



The 'local turn' in peacebuilding: a literature review of effective and emancipatory local peacebuilding

Hanna Leonardsson & Gustav Rudd

To cite this article: Hanna Leonardsson & Gustav Rudd (2015) The 'local turn' in peacebuilding: a literature review of effective and emancipatory local peacebuilding, Third World Quarterly, 36:5, 825-839, DOI: [10.1080/01436597.2015.1029905](https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1029905)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1029905>



Published online: 08 Jun 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 246



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

The ‘local turn’ in peacebuilding: a literature review of effective and emancipatory local peacebuilding

Hanna Leonardsson* and Gustav Rudd

School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

(Received 6 March 2015; final version received 12 March 2015)

This article is a literature review of the current local turn in peacebuilding. After a short introduction on the origins of ‘the local’ in peacebuilding, it gives an overview of current research and policy debates on the issue along two different lines. First, it emphasises the local in peacebuilding as a measure to increase peacebuilding effectiveness, as explored in the literature on the benefits of decentralisation and local governments for peace, as well as in the debates on local capacity and ownership as essential parts of peacebuilding policy. Second, it focuses on the local in peacebuilding as a means of emancipation and inclusion of local agency, expressed partly through the emphasis on voices from below and partly within the critical approaches to how the local has been interpreted in peacebuilding so far, arguing for a peacebuilding that is essentially local.

Keywords: literature review; peacebuilding; statebuilding; local governance; local agency

Introduction

Discussions on ‘the local’ in relation to peacebuilding are not new. As will be seen below, the inclusion of the local context, local communities and local agencies has been emphasised in conflict resolution and conflict transformation debates for at least two decades. In addition, the UN and other international peacebuilding partners have for some time talked about local governance, local capacities and local ownership. Nevertheless, more recent analyses of the failures of peacebuilding, or of instances where the peace implemented is too shallow, too centralised or neglects the local context, have exposed the use of the local as a rhetorical tool, implemented in practice to a limited extent.¹ As a response, a current local turn in peacebuilding is starting to form, putting emphasis on ‘the local’ in terms of the local context, local agency and dealing with local partners.²

*Corresponding author. Email: hanna.leonardsson@gu.se

Despite a growing number of research and policy papers focusing on the potential and liabilities of including the local in peacebuilding processes, to our knowledge few attempts have been made to give an overview of what constitutes the local turn.³ After an initial discussion on ‘peace from below’, originating from the mid-1990s, this article aims to provide a broad overview of the forefront of the literature when it comes to two central dimensions of the current local turn. The first dimension refers to the local in peacebuilding as a means of effective peacebuilding. The literature within this approach focuses on sub-national governments as pillars in peacebuilding and statebuilding design, emphasising local ownership and local capacity building. The second dimension instead focuses on the local as a means of emancipation expressed through the emphasis on voices from below. The literature within this approach argues for the inclusion of local agency in peacebuilding and criticises the way the local has been interpreted in peacebuilding so far.

Post-cold war peacebuilding and the origins of the local

With the end of the Cold War the international community faced new security challenges of internal violence and state failure. To address these challenges, in particular the UN launched a number of peace interventions.⁴ The promotion of peace was based on liberal ideals of democracy and market economies, which were reflected in framing documents such as the UN’s *Agenda for Peace*.⁵ However, the sad failures in Somalia, Rwanda and Bosnia showed that, accompanied by a frequent lack of political will in the international community, the UN’s peace intervention toolbox – including diplomacy, peace-making, peacekeeping and peacebuilding strategies – was ill-equipped for managing intrastate conflicts.⁶ These failures were followed by criticism of the liberal constitutional order designed and implemented by the West in post-conflict contexts.⁷

In parallel the emphasis on the role of civil society, local communities and local actors in peacebuilding grew during the 1990s, nurturing the idea of ‘peace from below’. Pioneering work by, for example, Lederach argued that ‘the greatest resource for sustaining peace in the long term is always rooted in the local people and their culture’.⁸ While taking a holistic approach to peacebuilding, in which domestic actors at different societal levels as well as international actors are considered important, Lederach emphasised the visions for peace inherent among local people and the need for the international community to recognise such people as resources and not recipients in peacebuilding. Thus ‘citizen-based peace making’ should be recognised as a principal component in peacebuilding efforts.⁹ Similarly, drawing on his experiences as a mediator in the wars in former Yugoslavia, Curle suggested that the best peace-making potential is found in the communities in conflict themselves. Thus, efforts should be made to empower and develop ‘local peacemakers’ and to build on indigenous sociocultural structures and practices.¹⁰ Addressing the issue of local actors as owners and builders of peace, Rupesinghe and Fetherston argue that local actors are ‘the primary architects, owners and long-term stakeholders’ of peace,¹¹ and that peace must be produced and reproduced by the people living in a specific post-conflict context.¹² War-zone ethnographer Nordstrom similarly shows how local people and communities affected by violent conflicts use

indigenous practices to handle post-conflict situations.¹³ Boulding adds that 'each social group has developed its own strategies of conflict resolution, uniquely rooted in local culture'.¹⁴ In relation to UN peace interventions Fetherston and Nordstrom write, 'given that peacekeepers interact extensively with communities in conflict, a reorientation that integrates macro- and micro-level activity aimed at long-term transformation is necessary'.¹⁵ They conclude that third-party interventions should be 'guided by a broader definition of success that is not only deduced from the top but also articulated from local frameworks of peacebuilding'.¹⁶ Thus, the common denominator of the holistic, transformative and long-term perspective is the emphasis on a peace built on internal, domestic and local traditions as well as cultural practices. Outside actors can lend valuable support but are never more than bystanders in decisions on what type of peace is to be built.

In the early 2000s, as a response to the emerging critique of peacebuilding operations, a new generation of international peace operations emerged, offering a more robust and coherent international response to violent conflicts.¹⁷ The then UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, announced an approach to peacebuilding that emphasised the importance of building local capacity for conflict resolution. This domestic peace would be achieved through 'reformed systems of governance that are responsive to people's basic needs at the local, regional and national levels'.¹⁸ Hence, from peace interventions concerned with overseeing ceasefires, peace operations had now grown to include capacity building and promotion of governance measures meant to pave the way for the local population to own and build sustainable peace.

The new generation of peacebuilding efforts, carried out by international actors such as the UN, EU and international nongovernmental organisations (INGOs), still adheres to the notion of a liberal peace, promoting democratisation, marketisation and human rights, yet supposedly through a coherent and participatory approach.¹⁹ Despite good intentions, the new generation of peacebuilding efforts has been extensively criticised for shortcomings in implementing its liberal goals, for ignoring the societal and human consequences on the ground and for being a top-down, Western, external intervention.²⁰

Effective peacebuilding through the sub-national level

As the unsatisfactory results of peacebuilding operations became clear and the UN's new approach was announced, peacebuilding operations shifted focus to building legitimate, efficient governmental institutions that made statebuilding an intrinsic part of peacebuilding operations.²¹ Acknowledging that exclusion of local arenas by the central state inhibits state legitimacy, and that the post-conflict state is often too weak for efficient governance, arguments arose on the need to look beyond national-level governance and see the conflict-mitigating potential of sub-national governments.²² Concepts such as local governance, local capacity and local ownership became central in the now emerging peacebuilding discourse, as indicated by the increased number of references to the local in international peacebuilding policy documents.²³ In this section we explore what the local represents for a selection of policy actors and peace researchers involved in effective peacebuilding debates.

For the UN local governance is ‘a vital means for the populace to have access to government – a foundation for any state–society compact’.²⁴ By supporting local governance in peacebuilding, the UN seeks to improve service delivery, promote democratic representation and encourage conflict prevention through dialogue: ‘ideally, local governance can serve as a valve mitigating local claims for political and socio-economic power’.²⁵ Other policy actors have taken similar approaches. The UK Department of International Development (DFID) promotes local governance by supporting non-state and community actors and building bridges between society and state.²⁶ The World Bank focuses on local governments to increase efficiency in service delivery and foster dialogue between citizens and their government representatives.²⁷ Municipality organisations, such as the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, focus on local governments and their role in building effective local governance.²⁸ Klem and Frerks at the City Diplomacy project argue that supporting local governments (rooted in traditional practices or not) strengthens their position as an intermediary between the state and the citizen. This is especially important in decentralisation processes, in which local governments are central in building the ‘social local contract’ and in representing the voice of local electorates, but also in the provision of human security and public services and in fostering reconciliation between warring local groups.²⁹ For the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), support of local governance structures can provide channels for representation through political organisation and basic protection, as well as service delivery.³⁰

Although the notion that local governance and local governments are beneficial to peace is not new,³¹ recent years have seen a rise in literature exploring the connection in depth. In several studies the claim is that carefully designed and well-governed decentralisation can help achieve stability and peace by increasing legitimacy, accountability, inclusion and participation, establishing stable sub-national arenas for citizen–state interaction and bargaining, but only where the sub-national level has sufficient means and autonomy to control resources. In addition to good decentralisation design, the relationship between local and central leaders, as well as having a leadership that permits and promotes peace initiatives, is of crucial importance.³²

However, this assumed success story of decentralisation does not come uncontested. In some research the conflict-mitigating potential of decentralisation is said to fail as a result of elite capture, low levels of administrative capacity and inability to raise sufficient resources. Such deficiencies may lead to widened economic and social gaps or the allocation of resources being perceived as unfair. In addition, in some instances decentralisation is said to increase corruption and nepotism as well as competition between national and sub-national decision makers.³³

Because of the contested benefits of decentralisation, some studies have turned to assessing these claims. In a quantitative study Siegle and O’Mahony find that, when decentralisation is characterised by high degrees of legitimacy, local government control over expenditures and capacity of local governments, it does have some conflict-mitigating effects.³⁴ Correspondingly Brancati finds evidence of the positive effects of decentralisation in a study of 30 countries. Yet, whenever there is a presence of political parties pertaining to a certain

regional identity, she finds that the risk of secessionist claims rises.³⁵ Similar mixed results can be found in Bland's analysis of Guatemala, El Salvador and Colombia, where access to local political power has often fuelled the conflicts, and decentralisation reform has thus provided a hope of peace. In the case of Guatemala Bland concludes that decentralisation and participatory mechanisms at the local level was one factor contributing to halting the 36-year civil war within a larger national peace process that ended the conflict in 1996. In El Salvador decentralisation improved the transition to peace after the signing of the 1992 peace agreement ending the 12-year civil war. On the other hand, in the case of Colombia, local governance reforms were not enough to end the lengthy and still ongoing internal conflict; they may even have furthered the conflict by providing additional resources to armed groups.³⁶ Within the field of urban policy planning Bollens conducted extensive research in the cities of Jerusalem, Belfast, Johannesburg, Barcelona, the Basque country, Sarajevo and Mostar and found that local governance has yielded varying results in terms of conflict mitigation.³⁷

Based on case studies of Mauritius, Namibia, South Africa and Rwanda, Hartmann and Crawford suggest that linking decentralisation to positive outcomes on poverty and conflict is often overestimated and that instead the effect of decentralisation depends on the role leaders allow it to play.³⁸ In Sierra Leone Jackson warns that, although fully functioning local governments may hold the key to conflict mitigation and development, an emphasis on reconstructing pre-war local government structures might risk re-establishing the same conditions that led to the war in the first place.³⁹ A somewhat more positive image emerges in the studies by Brinkerhoff and Mayfield as well as by Brinkerhoff and Johnson, as they claim that local governments in Iraq have the potential to positively influence conflict, but only with the right conditions for reconstruction and peace. Applying the framework of 'good enough governance', they argue that decentralisation can be part of good enough governance that manages to promote stability in post-conflict and fragile states.⁴⁰ Exploring Cambodia's emerging local governance system, Kim et al. argue that decentralisation through the introduction of direct and indirect elections, combined with gender equality legislation, has enabled women to participate in the political space. However, their study shows that women's participation is still modest (at most 20%), and that it remains influenced by prevailing gender norms, which allow them a voice in issues considered female but restricts their impact in other policy areas.⁴¹

Menkhaus addresses post-conflict statebuilding from a bottom-up perspective by assessing local non-state arrangements in Somalia that provide typical state functions, such as governance, public security and in some instances even public services. Menkhaus argues that statebuilding in Somalia may only succeed through the construction of a 'mediated state' that builds on partnerships with already existing local informal polities.⁴² In a study of the Casamance region in Senegal Forrest puts forth similar claims as he argues that already existing sub-nationalist movements should be seen as building blocks in efforts to counteract state fragility in Africa rather than as movements to be outmanoeuvred in a statebuilding process.⁴³ Jarstad argues along the same lines, pointing to the importance of addressing the 'horizontal dilemma', which concerns the balance

between whom to include and whom to exclude in peace processes.⁴⁴ In practice, international peace builders often regard local arrangements with suspicion, arguing that their inclusion in a peacebuilding deal may end in compromised results. However, as Barnett and Zürcher argue, including them might be the only option to achieve some peace instead of no peace at all.⁴⁵

The question of what actors and levels to include in peacebuilding processes is often framed within the terminology of local capacity and local ownership in peacebuilding policies. The UN emphasises the vital link between local capacity and ownership in peacebuilding processes, arguing that ownership will remain theoretical if local actors do not have the capacity to fully engage in all phases of planning and implementation.⁴⁶ DFID and the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) suggest building on already existing local formal and informal institutions, and supporting systems that strengthen civil society and link traditional authorities with local governance structures.⁴⁷ For the World Bank local capacity is strengthened by supporting local community committees and NGOs.⁴⁸ Yet others argue that external actors should support local capacity by investing in local peace councils and traditional dispute resolution mechanisms.⁴⁹ Hayman at Peace Direct emphasises that local capacity must be regarded as ‘a central element of any strategy for managing conflict’ and that ‘what is needed is a new orthodoxy that places local capacity (far beyond the government) at the centre, gives it a leadership role, and respects its expertise and commitment’.⁵⁰ Despite differing ideas on whose capacity to support, ie local government, local communities or civil society, critics of local capacity approaches argue that such approaches often assume a non-state and traditional local that is inherently authentic and legitimate, thus circumventing the need to critically assess who this local represents.⁵¹ In addition, Chandler suggests that, in the discourse of effective peacebuilding, supporting local capacity may be seen as a way for Western advocates of liberal peace to circumvent accountability for unwanted outcomes in policy interventions.⁵² Thus, by promoting local capacity, the question of responsibility for the outcome of the peace process is effectively transferred to those intervened upon.

As seen above, although the concept of local ownership is commonly used in peacebuilding policy, it remains contested. In practice, the UN often discusses local ownership in relation to national ownership, in which civil society is seen as the local that legitimises elite-level national ownership.⁵³ This raises questions about the role of civil society, presumably operating through the grassroots in ‘locally’ owned, bottom-up peacebuilding processes, but in practice sometimes consisting of professionalised NGOs based in the capital.⁵⁴ The International Stabilization and Peacebuilding Initiative (ISPI) is concerned about the ambiguity of the concept and how problematic it is to use because of the lack of clarity concerning its definition.⁵⁵ As shown by Jarstad, this ambiguity has consequences. In Afghanistan competing mindsets of what local ownership means in terms of institution building has led to a distrust of international actors among local security actors. In addition, the diversity of security actors on the ground has led international actors to respond with strategies of co-opting a plurality of actors into security sector reform (SSR), which in turn hybridises the security sector.⁵⁶ ACCORD both uses and scrutinises local ownership. It argues that, for many IGOs, local ownership is understood as:

a process of consulting and involving locals in implementing externally designed models, where the problems or challenges have already been diagnosed by external experts and solutions found through experiences from elsewhere. Thus local ownership, in this understanding, is about how those external models should be made to fit the local context.⁵⁷

Taking a critical perspective, ACCORD argues that local ownership instead should be understood as a concept based on the capacities of local societies to create their own social institutions and take their own decisions about the future. Supporting this process may pave the way for local communities to ‘develop the resilience necessary to address and manage context specific tensions in a sustainable way’.⁵⁸ In the same vein Donais uses a consumer metaphor: ‘international actors are both the producers and marketers of the liberal-democratic product (the only product available on the market), which local actors are expected to buy, and subsequently own’.⁵⁹ Instead of this, Donais asks for an inside-out vision, where international actors should provide the space for sustainable peace to be locally produced and rooted. This may be possible if the liberal peace framework goes beyond ‘ownership as buy-in’ and instead understands ownership as:

the outcome of both negotiations and contestation, in which a range of actors, international and local alike, interact both competitively and collaboratively to define, refine, and shape understandings of what peacebuilding entails in terms of concrete outcomes, the processes by which it is enacted, and the configuration of legitimate authority over both definitions and outcomes.⁶⁰

Björkdahl and Gusic add to the critique of how local ownership is perceived and operationalised in the liberal peacebuilding discourse, pointing to its shortcomings in terms of including critical agency.⁶¹

The picture that has emerged is that the sub-national governance and local actors discussed in academic and policy circles are sometimes beneficial to peace but in other cases criticised for shortcomings and for fuelling conflict. Explaining the sometimes disappointing results of local governance, the literature urges that ‘the right ingredients, appropriate timing and some degree of experimentation’ be used to achieve success.⁶² Nevertheless, the simple reliance on the right implementation of local governance has been questioned, eg by Hughes, who argues that the good governance agenda, capacity building and local ownership rather reflect the interests of and power structures preferred by reformers. Also, good governance offers very little room for manoeuvre at the local level and still promotes a liberal peace.⁶³ The focus on local actors sustaining and rooting processes of peace, as argued by Lederach, has thus influenced international peacebuilding. However, the question remains as to the extent to which it incorporates the holistic and bottom-up approach originally advocated. As we will see, the need to leave space for local peace initiatives is an important component of the emancipatory approach to peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding through local emancipation

The emancipatory approaches to peacebuilding derive from the notion of local agency as crucial in peacebuilding. Scholars and peacebuilding actors adhering

to this approach emphasise the need to listen to the voices from below and to criticise international peacebuilding agendas for ignoring the local beyond its rhetorical inclusion in policy papers. Found within both NGO activism and academic writing, the peacebuilding-through-local-emancipation approach implies both an ambition to include local voices and a critique of what has been done so far.

NGOs such as International Alert and Friends for Peace take a bottom-up approach by acknowledging that, as in the peace process in Nepal, '[local communities] are aware of the real causes of conflict and the ways to address them'.⁶⁴ It is therefore crucial to 'understand people's perceptions of peace and their views about the basic pre-conditions for bringing sustainable peace in their communities'.⁶⁵ Thus, instead of acceding to the presumed universal notion of liberal peace, NGOs building 'peace from below' take their point of departure from local understandings of peace. This civil society peacebuilding has been studied extensively by Paffenholz, who claims that civil society contributes to peace through a supportive role. Its contributions, however, depend on the phase of the conflict, the peacebuilding process and the performance of civil society activities. Overall, her study emphasises the diversity entailed in civil society peacebuilding and the different local actors involved.⁶⁶

The inclusion of local minorities in peace negotiations is argued to play a crucial role in the termination of conflict. In the cases of Sri Lanka 2002–06 and the Philippines in 2008, Shou illustrates how the failure to include local power sharing can be attributed to the failure of the two peace negotiations, since centre–periphery relationships are multifaceted, with central and local conflicts not necessarily evolving around the same divides. In addition, the strategic use of international human rights conventions by the Lumads in the Philippine case proved important for the rights they were awarded in peace negotiations compared to those granted ethnic minorities in Sri Lanka.⁶⁷ However, despite this tactic used by some indigenous peoples, another comparative case study of Nepal, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Liberia and Sierra Leone shows that, although there have been numerous international conventions and resolutions on women's involvement in peacebuilding, eg UNSCR 1325, and although women in post-conflict settings are actively involved in peacebuilding at the local level, women are still largely excluded from national and international processes of peace.⁶⁸

A number of studies examine the role of local agency in peacebuilding processes. Studying the role of young men in post-conflict Papua New Guinea, Kent and Barnett emphasise that peace cannot be sustained without individuals choosing to sustain it and that the choice of sustaining peace largely depends on the availability of peaceful pathways as alternatives to violence.⁶⁹ In the field of transitional justice Lundy and McGovern argue that a participatory approach in the design of, decision making on, and management and implementation of the judicial process is crucial for international justice and the rule of law to be considered legitimate and, thus, sustainable in the long run.⁷⁰ In a number of case studies (eg on Nicaragua, Nepal, South Africa and Northern Ireland) Odendaal raises the possibility of local peace committees furthering peace locally in the wake of national peace agreements.⁷¹ Finally, in a study on local zones of peace in Colombia, Northern Ireland, South Africa and the

South Caucasus, Mitchell and Hancock emphasise the importance of national–local relationships in coordinating national concerns with local needs for building sustainable peace.⁷²

The effect of neglecting the local in peacebuilding is illustrated in Autesserre’s rich analysis of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).⁷³ Autesserre argues that the failure of the massive peacebuilding efforts implemented in the DRC stems from ‘internationals’ regarding local tensions and local conflict resolution as ‘unimportant, unfamiliar, and unmanageable’.⁷⁴ Thus, peacebuilding efforts have established a one-sided, top-down unsustainable peace that ignores the micro-level and is unable to handle local violence, which has continued after the national peace agreement was signed. Similar arguments are made by Kappler in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, where EU engagement with professionalised NGOs implies a loss of NGO attachment to the grassroots they are there to represent.⁷⁵

Based in real-life expressions of local agency, such as those described above, and inspired by the postcolonial thinking of Spivak on the subaltern,⁷⁶ these critiques see the local as the use of countless everyday practices that transmit critical local agency through a diversity of spheres from the very personal to the transnational level. As described by Roberts, the everyday ‘refers to the ways people make their lives the best they can, manipulating with whatever tools and tactics are at their disposal the surrounding natural, social, economic and political structures, local and global, that empower or constrain their lives’.⁷⁷ In this sense, rather than a geographical space, the local refers to the everyday acts of a diversity of individuals and communities that go beyond elites and civil society normally associated with liberal peacebuilding. This understanding of the local emphasises that peacebuilding is not a one-way project imposed from the top but is continuously changing through encounters with local agencies.⁷⁸

It is through the ignorance of these everyday events that critics of liberal peacebuilding operations argue that so far little has been achieved beyond rhetoric on local ownership and participation, and that peace implemented through international peacebuilding operations will necessarily fail because their very design rests on externalised legitimacy and norms.⁷⁹ Instead, international peacebuilding is portrayed as inconsistent, sometimes furthering violence, disempowering the population and fostering victimhood by reproducing and reinforcing societal hierarchies as well as internal divisions.⁸⁰ As illustrated by Hudson within the discourse of participation, women are stripped of their agency as political actors because, if they settle for visibility in political bodies, the need for further societal transformation is ignored.⁸¹ As already seen above, the adherence of international actors to the benign discourses of good governance, local ownership, capacity building and participation also implies renouncing their own responsibility for unsuccessful transformation on the ground.⁸²

Instead of a top-down implementation of liberal peace, it is argued that peacebuilding never exists in a vacuum, and that ‘there is no shortage of agency in most post-conflict spaces at grassroots levels’.⁸³ Similarly to Bhabha’s argument on (colonial) authority and its message constantly being subject to local adaptations,⁸⁴ local agencies in processes of peace are constantly accepting, adopting, resisting and/or mocking ambivalent and unstable foreign interventions, outcomes are redefined, and locally interpreted forms of self-sustaining

(liberal) peace are created.⁸⁵ These variations of peace are referred to as emancipatory peace,⁸⁶ hybrid peace,⁸⁷ or popular peace.⁸⁸ Importantly, there is an emphasis on *peaces*, recognising the plurality of peace since ‘hybrids are awkward, constantly changing, and difficult to describe’.⁸⁹

However, despite the criticism that the liberal peacebuilding project excludes the everyday, most scholars keep envisaging a form of liberal peace, though hybridised.⁹⁰ To address this, De Coning proposes a fundamentally different form of peacebuilding, a form that builds on the knowledge that all self-sustainable peace is context-specific, home-grown and bottom-up. Contrary to what the concepts of statebuilding and peacebuilding lead us to assume, international actors cannot *build* peace based on a universal model of transformation but can only facilitate societies to self-organise and build peace in sometimes very complex and non-linear ways.⁹¹ In a similar strand, Leeuwen et al. emphasise the need to allow for peacebuilding heterotopias that are diverse, ambiguous and sometimes uncomfortable but that create real alternatives to the single world-view portrayed through liberal peace.⁹²

Conclusion

While acknowledging the pioneering work of the ‘peace from below’ approaches that emerged in the 1990s, this article has presented a literature review of two central dimensions within the current local turn in peacebuilding. The two dimensions consist of one effective approach to local peacebuilding and one emancipatory approach to the local as peacebuilding. The two approaches present slightly different views regarding what the local is and how to address it in order to achieve peace, with the first focusing on the sub-national arena as an actor in peacebuilding and the second focusing on everyday events and the inclusion of local agencies in peacebuilding processes for varieties of peace. Nevertheless, despite being presented as separate here, it should be emphasised that in the ongoing debate on peacebuilding the two approaches continuously feed into each other. In addition, further developments in the field will need to show whether the current local turn in peacebuilding represents alternations of, or alternatives to, the liberal world-view of peacebuilding.

Notes on contributors

Hanna Leonardsson is a PhD Candidate in Peace and Development Studies at the School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg.

Gustav Rudd has an MA in Global Studies and is a research assistant in Peace and Development Studies at the School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg.

Notes

1. Brinkerhoff and Johnson, “Decentralized Local Governance”; Paris and Sisk, “Managing Contradictions”; and Richmond, *A Post-liberal Peace*.
2. Mac Ginty and Richmond, “The Local Turn,” 771–772; UNDP, *Governance for Peace*; and Donais, *Peacebuilding and Local Ownership*, 1.
3. See Mac Ginty and Richmond, “The Local Turn”, for one such overview.
4. Paris, *At War’s End*; and United Nations, *United Nations Peace Operations*.

5. Paris, *At War's End*, 19–20; and United Nations, *An Agenda for Peace*.
6. Miall, *The Peacemakers*.
7. See, for example, Bertram, “Reinventing Governments”; and Clapham, “Rwanda.”
8. Lederach, *Building Peace*, 94. See also Ramsbotham et al., *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*.
9. Lederach, *Building Peace*.
10. Curle, “New Challenges for Citizen Peacemaking”; and Woodhouse, “Adam Curle.”
11. Rupesinghe, *Conflict Transformation*, 81.
12. Fetherston, “Transformative Peacebuilding.”
13. Nordstrom, *A Different Kind of War Story*.
14. Boulding, *Cultures of Peace*, 91.
15. Fetherston and Nordstrom, “Overcoming Habitus,” 102.
16. *Ibid.*, 113.
17. United Nations, “Security Council Encourages”; United Nations, “We the Peoples”; and United Nations, *Brahimi Report*.
18. United Nations, *No Exit without Strategy*.
19. Paris, *At War's End*, 5–6.
20. Greener, “Revisiting the Politics”; Leeuwen et al., “Thinking beyond the Liberal Peace”; Mitchell, “Peace beyond Process?”; Paris, “Saving Liberal Peacebuilding”; and Lidén et al., “Liberal Peacebuilding Reconstructed.”
21. Paris and Sisk, *Managing Contradictions*.
22. Brinkerhoff, *Governance in Post-conflict Societies*, 17; and Brinkerhoff, “State Fragility and Governance.”
23. Mac Ginty and Richmond, “The Local Turn,” 771.
24. United Nations, *Peace Dividends and Beyond*, 24–25.
25. *Ibid.*, 25; and UNDP, *Governance for Peace*.
26. DFID, *Building Peaceful States*.
27. World Bank, *The State- and Peacebuilding Fund*.
28. Bush, *Building Capacity*.
29. Klem and Frerks, “How Local Governments Contribute.”
30. ACCORD, “Legitimacy and Peace Processes.”
31. Cheema and Rondinelli, *Decentralization and Development*, 16; and Lijphart, *Democracy in Plural Societies*, 41–44.
32. Bland, “Decentralization”; Brancati, “Decentralization”; Brinkerhoff, “State Fragility and Governance”; Jackson, “Who Won and Who Lost?”; Kälin, “Decentralized Governance”; and Schou and Haug, *Decentralisation*.
33. Brancati, “Decentralization”; Cheema and Rondinelli, *Decentralizing Governance*; Jackson, “Who Won and Who Lost?”; Kälin, “Decentralized Governance”; and Schou and Haug, *Decentralisation*.
34. Siegle and O’Mahony, “Decentralization and Internal Conflict.”
35. Brancati, “Decentralization.”
36. Bland, “Decentralization.”
37. Bollens, “Urban Governance at the Nationalist Divide”; Bollens, *On Narrow Ground*; and Bollens, *Urban Peace*.
38. Hartmann and Crawford, *Decentralisation in Africa*.
39. Jackson, “Chiefs, Money and Politicians.”
40. Brinkerhoff and Johnson, “Decentralized Local Governance”; and Brinkerhoff and Mayfield, “Democratic Governance in Iraq?”
41. Kim et al., *A Gendered Analysis*.
42. Menkhaus, “Governance without Government.”
43. Forrest, “Subnationalism.”
44. Jarstad, “Dilemmas of War-to-democracy Transitions.”
45. Paris and Sisk, *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding*, 35–36.
46. United Nations, *Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture*.
47. DFID, “Building Peaceful States”; and USIP, *Empowering Local Peacebuilders*.
48. World Bank, *The State- and Peacebuilding Fund*.
49. Initiative for Peace, “A Guidance for Integrating Peacebuilding”; OECD, “Improving International Support”; and United Nations, *Report of the Secretary General*.
50. Hayman, *Ripples into Waves*, 1, 9.
51. Donais, *Peacebuilding and Local Ownership*, 1–21.
52. Chandler, “Post-conflict Statebuilding,” 343.
53. United Nations, *From Rhetoric to Practice*.
54. Kappler, “Divergent Transformation.”
55. Pietz and von Carlowitz, *Ownership in Practice*.
56. Jarstad, “Unpacking the Friction,” 384–385.
57. ACCORD, “Creating and Enabling,” 6.
58. *Ibid.*, 7.

59. Donais, *Peacebuilding and Local Ownership*, 32.
60. *Ibid.*, 37.
61. Björkdahl and Gusic, "The Divided City."
62. Cheema and Rondinelli, *Decentralizing Governance*, 9. See also Kälin, "Decentralized Governance."
63. Hughes, "The Politics of Knowledge"; Hughes, "Friction," 145–146; and Kappler and Richmond, "Peacebuilding and Culture." For similar discussions within the field of development, see Hyden, "Sovereignty, Responsibility, and Accountability."
64. International Alert, *Voices from the Villages*, 1.
65. *Ibid.*, vii.
66. Paffenholz, *Civil Society and Peacebuilding*.
67. Schou, "Conflict Resolution."
68. Moosa et al., "From the Private to the Public Sphere."
69. Kent and Barnett, "Localising Peace."
70. Lundy and McGovern, "Whose Justice?"
71. Odendaal, *A Crucial Link*.
72. Mitchell and Hancock, *Local Peacebuilding*.
73. Autesserre, *The Trouble with the Congo*.
74. *Ibid.*, 11.
75. Kappler, "Divergent Transformation."
76. Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?"
77. Roberts, "Post-conflict Peacebuilding," 413.
78. Mac Ginty, *International Peacebuilding*.
79. Richmond, *A Post-liberal Peace*, 119; and Richmond, "Failed Statebuilding versus Peace Formation."
80. Pogodda, "Inconsistent Interventionism"; and Pugh, "Local Agency," 312.
81. Hudson, "A Double-edged Sword?"
82. Pugh, "Local Agency," 314.
83. Roberts, "Post-conflict Peacebuilding," 421.
84. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*. This is also seen in international development practice. See Hasselskog, "(Re)creating Local Political Legitimacy."
85. Mac Ginty, "Hybrid Peace"; Richmond and Mitchell, "Peacebuilding and Critical Forms of Agency"; Richmond, "Beyond Local Ownership"; and Richmond, *Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding*.
86. Richmond, *A Post-liberal Peace*.
87. Mac Ginty, "Hybrid Peace"; Pugh, "Local Agency"; and Wilen, "A Hybrid Peace."
88. Roberts, "Post-conflict Peacebuilding."
89. Mac Ginty, *International Peacebuilding*, 11.
90. Richmond, *Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding*, 12; and Mac Ginty and Sangera, "Hybridity in Peacebuilding." See also "McCandless and Tschirgi: Hybridity in Peacebuilding and Development."
91. de Coning, "Understanding Peacebuilding," 6.
92. Leeuwen et al., "Thinking beyond the Liberal Peace."

Bibliography

- ACCORD. "Creating an Enabling Peacebuilding Environment: How Can External Actors Contribute to Resilience?" 2014. <http://www.accord.org.za/images/downloads/brief/ACCORD-policy-practice-brief-28.pdf>.
- ACCORD. "Legitimacy and Peace Processes: From Coercion to Consent." 2014. <http://www.c-r.org/accord-project/legitimacy-and-peace-processes>.
- Autesserre, S. *The Trouble with the Congo: Local Violence and the Failure of International Peacebuilding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Bertram, E. "Reinventing Governments: The Promise and Perils of United Nations PeaceBuilding." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39, no. 3 (1995): 387–418. doi:10.1177/0022002795039003001.
- Bhabha, H. K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Björkdahl, A., and I. Gusic. "The Divided City – A Space for Frictional Peacebuilding." *Peacebuilding* 1, no. 3 (2013): 317–333. doi:10.1080/21647259.2013.813172.
- Bland, G. "Decentralization, Local Governance and Conflict Mitigation in Latin America." In *Governance in Post-conflict Societies: Rebuilding Fragile States*, edited by D. W. Brinkerhoff, 207–225. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.
- Bollens, S. *On Narrow Ground: Urban Policy and Ethnic Conflict in Jerusalem and Belfast*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.
- Bollens, S. "Urban Governance at the Nationalist Divide: Coping with Group-based Claims." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29, no. 3 (2007): 229–253. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9906.2007.00341.x.
- Bollens, S. *Urban Peace in Divided Societies: Belfast and Johannesburg*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.
- Boulding, E. *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000.
- Brancati, D. "Decentralization: Fuelling the Fire or Dampening the Flames of Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism?" *International Organization* 60, no. 3 (2006): 651–685. doi:10.1017/S002081830606019X.

- Brinkerhoff, D. W. *Governance in Post-conflict Societies: Rebuilding Fragile States*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W. "State Fragility and Governance: Conflict Mitigation and Subnational Perspectives." *Development Policy Review* 29, no. 2 (2011): 131–153. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7679.2011.00529.x.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., and R. W. Johnson. "Decentralized local Governance in Fragile States: Learning from Iraq." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 75, no. 4 (2009): 585–607. doi:10.1177/0020852309349424.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., and J. B. Mayfield. "Democratic Governance in Iraq? Progress and Perils in Reforming State-society Relations." *Public Administration and Development* 25 (2005): 59–73. doi:10.1002/pad.348.
- Bush, K. *Building Capacity for Peace and Unity: The Role of Local Government in Peacebuilding*. Ottawa, ON: Federation of Canadian Municipalities et al., 2004.
- Chandler, D. "Post-conflict Statebuilding: Governance without Government." In *Whose Peace? Critical Perspectives on the Political Economy of Peacebuilding*, edited by M. Pugh, N. Cooper, and M. Turner, 337–355. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Cheema, G. S., and D. A. Rondinelli. *Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1983.
- Cheema, G. S., and D. A. Rondinelli. eds. *Decentralizing Governance: Emerging Concepts and Practices*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2007.
- Clapham, C. "Rwanda: The Perils of Peacemaking." *Journal of Peace Research* 35, no. 2 (1998): 193–210. doi:10.1177/0022343398035002003.
- Curle, A. "New Challenges for Citizen Peacemaking." *Medicine and War* 10, no. 2 (1994): 96–105. doi:10.1080/07488009408409148.
- de Coning, C. "Understanding Peacebuilding as Essentially Local." *Stability* 2, no. 1 (2013): 1–6. doi:10.5334/sta.as.
- DFID. *Building Peaceful States and Societies*. London: DFID, 2010. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67694/Building-peaceful-states-and-societies.pdf.
- Donais, T. *Peacebuilding and Local Ownership: Post-conflict and Consensus-building*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Fetherston, B. "Transformative Peacebuilding: Peace Studies in Croatia." Paper presented at the International Studies Association annual convention, Minneapolis, March 1998.
- Fetherston, B., and C. Nordstrom. "Overcoming Habitus in Conflict Management: UN Peacekeeping and War Zone Ethnography." *Peace & Change* 20, no. 1 (1995): 94–119. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0130.1995.tb00625.x.
- Forrest, J. "Subnationalism and Post-conflict Governance: Lessons from Africa." In *Governance in Post-conflict Societies: Rebuilding Fragile States*, edited by D. W. Brinkerhoff, 226–240. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.
- Greener, B. K. "Revisiting the Politics of Post-conflict Peacebuilding: Reconciling the Liberal Agenda?" *Global Change, Peace and Security* 23, no. 3 (2011): 357–368. doi:10.1080/14781158.2011.601855.
- Hartmann, C., and G. Crawford. eds. *Decentralisation in Africa: A Pathway out of Poverty and Conflict?*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University, 2008.
- Hasselskog, M. "(Re)creating Local Political Legitimacy through Governance Intervention?" In *Beyond Democracy in Cambodia: Political Reconstruction in a Post-conflict Society*, edited by J. Öjendal and M. Lilja, 189–223. Copenhagen: NIAS Press, 2009.
- Hayman, C. *Ripples into Waves: Locally Led Peacebuilding on a National Scale*. Peace Direct and the Quaker United Nations Office, 2010. <http://www.peacedirect.org/wp-content/uploads/Ripples-into-Waves-Peace-Direct-concept-paper.pdf>.
- Hudson, H. "A Double-edged Sword of Peace? Reflections on the Tension between Representation and Protection in Gendering Liberal Peacebuilding." *International Peacekeeping* 19, no. 4 (2012): 443–460. doi:10.1080/13533312.2012.709753.
- Hughes, C. "Friction, Good Governance and the Poor: Cases from Cambodia." *International Peacekeeping* 20, no. 2 (2013): 144–158. doi:10.1080/13533312.2013.791558.
- Hughes, C. "The Politics of Knowledge: Ethnicity, Capacity and Return in Post-conflict Reconstruction Policy." *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 4 (2011): 1493–1514. doi:10.1017/s0260210511000210.
- Hydén, G. "Sovereignty, Responsibility, and Accountability: Challenges at the National Level in Africa." In *African Reckoning: A Quest for Good Governance*, edited by F. M. Deng and T. Lyons, 37–66. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1998.
- Initiative for Peace. "A Guidance for Integrating Peacebuilding into Development." 2010. <http://www.initiativeforpeacebuilding.eu/pdf/1102PeaceDevelopment.pdf>.
- International Alert. *Voices from the Villages: People's Agendas for Peace*. International Alert and Friends for Peace, 2007. http://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/publications/voices_from_the_villages_cover.pdf.
- Jackson, P. "Chiefs, Money and Politicians: Rebuilding Local Government in Post-war Sierra Leone." *Public Administration and Development* 25, no. 1 (2005): 49–58. doi:10.1002/pad.347.
- Jackson, D. "Who Won and Who Lost? The Role of Local Governments in Post-conflict Recovery." In *The Imperative of Good Local Governance*, edited by J. Öjendal and A. Dellnäs, 350–382. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2013.

- Jarstad, A. K. "Dilemmas of War-to-democracy Transitions: Theories and Concepts." In *From War to Democracy: Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*, edited by A. Jarstad and T. Sisk, 17–36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Jarstad, A. K. "Unpacking the Friction in Local Ownership of Security Sector Reform in Afghanistan." *Peacebuilding* 1, no. 3 (2013): 381–396. doi:10.1080/21647259.2013.813179.
- Kälin, W. "Decentralized Governance in Fragmented Societies: Solution or Cause of New Evils?" In *Facing Ethnic Conflicts: Toward a New Realism*, edited by A. Wimmer, R. J. Goldstone, D. L. Horowitz, U. Joras, and C. Schetter, 301–311. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004.
- Kappler, S. "Divergent Transformation and Centrifugal Peacebuilding: The EU in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *International Peacekeeping* 19, no. 5 (2012): 612–627. doi:10.1080/13533312.2012.722001.
- Kappler, S., and O. Richmond. "Peacebuilding and Culture in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Resistance or Emancipation?" *Security Dialogue* 42, no. 3 (2011): 261–278. doi:10.1177/0967010611405377.
- Kent, S., and J. Barnett. "Localising Peace: The Young Men of Bougainville's 'Crisis Generation'." *Political Geography* 31, no. 1 (2012): 34–43. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2011.09.003.
- Kim, S., J. Ojendal, N. Chhoun, and T. Ly. *A Gendered Analysis of Decentralisation Reform in Cambodia*. Working Paper Series. Phnom Penh: Cambodia Development Research Institute, 2012.
- Klem, M., and G. Frerks. "How Local Governments contribute to Peacebuilding." In *City Diplomacy*, edited by A. Musch, 47–74. Hague: VNG International, 2008.
- Lederach, J. P. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace Press, 1997.
- Leeuwen, M. V., Verkoren, W., and F. Boedeltje. "Thinking beyond the Liberal Peace: From Utopia to Heterotopias." *Acta Politica* 47, no. 3 (2012): 292–316. doi:10.1057/ap.2012.1.
- Lidén, K., R. Mac Ginty, and O. P. Richmond. "Special Issue: Liberal Peacebuilding Reconstructed." *International Peacekeeping* 16, no. 5 (2009): 587–734.
- Lijphart, A. *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Lundy, P., and M. McGovern. "Whose Justice? Rethinking Transitional Justice from the Bottom Up." *Journal of Law and Society* 35, no. 2 (2008): 265–292. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6478.2008.00438.x.
- Mac Ginty, R. "Hybrid Peace: The Interaction Between Top-down and Bottom-up Peace." *Security Dialogue* 41, no. 4 (2010): 391–412. doi:10.1177/0967010610374312.
- Mac Ginty, R. *International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance: Hybrid Forms of Peace*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Mac Ginty, R., and O. P. Richmond. "The Local Turn in PeaceBuilding: A Critical Agenda for Peace." *Third World Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (2013): 763–783. doi:10.1080/01436597.2013.800750.
- Mac Ginty, R., and G. Sanghera. "Hybridity in Peacebuilding and Development." *Journal of Peace and Development* 7, no. 2 (2013): 3–8. doi:10.1080/15423166.2012.742800.
- McCandless, E., and N. Tschirgi. "Special Issue: Hybridity in Peacebuilding and Development." *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development* 7, no. 2 (2012): 1–114.
- Menkhaus, K. "Governance without Government in Somalia: Spoilers, StateBuilding, and the Politics of Coping." *International Security* 31, no. 3 (2006): 74–106. doi:10.1162/isec.2007.31.3.74.
- Miall, H. *The Peacemakers: Peaceful Settlement of Disputes since 1945*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1992.
- Mitchell, A. "Peace beyond Process?" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 38, no. 3 (2010): 641–664. doi:10.1177/0305829810364193.
- Mitchell, C. R., and L. E. Hancock. *Local Peacebuilding and National Peace: Interaction between Grassroots and Elite Processes*. London: Continuum, 2012.
- Moosa, Z., Rahmani, M., and L. Webster. "From the Private to the Public Sphere: New Research on Women's Participation in Peacebuilding." *Gender and Development* 21, no. 3 (2013): 453–472. doi:10.1080/13552074.2013.846585.
- Nordstrom, C. *A Different Kind of War Story*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Odendaal, A. *A Crucial Link: Local Peace Committees and National Peacebuilding*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2013.
- OECD. "Improving International Support to Peace Processes." Paris, 2011. <http://www.oecd.org/development/incaf/49071359.pdf>.
- Paffenholz, T. *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: A Critical Assessment*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2010.
- Paris, R. *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Paris, R. "Saving Liberal Peacebuilding." *Review of International Studies* 36, no. 2 (2010): 337–365. doi:10.1017/S0260210510000057.
- Paris, R., and T. D. Sisk. *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis, 2009. http://ezproxy.ub.gu.se/login?url=http://www.GU.eblib.com/EBLWeb/patron?target=patron&extendedid=P_401864_0&.
- Paris, R., and T. D. Sisk. *Managing Contradictions: The Inherent Dilemmas of Postwar Statebuilding*. Vienna: International Peace Academy, 2007.
- Pietz, T., and L. von Carlowitz. *Ownership in Practice: Lessons from Liberia and Kosovo*. Osnabrück: Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung, 2012.

- Pogodda, S. "Inconsistent Interventionism in Palestine: Objectives, Narratives, and Domestic Policy-making." *Democratization* 19, no. 3 (2012): 535–552. doi:10.1080/13510347.2012.674361.
- Pugh, M. "Local Agency and Political Economies of Peacebuilding." *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 11, no. 2 (2011): 308–320. doi:10.1111/j.1399-6576.2011.01113.x.
- Ramsbotham, O., T. Woodhouse, and H. Miall. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity, 2011.
- Richmond, O. P. "Beyond Local Ownership in the Architecture of International Peacebuilding." *Ethnopolitics* 11, no. 4 (2012): 354–375. doi:10.1080/17449057.2012.697650.
- Richmond, O. P. "Failed Statebuilding versus Peace Formation." *Cooperation and Conflict* 48 (2013): 378–400. doi:10.1177/0010836713482816.
- Richmond, O. P. ed. *Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding: Critical Developments and Approaches*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Richmond, O. P. *A Post-liberal Peace*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Richmond, O. P., and A. Mitchell. "Peacebuilding and Critical Forms of Agency: From Resistance to Subsistence." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 36, no. 4 (2011): 326–344. doi:10.1177/0304375411432099.
- Roberts, D. "Post-conflict Peacebuilding, Liberal Irrelevance and the Locus of Legitimacy." *International Peacekeeping* 18, no. 4 (2011): 410–424. doi:10.1080/13533312.2011.588388.
- Rupesinghe, K. *Conflict Transformation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Schou, A. "Conflict Resolution Attempts in Self-determination Disputes: The Significance of Local Minority Groups' Concerns in the Philippines and Sri Lanka." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37, no. 2 (2014): 302–321. doi:10.1080/01419870.2012.729670.
- Schou, A., and M. Haug. *Decentralisation in Conflict and Post-conflict Situations*. NIBR Working Paper. Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research, 2005.
- Siegle, J., and P. O'Mahony. "Decentralization and Internal Conflict." In *Making Decentralization Work: Democracy, Development, and Security*, edited by E. Connerley, K. Eaton, and P. Smoke, 135–166. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2010.
- Spivak, G. C. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, 271–315. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- United Nations. *An Agenda for Peace*. 1992. http://www.unrol.org/files/A_47_277.pdf.
- United Nations. *Brahimi Report*. 2000. <http://www.unrol.org/files/brahami%20report%20peacekeeping.pdf>.
- United Nations. *No Exit without Strategy: Security Council Decision-making and the Closure or Transition of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*. 2001. <http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/PKO%20S%202001%20394.pdf>.
- United Nations. *Peace Dividends and Beyond: Contributions of Administrative and Social Services to Peacebuilding*. 2012. http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/peace_dividends.pdf.
- United Nations. *Report of the Secretary-General: Peacebuilding in the Aftermath of Conflict*. 2012. <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/SG%20report%20PB%202012.pdf>.
- United Nations. *Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture*. 2010. <http://www.un.org/ga/president/64/issues/pbc/PBCReport.pdf>.
- United Nations. *From Rhetoric to Practice: Operationalizing National Ownership in Post-conflict Peacebuilding – Workshop Report*. 2011. http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/national_ownership_report.pdf.
- United Nations. "Security Council encourages Secretary-General to explore possibility of establishing Post-conflict Peacebuilding Structures." 1998. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/1998/19981229.sc6618.html>.
- United Nations. *United Nations Peace Operations: Year in Review*. 2005. <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/publications/yir/2005/>.
- United Nations. "We The Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the Twenty-first Century." 2000. http://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/pdfs/We_The_Peoples.pdf.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Governance for Peace: Securing the Social Contract*. 2011. http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/crisis%20prevention/governance-for-peace_2011-12-15_web.pdf.pdf.
- US Institute of Peace (USIP). *Empowering Local Peacebuilders*. Washington, DC: USIP, 2012. http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/Empowering_Local_Peacebuilders-March2012_1.pdf.
- Wilen, N. "A Hybrid Peace through Locally Owned and Externally Financed SSR-DDR in Rwanda." *Third World Quarterly* 33, no. 7 (2012): 1323–1336. doi:10.1080/01436597.2012.691833.
- Woodhouse, T. "Adam Curle: Radical Peacemaker and Pioneer of Peace Studies." 2010. <http://journals.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/journal-of-conflictology/article/viewFile/vol1iss1-woodhouse/vol1iss1-woodhouse>.
- World Bank. *The State- and Peacebuilding Fund: Addressing the Unique Challenges of Fragility and Conflict*. Washington, DC: World Bank. 2011. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTLICUS/Resources/511777-1240930480694/OPCFC_fragility-brochure-final-150.pdf.