For more information go to www.scnz.org.nz or contact Joanne Dean at joanne.dean@scnz.org.nz.

APEACE

APEACE is the product of six Year 12 Māori wāhine from Gisborne Girls High School who live and breathe their music. The project consisted of workshops about Parihaka, singing and song writing, and drama, culminating in the APEACE CD.

Learning about Parihaka was the catalyst that got the group thinking about war and peace in general, and who suffers most during times of conflict. “The songs are about the ongoing struggle for peace.” (CD cover). They pay tribute to the people of Parihaka and look outwards towards a global perspective.

– APEACE is the result of an Oro Art Studio project funded by Save the Children. The songs are performed by Roimata Fox, Luana – Shekinah Wilson, Laura West Wood, Raewyn Leach, Marrisse Te Kani Love and Catherine August. Songs were composed and directed by Malia Patea-Taylor. To purchase APEACE, go to www.amplifier.co.nz or contact Charmaine Clark, Project Manager, at the Oro Arts Studio Office, (06) 868 7722.

Waiata for Peace

APEACE

Aue
Haere ra
Atu ra

Can we share a little time
Will the good outweigh the bad in our lives
Can my soul know yours better
And silence no longer be right

Take it back a few years
Where living was making our history
Can you lend me your ears
I’ll give you my truth

Track 2, APEACE

PARIHAKA

Parihaka has come to symbolize perhaps one of the best-known instances of non-violent resistance against confiscation by Māori. Parihaka is a village located halfway between the Tasman Sea and Mount Taranaki. By the 1870s it was known as the largest and one of the most progressive communities in the country. After villagers peacefully resisted confiscation attempts by colonialists, on 5 November 1881, Parihaka was invaded by 1,500 armed colonial forces. The village was completely demolished and inhabitants were forced to leave. “The invasion was the result of a stand-off between the colonial government - with its land-usurping agencies - and the Māori people from many different tribes who were living at the settlement”.

The official Parihaka website states: “The suffering caused by the confiscation of tribal lands, the 1881 invasion, and the imprisonment of Parihaka men (some were held for up to 18 years without trial), remains a painful legacy for the community. Land claims are still unresolved. The spiritual legacy is one of living in harmony with the land and humanity. It is also a legacy of non-violent resistance and a belief in the peaceful and respectful co-existence of Māori and Pākehā.”

The community of Parihaka, which has been steadily recovering and rebuilding itself, has been hailed as “an icon of the international peace movement”.  

2 Sourced from: www.parihaka.org.nz
THE ROLE OF FOREIGN AID IN PEACEBUILDING

DR. JONATHAN MAKUWIRA

The transition from war to peacebuilding is a complex process that demands complex strategic planning. Peacebuilding implies creating security, rebuilding state institutions, developing local governance, re-establishing the rule of law, reconstructing the infrastructure, reforming education, reviving health care, protecting the environment, reviving the economy, re-integrating refugees and ex-combatants and re-establishing political dialogue and social networks. In order to revive and rebuild these, post-conflict situations need to be fully understood by all actors and should endeavour to encapsulate complex dimensions that fall within the social, political, economic and cultural arenas. A holistic approach, which focuses on short, medium and long-term benefits, should therefore be a priority. The question to be asked is: In what way(s) can foreign aid be used to benefit all sectors of society in a post-conflict situation without being part of the problem?

The question about the role of foreign aid in peacebuilding has been extensively debated. However, some fundamental issues about the dynamics of aid in post-conflict situations remain hanging. Despite the outpouring of the financial resources by bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, the impact on the ground leaves a lot to be desired. Who bears the blame when aid has not trickled down to the intended beneficiaries?

There is no doubt that foreign aid is a double-edged sword. It has good intentions as well as hidden agendas. There is great optimism that, if well managed, aid can facilitate initiatives aimed to alleviate people’s suffering and rebuild shattered communities emerging out of conflicts. Contrary to this, and very often, aid provision has to meet prescribed criteria formulated elsewhere with very little or no consultation with recipient governments. Aid, given in the name of “development”, is very political, particularly in post-conflict situations.

Obviously there is no national or international actor that can single-handedly bear the weight of peacebuilding and development. One of the major challenges of post-conflict peacebuilding and development is lack of knowledge of the root causes of the conflict. As different actors set in to provide relief and reconstruction, coordination of the activities of the various stakeholders becomes challenging. Everybody wants coordination but nobody wants to be coordinated. Even development agencies acknowledge that development creates tensions, produces gainers and losers, and changes established roles and relationships. These challenges become even more complex where such activities are undertaken in conflicts with ideological underpinning (e.g. the US invasion of Iraq), because such conflicts are driven by the ideology of “in the national interest”, which takes precedent over the welfare of the people.

In addition, there are conflicting images and discourses as to who leads the peacebuilding and development processes when donor interests and “band-aid” become the norm. Except for the popular discourses of “participation”, and “partnership building”, there appears to be no particular model (I am conscious of the uniqueness of each conflict situation that requires a unique intervention mechanism) that can be applied to post-conflict peacebuilding and development. On top of this, the neutrality of civil society actors in such situations has become questionable. Despite claiming international legitimacy to work alongside other development organisations such as the UN agencies, their primary focus may be serving their paymasters (donors).

Given that 90% of all conflicts are predominantly intra-state, great dangers arise when aid is poorly administered. One of the contentious issues in foreign aid discourse is “ownership”. Who owns aid package? Very often it is the aid agencies who dictate, under seemingly participatory processes, what needs to be done. The truth of the matter is that the recipients themselves know better and are more than capable to manage their own projects given the necessary financial and material support.

The recipients themselves know better and are more than capable to manage their own projects given the necessary financial and material support.

The question about the role of foreign aid in peacebuilding has been extensively debated. However, some fundamental issues about the dynamics of aid in post-conflict situations remain hanging. Despite the outpouring of the financial resources by bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, the impact on the ground leaves a lot to be desired. Who bears the blame when aid has not trickled down to the intended beneficiaries?

CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION, especially when external intervention is introduced, must:

1. be LOCALLY OWNED - external input is necessarily limited in impact and should concentrate mainly on supporting people or nations to resolve their own problems;
2. be NON-PARTISAN – attempts to build or preserve peace must accept that all parties have reasons for entering the conflict and have the right to have those reasons heard in a neutral environment;
3. be FULLY INCLUSIVE – promoting the values of tolerance, peaceful co-existence, human rights and respect for differences;
4. be based on a THOROUGH UNDERSTANDING of the causes of the conflict and the cultural, social, political and environmental setting in which local NGOs operate;
5. be BASED ON A PARTNERSHIP MODEL – accepting that outside intervention must be locally supported; with mutual accountability and recognition of the strengths, experience and skills brought to the process by both partners;
6. try to achieve a HOLISTIC APPROACH, addressing the full complexity of the conflict;
7. promote CAPACITY BUILDING – supporting the local partner towards self-reliance;
8. work through TRADITIONAL SYSTEMS as far as possible, while realising that these can also contribute towards the conflict – the status and mana of the systems, however, must not be undermined by the process;
9. stress the ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY – recognising that change can occur only with the support and involvement of the people and their organisations, not by military or foreign NGOs to community-based organisations, faith-based groups, trade union and other professional organisations, including the media;
10. recognise the GENDER components of conflict, especially the role of women as peace-builders in many societies, their particular experiences in conflict situations and their disproportionate representation (along with children) as the victims of conflict;
11. realise that achievement of conflict resolution may be GENERATIONAL – sometimes it is only the new generations who can learn to co-exist peacefully;
12. include an EXIT STRATEGY for the phasing out of external intervention and any other measures introduced as part of the conflict resolution process;
13. distinguish the DIFFERING ROLES OF MILITARY AND HUMANITARIAN components of the process, recognising the need for humanitarian space while sometimes needing a temporary framework of law and order, set up by military and police personnel, to create that space;
14. localise and regionalise responses to requests for support as far as possible – through establishment of national transformation networks which are linked regionally, following a principle of “NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT”, which recognises the value of resolving problems before they are allowed to escalate;
15. follow the rules of international law and abide by all relevant UN Conventions.

– Excerpted from the Council for International Development Position Paper: Conflict Transformation. For more information or for a full copy of the paper, go to www.cid.org.nz.

JUST CHANGE MAKING PLACE 17
My Personal Account of Women’s Roles in Conflict Resolution, Peace and Development in Solomon Islands

ALICE ARUHEETA

Extract from a paper presented at the Securing a Peaceful Pacific Conference, 15-17 October 2004, University of Canterbury, Christchurch

We approached Aligator Creek, east of Honiara, with a letter from Andrew Nori, Malaita Eagle Force (MEF)paramilitary spokesperson to the MEF camp eastern end of Aligator Creek, seeking their permission to cross the border to the Isatabu Freedom Movement (IFM) side to organise a meeting with them (IFM) within the next two days. We were encouraged to see the Anglican sisters manning the peace camp at Aligator Creek between IFM and MEF while the Anglican brothers took time out. Some of us went ahead and crossed the border without hearing an answer from MEF.

While on the other side with IFM, we offered a handshake to those willing the camp but they could not take it as getting in contact with a woman’s body in the role they were playing was disempowering. We met with some of the IFM leaders and chiefs. They were very welcoming. We planned a meeting to meet with them on Sunday at 2pm. We left them and crossed back across the border, said thank you to MEF camp and went back to Honiara.

From the outset, in the history of Solomon Islands (SI), conflict and peace have co-existed at all levels such as the individual, family, tribal, community and inter-Island level. Conflict resolution and peacemaking are not new concepts or new developments for women in SI, or in Melanesia for that matter. Factors within the recent civil conflict that rocked the SI and that made the situation new and unfamiliar to previous conflicts were the following:

- Militants and commanders were armed with high-powered weapons, homemade weapons, some were drunk and both militia groups were equipped with modern technology.
- Militants and commanders were clothed in army uniforms, drove around in tinted vehicles, wore dark glasses and were highly organised. I assumed someone must be providing some financial backing to them.
- The militants took the whole country hostage by taking over Honiara, the central focal point of the nation, creating a very life-threatening situation for all Honiara residents and the entire country. A lot of looting, rapes and killings and lack of law and order were observed.
- Both the militant groups used a significant number of young children who were carrying homemade guns/high-powered guns that were much bigger than themselves as militants.
- Honiara town was controlled by the militants, trying to provide law and order.

With such an environment, women’s roles in peacemaking were challenged. However, that environment did not deter us from challenging it back and taking a forefront role in facing the situation. Women residing in Honiara, representing all provinces, walks of life, ethnic groups and ages, took charge of the situation while the men were silenced and were still planning their strategies of how to deal with the situation. Women for Peace group was comprised of grassroots women who had no formal titles or tertiary qualifications, nor were they in the formal workforce, but instead survived on cash earned from marketing daily at different market outlets. These women felt the impact of the conflict much quicker than anyone else as it affected their daily livelihood. They responded immediately through the WFP activities.

Prior to taking charge of the situation, our consciences were clear. We took a neutral stand as mothers of the nation. We supported neither the MEF/paramilitary group, the IFM or the government. We were well versed with our cultural means of peacemaking, and we were equipped spiritually to face the situation. We were also armed with high-powered weapons, such as a clear conscience, neutrality, peaceful heart and love for our nation. Such weapons enabled the peaceful and non-violent parts of the conflict to prevail.

Culturally, a woman’s body, voice and words, her multiple welfare roles and her clothes are weapons of peace. Spiritually, we spent hours in prayer, singing and reading from the Bible before we would launch out to perform our different activities for the day.

We took a peaceful approach, represented and reminded the militants and commanders of their mothers, daughters, sisters and wives. We kindly asked them to come home. We reminded them that their families, their homes, their beds and their plates of food were waiting for them at home. “Why sleep out there for the cold wind and the mosquitoes? Please lay down your guns and come home”, was our simple plea and message. Each of our activities were accompanied with singing, prayers, handshake, smiles and laughter, giving of words of wisdom, food, humanitarian assistance and offering our views of alternative solutions to the conflict mainly to the leaders of the warring parties, government, churches and NGOs.

- Alice Aruheeta Pollard is a member of the Solomon Islands Women for Peace Group and is currently studying towards a PhD in Sociology at Victoria University of Wellington.

A woman’s body, voice and words, her multiple welfare roles and her clothes are weapons of peace.

Women, Peace and Security

The Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) was established in 1915 by mainly European and American women, to bring together women of different political beliefs and philosophies who are united in their determination to study, make known and help abolish the causes of war, and make the voices of women for peace heard.

The WILPF Section in Aotearoa was established in 1917, but went into recess until its reestablishment in the 1950s. We work closely with the National Council of Women, particularly in relation to CEDAW (Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women) and the recommendations from the UN Women’s Conferences, currently Beijing +10.

The rights of indigenous women and the effects of colonisation and militarism in the Pacific are major concerns for us. There is a WILPF Section in Tahiti/Polynesia, we work with the Bougainville Women for Peace and Freedom, and we also support the West Papua Solidarity movement, especially on issues relating to women and the effects of the Indonesian occupation on them.

We continue to monitor government policy and legislation on human rights, justice and military issues, and we have been very concerned about the effects of government policies in Aotearoa New Zealand especially in relation to Māori women. We made several submissions opposing the Foreshore and Seabed Bill, and we were actively involved in supporting the May 2004 Hikoi.

International WILPF has been very involved in the reform of the United Nations, working with UNIFEM and playing a key role in the passing of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 in 2000. In this part of the world we have worked on issues related to Resolution 1325 with the Australian Section of WILPF. Some of the specific issues we worked on were to use the Resolution to ask Member States of the UN to take up the case of the women in West Papua regarding the rape of the women by Indonesian military and militia. We sent documentation to the UN General Assembly, asking that they put pressure on the Indonesian Government to deal with the rapists.

We ask our governments what they are doing to implement Resolution 1325 and that other WILPF Sections urge their governments to use Resolution 1325 in their structures, electoral systems, police and judiciary.

– Joan Macdonald for WILPF Aotearoa. For more information, go to: www.converge.org.nz/pma/wilpf/

WOMEN IN PEACEBUILDING: a Case Study¹ from Bougainville, Papua New Guinea

THE LEITANA NEHAN WOMEN’S DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

The armed revolt by the Bougainville Revolutionary Army (BRA) against government troops in the late 1980s shattered the tranquil
Despite Promises, Violence Against Women Continues Unabated

The adoption of Resolution 1325 is an historic landmark, marking the first time that the UN Security Council addressed the specific role and experience of women in the context of armed conflict and post-conflict. Although not legally binding, Resolution 1325 sends a strong message to all governments, UN bodies and parties to armed conflict that special efforts must be made to protect the human rights of women and girls in conflict-related situations and to ensure a gender perspective in all activities related to peacebuilding and maintenance.

The UN itself has taken some steps toward fulfilling its obligations under Resolution 1325, but in general, across countries examined so far, there appears to be a lack of political will on the part of nearly all UN Member States and various UN bodies and agencies to apply the provisions of Resolution 1325 effectively to specific country situations. At the level of national or transitional governments, there is a similar lack of commitment and political will to implement Resolution 1325.

Amnesty International believes that the Security Council and UN system as a whole must do more to integrate the provisions of Resolution 1325 in their work, and it continues to urge the Security Council, Member States, and UN entities:

- To apply increased pressure to parties to armed conflict to cease all violations of the human rights of women and girls,
- To end impunity for genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes, including sexual and gender-based violations, and
- To conduct gender-sensitive investigations and report findings systematically to the Security Council.

– Dr. Aldijana Sisic is Campaign Director for Amnesty International New Zealand. For more information, go to: www.amnesty.org.nz.

territories on both sides in the conflict, often as the only sources of emergency assistance.

Women’s groups also took a political stand. Through prayer meetings, reconciliation ceremonies, peace marches and petitions, they alerted the international community and were a catalyst for peace. In 1996, after seven years of war, about seven hundred Bougainville women met for a week to discuss how to achieve peace, prompting many thereafter to begin working more actively for peace in their communities. Some mothers sought out their sons in the bush, helping them to re-enter village life; other women entered the jungle to negotiate with BRA leaders.

They also petitioned the government, travelling to the prime minister’s office to present a petition against the employment of mercenaries. Fifty women from Bougainville participated in meetings that led, in January 1998, to the Lincoln Peace Agreement, laying the groundwork for ceasefire, and drafted a parallel statement demanding involvement in future political processes.

After the blockade eased, attention was shifted to reconstruction, to address trauma and disruption caused by the civil war. The Leitana Nehan Women’s Development Agency initiated a two-year peacebuilding project teaching women and children about HIV/AIDS, the threats of substance abuse, and women’s rights, winning them the First Millennium Peace Prize for Women in 2001. They have also assisted more than 1400 victims of violence through counselling services, turning their attention to the scourge of domestic violence on the island.

While still vastly under-represented at the political level in the new autonomous government, the role of women and women’s groups has proven vital in community life in Bougainville, and will continue to do so.

1 This case study is an adaptation of a case study in Chapter 7, “Women: Making Peace” in the forthcoming People Building Peace II: Successful stories of civil society, a publication by the European Centre for Conflict Prevention, which will be launched in July 2005. For more information, please visit www.conflict-prevention.net
AMNESTIES, REPARATIONS AND RECONCILIATION: Kenya

Reconciling the present with the past

BRIAN BUNYAN

African wars of liberation tended to be violent, but were particularly so in Algeria, Zimbabwe and Kenya. There was some ferocity in the violence as the colonial power was attempting to develop and impose a settler population in each of them, which would lead to many atrocities being committed. The focus of this article is the current debate on reparations from the United Kingdom for its crimes during its colonial rule of Kenya. Two books have recently come out on the war of liberation in Kenya, which were able to take advantage of newly released archives and first-hand interviews to argue that the crimes and deaths during the war of liberation were far higher than previously expected.

In its brief moment on the world stage, European colonialism in Africa left a large impression, both in terms of lives and wealth lost. Human memories tend to be short, although the culture of oral history in many parts of Africa ensures that events and people are remembered. European colonialism is the child of many ideas, one of which is racism. Coupled with violence, it makes for a volatile mix. Violence is not only physical, meaning lives lost, but also emotional and psychological. Frantz Fanon wonderfully described this facet as a shattering of the psyche, because the identity of the colonised as a human being is rejected and is to be destroyed.

The term “Mau Mau” has constantly raised images of horror and midnight worship. One must give thanks to the British media for developing this image and ensuring that it remains to this day. But, research over the past few decades has done much to reverse it. The European settler world forcefully took large swathes of the best Kenyan land. The principal victims were the Kikuyu. The return of this land was the principal immediate issue that needed to be asked is how just it is to reverse a previous policy that had “closed” the reparations debate. One cannot keep opening the box of history and claiming that this or that issue had not been properly dealt with. Looking at how the post-independence period developed, one cannot help but remark that as the Kenyan government’s mishandled the reallocation of land, it is principally their responsibility to resolve the debate. There comes a time when the role of the principal actor who committed the greater majority of the atrocities is complete.

Of course, in the light of new research, this role can be re-examined, but how far back can you demand reparations? Wars make victims of all participants, including the supposed victors. Do only the former victims get reparations? Like violence, racism goes both ways, so under the cloud of colonialism with its racist undertones, the deaths of European civilians were often overlooked and forgotten, but British media would regularly focus on these deaths as African deaths were often forgotten in the Cold War era. If you dared to highlight one over the other, some would throw the accusation of racism at you.

As it is hard to put a price on human life and suffering, creating a reparation package would be close to impossible and there could arguably be a residual feeling of bitterness and lack of closure. An amnesty process, like in South Africa, would work much better, but sadly, many of the actors are dead, ill or very elderly. Recently, the new Kenyan government has been debating whether to rename a park after the freedom fighters and to set up a compensation fund for them. This debate needs to be closed quickly, because it has been almost 50 years since the end of the Mau Mau war. A recent development is the case of Maasai and Samburu women accusing British soldiers of rape during their stay and demanding compensation. We have not heard the end of this story.

- Brian Bunyan is News Editor of Peace News. Visit: www.peacenews.info – Peace News is also available at the Dev-Zone library.
THE ROAD TO PEACE: The Paradox of Reconciliation and Justice in Timor Leste  

RUTH HUBSCHER

Both the beginning and the end of the Indonesian occupation of Timor Leste were marked by a huge loss of life and destruction. In the first five years of Indonesian rule, up to a third of the country’s population died through a combination of famine, disease and wartime atrocities. Twenty-five years later and many East Timorese must have felt a sense of déjà vu. This time approximately 1,500 people were killed, a third of the population were forced to flee to refugee camps inside the Indonesian province of West Timor and the rest of the population escaped into the hills while Indonesian sponsored thugs and other Timorese men, press-ganged into joining militia groups, razed the country, destroying 70% of the territory’s buildings and infrastructure.

Three years after gaining independence, the people of Timor Leste feel torn between the need to see justice done and their desire to leave the past behind and move forward. This issue is evident from the top echelons of government, where in the world of realpolitik, reconciliation is seen as more important than justice in dealing with neighbour and former coloniser Indonesia, down to relationships between victims and former low level militia in the sucos and aldeias of Timor’s rural areas. The fine balance between reconciliation, restorative justice and formal justice remains an issue of dissatisfaction with many people, and the leadership struggle to find a balance between people’s desire for retribution and the social, political and economic need to put things behind them, mend bridges with their powerful neighbour Indonesia and face the country’s pressing social and economic needs.

The clash between these opposing needs first became apparent while the country was still under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. UN organisations involved in justice and human rights attempted to ensure that perpetrators of violence were punished, while the High Commission for Refugees and UNTAET on occasion cooperated with these same militia leaders in attempts to cajole them into allowing the 200,000 refugees to return home. Frustration with this primacy of the aims of the latter group led an association of local NGOs in 2000 to release a statement stating:

The East Timorese people also seek reconciliation between all sections of their society - but bringing the key perpetrators of war crimes to justice is an essential element of reconciliation.

The country is now independent, but the issues have by no means disappeared. The government leads a drive towards reconciliation, both at the local and the international level, with Prime Minister Mari Alkatiri asking his people to “forget the past and look to the future.” Many Timorese have accepted his rationale, and when queried about their own feelings on the period will trot out something along the lines of “Militia action is the consequence of war. Now we have reconciliation”.

In Timor Leste, there is a history of the least powerful being the victims of struggles between the more powerful. Out of Dili there is a sense of acceptance within much of the population that at least in terms of relations with Indonesia, passing up justice is a necessary price of peace. Dili’s political activists, however, are less convinced and accuse the country’s leaders of suppressing their calls for justice.

When people were massacred in Liquica church the militia came and killed many people. I’ve seen some of those people here and we have already had reconciliation. But we can’t hide our feelings - what is in our heart. It isn’t easy for the young to forget, so when there is a party, young people try to drink a lot and use the opportunity to beat them. Two days ago there was a cockfight. Two people were beaten by the youth because they had been involved in the militia in 1999. It isn’t easy for people to forget.

The biggest factor affecting the levels of violence against former militia in rural communities has been the process of the community-based restorative justice system, CAVR. While the official Timorese court system struggles to cope with the back load of cases of people accused of perpetrating serious crimes, particularly given that the most serious offenders remain safely inside Indonesia, the CAVR’s mandate only extends to low level crimes such as the destruction of property. Nonetheless, in small communities, where every day, people are faced with those who have abused them or their property, the community-based truth and reconciliation forum has provided both victims and perpetrators of low-level violence with a sense of closure to the period. Based around the traditional conflict resolution mechanism of nahe bitti boot, the greatest complaint against it has been that its mandate was not wide enough.

It would be foolish to suggest, however, that the hearings created reconciliation in a deeper sense. The anger of victims of violence lingers on. There is continued resentment that many perpetrators did not take part in the process, that many people accused of serious crimes have not been charged, and that the majority of victims have not had a voice in the process. If anything, the CAVR has allowed victims and perpetrators to reconcile themselves to their shared future. There is no question that the past will be forgiven or forgotten.

– Ruth Hubscher completed a Masters Programme in Development Studies at Massey University, her research was on the reintegration of refugees in Timor Leste. Previously Ruth has lived and worked with Karenni refugees on the Thai-Burma border.

NZAID: Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities in Indonesia

Conflict prevention and peacebuilding is a priority area for the New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) in Indonesia. NZAID partners with four local NGOs and two international NGOs to enhance conflict prevention through a variety of strategies. NZAID’s support for research by the International Crisis Group raises the intellectual discourse on the causes and solutions of conflict in Indonesia.

NZAID focuses on eastern Indonesia, and most peacebuilding projects are in the province of Maluku. One gender-focused NGO partner, however, KAPAL Perempuan, conducts peacebuilding activities across 17 provinces. Another local NGO, Bina Swadaya, builds peace between communities in Maluku through activities for youth. Activities include the joint management of a community radio station and games that emphasise similarities between the communities. NZAID is also partnering with Mercy Corps in the same province to support the return of internally displaced peoples (IDPs).

The Foundation for a Prosperous Indonesia is another NZAID partner, aiming to reduce the economic causes of conflict through the promotion of sustainable livelihoods in three of Indonesia’s eastern provinces. One programme utilises a revolving credit scheme to finance community crop and poultry farming activities. The foundation also builds community capacity in conflict mediation.

NZAID recently assisted two leading Indonesian academics in the field of conflict resolution to present a joint paper at the Sixth Biennial Conference of the Asian Association of Social Psychology from 2-5 April 2005 in Wellington. The opportunity also allowed for a network of seven Indonesian universities specialising in conflict resolution (ILMIA) to create linkages with universities in Aotearoa New Zealand.

NZAID also partners with the Indonesian Peace Institute to build peace at the village level in post-conflict areas. This NGO informs relevant ministers in the Indonesian Government on peacebuilding issues. This project has been recognised by the UN’s Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict. The UN has invited the institute to discuss the project’s success at the global conference “From Reaction to Prevention” at the UN Headquarters in New York in July 2005.

Training for Peace

JUDITH MARTIN

In missions ranging from Acheh to Timor Leste, Afghanistan to Solomon Islands, Iraq to Kosovo, New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) soldiers, sailors and airmen have racked up a range of skills and training in recent years that many people may not instinctively associate with military personnel.

Chief of Army Major General Jerry Mateparae says while his service’s main training focus is on war-fighting operations, “a residual effect of that is that we can deploy and conduct peace-support or peacekeeping operations”. In other words, to be able to keep the peace, peace has to first be established.

NZDF personnel all receive extensive training on how to protect themselves and each other, how to survive and how to continue working effectively in adverse conditions. In recent years they have seen service in most of the world’s conflict zones, ranging from the Middle East, Afghanistan and Iraq, states throughout Africa, and nations throughout the Pacific and Indonesia.

A major weapon in their arsenal - it is the one used by far the most - is their ability to talk, listen and generally relate to the different cultures and people they are dealing with. Commonly called “hearts and minds”, it is, while not a new concept, behind much of Aotearoa New Zealand’s success in helping forge peace in selected areas throughout the world.

NZDF personnel were at the forefront of negotiations in one of the Pacific’s most successful peacekeeping operations in recent years, Operation Belisi in Bougainville – no ordinary peace-support mission. Aotearoa New Zealand (and Australian) truce and peace monitors went unarmed to an island where, until only weeks before their arrival, a bitter war had been fought. The monitors originally faced deep suspicion, but used their negotiation skills, their knowledge of the Pacific way of life and their military professionalism to get alongside the various factions and persuade them to make peace.

Major Rob Te Moana, who works from Headquarters, Joint Forces New Zealand, assists in the planning and organising of training required to suit individual missions NZDF personnel undertake.

The mission’s threat level - how dangerous it is to the contingent
Possibilities for Peace in the Asia-Pacific

Feedback from the Peace, Justice and Reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific Region", International Conference at the Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (APACS), 31 March - 3 April 2005

“To merely describe the world as it is does not assist in making it better. We need intellectual effort that maps the path of positive peace.”

With this quote from an unnamed regional scholar, Greg Urwin, Secretary General of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, opened the “Peace, Justice and Reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific Region International Conference”, hosted by the Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Queensland. The quote matched the conference theme: peace and conflict resolution theory that is relevant to the region.

The conference brought together a diverse range of participants from throughout the Asia-Pacific region, as well as many coming from as far away as Belgium, England, the US and Canada. The presence of Australian Aboriginal representatives was also evident – from the first welcome to participation in panel discussions.

Austalian, New Zealand and Pacific academic institutions were also well represented but probably outnumbered by practitioners from professional associations, NGOs, and HQ and field staff from government and international agencies. Lawyers, judges and others with a justice background sat side-by-side with grassroots activists, caught in animated discussions. Kevin Clements, the director of the centre, emphasized that in organizing the conference, the centre had sought to “integrate social and political perspectives, human rights, law and order, researchers and practitioners.”

Imogen, a participant from the Cook Islands, commented, “I represent a group of sub-chiefs that are aware that the chiefly powers have been eroded by government and modernization. We need to develop a modern role that is relevant and forward looking. I am here to learn about other experiences and approaches that may be relevant for us in the Cook Islands. I hope that this will be in the form of lasting relationships.”

Over the three days of the conference several themes were developed, including development, governance and security; post-conflict reconstruction; and law reform and justice. With presentations often cut short by time, lively discussion continued out in the halls and into the dining room.

“The mix of people we have brought together reflects the practical orientation of ACPACS,” Clements explained. “In some ways more like an NGO than an academic department, we aim to integrate research and practice. Ten years from now we would like to be seen as very relevant to peace and reconciliation efforts in the region as well as having made a contribution closer to home, in the area of indigenous rights in Australia.”

This idea came up again in a plenary session entitled, “The Pacific Speaking to Australia”, which brought Pacific Island intellectual and institutional leaders together. “Invest in development today, not security tomorrow,” we were told. “Sign the Kyoto protocol before our islands have sunk!” and “Go visit the villages before you give advice and prepare policy that affects our citizens.”

A challenge was made to participants from Aotearoa New Zealand: “Before you come to us, sort out your own issues at home. At least in New Zealand you have engaged with your indigenous population, but don’t leave it unfinished if you want to maintain your credibility in the region.”

– Rendt Gorter comes from 10 years of work in international aid. He is a PhD candidate at the University of Auckland. He is interested in the social processes that underlie conflict over natural resources. Rendt is always keen to hear of relevant issues that illustrate how people and organisations adapt – or not – to changes in access to public fisheries or forestry resources. This also extends to policy consultation processes concerning environmental interaction in general, both in New Zealand and in the Asia-Pacific region. He lives on Great Barrier Island. For more information go to http://rendt.gorter.gen.nz.

and individuals undertaking the peacekeeping or peace-support operations - is the first issue considered when training planning begins.

“Then we look at the tasks our personnel are expected to perform. From there we gather as much information as possible to enable us to put together an effective training regime. The information can come from a variety of sources - databases, local knowledge and other sources”. Each mission invariably places cultural demands on deployed personnel.

“New Zealand military personnel are fortunate in that the majority appear to have a natural ability to empathise with and understand other cultures. We still provide cultural awareness training though prior to a deployment, along with a raft of other training.

“For Defence Force personnel, the last thing they want or need to do is to offend another culture during their deployment. If that were to happen they would lose the respect of the local people, and any rapport established would be lost as well. If you lose the hearts and minds of the local populace, you’re creating brick walls in the way of achieving what you set out to do”.

– Judith Martin is the Strategic Projects Editor in the NZDF Public Relations Unit.

Lawyers, judges and others with a justice background sat side-by-side with grassroots activists.
Demilitarizing the Mind: African Agendas for Peace and Security.


Reviewed by CHRISTOPHER LAMONICA

Carl von Clausewitz famously stated that war is “a continuation of politics by other means.” In the African context, where political avenues have continued to tragically fail, this statement takes on new significance; among African states “militarism” is a stubbornly recurring form of governance. Despite this reality, many Africanists continue to skirt the inconvenient issue of military takeover in favour of commenting on the prospects for democratic governance in a post-Cold War world. In Just Africa’s innovative book, Demilitarizing the Mind, edited by Alex de Waal, the complex challenges to ending the cycle of war and resulting militarism in Africa are considered with a renewed sense of urgency. At the outset, the contributors rightly attack status quo approaches to African political problems, which include commissioning consultants and/or specialists whose aim is to present conference papers. Consultants, they suggest, tend to reproduce their own viewpoints or repeatedly present the “prevailing wisdom” with little concrete impact. Similarly, specialists’ conference papers “suffer from the drawback that the ensuing discussion tends to focus on the identity of the author.” The contributors make clear at the outset that the results of these processes are wholly insufficient. In both instances, they explain, individuals that are actually involved in the affairs of African governance are systematically ignored and the more difficult, or taboo, issues avoided. For those who would tend to agree that the majority of writing on African affairs is largely a superficial affair, the question might then come to mind: Does Demilitarizing the Mind offer some hope for real and substantive analysis?

In some sense, yes: Just Africa’s methodology is refreshingly different. The chapters of the book are the result of written and oral comments made by various groups. What is especially innovative is that in all cases the contributions, particularly those related to controversial issues, are kept anonymous. In Demilitarizing the Mind, Justice Africa’s role is not to provide consultative “solutions” but to assist with the presentation of views. Their stated goals are to “stimulate thought” and to consider “what peace and security order in Africa might look like.” In an effort to encourage frankness of views, all of the book’s chapters are left unsigned. In doing so, Justice Africa intentionally sets aside the egos of scholars, African state leaders, and others, by not naming names, with the hope that this process will expose the realities behind militarism in Africa.

In some sense, no: The true strengths of the book are its methodology and organisation, but not its substance. With the methodological problem of openness of perspectives addressed, then, a note here on the book’s organisation. Justice Africa has organised the content of the book along three main lines of inquiry: First, conflict prevention, i.e. the circumstances that lead to militarism are addressed; second, war itself, i.e. the reasons why a military government once in power stays in power, and third, post-conflict circumstances, i.e. what can be done to demilitarise the parties previously involved in a conflict. Along the first lines of inquiry, the contributors contend that it is the combined problems of having weak and opaque institutions in Africa that have served as an impediment to demilitarisation. The lack of information on neighboring state action amidst an atmosphere of fear – due to, notably, news, or rumours, of neighboring state conflict - all too often leads to ‘emergency powers’ being declared, thereby justifying the use of military force. While admitting that the overlap of concerns and approaches can be quite complex, Justice Africa nevertheless does an admirable job of tackling the problems surrounding militarism in a remarkably structured fashion. Following a brief discussion of the traditional factors that contribute to military action including military factors, political factors and economic factors, a range of perspectives is considered as are the capacities of African institutions at various levels, including: the community/grassroots level, the civil society/private sector level, the national political level, the regional level, and the international level. The tabulated results are somewhat forced but the text - that includes the bulk of the book - is a refreshingly lucid read.

As the subtitle of the book suggests, then, much of the discussion centers around how things “ought to be.” And, to the extent that this is exactly what Justice Africa had in mind at the outset: To consider “African agendas for peace and security.” Specific examples of challenges faced are provided, including social mobilisation and the prevailing political cultures, but we are reminded throughout that the overall aim is to think about how militarism - “a sad reality in Africa” – can be mitigated. It appears that the underlying, if unstated, assumption of this collaborative work is that the best prospects for Demilitarizing the Mind are to be found through openness of prevailing challenges and practices; only then will matters improve, at all levels. Perhaps it is true that militarism, and war, can be avoided through improved understanding and that openness allows us to structure conflicts within existing political structures. Justice Africa, then, joins an age-long group of innovators who have challenged Clausewitz on this point: that war is simply one of many traditional ‘political options’ available.

- Christopher LaMonica, PhD, is a lecturer at Victoria University of Wellington.

RESOURCES FROM THE DEV-ZONE KNOWLEDGE CENTRE

DARFUR PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (DPADO) is a non-profit organisation seeking peace and development in Darfur, Western Sudan in Africa. Concerned about the ethnic conflict, DPADO is working to address the root causes of the conflict, analyse, design and implement appropriate techniques for conflict resolution in Darfur, and provide a framework for international, national, and human rights interventions. www.darfurpeaceanddevelopment.org

INCOME GUIDE TO INTERNET SOURCES ON TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION includes: email lists and newsgroups; news sources; academic centres, programmes and institutes; academic articles; non-governmental organisations. Most of the sources relate to South Africa, Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina, with a smaller number relating to Latin America. www.incore.ac.uk/services/cda/themes/truth.html

CONCILIATION RESOURCES (CR) serves as an international resource for local organisations pursuing peacebuilding and conflict resolution initiatives. Its principal objective is to support the sustained activities of those working at community or national levels to prevent or transform armed conflict into opportunities for social, economic and community development based on more just relationships. www.c-r.org

THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP is an independent, non-profit, multinational organisation, with over 100 staff members on five continents, working through field-based analysis and high-level advocacy to prevent and resolve deadly conflict. www.crisisgroup.org

WATChLIST ON CHILDREN AND ARMED CONFLICT works to protect the security and rights of children in specific armed conflicts. www.watchlist.org

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY AND PRACTICE OF NON-MILITARISATION AND DEMILITARISATION (APRED) works mainly on countries without armies to further promote peace, advocating demilitarisation and promoting comprehensive peace policies. APRED conducts research and does training on various themes related to peace, including peace zones, the human right to peace, conflict transformation and treaty analysis or establishing. www.demilitarisation.org

THE PEACEKEEPING BEST PRACTICES UNIT has responsibilities within the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in the areas of policy and knowledge management. It features a searchable documents library containing UN and external reports, lessons learned studies and best practices on peacekeeping. The site has a directory of organisations working in the area of peacekeeping and a calendar listing peacekeeping events around the world. http://pbpu.unib.org/pkbpu/

THE CENTRE FOR GLOBAL NONVIOLENCE aims to be a creative facilitator of research, education-training, and problem-solving leadership for non-violent global transformation. www.globalnonviolence.org
The international legal definition of genocide as described in the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide describes two important elements: the mental element (the intent to eliminate a national, ethnical, racial or religious group), and the physical element (the act of trying to make a people extinct).

In Rwanda, during four months in 1994, up to 1,000,000 Tutsi, and between 10,000 and 50,000 moderate Hutu were killed by members of the Hutu majority, in an attempt to eliminate all Tutsi people.

Today, the survivors of the genocide live in the same towns as the killers. Imagine seeing your father’s killer every day on your way to work.

Forgiveness is very important. ..if we say we’re going to kill everybody that killed somebody then everyone is dead!

Today, the survivors of the genocide live in the same towns as the killers. Imagine seeing your father’s killer every day on your way to work.


Eleven years after the genocide in Rwanda, each attempt to live together peacefully, to heal the physical and emotional wounds of Rwandan society, to address the reasons for the genocide, are expressions of intent for a peaceful future.

One of the first attempts at building peace for Rwanda was the eradication of the ethnic identity cards that had made it so easy to know who to kill during the genocide. Another step towards peace has been the legal process. It is envisaged that as people take ownership for their crimes, the genocide survivors can start to move forward.

Because so many people were involved in the killings (estimates range into the millions), trying all the suspected killers in conventional courts would take up to 100 years. Instead, most of the accused are tried in the traditional Gacaca courts. Epiphania Muteteri, whose parents and two brothers were killed in the genocide, often sees their killer in her village.

She says, “I want him to come here to my house and tell me why he did it and ask for forgiveness. I am angry that he does not come to see me, but I will go and hear his confession when he goes before the Gacaca.”

Although Rwanda has the death penalty for murderers, in the Gacaca courts, the accused killers admit to their crimes in front of Inyangamugayo (people of high moral integrity) and go free. If it is discovered the accused has lied or hidden any details, then they are sent back to prison for a 30-year term. However, the planners and architects of the genocide are still being tried through state courts or the UN-backed International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in Tanzania (which has completed only 12 cases since 1994).

Luwi Buchike, a Rwandan living in Wellington, says, “Forgiveness is very important. I think Rwanda should be a very good example. People killed each other but eventually they said we should forgive each other because if we say we’re going to kill everybody that killed somebody then everyone is dead!”

— Pania Walton is Schools Programme Officer at the Global Education Centre, Dev-Zone’s sister programme at the DRC.

1 Interviewed by Philip Gourevitch in: Philip Gourevitch, We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families, New York: Picador, 1998.
3 From an interview with the author, February 2005.
Western governments increasingly view development in impoverished nations as a key to ensuring stability and security. The Bush Administration considers development to be a core national security issue, pursuing the twin goals of military might to destroy terrorists and doing out development assistance in an attempt to win the hearts and minds of potential terrorists in the developing world. Poverty and violence are inextricably linked, thus the reasoning goes: eliminate poverty and peace will prevail. There is undoubtedly merit to this pursuit; however, despite good intentions, development is not a panacea for violence. Indeed, development in itself is neither an intrinsic good nor bad.

Nepal is currently in the midst of a nine-year-old Maoist insurgency that has claimed over 11,000 lives. Since the outbreak of violence, the Nepalese government, with the backing of the US, UK and Indian governments, has followed Washington’s two-pronged approach of military action and development aid to defeat the rebels. Development is nothing new to Nepal; international development organisations have been active in Nepal for over 40 years. However, despite the country’s planned development efforts, the basic indicators of life and economy have in most cases deteriorated or remained almost unchanged, and the past 20 years have seen poverty and food insecurity grow increasingly worse despite the presence of the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNDP, USAID and over 40,000 NGOs and INGOs. Development has done little to curb the insurgency, and an examination into development activities reveals that it may have directly contributed to it.

Development efforts can be stunted or counterproductive in countries that suffer from poor governance, high levels of corruption and extreme inequality. Nepal retains elements of a feudal society, and the caste system remains deeply entrenched in the rural areas. In conditions such as these, development funds often find their way to party supporters and elites, the result of which is the creation of deeper inequalities in resource distribution, further alienation of farmers and an escalation in the grievances of the poor. Research has shown that conflicts in Nepal escalate when development agencies enter a village setting.

The Bush Administration considers development to be a core national security issue, pursuing the twin goals of military might to destroy terrorists and doing out development assistance in an attempt to win the hearts and minds of potential terrorists in the developing world.

Vandana Shiva, an Indian physicist and ecologist, has long claimed that misguided development, what she calls “developmentatic development”, can lead to violence. She defines mal-development as a, “violation of the integrity of organic, interconnected and interdependent systems, that sets in motion a process of exploitation, inequality, injustice and violence”. In Nepal where 81% of the population make their living from agriculture and related activities, most of which is subsistence-based, rural poverty is largely an agricultural issue. External development in Nepal has generally been conducted using a positivistic, top-down decision-making framework and has resulted in the marginalisation of the needs, knowledge, experiences and traditional rights of local communities. Much of this is due to the much-hyped Theory of Himalayan Degradation which gained prominence in the 1970s and largely blamed peasants in Nepal for deteoration and decreasing soil fertility. Since that time, many of the development organisations have worked to diffuse the crisis by changing the agricultural and animal husbandry practices of Nepal’s peasants thus undermining the subsistence ecological system in which peasants are engaged in a symbiotic production relationship with their environment and domestic animals. It is now clear that the environmental degradation in Nepal is more complex and can’t be fully understood without examining the socio-economic interactions as well as development activities, market creation and the political climate.

Many Nepalese academics agree that intervention by external development organisations without a proper understanding of local systems, lack of user participation in rural development and natural resource management have directly contributed to the current conflict. The shortcomings of development programmes in Nepal are really two told. On the one hand, they view the traditional agricultural system of peasants as an anachronism and a hindrance to progress and prosperity. While on the other, as the livelihood of the substantial farmer comes under threat they are encouraged to shift to a production-based economy in order to generate income. The resulting dynamic of market mechanisms and development induced commercialisation focuses on cash crop production while pushing food crops to marginal areas. This productivity-based development has done little to address the widening gap between the rich and poor, unemployment and degradation of the natural resource base. Dr. N.S. Joshi, Senior Scientist and Policy Advisor at the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, has found that this trend has resulted in the relatively better land being used for cash crops, while staple food crops are pushed to sub-marginal holdings with low productivity, compelling the extension of crops to still more sub-marginal lands. Much of the development-induced commercialisation is a direct result of structural adjustment programmes initiated by the World Bank and the IMF in 1991. – Micah Sherman has recently relocated to NZ from the US and now works as an air quality and energy consultant in Auckland. He holds a master's degree in environmental science from Lund University in Sweden where he wrote his thesis on environmental degradation in Nepal.

**BROADER RESOURCES FROM THE DEV-ZONE KNOWLEDGE CENTRE**

**CAMPAIGN AGAINST ARMS TRADE (CAAT)** is a broad coalition of groups and individuals working to end the international arms trade. CAAT’s priorities are to: end government subsidies and support for arms exports; and exports to oppressive regimes, to countries involved in armed conflict or regions of tension, and to countries whose social welfare is threatened by arms spending, which will escalate and reduce the arms trade and lead to its eventual end. www.caat.org.uk

**INTERNATIONAL ALERT** works to help build lasting peace in countries and communities affected or threatened by violent conflict. They work through capacity building, mediation and dialogue, with regional programmes in Africa, the Caucasus and Central, South and South East Asia. They also conduct policy analysis and advocacy at government, EU and UN levels on cross-cutting issues such as business, humanitarian aid and development, gender, security and policy in relation to conflict. www.international-alert.org

**SAFERWORLD** works to identify, develop and publicise more effective approaches to preventing armed conflict. Saferworld has two research programmes: Arms and Security; Conflict Prevention. www.saferworld.org.uk

**THE COEXISTENCE INITIATIVE** seeks to catalyse a global awareness of, and commitment to, creating a world safe for difference. The Coexistence Initiative envisions a world in which coexistence is an accepted and enduring framework for human interaction, including tolerance and greater understanding between very different settlement of conflicts without recourse to violence; an end to the human tragedies of genocides, ethnicities and war. www.coexistence.net

**THE CENTER FOR ARMS CONTROL AND NON-PROLIFERATION (CAAT)** seeks the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons as a significant tool of US national security policy. The Centre covers numerous peace and security issues affected by proliferation of weapons of mass destruction including US nonproliferation programmes, national missile defence, failed and post-conflict states and irresponsible defence spending. www.armscontrolcenter.org

**CONTROL ARMS** is a campaign jointly run by Amnesty International, the International Network on Small Arms and Oxford. The flow of arms to those who openly flaunt international human rights and humanitarian laws is being ignored by many governments and companies. Guns especially have never been so easy to obtain. Their increased availability threatens life and liberty in communities and cities around the world. Including yours. www.controlarms.org

**INTERNATIONAL ACTION NETWORK ON SMALL ARMS** is a network of over 340 organisations from 71 countries working to prevent the proliferation and misuse of small arms and light weapons. The network is a wide range of organisations such as human rights groups, relief and development agencies, gun control groups, and religious and public health groups. www.sarsa.org

**DISARMAMENT EDUCATION RESOURCES** - UN DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS provides details of the United Nations Study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education, disarmament presentations, downloadable publications, as well as a history of contemporary disarmament activities on disarmament education. http://disarmament.un.org/8080/education/
PeacE

If I could change the world
I’d dismantle all the bombs
If I could change the world
I would feed all the hungry
If I could change the world
I would shelter all the homeless
If I could change the world
I would make all people free
I can not dismantle all the bombs
I can not feed all the hungry
I cannot shelter all the homeless
I can not make all people free
I can not because there is only one of me.
When I have grown and I am strong I will find many more of me,
We will dismantle all the bombs
We will feed the hungry
We will shelter all the homeless
We will make all the people free.
We will change the world
Me and my friends all together, together at last.

JoJo age 11

News from the DRC

The Development Resource Centre (DRC) has undergone many changes over the last few months. Irene To'o has left us and Bonnie Flaws has joined us permanently as our Office Administrator. While we will miss Irene’s wonderful input, we are overjoyed to have Bonnie as a permanent part of the DRC team. Our Organisational Development Manager, Valerie Williams, left us in March on maternity leave and was replaced by Marc Schrafft.

In April, DRC Director Jonquil Brooks participated in the Asia Pacific Alliance (APA) annual meeting in Bangkok. APA is a network of NGOs and donor agencies from the Pacific Rim countries, committed to forwarding the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD). The ICPD focuses on the relationships between population, environment and development. Also in April, the DRC participated in a meeting with key Pacific groups and donors, to discuss how best to improve the well-being of people in Pacific Island countries. The Pacific Island Association of NGOs (PIANGO) organised the meeting, which was held in Nadi, Suva.

The DRC has officially joined the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP) campaign, also known as Make Poverty History. This is a global campaign, mobilising people around the world to demand an end to poverty. For more details, visit www.whiteband.org. For details of the Aotearoa New Zealand Make Poverty History Campaign, visit www.makepovertyhistory.org.nz.

Peace Education

UNICEF

Civilian casualties in armed conflict has increased dramatically and is now estimated at 90% – about half are children.

UNICEF uses peace education following periods of conflict to teach children how to prevent and settle disputes without violence. Peace education helps children to learn values in a friendly and protective environment. UNICEF also helps child soldiers to settle back into their communities and build a new life.

Through peace-minded education, children and young people are given the power to bring about positive change, both locally and globally. Children learn to respect each other and say no to war.

On January 19, 1996, 23 year-old Joshua “JoJo” White was returning home with friends from work at Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School in California when he was confronted by a stranger who shot him to death. As a young man, JoJo was especially concerned with the effects that violence and inequality have on children. His parents, Naomi White and Derrel Myers, fund the JoJo White Solidarity Project, which helps to fund peace and justice programmes.

Reprinted with the permission of JoJo’s parents.