

Theoretical Approaches to Avoid Challenges in the post – Conflict Situation

Nisanka Sanjeevani Ariyaratne*

Abstract

Valuable scholastic works published the last two decades on the post-conflict reconstruction. Nevertheless, among them, some scholars introduced the term of the post-conflict as a highly controversial one. Although, there are different contradictory definitions towards to the term of post-conflict; nevertheless, this term is commonly used to identify specific characteristics and needs in the recovery context. By and large, successful post-conflict reconstruction simultaneously addressed material infrastructure development and reconciliation. The principle objective of this paper is to examine how post conflict theoretical approaches address the challenges in the post conflict context. The second objective is to understand how people perceive the post- conflict reconstruction policies in terms of their own socioeconomic, political and cultural advancement. The final objective is highlight contradictory problems of the post conflict context and various other stakeholders. The paper mainly investigates two research questions. The first research question is what are the main strategies and approaches to overcome post- conflict challenges? Subsequently the study examined what are the main factors for making the peoples dissatisfied with post conflict situations. This study presents its research findings based on qualitative research methodology. Among a wide range of qualitative research approaches, the study mainly based on interpretive approach. On account of various practical issues; scholars have made different kinds of arguments to overcome the PCR challenges. Hence, some scholars argued that more productive approaches are needed to conceptualize post-conflict context. Contemporary a number of practical approaches such as Process - Oriented Approach, Security Sector Reforms (SSR), Pinheiro Principles, Liberal Peace-Building paradigm, theory of Conflict Sensitivity, the concept of liberal peace, Conflict-Related Development Analysis (CDA), Comprehensive Approach (CA), Community-Driven Development (CDD), and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration(DDR) approaches are using to wipe out challenges and shortcomings from the post conflict context.

*Senior Lecturer, University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka. E-mail: nisanariyaratne@yahoo.com

In fact, all post-conflict societies made up specific social, economic and political challenges and these complex issues are undermining sustainable peace. Indeed, a considerable amount of empirical findings demonstrated post- conflict reconstruction is not an easy task. By and large, decline after a conflict, various internal and external actors are seeking the most appropriate resolutions to overwhelm these challenges. Nevertheless, the last three decades the PCR history demonstrates us a large number of shortcomings and unfortunately these hardships are still remaining in these countries.

Keywords: Post-conflict, Reconstruction, Approaches, Challenges.

Introduction

Valuable scholastic works published the last two decades on the post-conflict reconstruction. Nevertheless, among them, some scholars introduced the term of the post -conflict as a highly controversial one. Nkurunziza (2008) discussed two definitional problems relating to the concept (Nkurunziza, 2008). In his work, the title of “*Civil War and Post – Conflict Reconstruction in Africa,*” according to his explanation his first definitional problem is the determination of beginning post- conflict period. Nkurunziza has declared it is often impossible to decide a precise date when a conflict is supposed to have ended. Moreover, he emphasized that low-intensity hostilities may continue even after signature of a peace agreement by belligerents. Secondly, he points out the official end of a war possible to termination with a comprehensive agreement between the warring parties. Nevertheless, he explained even when such an agreement does not necessarily end all acts of violence it reduces them dramatically. He proved his second definitional problem from Burundi. Burundi ended officially when the government signed a comprehensive ceasefire agreement with the main rebel group on 29th November 2003 even if some sporadic violence by another small rebel group persisted until the middle of 2008(Nkurunziza, 2008). Jackson & Scott (2007) made a study under the title of “Local Government in Post-Conflict Environments” can also be taken at work of considerable value on this subject. They both also presented similar notion to Nkurunziza (2008) doctrine and they also accepted post- conflict is a controversial term (Paul &Scott, 2007). Their work discussed there is usually a very blurred line as to when an environment transitions from conflict to post-conflict. In addition, these two authors pointed out that, there may also be repeated transitions back and forth across that line as violence can break out at any time. They have made an attempt to verify it from Sierra Leone. Thus, they defined that there are no tidy dates that mark the beginning or the end of Sierra Leone’s conflict. Eventually, Jackson & Scott stressed that in such environments, it is often impossible to clearly identify distinct times of peace or conflict (Paul &Scott, 2007).

Similarly, above two scholarly works, Brown, *et. al* (2011) made a study under the title, “*A Typology of Post- Conflict Environments.*” They pointed out that, hostilities do not normally end abruptly, after which there is complete peace. In fact, rebellions may be an agreed “peace” but fighting often continues at a low- level or sporadically over a short period (Graham, *et. al*, 2011). Thus, they both argued that the “post-conflict” situation is not easy to define. Strand and Dahl (2010) their work titled “*Defining Conflict- Affected Countries*”, they both defined the term of “post-conflict” is difficult to conceptualize. Likewise, two authors illustrated examples of battle-related fatalities occur after the signing of a formal peace settlement or a cease-fire agreement (Håvard&Marianne,2011). Mari Fitz Duff (2003) shows her criticism the term of post- conflict. According to her argument, “we also should not use the term post-conflict. Conflicts, in fact, do not end – but they do change”(Martina, 2004). Although, there are different contradictory definitions towards to the term of post- conflict; nevertheless, this term is commonly used to identify specific characteristics and needs in the recovery context. However, in that condition reconstruction is foremost to wipe out conflict- related grievances from the recovery context. The term of Reconstruction usually identifies as a process of rebuilding material infrastructure after the civil war (Michael&Peiris, 2010). Nevertheless, a paper published by Caritas Suisse (2000) criticizes the use of the term ‘reconstruction’ and ‘rehabilitation’ because they focus primarily on repairing physical damage and suggest that the primary objective is to restore pre-war conditions.(Martina, 2004). Mari Fitzduff (2003) made a similar argument Caritas Suisse (2000) she argues that the most of today’s conflicts are sub national, and caused by the inability or the unwillingness of governments to ensure that there is a recognition of equity, exemplified through structural, political and economic issues that serve all communities equally. The consideration of reconstruction in a post-settlement stage implies going back to the past which exemplifies the every factor that created the conflict (Martina, 2004).

Theoretical Literature on Post- Conflict Reconstruction

By and large, successful post-conflict reconstruction simultaneously addressed material infrastructure development and reconciliation. Hence, some scholars argued that more productive approaches are needed to conceptualize post-conflict context. Graham Brown *et.al* (2011) has pointed out; post- conflict reconstruction should not as a period bounded one and single specific event. They have discussed a **process – oriented approach** and they have emphasized that the process - oriented approach mainly involves to achieving a range of peace milestones. According to their process- oriented approach, they suggested six peace milestones such as the cessation of hostilities and violence, signing of peace agreements, demobilization disarmament and reintegration, refugee repatriation, establishing a functioning state achieving reconciliation and

social integration, and economic recovery (Graham, et. al, 2011). However, both authors have shown less attention to solving security dilemmas in the conflict recovery context. Barbara Walter (1997) argues in her works titled “*The Critical Barrio to Civil war Settlement*”, as she indicated that security guarantees are compulsory to resolve civil wars and insecurity is the critical barriers to stable civil war settlement. In addition to that, she stressed that “security guarantees are a necessary [but] not sufficient condition for settlement (Babara,1997). Again, she (1999), made a study under the title of “*Designing Transitions from Civil War Demobilization, Democratization, and Commitments to Peace*”, she argues that, “third parties can verify compliance with the terms of demobilization and warn of a surprise attack, they can guarantee that the soldiers will be protected as they demobilize, and they can become involved if one or both sides resumes the war(Babara,1997).A recent essay, *Liberal Social Reconstruction and the Resolution of Civil Wars in Central America* by Mark Peceny and William Stanley (2001), they contributed Walter’s security dilemma argument, exemplifies **Liberal Social Reconstruction Approach**. They made an argument, the record of the last decade exhibits a more complex set of outcomes than observed during the Cold War. Moreover, Peceny and Stanley, illustrated a considerable evidence of recent conflicts, such as Bosnia and Mozambique, confirm the importance of forceful international guarantees. The other contemporary cases suggested that security guarantees are not as effective or necessary as they may have been previously. However, El Salvador and Guatemala, two of the three civil war settlements in Central America, had no international security guarantees and limited or non-existent power-sharing agreements. Yet they have been among the greatest successes of international efforts to resolve civil wars (Mark, &William, 2001). According to Liberal Social Reconstruction argument of Peceny and Stanley, non-coercive, liberal international intervention can, under some circumstances, substitute for security guarantees in helping to resolve civil wars. The three main elements of this approach are as follows:

- If local actors come to believe in liberal ideals of tolerance for diversity and the non-violent resolution of conflicts, they will be more inclined to settle their civil wars.
- The way to provide solutions to security dilemmas is to construct political institutions that limit the ability of the state to use force against its citizens.
- If the dominant groups in a civil war signal credible commitment to liberal norms and practices, potentially vulnerable groups can have reasonable confidence in their future safety, even in the absence of power sharing- or forceful external guarantees.

Even limited liberal social reconstruction can be a sufficient condition for settlement, even though not a necessary condition for civil war settlement ((Mark, &William, 2001).The United Nations see SSR as “a process of assessment, review and implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation led by national authorities and accountable security for the state and its peoples without discrimination and with full respect for human rights and the rule of law(UN,n.d).According to UN perspective of SSR, it is generally accepted that the security sector includes defense, law enforcement, corrections, and intelligence services and institutions responsible for border management, customs and civil emergencies. In (1998) Nicole Ball wrote that SSR must “integrate issues pertaining to the internal security such as police, administration of the justice, and the rule of the law with issues relating to the armed forces, the intelligence service, paramilitary forces, and the civilian institutions responsible for managing and monitoring them(Atsushi &Jan,2007). Similarly (2002) Dryland Hendrickson and Andrzej Karkoszka define SSR as “an attempt to develop a more coherent framework for reducing the risk that states weakness or failure will lead to disorder and violence. It is the transformation of security institutions so that they play an effective, legitimate and democratically accountable role in providing external and internal security for their citizens (Atsushi &Jan, 2007).

Although, UNO have a pessimistic view of SSR; nevertheless some scholars argued that implementing challenges of the SSR. Atsushi Yasutomi and Jan Carmans showed the difficulty of implementing security sector reforms in a post-conflict context is the presence and/or absence of interaction between external and local actors, namely the donor communities (international organizations and individual countries) that implement security sector reform policies in post-conflict states on the one hand; the government, parliament, judicial systems, the media and other civil society organizations of the post-conflict states on the other(Atsushi &Jan,2007)

Lauren Hutton (2010) pointed out; several challenges from Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau; such as in practice, local ownership has translated into the engagement of a narrow political elite in SSR processes, no national the interventions pursued, mismatch between formal security and justice norms and local practices and difficult to determine if SSR is truly part of the peace building agenda or if it is just being used as a means to justify and solicit support for building state security agencies (Lauren,2010).Alice Hills (2010) shows that there is very little chance that a donor-led intervention will achieve fundamental reforms within the security sector. Hills (2010) made an argument “It is difficult enough to implement democratic-style police reform in liberal democracies and post-conflict societies where there is a genuine desire

for change (Alice ,2010). Not only had that, under the SSR Justice Sector reform faced many challenges in the post - conflict backgrounds. Eight key challenges of Justice Sector are outlined by KirstiSamuels (2006) according to his analysis ; lack of coherent strategy and expertise, insufficient knowledge of how to bring about change, a general focus on form over function, emphasis on the formal legal system over informal and traditional systems, focus on short- term reforms over long term strategies, emphasis on wholesale over incremental and context determined change, insufficient attention to the need for local change agents and poorly designed insufficiently long training and legal education programs and rushed and compromised constitution-making (Kirsti ,2006).EirinMobekk (2010) raised an argument since SSR practitioners frequently follow Western definitions of civil society when seeking local counterparts, hence, it cannot be involved in SSR. Subsequently, he stressed that not always sufficiently underlined when discussing local ownership is that some insiders do not always want to include civil society; frequently, the political, military and police leadership have also worked to exclude it. Furthermore he explains that; although, on state security and justice actors are importance to succeed the SSR; however, SSR practitioners focus mainly on formal security and justice systems (Eirin,,2010). In contrast, Marina Caparini (2010) she stressed that; civil society approaches for SSR are often premised on unspoken assumptions about who or what constitutes civil society and, therefore, should or should not be engaged.(Marina, 2010).

The Gender Approach to SSR, is widely discussed (2010) by Jennifer Erin Salahub and Krista Nerland they criticized that SSR policy and practice have not effectively supported women's participation in high-level security sector decision-making processes (Jennifer,& Nerland,2010). Moreover, they comment that fewer women are trained in the security forces of their home countries; they are also less likely to be represented among the trainers, mentors and policy makers working on SSR issues in conflict-affected states (Jennifer, & Nerland, 2010) Subsequently, their argument was “without broadening the access of women and other marginalized groups to channels of influence over SSR and gender programming, it is difficult to destabilize narrow conceptions of national ownership that dominate the discourse on reform”(Jennifer,& Nerland,2010). Nicholas Galletti and Michael Wodzicki (2010) argued that human rights should be at the forefront of SSR efforts (Nicholas& Michael, 2010). Although, human rights are foremost in the SSR, Nicholas Galletti and Michael Wodzicki demonstrated three primary challenges when human rights include to SSR. As they discuss the first challenge to applying a human rights framework to SSR is political. The second challenge is security sector that respects and protects human rights is the lack of accountability and the third major challenge to

implementing a human rights approach to SSR relates to the respect for economic, social and cultural rights((Nicholas& Michael, 2010). William A. Byrd (2010) shows a number of basic linkages and principles relating to the financial dimension of SSR. He declared that financial issues, and, in particular, the unsustainable fiscal sustainability not gain fruitful results from the SSR practices (William, 2010).

Alex Martin and Peter Wilson (2010) argues that SSR should still involve capacity building and technical assistance, even as political change is handled in a more sophisticated way, and that it is precisely the capacity-building element that creates a demand for the private sector to be involved in SSR (Alex & Wilson, 2010). Jeffrey Isima, (2010) identified coordination and sequencing two essential tools for successful reform of national security systems. Nevertheless, he emphasized that the failure or inability to overcome the difficulties of coordination and sequencing will generate setbacks to achieving the holistic vision of SSR.(Jeffrey, 2010). In fact, Pinheiro Principles claims generally pertain to the notion that a property restitution process can enhance the rule of law in a post-conflict society. Thus, proponents of property restitution link the remedy with promoting post-war peace and reconciliation and bolstering economic and social stability (State.gov, 2009). The Pinheiro Principles are the culmination of more than a decade of international and local activities in support of the emerging right to housing and property restitution as a core remedy to displacement.(State.gov, 2009). However, Megan J. Ballard (2010) shows two basic limitations of those Principles. According to him, the first limitation is it may fail without strengthen the rule of law and increase the prospects for sustainable peace. Second, the process itself may preclude limited the potential for reconciliation and restorative justice (Megan, 2010). In the present context, Liberal Peace-Building paradigm experimented to establish sustainable peace in post-conflict states. The concept of liberal peace was firstly introduced by Kant in the late 18th century. The Liberal Peace thesis has a central position in liberalism theory and is driven by the notions of interdependence and democracy (Zenonas ,2012). The liberal peace-building paradigm assumes that the threefold transformation to peace, democracy and market economy is a self-strengthening process leading to sustainable development. Roland Paris 2010 argues, “Pro-liberalization rhetoric that dominated the peace building discourse in the early-to-mid-1990s when democratization and marketization were portrayed as almost magical formulas for peace in war-torn states (Roland, 2010). Moreover, “hyper-critical” school scholars made the argument to the Liberal peace building paradigm, they show problematic assumptions and contradictions within the model itself and its claims of the specifying effects of the democratization and marketization (Tadjbakhsh,,(2011). By and large, liberal peace-building paradigm advocates less liberal frameworks of intervention, with less attention to the reconstruction of

sovereign states, democracy and the free market (Chandler,2010).These critics argue against the liberal peace approach on the basis that it is unsuitable in the context of post-conflict states and situations of state failure.

The theory of “conflict sensitivity” it holds that it is necessary for the intervention in countries in tension or armed conflict to adopt a “sensitive view” of the context and thus avoid having a negative impact on the degree of violence in the country through a series of tools and resources (Prandi,,2010). Mary Anderson’s Do No Harm’ (DNH) work made a significant contribution to debate of the conflict sensitivity. According to Mary Anderson the DNH is “to learn more about how assistance that is given in conflict settings interacts with the conflicts (Anderson, 2004). Anderson proposes Seven-Step Approach to assistance programming in the context of violent conflict (Anderson, 2004).

- a.) Understanding the context of conflict
- b.) Analyze (identify and unpack) dividers and sources of tension
- c.) Analyze (identify and unpack) connectors and LCPs (Local Capabilities for Peace)
- d.) Analyze - identify and unpack - the assistance project
- e.) Analyze the assistance programme’s impact on the context of conflict through Resource Transfers (RTs) and Implicit Ethical Messages (IEMs)
- f.) Generate programming options
- g.) Test options and redesign programme

By and large, the central message of Anderson’s work is donors must sensitive to an effective contribution to state building and donors need to develop a deeper knowledge of the history and diversity of a country (oecd.org,2014). Along the same lines, Goodhand (2006), provided significant insight to the conflict-sensitive approaches. Goodhand proposes three different kinds of approaches to international interventions in contexts of tension or armed conflict (Prandi,. 2010).

- a) Intervention around the conflict: Affecting different realms of peace-building (such as activity in the primary, secondary or tertiary sector) without taking into account the context of tension or armed conflict.
- b) Intervention in the conflict: Affecting different realms of peace-building (such as development or humanitarian action),
- c) Intervention on the conflict: Affecting realms of peace-building in order to act on the causes or consequences directly related to the situation of tension or armed conflict ((Prandi,. 2010).

The Conflict-Related Development Analysis (CDA), is an analytical tool targeted at UNDP practitioners and other development agencies working in conflict prone and affected situations. This CDA approach mainly considers as a practical tool to better understand the linkages between development and conflict, with a view of increasing the impact of the development conflict (Undp,org, 2003) . The CDA methodology constructed based on a set of key assumptions;

- a.) Each conflict is unique so that analysis needs to be conflict-specific.
- b.) Conflicts arise from sets of interconnected and interconnected causes of violent conflict
- c.) Some actors may have an interest in promoting and driving conflict.
- d.) Development can be a cause of violence conflict, as well as a part of the response to address it.
- e.) Development agencies should aim at ‘doing no harm
- f.) Development agencies should maximize their impact on conflict (Undp,org, 2003)

The Comprehensive Approach (CA), is beneficial to all levels of crisis management: strategic, operational and tactical. Moreover, CA special attention paid to linking security and development together in fragile states and taking the local population and authorities increasingly into consideration in the field (Rintakoski, &Autti, 2008). Contemporary, CA adopted atthe multinational level by United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Likewise, based on CA principles; The EU has developed its concept to Emergency and Crisis Coordination Arrangements (CCA). At present, NATO is focusing on developing the Comprehensive Approach as an operational concept based on its Effect-based Approach to Operations (EBAO).The OSCE works within three dimensions of security: the politico-military, the economic-environmental, and the human dimension. All three dimensions carry equal weight, are embedded in all activities (Rintakoski, &Autti, 2008). However, Comprehensive Approach Seminar in 2008 pointed out, it particular challenge such as hard to communicate with other high-impact actors, resource-intensive and time- consuming, and it may be inefficient to organize meetings with a very large number of different actors participating and voicing their opinions (Rintakoski, &Autti, 2008).

Meanwhile, some scholars argued that the most of theoretical approaches for post- conflict reconstruction are gender blindness. They suggested that a wide range of activities requires to gender perspectives

include into post-conflict reconstruction. As Bouta (2005), explained that “adoption of Community-Driven Development (CDD) approaches to post-conflict reconstruction can encourage more gender-balanced representation in local decision-making processes”(Tsjeard, *et. al.* 2005).Richards et al. (2004) included their contribution to the CDD and they demonstrated four main practical threats of CDD (Richards,. et.al, 2004).

- a.) Communities decide priorities undemocratically, or there is political partiality in the project selection process.
- b.) Old NGO fraud becomes new CBO fraud
- c.) Village people do not know their rights,
- d.) There is a lack of basic capacity to handle direct community financing, including low levels of literacy and numeracy(Richards,. et.al, 2004)

Some scholars argued that a number of different approaches used for the assessment of needs in post- conflict Societies. However, none of the assessments analyzed covered all those necessary elements in combination. To filling that gap, the UN considers the DDR (Integrated disarmament, demobilization and reintegration) is a multidimensional approach to peace building and reconstruction in post-conflict societies. The UN sees the DDR as an early step in a series of peace-building processes. The DDR focuses on the immediate management of people previously associated with armed forces and groups; lays the groundwork for safeguarding and sustaining the communities in which these individuals can live as law-abiding citizens; and builds national capacity for long-term peace, security and development (Unddr.org, 2006). Whereas Lois Bruthus (2004) critics the DDR from Liberian experience. He stressed that “the DDR framework faced problems of coherence regarding both the overall economic convergence and its social consequences for regional development (Bruthus, 2004).

Conclusion

In fact, all post -conflict societies made up specific social, economic and political challenges and these complex issues are undermining sustainable peace. Indeed, a considerable amount of empirical findings demonstrated post- conflict reconstruction is not an easy task. By and large, decline after a conflict, various internal and external actors are seeking the most appropriate resolutions to overwhelm these challenges. Nevertheless, last three decades the PCR history illustrates us a large number of shortcomings still are remaining in these countries. On account of various practical issues; scholars have made different kinds of arguments to overcome the PCR challenges.

References

- Anderson, M.B. (2004). *Do No Harm*”, *Reflection on the impacts of international assistance provided to the occupied Palestinian territories*. Cambridge, CDA collaborative learning projects.
- Alex, Martin and Peter, W. (2010). The role of the private sector in security sector reform. In: Mark S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform*(p.315-326). Canada: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Alice ,H. (2010). Learning the Hard Way: Implementation SSR in Africa’s Post Authoritarian State. In: Mark S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform*(pp..177-191.).Canada:The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Atsushi, Y. and Jan, C. (2007).Security sector reform (SSR) in post-conflict states: challenges of local ownership, *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies*, (pp. 100-127)
- Barbara,. F. W. (1997).The critical barrier to civil war settlement. *International Organization*, 51, p. 362.
- Barbara, F. W. (1999). Designing transitions from civil war: demobilization, democratization, and commitments to Peace,*International Security*, .24, p. 137.
- Bruthus,L.(2004).*The Stockholm initiative on DDR*. Retrieved from. <http://www.government.se/content/1/c6/06/53/96/34e491ae.pdf>.
- Chandler,,D. (2010). The uncritical critique of ‘liberalpeace. *Review of International Studies*. 36, pp.137-138.
- Eirin, M. (2010). Security sector reform and the challenges of ownership. In: Mark S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform*(pp.220-243.). Canada: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Graham, B.et. al.(2011). *A Typology of post-conflict environments*.Retrieved from<https://soc.kuleuven.be/web/files/12/80/wp01.pdf>
- Håvard, S. and Marianne, D. (2011). *Defining conflict-affected countries*, Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report.Retrieved from,<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001907/190711e.pdf>
- Jeffrey, I. (2010). Scaling the hurdle or muddling through coordination and sequencing implementation of security sector reform in Africa. In: Mark, S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform*.(pp.327-336). Canada:The Centre for International Governance Innovation.

- Jennifer, E.,S., and Nerland,K.(2010) .Just add gender? challenges to meaningful integration gender in SSR policy and practice. Africa.In: Mark, S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform* (p.263-280.). Canada: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Kirsti S.(2006). *Rule of Law Reform in Post-Conflict Countries: Operational Initiatives and Lessons Learnt*. Washington DC,USS: 2The World Bank.
- Lauren, H. (2010). Following the yellow brick road? Current and future challenges for security sector reform in Africa. In: Mark, S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform*(pp.192-. 207).Canada: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Marina, C. (2010). Civil society and the future of security sector reform. In: Mark S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform* (p.p.244-262). Canada: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Mark, P. andWilliam, S. .(2001). Liberal social reconstruction and the resolution of civil wars in Central America. *International Organization*, 55, pp. 149-182.
- Martina, F. (2004). *Recovering from violent conflict: regeneration and re-Integration as elements building*.Retrieved fromhttp://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Handbook/Articles/fischer_handbook.pdf
- Megan J. B. (2010). Post-conflict Property restitution: flawed legal and theoretical foundation. , *Berkeley Journal*,,28, pp. 489-490.
- Michael, S. andPeiris, P.(2010). Reconstruction challenges in Sri Lanka. In: Herath,D. et.al (eds.). *Post- war reconstruction in Sri Lanka: prospects and challenges* (pp 25-32.). Sri Lanka: International Center for Ethnic Studies.
- Nicholas, G. and Michael, W. (2010) . Securing human rights: shifting the security sector reform.In: Mark S.(Ed.), *The future of security sector reform* (pp..281-300.). Canada: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Nkurunziza,J, D.,(2008). *Civil war and post conflict reconstruction in Africa*. Paper presented at theUnited Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from<http://www.afdb.org/fileadm>
- oecd.org,(2014). *Do No Harm: international support for state building*. Retrieved from<http://www.oecd.org/dac/incaf/44409926.pdf>,.
- Prandi,,M. (2010). From armed conflicts to peace-building. In :Prandi, M. and Lozano,J.M.(Eds.) ,*CSR in conflict and post-conflict environments: from risk management to value creation* (p.28).Barcelona , Roman Liull University.

- Paul, J. and Scott, Z. (2007). Challenges for improving local decision making and service Delivery Capacities. Paper presented at the Workshop on Local Government in Post-Conflict situations, University of Birmingham, UK. Retrieved from <http://www.capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/.../7->
- Richards, P. et al. (2004). *Social capital and survival: prospects for community-driven development in post-conflict Sierra Leone*. Washington DC, The World Bank.
- Rintakoski, K. and Autti, M. (2008, June). *Comprehensive approach: trends, challenges and possibilities for cooperation in crisis prevention and management*. Paper presented at the Comprehensive Approach Seminar, Finland, Ministry of Defence. Retrieved from <http://www.defmin.fi/files/1316>.
- Roland, P. (2010) *Saving building liberal peace*. Retrieved from http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Saving_Liberal_Peacebuilding_FIN_AL.pdf
- State.gov, (2009). *The pinheiro Principles, United Nations principles on housing and property restitution for refugees and displaced person*. Retrieved from <http://2001-2009.state.gov/documents/organization/99774.pdf>,
- Tadjbakhsh, S. (2011). Liberal peace in dispute. In: Tadjbakhsh, S. (Ed.), *Rethinking the liberal peace: external models and local alternatives*. (p.05). New York, Routledge.
- Tsjeard, B. et al. (2005). *Gender, conflict, and development*, Washington DC, the World Bank.
- Undp.org. (2003). *Conflict related development analysis (CDA)*. Retrieved from <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/documents/cpr/documents/pr>
- Un.org. (n.d). *SSR perspectives*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/events/peacekeepersday/pdf/securityreform.pdf>,
- Un.Org. (2006.) *The UN approach to DDR*. Retrieved from <http://www.unddr.org/uploads>,
- William, A. B. (2010), The final dimension of security sector reform. In: Mark S. (Ed.), *The future of security sector reform*. (Pp.301-313.). Canada: The Centre for International Governance Innovation
- Zenonas, T. (2012). *Liberal peace and peace-Building: another critique*. Retrieved from <http://thegwpost.com/2012/06/02/liberal-peace-and-peace-building-another-critique/>,